



the Book
of the Discipline

I.B. HORNER

Sacred Books of the Buddhists
VOLUMES X, XI, XIII, XIV, XX, XXV

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE

VINAYAPITAKAM

Translated by

I.B. HORNER, M.A.

FELLOW AND ASSOCIATE OF NEWNHAM COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

Supplementary translation by

BHIKKHU BRAHMALI

Originally published by

PALI TEXT SOCIETY

This edition prepared by

BHIKKHU SUJATO for SUTTA CENTRAL

Main Contents

I	The Analysis of Monks' Rules (<i>Bhikkhuvibhaṅga</i>)	1
II	The Analysis of Nuns' Rules (<i>Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga</i>)	1049
III	Khandhaka	1337

Volume I

The Analysis of Monks' Rules (*Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*)

Contents of Volume I

Translator's Introduction	17
Editorial Note	68
Preface to the SuttaCentral Edition	70
Abbreviations	75
The translation of the <i>Pārājika</i> rules	77
Structural changes	78
Variant numbering for <i>bhikkhunī</i> rules	80
Semantic markup	81
Formats	83
Monks' Expulsion (<i>Pārājika</i>) 1	84
The origin of the Vinaya	84
Origin story	100
First sub-story	100
First preliminary ruling	112
Second sub-story	112
Second preliminary ruling	113
Third sub-story	114
Final ruling	115
Definitions	115
Permutations	121
Permutations part 1	121
Summary	121
Exposition part 1	121

Exposition part 2	121
Permutations part 2	124
Non-offence clause	124
Case rulings	125
Case details	125
Monks' Expulsion (Pārājika) 2	137
Origin story	137
First sub-story	137
Preliminary ruling	143
Second sub-story	143
Final ruling	144
Definitions	144
Permutations	146
Permutations part 1	146
Summary	146
Exposition	147
Permutations part 2	159
Permutations part 3	160
Non-offence clause	162
Case rulings	163
Case details	163
Monks' Expulsion (Pārājika) 3	185
Origin story	185
First sub-story	185
Preliminary ruling	191
Second sub-story	191
Final ruling	193
Definitions	193
Permutations	195
Summary	195
Exposition	196
Non-offence clause	203
Case rulings	203

Case details	204
Monks' Expulsion (Pārājika) 4	218
Origin story	218
First sub-story	218
Preliminary ruling	223
Second sub-story	223
Final ruling	224
Definitions	224
Permutations	226
Summary	226
Definitions	227
Exposition	228
Non-offence clause	238
Case rulings	238
Case details, part 1	239
Case details, part 2	247
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 1	257
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 2	264
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 3	280
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 4	288
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 5	294
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 6	311
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 7	330
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 8	335
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 9	351
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 10	358
Monks' Formal Meeting (Saṅghādisesa) 11	365

Monks' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 12	369
Monks' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 13	374
Monks' Undetermined (<i>Aniyata</i>) 1	388
Monks' Undetermined (<i>Aniyata</i>) 2	394
Translator's Introduction	399
The <i>Nissaggiya</i> Group	401
The <i>Pācittiya</i> Group (Nos. 1–60)	417
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 1	444
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 2	453
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 3	463
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 4	469
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 5	474
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 6	480
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 7	487
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 8	490
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 9	494
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 10	498
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 11	506
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 12	509
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 13	511
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 14	514
Monks' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 15	518

Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 16	524
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 17	528
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 18	533
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 19	538
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 20	541
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 21	545
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 22	549
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 23	556
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 24	564
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 25	568
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 26	571
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 27	574
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 28	580
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 29	585
Monks' Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) 30	589
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 1	593
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 2	600
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 3	614
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 4	618
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 5	621
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 6	625

Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 7	630
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 8	635
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 9	646
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 10	650
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 11	653
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 12	657
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 13	661
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 14	664
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 15	669
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 16	672
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 17	675
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 18	679
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 19	682
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 20	686
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 21	688
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 22	697
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 23	700
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 24	703
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 25	706
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 26	709
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 27	712

Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 28	716
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 29	719
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 30	724
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 31	727
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 32	730
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 33	738
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 34	744
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 35	749
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 36	754
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 37	757
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 38	760
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 39	763
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 40	766
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 41	769
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 42	773
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 43	776
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 44	779
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 45	782
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 46	784
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 47	790
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 48	795

Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 49	798
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 50	800
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 51	803
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 52	808
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 53	810
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 54	813
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 55	816
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 56	818
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 57	821
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 58	826
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 59	830
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 60	833
Translator's Introduction	836
The Monks' Pācittiya Group (Bu-Pc.61–Bu-Pc.92)	836
The <i>Sekhiyas</i>	857
Nuns' Pātimokkha Rules	859
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 61	887
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 62	889
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 63	891
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 64	894
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 65	897
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 66	902

Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 67	905
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 68	908
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 69	914
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 70	917
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 71	922
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 72	926
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 73	929
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 74	933
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 75	935
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 76	937
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 77	939
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 78	942
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 79	945
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 80	948
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 81	951
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 82	954
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 83	957
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 84	964
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 85	969
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 86	974
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 87	977

Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 88	979
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 89	981
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 90	984
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 91	986
Monks' Expiation (Pācittiya) 92	987
Monks' Confession (Pāṭidesaniya) 1	990
Monks' Confession (Pāṭidesaniya) 2	994
Monks' Confession (Pāṭidesaniya) 3	997
Monks' Confession (Pāṭidesaniya) 4	1002
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 1	1007
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 2	1008
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 3 & 4	1008
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 5 & 6	1009
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 7 & 8	1009
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 9 & 10	1010
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 11 & 12	1011
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 13 & 14	1011
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 15 & 16	1012
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 17 & 18	1012
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 19 & 20	1013
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 21 & 22	1013

Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 23 & 24	1014
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 25	1014
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 26	1015
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 27	1015
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 28	1016
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 29	1016
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 30	1017
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 31	1017
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 32	1018
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 33	1018
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 34	1019
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 35	1019
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 36	1020
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 37	1021
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 38	1022
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 39	1023
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 40	1023
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 41	1024
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 42	1024
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 43	1025
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 44	1025

Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 45	1026
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 46	1026
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 47	1027
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 48	1027
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 49	1028
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 50	1028
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 51	1028
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 52	1029
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 53	1030
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 54	1030
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 55	1030
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 56	1031
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 57	1032
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 58	1034
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 59	1034
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 60	1035
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 61	1035
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 62	1036
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 63	1036
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 64	1037
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 65	1037

Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 66	1038
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 67	1038
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 68	1039
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 69	1039
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 70	1042
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 71	1042
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 72	1043
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 73	1043
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 74	1043
Monks' Training (Sekhiya) 75	1044
Monks' Deciding of Legal Questions	1046
Monks' Conclusion	1048

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

BD 1.v

The present translation of the Vinaya-Piṭaka is based upon Hermann Oldenberg's extremely careful edition of the Pali text of the Vinaya-Piṭaka, published in five volumes in the years 1879-1883. In the Introduction to Volume I of his edition, Oldenberg wrote (p. x) that he had been compelled to relinquish his original intention of adding a complete translation to the text. But in the years 1881, 1882, 1885 T.W. RHYS DAVIDS and OLDENBERG collaborated in the production of a partial translation, called *Vinaya Texts*, published in the *Sacred Books of the East Series* (Volumes XIII, XVII, XX) in three volumes.

The detailed handling, exposition and analysis of many important, interesting, difficult and obscure points make of *Vinaya Texts* a work of remarkable scholarship. In addition, the erudition of one who had had opportunities of investigating contemporary monasticism in Ceylon has been bestowed upon it. Indeed, Rhys Davids' and Oldenberg's translation can admit of supplement in only two respects, while in all others I am aware that my attempt at a critical translation compares but unfavourably with theirs.

In the first place, what is now needed, both for its own sake and in order to bring the Vinaya into line with, at least, the Sutta-Piṭaka, is a complete, as against a partial translation into English. This is one of the two respects in which *Vinaya Texts* can be supplemented. Secondly, our knowledge of various aspects of Buddhism has doubtless increased during the fifty-two years which separate the appearance of Volume III of *Vinaya Texts* and the appearance of Volume I of *The Book of the Discipline*. During this time the Pali Text Society has been founded, and has published all the Pali Canonical "books," practically

all the Commentaries and other post-Canonical “books”, together with a considerable number of translations, not to mention a Dictionary. This mass of material, not available to the original translators of the Vinaya, has made possible a comparison of passages, phrases and words occurring in scattered parts of the Canon, so that now a more definite and perhaps less tentative interpretation of the significance of some of them, as they appear in the Vinaya, can be presented. This is the second way in which *Vinaya Texts* can be supplemented. It is only by discovering what words and phrases signify in passages other than those with which one is at the moment concerned, that the general, and even the exceptional, meaning of those same words and phrases can be more or less accurately gauged. I have considered it desirable, in the light of the knowledge made accessible during the last fifty years by the issues of the Pali Text Society and certain books on Early Buddhism, to revise and remould some of the renderings in *Vinaya Texts*. Even so, one cannot fail to be impressed by the vision of the original translators, whose interpretations, sometimes no more than leaps in the dark, have often proved successful and unimpeachable.

There is reason to suspect that some words and phrases are peculiar to the Vinaya, or have a special connotation in it, but there can be no certainty upon this point, until the Concordance, which is being compiled under the auspices of Mrs. Rhys Davids, is brought to completion.

Since the study of Early Buddhism is admittedly still in its infancy, many of the rich and variegated treasures of its storehouse as yet await investigation. Hence, I am fully aware that *The Book of the Discipline* is nothing more than an interim translation, needed for the reasons given above, but in no way claiming to be final and definitive.

The word *vinaya* has come to be paired, as it were (although since precisely when we do not know), with the word *dhamma*. This is a word whose long history needs a detailed study, such as we have

in W. GEIGER's *Dhamma*, 1920, while *vinaya* is considerably easier of definition. Whatever the exact meaning or meanings of *dhamma* may have been at one stage in the history of Early Buddhism or at another, or at one part of the Sayings or at another, it is a fair enough description to say that *dhamma* concerned the inner life of Gotama's followers, their conscience, their mental training and outlook and, later, stood for the body of teaching that they were to believe and follow; and that *vinaya* was the discipline governing and regulating the outward life of the monks and nuns who had entered the monastic Orders, the foundation of which is attributed to Gotama. *Dhamma* may indeed be said to be all that *vinaya* is not.¹ Two Piṭakas are devoted to *dhamma*: the Sutta-Piṭaka and the (later) Abhidhamma-Piṭaka; one, the Vinaya-Piṭaka, as its name implies, to *vinaya*.²

I have called the present translation *The Book of the Discipline*, rather than *The Basket (Piṭaka) of the Discipline*, on the analogy of *The Book (Nikāya) of the Kindred Sayings* and *The Book of the Gradual Sayings*. What was originally an oral tradition of Sayings became, at some time, committed to palm-leaf manuscripts. Later still, these were "edited" to form the material of printed books. Today the early Sayings survive nowhere but in books.

Oldenberg began his edition of the text of the Vinaya-Piṭaka with the section known as the Mahāvagga. This, together with the Cūlavagga to which he proceeded, constitutes the Khandhakas. He placed the Suttavibhaṅga after these, and ended with the admittedly later Parivāra. But properly speaking, the Pali Vinaya begins with the Suttavibhaṅga. The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin school "follows the same general arrangement,"³ as do apparently the Chinese Vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka school and the Dulva, or Tibetan Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.⁴ Be this as it may, the Pali Vinaya is the only one

¹ OLDENBERG, *Vinaya Texts* i.xiii. ² For chronology of the Pali Canon, see B.C. LAW, *History of Pali Literature*, Chapter 1. ³ E.J. THOMAS, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p.267; but see DUTT, *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism*, p.283f. ⁴ OLDENBERG, *Vinaya Texts* i.xlivff.

with which we can concern ourselves here. Comparisons with the Vinaya of other schools must be left to one side, as must comparisons with the rules and discipline of pre-Sakyan sects and contemporary sects, including the Jain Orders of monks and nuns.¹

According to Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, the oldest portion of the Vinaya is the Pātimokkha, or list of 227 rules,² or courses of training to be observed. As this seems to be indisputably the case, it is only fitting that the Suttavibhaṅga should precede the Khandhakas. For the Suttavibhaṅga is that portion of the Vinaya which contains the Pātimokkha.

In their *Vinaya Texts*, Rhys Davids and Oldenberg open with the Pātimokkha. Buddhaghosa in his Commentary, the Samantapāsādikā (denoted as Vin-a in the footnotes to my translation),³ begins with the Suttavibhaṅga *in extenso*. I therefore follow the same plan, and mention it chiefly to indicate that my Volume I does not correspond to Oldenberg's Volume I, but approximately to the first two-thirds of his Volume III. Considerations of length alone prevented me from including all his Volume III in my Volume I of *The Book of the Discipline*. On the other hand, this present volume corresponds to the opening portion of Volume I of *Vinaya Texts*. The chief difference between the presentation of the Suttavibhaṅga in *Vinaya Texts* and *The Book of the Discipline* is that, in the former the Suttavibhaṅga is cut down to comprise nothing more than the Pātimokkha rules themselves, all auxiliary material being omitted, while the latter, when finished, will contain, with very few exceptions,⁴ an unabridged translation of the entire Suttavibhaṅga.

The Vinaya, the Discipline, especially that portion of it called Suttavibhaṅga, appoints and decrees a definite standard of outward morality, comprised in courses of training laid down for the proper behaviour of monks and nuns. On the surface the Suttavibhaṅga is

¹ See JACOBI, *Jaina Sūtras*, i.xixff. (Sacred Books of the East XXII). ² See S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 92, and B.C. LAW, *History of Pali Literature*, i.20f., for notes on variant numbers of the rules. Also WINTERNITZ, *History of Indian Literature*, ii.23, n. 5, for numbers of rules recognised by various schools. ³ i.e., Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā, Commentary on the Vinaya. ⁴ See below, **BD 1.xxxvii**.

not much more than an attempt to restrain unsuitable behaviour; but in reality it also arrives, though in many cases by a long process of exclusion, at the kind of positive conduct to be pursued by the monk who wishes his life to be externally blameless, so far as his relations with his fellow monks, with the Order as a whole, and with the laity are concerned.

This limitation of the Suttavibhaṅga to an outward and objective field is amply indicated by the striking absence from it, of any passage stating that the observance of the courses of training “made known for monks by the lord” will conduce to the realisation of desirable subjective states. The gulf between this and the pre-eminently subjective attitude of the Sutta-Piṭaka is immense. Never once is it said, in the Suttavibhaṅga, that the courses of training should be followed so as to lead, for example, to the rejection of passion, of hatred, of confusion, to the destruction of the *āsavas* (cankers), to making the Way (one, fourfold, eightfold) become, to the mastery of *dhamma*, to the attainment of perfection. Always the recurrent formula of the Suttavibhaṅga declares that breaches of a course of training are “not fitting, not suitable, not worthy of a recluse, not to be done,” and so on, and that such lapses are not “for the benefit of non-believers nor for increase in the number of believers.” Thus a standard of conduct is imposed from outside, and for external, impersonal reasons, instead of insistence being laid, as in the Nikāya teaching, on the great subjective states attainable through a man’s own efforts of will.

The word Suttavibhaṅga means analysis or classification (*vibhaṅga*) of a *sutta*, a term here applied to each rule or course of training included in the Pātimokkha. The literal meaning of *sutta* (*sūtra*) is of course string or thread, and as such also appears in the Vinaya. But its meaning of rule or clause or article is apparently peculiar to this composition, and is, according to Dr. E.J. THOMAS,¹ earlier than its meaning of separate discourse. That the word *sutta*, in the Vinaya, probably does bear the meaning of rule, as was suggested

¹ *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 268, n. 2.

in *Vinaya Texts*,¹ is indicated by various passages. For example, at **Vin 1.65–68**, a monk is not to receive the *upasampadā* ordination if he does not know the two Pātimokkhas² rule by rule (*suttato*); at **Vin 2.68**, it is said: “This thing is in a rule (*suttāgata*) and comes up for recitation every half-month.”³ The thing (*dhamma*) here referred to is not in a Sutta, or Sutta-Piṭaka discourse, but does occur, as part of a course of training, in the Vinaya. Further, the Vinaya Commentary mentions, calling it a *sutta*,⁴ the statement allowing an *ārāma* (park) to monks. The one reference that I have come across to the compound Suttavibhaṅga in the Vinaya text⁵ (apart from its use as the title of the section bearing its name) is in association with *sutta*. Both these terms appear here to refer as clearly to Vinaya and not to Sutta-Piṭaka material, as do the others cited above.

As the Suttavibhaṅga has come down to us,⁶ it is divided into two sections: *Pārājika* and *Pācittiya*. Between them, these two sections comprise 227 rules divided into the eight groups of the four *Pārājikas*, the thirteen *Saṅghādisesas*, the two *Aniyatas*, the thirty *Nisaggiya Pācittiyas*, the ninety-two *Pācittiyas*, the four *Pāṭidesaniyas*, the seventy-five *Sekhiyas*, and the *Adhikaraṇasamatha* rules.⁷ Only the first three groups are contained in Volume I of *The Book of the Discipline*. There is a corresponding *Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga*, sometimes referred to as the *Bhikkhunī-vinaya*, or Discipline for Nuns, with its set of Pātimokkha rules. This will appear in a later volume of this translation.

The Suttavibhaṅga material is usually arranged in a series of four groups:

1. a story leading up to a rule;
2. a Pātimokkha rule, which always states the penalty incurred for breaking it;
3. the Old Commentary, the *Padabhājanīya*, on each rule, defining it word by word;

¹ Volume i.xxviiiif. ² The one for the monks and the one for the nuns. ³ See below, **BD 1.xi**. ⁴ Vin-a 81. ⁵ **Vin 2.97**. ⁶ For date of compilation of the Suttavibhaṅga see *Vinaya Texts*, i.xxi. ⁷ Cf. B.C. LAW, *History Of Pali Literature*, i.46f.

4. more stories telling of deviations from the rule, and showing either that they were not so grave as to entail the maximum penalty, or that they were reasonable enough to warrant, in certain circumstances, a modification or a relaxation of the existing rule, or that they were not such as to be rendered permissible by any extenuating circumstances.

Items (3) and (4) are sometimes reversed in position, and (4) is now and again absent altogether.

The Pātimokkha rules are the core of the Suttavibhaṅga. This list of rules, or list of courses of training, was recited twice a month on the *uposatha* (observance, Sabbath, or avowal) days, held on the nights of the new and the full moon.¹ In Vedic times, the *upavasatha* was a fast day kept for the preparation of and the performance of the Soma sacrifice. According to the Pali tradition, *paribbājakas*, or wanderers belonging to other sects, also held sacred two, if not three, days in each month for the recitation of their *Dhamma*.² It was in imitation of this popular custom that the Sakyan *bhikkhus* assembled on these same three days. Later, apparently, these were reduced to two,³ and were devoted to the recitation of the Pātimokkha rules.

This recitation served the double purpose of keeping the rules fresh in the minds of the monks and nuns, and of giving each member of the monastic community the opportunity, while the rules were being repeated or recited,⁴ to avow any offences that he or she had committed. After the avowal came the due punishment. In the Suttavibhaṅga, the monk is usually shown as avowing his offence to Gotama, or to one of the monks, or to a group of monks, directly [when] he had committed it, and not as waiting to avow it before the full congregation (*saṅgha*) of monks. He was thus “pure” for the *uposatha* ceremony, and could take his place at the meeting.

Oldenberg sees in the term Pātimokkha, freedom “from sins there named,”⁵ that is, in the list of rules called Pātimokkha. This

¹ Vin 1.104. ² Vin 1.101. ³ Vin 1.104. ⁴ Not “read out,” as Oldenberg says, *Vinaya Texts* i.xv. ⁵ *Vinaya Texts* i.xv.

is part of what amounted in Oldenberg to an obsession with “the doctrine regarding release from suffering, which forms so central an idea in the ancient Buddhist faith.”¹ But the monks were not asked, as Oldenberg states, whether they were “free from the sins there named.” The word for “free” or “freed” would have been *vimutta*. What they were asked was whether they were *parisuddha*, quite pure, pure in the matter of having kept the rules, therefore outwardly pure. I think that if Oldenberg had looked upon the Pātimokkha as a list of rules or courses of training, as I have called them above, and not as a “list of those offences which deserved punishment or some kind of expiation,”² he would not have been so much dominated by the idea of freedom from “sins.” Moreover, “sin” is not even a Sakyan conception.

This is leading us up to the derivation of the word *pāti-* (*pāṭi-*) *mokkha*. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, following Childers, refer it to *pāṭi* (Sanskrit, *prati*) + *muc*, and see in it “disburdening, getting free.”³ Buddhaghosa, too, at Visuddhimagga 16, derives it from *muc*, in the sense of being free from the punishments of *niraya* (hell) and other painful rebirths. But it was not the getting free that was of such importance as the being bound. This came first. Preceding the notion, if indeed it ever existed at the time when the Vinaya was compiled, that the monk should be free of sin or of the punishment for sin, came the assumption that the rules, as binding, should be followed and obeyed, and that a monk should be “bound by the restraint of the Pātimokkha” (*Pātimokkhasaṃvarasaṃvuta*).

S. DUTT is of the opinion that Pātimokkha means “bond.” He regards it as an external bond of union devised to convert the Sect of the *Sakyaṇputtiya samaṇas* into an Order.⁴ RHYS DAVIDS and STEDE in the *Pali-English Dictionary* say that it has the “sense of binding, obligatory, obligation,” and that the Sanskrit adaptation of the Pali should be *pratimokṣya*, “that which should be made binding,” and not *prātimokṣa*. *Prātimokṣya*, according to these lexicographers, is the

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i.xiv. ² *Vinaya Texts* i.xv. ³ *Vinaya Texts*, i.xxviii. ⁴ *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 89f.

same as the Pali *Pātimokkha*, “binding, obligatory,” from *patimuñcati*, to fasten, to bind.¹

Dr. E.J. THOMAS, on the other hand, says that *Pātimokkha* is “in Sanskrit *prātimoksha*. In form it is an adjective formed from *pa-timokkha*, binding, from *pāti-muc-* ‘to fasten or bind on (as armour),’ and thus should mean ‘that which binds, obligatory,’”² thus agreeing with the definition given in the *Pali-English Dictionary*, but not with the derivation.

The word is defined in the *Mahāvagga* of the *Vinaya* as the “face, head of all good states,”³ but as WINTERNITZ pointed out this derivation “is quite impossible.”⁴ Winternitz himself was inclined to explain *Pātimokkha* as “that which is to be redeemed,”⁵ but unfortunately he did not support this statement, except by saying he thought that the correct translation of *saṃgaram* *Pātimokkham* of *Ja* 5.25 should be “a promise to be redeemed.”

Nearly all these authorities agree that the term is borrowed from other sects, and dates from pre-Buddhist days.

The question of the composition of the *Pātimokkha* rules is one which, while being of the greatest interest, is not very likely to grow out of the speculative stage. This question has two sides to it: that of *when* and that of *how* the rules came to be formulated. I can only point out the existence of these problems, not attempting to solve them. The solution of the one would to a large extent elucidate the other.

The rules were either drawn up in their entirety in Gotama’s lifetime; or they were drawn up in their entirety after his *parinibbāna* (utter waning); or some were drawn up during his lifetime and others afterwards. The last assumption is that most generally favoured by scholars, who adduce “additions and modifications,” repetitions and inconsistencies, existing among the collection of rules.⁶ Again, if it were held that the rules were codified into their present shape after

¹ Cf. *Vin* 3.249, *patimuñcati*, to bind on or tie on a head-pad. ² *History of Buddhist Thought*, 15, n. 1. ³ *Vin* 1.103. ⁴ *History of Indian Literature*, ii.22, n. 2. ⁵ *History of Indian Literature*, ii.22, n. 2. ⁶ E.g. E.J. THOMAS, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p.14.

Gotama's *parinibbāna*, this would not at all necessarily mean that they were not known and enforced during his ministry. The question of how they were composed likewise suggests three alternatives: either that some actual event led up to the framing of each rule; or that they were all formulated in readiness to meet events, but before these had occurred; or that some had an historical source, while others owe their existence to precautionary imagination.

It is conceivable that not one of the Pātimokkha rules was framed until someone, lay-followers or the more dependable monks and nuns, had seen, heard or suspected a mode of behaviour which seemed to them unfitting in a member of one of Gotama's Orders. Each rule is therefore very possibly the direct result of some actual event, and was not made with merely hypothetical cases of wrongdoing in mind. On detecting, even on suspecting that conduct unfitting in a recluse, unworthy of a monk had been perpetrated, the action was reported, as it is almost invariably stated, to Gotama, either by the errant monk himself or by those vigilant in the interests of the Order. The Suttavibhaṅga shows that if the action were found to be blameworthy, a course of training was set forth, a penalty was attached, and it henceforth became manifest that a breach of each rule of right conduct would incur a like penalty.

Prevention of unsuitable behaviour in monks and nuns seems to have rested on two bases. In the first place the presumption that a certain line of conduct had been forbidden by Gotama, apparently appealed to the purer-minded and more zealous monks. Secondly, the penalty, fixed commensurably with the breach of the rule, will doubtless have exercised a deterrent influence over the behaviour of some of those monks who were not susceptible to the dictates of loftier motives.

Although the framing of each major rule is without exception attributed to Gotama, it has never been suggested that at the inception of the Orders he thought over all the possible cases of wrongdoing and depravity of which the monks might be capable, and propounded a ready-made body of rules to meet every conceivable contingency.

It is, however, more likely that the majority of the rules grew up gradually, as need arose, and are the outcome of historical developments that went on within the Order. At the same time it would not have been impossible for the Sakyans to have borrowed at all events the outline of a compendium of rules from other sects. We cannot tell with any degree of accuracy the historical Order in which the rules were formulated. All that can be said is, that there is no need to imagine that offences were perpetrated and rules promulgated in the order in which they now appear in the Suttavibhaṅga.

Again, it is to my mind questionable whether all the offences, grave and petty, all the adroit evasions and twistings, all the cases of illness which prevented a rule from being carried out to the letter, all the multifarious detail of communal life, were reported to Gotama, who then pronounced his verdict, and either framed a new rule or altered an existing one.

The rules are doubtless ascribed to him so as to give them weight, but of what proportion he was in fact the author we can never know. We can merely judge that, as some of his disciples were competent to preach *dhamma*, so some would also have been competent to meet a case of wrong-doing by admonishment and rebuke, and by decreeing an appropriate penalty as a safeguard for the future. Indeed, in the Suttavibhaṅga, although by far the greater number of rules is said to have been enunciated by Gotama, many a sub-rule at least (as in **Bu-Ss 9**, **Bu-Ss 10**, **Bu-Ss 11**) is laid down without reference to the Founder. Although he remains the central figure in the Vinaya, any absence of reference to him is an indication either that some transgressions occurred and were legislated for after his *parinibbāna* (utter waning), or that, even while he was still alive, it was not thought necessary to trouble him with the entire mass of items, some of them very trivial, that was bound to arise in the organisation of “unenclosed” Orders of monks and nuns. This was the more complicated both because the members of the Orders were, and were recognised to be, at varying stages of spiritual development, and because their behaviour was not viewed solely as it affected internal policy, but also as it affected

the laity.

For the believing laity, though naturally not to the forefront in the Vinaya, are in a remarkable way never absent, never far distant. They perpetually enter into the life of the Order as supporters, critics, donors, intensely interested; and themselves affected by Sakya, it seems that they were deeply anxious for its success. Thus the Vinaya does not merely lay down sets of rules whose province was confined to an internal conventional life. For this was led in such a way as to allow and even to encourage a certain degree of intercommunication with the lay supporters and followers, no less than with those lay people who were not adherents of the faith. What was important, was that the monks should neither abuse their dependence on the former, nor alienate the latter, but should so regulate their lives as to give no cause for complaint. With these aims in view, conduct that was not thought seemly for them to indulge in had to be carefully defined; and it became drafted in rule and precept.

Indian monasticism differs from Western in the important respect that the former stood in no need of fighting battles against temporal powers. The world in which Gotama's Orders grew up was fully in favour of experiments in religious devotion. Such struggles as there were, were not between monks and the armies of hostile kings, not between monks and the active scorn of the world, but struggles, no less heroic in intention perhaps, to strengthen the monks against themselves and their human weaknesses, to endow them with goodness and virtue as the living witnesses to man's desire for perfection, to fortify them for victory in the contest between the spirit and the flesh, between right and wrong—undying ideals to which many an ordinary layman ardently clung, but to which he could not himself aspire.

In the Vinaya literature that has come down to us, Gotama is nowhere shown as legislating for his lay-followers, as Mahāvīra did for his. Yet, even in the absence of a Vinaya for laymen, it is apparent that an attitude of toleration and common-sense admitted much that was permissible to the worldly section of the community that

was not considered to be fitting in monks. Had no difference been insisted upon, one of the most potent reasons for the existence and for the popularity of monks would have been rendered invalid. For one of the points of entering Gotama's Order was to learn control of body, mind and speech. This, it was thought, was essential to spiritual progress, and was extremely hard to attain, unless the shackles of the household life had been laid aside. Then man, as monk, could more readily attain perfection and its fruit (*arahattaphala*), the goal of brahmacariya, the good, divine, holy or Brahma-life. *Arahatta*, as the goal, was at some time in the early history of the Order substituted for that other goal: an approach to Brahma, that Highest, an approach which India, in the sixth century B.C., held that each and every man was potentially capable of making. Because religion was understood in those days, men who, according to popular estimate, showed that they were on the Way to the Highest, were thus regarded as Brahma or *arahatta*, were revered and not despised.

Yet, as in any others, the Vinaya shows that there were in Gotama's Orders indolent, lax, greedy monks and nuns, those who were lovers of luxury, seekers after pleasure, makers of discord. We should, however, be greatly mistaken if we insisted upon regarding the Order as riddled by scandal, by abuses and by minor forms of wrong-doing. There is no doubt that these existed; but there is no justification, simply because they happen to be recorded, for exaggerating their frequency, or for minimising the probity and spiritual devotion of many men who, in Gotama's days, were monks. Records of these are to be found in the Nikāyas, in the Thera-therī-gāthā; and, too much overlooked, there are in the Vinaya, the virtuous, moderate monks who, vexed and ashamed, complain of the misdemeanours of their fellows.

As historians, we must be grateful to these inevitable backsliders, for theirs is this legacy of the Pātimokkha rules. Had the Order contained merely upright, scrupulous monks and nuns—those who were steadfastly set on the goal of the Brahma-life, and those who had, in the circumstances, to voice their annoyance with the wrong-

doers—in all likelihood the Vinaya, the Discipline, the Pātimokkha rules would not have come into being, and much of the early history of the Order would now be known to us solely through the indirect and fragmentary way of the Sutta-Piṭaka.

If monks behaved in a way that was censurable in monks, this does not necessarily mean that their conduct was wrong in itself. Various activities were not only permissible for lay-people, but were fully accepted to be such as could be unquestionably pursued by them. Marriage, negotiating for parties to a marriage, trading, the owning of possessions, are cases in point. Nor could we maintain that, before a particular course of training had been made known, the conduct of a monk was necessarily reprehensible if it resembled that which was legitimate for the laity. For all monks came into the Order from the laity. Therefore if it did not at once strike them that in certain respects their behaviour should change when their vocation changed, it is only natural that in the meantime they should have indulged in pursuits for which, as laity, they had attracted no adverse criticism.

I think it very likely that some of the courses of training for monks that are included in this volume were formulated as a result of this bringing over of lay-life into the religious life; for a difference between the two had to be made, and then maintained. Others most certainly were formulated as the result of behaviour which, whether evinced by a layman or a monk, would have been regarded as equally blameworthy; others, again, to prevent the monks from being an intolerable burden on the laity; while still others were formulated so as to preserve the harmony and well-being of the Order.

Now and again, monks, contemplating a certain action which they knew to be forbidden or which they knew to be wrong, are recorded to think: “There will be no blame for me.” Was this because they had done similar things while still “in the world” without incurring censure, and so thought that they would be immune from blame after they had gone forth? Or did they think that there was some reason why they personally would incur no offence for their

deed? If so, spiritual pride had still to be humbled in them.

The Pātimokkha rules of the Pali Vinaya fall into eight sections, classified according to the gravity of the offence committed. Of these eight sections, only three are covered by the present volume. These are, first, the four *Pārājika* rules, framed to govern those offences, the most serious of all, which involve “defeat,” and whose penalty is expulsion from the Order; and secondly, the thirteen *Saṅghādisesa* rules, framed for the type of offence which is so grave as to necessitate a formal meeting of the Saṅgha, or whole community of monks present in the district or in the *vihāra* where the offence was committed. The penalties incurred for a *Saṅghādisesa* offence are chiefly that of being sent back by the monks to the beginning of the probationary period, together with that of undergoing the *mānatta* discipline. The terms *pārājika*, *saṅghādisesa* and *mānatta* are shortly discussed on **BD 1.xxvif.**, **BD 1.xxixff.**, **BD 1.38**, **BD 1.195f.** below.

Thirdly, included in this volume, are the two *Aniyata* rules, designed to meet offences whose nature is so “undetermined” that only individual circumstances can decide whether it is such as to involve defeat, or a formal meeting of the Order, thereby being linked with the two preceding sections of rules; or whether it is such as to require expiation (*pācittiya*). Because of this further possibility, the *Aniyata* rules are linked with the next group but one, the *Pācittiya* rules.

The first three *Pārājika* rules are levelled against the breach of a code of morality generally recognised and active among all civilised communities: against un-chastity, against the taking of what was not given, and against the depriving of life.

Evidently the aim of the strictures on unchastity, with which **Bu-Pj 1** is concerned, was partly to bring the monks into line with members of other preceding and contemporary sects whose members, having renounced the household state, had to be celibate. This notion already had history behind it by the time the Sakyā Order of monks came into being. It was a notion based as much on common-sense, as on the conviction that restraint and self-taming were indispensable

factors in the winning of the fruit of a monk's life.

It is perhaps not necessary to believe that each or any of the many and curious forms of unchastity, mentioned in **Bu-Pj 1**, ever was actually perpetrated by a monk. Such comprehensive treatment as is found is not needed either to support or to elucidate the meaning of the general rule. This was clear enough. It is possible, of course, that some of the delinquencies did occur, while others did not, but we do not know. In any case, it is also possible that at the time of the final recension, each rule was minutely scrutinised and analysed, and all the deviations from it, of which the recensionists had heard or which they could imagine, were formulated and added in some kind of order. For then there would be in the future no doubt of the class of offence (E.g. *Pārājika*, *thullaccaya* or *dukkata*) to which any wrong behaviour that had been or should be committed, belonged, or of what was the statutory penalty for that offence. The smooth and detailed handling of some parts of the other *Pārājika* rules and of some of the *Saṅghādisesa* rules, likewise suggests that these are the outcome, not of events, so much as of lengthy and anxious deliberations. The recensionists had a responsible task. They were legislating for the future, and they would, I think, have been determined to define in as minute a way as possible the offence already stated in a general way in each major rule.

Stealing is ranked as a *Pārājika* (**Bu-Pj 2**), or the gravest kind of offence, not merely because civilisation agrees that, for various reasons, it is wrong to take something not given. It was particularly reprehensible for a Sakyan monk to steal, since at the time of his entry into the Order he morally renounced his claim to all personal and private possessions, and should henceforth have regarded anything he used as communal property, lent to him for his needs. In addition, it may be urged that if monks were restrained from stealing, any tendencies they may have had towards greed and gluttony, towards finery and luxury, towards carelessness in the use of their requisites, would have been reduced and perhaps eradicated, thus allowing a greater margin for the exercise of unfettered spiritual endeavour.

There is a point in **Bu-Pj 2** to which I should like to draw attention. The rules concerned with taking what was not given show that stealing something of or above a definite, though small, value, namely, five *māsakas*,¹ is a more blameworthy offence than stealing something worth less than five *māsakas*. Five *māsakas* apparently constitute the lowest commercial value that an object can have, and anything less is presumably commercially valueless and therefore negligible. But all tendency towards acquisition had to be suppressed in the monks, all inclination to regard objects in the light of possible possessions to be checked. And further, it had to be remembered that monks might not know the exact value of some particular object.²

In **Bu-Pj 2**, the value in *māsakas* of the object stolen becomes the standard of moral transgression, and hence the criterion of the gravity of the offence committed: to steal something of more than five *māsakas* entails defeat; to steal something of the value of from one to four *māsakas* is said to be a grave offence;³ while to steal something worth less than one *māsaka* is called an offence of wrong-doing.⁴ Thus the gravity of the offence of stealing is shown to be to some extent dependent upon the value of the object stolen. At **Vin 1.96**, on the other hand, it is said to be an offence entailing defeat to steal even a blade of grass. These inconsistencies doubtless suggest that these rules were drawn up at different times.⁵

No doubt the depriving of life ranked as a *Pārājika* offence (**Bu-Pj 3**) partly because it is the very opposite of *ahimsā*, non-violence, non-injury, which was an idea prevalent in India before the advent of Sakya. Again, the teaching on rebirth and the allied teaching on *karma*, both pre-Sakyan notions, would hold that the murderer, in consequence of his deed, obstructs his progress through the worlds, until he has worked off the fruit of his action. The problems of Freewill and Predetermination find no place in Indian philosophy. Man's will is assumed to be free. Hence the murderer might have

¹ Below, **BD 1.85**. ² Below, **BD 1.114**. ³ *Thullaccayā*, a technical term. ⁴ *Dukkaṭa*, another technical term. ⁵ See *Vinaya Texts*, i.xxv, for plausible argument for the introduction of the new terms *thullaccaya* and *dukkaṭa* into the final recension of the Vinaya.

chosen otherwise: the deed of murdering was not pre-ordained. To incite a person to death was considered as bad as murdering him. For if praise of “the beauty of death” inspired him to die at will, if he cut himself off before he had done his time here, the fruits of past deeds, both good and ill, would still remain to be worked off by him.

It may seem strange to a European living in the twentieth century that the offences of unchastity, stealing and murder receive the same legal punishment. But different ages have different values. In England, hanging was the penalty for sheep-stealing up to modern times. And the Pātimokkha rules relate to more than two thousand years ago, some of them being rooted in an even more remote antiquity. Besides, we must remember that they were for monks, and not only for Sakyan monks. The Jains had precepts corresponding to these first three *Pārājika* rules, as did the common precursors of Jain and Sakyan, the *sañyāsins* or brahmin ascetics and recluses.¹

Those who had gone forth into homelessness were to withstand all temptation and ambition offered by life “in the world,” they were to be beyond the reach of its quarrels, loves and hatreds. For, if they continued to behave as those who had not gone forth, their supporters would fall away, the non-believers would think but little of them, and the believers would not increase in number.

The injunctions against unchastity, the taking of what was not given, and against the depriving of life, besides corresponding to the brahmin and Jain precepts, also correspond to the first three Buddhist *sīlas*, moral “habits,” or precepts of ethical behaviour. These, however, run in reverse order from the *Pārājikas*, and begin with the precept of refraining from onslaught on creatures. Next comes refraining from taking what was not given, and thirdly the precept of refraining from unchastity (here called *abrahmacariya*, as it is in the Jain *sūtras*). The fourth *Pārājika*, alone of the *Pārājikas*, does not find any corresponding matter among the *sīlas*. If the relation of the *Pārājikas* to the *sīlas* were worked out, some cogent reason for these discrepancies might emerge.

¹ See JACOBI, *Jaina Sūtras*, i.xxiii (Sacred Books of the East XXII).

At present I can only suggest that the fourth *Pārājika*, of which I have shortly spoken elsewhere,¹ is concerned more with a monk's spiritual state than with his outward behaviour.² In this it differs from the *sīlas*, and more interesting still, from the other *Pātimokkha* rules. These are, with the striking exception of the fourth *Pārājika*, concerned with the here and now, with the regulation of certain aspects of community life, with matters affecting the Order, with the arrangement of various mundane affairs, with questions of conduct concerning the opposite sex and the lay followers, with questions of property.

The curious fourth *Pārājika*, concerned with the offence of "claiming a state or quality of further-men" (*uttarimanussadhamma*), seems to have been fashioned in some different mould, and to belong to some contrasting realm of values. It is by no means a mere condemnation of boasting or lying in general, for it is the particular nature of the boast or the lie which makes the offence one of the gravest that a monk can commit: the boast of having reached some stage in spiritual development, only attainable after a long training in the fixed and stable resolve to become more perfect, and to make the potential in him assume actuality. The seriousness of the offence of unfoundedly claiming a state of further-men is further emphasised by the statement at *Pārājika* 4 that, if a deliberate lie is uttered in connection with such a claim, then that lie constitutes an offence entailing defeat. Yet, in the *Suttavibhaṅga*, it is far more common to find that deliberate lying ranks as an offence requiring expiation (*pācittiya*), which is not nearly so grave as one "involving defeat."

I have suggested elsewhere that the claiming of a state, or states, of further-men, to which the claimant was not entitled, could have only appeared as a most heinous offence to people by whom a teaching on becoming, on becoming more perfect, of going further, was held in much esteem. Perhaps the greatest of Mrs. Rhys Davids' many

¹ *Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected*, p.111ff. ² The fifth Jain precept, to renounce all interest in worldly things, calling nothing one's own (*aparigraha*), seems to be on a rather different basis from the other Jain precepts.

contributions to the interpretation of Early Buddhism, is that this idea of becoming was of living power and force to Gotoma's early followers. If so, one may conclude, tentatively, that the fourth *Pārājika* belongs to an ancient Sakyan stratum, and that in this, other-worldly (*lokuttara*) matters were held to be as important as, if not more so than, worldly (*loka*) matters. For I think it possible that the *Pārājikas* are arranged in an ascending scale of gravity, in which the offence held to be the worst morally, though not legally, is placed last. Be this as it may, if spiritual progress and development had not been valued by the Sakyans, to whom this precept appears to be peculiar, the offence of untruly claiming the attainment of this or that advanced spiritual state could not have ranked as a *Pārājika* offence.

It should be remarked that talk on conditions of further-men, though not absent from the Sutta-Piṭaka, is at no place accentuated in it. There is, for example, a Saṃyutta passage, which is the exact parallel of a long Vinaya passage, with the noteworthy exception that in the former there is no reference to Moggallāna as one held by other monks to be claiming a state of further-men, an imputed claim which seems to be the pivot of the Vinaya passage.¹ I have chosen to translate *pārājika* by "defeat" chiefly, I admit, because Rhys Davids and Oldenberg rendered it in this way. They follow Buddhaghosa, who, to quote E.J. THOMAS,² "interprets *pārājika* as 'suffering defeat,' and the Mūlasarvāstivādins appear to do the same (Mahāvvyutpatti 278, 279)." The editors of *Vinaya Texts* refer "the word to the passive of *ji* (to defeat) with *parā* prefixed."³ B.C. LAW also considers these four rules are concerned with "acts which bring about defeat."⁴ Although it may be grammatically incorrect to refer *pārājika* to *parā-ji*,⁵ to my mind no more convincing derivation has so far been put forward. BURNOUF's idea⁶ (adopted by CHILDERS⁷ and others) is that *pārājika* is derived from *parā + aj*, meaning a crime which involves the expulsion or exclusion of the guilty party. *parā + aj* may be a better source,

¹ SN ii.254-262 = Vin 3.104ff. See below, BD 1.180ff. ² *History Of Buddhist Thought*, p.16, n. 2. ³ *Vinaya Texts*, i.3 n. ⁴ *History of Pali Literature*, i.47, i.50. ⁵ E.g. KERN, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, 85. ⁶ *Introduction à l' History du Buddhisme indien*, 2nd edition, 268. ⁷ *Pali Dictionary*

grammatically speaking, for *pārājika* than is *parā+ji*. Yet, that the sense intended is “defeat,” seems to me rather less doubtful than that it is expulsion, and *aj*, though a Vedic root, meaning “to drive away,” is unknown as a root in Pali.

It might be argued that because in each promulgation of the *Pārājika* rules the words *pārājiko hoti* is followed by the word *asaṃvāso*, “not in communion,” this is because the two are complementary, *asaṃvāso* filling out the sense intended by *pārājika*. Such an argument would naturally increase the tendency to regard *pārājika* as a word standing for expulsion or exclusion, probably of a permanent nature.¹ But may it not be that *pārājika* and *asaṃvāso* represent not complementary, but disparate ideas, the not being in communion introducing a new notion, and one connected with and dependent upon not expulsion, but defeat?

If a monk were found to be unworthy to be in communion, unfitted to take his part in the communal acts and jurisdiction, then he would have to be expelled. But equally, he would have to cease to be in communion (which would entail expulsion, either temporary or permanent), if he found that he was defeated in his endeavour “to achieve the end for which he entered the Order.”²

It is beyond all doubt that the punishment for breach of the *Pārājika* rules indeed involves expulsion. But it seems unnecessary to take the etymologically obscure *pārājika* itself to mean expulsion, when this notion is covered by the word *asaṃvāso*, with which, as I have said, *pārājika* is always coupled in the formulation of the *Pārājika* rules. In addition, it may be remarked that the *Suttavi-bhaṅga* has the verb *nāseti* (causative of *nassati*), meaning “to be expelled.”³

In such a very controversial case, I have preferred to follow the commentator. It appears very probable that many of these words: *Pātimokkha*, *Pārājika* itself, *Saṅghādisesa*, were adopted from pre-Buddhist sects, and thus had some tradition behind them. Now, it

¹ E.J. THOMAS, *History of Buddhist Thought*, 16; KERN, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, 85. ² B.C. LAW, *History of Pali Literature*, i.47, n. 1; also cf. p.50. ³ E.g. *Vin* 3.33, *Vin* 3.40 = *BD* 1.50, *BD* 1.62 below.

may well be that the commentator explained the word *pārājika* according to a meaning that for it and for him had become traditional. In which case, such an explanation will as truly enshrine something of the history of that word as later and inconclusive attempts at grammatical analysis. Moreover, the reference, in the third formulation of *Pārājika* 1, to not disavowing the training and not declaring weakness, together with the subsequent detailed analysis of these phrases (below, **BD 1.42ff.**), to my mind lends weight to the suggestion that a monk becomes one who is defeated (*pārājiko hoti*)¹ through his own inability or “weakness” to lead the Brahma-life.

Like the *Pārājika* rules, the *Saṅghādisesas* begin (in **Bu-Ss 2–Bu-Ss 1** is in a category apart) with four rules connected with a monk’s conduct towards women. Then come two rules (**Bu-Ss 6, Bu-Ss 7**) in which injunctions for building a hut and a *vihāra* on sites approved by other monks, are set forth. The point of these rules appears to be to prevent monks from begging building materials too greedily from the laity, and to prevent them from building anywhere where animal life would be endangered or destroyed. The force of the injunction that the hut or the *vihāra* must have an open space round it, is difficult to interpret, and the Old Commentary gives no practical help. It probably means that no monk should live in a secret place. The laity, who had contributed to the building of the hut or *vihāra*, would very likely wish to have seen that the monk was behaving in a way worthy of their gift, and hence his conduct and habits must be open to unhindered inspection.

Bu-Ss 8 and **Bu-Ss 9** comprise rules against the defamation of one monk by another. Then come two against the making of a schism in the Order, while **Bu-Ss 12** is concerned with the offence that a monk incurs if he is difficult to speak to. All such transgressions, leading to disharmony in the Order, would have made it hard for the Order to maintain itself and to progress. And if there had been repeated

¹ On *hoti* = *bhavati* to become, see MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *To Become or Not to Become*, p.18ff.

quarrels, discord and stubbornness, the Order would have become discredited among its lay supporters.

The twelfth *Saṅghādisesa* should be compared with the Anumāna Sutta.¹ The Old Commentary's definition of *dubbacajātika*, "difficult to speak to" (Vin 3.178 = BD 1.311 below), is word for word the same as the Anumāna's description of the monk whom his fellows consider unfit to be taught or, instructed.² Buddhaghosa states³ that the Ancients (*porāṇā*) called this Sutta the Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha. This leads us to wonder if the twelfth *Saṅghādisesa* indeed represents some specially ancient fragment of the Pātimokkha, and whether, while the rules were being shaped, refusal to take the training with deference and respect appeared amongst the earliest offences that a monk could commit.

The last and thirteenth *Saṅghādisesa* rule is against bringing families into disrepute. This, again, would make the Order unpopular among the lay followers. It must be remembered that it was considered highly important to propitiate these, to court their admiration, to keep their allegiance, to do nothing to annoy them. For without their active interest and support the Order could not have endured. It is true that, had it been disbanded, the Sakyaputtiyas, as individuals, would not have come to starvation. For the "holy man," be he *samaṇa*, *sādhu*, *sañyāsin* or *fakir*, in India always has had his physical needs fulfilled. And some Sakyaputtiyas doubtless could have reverted to a household life; while others might have gone to dwell in the forests, there to subsist on fruits and roots (*phalamūla*), and to dress in bark and antelopes' hides, as did some of their brahmin precursors and contemporaries. But, in fact, the Order became a powerful magnet, attracting men and women from many and various families, classes, trades and occupations, from the ranks of the Jains and Wanderers (*paribbājaka*). Historically, the success of the Early Buddhist experiment in monasticism must be in great part attributed to the wisdom

¹ MN15. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 742, says that this Sutta is one of the five spoken for the disciples of the four groups (i.e., monks and nuns, male and female lay-followers). ² MN i.95, line 12ff. ³ MN-a ii.67.

of constantly considering the susceptibilities and criticisms of the laity.

Like the meaning of *pārājika*, the meaning of *saṅghādisesa* is controversial. Again B.C. LAW¹ and I follow *Vinaya Texts* in rendering *saṅghādisesa* as offences (or rules or matters) which require a formal meeting of the Order.

Now, one part of the penalty imposed for a breach of any one of the thirteen *Saṅghādisesa* rules, namely, a return to the beginning of the probationary period, has apparently led KERN, for example, to describe the *Saṅghādisesas* as offences “involving suspension and a temporary exclusion”²—from the Order or from taking part in its legal procedure is not made clear, though the latter must be meant. The other part of the penalty, namely, the necessity of undergoing the *mānatta* discipline, has apparently led E.J. THOMAS,³ for example, to describe these offences as those which involve “a period of penance and reinstatement by the Assembly.” BURNOUF suggests⁴ that *saṅghādisesa* means “that which should be declared to the Saṅgha from the beginning to the end.” He further states that the Chinese syllables, *pho chi cha*, the equivalents of *ādisesa*, are “probably altered.” This may be because the Pali had already been altered from some more definite phrase containing less ambiguity and obscurity. CHILDERS suggests⁵ that this class of offence is so called because as much in the beginning (*ādi*) as in the end (*sesa*) a Saṅgha is required to administer the stages of penalty and ultimately rehabilitation.

Neither of the descriptions—suspension or penance—is contained etymologically in the word *saṅghādisesa*. That both were penalties incurred by this type of offence is indubitable. But by derivation, the compound *saṅghādisesa* could not possibly mean either suspension, *mānatta* discipline or reinstatement. Comparison with the Sanskrit brings us no nearer to an elucidation. For as KERN remarks,⁶ “Neither a Sanskrit *Saṅghāvaśesa* nor *Saṅghātīśesa*, i.e. remnant of

¹ *History of Pali Literature* 47, 50. ² *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 85. ³ *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 17. ⁴ *Introduction à l'History du Buddhisme indien*, 2nd edition, p. 269. ⁵ *Pali Dictionary*. ⁶ *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 85, n. 9.

the Saṅgha, renders a satisfactory meaning.”

In the circumstances it is best to allow that we are in the realm of ancient technicalities, whose exact significance the passage of time has dimmed. In a translation, we can, however, pay due regard to the only member of the compound *saṅghādisesa* which is neither grammatically obscure nor controversial. This is *saṅgha*, meaning for Sakya the Order, or any part of the whole Order resident within a certain boundary, district or *vihāra*. That the offence could not be settled without the intervention of the Order is a point for which there is the support of the Old Commentary. This states clearly that “it is the Order which places (the wrong-doer) on probation, it sends (him) back to the beginning, it inflicts the *mānatta*, it rehabilitates.”¹ Moreover, as noted by Childers, Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, this type of punishment had to be enforced, could only be enforced, by formal resolutions (*saṅghakamma*) carried at meetings of the Order.

It is just possible that *kamma*, most usually work, which the Old Commentary states is a synonym for this class of offence, has also a specialised sense of “proceedings, ceremony performed by a lawfully constituted Saṅgha of monks.” Such proceedings were formal in character, with motions and resolutions, and rules for their validity. Thus, if *kamma* were indeed a synonym for this class of offence, and if it means acts of a formal nature, then what *saṅghādisesa* means is a type of offence whose punishment must be meted out by some formal administration on the part of the Order.

It may well be that the penalty for every class of offence could be imposed, or came at some time to be regarded as effective, only as the result of the jurisdiction of the Order met together in solemn conclave. This, however, would not prove that the word *saṅghādisesa* does not contain some special reference to the Order as that instrument which, in this type of offence, administers the penalty. It is more than possible that some of the other rules were known and named before the codification of the Pātimokkha, but that the penalty for breaking them could be imposed by one or more individuals. Otherwise it

¹ See below, [BD 1.196](#).

could hardly have been necessary for the Old Commentary expressly to state that it is the Order, and not one man or many persons, which imposes the *Saṅghādisesa* penalties.¹

As S. DUTT shrewdly observes,² “It is significant that only one of the group of offences (*Saṅghādisesa*) is mentioned as coming within the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Saṅgha, and it is in the case of this group only that certain penalties to be imposed upon the *bhikkhu*, even against his will ... viz. *Parivāsa* and *Mānatta*, are laid down. In the case of the other offences it is nowhere stated or suggested in the Pātimokkha itself that the Saṅgha should have jurisdiction over them, and no mode of exercising such jurisdiction is defined, as in the case of the *Saṅghādisesas*.”

It is not impossible that originally the various Saṅghas, which were really sub-divisions of the whole Saṅgha, exercised their jurisdiction over each individual member only in the case of the *Saṅghādisesa* offences, only coming later to exercise such jurisdiction in the case of all classes of offence. If this is so, we do well, I think, to underline the formalities which the *Saṅghādisesa* offences entailed, and were very likely alone in so doing at first. For by this means some early feature of the Order’s history may be kept in mind.

The two *Aniyatas*, or undetermined matters, evince a remarkable amount of trust put in a woman lay-follower. Doubtless Visākhā was one of the most generous patrons of the Order, a great supporter of the faith, to whom the Order had full reason to be grateful. Here she is shown expostulating with Udāyin for what seemed to her unsuitable behaviour in a monk. The interesting thing is that both the *Aniyata* rules, generalised as are all the Pātimokkha courses of training from a particular case, allow a monk “to be dealt with” according to what a trustworthy woman lay-follower should say. Thus Visākhā, herself eminently trustworthy and single-minded in her efforts to improve conditions in the Order, is instrumental in bringing to all reliable women lay-followers the responsibility of procuring investigation

¹ See below, **BD 1.196**. ² *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.105.

into a monk's conduct, if she has seen him sitting secluded with a woman. These two *Aniyata* rules indicate the respect and deference that was, at that time, paid to women. They were not scornfully brushed aside as idle gossips and frivolous chatter-boxes, but their words were taken seriously.

It may be pointed out here that the Vinaya shows, that if monks went astray, this was not always due to the baneful influence of women. For now and again monks took the initiative, and begged and cajoled laywomen and even nuns. Sometimes they got what they wanted, at others the women stood firm. When they asked lewd questions, women are shown as being innocent of their meaning.¹ It is also apparent from the two *Aniyatas* that women of the world might do certain things with impunity, but that those same things, if done by Sakyān recluses, were blameworthy. Their life was to be organised on a different basis, as *Pārājika* 1 shows, from that of the laity, and a recognition of this, and attempts to preserve the difference, are visible in many parts of Vinaya III.

The Old Commentary, or Padabhājanīya, is now incorporated in the Suttavibhaṅga, and forms an integral part of it. Since it explains each Pātimokkha rule word by word, so that we get from it the meaning which the words possessed at all events at the time when the Old Commentary was compiled, this ancient exegesis, often of very great interest, is a most valuable critical apparatus. The purpose of the Old Commentary was evidently to make each rule absolutely clear, so that no misconception could arise through lack of lucid definition. Words not contained in the rule, but appearing in the stories, are not commented upon.

Rhys Davids and Oldenberg think that when the rules had been formulated and each word interpreted, some explanation was wanted as to how the rules originated. Thus, they hold, stories were invented to introduce each rule. Personally I do not think it necessary to take quite such a hard-and-fast view. For it seems to me possi-

¹ BD 1.219 below.

ble that in some cases the story may be true, or may have had some historical foundation, so that the rule came to be made on account of the self-same events which, later, were recorded. In other cases, the story may quite possibly be an invention, the original reason for framing the rule and the name of the first wrong-doer involved having long been forgotten. It would now be very difficult to judge which stories may be more or less true and which may be purely fictitious.

The point of the series of short stories or incidents, which usually follow the Old Commentary's exegesis, is to show what exceptions could be made to a rule, what exemptions were permissible, what lesser and sometimes what graver offences were incurred, and what was an offence from which there could be no exemption since it tallied in all its main respects with that which had led to the framing of the rule. These stories are not invariably ascribed to any particular person, as are those introducing the rule. They not seldom attach the behaviour which needs consideration to "a certain monk."

These stories reveal the existence of different grades of penalty for different types of offence against the main rules. Not merely are there five great classes of offences—*Pārājika*, *Saṅghādisesa*, *Nissaggiya Pācittiya*, *Pācittiya* and *Pāṭidesaniya*—there are also *thullaccaya* (grave) offences, and *dukkāṭa* offences (those of wrong-doing). These are of constant recurrence in the stories, or "Notes giving the exceptions to, and extensions of, the Rule in the Pātimokkha."¹ Of rarer appearance are offences of wrong speech. One or other of these offences is said to be incurred if behaviour has approximated to that which a particular Pātimokkha rule has been designed to restrain, but which is, so far as can be judged, not so grave in nature as a breach of the rule itself, because of certain differences in its execution, or because of certain extenuating circumstances.

Sometimes the stories are grouped together to form a set. Although, where this occurs, each story may show no more than a

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i.xix.

minute variation from the others, they are all set out at length. Putting the gist of the stories into general terms, each one would then read something as follows: If this is done, but not that, though the other thing is done, such and such an offence is incurred. If this is done and that, but not the other thing, such and such an offence is incurred. If this is not done, but that is done, and the other thing is (is not) done, such and such an offence is incurred. And so on through permutation and combination of deeds done or not done, until the final case is achieved where no offence is incurred.

These groups of stories are apt to be tedious to Western readers. I have therefore put them, when they occur, into a smaller type, as also other passages concerned with small shades of differences. Doubtless such meticulous detail was useful in defining exactly what was lawful and what was not lawful for monks to do, and in preventing the evasions which from time to time they seemed ready to attempt. As history, these stories are as interesting in evincing an Oriental love and management of detail as in revealing items of topical value in regard to manners and customs. The manner and time of their formulation are as problematical as those of the major rules.

At the end of each *Pārājika*, *Saṅghādisesa* and *Aniyata* Rule, general circumstances are stated where the breach of the rule is riot to be counted as an offence. The most comprehensive of these is when a monk is mad, in pain or a beginner. Others have a more specialised import. Thus, for example, there is said to be no offence if a monk had some course of behaviour forced upon him, but did not consent to it (as in **Bu-Pj 1**); if he did something accidentally, not intending to do it (as in **Bu-Pj 3**); if he did something unsuitable, being under a misapprehension (as in **Bu-Pj 2**).

The occasions when it is stated that no offence is incurred are all remarkable for their humane and lenient tone, for their reasonableness and common-sense. Thus there is no offence if something not given is taken for the sake of food (**Bu-Pj 2.7.38**), or is only taken for the time being (**Bu-Pj 2.7.40**), it being assumed, apparently, that there

was the intention of returning it. Again, two occasions are recorded¹ where a monk died, in the one case through being tickled,² and in the other through being trod upon.³ Yet no murderous act was done, or the verdict would have been different, and not that “there is no offence involving defeat.” It seems probable that the monks who died were nervy, delicate or infirm, and received a shock or heart-attack resulting in their death, but had they been in normal health they would have come to no harm.

It must be admitted that several early literatures have a coarse side. That the translations of Pali canonical works have so far been not in the least offensive, is mainly, or it may be said only, because the Sutta-Piṭaka and the Abhidhamma-Piṭaka deal chiefly with spiritual matters. The Vinaya, on the other hand, being concerned with behaviour, is forced occasionally to go into some aspects of life irrelevant to the subject-matter of the other two Piṭakas. Such expositions are, however, almost entirely confined to *Pārājika* 1 and *Saṅghādisesa* 1.

With regard to this preservation of crude passages in the Vinaya, three points must be insisted upon. In the first place they were neither spoken nor written down for a general public, but were intended only for the devotees of celibacy. Secondly, the motive which led to their being uttered or written down was not a desire to shock, but the need to prevent unchastity. Thirdly, the pattern on which the compilers of the Suttavibhaṅga worked was one of almost unbelievable detail, for in their efforts to be lucid, case after case of possible or actual deviation from the general rule was investigated, penalised and perpetuated. Hence it cannot justly be said that the tendency to be detailed is greater or more insistent in one *Pārājika*, or in one

¹ Vin 3.84 (= BD 1.145, BD 1.146 below). ² *añgulipatodaka*. *Pali-English Dictionary* has “nudging with the fingers,” *Critical Pali Dictionary* “tickling with the fingers.” *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.113 has in the text “nudging one another with the fingers,” but *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.113, n. 3, in referring to the above Vinaya passage (= Vin 4.110) says: “It must there mean ‘tickling.’” GS iv.225 (AN iv.343) has “poking one another with the fingers.” ³ Or *ottharati* may mean to spread out, to stretch out.

Saṅghādisesa, than in others. Such lack of restraint as is found may be embarrassing to us, but it must be remembered that early peoples are not so much afraid of plain speech as we are. No stigma of indecency or obscenity should therefore be attached to such Vinaya passages as seem unnecessarily outspoken to us. For they were neither deliberately indecent nor deliberately obscene. The matters to which they refer had to be legislated for as much as had matters of theft and murder, of choosing sites for huts and *vihāras*.

Nevertheless the differences in the outlook of an early society and a modern one may easily be forgotten or disregarded. I have therefore omitted some of the cruder Suttavibhaṅga passages, and have given abbreviated versions of others, while incorporating them in their unabridged state in Pali in an Appendix, and marking them by an asterisk in the text. Even in omitting or expurgating such passages, I yet think that they are interesting historically, scientifically and psychologically, even psycho-analytically, and that they might be of value to anyone making a detailed comparison of Eastern and Western Monachism.

Of the various forms of address recorded in **Vin 3.1-194** (to which this volume of translation corresponds), the most frequent are *bhagavā*, *bhante*, *bho*, *āyasmā*, *āvuso*, *ayya*, *bhagini*. I will do no more now than briefly indicate them, leaving a fuller investigation to the Introduction to the final volume, when all the Vinaya data for modes of address will be before us.

Only Gotama is recorded to be addressed as *bhagavā*. This, therefore, is a very honourable term, which I have rendered by “lord.”

Bhante, one of several vocative forms of *bhavant*, is of very frequent occurrence. When Gotama is addressed as *bhante*, I have used the rendering “lord.” In order to preserve this appellation for him alone, when the named and unnamed monks who are his disciples are addressed as *bhante*, I have used the rendering “honoured sir.”

Bho (plural *bhonto*), another vocative form of *bhavant*, appears to be a more familiar form of address than is *bhante*, and is used

as between equals, or from a superior to an inferior. It is of fairly frequent occurrence, sometimes being followed by another vocative, such as a proper name. I have translated *bho* as “good sir.”

Āyasmā is not a form of address. It is an honorific designation, and is the most usual way in which monks and *theras* are referred to in the narrative, followed by their proper name. I have translated it as “the venerable.” Nuns are never designated by this term, nor are lay-people.

Āvuso may be said to be the habitual mode of address used between monks. The only other word that they appear to use in speaking to one another is *bhante*.¹ They are also recorded to address laymen as *āvuso*, and this practice is sometimes reversed, although the laity seem more usually to have said *bhante* in speaking to the monks, sometimes combined with *ayya*. I have translated *āvuso* as “your reverence” and “reverend sir.” Since *āvuso* is masculine in form, it was never used in addressing nuns.

Ayya and *ayyo* (nominative plural used as a vocative) are frequently used in speaking of a person and in addressing him, both directly and obliquely. It appears to be more flexible than the other terms noted above, both with regard to those who use it and with regard to those to whom it is applied. I have translated it as “master” if followed by a proper name, and as “the master” if this is not the case. It is not infrequently combined with *bhante*. *Ayya* was an epithet in use among the laity, as well as between the laity and the monks. But in the part of the Vinaya translated in this volume it does not happen that a lay-person is addressed as *ayya* by a monk, or that any monk is so addressed by a fellow-monk.

Although monks did not address their fellows in the Brahma-life as *ayya*, nuns use *ayye* (feminine, “lady, noble lady”) in speaking to

¹ FRANKE in Journal of the Pali Text Society, 1908, holds that the Cullavagga Council reports were invented exercises to show ways of address. His argument is based on the decree of DN ii.154, ascribed to the dying Gotama, after which seniors were to address juniors as *āvuso*, while juniors were to address seniors as *bhante*. The terms *āvuso* and *bhante* were also in use among the Jains, cf. *Āyāraṃgasutta* (PTS edition), e.g. p.106.

one another. Laywomen also use this form of address in speaking to nuns and to other laywomen. Monks, however, never appear to address either nuns or laywomen as *ayye*.

Bhagini, “sister,” is the most usual way in which monks are recorded to address both laywomen and nuns. Yet nuns do not, as far as is recorded, address one another as *bhagini*. Unluckily, in this portion of the Vinaya there are no records of intercommunication between nuns and laywomen, so we get here no indication of how they addressed one another.

From these short notes it will have emerged that the words *bhikkhu* and *bhikkhuni* do not occur as forms of address used between the two sections of the religious community, any more than that lay-people address monks and nuns with these terms. On the other hand, Gotama is sometimes recorded to address a monk as *bhikkhu*, and also to refer to individual monks in this fashion. And there is a certain story ([Vin 3.131](#) = [BD 1.220](#) below) in which a female wanderer addresses a monk as *bhikkhu*. In the narrative, monks are ordinarily spoken of as *bhikkhu*, unless the personal name of the monk concerned has been recorded. If it has, it is usually preceded by *āyasmā*, and never, I think, by *bhikkhu*. On the other hand, the narrative, if referring to a nun, consistently calls her *bhikkhuni*, and this description precedes her proper name, if this has been recorded. In this part of the Suttavibhaṅga there are no records showing Gotama speaking with nuns, so we have no means of knowing how he usually addressed them. When speaking of them, he is, however, recorded to have used the word *bhikkhuni*.

The translation of the term *bhikkhu* presents many difficulties. I have selected the term “monk” and have rejected “mendicant, almsman, brother, friar,” not necessarily because “monk” is the most literal, but, for reasons which I will state shortly, it appears to me the best and most suitable rendering.

Although neither “monk,” nor the terms rejected, are precise equivalents for *bhikkhu*, I could not find sufficient grounds for leaving

bhikkhu untranslated, as though it were untranslatable. Further, I became more and more convinced that where an English word is possible, where it coincides to some extent with the significance of the Pali, although the known facts of history preclude full identity of meaning, it is more desirable to use it than to leave the word untranslated. Untranslated words are balking to the English reader, and it is for the English reader that this series is primarily designed. But before giving the reasons which determined my choice of “monk” as the nearest equivalent for *bhikkhu*, a few words must be said about each of the terms that has not been selected.

“Mendicant,” literally “a beggar for alms,” from *mendicare*, to beg, *mendicus*, “a beggar,” is also doubtless etymologically correct¹ as a translation of *bhikkhu*. Yet, I think, it lays too much emphasis on one aspect only of the *bhikkhu*’s life, and ignores the other connotations of *bhikkhu* adduced by the Old Commentary,² as well as his functions of meditation and preaching. Moreover, in English it has no feminine, unless one falls back on the cumbersome “woman (or female) mendicant” as one is forced to say “woman (or female) slave” (*dāsi*) and “woman (or female) recluse” (*samaṇi*), a practice to be avoided as far as possible.

Professor B.M. BARUA speaks of the *bhikṣu*s as “Buddhist mendicants, monks or recluses,”³ a sentence which well shows the hesitation which all translators must feel in trying to translate the term *bhikkhu*. An objection here would be, though it is a fault into which we all fall, that “Buddhist” is an anachronism, since “Buddhist” and “Buddhism” are terms of a much later invention. “Sakyan mendicant” would be possible; and it is true that here, as in all the other translations for *bhikkhu* that are being considered, the word “Sakyan” is wanted in all cases where it is necessary to distinguish the monastic followers of Gotama from those adherents of other sects who were also known as *bhikṣu*. But I doubt if the Pali Canon demands the draw-

¹ *Introduction à l’ Histoire du Bouddhisme indien*, 2nd edition, p. 245, where he says that the sense of the word *bhikkhu* means exactly “one who lives by alms.” ² *Vin 3.24*.

³ *Maskarī as an Epithet of Gośāla*, *Indian History Quarterly*, iii.2, p. 253.

ing of such a distinction, for in it, I believe, the term *bhikkhu* denotes exclusively the Sakyan *bhikkhu*. Moreover, if it came to the feminine, the phrase “Sakyan female mendicant” would be unwieldy, and it seems a pity to use three words where two should suffice.

“Almsman” has “almswoman” for its feminine, and is further doubtless etymologically correct. For *bhikṣa* and *bhikṣuḥ* (Sanskrit) are the noun and participle derived from the desiderative base of *bhaj*, to beg, to beg for alms. But again, like “mendicant,” it lays too strong a stress on one aspect only of what the words *bhikkhu* and *bhikkhunī* came to stand for. For the Sakyan *bhikkhu* came to be much more than one dependent on others for the necessities of life. This is one of the reasons why I have not adopted LORD CHALMERS’ rendering of “almsman”¹ here, as I have elsewhere.² Again, “almsman” may not inevitably mean one who asks for or who lives on alms, for it may also be used to mean a giver of alms. In addition, “almsman” would have a cumbersome translation in German and some other European languages. Hence I think that, as a possible rendering, it should be rejected.

“Brother” is, as a translation of *bhikkhu*, historically incorrect. It is the term by which *bhikkhu* is rendered in the Cambridge translation of the Jātakas, and the English title of the PTS translation of the Theragāthā reads “Psalms of the Brethren.” *Thera* is merely a *bhikkhu* of long standing. In spite of the recommendation for “brother” derived from its use in these works, the advance in Pali studies since the date of their publication shows that *bhikkhu* does not mean what “brother” means. It might be argued that the term “brother” draws attention to the *bhikkhu*’s relation to his fellow-members of the religious community, and that such a relation was explicitly recognised, in so far as *bhikkhus* addressed the *bhikkhunīs* not as *bhikkhuni* but as *bhaḡini*, “sister.”

Yet against this argument we must set the fact that neither Order looked to anyone or to any kind of being as their “father” or their “mother.” Nor were the *viḡaras* ruled over by anyone corresponding

¹ *Further Dialogues of the Buddha.*

² *Women under Primitive Buddhism.*

to an abbot, father or bishop. Power of authority was not vested in an individual, but in the Pātimokkha courses of training and the Order (*Saṅgha*) of monks. All that can be said is, that the *bhikkhus* were “brethren” to the extent that, apart from the three grades of *theras* (Elders), those of middle standing, and novices, no hierarchy existed among them, but terms of more or less equality.

There is, besides, another argument, to my mind so insuperable as to extinguish the claims of “brother” as in any way a suitable term by which to render *bhikkhu*. For *bhātar*, the accepted word for “brother,” and one in current terminology, was never apparently regarded as synonymous with *bhikkhu*, and indeed never seems to have been connected with members of the Order. These are never recorded to address one another or laymen as *bhāta*. Nor do the lay-people so address them. Had “brother” been wanted, had it been able to fulfil some purpose in the monastic life, surely *bhātar* would have been used, for it was to hand. As it is, the word seems to have been restricted in its use to the relationship of blood-brothers,¹ and even among the laity *bhāta* was not used in address, but *tāta* (dear).

With this absence of *bhātar* as a term used in the religious life, it is curious that monks used its opposite, *bhaginī*. But it should be noted that they addressed laywomen as well as nuns as *bhagini*. Hence the word *bhaginī* is clearly precluded from containing any unique reference to *bhikkhunīs*. Thus the two terms, *bhaginī* and *bhikkhunī* cannot be said to be precisely equivalent in meaning. The latter is applicable to women to whom the former is not applicable. Yet the implication remains, if words mean anything, that monks regarded women as “sisters,” while they did not regard men as “brothers.” There must be some historical reason for this. I venture to suggest that the celibacy to which the monk was consecrated was answerable for his looking upon women as *bhaginī*. But I am not prepared to say that this is the whole story, although I believe that it may be the root of the matter.²

¹ E.g. at Thig.408, Ja 1.308. ² Cf. SN iv.110, where, however, there is also mention of the “mother-mind” and “daughter-mind.”

“Friar,” although it has the English feminine “friaress,” does not appear to me such an acceptable rendering for *bhikkhu* as is “monk.” It is true that friars are much more than mendicants or almsmen, as a *bhikkhu* is, or came to be, much more than one who merely begs for alms. When, in the West, mendicancy became symbolic under St. Francis, the friars were to beg, as other poor men. The Sakyan *bhikkhu*, too, had to beg. Yet the growing belief that merit was to be acquired by giving in many cases inspired the laity to give before they had been begged. Hence begging did not take, such a high place in the duties of Gotama’s Order as it did in the West after St. Francis’ death; and I doubt if, in India, it was ever symbolic.

On the other hand, “friar,” being derived from *la*, is open to the same general objections as is “brother.” Moreover, the Western friar, a later development than the monk, and with the monastic tradition behind him, never aimed at saving himself. He was a brother to the whole world, and went about talking to people at the wayside, to birds and animals; while the prime concern of *bhikkhus*, however much they may have preached, was with the attainment of their own perfection.

Having now considered various arguments for and against mendicant, almsman, brother, friar as translations of *bhikkhu*, I will put forward the reasons which led me to choose “monk” for this term, and “nun” for *bhikkhuni*. It may be that only a profound study of Western Monachism could fully justify or condemn this choice, but from a superficial study it would appear that the similarities between a “monk” and a *bhikkhu* outweigh their differences. These similarities and differences must be judged by the historical associations of the two words. Etymologically they are not connected. Yet in the East and in the West there were these movements, comparable in a general way, though varying in detail, towards ordering and organising religious life in a fashion that necessitated its devotees renouncing their former modes of life and their former worldly pre-occupations.

The two words, monk and *bhikkhu*, are the outcome of certain and definite historical tendencies. Because these did not follow the

same course of development in East and West, the two words, although comparable in meaning, are not synonymous. For each is the expression of a particular phase of that development. If this is borne in mind, if we remember that we are dealing with historical variations of a common tendency, it will seem to us less remarkable that Western terminology offers no equivalent with which the term *bhikkhu* can be made exactly to fit, and more remarkable that a study in comparisons is as possible as it is.

The Western monk, coming into Europe from the East, has, like the Buddhist *bhikkhu*, a long and complicated history, and monks of one century and Order differ considerably from monks of another century and Order. The word monk (*monachus*) is derived from *monos*, meaning "alone." For originally monks abandoned the worldly life for the sake of that solitude in which, by meditation and contemplation, they could attempt to save their souls. Communion with God would enable their souls to be entered by God. Later the outward forms of monkdom changed, and monks came to live a communal life in convents, observing the Rule of the Order which they had entered, and taking the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. It was the monk's great work to go out into the world so as to save men and to bring men to God. A separate development, a still further change displaced the monk's earlier ideal of finding his own salvation while leading the life of a hermit or anchorite in the desert. Moreover, as monasticism developed, century by century, the early communal poverty gave way to communal plenty. Monasteries became land-owners, monks became cultivators of the soil, makers of various kinds of produce, copyists of manuscripts, storehouses of learning, although by none of these activities was individual property or gain supposed to result.

Now the Buddhist *bhikkhu* did not live alone, but in communities; and there is nothing in the derivation of *bhikkhu* comparable to *monos*. *bhikkhu*, *bhikṣu* is from the desiderative base of *bhaj*, to beg, to beg alms. On the other hand, he did go into seclusion for meditation during the "day-sojourn" (*divāvihāra*, cf. *siesta*), and sometimes for

longer periods he retreated to lonely spots far from the haunts of men. And possibly in his earlier history, as *bhikṣu*, he was one who lived alone, only gradually coming to live in a community, as the monk came later to lead a cenobitic life. Part of the moral duty of the Buddhist *bhikkhu* was, if he had talent that way, to go forth and give *Dhamma* for the sake of *devas* and mankind. In this he resembles certain Orders of Western Monachism which had as their mission the salvation of the world. The early Friars, too, did wayside teaching and preaching, but later this was regulated by authority and made orthodox. Monks, in Gotama's Order, were certainly not segregated, and the Vinaya reveals all manner of inter-communication between the religious and the lay sections of society.

In order to give *dhamma*, the *bhikkhu* had to tour the countryside for nine months in each year. This would also prevent him from being a constant drain on the resources of the laity at any one place. But he was forbidden to travel during the three months of the rains. In this there was nothing similar to the Benedictine "vow of stability," by which a monk undertook to remain permanently at one house. This vow was imposed because wandering ascetics had become a nuisance, whereas Buddhist monks had to stay in one fixed abode for the rains, lest in journeying during this season they should harm the young crops or destroy animal life. A motive such as the latter was far from the thoughts of Western monks, one of whose many activities was to tend the crops and dig the soil. Their view of life did not include a close kinship existing between men and animals, and even the Friars, who spoke to the animals as their "brothers," did not suggest that a man might be undergoing rebirth as an animal (*tiracchāna-gata*).

It may also be supposed that the nine months of touring was made obligatory on a Buddhist monk in order to keep him healthy. The heaviest manual work he did was the washing, bleaching and beating of his robes, and now and again repairs to buildings. This was not because the entrants into the Order were weak, decrepit or sick. It was because the nature of the beliefs which they held made

work on the land impossible for them. In the West, agriculture and all forms of manual labour were regarded as essentials in the main work. They served the further purpose of helping the conquest of the spirit in its perpetual battle with the flesh, and of sharpening and toughening the monks against the vice of *acedia*. The Eastern *bhikkhu* who, on account of the climate, might have been more prone to this was, I think it reasonable to hold, fortified against sloth and indolence by the discomforts of journeying on foot (for the use of vehicles was not allowed), no less than by preaching and by spiritual exercises.

The Buddhist *bhikkhu* has to renounce his worldly possessions before he is ordained, and after his ordination he should own no private property, but should regard his bowl and robe and other requisites as being the communal property of the Order, lent to him for his use. He should lead a life of chastity. He should be obedient to the Pātimokkha courses of training. In these particulars his case closely resembles that of an European monk. But, and here is a great difference between the Western monk and the *bhikkhu*, as understood in the sixth century B.C. in India: there were no vows for a Sakyan *bhikkhu* to take. He did not make any vows, did not bind himself by vows. If he attempted right behaviour, this was because his spiritual training had led to the taming of the self. But where this was of no avail, penalties were inflicted and the discipline was tightened, sometimes in ways which left no loop-holes for laxity.

If there were no initial vows, far less were there any “final vows,” making a return to life “in the world” extremely difficult, if not impossible. For even after the second ordination ceremony, the *upasampadā*; a *bhikkhu* was able, if he wished, to “leave the Order,” *vibbhamati*, as is the Vinaya word, and to “turn back to the low life of the layman,” *hīnāyavattati*, as is the Piṭakan expression. What was binding on the *bhikkhu* was the one rule, the Pātimokkha, under which he lived, the one training and the one work, as the definition of “in communion” at the end of each *Pārājika* rule shows, If he was not at one with these, he was defeated and expelled from the Order.

A *bhikkhu* goes for alms, he begs, silently, for alms; he is entirely dependent on the laity for food, robes, lodgings and medicine. In the great centuries of Western Monachism monks, far from being beggars for alms, were the donors of abundant charity. *bhikkhus* received alms, they did not give them. If a *bhikkhu* received no *kaṭhina* cloth at the time of its distribution, he wore rags taken from the dust-heap. Moreover, a mark of the *bhikkhu* is that he is one who wears the patchwork cloth (*bhinnapaṭadhara*). For even gifts of robe-material had to be made up, not whole, but in pieces, symbolical of a beggar's rags. The "yellow robes" of a *bhikkhu* are comparable to the Western "habit," the frock and cowl.

In looking for points of contact between "monks" and *bhikkhus*, their relation to the lay-followers might be adduced. In, for instance, a Cistercian abbey the brethren were divided into the monks (*monachi*) and the lay-brothers (*conversi*). The Buddhist Order also had its lay followers. But there, I think, the similarity between the Buddhists and the Cistercians ends. For the Buddhist lay-followers of the faith, in supporting the religious exponents and answering their call of poverty, did not regard them as the means of transmitting their gifts of charity to other needy laity. These gifts were made to and for the *bhikkhus*, and there the matter ended. Nor were the lay-followers organised as were the *conversi*. They did not live in the *vihāras* and they had no cloistral duties to perform. These were executed by those *bhikkhus* who had been duly appointed to various offices, such as that of food-distributor, assigner of lodgings, robe-distributor, silver-remover, and so forth, offices comparable to those of almoner, kitchener, cellarer of the Western convent, and which in Cistercian abbeys were performed by the *conversi*. The *vihāras* did not receive laity as guests; they only received monks from other districts. In Western monasteries the entertainment of lay-visitors was a very important matter.

The wide scope of meaning compressed into the word *bhikkhu* is doubtless an indication that the word was of gradual growth, its significance increasing as the object which it connoted acquired

more and more aspects and characteristics. I think the plain historic fact is that originally *bhikkhus* were no more than “men of the scrap-bowl.” To this was added, for their greater merit, the meaning of men who, besides living on begged meats, had broken away from this or that undesirable state, and had assumed various distinguishing marks.

In spite of the differences between *bhikkhu* and monk, the affinities between them seem to me marked enough to warrant translating *bhikkhu* as “monk.” I have also chosen “monk” for various other reasons. In the first place, in the translations of Pali literature which have already appeared, no less than in several books on Early Buddhism, monk is a rendering that has been commonly adopted for *bhikkhu*. This word, therefore, has some tradition behind it, and hence will not arrest the reader’s attention with a sense of unfamiliarity. Secondly, in deciding upon the nearest English equivalent for *bhikkhu*, I had to take into account the fact that an easy feminine form would be required. “Nun” is a very convenient translation for *bhikkhuni*, and has, moreover, equivalents in other European languages. This is not a negligible point when comparing translations. Another reason for the choice of “monk” was that, in the period of Indian history under review, this word necessitates, in the last resort, the drawing of a distinction merely between the Sakyan monk and the Jain monk. Each of the other possible terms—almsman, mendicant, friar¹—might be applicable to the disciples of other sects; but these could hardly be termed “monks.”

The tremendous growth in the meanings and associations of both “monk” and *bhikkhu* clearly shows that in some cases it is impossible for the history of words to be contained in their etymology. I mention this tendency for words to grow and change, a tendency not of course peculiar to these two terms, simply to remind the reader that etymology is not an infallible guide to the developed meaning of terms. By the time the objects that such terms denote have passed through several phases, their historical meaning their significance in and for

¹ “Brother” is hardly possible, as I have tried to show above.

history, may have come to be more than their etymological meaning indicates, different from it, even the very reverse of it. The most that etymology can do in such cases is to point to the meanings that the words once, very likely originally, possessed. This is of undoubted importance. But to translate them according to that meaning, and without a due regard for the known facts of their evolution, would be grossly to neglect the significance that they came to acquire as a result of their historical development.

In rendering *samaṇa* by “recluse” I am adopting what has come to be a fairly usual translation. I am aware that it is a far from happy one. It has no feminine form in English; its connotation of being segregated and living in isolation is misleading. For the Sakyan *samaṇas* were not segregated, in the sense of being confined within the *vihāra* precincts and forbidden to mix with the laity. They were restricted from following worldly occupations, for it was held that these should be given up when a man or woman went forth from the household state. But the Sakyan *samaṇas* were in no way anchorites or hermits. Nor do I think “ascetic”¹ a particularly suitable rendering. For nowhere is asceticism, as understood in the West, made of importance in Pali literature. The chief asceticism which it recognises is a taming, a training (*damatha*, from the root *dam*), the restraint of evil deeds, thoughts and words. Thus, although “ascetic” may, etymologically, be more correct than “recluse,” unless the Sakyan meaning of asceticism be thoroughly understood, and its Western connotations of bodily mortifications and austerities be dispelled, “recluse” comes nearer to the Pali than does “ascetic.” For there were times when the *samaṇas* went into seclusion for meditation. There are, besides, other words in Pali, such as *tāpasa*, literally burning, which more definitely connote an ascetic.

MRS. RHYS DAVIDS says that “monk” is our nearest word² to *samaṇa*, although she also puts forward another word, namely “re-

¹ E.g. E.J. THOMAS, *History of Buddhist Thought*, 72, 82, 89. ² *The Birth of Indian Psychology and its Development in Buddhism*, p.185; and cf. her *Outlines of Buddhism*, p.62, p.65.

treater,”¹ which perhaps is the best in the sense of preserving the history buried in the word *samaṇa*, *śramaṇa*. Doubtless “monk” could have been used for *samaṇa*, had this word not been selected as the most appropriate for *bhikkhu*. For from internal evidence, not only of the Suttavibhaṅga but of other parts of the Canon and the Commentaries,² it would appear that the Sakyan *samaṇa* was to all intents and purposes regarded as much the same as the Sakyan *bhikkhu*. The difference came to be more in the name than in the object, and may even have depended more on the person who used the term than on the person of whom it was used. This, in its turn, may depend on some earlier aspects of the history of the two terms.

The word *samaṇa* is not used as a direct form of address in the portion of the Suttavibhaṅga here translated. The brahmin of Ve-rañjā, before he became a lay-follower, does not address Gotama as *samaṇa*, although in speaking to him he uses this word of him (Vin 3.2 = BD 1.2 below); and Gotama, in this same conversation, is recorded to apply the term to himself. The schismatics also refer to Gotama in this way (Vin 3.171, Vin 3.172 = BD 1.296ff. below), but not in his presence. Monks are not recorded to address one another in this way, nor do the nuns employ the feminine *samaṇi* (vocative) when speaking to one another, nor the nominative *samaṇī* in speaking of one another. The laity, on the other hand, are sometimes recorded to speak of a particular monk by his personal name, coupled with the appellation *samaṇa*, such as *samaṇa* Udāyi (Vin 3.120 = BD 1.200 below). They also refer, so it is said, to monks as *samaṇā*, whether they admired them (Vin 3.119 = BD 1.200 below) or were vexed with them (Vin 3.120 = BD 1.200 below).

The curious thing is that the negative forms, *asamaṇo*, *asamaṇī*, occur quite often as terms of reproach, and meaning “not a true recluse.” On different occasions lay-people and monks are recorded

¹ *Buddhism*, Home Univeristy Library, new edition, p.198. ² Canonical references very frequent. For commentaries see, e.g. AN-a iii.156 (Siamese edition), *bhikkhū kaṇhādhimuttikā ti samaṇā nām’ ete*; and MN-a ii.4, where *samaṇas* are explained as those on the four ways to arahantship, thus being identified with *bhikkhus*.

to have reprimanded a monk for his bad behaviour by saying *asamaṇo 'si tvam*, “you are not a (true) recluse.” A nun is recorded to have rebuked another nun in the single phrase *asamaṇī 'si tvam*. This was evidently such a serious reproach as to send the person rebuked to Gotama to receive his verdict on the offence committed or imputed, as the case may have been. If the action performed by the monk or nun in question is found by him to be blameworthy, one of the words of censure put into his mouth is always *assāmaṇaka*, “not worthy of a recluse, not belonging to a recluse” (e.g. **Vin 3.24 = BD 1.43** below).

A common designation of the monastic followers of Gotama was *samaṇā Sakyaputtiyā*, recluses (literally sons of the) Sakyans, or Sakyan recluses. This was also used of them by the laity (e.g. **Vin 3.43, Vin 3.136, Vin 3.172 = BD 1.67, BD 1.234, BD 1.299** below), including those occasions where the monks had given them cause for complaint (**Vin 3.44, Vin 3.73, Vin 3.119 = BD 1.70, BD 1.125, BD 1.200** below). In each definition that it gives of *pārājika*, the Old Commentary invariably states that the errant *bhikkhu* is become one who is not a *samaṇa*, not a *Sakyaputtiya*. These two words, *asamaṇa* and *asakyaputtiya*, are sometimes used together in other passages as terms of abuse (**Vin 3.164f. = BD 1.283** below). It may also be noted that, as the monastic disciples of Gotama were called *samaṇā Sakyaputtiyā*, so the followers of Mahāvīra were called, even in the Pali canon,¹ *samaṇā Ni-gaṇṭhā*, or to be exact, *nigaṇṭhā nāma samaṇajātikā*, a kind of recluse called *nigaṇṭhas* (Jains).

If the Sakyan *samaṇa* came to correspond with the Sakyan *bhikkhu* on the one side, on the other he came to correspond with *brāhmaṇa*, brahmin, in the meaning of this term as it grew into Sakya, and also into Jainism.² For the fact that *samaṇa* often appears in combination with *brāhmaṇa* in Pali canonical literature does not there, I think, necessarily imply any opposition between the two, any more

¹ AN i.206 ² *Jaina Sūtras*, ii.138 (edited by JACOBI, Sacred Books of the East XLV): “He who has no worldly attachment after entering the Order, who does not repent of having become a monk ... him we call a *brāhmaṇa*.” Again at p.422: “The *samaṇas* or *brāhmaṇas* who say thus ... do not speak as *samaṇas* or *Nigranṭhas*.”

than it does in Jaina literature.¹ According to Professor B.M. BARUA,² there were various sects or groups or schools of Śramaṇa who broke away from the “later form of Brahmanic religion, superstition and mysticism.” So far there was opposition. But by the time that the Sakyaputtiyas were known as *samaṇas*, the term *brāhmaṇa* was also being incorporated into Sakyan usage, and was there receiving a new meaning.

While brahmins as a class remained, brahmins by birth and occupation, brahmins forming sects of ascetics, living by various rules, the word *brāhmaṇa* was developing for Sakya the meaning of the best, the highest person, not because of birth and lineage, but because of spiritual endeavour and attainment. To this, *samaṇa* in public opinion was evidently equivalent. Had not the two words come to have some identity of meaning, not exactly the same things would have been said of them both, as is the case in a formula occurring now and again in this part of the Suttavibhaṅga (e.g. Vin 3.44, Vin 3.120 = BD 1.70, BD 1.200 below). On the other hand, the words *samaṇa* and *brāhmaṇa* occur in two other sentences at Vin 3.44, once separated by the disjunctive *vā* (or), once forming a compound. It is possible that some divergence between the two is intended here, as perhaps referring to members of different sects; in which case the two words would not be substitutes or synonyms for one another.³

I have left *brāhmaṇa* in its anglicised form of brahmin. The time is perhaps not yet ripe to draw an infallible distinction between brahmins as members of a sect opposed to Sakya, and brahmins as men, as monks, who had attained, or who had failed to attain, some of the ethical attributes and mental development inculcated by Sakya. A verse in the Dhammapada clearly identifies the three, for it ends: *so brāhmaṇo so samaṇo sa bhikkhu* (Dhp 142). To differentiate between the Sakyan and non-Sakyan uses of *brāhmaṇa*, as this word occurs

¹ Cf. Jaina Sūtras, ii.140, and last note. ² Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy, p. 242. See also p. 237ff. ³ On *samaṇas* see B.M. BARUA, Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy, p. 242, and RATILAL MEHTA, Asceticism in Pre-Buddhist Days, Indian Culture, iii.4.

in the Pali canon, would be to emphasise the new meaning which, under Sakya, accrued to *brāhmaṇa*, as a word adopted from earlier times.

For there is no doubt that the three terms—*bhikkhu*, *brāhmaṇa* and *samaṇa*—were, in their Sanskrit forms of *bhikṣu*, *brāhmaṇa*, *śramaṇa*, already in the terminology of pre-Sakyan days.¹ Each word will therefore have some pre-Sakyan history, even though this is, in many respects, still obscure. *Brāhmaṇa* is of course a term of enormously long and complicated history, of indisputable antiquity. Professor B.M. BARUA says² that “*śramaṇas* became known, perhaps from the practice of begging, as *bhikṣus* (mendicants).” And referring to a passage in the Aṅguttara Commentary, he further points out that “by the *bhikṣus* must have been meant the members of the fourth Brahmanic order, that is, the Brahmanist ascetics in the fourth stage of efforts and fruitions who are designated *bhikṣu*, *yati* or *parivrājaka* in the Dharma-Sūtras and the Dharma-Sāstras.”³ It is worth while to mention that, according to Jacob’s Concordance, in the early Upāniṣads, *śramaṇa* appears but once,⁴ *brāhmaṇa* many times, and *bhikṣu* not at all. *Śramaṇa* occurs, however, in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.

If *bhikkhu* were equivalent in fact to *samaṇa*, and if this were, on some occasions at least, equivalent to the Sakyan usage of *brāhmaṇa*, ‘it is not difficult to see why the life of monks continued to be called *brahmacariya* under Sakya.’⁵ But as the most suitable translation of *brahma* has still to be decided upon, when it occurs in the compounds *brahmacariya* and *brahmacārin*, I have left it untranslated.⁶ The difficulty is to determine what was meant by the “best life.” Whether at one time *brahma*, as part of the compound *brahmacariya*, may not have possessed the deep and essential meaning of the All, the All-Real, the Highest that it possessed in the Upaniṣadic teaching

¹ Cf. interesting Jaina tradition that Mahāvīra’s parents were followers of the *śramaṇas*, Sacred Books of the East xxii.194. ² *History of Pre-Buddhist Philosophy*, p.240. ³ *Maskarī as an Epithet of Gośāla*, Indian History Quarterly, iii.2, p.254. ⁴ *Bṛhadāranyaka* 4,3,22. ⁵ See *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.212–215. The word *brahmacārin* occurs once in the Rg Veda in the (later) Maṇḍala, Rg Veda 10.109.

⁶ Vin 3.164 = BD 1.282 below.

is as yet a matter of controversy. I find it hard to believe that Sakya arose either in ignorance of this teaching or uninfluenced by it. And even if, as seems highly probable, *brahmacariya* and *brahmacārin* are words taken over by Sakya (and Jainism) from pre-Sakyan sects, it has still to be established that for these *brahma* did not contain some profound philosophical or religious significance.

Besides *brahmacariya* and *brahmacārin*, I have left untranslated two other words of great importance. These are *dhamma* and *tathāgata*.

Dhamma is a word whose meaning appears to vary in varying contexts. It may mean something like what we should call “conscience,” that which should be done, in one passage; the externalised body of doctrine, in another; fashion, act (*etena dhammena*, Vin 3.133 = BD 1.225 below), in a third. Mrs. Rhys Davids has written at some length on the meaning of *dhamma* in her later works, to which I now refer the reader.

ANESAKI, in his essay on *Tathāgata*,¹ closely connects the notion of *tathāgata* with that of *Dhamma*, but he comes no nearer to a conclusive translation of *tathāgata* than do others. For the very ambiguity of its derivation precludes any definitive meaning. This being the case, and because Anesaki has virtually shown that no empirical investigations of the uses of the term can bring us near to a meaning fixed once and for all, we must regard *tathāgata* as a term best left untranslated. I give here four ways in which it might be rendered:

1. The one thus-gone, or thus-going (*tathā-gata*), since *gata* may be taken as a present as well as a past participle;
2. The one thus-come, or thus-coming (*tathā-āgata*);
3. The truth-finder, used by Lord Chalmers in *Further Dialogues of the Buddha*, as the result of empirical considerations;
4. The Way-farer, a rendering suggested by MRS. RHYSDAVIDS,²

¹ *Katam Karaniyam*, Tokyo, 1934, p.240ff. ² *Sakya*, pp.67-68, p.381; *Manual of Buddhism*, p.116.

and used by F.L. WOODWARD in *Gradual Sayings*, V.¹

In Pali literature the term is not applied exclusively to Gotama himself.

If the meaning of words is liable to vary in different contexts, it is wiser and less misleading not to translate those words until there has been some further advance in Pali criticism and interpretation.

Deva, *devatā* and *yakkha* are other words that I have not translated. This is partly because the nature of these beings has not yet been fully investigated or established; and partly because the little we do know of them leads us to suppose that they represent kinds of beings for whom in English there are no acceptable equivalents. For example, in canonical Pali, *devas* are no longer “gods,” as they were in the Vedic age; nor are they “angels.”² Mrs. Rhys Davids has suggested that they were “brave and pious gentlemen who have passed as ‘*devas*’ to the next world only to come back one day as men.”³ There is no doubt that these three classes of being are regarded as having a close contact with the world of men. The word *deva* is often coupled with *manussa*, men, people (e.g. [Vin 3.1](#)). The earth-*devas* are recorded to have heard of Sudinna’s lapse, and to have communicated it to the other groups of *devas* ([Vin 3.18](#) = [BD 1.33](#) below). It is told how a *devatā* (feminine) belonging to Māra’s retinue came and encouraged Migalaṇḍika for having deprived the monks of life ([Vin 3.69](#) = [BD 1.118](#) below).

Neither do *yakkhas* seem far removed from the human sphere. Words like “fairies, sprites or goblins” do not accord at all well with the Indian way of thinking. There are the predatory *yakkhas* (or *yakkhas* in the form of beasts of prey) who killed some monks, and there is the story of the exorcist monk who deprived a *yakkha* of life ([Vin 3.84](#) = [BD 1.146](#) below). A monk is recorded to have had sexual intercourse with a *yakkhini* ([Vin 3.37](#) = [BD 1.56](#) below), although the Old Commentary does not include this type of being among *mātugāma*, women-kind (e.g. [Vin 3.121](#) = [BD 1.202](#) below). It defines *mātugāma* as

¹ See GS v.xiii; *Verses of Uplift*, Sacred Books of the Buddhists VIII, p. 81, n. 2. ² A. COOMARASWAMY, *A New Approach to the Vedas*, p. 60ff. ³ *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 92.

manussitthi, human women, and carefully and deliberately excludes *yakkhīs*, *petas*, and female animals.

Where the word *peta*, and the feminine *petī*, occur I have used the translation suggested by MRS. RHYS DAVIDS¹ of “departed one”. It appears that *petas*, departed ones, those who have gone on, gone before, were regarded as still endowed with life, and able to speak to men. There is the story of the body, inhabited by the *peta* (Vin 3.58 = BD 1.97 below), which rose up in the cemetery, by what the Commentary calls “the *peta*’s own power,” and pursued a monk, asking him not to remove his outer cloak from him. It is also curious that it was thought possible for a monk to commit an offence with *petas*, and that although an offence committed with *petas*, *yakkhinīs* and *nāgīs* (female serpents?) is as grave in nature as one committed with a human woman, these beings are excluded from the Old Commentary’s definition of “woman-kind.” It almost looks as if a *peta* means one who is quite recently dead, and whose mind and spirit still have power over the body, being not yet entirely dissociated from it.

I think that what emerges most clearly from the Vinaya references to *devas*, *devatās*, *yakkhas* and *petas*, is that there is a non-human world (cf. *amanussagāma* at Vin 3.46 = BD 1.74 below) whose various denizens penetrate the human world and participate in the affairs of men, as their counterparts are thought to do in India, Burma and Ceylon at the present day.

Where names of weights, measures and mediums of exchange occur, I have left them untranslated, and have given notes. All attempts to correlate English words to these would be wholly misleading, and would conjure up a set of wrong ideas.

Amongst the store of incidental knowledge that this part of the Vinaya brings to light, it should be noted that the word *nibbāna* occurs only twice, each time in the same stereotyped formula (Vin 3.20, Vin 3.111 = BD 1.35, BD 1.194 below). I have translated it as “waning.” Nothing more can be safely deduced from its virtual absence than the concentration of this portion of the Suttavibhaṅga on outward

¹ *Indian Religion and Survival*, p. 35; and cf. p. 59.

morality, on forms of behaviour to be regulated and guided by an external standard rather than by an appeal to the inner conscience, the inner morality which, in the India of the sixth century B.C., was held to be immanent in man.

Besides this piece of negative information, a good many positive details, mostly concerning contemporary manners and customs, are brought to light in this part of the Suttavibhaṅga. There is, for example, mention of the punishments that a king could mete out to a thief, while there emerges the very fact that a king meted them out (Vin 3.46 = BD 1.72, BD 1.73 below); mention of some of the kinds of ornaments used (Vin 3.48, Vin 3.180 = BD 1.75f., BD 1.314 below); some of the kinds of games played (Vin 3.180 = BD 1.316 below); the sort of food-stuffs in common consumption; various kinds of animals, birds, insects, plants and flowers (Vin 3.48, Vin 3.49, Vin 3.52, Vin 3.58 = BD 1.79, BD 1.80, BD 1.87, BD 1.98 below); there is mention of the existence of customs, frontiers and customs' houses (Vin 3.52, Vin 3.62 = BD 1.86, BD 1.104 below); smuggling, kidnapping of children, the kind of treatment given by monks to their ill comrades; there is evidence for the belief that trees may be inhabited by conscious beings; and there is the indication that Indians, then as now, appear to have no difficulty in dying at will. I have nothing to add to Rhys Davids' and Oldenberg's remarks on the knowledge and use of writing¹ at the time of the compilation of the Vinaya.

The following authorities, including the late Professor E.J. Rapson, kindly helped me on the difficult point of finding a translation for the term *bhikkhu*; their letters were most interesting, while showing a considerable diversity of opinion. I have much pleasure in tendering my thanks to all their writers: to Professor J. Przyluski, Mrs. Rhys Davids, Professor Otto Schrader, Professor Helmer Smith and Professor F.W. Thomas. Above all, I should like to express my gratitude to my friend, Miss A.M. Cooke, for her illuminating conversations on the Western monk. It remains for me to thank, especially and most sincerely, Mrs. Rhys Davids for entrusting the translation of

¹ *Vinaya Texts*, i.xxiiiff.

the Vinaya to me, for her many rewarding suggestions, and for the help that she has generously bestowed upon the preparation of this volume.

(*Note by Sujato: The following notes on the text do not apply to this SuttaCentral edition.*)

An asterisk in the text denotes that the word or passage beside which it appears is given in full in Pali in the Appendix.

The page numbers, given in square brackets in the text, and corresponding to Oldenberg's page numbers of his edition of the *Vinayaṭīkā*, are placed, not at the beginning of the pages to which the translation corresponds, but at the end. This has been done in order to introduce a certain consistency, for all Vinaya numbering—of section, sub-section and paragraph—is placed at the end.

I.B. HORNER

Manchester, 1938.

EDITORIAL NOTE

At the translator's request I say here a few words. Words of valediction for a work which is a genuine labour of love. Result though it be of strenuous, unfaltering research, the translation of an ancient thesaurus of monastic legality, as is the Pali Vinaya Ṭīkā, is not of the class we call "best seller." Labour and printing costs have been alike undertaken by my friend and colleague, the translator. And I am not a little proud to think that a book which my husband helped, in his early efforts, to bring in part before European readers, should now receive my blessing in its first complete form after this interval of over half a century.

It may interest some to learn, as to that translation in part, how the two translators divided the work. For living in different countries, each translating in his leisure moments, there seems to have been (more's the pity!) very little if any collaboration. No correspondence

survives revealing that any took place. On the fly-leaf of Volume I of *Vinaya Texts*, Sacred Books of the East XIII, there stands in Rhys Davids' handwriting the following:

“Of the work I have translated the

- Pātimokkha i.1–90.
- Mahāvagga v and vi.22; ii.1–ii.81. 80pp.
vi.32–vii.3. 43pp.
viii.12–32. 49pp.
- Cullavagga i–iii 120pp.
iv.1–12 (the whole volume). 440pp.
Total: 800pp. out of 1230pp.

The rest, as is well known, was the work of that fastidiously careful scholar, Hermann Oldenberg.”

As she has stated in her Introduction, Isaline Horner begins her translation at the beginning, as Oldenberg did not, in his edition of the Pali text, published shortly before the birth of the Pali Text Society. The Sacred Books of the East translation was a large selection, not the complete work.

In the *Vinaya*, taking it by and large, we have the records of a great effort, put forth by the culture of North India during the sixth to the third century B.C., to “get rich quickly” in things, not of worldly experience, but of man's spiritual fortune. The idea, in monasticism, was that the man, in striving to become a *More* than his worldly fellows, could best do so by making his life here a *Less*. By cutting out a great part of what our poets have called “life in the whole,” it was judged he would, by living a simplified remainder, progress much faster. Progress, that is, towards that waning out of repeated spans of life as he knew it here, or heard of it in the next world or worlds.

This is surely to misunderstand life as we find it. An enemy army is not conquered by its being attacked in one section only. The monk admitted that he bore his enemy about with him in body and mind. And to shelter body and mind from opportunities of efforts towards

a Better, such as life in its fullness alone could afford, was no sound method of seeking to grow. Man is but a less if he shirk much of life. Not along such lines does the Hand draw him which *au fond de l'idéal fait signe*. (Being in the depths of the evidence is ideal.)

It is doubtless true that the withdrawn life is not only good at times, but may, there or then, be necessary for the student. But I do not find this need expressing itself in Buddhist monastic literature as a motive for leaving the world. I may be wrong, and shall welcome correction. For the history of monasticism, especially of monasticism in what was perhaps its cradle, has yet to be written. And a complete translation of the Vinaya Piṭaka will bring such a work nearer the day when it can be written.

C.A.F. RHYS DAVIDS

PREFACE TO THE SUTTA CENTRAL EDITION

The Vinaya is one of humanity's most extraordinary texts. Always reasonable, often surprising, and full of outrageous and entertaining stories, it offers a vision of an ideal community that is as relevant—and as challenging—as it has ever been. The Vinaya is thoroughly anarchist: no hierarchy, no power vested in individuals, consensus decision making, and property held in common. It is this that has allowed the Sangha the flexibility to adapt Vinaya practice in response to changing times and places. The Vinaya dispenses with power in favour of principle. It works because the monastic community wants to do the right thing, and are willing to work together with sincerity. Originating in a culture where torture and capital punishment were considered normal, the Vinaya envisages no punishment worse than expulsion from the community, while most “offences” may be settled with a simple confession to another monastic.

The treatment of women in the Vinaya is somewhat complex and controversial. However it must be borne in mind that the overriding purpose of the nuns' Vinaya is so that women can set up and run independent spiritual communities, teaching and training them-

selves. And, as several Vinaya rules show, nuns were fully involved in building monasteries, teaching the lay community, and all other aspects of monastic life. There is no power of command by monks over nuns, and nowhere are the monks allowed to make Vinaya rulings for the nuns. The nuns were a self-governing community, fully autonomous except for a few occasions when they participated jointly in formal acts of the Sangha together with monks. But even on such occasions, the monks were not in control: the Vinaya is in control and the monks must act in accord with Vinaya.

In this and many other matters we see in the Vinaya a constant compromise and adjustment, as the ideals of the Dhamma run up against the realities of our profane world. The Vinaya does not shy away from the sordid, even the evil. A large proportion of the text documents the wicked behaviour of monastics. Yet it is essentially optimistic. It assumes that people will, by and large, tell the truth and try to do the right thing; and that, with the significant exception of the *Pārājika* rules, everyone deserves a second chance.

The voice of the Buddha runs like a thread of light through the entire Vinaya, informing every decision, and present on almost every occasion. Yet much of the Vinaya as we have it today originated later; I would put the main period of composition of the Vinayas at perhaps 100–200 years after the Buddha. We are fortunate to have many different recensions of Vinaya texts, a few of which are referred to by Horner in her introduction. Comparative studies of the Vinaya, while still inadequate, have come a long way since her time. One of the overwhelming findings of these studies is that, while the *Pātimokkha* texts of the different versions are almost identical, the background stories, detailed analyses, and case studies vary considerably. Together with the very strong evidence of massive editorial input in the text, for example in the artificial repetitions of nearly identical events, it is clear that the Vinaya texts as they stand constitute a complex, highly sophisticated literature that evolved and developed over a considerable period of time. While it is not possible to say with certainty exactly what originated with the Buddha,

we will not stray too far from the truth if we assume that the rules, and some of the other material such as certain *Saṅghakammas*, originate from the Buddha himself, while most of the other material is the product of later generations. This later material is not a fixed recitation as the Pātimokkha was, but neither is it entirely invented; rather, it draws freely and creatively from earlier traditions.

In 2013, as work for SuttaCentral was gathering pace, we heard the good news that on 10 May the Pali Text Society had released a number of texts under a Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial 3.0 licence. This release included the six volumes of the classic Vinaya translation by I.B. HORNER, *The Book of the Discipline*. Crucially, the terms of the release permit derivative works, which meant that the way was open to create a new edition of this classic of 20th century Buddhist scholarship.

We immediately undertook to create a natively digital edition of this translation, which remains the only complete translation of the Vinaya into English. In doing so, we aimed to honor the work of I.B. Horner and the Pali Text Society, and to promote a greater awareness and understanding of the Vinaya for those who are not able to access the printed edition.

The process of creating this edition was this. First the text was scanned, OCR-ed, converted into a Word document, and proofread. This initial process was done by Ven Jaganātha assisted by Ven Nibbidā. They then handed the project to me, and I engaged an IT firm, Hi-Tech Outsourcing Services, to convert the Word document into a detailed, clean, and semantic HTML/XML file, as well as doing another round of proofreading. This demanding project was handled with skill and good cheer by Jatin Patel and his team at Hi-Tech. Finally I went over the files, doing final touches like headings, ensuring that references were consistent, creating internal links, and further proofing. Ultimately the text is marked up in HTML5, closely related to the markup used on SuttaCentral, but with a few special features.

Horner's translation is easy to criticize. It regularly relies on over-literal renderings, while at the same time there are many errors in

rendering the Pali. The style is distractingly archaic, and it would be a mistake to attribute this to the passing of time since publication: it was already archaic when it was published. The Parivāra translation, for example, was published in 1966, the same year “Good Vibrations” and “Rainy Day Women # 12 & 35” were released; yet it unironically uses the phrase “Thou understandeth...”. Such archaisms indicate a gulf not in time but in culture. Horner belonged to a generation where Buddhist studies were the province of a European intellectual elite; while the popularization of Buddhism that began in that decade owed more to the Beach Boys and Bob Dylan than to the academic texts of the Pali scholars.

Perhaps the most glaring example of the gulf in time and culture between ourselves and Horner lies not in the style of the translation but in her doctrinal interpretations. Writing in the mid-20th century, Horner came under the influence of her teacher and mentor, Caroline Rhys-Davids, and her overbearing tendency to read every possible word and phrase as implying that the Buddha’s *real* teaching was of a “Self” that was made to “Become”. Thankfully, such interpretations have (mostly) disappeared from the Buddhist world, and exist now as relics of the West’s gradual and uncertain progress towards understanding the *Dhamma*, best discreetly passed over. I only mention this here because I suspect that some modern readers, unfamiliar with the historical context, will find such references confusing.

Despite this, with one important exception—the *Pārājika* rules, which I will discuss below—no substantive changes have been made to the text. Tempting though it has been to correct some long standing mistakes (nuns do not carry weapons!), I have endeavoured to recreate in digital form the work of I.B. Horner. Rather than attempting piecemeal corrections I felt it would be better to start with a faithful digital text, then undertake a thorough revision.

However, I have not been so conservative when it comes to the structure and referencing systems used in the text. Our goal has been to create an edition that is compatible with SuttaCentral, and

many details have been standardized accordingly. In particular, the text incorporates a truly staggering quantity of references in the footnotes. Normally for SuttaCentral's texts we exclude footnotes and similar material: we are presenting the ancient texts, not modern opinions. However, in this case I felt that the value of the notes was such that it would be a shame for them to be omitted from a digital edition. It is precisely the interconnectedness that marks the Vinaya as a sophisticated system, and nowhere have the relations between various parts of the text been delineated in as much detail as in Horner's notes. We thus decided to include the notes in a separate digital edition, while the text on SuttaCentral will, as usual, be presented without notes.

This meant we had to sort out the nearly 12,000 internal cross-references, as well as over 7,000 external references. The internal references required a great deal of work to standardize. To start with, there is the problem that the entire text runs three distinct referencing systems in parallel:

1. The "volume and page" of the PTS Pali edition;
2. The "volume and page" of the English translation;
3. The "chapter and section" numbers, which are the same for both editions.

It is a shame that the editors of the Pali editions did not uniformly insist on a detailed "chapter and section" system, as we are now in the unfortunate situation where the academic standard is to reference the volume and page of the increasingly outdated PTS Pali paper editions.

The situation is more complex than that, however. For the original text placed the reference numbers at the *end* of the section they refer to, following the Pali tradition. Such an arrangement does not sit easily with the logic underlying modern documents, which are codified in systems such as HTML, and for this edition we have relocated all references to the *beginning* of the relevant section

In addition, Horner often used highly abbreviated forms of ref-

erence, making it difficult to tell exactly what level of section or subsection is being referred to. We have tried to eliminate this problem by spelling all references out in full. Once the references had been made (so far as possible) entirely explicit and consistent, it was a (relatively) simple matter to turn them into hyperlinks. Thus all of the internal cross references should, in theory, link to the correct place in the text. Any errors found in the references are likely to be the result of the digitizing process, rather than being in the original text, for errors of reference in the text are exceedingly rare (although I have silently corrected a very few).

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations follow the system we use on SuttaCentral. While we do not arbitrarily violate accepted scholarly custom, the constraints of our environment force us to do some things differently. For SuttaCentral, each abbreviation must be:

- Unique across the entire corpus;
- Case insensitive;
- Without special characters such as diacriticals;
- Usually two, hopefully no more than three, characters long.

While it may take some getting used to, the system is quite powerful. “Bi-Pj 1” is “Bhikkhunī Pārājika 1”, “Kd 3.2.1” is “section 2, subsection 1 of the third Khandhaka”, and so on. I have also written in full all of the rarely-used abbreviations, including almost all abbreviations for things outside the Pali canon. Table 1 presents a list of abbreviations as used in this book.

Table 1: List of Abbreviations

BD	The Book of the Discipline
Vin	Pali Text Society’s Pali edition of the Vinayaṭṭaka
Bu	Bhikkhu
Bi	Bhikkhunī
Pj	Pārājika

Ss	Saṅghādisesa
Ay	Aniyata
NP	Nissaggiya Pācittiya
Pc	Pācittiya
Pd	Pāṭidesaniya
Sk	Sekhiya
As	Adhikaraṇasamatha
Kd	Khandhaka
Prv	Pārivāra
DN	Dīgha Nikāya
MN	Majjhima Nikāya
SN	Saṃyutta Nikāya
AN	Āṅguttara Nikāya
Kp	Khuddakapāṭha
Dhp	Dhammapada
Ud	Udāna
It	Itivuttaka
Snp	Sutta Nipāta
Vv	Vimānavatthu
Pv	Petavatthu
Thag	Theragāthā
Thig	Therīgāthā
Tha-ap	Thera-apadāna
Thi-ap	Therī-apadāna
Ja	Jātaka
Mnd	Mahāniddeśa
Cnd	Cūḷaniddeśa
Pt	Paṭisambhidhāmagga
Ne	Netti
Mil	Milindapañha
Ds	Dhammasaṅgaṇī
Vb	Vibhaṅga
Pp	Puggalapaññatti
Kv	Kathāvatthu

-a	-Aṭṭhakathā (Commentary)
Vism	Visuddhimagga
GS	Gradual Sayings (PTS translation of the Aṅguttara)
KS	Kindred Sayings (PTS translation of the Saṃyutta)

Note that in most references the “volume” is in Roman numerals. The exceptions are the main references, Vin and BD, where the automated linking of cross-references would be made more difficult using Roman numerals, and they are therefore in ordinary numerals. Thus Vin 2.34 means “Volume 2, page 34 of the PTS Pali edition of the Vinayaṭīṭaka”, while DN i.45 means “Volume 1, page 45 of the PTS Pali edition of the Dīgha Nikāya”. Where such texts appear without Roman numerals, they indicate a *sutta* number; thus MN 34 means “the thirty-fourth discourse of the Majjhima Nikāya”.

In addition, I have eliminated most of the abbreviations used by Horner. She abbreviated “translated” as “transld.”, for example, and peppered liberally through the text are countless other standard and non-standard abbreviations that serve little purpose except to make a difficult text more difficult.

THE TRANSLATION OF THE PĀRĀJĪKA RULES

The single exception to the principle of preserving Horner’s translation lies in the *Pārājīka* rules. Here we present a substantially revised translation by Ven. Brahmali. The reason for presenting this material here is, on my part, a little embarrassing: I lost the originals.

What happened was this. When preparing the text, in discussions with Ven. Brahmali, we agreed that this would be a wonderful chance to correct and improve the many long-standing problems with Horner’s translation. Yet we also wanted to honor her work by presenting it as is. So we decided to produce a faithful digital edition of her translation, and meanwhile, Ven. Brahmali undertook a substantive revision. Ven. Brahmali is a Pali scholar of some twenty years, was a major assistant to Bhikkhu Bodhi in the translations of the Saṃyutta and Aṅguttara Nikāyas, and has been teaching

and practising the Vinaya for many years in a Sangha community; I cannot think of anyone better qualified to do this work. Yet it is, of course, a difficult and long process, and he has many other duties calling his attention, so we agreed to release the Horner translation first, and allow the revision to proceed at its own pace.

However, after handing the HTML files of the four *Pārājikas* to Ven. Brahmali, I neglected to keep copies, while he, making the unwarranted assumption that I was competent, proceeded to overwrite the files I gave him. Of course, we still had the original Word document, but it would be a long and dreary process to begin the markup process from scratch. In addition, as it happens, the first *Pārājika* is the place where Horner's translation is the most deficient, due to her Edwardian sense of propriety. So I decided to include Brahmali's translation of the four *Pārājikas*.

This creates some issues. First is that of consistency: Brahmali uses some different renderings of Vinaya terms. Hopefully this will not prove too confusing, and will be made up for by his more accurate and articulate translation. More problematic, his translation dispenses with the complex notes and cross-references of Horner's edition, since there is no need to duplicate this work. However, it would be a shame to omit the notes from these important rules. So I have made the choice, admittedly imperfect, to include Horner's notes with Brahmali's translation. This occasionally results in incongruity, repetition, or omission; I hope the reader can forgive such infelicities under the circumstances. It should be borne in mind that this will not be the final version of Ven. Brahmali's translation. While it is complete and careful as far as it goes, when translating the remainder of the Vinaya it is to be expected that he will want to make some corrections and modifications to this section.

STRUCTURAL CHANGES

Some structural changes have been made. I have introduced a fuller and more informative set of headings, which were lacking in some portions of Horner's text, notably the Khandhakas. The detailed head-

ings are based on those found in the Mahāsaṅgīti Pali edition used on SuttaCentral. These mostly break the text at obvious places, which usually, though not always, correspond to breaks of some kind in Horner’s edition, such as section numbers, spaces in the text, or notes on the end of sections. Occasionally, however, the breaks in the Mahāsaṅgīti break impose themselves on the text, forcing new paragraph breaks, as for example at the very beginning of the discourse on the eight wonderful qualities of the ocean (**Kd 19.1.3**); in Horner’s text the Buddha’s speech starts in the same paragraph as the introductory statement, whereas in the Mahāsaṅgīti edition the Buddha’s speech begins after a new heading.

In a few cases the Mahāsaṅgīti headings spell out the text in more detail, exposing the highly compressed form of Horner’s text in such instances. While this might seem to add a certain disjointedness to the text, as seen for example in **Kd 11.11.1**, it has the advantage of revealing with greater clarity the extreme formalism of the text’s structure.

In addition, the structure in a few cases has been adapted. Most importantly, the Khandhakas are now treated as such, rather than the artificial division of “Mahāvagga” and “Cullavagga”, which exist only as conveniences for the manuscript editions, and which have no counterparts in other Vinayas.

Two of Horner’s chapters in the Parivāra have been divided: her Chapter IV has become Prv.4 and Prv.5, and her Chapter VII has become Prv.8 and Prv.9. The numbering of other Chapters has been adjusted accordingly, and I have made minor changes to some of the wording so that the text remains comprehensible. This numbering is used in the Mahāsaṅgīti Pali edition used on SuttaCentral, and Horner’s extensive discussions of the problems with her numbering (see **BD 6.xiii**), which she based on Oldenberg’s Pali text, make it clear that the Mahāsaṅgīti numbering is preferrable. Table 2 contains a list of the changed numbering for the Parivāra chapters.

Many of the verses have been reformatted; in such cases I have merely tried to present Horner’s wording in a clear manner, and

Table 2: Changes in numbering for Parivāra Chapters

Horner	SuttaCentral
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4 and 5
5	6
6	7
7	8 and 9
8	10
9	11
10	12
11	13
12	14
13	15
14	16
15	17
16	18
17	19
18	20
19	21

have not tried to match the verses line by line with the Pali. In one or two cases—notably the lengthy passage at **Kd 1.15.6**—text mistakenly treated as prose has been formatted as verse (without changing the content).

In some cases, such as the Ekuttara of the Parivāra, I have treated the text as a list for clarity.

VARIANT NUMBERING FOR *BHIKKHUNĪ* RULES

One area of difficulty is the numbering of the *bhikkhunī* rules. The nuns incorporate many of the monks' rules, but these are not marked in the Pali text. We only know the full list of nuns' rules from the commentaries and the independent *Nuns' Pātimokkha* texts. In most cases this does not affect the numbering. The *Sekhiyas* and *Adhi-*

karaṇasamathas are identical for monks and nuns. The *Pāṭidesaniyyas* are, on the other hand, completely different so there is no overlap. With the *Pācittiyas* and the *Nissaggiya Pācittiyas*, the nuns' rules are listed at the start, and the monks' rules added after, so they do not affect the numbering.

However, in the case of the *Pārājikas* and *Saṅghādisesas* the numbering of the nuns' rules is affected by the inclusion of the relevant monks' rules. The numbering in Horner's text ignored the monks' rules and simply listed the nuns' rules in sequence as found in the Pali. This follows the indications found at the end of each rule in the Pali text; however the Pali is not consistent, as elsewhere the rules are, as here, simply counted from one to eight (eg. [Prv 2.1:Bi-Pj 6](#)). When incorporated as a combined edition on SuttaCentral each number must be unique. I have therefore changed the numbering of the relevant rules for nuns as per Table 3.

Table 3: Changes in numbering of bhikkhunī rules

Horner	SuttaCentral
Bi-Pj.1	Bi-Pj.5
Bi-Pj.2	Bi-Pj.6
Bi-Pj.3	Bi-Pj.7
Bi-Pj.4	Bi-Pj.8
Bi-Ss.7	Bi-Ss.10
Bi-Ss.8	Bi-Ss.11
Bi-Ss.9	Bi-Ss.12
Bi-Ss.10	Bi-Ss.13

SEMANTIC MARKUP

One of the features of our text is that it incorporates semantic markup. (Of course this only applies to the HTML version.) This is especially beneficial in the Vinaya, which has such a detailed and technical structure. Thus rules are marked “rule”, terms defined as “term”, definitions as “gloss”, and so on. Some of this semantic markup is visible in the text, but not all. You can see, for example, that rules are

bold, definitions are green, mnemonic verses are grey-on-grey, and so on. I tried to maintain a balance between readability and clarity of structure. Thus there is much semantic information that is hidden, but which can be exposed by a simple change to the CSS; it may also be used for delimiting searches and the like. Note that the addition of semantic tags is not complete. Table 4 contains a list of the semantic tags used in the text.

Table 4: Semantic markup

bhik- khuni	Matter concerning nuns.
kamma	Formal acts of the Sangha and other codified statements spoken in the midst of the Sangha.
jataka	Jātaka type material.
sutta	Sutta type material.
rule	Any class of rule.
subrule	A rule subsumed under another rule.
al- lowance	An allowance by the Buddha.
uddana	Mnemonic summary, usually in verse form.
term	Word or phrase to be defined.
gloss	Definition of such a word or phrase.
author	Author, editor, or translator of a secondary source.
essay	Title of an article in a journal, etc. Note that we do not use “article” for this to avoid conflicting with the HTML5 <code>article</code> tag.
book	Title of a book.
journal	Title of an academic journal. These are usually spelled out in full.
add	Material added to the text by the translator. Usually consists of instructions for expanding abbreviated text.
gatha	Verse.
namo	Words of homage.

Much more can, and should, be done in this area, such as clearly

marking all background stories, and so on. We hope to produce a more fully marked up edition in the future, but this will wait for further revisions of the translation by Ven. Brahmali.

FORMATS

In such a massive and complex text, I can hardly hope to have eliminated all mistakes. Despite the great help given by the many hands who have worked on this edition, I am all too conscious of what remains undone. Yet other duties call, and I cannot delay this publication indefinitely. Of course, one of the advantages of a digital edition is that it allows for progressive enhancement and correction. If you notice any mistakes, I would be grateful if you would point them out to me.

We have produced the text as HTML, and the ebook format EPUB, in addition to a PDF version produced with L^AT_EX. My own experience with the various ebook formats is that they are erratic and unstable, and display quite differently on each device. This is particularly the case for a complex document such as this. We have, nevertheless, done our best to produce standards compliant and clean files, and they work well on the systems we have used for testing.¹ The PDF should, of course, work well everywhere. Since the base text is in clean HTML5, it can be readily adapted to other formats. If you make any substantive adaptations, or would like to see a different format, please let me know.

The licence of the text allows for a printed edition as long as it is for free distribution. The PDF we have produced is, however, optimized for the screen. If you would like to sponsor a printed edition, please contact me and I will help prepare a PDF to your specifications.

BHIKKHU SUJATO

Sydney, March 2014.

¹ One bug I am aware of: in the ebook reader Calibre, the popup footnotes will not work properly in the default “paged mode”; choose the “flow mode” and all should be well. (Incidentally, I have not had good results using Calibre to convert this file into other formats, as it dirties the code and breaks the footnotes.)

MONKS' EXPULSION (PĀRĀJIKA) 1

Homage to the Master, the Arahant, the truly Awakened One

THE ORIGIN OF THE VINAYA

At one time the¹ Buddha, the Master, was staying at Verañjā² near Naḷeru's Nimba tree³ with a great Sangha of five hundred monks. Now a brahmin⁴ of Verañjā was told:

“Sir⁵, the recluse⁶ Gotama, the Sakyan,⁷ having gone forth from the Sakyan clan, is staying at Verañjā near Naleru's Nimba tree with a great Sangha of five hundred monks. That Master Gotama has acquired a good reputaton,⁸ thus:

‘He is indeed a Master, an *arahant*, fully awakened, accomplished in true knowledge and conduct, fortunate, knower of the worlds, unrivalled trainer of tamable people, teacher of gods and humans, the Awakened One, the Master. Having realised with his own direct knowledge this world with its gods, its lords of death and its supreme

¹ From here to end of **Bu-Pj 1.1.1** cf. AN iv.173. ² Quoted at DN-a i.12. Vin-a 108 merely says that Verañjā was the name of a town. It is mentioned again at AN iv.172, AN iv.197. At AN ii.57 it is said that Gotama was “journeying along the high-road between Madhurā and Verañjā.” For Madhurā on the Jumna see *Buddhist India*, p. 36; C.H.I.i.316. MN 4 says that Gotama addressed some brahmins and householders from Verañjā at Sāvattthī. ³ Vin-a 108 says that here the *yakkha* is called Naḷeru, that *pucimanda* is the *nimba*-tree (Azadirachta Indica), and that *mūlaṃ* is *samīpaṃ*. Cf. Pucimandajātaka, Ja iii.33. ⁴ Vin-a 111, *mātāpitūhi katanāmasena panāyam Udayo ti vuccati*. ⁵ See Introduction, **BD 1.xxxviii**. ⁶ See Introduction, **BD 1.lff**. ⁷ BRAHMALI: *Sakyaputta*, literally son of the Sakyan(s), but a Pali idiom meaning simply “a Sakyan.” ⁸ cf. DN i.87.

beings, this population with its recluses and brahmins, its gods and humans, he makes it known to others. He teaches a *Dhamma* that is good in the beginning, good in the middle and good in the end, with the right meaning and phrasing; he reveals a perfectly complete and pure spiritual life.’ Good indeed it is to see such *arahants*.”¹

Then the brahmin of Verañjā approached the Master, exchanged friendly greetings with him and sat down to one side.² He then said this to the Master:

“I have heard, good³ Gotama, that the recluse Gotama does not pay homage to brahmins who are worn, old, burdened with years, advanced in life, come to the last stage;⁴ nor that he stands up for them or offers them a seat. This is indeed so, for the good⁵ Gotama does not pay homage to brahmins who are worn, old, burdened with years, advanced in life, come to the last stage; nor does he stand up for them or offer them a seat. This, good Gotama, is not proper.”⁶

“Brahmin, in the world with its gods, its lords of death and its supreme beings, in this population with its recluses and brahmins, its gods and humans, I do not see one to whom I should pay homage, for whom I should rise up or to whom I should offer a seat. For if the Tathāgata should pay homage to anyone, rise up for him or offer him a seat, his head might even split asunder.”⁷

¹ All this is stock. ² BRAHMALI: The following is found in almost identical terms at AN 8.11. ³ *Bho*. This is the vocative, singular and plural, of *bhavant*. See Introduction, BD 1.XXXVIII. ⁴ Also stock; cf., e.g., MN i.82, Snp p.50, Snp p.92; Vin 2.188. ⁵ *Bhavañ*. ⁶ *Na sampaññaṃ eva*. Vin-a 130 *taṃ abhivādanādināṃ akaraṇaṃ ayuitaṃ eva*. Similar passages are at AN i.67 (AN-a: *na yuttaṃ eva, na anucchavikaṃ eva*). Translator at GS i.63 says “the idea here is ‘not the perfect gentleman’ or ‘bad form.’” See also AN iii.223; AN iv.173. ⁷ *muddhāpi tassa vipateyya*. Buddhaghosa explains at Vin-a 131: “the head of that man (*tassa puggalassa*) having been cut off from the neck, may it fall to the ground.” Same phrase occurs at DN i.143; DN iii.19; DhP 72.

Cf. Ja v.33, *muddhāpi tassa vipphateyya sattadhā* with variant readings: *vipa-*, *vipha-* and *phaleyyuṃ*. Cf. Ja v.493, *muddhāpi me sattadhā phaleyya* (“perhaps the best reading” — Pali-English Dictionary), and *ibid.*, *muddhāpi tassa vipateyya sattadhā*.

“The revered¹ Gotama lacks taste.”²

“There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one could truly say of me, ‘the recluse Gotama lacks taste.’ For tastes for forms, sounds, scents, flavours, and tangible objects—these have been destroyed by the Tathāgata, cut off at the root, made like a palm-stump, so utterly done away with that they are incapable of future arising. This is a way in which one could truly say of me, ‘the recluse Gotama lacks taste.’ But that is not what you meant.”

“The revered Gotama is without enjoyment.”³

“There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one could truly say of me, ‘the recluse Gotama is without enjoyment.’ For enjoyments of forms, sounds, scents, flavours, and tangible objects—these have been destroyed by the Tathāgata, cut off at the root, made like a palm-stump, so utterly done away with that they are incapable of future arising. This is a way in which one could truly say of me, ‘the recluse Gotama is without enjoyment.’ But that is not what you meant.”

“The revered Gotama professes the doctrine of non-action.”⁴

“There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one could truly say of me, ‘the recluse Gotama professes the doctrine of non-action.’ For I teach the non-doing of misconduct by body, speech and mind. I teach the non-doing of manifold bad unwholesome actions. This is a way in which one could truly say of me, ‘the recluse Gotama professes the doctrine of non-action.’ But that is not what you meant.”

“The revered Gotama professes the doctrine of annihilation.”⁵

“There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one could truly say of

¹ *Bhavaṃ*. ² *Arasarūpa*. Vin-a 131 takes this to mean lack of good manners. Gotama is said not to show complete taste, which consists in paying reverence, making salutation, getting up from the seat and making a respectful greeting. cf. Taittirīya Upaniṣad ii.7. ³ *Nibbhoga*, or “property,” as at GS iv.118. Vin-a 134 says that greeting the aged is *sāmaggi-paribhoga*. ⁴ For this passage to end of Bu-Pj 1.1.3 cf. Vin 1.234-236 and AN iv.18off., in both of which Gotama is represented as speaking with the General Sīha. The theory of non-action is usually attributed to Pūraṇa Kassapa, as at DN i.52f. The theory of *kiriya-vādin* and *akiriya-vādin* is also stated at AN i.62. ⁵ *Ucchedavāda*, or cutting off. cf. DN i.34. Rhys Davids refers to Kaṭṭha Upaniṣad i.20, where the doubt as to whether, after a man is dead, he exists or not, is also voiced by Naciketas. Cf. also MN ii.228.

me, 'the recluse Gotama professes the doctrine of annihilation.' For I speak of the annihilation of sense desire, anger and confusion;¹ I speak of the annihilation of manifold bad unwholesome qualities. This is a way in which one could truly say of me, 'the recluse Gotama professes the doctrine of annihilation.' But that is not what you meant."

Vin 3,3

"The revered Gotama is one who detests."²

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one could truly say of me, 'the recluse Gotama is one who detests.' For I detest misconduct by body, speech and mind, and the acquisition³ of manifold bad unwholesome qualities. This is a way in which one could truly say of me, 'the recluse Gotama is one who detests.' But that is not what you meant."

BD 1,5

"The revered Gotama is a disciplinarian."⁴

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one could truly say of me, 'the recluse Gotama is a disciplinarian.' For I teach the *Dhamma* for the disciplining of sense desire, anger and confusion; I teach the *Dhamma* for the disciplining of manifold bad unwholesome qualities. This is a way in which one could truly say of me, 'the recluse Gotama is a disciplinarian.' But that is not what you meant."

"The revered Gotama is one who practises austerities."⁵

"There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one could truly say of me, 'the recluse Gotama is one who practises austerities.' For I say that bad unwholesome qualities—misconduct by body, speech and

¹ cf. SN iv.252, definition of *nibbāna*. ² *Jegucchī*, one who loathes, or feels abhorrence. See *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.237, n. 2, and cf. MN i.77, MN i.78. ³ *Samāpatti*.

⁴ *Venayika*. Vin-a 135 says that the brahmin did not see the lord paying reverence and so forth, and said that he restrained these acts with regard to the "highest in the world," therefore he thought him one to be restrained, one to be suppressed. At MN i.140 Gotama is represented as telling the monks that he is charged with being *venayika*. It here seems to mean annihilationist, for it is combined with: "he preaches the disintegration, the destruction and annihilation of existing creatures." But as translator (GS iv.119, n. 4) remarks, we have *natthika* and *ucchedavāda* for nihilist and annihilationist. See *loc. cit.* for valuable remarks, and AN v.190. ⁵ *Tapassī*, connected with *tapas*, literally burnt up. It can also mean "one who has his senses under control."

mind—are to be burned up.¹ He who has destroyed the bad unwholesome qualities that are to be burned up, who has cut them off at the root, made them like a palm-stump, done away with them so utterly that they are incapable of future arising—him I call one who practises austerities. The Tathāgata has destroyed the bad unwholesome qualities that are to be burned up, has cut them off at the root, made them like a palm tree, done away with them so utterly that they are incapable of future arising. This is a way in which one could truly say of me, ‘the recluse Gotama is one who practises austerities.’ But that is not what you meant.”

“The revered Gotama is withdrawn.”²³

“There is indeed, brahmin, a way in which one could truly say of me, ‘the recluse Gotama is withdrawn.’ He whose future conception in a womb, whose rebirth in a future life, is destroyed and cut off at the root, made like a palm-stump, so utterly done away with that it is incapable of future arising—him I call one who is withdrawn. The Tathāgata’s future conception in a womb, his rebirth in a future life, is destroyed and cut off at the root, made like a palm-stump, so utterly done away with that he is incapable of future arising. This is a way in which one could truly say of me, ‘the recluse Gotama is withdrawn.’ But that is not what you meant.”

“Brahmin, suppose there was a hen⁴ with eight or ten or twelve eggs, which she had properly covered, properly warmed and properly incubated. Is the first chick that hatches safely—having pierced through the egg-shell with the point of the claw on its foot, or with its beak—to be called the eldest or the youngest?”

“He is to be called the eldest, good Gotama, for he is the eldest of those.”

“Even so, brahmin, in this generation without understanding, being like an egg, covered over, I alone⁵ in the world have split the

¹ *tapanīyā*; cf. AN i.49 and “should be mortified” at GS iv.120. ² BRAHMALI: The Pali puns on the word *apagabbha*, which has the double meaning of “timid” and “not going to a womb”, i.e. not being reborn. “Withdrawn” is an attempt at capturing this. ³ *apagabbha*. Vin-a 136, the brahmin says that Gotama is either destined to be reborn again in a mother’s womb or not to arise in a deva-world. ⁴ cf. MN i.104.

eggshell of ignorance and reached the unsurpassed full awakening. I, brahmin, am the world's eldest¹ and best.²

“Brahmin,³ I was firmly energetic and had clarity of mindfulness; my body was tranquil and my mind unified. Fully secluded from the five senses, secluded from unwholesome mental qualities, I entered and remained in the first *jhāna*, which consists of rapture and happiness born of seclusion, accompanied by movement of the mind. Through the stilling of the movement of the mind, I entered and remained in the second *jhāna*, which has internal confidence and unification of mind⁴ and consists of rapture and happiness born of *samādhi*. Through the fading away of rapture, I remained even-minded, mindful and clearly comprehending, experiencing happiness directly, and I entered and remained in the third *jhāna* of which the noble one declare, ‘he is even-minded, mindful, and abides in happiness.’ Through the abandoning of happiness and suffering and the earlier ending of joy and displeasure,⁵ I entered and remained in the fourth *jhāna*, which has neither suffering nor happiness and consists of purity of mindfulness and even-mindedness.⁶

Then with the mind collected, clarified, purified, flawless, void of taints, grown soft and pliable, steady and imperturbable,⁷ I directed it⁸ to the knowledge of the memory of former lives. I recollected many past lives, that is to say, one birth,⁹ two births, three births, four births, five births, ten births, twenty births, thirty births, forty births, fifty births, a hundred births, a thousand births, a hundred thousand births, and many eons of world dissolution, many eons of

⁵ *eko* = *eko adutiyo*, Vin-a 139. ¹ Vin-a 140, on account of being the first-born among *ariyas*. In Vin-a 165 *ariyas* are defined as Buddhas, paccekabuddhas, and the disciples of Buddhas. ² cf. DN ii.15, *aggo, jeṭṭho, seṭṭho*. ³ This passage to end of Bu-Pj 1.1.8 below = MN i.21, but the Majjhima omits the simile of the chick. ⁴ *ekodibhāva*. ⁵ Explained by the Commentary to mean bodily ease and bodily discomfort. ⁶ cf. AN i.53; SN v.318. ⁷ Vin 3.4; MN i.22, read *āṇaṅjappatte* with variant readings; AN ii.211; DN i.76; MN i.182 all read *āṇejjappatte*. This passage to end of Bu-Pj 1.1.8 below = MN i.22 = MN i.182–183, except that these omit the simile of the chick. ⁸ cf. AN ii.211; DN i.76ff. ⁹ cf. SN ii.122.

world evolution,¹ and many eons of both dissolution and evolution: “There I had such a name, such a family, such appearance,² such food, such experience of happiness and suffering, and such a life-span. Passing away from there I was reborn elsewhere, and there I had such a name ... and such a life-span. Passing away from there I was reborn here. Thus I recollected many past lives with their characteristics and particulars.” This was the first knowledge attained by me in the first watch of that night;³ ignorance was dispelled, understanding arose, darkness was dispelled, light arose, as it is for one who remains heedful, ardent and energetic.⁴ This, brahmin, was my first successful breaking forth like a chick’s from the eggshell.

Then with the mind collected, clarified, purified, flawless, void of taints, grown soft and pliable, steady and imperturbable, I directed it to the knowledge of the arising and passing away of beings. With the purified divine eye surpassing that of humans, I saw beings passing away and getting reborn, inferior and superior, beautiful and ugly, gone to good destinations⁵ and bad destinations,⁶ and I understood how beings fare according to their kamma: “These beings⁷ who engaged in misconduct by body, speech and mind, who abused the noble ones, held wrong view and acted accordingly,⁸ at the breaking up of the body after death, have arisen in the plane of misery, a bad destination, the abyss, hell. But these beings who engaged in

¹ I follow Lord Chalmers’ translation at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.15, for, although it is not perfect, it gives the idea that the process is eternally repeated. KS ii.86 reads “æon of involution ... of evolution”; GS iv.121, “rolling on and rolling back”; GS ii.145, “rolling up and rolling back.” The brahmanic idea is that as Viṣṇu sleeps on the giant cobra, he dreams the world; this is its out-rolling, its coming to be. When he awakes the world falls into nothingness, it is withdrawn, until the god sleeps and dreams again. ² Vin-a 160, *evamvaṇṇo ti odāto vā sāmo vā*. ³ See *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.15, n. 1 for this night being occupied with the “chain of causation,” as at Vin 1.1. ⁴ *pahitatta*; see MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *The Birth of Indian Psychology and its Development in Buddhism*, p. 295. ⁵ Vin-a 164, *sugate ti sugatigate ... duggate ti duggatigate*, literally gone to a good bourn, etc.; or, in a good bourn, etc. ⁶ Vin-a 164, *sugate ti sugatigate ... duggate ti duggatigate*, literally gone to a good bourn, etc.; or, in a good bourn, etc. ⁷ *Bhonto*. ⁸ *kammasamādāna*, translated at GS iii.295, “action’s moulding,” and at GS iv.122, “men who have acquired this karma.”

good conduct of body, speech and mind, who did not abuse the noble ones, held right view and acted accordingly, at the breaking up of the body after death, have arisen in a good destination, a heaven world. Thus with the purified divine eye surpassing that of humans, I saw beings passing away and getting reborn, inferior and superior, beautiful and ugly, gone to good destinations and bad destinations, and I understood how beings fare according to their kamma.¹ This was the second knowledge attained by me in the middle watch of that night. Ignorance was dispelled, understanding arose, darkness was dispelled, light arose, as it is for one who remains heedful, ardent and energetic. This, brahmin, was my second successful breaking forth, like a chick's from the eggshell.

Then² with the mind collected, clarified, purified, flawless, void of taints, grown soft and pliable, steady and imperturbable, I directed it to the knowledge of the ending of the corruptions. I knew according to reality: This is suffering, this is the arising of suffering, this is the ending of suffering, this is the course leading to the ending of suffering. I knew according to reality: These are the corruptions, this is the arising of the corruptions, this is the ending of the corruptions, this is the course leading to the ending of the corruptions. When I knew and saw this, my mind was freed from the corruption of sense desire, my mind was freed from the corruption of existence, my mind was freed from the corruption of false views, my mind was freed from the corruption of ignorance.³ When it was freed, I knew,⁴ "It is freed," and I understood that birth is ended, the spiritual life has been lived, the job has been done, there is no further state of existence.⁵ This was the third knowledge attained by me in the third watch of that night. Ignorance was dispelled, understanding arose, darkness was dispelled, light arose, as it is for one who remains heedful, ardent and energetic.⁶ This, brahmin, was my third successful breaking forth, like a chick's from the eggshell."

¹ This passage = SN ii.122f. ² For this passage cf. AN ii.211; MN i.23; MN iii.36.

³ These are the four āsavā. At MN i.23 and AN ii.211, AN iv.179 only three āsavas are mentioned. ⁴ Cf. GS ii.225, n. 2; GS iv.123. ⁵ One of the formulæ of arahantship

⁶ To here from Bu-Pj 1.1.5 above = MN i.21 (and of MN i.182–183).

When this had been said, the brahmin of Verañjā said to the Master:

“Good Gotama is the eldest; good Gotama is the best. Wonderful, good Gotama, wonderful. As one might set upright what had been overturned, or reveal what had been hidden, or show the way to one who was lost, or bring a lamp into the darkness so that those with eyes might see forms—even so has the good Gotama made the *Dhamma* clear in many ways. To good¹ Gotama I go for refuge, and to the *Dhamma* and to the Sangha of monks. May the good Gotama accept me as a lay follower who from today has gone for refuge for life.² May the good Gotama consent to spend the rains at Verañjā together with the Sangha of monks.” The Master consented by silence. Then the brahmin of Verañjā, understanding that the Master had consented, rose from his seat, paid homage to him and departed, keeping his right side towards him.

At that time Verañjā³ was short of food⁴ and stricken by hunger, with crops blighted and turned to straw. It was not easy to keep oneself going⁵ by collecting alms. Just then some horse-dealers from

¹ Here *bhagavantam*; at AN iv.179 *bhavantam*. ² Vin 1.236; MN i.24, MN i.488f., etc., for this stock passage. To here, from beginning of this *Pārājika*, cf. AN iv.173.

³ Burlingame, *Buddhist Legends*, ii.193, says that Jātaka no. 183 is derived from this Vinaya story; and that the Commentary on Dh 83 is derived from this Jātaka; cf. Dh-p-a ii.153ff. ⁴ Cf. below Bu-Pj 1.5.5; Bu-Pj 4.1.1.

The meaning of these four stock-phrases is doubtful: (1) Short of almsfood = *dubbhikkhā*; may also mean: (suffering from) famine. Vin-a 174, *dullabhikkhā*, almsfood (was) hard to get. (2) Difficult to obtain = *dvihitika*; may also mean: crops were bad. See article in *Pali-English Dictionary*. (3) Suffering from famine = *setaṭṭhikā*; may also mean: i) (strewn with) white bones, ii) mildew. So translated at *Vinaya Texts* iii.326 Vin 2.256), where this word used in simile = AN iv.279, translated GS iv.185 (see GS iv.185 n. 2), “white-as-bones” (disease). (4) Food tickets were issued = *salākāvuttā*; may also mean: people subsisted on blades of grass. Vin-a 175 gives both meanings. GS i.142 = AN i.160: grown to mere stubs. At AN i.24 Kuṇḍadhāna is called “chief among those who are the first to receive a food ticket” (GS i.18). AN-a i.26of. apparently refers to a food ticket. Cf. Vin-a 174f., AN-a ii.257, SN-a iii.106. Also GS i.142, KS iv.228 (= AN i.160, SN iv.323) and their notes. ⁵ *yāpetum*. Cf. description of Vesālī in opposite terms at Vin 1.238.

Uttarāpathaka¹ entered the rains residence at Verañjā with five hundred horses. In the horse-pen² they prepared *pattha* measure after *pattha* measure of steamed grain³ for the monks. The monks, having dressed in the morning, took their bowls and robes and entered Verañjā for alms. Being unable to obtain anything, they went to the horse-pen. Having brought the *pattha* measures of steamed grain back to the monastery, they pounded them and ate them. Venerable Ānanda, having crushed a *pattha* measure of the steamed grain on a stone, took it to the Master, and the Master ate it.

Now the Master had heard the sound of the mortar. Tathāgatas sometimes ask knowing,⁴ and knowing sometimes do not ask; they ask knowing the right time to ask, and they ask knowing the right time when not to ask. Tathāgatas ask when it is beneficial,⁵ not when

¹ Probably meaning Northern India, see B.C. LAW, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p.48. At Ja ii.287 five hundred horse-dealers from Uttarāpatha are mentioned. Also a certain dealer had five hundred horses. ² *Assamaṇḍalika*. Vin-a 176 says: “Not being able to journey during the four rainy months in this district, they built outside the city in a place not submerged by water, sleeping quarters (*vāsāgara*) for themselves and stables (*mandira*) for the horses, encircled by a fence.” ³ *Pattha-patṭhamūlaka* = Dh-p-a ii.154, where n. 4 gives Fausböll’s reading, *patṭan thūlakam*. In my copy of Fausböll’s edition of the Dhammapada, which was formerly Trenckner’s, Trenckner has altered this reading to *patṭham mūlakam*. Vin-a 176 reads °*pulakam* with variant reading *mūlakam*. *Pattha* is a measure of a certain capacity. See RHYS DAVIDS, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p.18. At Vin-a 176 it is said: *pattho nāma nāḷimattam*. *Nāḷimattam* would seem to mean as much as a tube or hollow stalk holds; translated at GS ii.210 “root-fibres.” Snp-a 476 says *cattāro patthā āḷhakam*, an *āḷhaka* being another measure; thus one *pattha* = ¼ *āḷhaka*. At Dh-p-a ii.70; Pv-a 283 and Ja i.419 *pattha* is used of *ajalaṇḍika*, put down a bad monk’s throat.

Buddhaghosa says, Vin-a 176, that a *pattha* measure of *pulaka* was prepared for each monk, the horse-dealers saying, “What if we were now to take a *pattha* measure from the morning meal of each horse and give it to each monk. Thus they will not suffer and the horses will be kept going.” Buddhaghosa says, *pulakam nāma nitthusan katvā ussedetvā gahitayavataṇḍulā vuccanti*, which would seem to mean: “having done away with the husk and having steamed it—*pulaka* is the name of barley and rice husked and taken after steaming” = steamed — i.e., rice ready for boiling.

Ussedeti is not given in *Pali-English Dictionary*, but *sedeti* is given as causative of *sijjati*, to heat, to steam. ⁴ = Vin 1.158 = Vin 3.88–89 below.

it is unbeneficial; in regard to what is unbeneficial, the Tathāgatas have destroyed the bridge.¹² The Buddhas, the Masters, question the monks for two reasons: “We shall teach the *Dhamma* or lay down a training rule for the disciples.”

Then the Master addressed Venerable Ānanda: “Ānanda, what is this sound of a mortar?”

Then Venerable Ānanda informed the Master.

“Good, good, Ānanda, you who are superior people³ have conquered⁴ (the problems of famine);⁵ later generations⁶ will despise even rice and meat.”

Then Venerable Mahāmoggallāna⁷ approached the Master, paid homage to him and sat down to one side. He then said to him:

“At present, Master, Verañjā is short of food and stricken by hunger, with crops blighted and turned to straw. It is not easy to keep oneself going by collecting alms. Master, the under-surface of this great earth is abounding with food,⁸ and its taste is just like pure honey.⁹ It would be good, Master, if I inverted the earth,¹⁰ so that the monks might enjoy the nutritive essence of the water-plants.”

“But what will you do with those creatures, Moggallāna, who are

⁵ *Attha*, in Sakya the positive goal. The translators of [Vin 1.158](#) at *Vinaya Texts*, i.327 translate *atthasamhita* as “full of sense,” thus taking *attha* (quite unnecessarily) in its later, debased and narrowed meaning. The negative word *anatta* appears at [Vin 1.10](#) in the First Utterance, the positive form being there absent. See [GS iv.](#), [GS vii.](#) and [GS xix.](#) ¹ BRAHMALI: This seems to mean that Tathāgatas are unable to do what is unbeneficial due to their achievement of awakening, cf. [Vin-a i.180,7.](#)

² *Setughāta*. [Vin-a 180](#) says *setu vuccati maggo*. Thus if we follow Buddhaghosa in this interpretation of *setughāta*, the rendering “the bridge is pulled down for the Tathāgatas” of *Vinaya Texts* i.327 must be given up. Cf. [AN i.220](#), where it seems to mean the breaking down of new actions; and cf. [AN i.260](#); [AN ii.145](#); [Ds 299ff.](#)

³ *Sappurisa*. On prefix *sa-* see Mrs. Rhys Davids, Introduction to [GS i.ixf.](#) ⁴ *Vijitam*, also meaning conquered, subdued. [Vin-a 180](#) says *dubbhikkham vijitam lobho vijito icchācāro vijito*.

⁵ BRAHMALI: See [Vin-a i.180,24.](#) ⁶ *Pacchimā janatā*. [Vin-a 181](#) says *anāgate*; also that they will be sitting in the *vihāra*, getting food easily, but feeling nothing but contempt for it as being not to their liking. Cf. below, [BD 1.66.](#)

⁷ Generally paired with Sāriputta. At [AN i.23](#) he is called chief among the disciples who have psychic power. Cf. [Vin 1.39](#); [Thag 382ff.](#) ⁸ BRAHMALI: See [Vin-a i.182,9.](#)

⁹ For this simile cf. [DN iii.87.](#) ¹⁰ [Vin-a 182](#) explains: so as to turn up the lowest level to the top.

supported by the earth?”

“Master, I will make one of my hands broad, like the great earth, and I will make those creatures who are supported by the earth go there. Then with the other hand I will invert the earth.”

“Enough, Moggallāna, please do not invert the earth, or beings may become deranged.”¹

“It would be good, Master, if the whole Sangha of monks could go to Uttarakuru² for alms.”

“Enough, Moggallāna, do not pursue this idea.”

Now while Venerable Sāriputta³ was in seclusion, he thought this: “For which Buddhas, for which Masters, did the spiritual life not last long? For which Buddhas, for which Masters, did the spiritual life last long?”

Then, in the evening, Venerable Sāriputta came out of seclusion and approached the Master. He paid homage to him, sat down to one side and said this: “Just now, Master, as I was in seclusion, I thought this: ‘For which Buddhas ... last long?’”

“Sāriputta, the spiritual life established by Master Vipassī,⁴ Master Sikhī and Master Vesabhū did not last long. But the spiritual life established by Master Kakusandha,⁵ Master Konāgamana and Master Kassapa did last long.”

“And what, Master, is the reason why the spiritual life established by Master Vipassī, Master Sikhī and Master Vesabhū did not last long?”

“Sāriputta, Master Vipassī, Master Sikhī and Master Vesabhū were disinclined to teach the *Dhamma* in detail to their disciples.

¹ *Vipallāsa*, from *vi + pari + as*, literally to throw round against. ² B.C. LAW in his *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p.17, p.53, says that Uttarakuru “is alluded to in Pāli literature as a mythical region.” ³ Usually paired with *Moggallāna*. See *Psalm of the Brethren*, p.340. At AN i.23 he is called chief among the disciples “of great wisdom.” ⁴ Some of the 24 Buddhas. For Sikhī see SN i.155ff., and for all three Ja i.4ff.; DN ii.2ff. ⁵ The last three Buddhas before the present supreme Buddha. Cf. Ja i.43; Dh-p-a i.84, Dh-p-a iii.236; DN ii.2ff.

D 1.16
They had few discourses¹ in prose and in prose and verse, few expositions, verses, inspired utterances,² quotations, birth stories, amazing accounts and analyses^{3,4}; and training rules were not laid down and a Pātimokkha was not recited. After the disappearance of those Buddhas, those Masters, after the disappearance⁵ of the disciples enlightened under those Buddhas,⁶ those who were the last disciples—of various names, clans,⁷ and social strata,⁸ who had gone forth from various families—caused that spiritual life rapidly to disappear. It is just like various flowers, lying on a flat piece of wood⁹ without being tied together by a thread, are scattered about, whirled about and destroyed by the wind. Why is that? Because they are not held together by a thread. Even so, at the disappearance of those Buddhas, those Masters, at the disappearance of the disciples enlightened under those Buddhas, those who were the last disciples—of various names, clans and social strata, who had gone forth from various families—caused that spiritual life rapidly to disappear. Instead those Masters were untiring in exhorting their disciples, after reading their minds with their own.¹⁰

Formerly, Sāriputta, while staying in a certain frightening jungle thicket, Master Vessabhū, the *arahant*, the fully Awakened One, exhorted and admonished a Sangha of a thousand monks, reading

¹ See *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.93, n. 1 on meaning of “Suttas”; not explained in Vinaya Commentary on above passage. Also on these names see E.J. THOMAS, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 277ff., and J. PRZYLUKSI, *Le Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 342ff. At DN-a i.23f., Vin-a 28, AN-a iii.5f., Atthasālinī 26, these nine *aṅgas* of the Canon are listed and described. ² *Udāna*. On this name see *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, Vol. XIII, p. vf. ³ BRAHMALI: *Vedalla*. ⁴ On derivation of *vedalla*, see J. PRZYLUKSI, *Le Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 344; E.J. THOMAS, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 278, n. 1. ⁵ Vin-a 187, “after the disappearance of the *khandhas*, after the *parinibbāna*.” ⁶ Vin-a 187, *anubuddhā = sammukhasāvākā*. At Thag 679 = Thag 1246 = SN i.193 *buddhānubuddho yo thero Koṇḍañño*, translated, “who next to our great Waked One was awake.” SN-a i.282 says: “The Teacher was first enlightened in the four truths, afterwards the *thera*.” Thus an interesting variation is apparent in the interpretation of *buddhānubuddho* as given by SN-a and Vin-a ⁷ Vin-a 187, such as “protected by Buddha, protected by *dhamma*.” ⁸ Vin-a 187, such as *khattiya, brāhmaṇa*. ⁹ *phalaka*, a board, a plank. Perhaps a tray here, such as flower-vendors carry. ¹⁰ Cf. DN i.79; MN i.445; SN ii.233.

their minds with his own, saying: ‘Think like this,¹ not like this;² pay attention like this,³ not like this;⁴ forsake this,⁵ having attained this,⁶ abide in it.’ Then, when those thousand monks had been exhorted and admonished by Master Vessabhū, the *arahant*, the fully Awakened One, their minds were freed from the corruptions without grasping.⁷ But if anyone not devoid of desire should enter that frightening jungle- thicket, usually their hair would stand on end. This is the reason why the spiritual life established by Master Vipassī, Master Sikhī and Master Vesabhū did not last long.”

“But what, Master, is the reason why the spiritual life established by Master Kakusandha, Master Konāgamana and Master Kassapa lasted long?”

“Sāriputta, Master Kakusandha, Master Konāgamana and Master Kassapa were diligent in teaching the *Dhamma* in detail to their disciples. They had many discourses in prose and in prose and in verse, many expositions, verses, inspired utterances, quotations, birth stories, amazing accounts and analyses; and training rules for their disciples were laid down and a Pātimokkha was recited. At the disappearance of those Buddhas, those Masters, at the disappearance of the disciples who were enlightened under those Buddhas, those who were the last disciples—of various names, clans and social strata, who had gone forth from various families—established that spiritual life for a long time. It is just like various flowers, lying on a piece of wood but being well tied together by a thread, are not scattered about, whirled about or destroyed by the wind. Why is that? Because they are well tied together by the thread. Even so, at the disappearance of those Buddhas, those Masters, at the disappearance of the disciples who were enlightened under those Buddhas, those who were the last disciples—of various names, clans and social strata, who had gone forth from various families—established that spiritual life for a long

¹ Vin-a 188, i.e. to the three *vitakkā*: viz., renunciation, benevolence and non-injury.

² Vin-a 188, to their opposites: viz., sensual pleasures, malevolence and injury.

³ Vin-a 188, i.e. to impermanence, sorrow and non-self. ⁴ Vin-a 188, i.e. to their opposites. ⁵ Vin-a 188, i.e. what is wrong. ⁶ Vin-a 188, i.e. what is right.

⁷ *Anupādāya*.

time. This is the reason why the spiritual life established by Master Kakusandha, Master Konāgamana and Master Kassapa lasted long.”

Then Venerable Sāriputta got up from his seat, put his robe over one shoulder, put the palms of his hands together and said to the Master:

“This is the right time, Master,¹ to lay down training rules and recite a Pātimokkha, so that this spiritual life may persist and last for a long time.”

“Hold on, Sāriputta, the Tathāgata will know the right time for that. The teacher does not lay down training rules for his disciples and recite a Pātimokkha until the causes of corruption appear in the Sangha.² And they do not appear until the Sangha has attained long standing,³ great size⁴⁵⁶ or great learning.⁷ But when this happens, then the Teacher lays down training rules for his disciples and recites a Pātimokkha in order to ward off those causes of corruptions. Sāriputta, the Sangha of monks is devoid of immorality,⁸ devoid of danger, stainless, purified, established in the essence.⁹ The most backward¹⁰ of these five hundred monks is a stream-enterer, not liable to be reborn in any state of misery, assured, bound for awakening.¹¹

¹ *Sugata*. ² Vin-a 191, things belonging to the here and now and to the next world, the bonds of murder, bad conscience and the reproaching of others, and a variety of ill and woe. For this passage, cf. MN i.445. ³ Vin-a 194 quotes Kd 1.31. ⁴ Vin-a 194 quotes Bu-Pc 5; cf. MN-a iii.156. ⁵ *lābhaggamahatta*. Vin-a 194 *lābhassa aggamahattam yo lābhassa aggo uttamo mahantabhāvo tam patthot iti attho*. For list of “gains” see AN i.38. At MN i.445 we find *lābhaggam*, translated *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.317 as “wealth.” ⁶ Vin-a 195 quotes Bu-Pc 41; cf. MN-a iii.156. ⁷ Vin-a 195 quotes Bu-Pc 68; cf. MN-a iii.157. ⁸ *nirabbuda*. *Lokasmim abbuda*, translated at KS i.61 “a hell on earth,” and SN-a i.100 says that “thieves are those who cause ruin in the world.” At Vin-a 195 *nirabbudo = niccoro*, free from thieves. It explains that here thieves mean those who are immoral, not being true *samaṇas*; but pretending to be, they steal the requisites of others. Therefore *nirabbuda* (free from ruin) means free from thieves, free from immorality. *Nirabbuda* recurs below, Vin 3.18. ⁹ Buddhaghosa says, Vin-a 195, that this consists of virtue, contemplation, wisdom, freedom, and knowledge and insight into freedom. ¹⁰ *pacchimaka*. At AN ii.80 and DN ii.155 Gotama is made to use this sentence in addressing Ānanda. The Commentary on AN ii.80 and at DN-a ii.593 say that by *pacchimaka*, Ānanda is meant. Our the Commentary (Vin-a 195) naturally does not refer to him. ¹¹ A usual formula for stream-entrants.

Then the Master addressed Venerable Ānanda: “Ānanda, it is the custom for Tathāgatas not to tour the country without having taken leave of those who invited them to spend the rains. Let us go to the brahmin of Verañjā and take leave.”

“Yes, Master.”

Then the Master dressed, took his bowl and robe and, with Venerable Ānanda as his attendant,¹ went to the dwelling of the brahmin of Verañjā and sat down on the prepared seat. Then the brahmin of Verañjā approached the Master, paid homage to him and sat down to one side. The Master then said to the brahmin of Verañjā:

“Brahmin, having stayed for the rainy season according to your invitation, we are taking leave of you. We wish to depart for a tour of the country.”

“It is true, good Gotama, that you have stayed for the rainy season according to my invitation, but a gift has not been given. That is not good, nor is it because we did not want to give. It happened because household life is busy and there is much to do. May the good Gotama consent to a meal tomorrow together with the Sangha of monks.”

The Master consented by keeping silence. Then the Master, having taught, roused, gladdened and delighted the brahmin of Verañjā with a talk on the *Dhamma*, rose from his seat and went away. Then, when the night was over, the brahmin of Verañjā prepared various kinds of delicious food² in his own home, and then informed the Master:

“It is time, good Gotama, the meal is ready.”

Then the Master, having dressed in the morning, took his bowl and robe and, together with the Sangha of monks, he went to the dwelling of the brahmin of Verañjā and sat down on the prepared seat. Then, with his own hands, the brahmin of Verañjā served various kinds of delicious food to the Sangha of monks with the Buddha at its head. When they were satisfied and the Master had eaten and

¹ *Pacchāsamaṇa*, the junior monk who walks behind the senior on his rounds. Ānanda accompanies Gotama again at [Vin 4.78](#). ² Defined at [Vin 4.92](#).

finished his meal, he gave the Master a set of three robes and a pair of robes to each monk.¹ The Master instructed, roused, gladdened and delighted the brahmin of Verañjā with talk on the *Dhamma*, and then rose from his seat and departed.

The Master, having remained at Verañjā for as long as he liked, went to Payāgapatiṭṭhāna via Soreyya,² Sankassa³ and Kaṇṇakujja.⁴ There he crossed the river Ganges and proceeded to Benares. Having remained at Benares for as long as he liked, he set out for Vesālī on tour. Wandering on tour by stages, he arrived at Vesālī.⁵ There he stayed in the Great Wood, in the hall with the peaked roof.

The chapter on Verañjā is finished

ORIGIN STORY

FIRST SUB-STORY

At that time not far from Vesālī was a village called Kalandaka. There lived Sudinna, the son of a prominent merchant.⁶ Now Sudinna the Kalandaka⁷ went to Vesālī on some business together with many friends. At that time the Master was seated, surrounded by a great assembly of people, teaching the *Dhamma*. When Sudinna saw this he thought:⁸ “Perhaps I should listen to the *Dhamma*?”⁹ Then Sudinna approached the assembly and sat down to one side.

As he was sitting there, Sudinna thought: “So far as I understand

¹ *dussayuga*, cf. [Vin 1.278](#) and *Vinaya Texts* ii.190, n.; MN i.215 = SN v.71. ² A town near Takkasilā; mentioned also in connection with these other two towns at [Vin 2.299](#).

³ A town, said by Fausböll to be the locus of DhP 181. At its gate Sāriputta interpreted a problem, on which Jātaka 134 is based. See Ja i.473. ⁴ The modern Allahabad.

⁵ Capital of the Vajji country. See B.C. LAW, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p.12f.

⁶ Vin-a 202 says that as other people there were called Kalanda(ka), Sudinna was also called “son of the great merchant” (*setṭhiputta*) — to distinguish him. ⁷ Referred to at [Vin 2.286](#) as “the first *pārājika*, promulgated at Vesālī on account of Sudinna with regard to sexual intercourse.” Referred to at Mil 170. ⁸ Vin-a 202, “because having in former births been very meritorious, he was incited, a clansman’s son, bound to become” (*bhabbakulaputta*). ⁹ This same story is told in practically the same words about Raṭṭhapāla at MN ii.55ff.

the *Dhamma* taught by the Master, it is no easy matter for one who lives in a house to lead the spiritual life that is utterly perfect and pure as a polished conch shell. Perhaps I should cut off my hair and beard, put on the yellow robes and go forth from home into homelessness?”

When the crowd had been taught, roused, gladdened and delighted by the Master with talk on the *Dhamma*, they rose from their seats, paid homage to the Master, circumambulated him with their right side towards him and departed. When the crowd had departed, Sudinna approached the Master, paid homage to him and sat down to one side. He then said to the Master:

“Master, so far as I understand the *Dhamma* taught by the Master, it is not an easy matter for one who lives in a house to lead the spiritual life that is utterly perfect and pure as a polished conch shell. Master, I wish to cut off my hair and beard, put on the yellow robes and go forth from home into homelessness. May the Master let me go forth.”

“But, Sudinna, do you have your parents’ permission?”

“No, Master.”

“Sudinna, Tathāgatas do not ordain a child without the parents’ permission.”

“I will do whatever is necessary, Master, to get my parents’ permission.”

Then Sudinna, having finished his business in Vesālī, returned to Kalandaka. There he approached his parents and said:

“Mother and father, in so far as I understand the *Dhamma* taught by the Master, it is no easy matter for one who lives in a house to lead the spiritual life that is utterly perfect and pure as a polished conch shell. I wish to cut off my hair and beard, put on the yellow robes and go forth from home into homelessness. Give me your permission to go forth.”

His parents replied:

“But, Sudinna, you are our only child, dear and beloved, you live in comfort and are well cared for. Sudinna, you have no experience of suffering. Even if you died, we would not willingly be without you.

How can we, while you are still living, permit you to go forth from home into homelessness?”

A second time Sudinna said to his parents: “Mother and father ...” “... into homelessness?” A third time Sudinna said to his parents: “Mother and father ...” “... into homelessness?”

Thinking, “My parents do not permit me to go forth,” he lay down on the bare ground and said: “I will either die right here or go forth.” And he stopped eating and did not eat at the next seven meals.¹

Then his parents said: “Dear Sudinna, you are our only child, dear and beloved, you live in comfort and are well cared for; you have no experience of suffering. Even if you died, we would not willingly be without you. How can we, while you are still living, permit you to go forth? Get up, Sudinna, eat, drink and amuse yourself. Find delight² in sensual pleasures and in doing meritorious actions.³ We do not allow you to go forth.” When they had said this, Sudinna was silent.

A second time and a third time the parents of Sudinna said: “... We do not permit you to go forth.” A third time Sudinna was silent.

Then the friends of Sudinna approached him and said: “Sudinna, you are your parents’ only child, dear and beloved. You live in comfort and are well cared for; you have no experience of suffering. Even if you died, your parents would not willingly be without you. How can they, while you are still living, allow you to go forth? Get up, Sudinna, eat, drink and amuse yourself. Find delight in sensual pleasures and in doing meritorious actions. Your parents will not allow you to go forth.”

When they had said this, Sudinna was silent. A second and a third time the friends of Sudinna said: “Sudinna, you are ...” and a third time Sudinna was silent.

Then the friends of Sudinna approached his parents and said: “Mother and father, Sudinna says that he will either die right there on the bare ground or go forth. If you do not allow Sudinna to go

¹ This passage omitted at MN ii.57, see MN ii.57, n. 7. ² *Abhiramassu* or “indulge in love”; but from the context I think not here. Cf. below, **BD 1.114**. ³ Vin-a 205, “giving gifts, cleansing the way to a good bourn, doing good actions.”

forth, he will die there. But if you allow him to go forth, you will see him again afterwards. And if he does not enjoy the going forth, what alternative¹ will he have but to come back here? Allow Sudinna to go forth.”

“We allow him,” they said.

Then the friends of Sudinna approached him and said: “Get up, Sudinna, your parents allow you to go forth from home into homelessness.”

Then Sudinna thought: “They say that my parents will allow me to go forth from home into homelessness.” And he rose, joyful, delighted and elated, stroking his limbs with his hands. Then Sudinna, having spent a few days regaining his strength, approached the Master, paid homage to him and sat down at one side. He then said to the Master:

“I am permitted by my parents, Master, to go forth from home into homelessness. May the Master allow me to go forth.”

Then Sudinna received the going forth in the presence of the Master, and he received the full ordination. And not long afterwards Venerable Sudinna practised these kinds of ascetic practises:² living in the wilderness, going on alms-round, wearing rags, going on continuous alms-round; and he dwelt depending on a certain village of the Vajjians.

At that time the Vajjians³ were short of food⁴ and stricken by hunger, with crops blighted and turned to straw, and it was not easy to keep oneself going by collecting alms. Now Venerable Sudinna thought to himself: “At present the Vajjians are short of food and stricken by hunger, with crops blighted and turned to straw, and it is not easy to keep oneself going by collecting alms. But I have many relations in Vesālī who are rich, have great wealth and property, much gold and silver,⁵ many resources and requisites, much wealth

¹ *gati*, literally going or bourn. ² Vin-a 206, *dhutaḅuṇe* = *kilesaniddhunanake ḅuṇe*.

³ Tribes belonging to one of the sixteen stock *mahājanapadas* (AN i.213, AN iv.252, AN iv.256, AN iv.260). See E.J. THOMAS, *The Life of Buddha*, p.13, and, on the Vajjis or Vajjians, T.W. RHYS DAVIDS, *Buddhist India*, p.25. ⁴ Cf. above Bu-Pj 1.2.1, and below, Bu-Pj 4.1.1. ⁵ *jātarūpa-rajata*. See below, BD 1.28, n. 1.

in grain.¹ Perhaps I should live in dependence on my relatives? Because of me my relations will be able to make offerings and make merit, the monks will obtain requisites and I will not go short of almsfood.”

Then Venerable Sudinna, having put his lodging in order, took his bowl and robe and set out for Vesālī, where he arrived by travelling in stages. There the Venerable Sudinna stayed in the hall with the peaked roof in the Great Wood. The relations of Venerable Sudinna heard that he had arrived in Vesālī and they brought him sixty offerings of barley as a gift of food.² Then Venerable Sudinna, having given these sixty offerings of barley to the monks, dressed in the morning, took his bowl and robe and entered the village of Kalandaka for alms. As he was going about Kalandaka on a continuous alms-tour, he came to his own father’s house.

At that time the female slave of Venerable Sudinna’s relations wanted to throw away the previous evening’s porridge. But Venerable Sudinna said to her:

“If that is to be thrown away, sister, put it here in my bowl.”

As the slave-girl of Venerable Sudinna’s relations was putting the previous evening’s porridge into his bowl, she recognised his hands, feet and voice.³ She then went to his mother and said:

“Please know,⁴ madam, that the young master Sudinna is back.”

“If you speak the truth, I will make you a freed woman.”

Just then Venerable Sudinna was eating the previous evening’s porridge at the base of a certain wall.⁵ The Venerable Sudinna’s father,

¹ For this stock phrase cf. AN ii.86; SN i.17. On prosperity of Vesālī, cf. Vin 1.268.

² Vin-a 207 explains that each offering would feed ten monks, therefore sixty would feed six hundred. ³ Vin-a 208 explains that Sudinna had been a monk for eight years, so although the slave did not know him at once, she recognized the character of his hands, feet and voice. ⁴ *yagghe*. ⁵ *aññataran kuḍḍamūlaṃ nissāya*. *Pali-English Dictionary* calls *kuḍḍamūla*, “a sort of root.” But Vin-a 209 says it means “that in this district there are rooms in the houses of the large householders where there are seats prepared, and where those going for alms sit down and eat the gruel offered to them.” cf. MN i.62, where *kuḍḍam* with variant reading *kuḍḍamūlaṃ*. MN-a iii.297 = Vin-a 210. Lord Chalmers translates “under the hedge.” May mean “leaning against a wall.”

coming from work, saw him there. He approached him and said:

“But, Sudinna, isn’t there ... and you are eating old porridge! Isn’t there your own home to go to?”

“We went to your house, householder. That’s where we received this porridge.”

Then Venerable Sudinna’s father took him by the arm and said: “Come, Sudinna, let’s go to the house.”

Then Venerable Sudinna went to his own father’s house and sat down on a prepared seat. And his father said to him: “Eat, dear Sudinna.”

“There is no need, householder, I have finished eating for today.”

“Then please come back for the meal tomorrow.”

Venerable Sudinna consented by keeping silent. He then rose from his seat and departed.

Then Venerable Sudinna’s mother had the ground smeared with fresh cow-dung, had two heaps made, one of gold coins¹ and the other of gold. The heaps were so large that a man standing on one side could not see a man standing on the other. Hiding these heaps with screens and preparing a seat between them surrounded by a curtain, she addressed Venerable Sudinna’s former wife:

“Daughter-in-law, adorn yourself in the way that our son Sudinna found you especially attractive.”

“Yes, madam,” she responded.

Then, in the morning, Venerable Sudinna dressed, took his bowl and robe and went to his father’s house, where he sat down on the prepared seat. His father approached him, uncovered the heaps and said:

“This dowry, dear Sudinna, the fortune from your mother, is yours. Another is the fortune from your father and another from your ancestors.² It is possible, Sudinna, to return to the low life, enjoy wealth and make merit. Come, Sudinna, please do so.”

¹ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2969.) ² It is curious that here there seem to be *three* heaps, whereas just above it is said that two were made.

“I am not able to do so, father, I cannot. I am enjoying¹ the spiritual life.”

A second and a third time Venerable Sudinna’s father repeated his request. Venerable Sudinna replied:

“If you would not get offended, householder, we could tell you what to do.”

“Speak, Sudinna.”

“Well then, householder, make some large bags of hemp-cloth, fill them with the coins and the gold, take them away in carts and dump them in the middle of the Ganges. And why? Because you would avoid the danger, fear,² terror, and (trouble with) protection that they will cause you.”

When he had said this, his father became displeased and thought, “How could our son Sudinna speak like this.”

Then he addressed Venerable Sudinna’s former wife: “Well now, daughter-in-law, as you were dear and beloved by him, perhaps our son Sudinna will listen to you.”

Then the former wife of Venerable Sudinna took hold of his feet and said: “What are these nymphs like, my lord’s son, for whose sake you lead the spiritual life?”

“I do not lead the spiritual life, sister, for the sake of nymphs.”

Then the former wife of Venerable Sudinna thought:

“From today my lord’s son calls me ‘sister’” and she fainted on the spot.

Then Venerable Sudinna said to his father: “If, householder, there is food to be given, give it, but do not annoy me.”

“Eat, Sudinna,” he said.

Then, with their own hands, Venerable Sudinna’s mother and father served and satisfied him with various kinds of delicious food.

Then, when Venerable Sudinna had finished his meal, his mother said to him:

“This family, dear Sudinna, is rich, has great wealth and property,

¹ *abhirato*, to be translated in this context as above. But see below, **BD 1.114**.

² *Chambhitatta*, see below, **BD 1.119**, n. 3.

much gold and silver, many resources and requisites, much wealth in grain. It is possible, dear Sudinna, to return to the low life, enjoy wealth and make merit. Come, Sudinna, please do so.”

“Mother, I am not able to do so, I cannot. I am enjoying¹ the spiritual life.”

A second time ... a third time Venerable Sudinna’s mother said: “This family, Sudinna, is rich ... much wealth in grain. For this reason, dear Sudinna, beget offspring; do not let the Licchavis² take over our heirless property.”

“It is possible for me to do this,³ mother.”

“Where are you staying at present?”

“In the Great Wood,” he said. Then Venerable Sudinna rose from his seat and departed.

Then the mother of Venerable Sudinna addressed his former wife: “Daughter-in-law, as soon as you menstruate, please tell me.”

“Very well, madam,” she replied. Not long afterwards Venerable Sudinna’s former wife menstruated, and she reported it to Venerable Sudinna’s mother.

“Daughter-in-law, adorn yourself in the way that our son Sudinna found you especially attractive.”

“Very well, madam,” she replied.

Then Venerable Sudinna’s mother, together with his former wife, approached Venerable Sudinna in the Great Wood. There she said to him:

“This family, dear Sudinna, is rich, has great wealth and property, much gold and silver, many resources and requisites, much wealth in grain. For this reason, Sudinna, beget offspring; do not let the Licchavis take over our heirless property.”

“It is possible for me to do this, mother,” he said. He then took his former wife by the arm, plunged into the Great Wood and—there

¹ *abhirato*, here I think meaning simply as translated above. But see below, **BD 1.114**.

² Their capital was at Vesālī. ³ Vin-a 212 says that he said this thinking that if he had issue his relations would no longer bother him about looking after the property, and so he would be able to follow the *dhamma* of recluses at ease.

being no training rule and he seeing no danger—had sexual intercourse with his former wife three times. As a result she conceived.

The earth-gods cried out: “Good sirs, the Sangha of monks has been healthy¹ and free from danger. But Sudinna the Kalandaka has produced a tumour, has produced danger.”

The gods belonging to the heaven of the four great kings hearing the cry of the earth-gods in turn cried out ... the Tāvātīmśa gods ... the Yāma gods ... the Tusita gods ... the gods who delight in creation ... the gods who control the creation of others ... the gods belonging to the retinue of the supreme beings in turn cried out:

“Good sirs, the Sangha of monks has been healthy and free from danger. But Sudinna the Kalandaka has produced a tumour, has produced danger.” Thus in that moment, in that instance, the report spread as far as the Brahmā-world.²

Then the pregnancy of Venerable Sudinna’s wife developed and she eventually gave birth to a son. Now the friends of Venerable Sudinna called this boy Bijaka³; they called Venerable Sudinna’s former wife Bījaka’s mother; they called Venerable Sudinna Bijaka’s father. After some time they both⁴ went forth from home into homelessness, and they realised *arahantship*.

But Venerable Sudinna was anxious and remorseful, and he thought: “Indeed, it’s a loss for me, it’s no gain; indeed, it’s badly gained by me, not well-gained: having gone forth in such a well-proclaimed *Dhamma* and training, I was not able for life to practice the perfectly complete and pure spiritual life.” And because of his anxiety and remorse, he became thin, haggard and pale, his veins protruding all over his limbs; he became sad, of sluggish mind, miserable, depressed, remorseful, weighed down with grief.⁵

Then the monks who were Venerable Sudinna’s friends said to him: “Formerly, friend Sudinna, you were handsome, your features rounded, your face a good colour, your skin clear. But now you are thin, haggard and pale, your veins protruding all over your limbs;

¹ *nirabbuda*, cf. above, BD 1.19, n. 4. ² Vin-a 215, *brahmalokā = akaniṭṭhabrahmalokā*, i.e. the worlds of the Elder Brahmā-devas. ³ BRAHMALI: Literally, “Seed.”

⁴ *Ibid.*—i.e., Bijaka and his mother. ⁵ Stock.

and you are sad, of sluggish mind, miserable, depressed, remorseful, weighed down with grief. Could it be, friend Sudinna, that you lead the spiritual life dissatisfied?”¹

“I do not, friends, lead the spiritual life dissatisfied. I have done an bad deed. I have had sexual intercourse with my former wife. That is why I am anxious ... I was not able for life to practice the perfectly complete and pure spiritual life.”

“Friend Sudinna, no wonder you are anxious,² no wonder you feel remorse, in that, having gone forth in such a well-proclaimed *Dhamma* and training, you were not able for life to practice the perfectly complete and pure spiritual life. Is not, friend, the *Dhamma* taught by the Master in various ways for the sake of dispassion, not for the sake of passion; for the sake of freedom from bondage, not for the sake of bondage; for the sake of non-grasping, not for the sake of grasping? When the *Dhamma* is taught by the Master for the sake of dispassion, how can you be intent upon passion? When the *Dhamma* is taught by the Master for the sake of freedom from bondage, how can you be intent upon bondage? When the *Dhamma* is taught by the Master for the sake of non-grasping, how can you be intent upon grasping? Friend, has not the *Dhamma* been taught in many ways by the Master for the waning of passion, for the subduing of intoxication, for the restraint of desire, for the abolition of clinging, for the annihilation of the round of existence,³ for the destruction of craving, for fading away, for cessation, for extinguishment?⁴ Has not the abandoning of sense pleasures been declared in many ways by the Master, the full understanding of the perception of sense pleasures, the abolishing of thirst for sense pleasures, the elimination of thoughts of sense pleasures, the stilling of the fever of sense pleasures? It will not, friend, give rise to confidence in those without it, nor increase the confidence of those who have it, but it will hinder

¹ *anabhirato*, Vin-a 217, “fretting, longing to be a householder ... but I find no delight (*anabhirato*) in making become the conditions of higher righteousness.” See below, **BD 1.114**, notes. ² = **Vin 2.250**. ³ Vin-a 218, *tebhūmakavaṭṭaṃ ucchijjati* (i.e. the *kāma*, *rūpa* and *arūpa* becomings). ⁴ Cf. AN ii.34, and various passages in SN v.

confidence in those without it and it will cause some with confidence to change their minds.”

Having rebuked Venerable Sudinna in various way, those monks told this matter to the Master. And in this connection the Master convened the Sangha of monks and questioned Venerable Sudinna:

“Is it true, Sudinna, that you had sexual intercourse with your former wife?”

“It is true, Master.”

The Buddha, the Master, rebuked him: “Foolish man, it is not suitable it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is unworthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How could you go forth in such a well-proclaimed *Dhamma* and training and not be able for life to practice the perfectly complete and pure spiritual life? Have I not taught the *Dhamma* in many ways for the sake of dispassion ... When the *Dhamma* has been taught by me for the sake of dispassion, how can you be intent upon passion? ... Have I not in many ways declared the abandoning of sense pleasures ... the stilling of the fever of sense pleasures? It would be better, foolish man, for your male organ to enter the mouth of a terrible and poisonous snake than to enter a woman. It would be better for your male organ to enter the mouth of a black snake than to enter a woman. It would be better for your male organ to enter a charcoal pit, burning, ablaze, afire, than to enter a woman. Why is that? Because for that reason you might die or experience deadly suffering, but you would not on that account, at the breaking up of the body after death, be reborn in the plane of misery, a bad destination, the abyss, hell. But for this reason, at the breaking up of the body after death, you might be reborn in the plane of misery, a bad destination, the abyss, hell.¹ Foolish man, you have practised what is contrary to the true *Dhamma*,² the common

¹ Cf. below, **BD 1.155**. ² *asaddkamma*. Vin-a 221, “You would follow untrue *Dhamma* of inferior people.” On prefix *sa-* see Mrs. RHYS DAVIDS, introduction to GS i.ix.f.

practice, the low practice,¹ the coarse practice, that which ends with a wash,² that which is done in private, that which is done wherever there are couples. You are the forerunner, the first performer of many unwholesome things. It will not give rise to confidence in those without it, nor increase the confidence of those who have it, but it will hinder confidence in those without it and it will cause some with confidence to change their minds.”

Then the Master, having rebuked Venerable Sudinna in various ways, spoke in dispraise of being difficult to support and maintain, in dispraise of great desires, lack of contentment, socialising³ and laziness, but he spoke in praise in various ways of being easy to support and maintain, of desiring little, contentment, self-effacement,⁴ ascetic practices, serenity, decrease of defilements,⁵ and of the putting forth of energy.⁶ Having given a *Dhamma* talk on what was right and seemly, he addressed the monks:

“On account of this,⁷ monks, I will lay down a training rule for the monks for the following ten reasons: for the well-being of the Sangha, for the comfort of the Sangha, for the restraint of recalcitrant people, for the ease of well-behaved monks, for the restraint of corruptions that pertain to the present life and for warding off corruptions that pertain to future lives, to give rise to confidence in those without it and to increase the confidence of those who have

¹ Vin-a 221, “outcastes (*vasala*) rain down evil *dhamma*; the *dhamma* of the outcaste, low men is outcaste, or it is a *dhamma* pouring out the *kilesas*.” *Vasala* at Snp 116ff. translated by LORD CHALMERS, *Suttanipāta*, Harvard Oriental Series 37, as “wastrel.” ² *Odakantika*—i.e., following the sexual act. Vin-a 221 explains: *udakakiccaṃ antikam avasānam assā ti*, the water-libation (the cleansing, the washing) is at an end, finished for him. The word *udakakicca* occurs at DN ii.15, but DN-a is silent. ³ *Saṅganika* = *kilesasaṅganika*, Vin-a 222. ⁴ *Sallekhana* = *niddhunana*, Vin-a 222. ⁵ *Apacaya* = *sabbakilesāpacayabhūtā*, Vin-a 222. ⁶ = Vin 1.45 = Vin 2.2 = Vin 3.171 = Vin 4.213, where this standing *dhamma*-talk is given. These are doubtless the subjects to be filled in where the text in so many places baldly states that Gotama “gave *dhamma*-talk.” All my renderings differ from those given at *Vinaya Texts* i.153, *Vinaya Texts* ii.331; *Vinaya Texts* iii.252. Cf. MN i.13. The Commentary on Vin 3.171 is silent. ⁷ I.e., Sudinna’s offence, Vin-a 223.

it, for the continuation of the true Dhamma¹ and for supporting the training.² And, monks, this training rule should be recited thus:

FIRST PRELIMINARY RULING

If a monk has sexual intercourse, he is expelled³ and not in communion.”

Thus the Master laid down this training rule for the monks

The section on Sudinna is finished

SECOND SUB-STORY

At one time a certain monk in the Great Wood near Vesālī won over a female monkey with food and had sexual intercourse with her. Then, in the morning, he dressed, took his bowl and robe and entered Vesālī for alms. Now at that time a number of monks who were engaged in touring the lodgings came to this monk’s dwelling. The female monkey, seeing those monks coming, went up to them and shook her buttocks in front of them, wagged her tail, presented her buttocks and made a gesture. Then the monks thought: “Undoubtedly this monk is having sexual intercourse with this monkey,” and they hid

¹ Vin-a 225 says that *saddhamma* is threefold: (1) the Tipiṭaka, all the utterances of the Buddha (cf. Kp-a 191ff.); (2) the thirteen scrupulous ways of life, the fourteen duties, virtue, contemplation, insight; (3) the four *ariyan* Ways and the four fruits of *samaṇaship* and *nibbāna*. ² Vin-a 226 says that *Vinaya* or discipline is fourfold: discipline by restraint, by rejection, by calm, by making known. ³ On derivation of *pārājika*, see *Vinaya Texts* i.3, n. 2. Editor takes it as “involving or suffering defeat,” either specifically as defeat in the struggle with *Māra*; or more probably defeat in the struggle against evil generally, defeat in the effort to accomplish the supreme goal of arahantship. Vin-a 259 gives *pārājiko ti parājito, parājayam āpanno*, defeated, fallen on defeat. “In this meaning *pārājika* exists for those people for whom there is an offence (*āpatti*) against the training. Whoever transgresses against the course of training, it defeats him (*parājeti*), therefore it is called a defeat. Whoever commits an offence, that defeats him, therefore that is called a defeat. The man, inasmuch as defeated, fallen on defeat, is thereby called a defeated one.” We thus get a neuter, feminine and masculine reference for *pārājika*. Childers says, “meriting expulsion.”

to one side. Then, when that monk had gone for alms in Vesālī and had returned with his almsfood, he ate one part himself and gave the rest to the female monkey. Having eaten the food, the monkey presented her buttocks to the monk. He then had sexual intercourse with her.

Then those monks said to that monk: “Friend, hasn’t a training rule been laid down by the Master? Why then do you have sexual intercourse with a monkey?”

“It is true, friends, that a training rule has been laid down by the Master, but it refers to human women, not to animals.”

“But, friend, that is just the same. It is not suitable, it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it ought not to be done. How could you go forth in this well-proclaimed *Dhamma* and training and not be able for life to practice the perfectly complete and pure spiritual life? Has not the *Dhamma* been taught in various ways by the Master for the sake of dispassion and not for the sake of passion¹ ... for the stilling of the fever of sense pleasures? Friend, it will not give rise to confidence in those without it ... and it will cause some with confidence to change their minds.”

Having rebuked that monk in various ways, they told this matter to the Master. The Master then had the Sangha of monks convened, and questioned that monk:

“Is it true, monk, that you had sexual intercourse with a monkey?”

“It is true, Master.”

Then the Master rebuked him, saying: (= Bu-Pj 1.5.11 above. *Instead of of a woman, read of a monkey*) ... “... Foolish man, it will not give rise to confidence in those without it ... And so, monks, this training rule should be recited thus:

SECOND PRELIMINARY RULING

“If a monk has sexual intercourse, even with an animal,² he is expelled and not in communion.”

Thus the Master laid down this training rule for the monks.

¹ Cf. above, Bu-Pj 1.5.10. ² Cf. Vin 1.96.

THIRD SUB-STORY

At that time a number of Vajjian monks from Vesāli ate, slept and bathed as much as they liked. Doing so and not paying proper attention, they had sexual intercourse, without first renouncing the training¹ and disclosing their weakness. After some time they were affected by loss of relatives, by loss of property and by illness. They then approached Venerable Ānanda and said:

“Bhante Ānanda, we do not blame the Buddha, the *Dhamma* or the Sangha; we only blame ourselves. We were unfortunate, we had little merit: having gone forth in such a well-proclaimed *Dhamma* and training, we were unable for life to practice the perfectly complete and pure spiritual life. If, bhante Ānanda, we were now to obtain the going forth and the full ordination in the presence of the Master, we would have clarity about wholesome qualities and be devoted day after day to developing the aids to awakening.² Bhante Ānanda, please inform the Master of this matter.”

“Yes, friends,” he replied. He then went to the Master and informed him of this matter.

“It is impossible, Ānanda, it cannot happen,³ that the Tathāgata

¹ *sikkhamā apaccakkhāya*, not having denied the teaching, not having said: “I renounce (formally) my submission to the discipline,” i.e. “I am no longer a monk.” Cf. *Vinaya Texts* i.275, n. 2, where editor thinks this is a formal renunciation of the Order as opposed to the Vinaya’s term *vibbhamati*, “he returns to the house.” Cf. AN iv.372, where among the nine Impossible (abhabba) is that the monk who is an arahant should disavow the Buddha, *dhamma* or Order. At SN ii.231 a monk, assailed by passion, disavows the training and *hīnāyāvattati*, the Sutta word for returning to the low life of the layman, and cf. SN ii.271.

Paccakkhāti is *paṭi+akkhāti=ā+khyā*, and not *paṭi+akkh*. The root *akkh* is purely theoretical and would certainly not explain the *ā* of *paccakkhāti*, *paccakkhāya*.

² The term *bodhipakkhiyadhamma*, or as it is here *bodhipakkhika*^o, is not usually considered to belong to the earlier literature. The later literature and Commentaries reckon these states as thirty-seven. On their arrangement see MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Sakya*, p. 395, and KS v.i. ³ Following Woodward’s translation at GS i.25 and see GS i.25 n. 6. Vin-a 229 elucidates *anavakāso* by *kāraṇapaṭikkhepavacanāṃ*.

should abolish a training rule that entails expulsion because of the Vajjians.”

The Master then gave a *Dhamma* talk and addressed the monks: “Monks, if a monk, without first renouncing the training and disclosing his weakness, has sexual intercourse, he may not receive the full ordination. But, monks, if someone has sexual intercourse after first renouncing the training and disclosing his weakness, he may receive the full ordination.

“And so, monks, this training rule should be recited thus:

FINAL RULING

“If a monk, having entered upon the monks’ training and way of life, without first renouncing the training and disclosing his weakness, has sexual intercourse, even with an animal, he is expelled and not in communion.”

DEFINITIONS

A means: whoever, of such a kind, of such activity, of such social standing, of such name, of such family, of such conduct, of such behaviour, of such association,¹ who is an elder,² one who is new or one of middle standing:—this is called **a monk**.

Monk means: he is a monk because he lives on alms; a monk because he has gone over to living on alms; a monk because he is one who wears the patchwork cloth; a monk by convention; a monk on account of his acknowledgement; a “come, monk” monk; a monk because he was ordained by going to the three refuges; a good monk; a monk of substance; a trainee monk; a monk beyond training; a monk who is ordained by a complete Sangha through a procedure³ of one motion and three announcements,⁴ which is unchallengeable

¹ For definition of *gocara* see Vb 247. ² Vin-a 239, *thera* is one who has completed ten years; *nava*, a novice, is one of four years standing; and *majjhima* is one of more than five years standing. ³ So Vin-a 243. ⁴ *ñatticatuttha*.

and fit to stand. The monk who is ordained by a complete Sangha through a procedure of one motion and three announcements, which is unchallengeable and fit to stand,¹ this sort of **monk** is meant in this case.

Training means: the three trainings are—training in the higher morality, training in the higher mind, training in the higher wisdom. The training in the higher morality is the training meant in this case.

Way of life means: whatever training rule is laid down by the Master: this is called *way of life*. One trains in this, and thereby one is called **possessed of the mode of life**.

Without first renouncing the training and disclosing his weakness means:

There is, monks, a disclosure of weakness without the training being renounced; and there is, monks, a disclosure of weakness together with the training being renounced.

“And how, monks, is there a disclosure of weakness without the training being renounced? Here, monks, a monk who is discontent, dissatisfied, desirous of abandoning the state of a recluse, disgusted, troubled and repelled² by monkhood, longing to be a householder, longing to be a lay-follower, longing to be a monastery attendant, longing to be a novice, longing to belong to another sect, longing to be a disciple of another sect, longing not to be a recluse, longing not to be a son of the Sakyan—he says and declares: ‘Perhaps I should renounce the Buddha?’ In this was, monks, there is a disclosure of weakness without the training being renounced.

Then further, discontent, dissatisfied ... longing not to be a son of the Sakyan, he says and declares: ‘Perhaps I should renounce the *Dhamma*?’ ... the Sangha ... the training ... the discipline ... the Pātimokkha ... the recital ... my preceptor ... my teacher ... being a disciple ... being a pupil ... our common preceptor ... our common teacher ... he says and declares: ‘Perhaps I should renounce my fellow monks?’ ... he says and declares: ‘Perhaps I should be a householder?’

¹ Cf. list of eighteen explanations of monk at Vb 245-246. ² For these three words, cf. DN i.213, where Gotama is made to use them in reference to the exercise of supernatural powers.

... 'Perhaps I should be a lay-follower?' ... 'Perhaps I should be a monastery attendant?' ... 'Perhaps I should be a novice?' ... 'Perhaps I should be an adherent of another sect?' ... 'Perhaps I should be a disciple of another sect?' ... 'Perhaps I should not be a recluse?' ... 'Perhaps I should not be a son of the Sakyan?' In this way, monks, there is a disclosure of weakness without the training being renounced.

"Then further, discontent, dissatisfied ... longing not to be a son of the Sakyan, he says and declares: 'But if I renounced the Buddha' ... he says and declares: 'But if I were not a son of the Sakyan' ... he says and declares: 'Perhaps I should renounce the Buddha?' ... he says and declares: 'Perhaps I should not be a son of the Sakyan?' ... he says and declares: 'Well then, I should renounce the Buddha' ... he says and declares: 'Well then, I should not be a son of the Sakyan' ... he says and declares: 'I think I should renounce the Buddha' ... he says and declares: 'I think I should not be a son of the Sakyan.' In this way, monks, there is a disclosure of weakness without the training being renounced.

"Then further, discontent, dissatisfied ... longing not to be a son of the Sakyan, he says and declares: 'I remember my mother' ... 'I remember my father' ... 'I remember my brother' ... 'I remember my sister' ... 'I remember my son' ... 'I remember my daughter' ... 'I remember my wife' ... 'I remember my relations' ... 'I remember my friends' ... 'I remember my village' ... 'I remember my town' ... 'I remember my fields' ... 'I remember my land' ... 'I remember my gold coins' ... 'I remember my gold' ... 'I remember my profession' ... he says and declares: 'I remember my former laughter, chatter and amusement.' In this way, monks, there is a disclosure of weakness without the training being renounced.

"Then further, discontent, dissatisfied ... longing not to be a son of the Sakyan, he says and declares: 'I have a mother, she ought to be supported by me' ... 'I have a father, he ought to be supported by me' ... 'I have a brother ... 'I have a sister ... 'I have a son ... 'I have a daughter ... 'I have a wife ... 'I have relations ... he says and declares: 'I have friends, they ought to be supported by me.' In this way, monks, there

is a disclosure of weakness without the training being renounced.

“Then further, discontent, dissatisfied ... longing not to be a son of the Sakyan, he says and declares: ‘I have a mother, she will support me’ ... ‘I have a father, he will support me’ ... (as above) ... ‘I have friends, they will support me’ ... ‘I have a village, I will live by means of it’ ... ‘I have a town, I will live by means of it’ ... fields ... land ... gold coins ... gold ... he says and declares: ‘I have a profession, I will live by means of it.’ In this way, monks, there is a disclosure of weakness without the training being renounced.

“Then further, discontent, dissatisfied ... longing not to be a son of the Sakyan, he says and declares: ‘This is difficult to do’ ... ‘this is not easy to do’ ... ‘this is difficult’ ... ‘this is not easy’ ... ‘I cannot endure’ ... ‘I am unable’ ... ‘I do not enjoy myself’ ... ‘I take no delight.’¹ In this way, monks, there is a disclosure of weakness without the training being renounced.

“And how, monks, is there a disclosure of weakness together with the training being renounced? Here, monks, a monk who is discontent, dissatisfied ... longing not to be a son of the Sakyan, says and declares: ‘I renounce the Buddha.’ In this way, monks, there is a disclosure of weakness together with the training being renounced.

“Then further, discontent, dissatisfied ... longing not to be a son of the Sakyan, he says and declares: ‘I renounce the Dhamma’ ... ‘I renounce the Sangha’ ... the training ... the discipline ... the Pātimokkha ... the recital ... my preceptor ... my teacher ... being a disciple ... being a pupil ... our common preceptor ... our common teacher ... he says and declares: ‘I renounce my fellow monks’ ... he says and declares: ‘Consider me a householder’ ... ‘Consider me a lay-follower’ ... a monastery attendant ... a novice ... an adherent of another sect ... a disciple of another sect ... not a recluse ... ‘Consider me not a son of the Sakyan.’ In this way too, monks, there is a disclosure of weakness together with the training being renounced.

“Then further, discontent, dissatisfied ... longing not to be a son of the Sakyan, he says and declares: ‘I have no need of the Buddha’ ...

¹ See [BD 1.114, n. 1](#).

'I have no need of my fellow monks.' In this way too, monks ...

"Then further ... he says and declares: 'No more of the Buddha for me' ... 'No more of my fellow monks for me.' In this way too, monks

...

"Then further ... he says and declares: 'The Buddha is no of use to me' ... 'My fellow monks are of no use to me.' In this way too, monks

...

"Then further ... he says and declares: 'I am well freed from the Buddha.' ... I am well freed from my fellow monks.' In this way too, monks ... being renounced.

"Or whatever other synonyms there are for the Buddha, for the *Dhamma*, for the Sangha, for the training ... for one's fellow monks, for householders ... or for not being a son of the Sakyan; he speaks and declares by way of these indications, by way of these marks, by way of these signs. In this way, monks, there is a disclosure of weakness together with the training being renounced.

"And how, monks, is the training not renounced? Here, monks, if one renounces the training by way of these indications, by way of these marks, by way of these signs, but one is insane, then the training is not renounced. If one renounces the training in the presence of one who is insane, the training is not renounced. If one who is deranged renounces the training ... if one renounces the training in the presence of one who is deranged ... if one is overwhelmed by pain ... if one renounces the training in the presence of one who is overwhelmed by pain ... if one renounces the training in the presence of gods¹ ... if one renounces the training in the presence of an animal, the training is not renounced. If an Indian² renounces the training in the presence of a foreigner³ and he does not understand, the training is not renounced. If a foreigner renounces the training in the

¹ Vin-a 255, from the earth *devatās* to the *devatās* of the Akaniṭṭha realm. ² Vin-a 255, *ariyaka* means the proper mode of speech, the language of Magadha. Note the form *ariyaka*. ³ *milakkhuka*. Cf. *Mlecchas*, now a term for all non-caste people. Here perhaps the aboriginal inhabitants of India. Vin-a 255 says, *nāma yo koci anariyako Andha-Damiḷādi*, the people of Andha (i.e. the Telugus) and the Tamils, cf. Vb-a 387, Vb-a 388.

presence of an Indian ... if an Indian renounces the training in the presence of an Indian ... if a foreigner renounces the training in the presence of a foreigner and he does not understand, the training is not renounced. If he renounces the training as a joke ... he renounces the training by speaking too fast ... if he announces what he does not wish to announce ... if he does not announce what he wishes to announce ... if he announces to one who does not understand ... if he does not announce to one who understands ... or if he does not make a full announcement, the training is not renounced. In this way, monks, the training is not renounced.”

Sexual intercourse means: what is contrary to the true *Dhamma*, the common practice, the low practice, the coarse practice, that which ends with a wash, that which is done in private, that which is done wherever there are couples: this is called **sexual intercourse**.

Has means: organ with organ, genital with genital, even to the depth of a sesame seed, this is called **has**.

Even with an animal means: even having sexual intercourse with a female animal,¹ he is not a recluse, not a son of the Sakyan; how much less so with a woman: therefore it is called **even with an animal**.

He is expelled means: as a man with his head cut off is incapable² of living by (re-establishing) that bodily connection, so is a monk who has had sexual intercourse not a recluse, not a son of the Sakyan³: therefore it is said that **he is expelled**.

Not in communion means: **communion**⁴ means: a common official action, the same recital, the same training—this is called **communion**. He does not take part in this—he is therefore called **not in communion**.

¹ *Tiracchānagatitthi*, literally a woman gone to the animals. Cf. below, **BD 1.212**.

² *Abhabba*. ³ Cf. **Vin 1.96**. ⁴ *Saṁvāsa*, literally living with, co-residence. It often refers to the household life, as at **AN ii.57**, **AN ii.187**; **AN iii.164**; **AN iv.174**; **Sn 283**, **Sn 290**; but in *Vinaya* it is a term of importance in religion.

PERMUTATIONS

PERMUTATIONS PART 1

SUMMARY

Three kinds of female: a human female, a non-human female, a female animal. Three kinds of hermaphrodite: a human hermaphrodite, a non-human hermaphrodite, an animal hermaphrodite. Three kinds of *paṇḍaka*¹: a human *paṇḍaka*, a non-human *paṇḍaka*, an animal *paṇḍaka*. Three kinds of male: a human male, a non-human male, an animal male.²

EXPOSITION PART 1

There is an offence entailing expulsion if he has sexual intercourse with a human female through three orifices, the anus, the vagina or the mouth ... with a non-human female ... with a female animal ... with a human hermaphrodite ... with a non-human hermaphrodite ... with an animal hermaphrodite through three orifices, the anus, the vagina or the mouth. There is an offence entailing expulsion if he has sexual intercourse with a human *paṇḍaka* through two orifices, the anus or the mouth ... with a non-human *paṇḍaka* ... with an animal *paṇḍaka* ... with a human male ... with a non-human male ... with a male animal through two orifices, the anus or the mouth.

EXPOSITION PART 2

VOLUNTARY SEXUAL INTERCOURSE

For a monk who, having the intention of association, lets his penis enter a human female through the anus ... through the vagina ... through the mouth, there is an offence entailing expulsion. For a monk who ... lets his male organ enter a non-human female ... a female animal ... a human hermaphrodite ... a non-human herm-

¹ BRAHMALI: The exact meaning of *paṇḍaka* is disputed. ² BRAHMALI: Contrary to the PTS edition, the Mahāsaṅgīti takes this as a separate paragraph.

aphrodite ... an animal hermaphrodite through the anus ... through the vagina ... through the mouth, there is an offence entailing expulsion. For a monk who, having the intention of association, lets his penis enter a human *paṇḍaka* ... a non-human *paṇḍaka* ... an animal *paṇḍaka* ... a human male ... a non-human male ... a male animal through the anus ... through the mouth, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

FORCED SEXUAL INTERCOURSE

Opponents who are monks, having brought a human female into a monk's presence, insert his penis into her anus, her vagina or her mouth. If he agrees to the entry, if he agrees to having entered, if he agrees to remaining, if he agrees to the taking out,¹ there is an offence entailing expulsion. Opponents who are monks ... if he does not agree to the entry, but agrees to having entered, to remaining, to the taking out, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Opponents who are monks ... if he does not agree to the entry nor to having entered, but to remaining and to the taking out ... entailing expulsion. Opponents who are monks ... if he does not agree to the entry nor to having entered nor to remaining, but to the taking out ... entailing expulsion. Opponents who are monks ... if he does not agree to the entry nor to having entered nor to remaining nor to the taking out, there is no offence.

Opponents who are monks, having brought a human female who is awake ... asleep ... intoxicated ... mad ... drunk ... dead but undecomposed ... dead and mostly undecomposed ... there is an offence entailing expulsion. Having brought one who is dead and mostly decomposed into the monk's presence, they insert his penis into the anus ... the vagina ... the mouth. If he agrees to the entry, to having entered, to remaining, to the taking out, there is a serious offence ... if he does not agree, there is no offence.

(All this is repeated for a non-human female and a female animal; a human, a non-human and an animal hermaphrodite; a hu-

¹ BRAHMALI: This does not mean that he consents to the ending of the act, but that he consents to the intercourse at this stage.

man, a non-human and an animal *paṇḍaka*; a human male, a non-human male and a male animal; except that for the three categories of *paṇḍakas* and the three categories of males only two orifices apply, the anus and the mouth.)

Opponents who are monks, having brought a human female into a monk's presence, insert his penis into her anus ... her vagina ... her mouth, the female being covered, the monk uncovered ... the female uncovered, the monk covered ... the female covered, the monk covered ... the female uncovered, the monk uncovered. If he agrees to the entry, to having entered, to remaining, to the taking out, there is an offence entailing expulsion. ... If not, there is no offence. Opponents who are monks ... a human female who is awake ... asleep ... dead but mostly undecomposed ... entailing expulsion. Having brought one who is dead, but mostly decomposed into a monk's presence, they insert his penis into the anus ... the vagina ... the mouth, the female being covered, the monk uncovered ... both being uncovered. If he agrees to the entry ... to the taking out, there is a serious offence. ... If not, there is no offence.

(All this is repeated for a non-human female and a female animal; a human, a non-human and an animal hermaphrodite; a human, a non-human and an animal *paṇḍaka*; a human male, a non-human male and a male animal; except that for the three categories of *paṇḍakas* and the three categories of males only two orifices apply, the anus and the mouth.)

(**Vin 3.32-33**, §§ 5, 6 are repetitions of §§ 3, 4 but reading “opponents who are monks, having brought a monk into the presence of a human female) ...”

As the sections on “opponents who are monks” have been explained in detailed, so should the following categories be explained: opponents who are kings, opponents who are thieves, opponents who are scoundrels, “lotus-scent” opponents.¹

¹ *Uppalagandha*, perhaps a soubriquet of some brigands. Vin-a 268 says they needed human hearts: except monks, men were rare. Monks should not be murdered, so the brigands led them astray by bringing women to them. Cf. It-a ii.57.

PERMUTATIONS PART 2

He enters an orifice through an orifice,¹ there is an offence entailing expulsion. He enters a non-orifice through an orifice ... entailing expulsion. He enters an orifice through a non-orifice ... entailing expulsion. He enters a non-orifice through a non-orifice, there is a serious offence.

A monk molests a sleeping monk: if he wakes up and consents, both should be expelled; if he wakes up but does not consent, the molester should be expelled. A monk molests a sleeping novice: if he wakes up and consents, both should be expelled;² if he wakes up but does not consent, the molester should be expelled. A novice molests a sleeping monk: if he wakes up and consents, both should be expelled; if he wakes up but does not consent, the molester should be expelled. A novice molests a sleeping novice: if he wakes up and consents, both should be expelled; if he wakes up but does not consent, the molester should be expelled.

NON-OFFENCE CLAUSE

There is no offence: for one who does not know, for one who does not consent, for one who is insane, for one who is deranged, for one who is overwhelmed by pain, for the first offender.

The section on covering is finished

¹ BRAHMALI: The Pali word here translated “orifice” is *magga*, and it refers either to the anus or the genitals. The meaning of non-orifice, *amagga*, is not clear, but it could refer either to the mouth or to the situation described below in section [Bu-Pj 1.10.9](#). However, since the final offence in this series of permutations is a *thullaccaya*, a serious offence, the latter possibility seems more likely. ² *nāsetabbo*. I follow the rendering of *Vinaya Texts* i.215, which seems to suit the context better than the “to atone” of the *Pali-English Dictionary*. *Nāseti* is the causative of *nassati*, to disappear, to come to an end. Cf. below, [BD 1.62](#), [BD 1.280](#).

CASE RULINGS

MNEMONIC LIST

The female monkey, and the Vajjians,
householder and a naked one, adherents of other sects,
The girl, and Uppalavaṇṇā, then two about characteristics,/
Mother, daughter, and sister, and wife, supple, long,
Two sores, and a picture, and a wooden doll,/
Five with Sundara, five about charnel grounds, bones,
A female dragon and a female spirit, and a female ghost,
a *paṇḍaka*, impaired, he touched, /
The sleeping *arahant* in Bhaddiya, four about others in Sāvattī,
Three in Vesālī, garlands,¹ the one from Bharukaccha in his dream,/
Supabbā, Saddhā, a nun, a probationary nun, and a novice nun,
A prostitute, a *paṇḍaka*, a householder, one another,
one who had gone forth when old, a deer.

CASE DETAILS

At one time a certain monk had sexual intercourse with a female monkey. He became anxious, thinking: “The Master has laid down a training rule. Perhaps I have committed an offence entailing expulsion.”² They informed the Master ... “You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a number of Vajjian monks from Vesālī had sexual intercourse, without first renouncing the training and disclosing their weakness. They became anxious, thinking: “The Master has laid down a training rule. Perhaps we have committed an offence entailing expulsion.” They informed the Master ... “You, monks, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

¹ This is printed as *Mallā*. But the section Bu-Pj 1.10.21 below to which this heading refers has nothing to do with the Mallians, but it does have to do with garlands, *mālā*. I have therefore rendered it thus above. Oldenberg suggests the emendation at Vin 3.269, *mālā*; but *mallā* may be correct (= *malyā*). ² Here and following: *pārājikam āpattiṃ āpanno*, instead of the more usual *āpatti pārājikassa*.

At one time a certain monk, thinking he would avoid an offence, had sexual intercourse while looking like a layman. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, thinking he would avoid an offence, had sexual intercourse while naked. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, thinking he would avoid an offence, had sexual intercourse while dressed in a *kusa*-grass garment¹ ... while dressed in a bark garment² ... while dressed in a garment of wood shavings ... while dressed in a hair blanket³ ... while dressed in a horse-hair blanket ... while dressed in a garment of owls' wing ... while dressed in a garment of antelope hide⁴ ... He became anxious ... entailing expulsion.”

Now at one time a certain monk who was an alms-goer saw a little girl lying on a bench. Being lustful, he inserted his thumb into her vagina. She died. He became anxious ...” ... Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence entailing suspension.”⁵

Now at one time a certain brahmin youth was in love with the

¹ At AN i.240 = AN i.295 = AN ii.206 = Vin 1.305 = DN i.167 these various sorts of garments are given. At Vin 1.305 monks, including the one who was *nagga* are also given in this order. ² Cf. DN i.166–167 for these words. At Ja i.356 we get *purisaṃ phalakaṃ katvā*, translated “making this man my stalking-horse,” which editor suggests, *Vinaya Texts* ii.246, “may he a figure of speech founded on the use of this word and mean ‘making him his covering.’” ³ As Ajita Kesakambalin, see DN i.55.

⁴ Vin-a 272, “with the hair and hooves.” ⁵ See below, BD 1.195, n. 1.

nun Uppalavaṇṇā.¹ Then, when the nun Uppalavaṇṇā had entered the village for alms, he entered her hut and hid himself. The nun Uppalavaṇṇā, after her meal, when she had returned from almsround, washed her feet, entered her hut and sat down on the bed. Then that brahmin youth took hold of the nun Uppalavaṇṇā and raped her. The nun Uppalavaṇṇā informed the nuns. The nuns informed the monks,² who in turn informed the Master. “There is no offence, monks, for one who does not consent.”

BD 154

Now at one time the characteristics of a woman³ appeared on a certain monk. They informed the Master. He said: “Monks, I allow that very discipleship, that very ordination,⁴ those years as a monk, to be transferred to the nuns. Those offences that the monks have in common with the nuns are to be dealt with in the presence of the

Bu-Pj 1

¹ Thig verse 224ff., Thig-a 190; Dhp-a ii.48ff. and AN-a i.355–356 all relate how she had power in the sphere of light (cf. Dabba, in Bu-Ss 8 below), and say that she was born at Sāvattihī in the family of a great merchant. Dhp-a ii.49 tells much the same story as that given above, her assaulter there being a young kinsman, and it says that she went into the Dark Wood, because at that time forest-dwelling for nuns had not been forbidden. In Bu-NP 5 she is also said to have entered the Dark Wood. There is no doubt, I think, that the Uppalavaṇṇā of Vin 3.35 above and of Dhp-a are one and the same. That the Uppalavaṇṇā of the Therīgāthā is the same is less likely. For though some of the thoughts there attributed to her might be construed to be the outcome of her adventures, the main episode of her life as represented in the Therīgāthā is that of being her mother’s co-wife. Nothing is said of this surely very unusual situation in either Dhp-a or AN-a. Vin-a gives no story. It may be that Dhp-a and AN-a have welded the story of the two Uppalavaṇṇās into one story. Such a welding of two stories into one has a parallel in the story of Kisāgotamī, *Psalms of the Sisters*, p.109, with which cf. the story of Paṭācārā, *Psalms of the Sisters*, p.70. At AN i.24 Uppalavaṇṇā is called chief of the disciples who are nuns having psychic potencies; and at AN i.88 she and Khamā are taken as the standard and measure by which to estimate the disciples who are nuns. See HORNER, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p.168f. ² In no passage are the nuns recorded to tell the matter to the lord direct, but always through the medium of the monks. An exception to this is in the case of his aunt Mahāpajāpati. ³ *Itthilīṅga*. ⁴ *Taṃ yeva upajjhaṃ taṃ eva upasampadam*, explained at Vin-a 273 as *pubbe gahitauvajjhaṃ eva pubbe kataupsampadam eva ca anujānāmi*, which seems to mean: I allow the teacher who was taken before, the *upasampadā* that was conferred before ...

nuns. For those offences that the monks do not have in common with the nuns, there is no offence.”

At one time the characteristics of a man appeared on a certain nun. They informed the Master. He said: “Monks, I allow that very discipleship, that very ordination, those years as a nun, to be transferred to the monks. Those offences that the nuns have in common with the monks are to be dealt with in the presence of the monks. For those offences that the nuns do not have in common with the monks, there is no offence.”

1.10.7
D 1.55

At one time a certain monk, thinking he would avoid an offence, had sexual intercourse with his mother ... his daughter ... his sister. He became anxious ... He informed the Master. “You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk had sexual intercourse with his former wife. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

1.10.8

At one time a certain monk had a supple back.¹ Tormented by discontent, he took his penis into his own mouth. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

n 3.36

At one time a certain monk had a long penis. Tormented by discontent,² he inserted his penis into his own anus. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

1.10.9

At one time a certain monk saw a dead body, and on the body was a sore next to the genitals. Thinking he would avoid an offence, he inserted his penis in the genital and it came out through the sore. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

¹ Vin-a 177, he had formerly been a dancer. ² See below, **BD 1.114, n. 1.**

At one time a certain monk saw a dead body, and on the body was a sore next to the genitals. Thinking he would avoid an offence, he inserted his penis in the sore and it came out through the genitals. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain lustful monk contacted the genitals of a picture¹ with his penis. He became anxious ... “... Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion; there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a certain lustful monk contacted the genitals of a wooden doll² with his penis. He became anxious ... “... bad conduct.”

At one time a monk called Sundara, who had gone forth from Rājagaha, was walking along a carriage-road. A certain woman said: “Wait a moment, honoured sir, I will pay homage to you.” As she was paying homage she held up his lower robe and took his penis into her mouth. He became anxious ... “... Monk, did you consent?”

“I did not consent, Master.”³

“There is no offence, monk, for one who does not consent.”

Now at one time a certain woman, seeing a monk, said: “Come, honoured sir, have sexual intercourse.”

“Enough, sister, it is not allowable.”

“Come, honoured sir, I will make the effort, not you. In this way there will be no offence for you.” The monk acted accordingly. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain woman, seeing a monk, said: “Come, honoured sir, have sexual intercourse.”

¹ *Lepacitta*. Vin-a 278 says *cittakammarūpa*. ² *Dārudhitalikā*. Vin-a 278 says *kaṭṭharūpa*. ³ Vin-a 278 says he was a non-returner, therefore he did not agree.

“Enough, sister, it is not allowable.”

“Come, honoured sir, you make the effort, not I. In this way there will be no offence for you.” The monk acted accordingly. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain woman, seeing a monk, said: “Come, honoured sir ...” “... it is not allowable.”

“Come, honoured sir, rub inside but discharge outside ... rub outside but discharge inside. Thus there will be no offence for you.” The monk acted accordingly. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

Now at one time a certain monk went to a charnel ground and saw an undecomposed body. He had sexual intercourse with it. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk went to a charnel ground and saw a mostly undecomposed body ... “... entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk went to a charnel ground and saw a mostly decomposed body ... “... Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion; there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk went to a charnel ground and saw a decapitated head. He inserted his penis into the wide open mouth, touching it with the penis. He became anxious ... “... You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk went to a charnel ground and saw a decapitated head. He inserted his penis into the wide open mouth, without touching it with the penis. He became anxious ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion; there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a certain monk was in love with a certain woman. She died and her bones were thrown away and scattered in the charnel-ground. Then the monk went to the charnel ground, collected the bones and brought his penis into the (area of the) genitals. He became anxious ... “... Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion; there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a certain monk had sexual intercourse with a female dragon¹ ... with a female spirit² ... with a female ghost³ ... with a *paṇḍaka*. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk's faculties were impaired.⁴ Thinking he would avoid an offence because he felt neither pleasure nor pain, he had sexual intercourse. They informed the Master. “Monks, whether that foolish man felt anything or did not feel anything,⁵ there is an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, intending to have sexual intercourse with a woman, felt remorse at the mere touch ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence entailing suspension.”

At one time a certain monk was lying down in the Jātiyā Grove

¹ Vin-a 279 says “whether it is a young female *nāgā* (*nāgamāṇavikā*, cf. Ja iii.275 and Dh-p-a iii.232, translated at *Buddhist Legends*, iii.57, as ‘dragon-maiden’) or a *kinnari*” (birds [?] living in the heart of mountains); cf. Thig-a 255. ² Vin-a 279, “the female *yakkhas* are all *devatās*.” ³ Vin-a 279, “the *nijjhāmatanḥika petas* and so on are not to be approached, but there are *petas* who live in mansions; the demerit of these matures during the dark half of the month, but in the light half they experience bliss like *devatās*.” The *nijjhāmatanḥika petas* are consumed by thirst. At Mil 294 it is said that they do not derive benefit from offerings made by their living relatives. Cf. Mil 303, Mil 357. ⁴ *upahatindriya*. ⁵ *vedayi vā ... na vā vedayi*.

at Bhaddiya,¹ having gone there to spend the day. And he had an erection because of wind. A certain woman saw him and sat down on his penis; and having taken her pleasure, she departed. The monks, seeing the moisture,² informed the Master. “Monks, an erection occurs for five reasons: because of lust, because of excrement, because of urine, because of wind, because of being bitten by caterpillars. It is impossible, monks, it cannot be, that that monk had an erection because of lust. That monk is an *arahant*. There is no offence for that monk.”

At one time a certain monk was lying down in the Dark Wood at Sāvattthī, having gone there to spend the day. A certain woman cowherd saw him and sat down on his penis. The monk consented to the entry, to having entered, to remaining and to the taking out. He became anxious ... “You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk was lying down in the Dark Wood at Sāvattthī ... A certain woman goatherd saw him ... A certain woman gathering fire-wood saw him ... A certain woman gathering cowdung saw him and down on his penis ... “... entailing expulsion.”

Now at one time a certain monk was lying down in the Great Wood at Vesālī, having gone there to spend the day. A certain woman saw him and sat down on his penis; and having taken her pleasure, she stood laughing nearby. The monk woke up and said: “Have you done this?”

“Yes, I did it.” He became anxious ...

“Monk, did you consent?”

“I didn’t even know, Master.”

“Monk, there is no offence for one who doesn’t know.”

¹ The capital of the Aṅga kingdom. Here lived Meṇḍaka, famed for his psychic potency, [Vin 1.240ff](#). The town is mentioned also at [Vin 1.189](#), [Vin 1.190](#): AN iii.36.

² *kilinna*.

At one time a certain monk, having gone to the Great Wood at Vesālī to spend the day, was lying down and resting his head against a tree. A certain woman saw him and sat down on his penis. The monk got up hastily. He became anxious ...

“Monk, did you consent?”

“I did not consent, Master.”

“There is no offence for one who does not consent.”

At one time a certain monk, having gone to the Great Wood at Vesālī to spend the day, was lying down and resting his head against a tree. A certain woman saw him and sat down on his penis. The monk kicked her off.¹ He became anxious ...

“Monk, did you consent?”

“I did not consent, Master.”

“There is no offence for one who does not consent.”

At one time a certain monk had gone to spend the day in the hall with the peaked roof in the Great Wood at Vesālī. He opened the door and lay down. And he had an erection because of wind. Now at that time a number of women, bringing scents and garlands, came to the monastery to look at the monastic dwellings. Then those women saw that monk and they sat down on his penis. Having taken their pleasure, they said, “what a bull of a man,”² and they placed their scents and garlands and departed. The monks, seeing the moisture, informed the Master. “Monks, an erection occurs for five reasons: ...

¹ *akkamitvā pavaṭṭesi*. Vin-a 280 says that the monk, rising suddenly and giving a kick (*akkamitvā*), knocked her over in such a way that she rolled on the ground. The same expression recurs below, **BD 1.138**, in connection with a mortar. The Commentary on this passage, Vin-a 475 gives *akkamitvā* in explanation of *ottharivā*, which seems to mean “sitting on.” *Critical Pali Dictionary* says that *akkamati* is “to make a kick at one,” and in that connection cites the above passage. *Pali-English Dictionary*, evidently following the Commentary, gives “to rise” for this passage.

² *purisusabha*.

(as in Bu-Pj 1.10.17) ... There is no offence for that monk. I advise you, monks, when you are in seclusion during the day, to close the door.”

At one time a certain monk of Bharukaccha¹ dreamt that he had sexual intercourse with his former wife. He thought he was no longer a monk and that he would have to disrobe.² While on his way to Bharukaccha, he saw the Venerable Upāli³ and informed him of what had happened. Venerable Upāli said: “There is no offence, friend, since it was in a dream.”

At one time in Rājagaha there was a female lay-follower called Supabbā⁴ who had mistaken⁵ faith. She held the view that any woman who gives sexual intercourse gives the highest gift. Seeing a monk, she said: “Come, bhante, have sexual intercourse.”

“Enough, sister, it is not allowable.”

“Come, bhante, rub between the thighs, thus there will be no offence for you ... Come, bhante, rub against the navel ... the stomach ... the waist ... the throat ... the ear ... the coil of hair ... the spaces

¹ *Bhārukacchako bhikkhu*. Bharukaccha was a town, see Ja iii.188; and *Psalms of the Bretheren*, p.194, *Psalms of the Sisters*, p.103; here Vaḍḍha and his mother were said to have been born. PROFESSOR E. MÜLLER, *Journal of the Pali Text Society 1888*, p.63, says that Bharukacchaka is a monk; but he is mentioned nowhere but here. At Mil 331 the inhabitants of the town are called Bhārukacchakā. *Psalms of the Sisters*, p.103, n. 1, calls it “a seaport on the north-west seaboard, the Bharoch of today.”

² *Vibbhamissāmi*. *Pali-English Dictionary*, referring to the above passage, says “cohabiting.” But see below, **BD 1.114**, for an exact repetition of this phrase, where it is probably to be taken in its sense of “to leave the Order.” The question is, does the text of the above passage justify the Dictionary’s rendering? It is as easy to believe that the monk was merely returning to his former home as that he was declaring his intention of returning to his former wife. On the other hand, on **BD 1.62** below, *vibbhama* possibly means “cohabit.” At **BD 1.323** below, *vibbh°* probably means “left the Order.” Doubtless this meaning carried the other with it. See also **BD 1.114** and n. 3.

³ At AN i.25 he is called “chief among those who know the disciplinary rules by heart,” quoted by Vin-a 283. Verses at Thag 249, see *Psalms of the Bretheren* 168. Cf. *Vinaya Texts* ii.276, n. 1; MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p.217.

⁴ Mentioned, I think, nowhere but here. ⁵ BRAHMALI: Reading *mudhā* with the Mahāsaṅgīti, as against *Buddha* in the PTS edition.

between the fingers ... Come, bhante, having made an effort with my hand, I will make you discharge, thus there will be no offence for you.” The monk acted accordingly. He became anxious. “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence entailing suspension.”

At one time in Sāvattthī there was a female lay-disciple called Saddhā who had mistaken faith. She held the view that any woman who gives sexual intercourse gives the highest gift. Seeing a monk, she said: “Come, bhante, have sexual intercourse.”

“Enough, sister, it is not allowable.”

“Come, bhante, rub between the thighs ... Come, bhante, having made an effort with my hand, I will make you discharge, thus there will be no offence for you.” The monk acted accordingly. He became anxious ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence entailing suspension.”

At one time in Vesālī some Licchavi youths took hold of a monk and made him commit misconduct with a nun. Both agreed: both should be expelled.¹ Neither agreed: no offence for either.

At one time in Vesālī some Licchavi youths took hold of a monk and made him commit misconduct with a probationary nun ... with a novice nun. Both agreed: both should be expelled. Neither agreed: no offence for either.

At one time in Vesālī some Licchavi youths took hold of a monk and made him commit misconduct with a prostitute² ... with a *paṇḍaka* ... with a woman householder. The monk agreed: he should be expelled. The monk did not agree: there is no offence for him.

¹ *nāsetabbo*. Cf. above, **BD 1.50**. ² *vesī*, or low-caste woman.

At one time in Vesālī some Licchavi youths took hold of some monks and made them commit misconduct with one another. Both agreed: both should be expelled. Neither agreed: no offence for either.

10.26 At one time a certain monk who had gone forth in his old age went to see his former wife. She said, “Come, bhante, leave the Sangha,”¹ and she took hold of him. The monk, stepping backwards, fell down on his back.² She, having pulled up his robe,³ sat down on his penis. He became anxious ... They informed the Master. He said:

“Monk, did you consent?”

“I did not consent, Master.”

“There is no offence for one who does not consent.”

10.27 At one time a certain monk dwelt in the jungle. A young deer went to his place of urination, drank the urine and took his penis in its mouth. The monk consented. He became anxious ... He informed the Master. He said: “You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

*The first offence entailing expulsion is finished.*⁴

¹ *vibbhama*, see above **BD 1.60, n. 3**. ² Vin-a 284, says that he stepped back to free himself from her grasp, but fell down as he was weak through old age. But he was a non-returner, one who had cut off passion and sense-desires, therefore he did not consent. ³ *Ubbhujitvā*. Cf. **Vin 2.222**. ⁴ *samattam*, instead of the more usual *niṭṭhitam*.

MONKS' EXPULSION (PĀRĀJĪKA) 2

ORIGIN STORY

FIRST SUB-STORY

At one time the Buddha, the Master, was staying at Rājagaha on Mount Vulture's Peak. Now at that time a number of monks who were friends made grass huts on the slope of Mount Isigili¹ and entered the rains there. Among them was Venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son. Then, after three months, when the rains (residence) was over, the monks demolished their grass huts, put away the grass and wood and departed to wander around the country. But Venerable Dhaniya spent the rains there, and the winter and the summer. Then, while Venerable Dhaniya was in the village collecting alms, women gathering grass and firewood demolished the grass hut and took away the grass and sticks. A second time Venerable Dhaniya collected grass and sticks and made a grass hut. A second time, while Venerable Dhaniya was in the village collecting alms, women gathering grass and firewood demolished the grass hut and took away the grass and sticks. And the same thing happened a third time. Then Venerable Dhaniya thought: "Three times this has happened. But I am well-trained and experienced in my own craft, the potter's craft. Perhaps I should knead mud myself and make a hut consisting of nothing but clay?" Then Venerable Dhaniya did just that. He then collected grass, wood and cow-dung and baked his hut. It was a beautiful, lovely and

¹ One of the group of hills above Rājagaha, whence the other crests could be seen (MN iii.68ff.); a resort of the Order, Vin 2.76; where Godhika committed suicide, SN i.120; cf. DN ii.116.

charming little hut, and it was red just like a scarlet rain-mite.¹ And (when hit) it sounded just like the sound of a bell.

Then the Master, descending from Mount Vulture's Peak with a number of monks, saw the hut. He then addressed the monks:

"Monks, what is this beautiful, lovely and charming thing, which is red like a scarlet rain-mite?" The monks then informed the Master. The Buddha, the Master, was critical, saying:

"It is not suitable, monks, for that foolish man, it is not fit, it is not becoming, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it should not be done. For how could that foolish man make a hut out of nothing but clay? Certainly this foolish man can have no consideration, compassion and mercy for living beings.² Go, monks, and demolish this hut. Do not let future generations take up the destruction of living beings.³ **And, monks, a hut consisting of nothing but clay should not be made. If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct.**"⁴

"Yes, bhante," the monks replied, and they went to that hut and demolished it. Then Venerable Dhaniya said to those monks:

"Why, friends, are you demolishing my hut?"

"Friend, the Master has asked us to."

"Demolish it, friends, if the Lord of the Dhamma⁵ has said so."

Then Venerable Dhaniya thought: "Three times, while I was in the village collecting alms, women gathering grass and firewood demolished my hut and took away the grass and sticks. And now

¹ Indagopaka, literally Indra's cowherds. Commentary makes no remark. But cf. Thag 13 and *Psalms of the Brethren* 18, n., where it is said that "according to the (Thag) Commentary these are coral-red insects, alluded to in connection with recent rain, but said by some to be a red grass." Note also here Sir Charles Eliot's remark that the Russians call lady-birds, "God's little cows." Dhaniya's hut might have been of a round kraal-like shape, suggesting a beetle's back. Monier Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary gives under *indragopaka*, "the insect cochineal of various kinds"; and St. Petersburg Dictionary gives "Coccinelle." The coccineds are, however, lady-birds. ² *na hi nāma tassa moghapurisassa pāṇesu anuddayā anukampā vihesā bhavissati*. This must refer to the small creatures in the mud which would be destroyed when the mud was baked. ³ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2970.) ⁴ Vin-a 289, "There was no offence for Dhaniya, because it was a first offence." ⁵ *dhammasāmi*, cf. SN iv.94; AN v.226.

my hut made of nothing but clay has been demolished at the Master's request. Now the overseer of the wood-yard is a friend of mine. Perhaps I should ask him for wood and make a hut out of it?"

Then Venerable Dhaniya approached the overseer of the wood-yard and said this: "Three times, friend, while I was in the village collecting alms, women gathering grass and firewood ... has been demolished at the Master's request. Give me some wood, friend, I want to make a wooden hut."

"There is no such wood, bhante, that I could give you. This wood is held by the king, and it is meant for the repair of the town and put aside in case of emergency. Only if the king gives it, may you take it."

"Friend, it has been given by the king."

Then the overseer of the wood-yard thought: "These recluses, sons of the Sakyan, are followers of *dhamma*, of just conduct, committed to the spiritual life, speakers of truth, virtuous, of good conduct. Even the king has faith in these. He would not¹ say something is given if it were not." Then the overseer of the wood-yard said to Venerable Dhaniya: "You may take it, bhante." Then Venerable Dhaniya had that wood broken up into pieces, removed it by means of carts and made a wooden hut.

Now the brahmin Vassakāra,² the chief minister of Magadha, while he was inspecting the works in Rājagaha, went to the overseer of the wood-yard and said to him: "What is going on: where is the wood held by the king that is meant for the repair of the town and put aside in case of emergency?"

"Sir,³ that wood was given by the king to master Dhaniya."

Then the brahmin Vassakāra was upset: "How could the king give away the wood, which is meant for the repair of the town and put aside in case of emergency, to Dhaniya, the potter's son?"

Then the brahmin Vassakāra went to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha and said to him: "Is it true, sire, that the wood held by

¹ *na arahati*. ² At Vin 1.225 = DN ii.86 = Ud 87 he and Sunidha, another chief minister, were building a fortified town at Pāṭaligāma against the Vajjians. At DN ii.72 Ajātasattu, then King of Magadha, sent Vassakāra to tell Gotama that he (Ajāta^o) was going to fight the Vajjins. ³ *Sāmi*.

the king, meant for the repair of the town and put aside in case of emergency, were given by the king to Dhaniya, the potter's son?"

"Who said that?"

"The overseer of the wood-yard, sire."

"Well then, brahmin, send for the overseer of the wood-yard."

Then Vassakāra had the overseer of the wood-yard bound and taken by force.

Venerable Dhaniya saw the overseer of the wood-yard being bound and taken by force and said to him: "Friend, why is this happening to you?"

"Because of the business with that wood, bhante."

"Go, friend, and I too will come."

"Please come before I am done for, bhante."

Then Venerable Dhaniya went to the dwelling of King Bimbisāra and sat down on the appointed seat. Then King Bimbisāra approached Venerable Dhaniya, paid homage to him and sat down to one side. King Bimbisāra then said this to him:

"Is it true, bhante, that the wood held by the king, meant for the repair of the town and put aside in case of emergency, have been given by me to the master?"

"Yes, great king."

"We kings are very busy—having given, we may not remember. Please remind me, bhante."

"Do you remember, great king, when you were first anointed, speaking these words: 'Let the recluses and brahmins enjoy gifts of grass, sticks and water'?"

"I remember, bhante. There are recluses and brahmins who have a sense of shame, are scrupulous and desirous of training. They have a sense of conscience even in regard to small matters. What was uttered by me was meant¹ for these, and it concerned what is ownerless in the wilderness.² Yet you, bhante, imagine you can take wood not

¹ *Tesaṃ mayā sandhāya bhāsitaṃ. Sandhāya* of text altered to *saddhāya* at Vin 5.260. Vin-a 295 reads *sandh°*. ² Vin-a 295 says: "that grass, wood, and water not owned in the jungle, this is the meaning intended by me."

BD 1.7
Bu-Pj 2

given to you by means of this trick? But how could one like me flog, imprison or banish a recluse or a brahmin living in my kingdom? Go, you are free because of your status,¹² but do not do such a thing again.”

People criticised and denounced him: “These recluses, the sons of the Sakyan, are shameless, immoral, liars. They claim to be followers of *dhamma*, of just conduct, committed to the spiritual life, speakers of truth, virtuous, of good conduct. But there is no recluseship or brahminhood among these—it is lost to them. Where is recluseship and brahminhood among them? They have departed from it. They even deceive the king; what then other people?”

Monks heard the criticism of those people. Those monks who had few desires and a sense of shame, who were contented, scrupulous, and desirous of training, criticised and denounced Venerable Dhaniya: “How could he take wood belonging to the king that had not been given to him?” Then these monks informed the Master. And in this connection the Master convened the Sangha of monks and questioned Venerable Dhaniya:

“Is it true, Dhaniya, that you have taken wood belonging to the king that was not given to you?”

“It is true, Master.”

BD 1.7
Vin 3.4

The Buddha, the Master, rebuked him: “Foolish man, it is not suitable, it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How could you take wood belonging to the king that has not been given to you? This

¹ BRAHMALI: “*Loma*, “literally “hair,” but here seems to be used idiomatically to refer to status or social position. ² *Lomena*. Vin-a 295 says that *loma* is the characteristic mark of *pabbajjā*. It is like the case of some evil-minded people, who wanting to eat flesh, take a goat with a fine coat. A clever man comes along and thinks that the goat’s coat is valuable, so giving the other people two goats, he himself takes the valuable one. Thus this goat is freed on account of its coat or hair (*lomena*). Similarly, although the man who has done the deed (referred to in the text) is worthy of flogging or binding, yet because he bears the mark of an *arahan* (*arahaddhaja*) he is scatheless. Therefore, on account of his hair (*lomena*, i.e., the down on the limbs) which is the sign of his having gone forth, he is freed, like the valuable goat.

will not give rise to confidence in those without it,¹ nor increase the confidence of those who have it, but it will hinder confidence in those without it and it will cause some with confidence to change their minds.”

Now at that time a certain former chief minister of justice who had gone forth among the monks was sitting near the Master. The Master said to him: “For what amount of theft, monk, does King Bimbisāra flog, imprison or banish a thief?”

“For a *pāda*,² Master, for the worth of a *pāda*³, or for more than a *pāda*.”

Now at that time in Rājagaha a *pāda* was worth five *māsakas*.⁴

¹ AN i.98. At GS i.84 *appasannānaṃ* is translated “to believers” in error. It is, of course, “to non-believers or unbelievers.” ² For *pāda* see RHYS DAVIDS, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p. 2f., where he says “there is nothing to prove that it meant a coin at all; it may have been a weight ... recognised as a basis of calculation or a medium of exchange.” Vin-a 297 says, “then in Rājagaha a *kaḥāpaṇa* was (worth) twenty *māsakas*, therefore a *pāda* was (worth) five *māsakas*, and a *pāda*, because of this property, is to be called a quarter of a *kaḥāpaṇa* throughout the countryside.” At Vin 3.238, Vin 3.240, *kaḥāpaṇa* appears in definition of *rajata* (silver), *rūpiya* (silver), respectively, but I think that it need not necessarily mean silver literally, as the copper, wood and lac *māsakas* also appear in these definitions of *rajata* and *rūpiya*. See BD 1.72, n. for *māsaka*. At Vv-a 11 = Dh-p iii.108 we get a descending line, *kaḥāpaṇa*, *aḍḍhapāda*, *māsaka*, then *kākaṇikā*. For this last see RHYS DAVIDS, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p. 10. Owing to the uncertainty as to the exact nature of the coins *kaḥāpaṇa*, *māsaka*, *pāda*, if indeed they were coins at all, I think it better to leave them untranslated. All we can say is that the *kaḥāpaṇa* was the unit of exchange in Pali literature, and that the others were mediums of exchange of lesser value than the *kaḥāpaṇa*. To translate *kaḥāpaṇa* by “penny” and so on as does BURLINGAME, *Buddhist Legends*, ii.333f. brings us no nearer to the sense of the Pali. ³ *pādārahaṃ*. Here we have what is possibly an early use of *araḥaṃ*, when it simply meant “worth” or “value,” and not even so much as a “worthy person,” far less a saint or man perfected. ⁴ *māsaka* from *māsa*, a bean of the phaseolus, see below, BD 1.83, n. Enough has been said to show that usually twenty *māsakas* were reckoned to make a *kaḥāpaṇa*. As mentioned in foregoing note the copper, wood and lac *māsakas* are included in a definition of *rajata* and *rūpiya*. See also Vin-a 689–Vin-a 690, which speaks of *māsakas* made of skin, bone, fruits or seeds of trees, and says that some *māsakas* have figures stamped upon them. This passage goes on to say that, together with silver and gold, the gold *māsaka* and the silver *māsaka* are four things to be given up (by monks) See RHYS DAVIDS, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p. 8, p. 14. Cf. SN i.79.

Then the Master, having rebuked Venerable Dhaniya in several ways for being difficult to support ... “... And, monks, this training rule should be recited thus:

PRELIMINARY RULING

“If a monk takes by way of theft what has not been given to him—the sort of theft for which kings, having caught a thief, would flog, imprison or banish him, saying, ‘You are a robber, you are foolish, you have gone astray, you are a thief’—he too is expelled and not in communion.”

Thus the Master laid down this training rule for the monks

SECOND SUB-STORY

At one time the group of six monks went to the dyers’ spread (of dyed cloth)¹, carried off the dyers’ goods, took it to the monastery and divided it out. Other monks said:

“Friends, you have great merit, for many robes have accrued to you.”

“How is there merit for us, friends? Just now we went to the dyers’ spread (of dyed cloth) and carried off the dyers’ goods.”

“Friends, hasn’t a training rule been laid down by the Master? Why then do you carry off the dyers’ goods?”

“It is true, friends, that a training rule has been laid down by the Master, but it concerns the village, not the wilderness.”

“But, friends, that is just the same. It is not suitable, it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it should not be done. How could you carry off the dyers’s goods? It will not give rise to confidence in those without it, nor increase the confidence of those who have it, but it will hinder confidence in those without it and it will cause some with confidence to change their minds.”

¹ BRAHMALI: See Vin-a 2.298,16.

Then those monks, having rebuked the group of six monks in various ways, informed the Master. And in this connection the Master convened the Sangha and questioned the group of six monks:

“Is it true, monks, that you went the dyers’ spread (of dyed cloth) and carried off the dyers’ goods?”

“It is true, Master.”

The Buddha, the Master, rebuked them: “it is not suitable, foolish men, it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it should not be done. How could you go to the dyers’ spread (of dyed cloth) and carry off the dyers’ goods? It will not give rise to confidence in those without it ... to change their minds.” Then the Master, rebuking the group of six monks in various ways, spoke in dispraise of being difficult to support ... but he spoke in praise ... of the putting forth of energy. Having given a *Dhamma* talk on what was right and seemly, he addressed the monks ... “... And so, monks, this training rule should be recited thus:

FINAL RULING

“If a monk takes by way of theft from a village or from the wilderness what has not been given to him—the sort of theft for which kings, having caught a thief, would flog, imprison or banish him, saying, ‘You are a robber, you are foolish, you have gone astray, you are a thief’—he too is expelled and not in communion.”

DEFINITIONS

A means: whoever, of such kind ...

Monk means: ... this sort of **monk** is meant in this case.

Village means: a village of one hut, a village of two huts, a village of three huts, a village of four huts, an inhabited village, an uninhabited village,¹ a fenced-in village, a village which is not fenced in, a

¹ *samanusso pi gāmo amanusso pi gāmo*, or “a village that is inhabited or a village that is uninhabited.” See **BD 1.147, n. 2** below.

disorganised village, and even a caravan that is camping for more than four months is called a **village**. **The precincts of the village** means: of a fenced-in village, the outward stone-throw of a man of average height standing at the threshold (of the village gate); of a village not fenced in, the outward stone-throw of a man of average height standing within the precincts of a house.¹

Wilderness means: leaving aside the village and the precincts of the village, what remains is called the wilderness.²

What has not been given means: what has not been given, nor let go of, nor thrown away; what is guarded, protected, regarded as “mine”, what belongs to others—this is called **what has not been given**.

By way of theft means: intending to steal, intending to carry off.

If (he) takes means: if (he) takes, if (he) takes away, if (he) carries off, if (he) interrupts the mode of movement, if (he) removes from its base, if (he) does not fulfill an obligation.³

The sort of theft means: a *pāda*, the worth of a *pāda*, or more than a *pāda*.

Kings means: kings of the earth, local kings, governors of islands,⁴ governors of border areas, judges, chief ministers, or whoever metes out physical punishment—these are called **kings**.

A thief means: one who takes by way of theft anything having the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* that has not been given—he is called **a thief**.

Would flog means: they would flog with the hand, the foot, a whip, a cane, a rod, or by maiming.

¹ See Vism 71f., which goes into the question of fixing the village precincts at greater length. It adduces Vinaya evidence: a stone thrown by young men in a display or strength fixes the boundary. The standard throw decides this. The Visuddhimagga goes on to say that the Suttanta scholars say that the boundary is the fall of a stone thrown to drive away a crow. ² Quoted at Snp-a 83; and at Vism 73. Here Vibhaṅga definition is also collected: “it is jungle when one goes out by the gate pillars,” Vb 251. Suttanta views as to relation of jungle and village are also given at Vism 73.

³ *saṃketa*, see below Bu-Pj 2.4.30. ⁴ BRAHMALI: See Vin-a 2.309,6.

Would imprison means: they would imprison by constriction with a rope, by constriction with fetters, by constriction with chains, by constriction to a house, by constriction to a town, by constriction to a village, by constriction to a small town, by being guarded.

Would banish means: they would banish from the village, small town, town, province or rural district.

You are a robber, you are foolish, you have gone astray, you are a thief means: this is censure.¹

He too means: this is said with reference to the preceding offence entailing expulsion.

Is expelled means: just as a fallen, withered leaf could not² become green again, so a monk who takes by way of theft a *pāda*, the worth of a *pāda* or more than a *pāda*, which had not been given to him, is not a recluse, not a son of the Sakyan³—he is therefore called one who **is expelled**.

Not in communion means: **communion** means: a common official action, the same recital, the same training—this is called **communion**. He does not take part in this—he is therefore called **not in communion**.

PERMUTATIONS

PERMUTATIONS PART 1

SUMMARY

Being in the earth, being on firm ground, being in the air, being above ground, being in water, being in a boat, being in a vehicle,

¹ BRAHMALI: Because of the way I have translated the rule I have had to leave out the next two definitions, neither of which relate to anything in my translation. Both definitions are found in the Pali and in I.B. Horner's translation. However, since both of these definitions are verbatim repetitions of definitions already given under this rule (see the definitions of "The sort of theft" and "Should take" above), there is no loss of information. ² *Abhabba*. ³ Cf. *Vin 1.96*, where it is said that a monk who has received the *upasampadā* ordination should abstain from taking what is not given him and from theft, even of a blade of grass.

carried as a burden, being in a park, being in a monastic dwelling, being in a field, being on a plot of land, being in a village, being in the wilderness, water, tooth-wood, forest tree, goods being carried, deposit, customs station, a living being, footless, two-footed, four-footed, many-footed, a spy, a keeper of entrusted property, a mutually agreed theft, an arranged action, the making of a sign.

EXPOSITION

Being in the earth means: the goods are put down into the earth, buried, covered. If, intending to steal, he thinks, “I will take the goods that are in the earth,” and he seeks for a companion,¹ or he seeks for a hoe or a basket, or he goes (to the goods),² there is an offence of bad conduct.³ If he breaks a piece of wood or a slender tree⁴ growing there, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he digs up the soil or removes it or lifts it up, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches the container,⁵ there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes it quiver,⁶ there is a serious offence. If he moves it from its base,⁷ there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Putting his own vessel into (the container)⁸, if he touches something worth five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes it quiver, there is a serious

¹ *dutiya*, a second one, a mate or helper, a friend, associate or accomplice. ² (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2972.) ³ *Dukkaṭa*, explained at Vin-a 313 as *duṭṭhu kata*, badly, wrongly done; and transgressing being done is called *dukkāṭa*. This is not one of the worst transgressions. ⁴ *Latā*, a slender creeper. ⁵ BRAHMALI: *Kumbhi*, literally, “pot”, but here it functions as a container.

⁶ *Phandāpeti*, cf. MN i.404 *phandato phandāpayato*, translated at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.291, “who sets folk quaking or causes another to do so.” The meaning probably is that he takes hold of the article so that it throbs, trembles or shakes—a worse offence than merely laying hold of it, but not so bad as removing it. ⁷ *Ṭhānā cāveti*. Cf. Snp 442 *mā maṃ ṭhānā acāvayi*, translated H.O.S. Vol. 37, “May he never beat me back,” and Sacred Books of the East, Volume X, “that he may not drive me away from my place.” ⁸ BRAHMALI: Vin-a 2.316,15.

offence.¹ If he makes it enter his own vessel² or takes it with his fist,^{3,4} there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If, intending to steal, he touches goods held together by a string,⁵ or a bracelet,⁶ a necklace,⁷ an ornamental girdle,⁸ a robe, or a turban, there is an offence of bad conduct.

If he makes it quiver, there is a serious offence. If, grasping it at the top,⁹ he pulls it, there is a serious offence. If while stroking it, he lifts it,¹⁰ there is a serious offence. If he removes the goods even as much as a hair's breadth over the rim of the container, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If, intending to steal, he drinks, in one undertaking,¹¹ ghee, oil, honey or molasses¹² to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five

¹ *Thullaccaya*, an offence whose nature is grave, Vin-a 314. ² *Attano bhājanagataṃ vā karoti*. Cf. below, **BD 1.85**. *Bhājanagataṃ* explained at Vin-a 316 to mean *bhājane yeva hoti*, as *kumbhigataṃ* is *kumbhiyaṃ*, feminine locative. ³ BRAHMALI: So that contact is broken with the other goods in the container; Vin-a 2.316,28.

⁴ *Muṭṭhiṃ chindati*, i.e., of *kaḥāpanas*. Vin-a 316; which also says, *evam muṭṭhiṃ karonto muṭṭhiṃ chindati nāma*, making a fist so is called detaching a handful so that no *kaḥāpanas* come out between the fingers. ⁵ *Suttārūlham*. Vin-a 316, "putting on chains means, tying on chains, made of chains." Cf. **Vin 2.106** where the group of six monks wore similar things. ⁶ *Pāmaṅga*, at *Vinaya Texts* iii.69, "ear-drops."

Vin-a 316, "made of gold, made of silver, made of chains, strings of pearls and so on." Otherwise Buddhaghosa of no help here. Cf. Vin-a 534. ⁷ BRAHMALI: The next item occurring in I.B. Horner's translation is "an ornamental string hanging from the ear," but since this is not found in the *Mahāsaṅgīti*, I have left it out. Her note on this is: "*Kaṅṅasuttaka* at **Vin 1.286** seems to mean a clothes-line; but cf. **Vin 2.143**."

⁸ *Kaṭisuttaka*. Not enumerated at **Vin 2.136** where other special kinds of girdles are mentioned. The monks were forbidden to wear any of these things, **Vin 2.107**. The use of *kaṭisuttaka*, meaning a hip-string, is forbidden to the nuns at **Vin 2.271**.

⁹ *koṭiyam gahetvā = ākāsaṭṭham akaronto*, Vin-a 317. ¹⁰ *ghaṃsanto niharati*, which according to Vin-a 317 means that when a big pot is brim-full, drawing it out and levelling a chain (*pāmaṅga*) across the mouth of the big pot, if he draws the chain further than the mouth, so that he drags off whatever goods rise higher than the level of the top of the pot, there is a *pārājika* offence. But if, in pulling the chain, he does not pull over any goods, as he does not pull the chain beyond the rim, there is a *thullaccaya* offence. See above, **BD 1.77 n.**, on *pāmaṅga*. ¹¹ *payoga*, an elastic term, meaning action, business, undertaking; cf. **Vin 3.50** below, where it seems to mean occasion, occurrence, happening. ¹² These, with fresh butter, *navanīta*, constitute the five kinds of medicine, cf. below, **Vin 3.251**.

māsakas, there is an offence entailing expulsion. In this case, if he destroys it, throws it away, burns it or renders it useless, there is an offence of bad conduct.

Being on firm ground¹ means: the goods are put down on the firm ground. If, intending to steal and thinking, “I will steal the goods which are on the firm ground,” he either searches for a companion, or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes them quiver, there is a serious offence. If he moves them from their base, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Being in the air means: the goods are in the air.² A peacock, a francolin partridge,³ a partridge, a quail,⁴ a robe,⁵ a turban or different varieties of gold—⁶⁷ that falls to the ground when cut. If, intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods in the air,” and he either searches for a companion or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he cuts off their course of movement,⁸ there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes them quiver, there is a serious offence. If he moves them from their base, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

¹ *thalaṭṭham*. *Thala* is solid ground, firm ground, as opposed to water; dry ground—i.e., high, raised or sloping as opposed to low ground; or a plateau as opposed to a low-lying place. Vin-a 322 explains by *bhūmitale vā pāsādapab-batatalādīsu vā*. ² *ākāsagataṃ, gataṃ* being an elastic termination of some fixed significance. ³ *kapiñjara*, possibly with this meaning, cf. Kv 268 (*kapiñjala*) and Ja vi.538. ⁴ *vaṭṭako*. *Pali-English Dictionary* says a “cart,” *vaṭṭakā* being “quail.”

⁵ Blown by the force of the wind and extended on the ground, Vin-a 324. ⁶ BRAHMALI: This renders *hiraññaṃ vā suvaṇṇaṃ vā*. These are two different words for gold, the exact distinction between them being unclear. ⁷ *hiraññaṃ vā suvaṇṇaṃ vā*. While people are putting on, e.g. a necklace or while a goldsmith is making a *salākā*, if it falls from the fastener, and the thief makes off with it, Vin-a 324. But for these two words, *hirañña* and *suvaṇṇa*, cf. above BD 1.28, n. ⁸ BRAHMALI: Presumably this refers to something moving through the air, perhaps especially birds.

Being above ground¹ means: the goods are found above ground.²

On a bed, on a bench, on a bamboo pole for hanging robes from,³ on a cord for hanging robes from, on a peg in the wall,⁴ on an elephant tusk peg,⁵ in a tree, or even if just fastened to a bowl stand.⁶ If, intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods that are found above ground,” and he either searches for a companion or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes them quiver, there is a serious offence. If he moves them from their base, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Being in the water means: the goods are deposited in the water. If intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods in the water,” and he either searches for a companion or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. He either dives into the water or emerges from it, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches the goods, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes them quiver, there is a serious offence. If he moves them from their base, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If intending to steal, he touches either a blue, red, or white lotus which is growing there,⁷ or the sprout of a lotus, or a fish or a turtle to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes them quiver, there is a seri-

¹ *Vehāsaṭṭham*. There is usually little difference between *vehāsa* and *ākāsa*, which is part of the word explained in the preceding paragraph. Both usually mean “air” or “atmosphere.” But it is clear in this context that some greater difference is intended. In this paragraph, beginning “Being above ground,” the goods are shown to come into contact with something standing on or supported by the earth, and are not, as “in the air,” freed, like a bird, from the earth’s support. *Vehāsaṭṭham*, with *bhūmigatam*, occurs at DN i.115, and is translated at *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.i47 “above the ground,” which I follow, and at *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.94, “housed in treasury chambers.” DN-a i.284=MN-a iii.420 says “completing terraces and turrets (*pāsādaniyyūhādāyo*) and putting (it there) is called ‘above the ground.’” ² *vehāsaṭṭham*.

³ *cīvaravaṃsa*. This and the next, *cīvararajju*, are often found together in Vinaya; cf. Vin 1.47 and Vin 1.286 where these things were prescribed for the monks. ⁴ *bhit-tikhīla*. Vin-a 327, something knocked against the wall, driven straight in, or something that was there originally. ⁵ *nāgadanta*. Vin-a 327 says that this is curved. ⁶ Vin-a 328: this may be a support on a tree or on a fence or on a stick. ⁷ *tatthajā-taka*, literally born there.

ous offence. If he moves them from their base, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

A **boat** means: that by which one crosses.¹ **Being in a boat** means: the goods are deposited in a boat. If intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods which are deposited in the boat,” and he either searches for a companion or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the boat” ... or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes it quiver, there is a serious offence. If he loosens the moorings, there is an offence of bad conduct. If, having loosened the moorings, he touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes it quiver, there is a serious offence. If he makes it move up or down, or across the water even for as much as a hair’s breadth, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

A **vehicle**² means: a litter, a two-wheeled carriage, a cart, a chariot.³ **Being in a vehicle** means: the goods are deposited in a vehicle. If intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods deposited in the vehicle” ... or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the vehicle” ... or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches it ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

A **burden** means: a burden carried on the head, a burden carried on the back, a burden carried on the hip, one hanging down. If intending to steal, he touches the burden on the head, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes it quiver, there is a serious

¹ Vin-a 332, here meaning even a washerman’s tub or a sheaf of bamboos. ² *yāna*, a way, the act of going, so a vehicle. Earlier, in the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, it had meant a way, rather than the means of going, as *devayāna*, *pitṛyāna*, the way to the devas, the way to the ancestors. DASGUPTA, *History of Indian Philosophy* i.125 sees the word as “career”. This rendering was adopted by E.J. THOMAS, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p.178, in referring to later (Mahāyāna) teaching. The above definition clearly rules out “career” for this passage. ³ Cf. Vin 4.339 where two more are added: *sivikā pāṭaṅkī*, palanquin and sedan-chair.

offence. If he lowers it to the back, there is an offence entailing expulsion. If intending to steal, he touches the burden on the back, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes it quiver, there is a serious offence. If he lowers it to the hip, there is an offence entailing expulsion. If intending to steal, he touches the burden on the hip, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he causes it to quiver, there is a serious offence. If he takes it with his hands, there is an offence entailing expulsion. If intending to steal a burden in the hand, he deposits it on the ground, there is an offence entailing expulsion. Intending to steal, he takes it from the ground, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

A park means: a park with flowers, an orchard.¹ **Being in a park** means: the goods are deposited in the park in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. If intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods in the park” ... or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If intending to steal, he touches a root growing there,² or a piece of bark,³ a leaf, a flower,⁴ or a fruit to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If he claims the park,⁵ there is an offence of bad conduct. If he evokes doubt in the owner as to his ownership⁶, there is a serious offence. If the owner thinks, “I won’t get it back,” and he gives up the effort of reclaiming it,⁷ there is an offence entailing expulsion. If he resorts to the law⁸ and defeats the owner, there is an offence

¹ BRAHMALI: The word *ārāma*, “park”, also includes monasteries. ² *tatthajātaka*, cf. **BD 1.80, n. 5**; Vin-a 337f., applies this adjective only to *mūla*. ³ Bark was used for medicine or dye; to harm a tree with valuable bark was a *pārājika*, Vin-a 338.

⁴ Such as jasmine and lotus. ⁵ Vin-a 338, i.e. belonging to someone else, saying, ‘It is mine’; in this attempt to take what is not given, there is a *dukkāṭa*. ⁶ BRAHMALI: Vin-a 2.338,16. ⁷ BRAHMALI: Vin-a 2.338,21. ⁸ *dhuraṃ nikkhipati*, or “throws off his responsibility.” ⁹ *dhammaṃ caranto*. Vin-a ii.339: *bhikkhusanghe vā rājakule vā vinicchayaṃ karonto*; but the judges having descended to false witnesses pervert justice and conquer the keeper.

entailing expulsion. If he resorts to the law¹ but is defeated,² there is a serious offence.

Being in a monastic dwelling³ means: the goods are deposited in a monastic dwelling in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. If, intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods in the monastic dwelling” ... or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If he claims the monastic dwelling ... but is defeated, there is a serious offence.

A field means: where grain or vegetables grow.⁴ **Being in a field** means: the goods are deposited in a field in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. If, intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods deposited in the field” ... or goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If, intending to steal, he touches the grain or the vegetables which grow there to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* ...

¹ Here Vin-a 339 says, “but if proceeding with the investigation by means of Vinaya and Dhamma and the master’s teaching, he accomplishes his own defeat ... he falls into a *thullaccaya*.” ² *parajjati*. ³ Note that this paragraph and Bu-Pj 2.4.14 below do not begin by saying: “a *vihāra* means:”, “a village means:”, as do the others here.

⁴ There are seven sorts of grain (*pubbaṇṇa*) and seven kinds of pulses or cereals (*aparaṇṇa*). Cnd 314 distinguishes these two sorts of grain: *pubbaṇṇa* (natural) and *aparaṇṇa* (prepared). To the first, here called *dhañña*, belong *sāli* and *vīhi* (rice-sorts), *yava* (barley), *godhūma* (wheat), *kaṅga* (millet), *varaka* (beans), *kudrūsaka*. At *Dialogues of the Buddha* iii.70 n. 1 translator says *kudrūsaka* is a “kind of rye.” At DN iii.71 it is said that as now *sāli* and curry (*maṁsodana*) are the highest kinds of food, so when man’s life-span is reduced to ten years, *kudrūsaka* will become the highest food. At Vin 4.264 these kinds of grain are catalogued under *āmaka-dhañña*, “raw” grain, corn in its natural, unprepared state. At DN i.5 = AN ii.209 it is said that Gotama is one who abstains from accepting this *āmakadhañña*. Mnd 248, in defining *khetta* gives a rather different series of seven grains; *sāli*, *vīhi*, *mugga* (kidney-bean), *māsa* (a bean, *Phaseolus indica* or *radiata*), *yava*, *godhūma*, *tila* (sesame plant). Mil 106 again varies slightly: *sāli*, *vīhi*, *yava*, *taṇḍula* (rice-grain), *tila*, *mugga*, *māsa*. AN iv.108 = AN iv.112 includes *tila*, *mugga*, *māsa* under *aparaṇṇa*. A list of provisions for a journey at Vin 1.244 includes *taṇḍula*, *mugga*, *māsa*. Ja v.106 says that *hareṇukā ti aparāṇṇajā ti*.

there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If he claims the field ... but is defeated, there is a serious offence.

If he shifts a post, a cord, a fence, or a boundary, there is an offence of bad conduct. When one action of the shifting remains, there is a serious offence. When the last action of the shifting is completed, there is an offence entailing expulsion.¹

A plot of land means: the plot of land of a park or a monastery, the plot of land of a monastic dwelling. **Being on a plot of land** means: the goods are deposited on a plot of land in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. If, intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods on the plot of land” ... or he goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If he claims the plot of land ... but is defeated, there is a serious offence.

If he shifts a post, a cord, a fence, or a boundary, there is an offence of bad conduct. When one action of the shifting remains, there is a serious offence. When the last action of the shifting is completed, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Being in a village means: the goods are deposited in a village in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. If, intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods the village” ... or he goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

The wilderness means: any wilderness which is owned by people.² **Being in the wilderness** means: the goods are deposited in the

¹ *Ekam payogaṃ anāgate, āpatti thullaccayassa; tasmin payoge āgate, āpatti pārājikassa.* Note the use of accusative and locative. Vin-a 341 says, “desiring to make a field for himself using the enclosure of another person’s field, he digs in the wood. Each time he uses a piece, there is a *dukkaṭa* offence (*payoge payoge dukkaṭaṃ*); when one piece is still to come, there is a *thullaccaya* offence (*ekasmiṃ anāgate thullaccayaṃ*); when that piece has come, there is a *pārājika* (*tasmiṃ āgate pārājikaṃ*).” Commentary goes on to say that if by these means one is able to enclose a field for himself, then there is a *dukkaṭa* with the first *payoga*, and finally (*avasāne*) there is one of two things: a *thullaccaya* according to one, a *pārājika* according to the other. ² BRAHMALI: See Vin-a 2.342,4.

wilderness in four places: in the earth, on the firm ground, in the air, above the ground. If, intending to steal, he thinks, “I will steal the goods in the wilderness” ... or he goes himself, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If, intending to steal, he touches a piece of wood belonging there, or a creeper or grass, to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Water means: in a vessel, in a pond, or in a reservoir. If, intending to steal, he touches it ... there is an offence entailing expulsion. Putting his own vessel into (the container holding the water), if he touches water to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, intending to steal it, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes it quiver, there is a serious offence. If he puts it into his own bowl,¹ there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If he breaks the embankment, there is an offence of bad conduct. Having broken the embankment, if he empties water to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence entailing expulsion. If he empties water to the value of more than one *māsaka* but less than five *māsakas*, there is a serious offence. If he empties water to the value of a *māsaka* or less than a *māsaka*, there is an offence of bad conduct.

Tooth-wood means: either cut or uncut. If, intending to steal, he touches what has a value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes it quiver, there is a serious offence. If he moves it from its base, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Forest tree², “the oldest tree, but here (*idha*) all are taken for the use of people.” means: Whatever tree is owned by people. If, intending to steal, he fells it, for each blow there is an offence of bad conduct. When one blow remains (before the tree is felled), there is a serious offence. When that last blow is completed, there is an offence entailing expulsion.³

¹ *attano bhājanagataṃ karoti*, cf. above, BD 1.77. ² Vin-a 347 ³ Cf. above, Bu-Pj 2.4.12, Bu-Pj 2.4.14.

Goods being carried¹ means: the goods of another are being carried. If, intending to steal, he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If he thinks, “together with the carrier I will carry off the goods,” and he makes the carrier move one foot, there is a serious offence. If he makes him move the second foot, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If he thinks, “I will seize the fallen goods,” and he makes them fall, there is an offence of bad conduct. If, intending to steal, he touches the fallen goods to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Deposit means: goods deposited with oneself. If one is told, “give me the goods,” and one says, “I am not getting them,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If he evokes doubt in the mind of the owner (as to whether he will get them back), there is a serious offence. If the owner thinks, “he won’t give them to me,” and he gives up the effort of getting them back, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If he resorts to the law and defeats the owner, there is an offence entailing expulsion. If he resorts to the law but is defeated, there is a serious offence.²

Customs station means: it is established by a king in a mountain-pass, at a ford in a river or at the gate of a village, so that tax shall be received from a person entering there. If, intending to steal, and having entered there, he touches goods that have a (tax)³ value to the king of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he makes them quiver, there is a serious offence. If he goes beyond the customs station with one foot, there is a serious offence. If he goes beyond the customs station with his second foot, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If, standing within the customs station, he makes the goods fall outside the customs station, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

If he avoids the customs station, there is an offence of bad con-

¹ *haraṇaka*, from \sqrt{hr} , to bring, convey, carry, fetch. ² Cf. above, Bu-Pj 2.4.10.

³ BRAHMALI: See Vin-a 2.358,29.

duct.

Creature means: a human being.¹ If, intending to steal, he touches him ... there is an offence entailing expulsion. If he thinks, "I will take him away on foot," and he makes him move the first foot, there is a serious offence. If he makes him move the second foot, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Footless means: snakes and fish. If, intending to steal, he touches what has the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Two-footed² means: humans and birds. If, intending to steal, he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion. If he thinks, "I will take them away on foot," and he makes them move the first foot, there is a serious offence. If he makes them move the second foot, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Four-footed means: elephants, horses, camels,³ cattle, asses, domesticated animals.⁴ If, intending to steal, he touches them ... there is an offence entailing expulsion. If he thinks, "I will take them away on foot," and he makes them move the first foot, there is a serious offence. If he makes them move the second foot, there is a serious offence. If he makes them move the third foot, there is a serious offence. If he makes them move the fourth foot, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

¹ BRAHMALI: According to the commentary, this refers to slaves; see Vin-a 2.361,11.

² Vin-a 363 says there are three kinds of creatures born with wings: those with wings of down (*loma*), such as peacocks and partridges; those with wings of skin, such as bats; those with wings of bone, such as bees. ³ *oṭṭha*, "camel" in Classical Sanskrit. This word appears in another list of animals at Mil 32, there translated "camels." MORRIS, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1887, p. 150, for *oṭṭhiviyādhī* suggests "female elephant," a rendering followed by FRANCIS and NEIL in translating Ja iii.385. Here the *oṭṭhiviyādhī* is made to speak of feats done by her in battle with words which, however, ring equally true if they came from a camel. *Oṭṭha* can hardly mean "elephant" here, since the ordinary word *hatthi* is included in the list. MONIER WILLIAMS, *Sanskrit Dictionary*, Oxford, 1872, has *sa* ... a buffalo; a bull with a hump; a camel; a cart, a waggon; ... (i), f. a she-camel; an earthen vessel in the shape of a camel. ⁴ BRAHMALI: *Pasuka*. According to the commentary, this last term includes all four-footed animals; see Vin-a 2.363,23.

Many-footed means: scorpions, centipedes, caterpillars¹. If, intending to steal, he touches what has the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* ... there is an offence entailing expulsion. If he thinks, “I will take them away on foot,” and he makes them move, there is a serious offence for each leg that moves. When the last leg moves, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

A spy means: having spied out goods², if he describes them³ and says, “steal such and such goods,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If he takes those goods, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both.⁴

A keeper of entrusted property means: guarding goods that have been brought to him to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, and intending to steal, he touches them⁵ ... there is an offence entailing expulsion.

A mutually agreed theft means: if many have agreed together⁶ but only one steals the goods, there is an offence entailing expulsion for all of them.

An arranged action⁷ means: if one makes an arrangement for before the meal or for after the meal, for the night or for the day, saying, “take those goods according to this agreement,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If he takes those goods according to that agreement, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both. If he takes those goods before or after the time of the agreement, there is no offence for the instigator, but an offence entailing expulsion for the thief.

The making of a sign means: he makes a sign. If he says, “when I wink, raise my eyebrow, or raise my head, at that sign steal the goods,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If, at that sign, he steals the goods, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both. If he

¹ BRAHMALI: *Uccāliṅgapāṇakā*. The exact meaning is uncertain. ² “examining them and considering them.” Vin-a 365. ³ I.e., to another as goods put carelessly or unguarded in other houses or *vihāras*. ⁴ *ubhinnaṃ pārājikassa*, for he both incites others and assists in the theft himself. ⁵ “He puts them into a sack or a well.” Vin-a 366. ⁶ *samvidahitvā*, also below, Bu-Pj 2.7.34. ⁷ *saṃketakamma*.

steals the goods before or after the sign, there is no offence for the instigator, but an offence entailing expulsion for the thief.

PERMUTATIONS PART 2

If a monk tells a monk, “steal such and such goods,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If he steals them, thinking they are the ones he has been asked to steal, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both. If a monk tells a monk, “steal such and such goods,” but he steals something else, thinking they are the ones he has been asked to steal, there is no offence for the instigator, but there is an offence entailing expulsion for the thief. If a monk tells a monk, “steal such and such goods,” and he steals them, thinking they are something else than what he has been asked to steal, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both. If a monk tells a monk, “steal such and such goods,” but he steals something else than what he has been asked to steal, thinking it is something else, there is no offence for the instigator, but there is an offence entailing expulsion for the thief.¹

If a monk tells a monk, “tell such and such to tell such and such to steal such and such goods,” there is an offence of bad conduct. In informing the next person, there is an offence of bad conduct. If the (potential) thief agrees, there is a serious offence for the instigator. If he steals these goods, there is an offence entailing expulsion for all of them.²³ If a monk tells a monk, “tell such and such to tell such and such to steal such and such goods,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If he tells someone else than the one he was told to tell, there is an offence of bad conduct. If the (potential) thief agrees, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he steals these goods, there is no offence for the instigator, but there is an offence entailing expulsion for the conveyor of the message and the thief.

If a monk tells a monk, “steal such and such goods,” there is an

¹ BRAHMALI: The ellipses points found in I.B. Horner’s translation and in the PTS original used by her have been filled in in accordance with the Mahāsaṅgīti.

² BRAHMALI: That is, altogether four people. ³ Vin-a 369, *sabbesaṃ catunnam pi janānaṃ pārājikaṃ*.

offence of bad conduct. Having gone, he returns, saying, “I am not able to steal those goods,” and if he tells him again, “when you are able, then steal those goods,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If he steals the goods, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both.

If a monk tells a monk, “steal such and such goods,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If, having told him, he regrets it, but does not say¹ to him, “do not steal,” and he then steals those goods, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both.

If a monk tells a monk, “steal such and such goods,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If, having told him, he regrets it and says, “do not steal,” but the other says, “I have been told by you,” and he then steals those goods, then there is no offence for the instigator, but an offence entailing expulsion for the thief.

If a monk tells a monk, “steal such and such goods,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If, having told him, he regrets it and says to him, “do not steal,” and he says, “very well,”² and desists, there is no offence for either.

PERMUTATIONS PART 3

For one who steals there is an offence entailing expulsion when five factors are fulfilled: it is the possession of another; one perceives it as such; it is a valuable possession worth at least five *māsakas*; one has the intention to steal; if one touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it quiver, there is a serious offence / if one makes it move from its base, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

For one who steals there is a serious offence when five factors are fulfilled: it is the possession of another; one perceives it as such; it is an ordinary possession worth more than one *māsaka* but less than five *māsakas*; one has the intention to steal; if one touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it quiver, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it move from its base, there is a serious offence.

For one who steals there is an offence of bad conduct when five

¹ *na sāveti*, causative of *suṇāti*, to hear. ² *suṭṭhu*.

factors are fulfilled: it is the property of another; one perceives it as such; it is an ordinary possession worth one *māsaka* or less; one has the intention to steal; if one touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it quiver, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it move from its base, there is an offence of bad conduct.

For one who steals there is an offence entailing expulsion when six factors are fulfilled: one does not perceive it as one's own; one does not take it on trust;¹ one does not borrow it; it is a valuable possession worth at least five *māsakas*; one has the intention to steal; if one touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it quiver, there is a serious offence / if one makes it move from its base, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

For one who steals there is a serious offence when six factors are fulfilled: one does not perceive it as one's own; one does not take it on trust; one does not borrow it; it is an ordinary possession worth more than one *māsaka* but less than five *māsakas*; one has the intention to steal; if one touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it quiver, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it move from its base, there is a serious offence.

For one who steals there is an offence of bad conduct when six factors are fulfilled: one does not perceive it as one's own; one does not take it on trust; one does not borrow it; it is an ordinary possession worth one *māsaka* or less; one has the intention to steal; if one touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it quiver, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it move from its base, there is an offence of bad conduct.

For one who steals there is an offence of bad conduct when five factors are fulfilled: it is not the possession of another; but one perceives it as the possession of another; it is a valuable possession worth at least five *māsakas*; one has the intention to steal; if one touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it quiver, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it move from its base, there

¹ BRAHMALI: This means he has a prior agreement with the owner whereby he has permission to take his possessions or certain of his possessions.

is an offence of bad conduct.

For one who steals there is an offence of bad conduct when five factors are fulfilled: it is not the possession of another; but one perceives it as the possession of another; it is an ordinary possession worth more than one *māsaka* but less than five *māsakas*; one has the intention to steal; if one touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it quiver, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it move from its base, there is an offence of bad conduct.

For one who steals there is an offence of bad conduct when five factors are fulfilled: it is not the possession of another; but one perceives it as the possession of another; it is an ordinary possession worth one *māsaka* or less; one has the intention to steal; if one touches it, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it quiver, there is an offence of bad conduct / if one makes it move from its base, there is an offence of bad conduct.

NON-OFFENCE CLAUSE

There is no offence if one perceives it as one's own; if one takes it on trust; if one borrows it;¹ if it is the property of a ghost² or an animal; if one perceives it as discarded;³ if one is insane; if one's mind is unhinged; if one is overwhelmed by pain; if one is the first offender.⁴

The first section on stealing is finished

¹ I.e., with intention to give it back; Vin-a 372, *paṭidassāmi paṭikarissāmi*; cf. Vin 3.66 = Vin 2.174, where the lord is represented as allowing monks to take away temporarily. ² *petapariggāhe = pittivisāye*, Vin-a 372, the realm or world of the departed. MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Indian Religion and Survival* (London, 1934), p. 35, says *peta*, "a word which, meaning literally 'gone before,' is held to be a corruption of the older term *pitṛ-*, or fathers' world." Vin-a 372 says, "having done his time in the world of the departed where he had arisen and being reborn in that existence, all the devas of the retinue of the Four Firmament Devas go to destruction as departed ones: for these there is no guilt in that realm." ³ Vin-a 373. If he knows that these rags have no owner (*assāmika*) there is no offence in taking them; but if they have an owner, he should give them to him, having had them fetched. ⁴ Buddhaghosa says (Vin-a 373) that Dhaniya was the beginner, and there was no offence for him.

CASE RULINGS

MNEMONIC LIST

Five are told with dyers, and four with blankets,
Five indeed with darkness, and five with carrying, /
Five with speech, another two with wind,
Fresh, the dropping of a *kusa*-grass ticket,¹
in the sauna² is the tenth, /
Five are told with animal kills, and five without grounds,
Shortage of food, and boiled rice and meat, pasteries, cakes, sweetmeats, /
With requisites, bag, cushion, bolster, a bamboo robe-rack, on not coming
out,
And taking food on trust, another two on perceiving as one's own, /
Seven on not regarding as taking, and seven where they did take,
Seven where they took from the Sangha, and another two with flowers, /
Three on taking messages,³ three on taking jewels past,
And pigs, deer, fish, and setting a vehicle in motion, /
Two on a piece of flesh, two on wood, discarded, two on water,
Step by step, by arrangement, it did not amount (to five *māsakas*), /
Four handfuls at Sāvathī, two on scraps of meat, two about grass,
Seven on dividing the belongings of the Sangha, and seven on non-owners,
Wood, water, clay, two on grass,
seven on taking by theft the belongings of the Sangha,
One should not take away what has an owner,
one may borrow what has an owner, /
Campā and in Rājagaha, and Ajjuka at Vesālī,
And Benares, and Kosambī, and Sāgalā with Dalhika.

Vin 3.5

BD 1.9

CASE DETAILS

At one time the group of six monks went to the dyers' spread (of dyed cloth) and carried off the dyers' goods. They became anxious and thought, "The Master has laid down a training rule. Could it be that we have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion?"⁴ ... They informed the Master ... "You, monks, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion."

Bu-Pj 2

¹ A blade (or blades) of the *kusa* grass cast to give the proper distribution of robes. Vin-a 378. ² Text here reads *jantagghena*, but at Vin 3.58, where the story is given we get *jantāghare*. ³ *vuttavādino*. ⁴ Cf. Bu-Pj 1.10.1.

At one time a certain monk, having gone to the dyers' spread (of dyed cloth) and seeing a valuable garment, had the intention to steal it. On account of this he became anxious ... "There is no offence, monk, for the arising of a thought."

At one time a certain monk ... saw a valuable garment and, intending to steal it, he touched it. On account of this he became anxious ... "Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence of bad conduct."

At one time a certain monk ... saw a valuable garment and, intending to steal it, he made it quiver. On this account he became anxious ... "... but there is a serious offence."

At one time a certain monk ... saw a valuable garment and, intending to steal it, he moved it from its base. On account of this he became anxious ... "You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion."

At one time a certain monk who was an almsgoer saw a valuable blanket¹ and had the intention to steal it ... intending to steal it, he touched it ... intending to steal it, he made it quiver ... intending to steal it, he moved it from its base. On account of this he became anxious ... "You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion."

At one time a certain monk, seeing some goods during the day, took note of them, thinking, "I will steal them at night," and he stole them, thinking they were the ones he had seen. ... but he stole something else, thinking they were the ones he had seen. ... and he stole them, thinking they were something else.² ... but he stole something

¹ *uttarattharaṇa*. ² Which he had originally thought of stealing.

else, thinking it was something else. On account of this he became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, seeing some goods during the day, took note of them, thinking, “I will steal them at night,” but he stole his own goods, thinking they were something else. On account of this he became anxious ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a certain monk carrying the goods of another on his head touched the burden intending to steal it ... intending to steal it, he made it quiver ... intending to steal it, he lowered it onto his shoulder ... intending to steal it, he touched the burden on the shoulder ... intending to steal it, he made it quiver ... intending to steal it, he lowered it onto his hip ... intending to steal it, he touched the burden on the hip ... intending to steal it, he made it quiver ... intending to steal it, he took hold of it with his hands ... intending to steal the burden in his hands, he deposited it on the ground ... intending to steal it, he took it from the ground. On account of this he became anxious ... “You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, having spread out his robe in the open air, entered his dwelling. A second monk, thinking, “let not this robe be lost,” put it aside. Having come out of his dwelling, the first monk¹ asked the monks, “Friends, who has taken my robe?” The second monk² said, “I have taken it.” The first monk seized him and said, “You are no longer a recluse.” The second monk became anxious. He informed the Master. The Master said, “what was your intention?”

“Master, it was just a way of speaking.”

“There is no offence, monk, since it was just a way of speaking.”³

¹ The first monk. ² The second monk. ³ *āpatti* here followed by locative instead of genitive.

At one time a certain monk, putting down his robe on a bench ... putting down his sitting cloth on a bench ... putting his bowl under a bench, entered his dwelling. A second monk, thinking, "let not this bowl be lost," put it aside. Having come out, the first monk asked the monks, "Friends, who has taken my bowl?" The second monk said, "I have taken it." The first monk seized him ... "There is no offence, monk, since it was just a way of speaking."

At one time a certain nun, having spread out her robe on a fence, entered her dwelling. A second nun, thinking, "let not this robe be lost," put it aside. Having come out, the first nun¹ asked the nuns, "Ladies,² who has taken my robe?" The second nun³ said, "I have taken it." The first nun seized her and said, "You are no longer a recluse." On account of this the second nun became anxious. She informed the nuns. The nuns informed the monks. The monks informed the Master ... "There is no offence, monks, since it was just a way of speaking."

At that time a certain monk, seeing a robe blown up during a whirlwind, took hold of it, thinking, "I will give it to the owners." The owners reprimanded the monk, saying, "You are no longer a recluse." On account of this he became anxious ... "What was your intention, monk?"

"I did not intend to steal it, Master."

"Monk, there is no offence for one who does not intend to steal."

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal it, took hold of a turban blown up during a whirlwind, thinking, "lest the owners see it." The owners reprimanded the monk, saying, "You are no longer a recluse." He became anxious ... "You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion."

¹ The first nun. ² ayye. ³ The second nun.

At one time a certain monk went to a charnel ground and took the rags from a fresh corpse.¹ But the ghost² was still dwelling in that body.³ Then the ghost said to the monk, “Bhante, do not take my robe.” The monk took no notice and went away. Then the body got up⁴ and followed closely behind that monk. The monk entered his dwelling and closed the door, and the body fell down at that very place.⁵ He became anxious ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion. But a monk should not take rags from a fresh corpse.⁶ If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time, when robes belonging to the Sangha were being distributed, a certain monk, disregarding his *kusa*-grass ticket⁷ and intending to steal, took a robe. He became anxious ... “... entailing expulsion.”

At one time when Venerable Ānanda was in a sauna,⁸ thinking that the inner robe of another monk was his own, he put it on. That monk said, “Why, friend Ānanda, did you put on my inner robe?”

“Friend, I thought it was my own.”

They informed the Master. He said: “There is no offence, monks, for one who perceives it as his own.”

At one time a number of monks, descending from Mount Vulture’s Peak and seeing the remains of a lion’s kill, had it cooked and ate it. They became anxious ... “Monks, there is no offence when it is the remains of a lion’s kill.”⁹

¹ BRAHMALI: Defined by commentary as still warm; see Vin-a 2.374,29. ² *peta*. See above, **BD 1.92, n.** ³ “On account of its longing for a cloak,” Vin-a 374—i.e. probably naked and needing a cloak. ⁴ Through the *peta*’s own power, Vin-a 374. ⁵ At the closed door the *peta*, being devoid of desire for the cloak, left the body, and went according to its deed, Vin-a 374. ⁶ Still warm. Vin-a 374,29. ⁷ BRAHMALI: *Kusa*-grass was apparently used as robe tickets. ⁸ *jantāghara*. ⁹ This shows that vegetarianism was not (at this time) enjoined; cf. below, **BD 1.297, BD 1.298.**

At one time a number of monks, descending from Mount Vulture's Peak and seeing the remains of a tiger's kill ... seeing the remains of a panther's kill ... seeing the remains of a hyena's kill ... seeing the remains of a wolf's kill, had it cooked ... "Monks, there is no offence when it is the property of an animal."

2,7,12
1 3,59

At one time, when rice belonging to the Sangha was being distributed, a certain monk said without grounds,¹ "give me a portion for another," and he took it away. He became anxious ... "Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence entailing confession² for deliberately lying."³

At one time, when food belonging to the Sangha was being distributed, a certain monk ... when cakes belonging to the Sangha were being distributed, a certain monk ... when sugar-cane belonging to the Sangha was being distributed, a certain monk ... when certain fruits belonging to the Sangha were being distributed, a certain monk said without grounds, "give me a portion for another," and he took it away. He became anxious ... "Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is offence entailing confession for deliberately lying."⁴

2,7,13

At one time a certain monk, entering a rice kitchen⁵ during a shortage of food and intending to steal, stole a bowlful of rice. He became anxious ... "... expulsion."

At one time a certain monk, entering a slaughterhouse during a shortage of food and intending to steal, stole a bowlful of meat. ... "... expulsion."⁶

¹ *amūlaka*. ² *Pācittiya*, discussed in forthcoming volume. ³ He must therefore have eaten it himself, the "for another" being only an excuse. ⁴ He must therefore have eaten it himself, the "for another" being only an excuse. ⁵ *odaniyaghara*.
⁶ Again the fault is not in eating meat, it is in stealing.

At one time a certain monk, entering a bakery during a shortage of food and intending to steal, stole a bowlful of baked cakes ... intending to steal, stole a bowlful of cakes ... intending to steal, stole a bowlful of sweet-meats. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, seeing a requisite during the day, took note of it, thinking, “I will steal it at night.” He took it, thinking it was the one he had seen ... He took something else, thinking it was the one he had seen ... He took it, thinking it was something else than what he had seen ... He took something else, thinking it was something else than what he had seen. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, seeing a requisite during the day, took note of it, thinking, “I will steal it at night.” He took his own requisite, thinking it was something else. He became anxious ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a certain monk, seeing a bag on a bench and thinking, “if I take it from here I shall be expelled,” took it by moving the bench. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, stole a cushion belonging to the Sangha. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, stole a robe from a bamboo robe-rack.¹ He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

¹ Here *cīvaravaṁsa* is not in conjunction with *cīvararajju*, the cord or rope for hanging the robes on.

At one time a certain monk stole a robe in a dwelling, thinking, “if I come out from here I shall be expelled,” and he did not come out from that dwelling. They informed the Master. He said, “Monks, whether that foolish man comes out or not, there is an offence entailing expulsion.”

2,7,19 At one time two monks were friends. One of them went into the village for alms. The second monk, when food belonging to the Sangha was being distributed, took his friend’s portion. Taking it on trust, he ate it. Finding this out, the first monk¹ reprimanded him, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious ...

“Monk, what was your intention?”

“I took it on trust, Master.”

“There is no offence, monk, for one who takes on trust.”

2,7,20 At one time a number of monks were making robes. When food belonging to the Sangha was being distributed, having taken their shares,² they put them down.³ A certain monk, thinking that it was his own, ate another monk’s portion.⁴ He, finding this out, reprimanded him, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious ... “... Monk, what was your intention?”

1,101 “I thought it was my own, Master.”

“There is no offence, monk, for one who perceives it as his own.”

At one time a number of monks were making robes. When food belonging to the Sangha was being distributed, having brought a certain monk’s share with the bowl of another monk, it was put down. The monk who was the owner of the bowl ate the food, thinking it was his own. Finding this out, the owner of the food reprimanded him ... “There is no offence, monk, for one who perceives it as his own.”

2,7,21 ¹ The first monk. ² *paṭivisa*. ³ *Upanikkhittā honti*. *Upanikkhitta* is the participle of the perfect passive of *upanikkhipati*. ⁴ *paṭivisa*.

At one time mango thieves cut down some mangoes, collected them in a bundle and left. The owners pursued them. The thieves, seeing the owners, dropped the bundle and ran away. Some monks, perceiving them as discarded, had them offered¹ and ate them. The owners reprimanded these monks, saying, “You are no longer recluses.” They became anxious and informed the Master.

“Monks, what was your intention?”

“Master, we perceived them as discarded.”

“Monks, there is no offence for one who perceives them as discarded.”

At one time rose-apple thieves ... bread-fruit thieves ... jack-fruit thieves ... palm-fruit thieves ... sugar-cane thieves ... thieves of *timbarūka* fruit cut some of them down, collected them in a bundle and left. The owners ... “There is no offence, monks, for one who perceives them as discarded.”

At one time mango thieves cut down some mangoes ... left. Some monks, intending to steal them and thinking, “lest the owners see them,” ate them. The owners reprimanded the monks, saying, “You are no longer recluses.” They became anxious ... “You, monks, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time rose-apple thieves ... thieves of *timbarūka* fruit ... left. Some monks, intending to steal them and thinking, “lest the owners see them,” ate them. The owners ... “You, monks, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, took a mango belonging to the Sangha ... a rose-apple ... a bread-fruit ... a jack-fruit

¹ BRAHMALI: Offered in the sense that a non-monk gave them the fruit, not in the sense that the owners actually gave it away. This was presumably to avoid falling into *pācittiya* 40 for eating food that has not been properly given.

... a palm-fruit ... a sugar-cane ... intending to steal, took a *timbarūka* fruit belonging to the Sangha. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk went to a flower-garden and, intending to steal, took a flower worth five *māsakas* that had already been plucked. He became anxious. ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk went to a flower-garden and, intending to steal, picked a flower worth five *māsakas* and took it away. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time, as he was going to the village, a certain monk said to another monk, “Friend, I can take a message¹² to the family that supports you.” He went there and brought back a robe that he used it himself. The other monk, finding out about this, reprimanded him, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion. But, monks, you should not say, ‘I can take a message.’ If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a certain monk was going to the village. Another monk said to him, “Friend, please take a message to the family that supports me.” He went there and brought back a pair of robes. He used one himself and gave the other to the other monk. The other monk, finding out about this, reprimanded him, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious ... “Monk, there is no offence

¹ BRAHMALI: *Vutto vajjemi*, literally “I, spoken to (by you), could say.” It is not clear exactly what this means and it is possible that it simply refers to the conveying of greetings. ² *Vutto vajjemi ti*. Vin-a 382 says that this means, “being spoken to by you, I speak on your behalf.” Hence the one who takes the message of greeting will be treated at the house in the same way as is the regular diner there. Thus *vutto vadeti* means: to greet somebody on the part of somebody. The offence would seem to lie in the substitution of one monk for another. Vin-a 382 implies that it is allowed for one monk to take greetings from another if he is going to ask for something definite.

entailing expulsion. But, monks, you should not say, ‘please take a message.’ If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time, as he was going to the village, a certain monk said to another monk, “Friend, I can take a message to the family that supports you.” He replied, “please do so.” He went there and brought back an *ālḥaka* measure¹ of ghee, a *tulā* measure² of sugar and a *dona* measure of husked rice, which he ate by himself. The other monk, finding out about this, reprimanded him, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion. But, monks, you should not say, ‘I can take a message;’ nor should you say, ‘please take a message.’ If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct.”

¹ See RHYS DAVIDS, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p.18–p.20. Vin-a 702 gives a discussion on the *ālḥaka*, from which it appears that it was a very variable measure: “takes half an *ālḥaka* of grue’ means: takes the gruel made from two *nālis* of uncooked rice according to the Magadha *nāli*. In the Andha Commentary a Magadha *nāli* is said to be thirteen and a half *palas* (a weight). The *nāli* in use in the Island of Ceylon is larger than the Tamil *nāli*. The small Magadha *nāli* is the right measure. In the Great Commentary it is said that one Sinhalese *nāli* is equal to one and a half of this Magadha *nāli*.” At Snp-a 476 it is said that four *patthas* make an *ālḥaka*, reckoning by the Kosala *patthas*, and that four *ālḥaka* make a *dona*. See *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p.18, and cf. above, BD 1.12, on *pattha*. This word *ālḥaka* is the same as that which occurs in the name of one of the games, *pattālḥaka*, Vin 3.180, DN i.6, MN i.166. The various Commentaries always explain as *paṇṇanālika*, a *nālika* measure of leaves. *Nālika* = *nāli*. At AN ii.55 = AN ii.337 *ālḥaka* is used in connection with the “ocean.” It is therefore a liquid as well as a dry measure. It is translated as “gallon” at GS ii.64, and as “pailful” at GS iii.237. At Vin 1.240 it occurs in the compound *ālḥakathālikā*, translated at *Vinaya Texts* ii.122, “pint pots.” At AN iii.369 it occurs again in this same compound; translated at GS iii.262, “as big as pipkins,” with commentarial exegesis, n. 6, *taṇḍulālḥakassa bhattapacana-thālikā*, which seems to mean “a small bowl for cooking food to the extent of an *ālḥaka* of unboiled rice.” Same compound *ālḥakathālikā* occurs at Dhp-a iii.370, with variant reading *bhathathālikā*, as though the bowl of an *ālḥaka*’s capacity were being identified with a bowl of food. ² *Tulā* is some kind of measure. At SN ii.236 = AN i.88 Khemā and Upalavaṇṇā are called the *tulā pamāṇa* (measure) of the disciples who are nuns. *Tulā* at AN-a ii.157 simply seems to mean standard or weight. The Abhidhānappadīpikā § 481 (a late work), says that a *tulā* is a hundred *palas*.

At one time a certain man, carrying a valuable jewel, was going along a main road together with a certain monk. Then the man, seeing a customs station, put the jewel into the monk's bag without his knowing it. Having gone past the customs station, he retrieved it. The monk was remorseful ...

“Monk, what was your intention?”

“I did not know, Master.”

“There is no offence, monk, for who does not know.”

At one time a certain man, taking a valuable jewel ... seeing a customs station, he pretended to be ill and gave his own bag to the monk. When the man had passed the customs station, he said to the monk, “Give me my bag, bhante, I am not ill.”

“Why then, friend, did you say so?”

Then the man informed the monk. He became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, for who does not know.”

At one time a certain monk was going along a main road together with a caravan. A certain man won that monk over with a gift.¹ Seeing a customs station, he gave the monk a valuable jewel, saying, “Bhante, please take this jewel past the customs.” So the monk took the jewel past the customs station. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk out of compassion released a pig trapped in a snare. He became anxious ...

“What was your intention, monk?”

“I was motivated by compassion, Master.”²

“There is no offence for one who is motivated by compassion.”

At one time a certain monk released a pig trapped in a snare,

¹ *āmisena upalāpetvā*, literally cajoling with a reward. ² Literally, “I am one who has a sense of compassion.”

intending to steal it, thinking, “lest the owners see it.” He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk out of compassion released a deer trapped in a snare ... released a deer trapped in a snare, intending to steal it, thinking, “lest the owners see it.” ... out of compassion released fish trapped in a fish-net ... released fish trapped in a fish-net, intending to steal them, thinking, “lest the owners see them.” He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, seeing some goods in a vehicle, thought, “If I take these from here I will be expelled.” So he took them by setting the vehicle in motion. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, thinking, “I will give it to the owners,” seized a piece of flesh taken up by a hawk. The owners reprimanded that monk, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, for one who does not intend to steal.”

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal and thinking, “lest the owners see it,” seized a piece of flesh taken up by a hawk. The owners reprimanded the monk, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time some men who had put a raft together placed it on the river Aciravatī.¹ When the bindings were destroyed, they went away, the sticks being spread all over. Some monks, perceiving them as discarded, got them out of the water. The owners reprimanded those monks, saying, “You are no longer recluses.” They became anxious ... “Monks, there is no offence for one who perceives them as discarded.”

¹ B.C. LAW, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 36: “Aciravatī is the river Rapti in Oudh, on which the town of Sāvattthī was situated.”

At one time some men who had put a raft together placed it on the river Aciravatī. When the bindings were destroyed, they went away, the sticks being spread all over. Some monks, intending to steal and thinking, “lest the owners see it,” got them out of the water. The owners reprimanded the monks, saying, “You are no longer recluses.” They became anxious ... “You, monks, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

2.7.31 At one time a certain cowherd, hanging his robe on a tree, went to relieve himself. A certain monk, thinking it was discarded, took it. Then the cowherd reprimanded that monk, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, for one who thinks it is discarded.”

2.7.32 At one time, as a certain monk was crossing a river, a robe that had escaped from the hands of dyers, stuck to his foot. The monk took hold of it, thinking, “I will give it to the owners.” The owners reprimanded that monk, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, for one who does not intend to steal.”

1.10.7 At one time, as a certain monk was crossing a river, a robe that had escaped from the hands of dyers stuck to his foot . The monk took hold of it, intending to steal and thinking, “lest the owners see it.” The owners reprimanded the monk, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

2.7.33 At one time a certain monk, seeing a pot of ghee, ate it little by little. He became anxious ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a number of monks, having made an arrangement,¹ went away, thinking, “we will steal these goods.” One of them stole the goods. The others said, “We are not expelled; the one who took it is expelled.” They informed the Master. He said, “You, monks, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a number of monks, having made an arrangement and having stolen some goods, shared them out. When it was being shared out, none of them received a share that amounted to five *māsakas*. They said, “We are not expelled.” They informed the Master. He said, “You, monks, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time, when Sāvattthī was short of food, a certain monk, intending to steal, took a handful of rice belonging to a shopkeeper. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time, when Sāvattthī was short of food, a certain monk, intending to steal, took a handful of kidney-beans ... a handful of beans ... a handful of sesamum belonging to a shopkeeper. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time thieves in the Dark Wood near Sāvattthī, having killed a cow, eaten some flesh and put the remainder aside, went away. Some monks, perceiving it as discarded, had it offered and ate it. The thieves reprimanded those monks, saying, “You are no longer recluses.” They became anxious ... “There is no offence, monks, for one who perceives it as discarded.”

At one time thieves in the Dark Wood near Sāvattthī, having killed a pig ... “... for one who perceives it as discarded.”

At one time a certain monk went to a meadow and, intending to steal, took some cut grass worth five *māsakas*. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk went to a meadow and, intending to steal, cut grass worth five *māsakas* and took it away. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time some visiting monks divided up the mangoes belonging to the Sangha and ate them. The resident¹ monks reprimanded those monks, saying, “You are no longer recluses.” They became anxious. They informed the Master.

“What was your intention, monks?”

“We thought they was meant for eating, Master.”

“There is no offence, monks, for one who thinks it is meant for eating.”

At one time some visiting monks divided up the rose-apples belonging to the Sangha ... the bread-fruit belonging to the Sangha ... the jack-fruit ... the palm fruits ... the sugar-cane ... the *timbarūsaka* fruits belonging to the Sangha and ate them. The resident monks ... “There is no offence, monks, for one who thinks it is meant for eating.”

At one time the keepers of a mango-grove gave a mango to some monks. The monks, thinking, “They² have the authority to guard, but not to give,” had scruples and did not accept it. They informed the Master. He said, “There is no offence, monks, when it is a gift from a guardian.”

¹ *saṃvidahitvā*, also above, Bu-Pj 2.4.29, where the rule is laid down. ¹ *Āvāsika*.

² *Issara*.

At one time keepers of a rose-apple grove ... a *timbarūsaka* grove gave *timbarūsaka* fruit to some monks. The monks, thinking, “they have the authority to guard ...” ... “There is no offence, monks, when it is a gift from a guardian.”

At one time a certain monk, having borrowed a piece of wood belonging to the Sangha, used it to shore up the wall of his own dwelling. The monks reprimanded that monk, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” He became anxious and informed the Master. He said, “monk, what was your intention?”

“I was borrowing it, Master.”

“There is no offence, monk, when one is borrowing.”¹

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, took water belonging to the Sangha ... clay belonging to the Sangha ... intending to steal, took a pile of *tiṇa*-grass belonging to the Sangha. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, set fire to a pile of *tiṇa*-grass belonging to the Sangha. He became anxious ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence of bad conduct.”²

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, took a bed belonging to the Sangha. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk, intending to steal, took a bench belonging to the Sangha ... took a cushion ... a pillow ... a door ... a window³ ... intending to steal, took a rafter⁴ belonging to the Sangha. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

¹ Cf. below, **BD 1.110**. ² BRAHMALI: Because it was not moved from its base, says the Commentary; see Vin-a 2.389,25. ³ *ālokasandhi*, cf. Vin 1.48; Vin 2.209 = Vin 2.218.

⁴ *gopanāsi*, cf. AN i.261; MN i.80.

13.66 At one time the furnishings and requisites for a dwelling¹ belonging to a certain lay follower² were used elsewhere by some monks. That lay-follower became vexed, annoyed and angry, and said, “how can those venerables use elsewhere requisites belonging somewhere else?” They informed the Master. “Monks, one should not use elsewhere requisites belonging somewhere else. If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct.”

2.7.44 At one time some monks, having scruples about taking requisites³ to the *uposatha* hall or to a meeting place, sat down on the ground. Their limbs and robes were covered with dust. They informed the Master.⁴ “Monks, I allow you to borrow.”⁵

2.7.45 At one time at Campā⁶ a nun who was a pupil of the nun Thullanandā went to the family who supported the nun Thullanandā and said, “The lady⁷ wants to drink⁸ rice-gruel containing the three pungent ingredients.”⁹ When it was ready, she took it away and enjoyed

1 *Vihāraparibhoga*. See *Vin* 2.174. 2 Thus he could not give them to senior monks coming in, *Vin*-a 391. 3 *Vin*-a 390, a couch or chair. 4 Part of the story seems to be omitted. 5 = *Vin* 2.174. See also above, *BD* 1.109. *Tāvalālika*, translated at *Vinaya Texts* iii.217 as “for a certain time only”; and at *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.195 = *Buddhist Suttas*, second edition, p.241 (translation of *Ja* i.393), as “only for a time ... as temporary” (word occurring twice). At *Vinaya Texts* ii.154, n. 7, editor says *tāvakālika* means “only for a time, temporary, on loan,” and translates it by “on loan” at *Vinaya Texts* ii.347 (= *Vin* 2.174). At *Ja* i.121 the word is used of a cart taken on hire. Cf. *Vin* 4.286, when it is not considered an offence to give recluses robes temporarily.

6 The ancient capital of Aṅga. 7 *Ayyā*. 8 *Pātuṃ*, infinitive of *pivati*, balanced by *khādituṃ* in the next story. 9 *Tekaṭulayāgu*. *Vin*-a 391 says “made with either *tila* (sesamum), *taṇḍula* (rice-grain), *mugga* (kidney-beans), or *tila*, *taṇḍula*, and *māsa* (a bean), or *tila*, *taṇḍula* and *kulattha* (a kind of vetch), or any one prepared grain with *tila* and *taṇḍula*, making three (ingredients).” Cf. above, *BD* 1.83, n. 4. The word *tekaṭulayāgu* also occurs at *Vin* 1.210, where Gotama is said to make this gruel of *tila*, *taṇḍula* and *mugga*. Editor at *Vinaya Texts* ii.68, n. 2, says *kaṭu* means pungent, and that these three substances are explained to be ginger and two kinds of pepper. Apparently the gruel could be made of three kinds of grain and flavoured with three spices. But *Vin*-a 391 says: “It is said that they make this (gruel) mixing these three (prepared grains) in milk and four parts of water and adding ghee, honey and molasses.”

it herself. When the nun Thullanandā found out about this, she reprimanded her, saying, “You are no longer a recluse.” She became anxious. She then informed the nuns, who in turn informed the monks, who then informed the Master. “Monks, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but in a deliberate lie there is an offence entailing confession.”

At one time in Rājagaha a nun who was a pupil of the nun Thullanandā went to the family who supported the nun Thullanandā and said, “The lady¹ wants to eat a honey-ball.”² When it was ready, she took it away and enjoyed it herself. When the nun Thullanandā found out about this, she ... “Monks, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but in a deliberate lie there is an offence entailing confession.”

At one time in Vesāli the householder who was the supporter of Venerable Ajjuka had two children living with him, a son and a nephew. That householder said to Venerable Ajjuka, “Bhante, please point out this location³ to the one of these two boys who has faith and confidence.”

At that time the householder’s nephew had faith and confidence, and so Venerable Ajjuka pointed out that location to him. He then established a household with that wealth and made a gift. Then the householder’s son said to Venerable Ānanda:

“Bhante Ānanda, who is the father’s heir, the son or the nephew?”
“The son, friend, is the father’s heir.”

“Bhante, this master Ajjuka has pointed out our wealth to our cohabitant.”

“Friend, Venerable Ajjuka is no longer a recluse.” Then Venerable Ajjuka said to Venerable Ānanda:

“Friend Ānanda, please investigate.” At that time Venerable Upāli⁴ was siding with Venerable Ajjuka. Then Venerable Upāli said to

¹ Ayyā. ² *Madhugoḷaka*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives only one reference to *goḷaka* at Thig-a 255; and under *kīlā-goḷaka* to Vism 256 (cf. Khp-a 53). Vin-a 391 defines *madhugoḷaka* as *atirasapūva*, which seems to mean a “very tasty cake.” ³ *Okāsa*.

⁴ See above, **BD 1.60, n. 4**.

Venerable Ānanda:

“Friend Ānanda, when one is asked by the owner to point out a location to so-and-so, and one does so, what offence has one committed?”

“Bhante, one has not committed any offence, not even one of bad conduct.”

“Friend, Venerable Ajjuka was asked by the owner to point out a location to so-and-so, and he did so. Friend, there is no offence for Venerable Ajjuka.”

Now at that time in Benares the family that supported Venerable Pilindavaccha¹ was oppressed by thieves, and two children were kidnapped. Venerable Pilindavaccha having bought these children back by his psychic power placed them in a large house. People saw those children and said:

“This is the majesty of the psychic power of master Pilindavaccha,” and they placed confidence in Venerable Pilindavaccha. The monks became vexed, annoyed and angry, and said, “How can this Venerable Pilindavaccha bring back children who have been kidnapped by thieves?” They informed the Master. He said: “Monks, there is no offence in the area of psychic powers for one who possesses them.”

At one time the two monks Paṇḍaka and Kapila² were friends. One lived in a village and one at Kosambī. Then, while the first monk was going from the village to Kosambī, as he was crossing a river, a lump of fat that had escaped from the hands of pork-butchers stuck

¹ Vin 1.206ff. = Vin 3.248ff. recounts the feats he did by his mystic potency in Rājagaha when Bimbisāra was King of Magadha. At AN i.24 he is called “chief among the disciples who are dear and delightful to the devas.” At Ud 28 objections are raised to his “foul talk.” I think he is probably the same as the Pilinda-Vaccha of Theragāthā; see *Psalms of the Bretheren* ix and *Psalms of the Bretheren* p.14, n. 4; *Psalms of the Bretheren* p.15, n. 2. We learn from Commentary on Theragāthā that Pilinda was his name, Vaccha the name of his clan (cf. Vana-Vaccha, *Psalms of the Bretheren* xiii), and that he was waited on by a deva and acquired the Gandhāra charm. For this, see DN i.213; Ja iv.498. ² Mentioned, I think, nowhere but here. Naturally not the Kapila to whom MN-a i.91 refers as the depraved monk (cf. Vin 3.107), reborn with his saṅghāṭi-robe flaming.

to his foot. He took hold of it, thinking, "I will give it to the owners." The owners reprimanded him, saying, "You are no longer a recluse."

Then a woman cowherd who had seen him crossing said, "Come, bhante, have sexual intercourse." Thinking, "I am no longer a recluse," he had sexual intercourse with her.

When he arrived in Kosambī, he informed the monks and they informed the Master. He said, "Monks, there is no offence entailing expulsion for stealing,¹ but there is an offence entailing expulsion for having sexual intercourse."

Now at that time at Sāgalā,² a monk who was the disciple of Venerable Daḷhika, being tormented by discontent,³ took a turban⁴ from a shopkeeper. He then said to Venerable Daḷhika, "Bhante, I am no longer a recluse, I will leave the Sangha."⁵

"But what have you done, friend?" He told him. Having had the turban brought, Venerable Daḷhika valued it, and it was not worth five *māsakas*. "Friend, there is no offence entailing expulsion," and

¹ For he did not intend to steal it. ² See Mil p.1, for description of a city of this name. A Sāgalā, capital of the kingdom of the Maddas, is mentioned at Ja iv.230; Ja v.283, Ja v.285, Ja v.289f.; Ja vi.471. ³ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2972.) ⁴ *Veṭhana*, possibly a wrap or a cloak, as at Ja vi.12, taken as a disguise. A wrap to put over the "yellow robes" would have been a better disguise than a turban, but could a wrap possibly have been worth less than five *māsakas*? A turban, on the other hand, would have hidden the shaven head, but that is all. Perhaps it was meant symbolically. ⁵ *Vibbhamissāmi*. On those occasions when *anabhirati* is in connection with sexual desire, it would look as if *vibbhamissāmi* should then be translated, "I will co-habit," and not as "I will leave the Order." But except for the occurrence *anabhirati* in the above story, I see doubtful justification for such a rendering of *vibbhamissāmi* here. For the point of the story is that the monk has taken something worth less than five *māsakas*, which does not rank as a theft. However, we must remember that in the preceding story the offence is shown to be that of sexual intercourse, and not that of taking what was not given. Something of the same sort may have been here originally, but left out by a redactor.

he gave a talk on the *Dhamma*. That monk was delighted.¹

The second offence entailing expulsion is finished

¹ *abhirami*, aorist of *abhiramati*. I cannot help thinking that this word in this rather curious ending of the second *Pārājika* is meant to balance the *an-abhirati* with which this story began. *Abhiramati* and *abhirati* both derive from *abhi+ram*. It is most rare to find it said that a monk, when told that there is for him no offence, “was delighted,” and I more than ever believe that there are omissions in the text as we have it. I do not believe that the monk “was delighted” that he had committed no offence. I believe that in his appropriated *veṭhana*, he enjoyed himself (a meaning of *abhiramati*), or even fell in love (another meaning, cf. Snp 718, Snp 1085), which would balance the *anabhirati* of the opening sentence. I think, in fact, that this story was meant to end up in exactly the same way as the preceding one. But as the material for this is wanting, I have left the phrase as “was delighted.”

MONKS' EXPULSION (PĀRĀJIKĀ) 3

ORIGIN STORY

FIRST SUB-STORY

At one time the Buddha, the Master, was staying at Vesālī in the hall with the peaked roof in the Great Wood. At that time the Master talked in many ways to the monks on the subject of unattractiveness,¹ he spoke in praise of unattractiveness, he spoke in praise of developing (the perception of) unattractiveness,² he spoke thus and thus³ he spoke in many ways in praise of the attainment of unattractiveness.⁴ Then the Master addressed the monks:

“Monks, I wish to go into solitary retreat for half a month. No one is to approach me except the one who brings me almsfood.”⁵

“Yes, Master,” the monks replied, and accordingly no one approached the Master except the one to take him almsfood.

Then the monks thought, “The Master has talked in many ways on the subject of unattractiveness,” and they dwelt intent upon the practice of developing (the perception of) unattractiveness in its many different aspects. As a consequence they became troubled by

¹ Vin-a 393f. Cf. *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, 2nd edition, p. 63, n. 2. ² *asubhabhāvanā*, Vin-a 394 says, *avatassa cittassa bhāvanā vaḍḍhanā phātikammaṃ*, and goes on to say that the monk intent upon the impure attains the first musing, and then making insight to grow, he reaches the highest goal (*uttamattha*), arahantship.

³ *ādiṣṣa ādiṣṣa*, explained at Vin-a 394: *evam pi ittham pīti punappuna vavatthānaṃ katvā*. ⁴ BRAHMALI: According to the commentary, Vin-a ii.396,18, this refers to the state where the mind no longer inclines towards sexuality. ⁵ As at SN v.320, where the subject of *asubha*, the impure or “the unlovely,” also occurs, but with some omissions and variations.

their own bodies,¹ ashamed of them, loathing them. Just as a young woman or man, fond of adornments² and with head washed,³ would be ashamed, humiliated and disgusted if the carcass of a snake, a dog or a man were hung around their neck, just so those monks were troubled by their own bodies, ashamed of them and loathed them. They took their own lives,⁴ took the lives of one another, and they approached Migalaṇḍika,⁵ a sham recluse,⁶ the recluse lookalike, and said, “Friend, please kill us. This bowl and robe will be yours.” Then Migalaṇḍika, hired⁷ for a bowl and robe, killed a number of monks.

He then took his blood-stained knife to the river Vaggumudā,⁸ and while he was washing it he became anxious and remorseful: “Indeed, it’s a loss for me, it’s no gain; indeed, it’s badly gained by me, not well-gained. I have made much demerit because I have killed

¹ *sakena kāyena*, translated at KS v.284 “as to this body.”

² = DN i.80 = Vin 2.255 = MN ii.19; this simile omitted at SN v.320. ³ Vin-a 399, “washed, together with the head.” ⁴ *attanāpi attānaṃ jīvītā voropenti*.

Vin-a 399 says, “like that man, having no desire for the carcass, the monks being desirous of quitting (*pariccajati*) their own bodies, taking the knife *attanā pi... voropenti*.” This is probably a way of saying that they committed suicide, cf. SN v.320, *satthahāraṇaṃ pariyesanti ... satthaṃ āharanti*. Or the phrase might possibly mean that “the self deprives the Self of life”—i.e., there may be some notion lingering on from the Upaniṣad philosophy that this kind of slaying affects the Ātman, the All-Real, the Self. Some other *attā* couples of sayings occur in the Aṅguttara Nikāya—e.g., at AN i.57, AN i.149; AN iv.405; AN v.182, and at SN ii.68, and seem to have this implication. ⁵ Vin-a 399 calls him Migaladdhika, with variant reading as in the text. He is not mentioned at SN v.320, nor as far as I know at any other passage. ⁶ Vin-a 399, *samaṇakuttaka* = *samaṇavesadhāraka*, one who wears a recluse’s dress. “Having shaved his head and put on one yellow robe and another over his shoulder, depending on the *vihāra*, he lived on a substance of broken-meats.” ⁷ *bhaṭṭa*, Commentary is silent. If *bhaṭṭa* means soldier, cf. Sacred Books of the East translation of Mil 234, Mil 240, the sense would be that he hit about him with a knife, and perhaps stifled the monks with his robe. But *bhaṭṭa* can also mean “hireling, servant.” There seems to be no verb in Pali of which it is the past participle. It is connected with the Epic and Classical Sanskrit *bhaṭṭa*, which is connected with *bhṛta*. MONIER WILLIAMS, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, gives for this: “hired, kept in pay, paid; possessed of, endowed with, having earned, acquired, gained ...” ⁸ Vin-a 399 says, “a river considered by people to be lovely (*vaggu-matā*, *mata* from *maññati*), renowned for merit. He went there saying, “There I will wash away this evil.”

monks who were virtuous and of good conduct.”

Then a certain god¹ of Māra's retinue, walking across the water,² said to Migalaṇḍika, “Well done, superior man;³ it is a gain for you, it is well-gained. You have made much merit, because you bring those across who have not yet crossed.”⁴

Then Migalaṇḍika thought, “So it seems it is a gain for me, that it is well-gained by me, and that I have made much merit by bringing those across who have not yet crossed.” He then went from dwelling to dwelling, from dormitory to dormitory,⁵ and said, “Who has not yet crossed? Whom do I bring across?” And those monks⁶ who were

¹ Vin-a 400 says, “not a well-known earth-*devatā*, a holder of false views, on the side of Māra, taking Māra's part.” ² *abhijjamāne udake gantvā*. Vin-a 400 says, “coming as though walking on the earth's surface.” This power of walking on the water is one of the forms of *iddhi*, see DN i.78. *Bhijjamāna* is present participle of *bhijjati*, passive of *bhindati*+*a*, not being broken, or divided, therefore firm, unruffled, undivided, unbroken, undisturbed. But the reading at DN i.78 = AN i.170 is *udake pi abhijjamāno gacchati*, he goes on the water without breaking it (*Dialogues of the Buddha* i.88 and cf. AN i.255), but this loses the passive aspect of the verb. At DN i.212 we get *udake abhijjamānaṃ gacchantam*. However at MN i.34 = MN i.494 the reading is (as at Vin 3 above) *udake pi abhijjamāne*, translated *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.24, “on the water's unbroken surface.” Thus, there is a good deal of variation in the reading of *abhijj*°. See Ps.2.208 which reads °*māne*, and says that as ordinary people walk on the earth, so the psychic person (*iddhimā*) walks on the unbroken water, having first reflected on it. *Vism* 396, in explaining how by will-power such a person transforms the water to earth, quotes this Paṭisambhidāmagga passage. ³ *sappurisa*. On prefix *sa-* see GS i.ix. ⁴ *atiṇṇe tāresi*, Vin-a 401, “You free them from *saṃsāra* ... those who are not dead are not freed from *saṃsāra*, those who are dead are freed.” *Tarati*, to cross, was frequently used in connection with *ogha*, the flood, *mahogha*, the great flood. The flood was later broken up into four floods, which became identified with the four *āsavas*. But the commentarial exegesis, as above, which is not rare, shows the view that to be across was to be across nothing more nor less than *saṃsāra*, the round of death and rebirth. This is what, in the monkish outlook of the commentator, it was highly desirable to stop. Cf. Snp 571, *tiṇṇo tāresi imaṃ pajam*. ⁵ = Vin 1.216 = Vin 1.247. On *pariveṇa*, cell, see *Vinaya Texts* iii.109, n. 3, where editor says that it is here doubtless a cell used as a cooling room, after the steam bath. But at *Vinaya Texts* iii.203 editor takes *pariveṇa* to mean “a number of buildings,” in n. 1 saying that “here it evidently included several *vihāras*.” ⁶ *Tasmiṃ samaye*.

not free from desire became fearful and terrified,¹ with their hair standing on end, but not so those who were free from desire. Then Migalaṇḍika killed a monk, on a single day he killed two monks, on a single day ... three ... four ... five ... ten ... twenty ... thirty ... forty ... fifty ... on a single day he killed sixty monks.

At the end of that half-month, the Master arose from seclusion and addressed Venerable Ānanda: “Ānanda, why is the Sangha of monks so diminished?”

“It is because the Master talked to the monks in many ways on the subject of unattractiveness—he spoke in praise of unattractiveness, in praise of developing (the perception of) unattractiveness, and in many ways in praise of the attainment of unattractiveness. And, Master, those monks thought, ‘The Master has talked in many ways on the subject of unattractiveness,’ and so they dwelt intent upon the practice of developing (the perception of) unattractiveness in its many different aspects. As a consequence they became troubled by their own bodies, ashamed of them, loathing them. Just as a young woman or man, fond of adornments and with head washed, would be ashamed, humiliated and disgusted if the carcass of a snake, a dog or a man were hung around their neck, just so these monks were troubled by their own bodies, ashamed of them, loathing them. They then took their own lives, took the lives of each other, and they approached Migalaṇḍika, the recluse lookalike, and said, ‘Friend, please kill us. This bowl and robe will be yours.’ Then, Master, hired for a bowl and robe, Migalaṇḍika killed a monk ... on a single day he killed sixty monks. Master, please give another instruction² for the

¹ *Chambhitatta*. Cf. DN i.49. *Pali-English Dictionary* says that here DN-a i.50 wrongly explains it by *sakala-sarīra-calanam*. Vin-a 401 reads, “beginning with the flesh of the heart, the body trembled (*sarīracalanam*)”; it speaks of those being devoid of passion as being *khīṇāsava*. It also gives *thambhitatta* as a synonym of *chambhitatta*. *Pali-English Dictionary* says that this meaning of *thambhitatta* as fluctuation, unsteadiness, is late, and is caused by misinterpretation of *chambhitatta*. ² *Pariyāya*. Vin-a 402 explains it by *kammaṭṭhāna*, basis for meditation.

Sangha of monks to be established in final knowledge.”¹

“Well then, Ānanda, call together in the assembly-hall all the monks that dwell near Vesālī.”

“Yes, Master,” he said. And when he had done so, he approached the Master and said, “Master, the Sangha of monks is assembled. Master, please do what you think² is appropriate.”

Then the Master went to the assembly-hall, sat down on the prepared seat, and said:

“Monks,³ the *samādhi* by mindfulness of breathing, when developed and cultivated,⁴ is peaceful and sublime,⁵ an exalted state of happiness, and it stops and settles bad, unwholesome qualities on the spot,⁶ whenever they arise. Just as a big storm, when it arises out of season⁷ in the last month of the hot weather,⁸ stops and settles the dust and dirt in the atmosphere—even so the *samādhi* by mindfulness of breathing, when developed and cultivated, is peaceful and sublime, an exalted state of happiness, and it stops and settles bad, unwholesome qualities on the spot, whenever they arise. And how is the *samādhi* by mindfulness of breathing developed and cultivated in this way?

As to that, monks, a monk sits down in the wilderness, at the foot of a tree, or in an empty hut; he crosses his legs, straightens his body, and establishes mindfulness in front of him.⁹ Simply mindful,

¹ *Aññā*. See *Psalms of the Bretheren*, Introduction, p. xxxiii, and MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *The Birth of Indian Psychology and its Development in Buddhism*, p. 225, where she says “*aññā*—i.e., the having-come-to-know ... had taken the place of the older Sakyan term for the *summum bonum*: *attha* the thing needed, the thing sought;” and MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *The Birth of Indian Psychology and its Development in Buddhism*, p. 264, “coming-to-know or learning ... as what might be rendered as gnosis or saving knowledge.” ² *Maññasi*. At. SN v.321, *maññati*. ³ From here to end of Bu-Pj 3.1.3 below = SN v.321f. exactly. ⁴ Cf. MN i.421. ⁵ *Asecanaka*. Vin-a 403f. says, *nāssa secananti* (adulterating, mixing, sprinkling), *anāsittako* (unsprinkled) *abbokiṇṇo pāṭekko āveṇiko*. Cf. Thig. verse 55. ⁶ *Ṭhānaso*. Vin-a 404 *khaṇen’eva*. ⁷ Vin-a 404 says: having arisen, the whole sky is covered, and for the whole half-month of the bright moon in this *āsāḷha* month there are clouds shedding rain. ⁸ Called *āsāḷhamāsa* at Vin-a 404. ⁹ *parimukharū*. Or, “round the face.”

he breathes in;¹ simply mindful, he breathes out. When he breathes in long, he knows it; and when he breathes out long, he knows that. When he breathes in short, he knows it; and when he breathes out short, he knows that. While breathing in, he trains² in having the full experience (of the breath); while breathing out, he trains in having the full experience (of the breath). While breathing in, he trains in calming the activity of the body³; while breathing out, he trains in calming the activity of the body. While breathing in, he trains in experiencing rapture; while breathing out, he trains in experiencing rapture. While breathing in, he trains in experiencing happiness; while breathing out, he trains in experiencing happiness. While breathing in, he trains in experiencing the activity of the mind; while breathing out, he trains in experiencing the activity of the mind. While breathing in, he trains in calming the activity of the mind; while breathing out, he trains in calming the activity of the mind. While breathing in, he trains in experiencing the mind; while breathing out, he trains in experiencing the mind. While breathing in, he trains in gladdening the mind; while breathing out, he trains in gladdening the mind. While breathing in, he trains in unifying the mind; while breathing out, he trains in unifying the mind. While breathing in, he trains in freeing the mind; while breathing out, he trains in freeing the mind. While breathing in, he trains in contemplating impermanence; while breathing out, he trains in contemplating impermanence. While breathing in, he trains in contemplating fading away; while breathing out, he trains in contemplating fading away. While breathing in, he trains in contemplating cessation; while breathing out, he trains in contemplating cessation. While breathing in, he trains in contemplating relinquishment; while breathing out, he trains in contemplating relinquishment.

Monks, when the *samādhi* by mindfulness of breathing is developed and cultivated in this way, it is peaceful and sublime, an exalted

¹ Cf. DN ii.291 = MN i.56 for this passage, also MN iii.82, MN iii.89, and Ps.i.177, quoted Vism 272. ² *Sikkhati*, Vin-a 411, *ghaṭati vāyamati*, and goes on to say he trains himself in the three trainings: the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher wisdom. ³ BRAHMALI: That is, the breath.

state of happiness, and it stops and settles bad, unwholesome qualities on the spot, whenever they arise.”

And in this connection the Master convened the Sangha of monks and questioned the monks:

“Monks, is it true that some monks have taken their own lives, have killed one another, and have said to Migalaṇḍika, ‘Friend, please kill us. This bowl and robe will be yours’?”

“It is true, Master.”

The Buddha, the Master, rebuked them: “Monks, it is not suitable for these monks, it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it should not be done. How could those monks take their own lives ... and say ... ‘... This bowl and robe will be yours’? It will not give rise to confidence in those without it ... And, monks, this training rule should be recited thus:

PRELIMINARY RULING

If a monk intentionally kills a human being or searches for someone to kill him, he too is expelled and not in communion.”

Thus the Master laid down this training rule for the monks

SECOND SUB-STORY

At one time a certain lay-follower was ill. His wife was beautiful and pleasant, and the group of six monks had fallen in love with her. Then those monks said to each other: “Friends, if this lay-follower lives, we won’t get this woman. Come, let us praise the beauty of death to him.” So they went to that lay follower and said:

“Friend, you have done what is good¹ and wholesome; you have made a shelter from fear.² You have not done anything bad; you have not been greedy and immoral. What need have you of this wretched,

¹ Cf. AN ii.174, AN ii.175; It p.25. ² *katabhīruttāṇa*, Vin-a 436 says that he has gained protection against the dread beings have at the time of dying, possibly by means of a charm (*parittā*) as is suggested by the Commentary on AN ii.174.

difficult life? Death is better for you than life. When you have passed away, at the breaking up of the body after death, you will be reborn in a happy destination, in a heaven world.¹ There² you will amuse yourself and enjoy the five types of heavenly sensual pleasures.”³

Then that lay-follower thought, “The Masters have spoken the truth, for I have done what is good and avoided what is bad, and after death I will be reborn in a happy destination.”

He ate various types of detrimental food, he drank detrimental drinks,⁴ and because of this he became seriously ill⁵ and died.

His wife criticised and denounced them: “These recluses, the sons of the Sakyan,⁶ are shameless, immoral, liars. They claim to be followers of *dhamma*, of just conduct, committed to the spiritual life, speakers of truth, virtuous, of good conduct. But there is no recluseship or brahminhood among these—it is lost to them. Where is recluseship and brahminhood among them? They have departed from it. They praised the beauty of death to my husband. Because of them my husband has died.”

And other people criticised and denounced them: “These recluses ... Because of them that lay-follower has died.

Monks heard the criticism of those people. Those monks who had few desires and a sense of shame, who were contented, scrupulous, and desirous of training, criticised and denounced the group of six monks: “How could they praise the beauty of death to that lay-follower?” Then those monks informed the Master ...

“Is it true, monks, that you praised the beauty of death to that lay-follower?”

“It is true, Master.”

The Buddha, the Master, rebuked them: “Foolish men, it is not

¹ J. PRZYLUKI, *Le Concile de Rājagrha*, p. 368, where he says that in the oldest (Buddhist) period *svarga* (Pali, *sagga*) and *brahmaloka* are synonymous terms. This seems here borne out by next sentence in text. It has been suggested, and confuted by J. PRZYLUKI, *Le Concile de Rājagrha*, p. 371, that Asoka spoke only of *svarga*, and not of *nirvāna*, because he addressed the laity, and not monks. ² I.e., in a deva-world, Vin-a 436. ³ Cf. AN v.273. ⁴ Cf. Vin 1.44 for these four items. ⁵ *Kharo ābādhoppajji* = DN ii.127. ⁶ As below, BD 1.200, BD 1.223.

suitable, it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it should not be done. How could you praise the beauty of death to that lay-follower? This will not give rise to confidence in those without it ... And so, monks, this training rule should be recited thus:

FINAL RULING

“If a monk intentionally kills a human being or searches for someone to kill him¹ or praises death or incites someone to die, saying, ‘Good man, what use to you is this wretched, difficult life? Death is better for you than life.’ If, thinking² and intending³ thus, he praises death in various ways or incites someone to die, he too is expelled and not in communion.”

BD 1.12

DEFINITIONS

A means: whoever, of such kind ...

Monk means: ... this sort of **monk** is meant in this case.

Intentionally means: knowing, perceiving, having intended,⁴ having come to a conclusion, he transgresses.

Human being⁵ means: from the mind’s first arising,⁶ from the

Bu-Pj 3

¹ *satthahāarakam vāssa pariyeseyya*. For lack of any better interpretation, explanation of Vin-a 441 is followed here. Cf. SN iv. 62; MN iii.269. ² *iticcittamano*, so the mind and thought; Vin-a 442 says, “so the mind, (or heart, *citta*), so the thought; ‘death is better for you than life’ here means: the mind set on death, thought set on death, wherefore thought is called the illustration of mind. From this meaning the two are as if one, therefore, no division is to be seen; as the mind so the thought, as the thought so the mind.” This last phrase = BD 1.127 below, the old the Commentary on this passage. ³ *cittasamkappa*, intention of mind. On *samkappa*, as a term of “awareness, thought, reflection, purpose,” see MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *The Birth of Indian Psychology and its Development in Buddhism*, p. 55ff., p. 273ff. ⁴ = Vin 4.290, and = Vin 3.112 in explanation of *sañcetanika*. At Vin 2.91 it is said that whatever transgression is committed like this, is called a legal question whether an offence be wrong. ⁵ *Manussaviggaha*. ⁶ Vin-a 437 paraphrases by *paṭhamam paṭisandhicittam*, the mind being first reinstated.

time of consciousness becoming first manifest in a mother's womb, until the time of death—in between these; this is called a **human being**.

If (he) kills means: he cuts off the faculty of life,¹ brings it to an end, interrupts its duration.

Or searches for someone to kill him means: a knife, a dagger, an arrow, a cudgel, a stone, a sword, poison or a rope.²

Or praises death means: he shows the danger in living, and speaks in praise of death.

Or incites someone to die means: he says, “take a sword, or eat poison, or die by hanging yourself with a rope.”

Good man, means: this is a form of address.

What use to you is this wretched, difficult life means: **wretched life** means: the life of the poor is wretched compared to the life of the rich; the life of the impoverished is wretched compared to the life of the wealthy; the life of humans is wretched compared to the life of gods. **Difficult life**³ means: for one whose hands are cut off, for one whose feet are cut off, for one whose hands and feet are cut off, for one whose ears are cut off, for one whose nose is cut off, for one whose ears and nose are cut off. Because of this sort of wretchedness and because of this sort of difficult life, one says, “death is better for you than life.”

Thinking means: mind and thought are equivalent.

Intending means: perceiving death, intending death, aiming at death.

In various ways means: in manifold manners.

If he praises death means: he shows the danger in living and speaks in praise of death, saying, “When you have passed away, at the breaking up of the body after death, you will be reborn in a happy destination, in a heaven world. There you will amuse yourself and enjoy the five types of heavenly sensual pleasures.”

¹ Cf. Vb 123. ² *Satthahāraka* as we have seen is literally “sword-carrier,” so that this definition probably implies “carrying a knife ... carrying a rope.” Cf. below, **BD 1.133**, where these items are grouped together under “a trap.” ³ *dujjivita*.

If he incites someone to die means: he says, “Take a sword, or eat poison, or die by hanging yourself with a rope; or fall into a lake, into a pit, or off a cliff.”¹

He too means: this is said with reference to the preceding offences entailing expulsion.²

Is expelled means: just as an ordinary stone which has been broken in half cannot be put together again,³ so a monk who has intentionally killed a human being is not a recluse, not a son of the Sakyan⁴—he is therefore called one who **is expelled**.

Not in communion means: **communion** means: a common official action, the same recital, the same training—this is called **communion**. He does not take part in this—he is therefore called **not in communion**.

PERMUTATIONS

SUMMARY

Oneself, having resolved,⁵ by a messenger, by a series of messengers, by a messenger who does not follow instructions,⁶ by a messenger gone and returned again.

Not in private, but perceiving it as private; in private, but perceiving it as not private; not in private, and perceiving it as not private; in private, and perceiving it as private.

He praises by means of the body; he praises by means of speech;

¹ Vin-a 443, *papātā ti pabbatantare vā thalantare*. ² Vin-a 443 says, “like the blame-worthy man who has fallen into defeat, having committed sexual intercourse, and having taken what was not given.” ³ This is the only *Pārājika* where, in the simile, the word *abhabba* does not occur. ⁴ Cf. Vin 1.97, where it is said that a monk who has received the *upasampadā* ordination should not deprive any living being (*pāṇa*) of life, even down to an ant or a worm. ⁵ *Adhiṭṭhāya*. *Adhiṭṭhati* or *adhiṭṭhahati*, *adhiṭṭhāti*, *adhiṭṭheti* is a word of wide meaning. *Critical Pali Dictionary* includes above passage under “to determine, resolve, wish.” Vin-a 445 explains *adhiṭṭhahitvā* by *samīpe thatvā*. On the “volitional force” of *adhiṭṭhāna* consult MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *The Birth of Indian Psychology and its Development in Buddhism*, p. 112. *Adhiṭṭhita* used in connection with robes at Vin 3.196. ⁶ BRAHMALI: See Vin-a 2.449,28.

he praises by means of both the body and speech; he praises by means of a messenger; he praises by means of a writing.¹

A pit, a piece of furniture,² placing near, medicine, arranging a sight, arranging a sound, arranging a smell, arranging a taste, arranging a touch, arranging *dhamma*, announcement, instruction, making an arranged action,³ making a sign.

EXPOSITION

Oneself means: one oneself kills by means of the body or by means of something attached to the body or by means of something released.

Having resolved means: having resolved, he tells someone: hit thus, strike thus, kill thus.

BY A MESSENGER

If a monk tells a second monk, “Kill so-and-so,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the second monk kills that person,⁴ thinking he is the one he was told to kill, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both.

If a monk tells a second monk, “kill so-and-so,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the second monk kills someone else, thinking he is the one he was told to kill, there is no offence for the instigator, but there is an offence entailing expulsion for the murderer.

If a monk tells a second monk ... If the second monk kills that person, thinking it is someone else than the one he was told to kill, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both.

If a monk tells a second monk ... If the second monk kills someone else, thinking it is someone else than the one he was told to kill, there is no offence for the instigator, but there is an offence entailing expulsion for the murderer.

BY A SERIES OF MESSENGERS

If a monk tells a second monk, “tell so-and-so to tell so-and-so to kill so-and-so,” there is an offence of bad conduct. In informing

¹ *Lekhāya*. *Lekhā* means literally a scratching, therefore a writing. See below, **BD 1.131**, n. 1. ² *Apassena*. ³ *Sarīketakamma*. See above, **BD 1.88**. ⁴ *Tarī*.

the next person, there is an offence of bad conduct. If the (potential) murderer accepts, there is a serious offence for the instigator. If he kills that person, there is an offence entailing expulsion for all of them.

BY A MESSENGER WHO DOES NOT FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS

If a monk tells a second monk, “tell so-and-so to tell so-and-so to kill so-and-so,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the second monk tells someone else than the one he was told to tell, there is an offence of bad conduct. If the (potential) murderer accepts, there is an offence of bad conduct. If he kills that person, there is no offence for the instigator, but there is an offence entailing expulsion for the conveyor of the message and for the murderer.

BY A MESSENGER GONE AND RETURNED AGAIN

If a monk tells a second monk, “kill so-and-so,” there is an offence of bad conduct. He goes, but returns, saying, “I was not able to kill him.” If the first monk tells him again, “when you are able, then kill him,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the second monk kills that person, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both.

If a monk tells a second monk, “kill so-and-so,” there is an offence of bad conduct. He then becomes remorseful, but does not say, “do not kill him.” If the second monk then kills that person, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both.

If a monk tells a second monk, “kill so-and-so,” there is an offence of bad conduct. He then becomes remorseful and says, “do not kill him.” If the second monk replies, “I have been told by you to do so,” and then kills that person, there is no offence for the instigator, but there is an offence entailing expulsion for the murderer.

If a monk tells a second monk ... He then becomes remorseful and says, “do not kill him.” If the second monk replies, “very well,” and desists, there is no offence for either.

Not in private, but perceiving it as private, he says aloud, “if only so-and-so were killed,” there is an offence of bad conduct. **In pri-**

vate, but perceiving it as not private, he says aloud, “if only so-and-so were killed,” there is an offence of bad conduct. **Not in private, and perceiving it as not private**, he says aloud, “if only so-and-so were killed,” there is an offence of bad conduct. **In private, and perceiving it as private**, he says aloud, “if only so-and-so were killed,” there is an offence of bad conduct.

He praises by means of the body means: in making a gesture with the body,¹ which effectively says, “Whoever dies thus,² receives wealth, fame or goes to heaven,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If, because of that praise, the target person thinks, “I shall die,” and he does what is painful, there is a serious offence.³ If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

He praises by means of speech means: in saying, “whoever dies thus ...” ... If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

He praises by means of the body and speech means: in making a gesture with the body and saying, “whoever dies thus ...” ... If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

He praises by means of a messenger means: in giving instructions to a messenger, saying, “whoever dies thus, receives wealth, fame or goes to heaven,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If, having heard the messenger’s instruction, the target person thinks, “I shall die,” and he does what is painful, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

¹ *Kāyena vikāraṃ karoti* (*dasseti*, Vin-a 452, with variant reading *karoti*), literally he makes an (expressive) gesture. ² According to Vin-a 452, by taking a sword or by drinking poison, as at **BD 1.127** above. ³ **BRAHMALI**: That is, the pain that arises as he tries to kill himself.

He praises by means of a writing means: in writing:¹ “Whoever dies thus, receives wealth, fame or goes to heaven,” there is an offence of bad conduct for each character.² If, having seen the writing, the target person thinks, “I shall die,” and he does what is painful, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

A pit means: in digging a pit for people, thinking, “falling into it someone will die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If a person falls into it, there is an offence of bad conduct. If, when he has fallen, he experiences pain, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

In digging a non-specific pit, thinking, “whatever falls in will die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If a person falls into it, there is an offence of bad conduct. If, when he has fallen, he experiences pain, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing

¹ *lekhaṃ chindati*, Vin-a 452, “he cuts syllables (*akkharāni*) on a leaf or a book (*pot-thake*, cf. Sanskrit *pustaka*). Cf. Ja ii.90, *akkharāni chinditvā*, here on a *kaṇḍa*, a stalk or cane. *Lekhaṃ chindati* could not therefore here mean “destroys the letter” as Pali-English Dictionary says. Cf. *rūpaṃ chindati* at Vin-a 690 in connection with cutting a figure on the wooden *māsaka*. *Lekhā* therefore does not necessarily mean writing as we have it today. At Vin 4.7 *lekhā* is one of the three “high crafts” (or occupations, *sippa*). At Vin 1.77 = Vin 4.128 Upāli’s parents decide against letting him learn *lekhā* on the grounds that his fingers will become painful. At Vin 4.305 it is said to be no offence for a nun to learn writing (*lekhaṃ pariyāpunāti*). *Lekha* is the writing, the letter; *lekhā* the line, the tracing (cf. Ja 6. 56). Vin-a 867 explains by *akkharāni likhantassa*. Cf. Vin-a 739 *lekhā ti akkharalekhā*, letters: syllables or letters; see next note for *akkhara*.

At Vin 2.110 the context seems to demand another meaning for *lekhā*: it is to be something that can be separated from the bowl; this can be given away, whereas *lekhaṇ ca me paribhogaṃ bhavissati*, “so that the chips shall remain my property” (*Vinaya Texts* iii.78), or “the chips will come to be for my personal use,” or “the chips will be of use to me.” (*Paribhoga* is that which one uses, of use, rather than property.) At this passage *lekhaṃ* (which has faulty variant reading *likhaṃ*; cf. *likhāpaṇṇa* for *lekhā*° at Pv-a 20) is almost certainly to be taken in its meaning of “chips, shavings.”

At AN i.283 = Pp 32 three kinds of individuals are described: *pāsāṇalekhūpama*, *pathavilekhūpama*, *udakalekhūpama*. Here *lekhā* is translated at GS i.262 by “carving.” Neither Commentary remarks on *lekhā*.² *akkharakkharāya*, or “for the syllables and syllables” so “for each syllable.” *Critical Pali Dictionary* says that *akkhara* is opposed to *pada*, word. *Akkhara* seems to be connected with *akṣara* of the Upaniṣads, the Imperishable—perhaps because the letters when engraved could faintly emulate the Imperishable (*Veda*).

expulsion. If a spirit, ghost or animal in human form¹ falls into it, there is an offence of bad conduct.² If, when it has fallen, it experiences pain, there is an offence of bad conduct. If it dies, there is a serious offence. If an animal falls into it, there is an offence of bad conduct. If, when it has fallen, it experiences pain, there is an offence of bad conduct. If it dies, there is an offence entailing confession.³

A piece of furniture means: if he places a dagger in a piece of furniture, smears the furniture with poison or makes it weak, or if he places it near a lake, a pit or a cliff, thinking, “falling down, he will die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the target person experiences pain on account of the dagger or the poison or the fall, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Placing near means: if he places a knife, a dagger, an arrow, a club, a stone, a sword, poison or a rope⁴ near him, thinking, “using this he will die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the target person thinks, “using that, I shall die,” and he does what is painful, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Medicine means: if he gives ghee, butter, oil, honey or molasses,⁵ thinking, “having tasted this, he will die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. When the target person tastes it and experiences pain, there

¹ *Tiracchānagatamanussaviggaha*, literally a man taking up the form of one going as an animal. This is obviously meant to be something different from *tiracchānagata*, going as an animal, just below. The former probably refers to an animal who has the power to put on human form in this life; for this is a belief which existed at that time. Cf. the rule which forbids an animal in human form to be ordained, [Vin 1.86](#), [Vin 1.87](#). The latter, going as an animal, or just an animal, is a fairly forceful expression in connection with the belief in rebirth, meaning that someone is going as an animal in this rebirth. ² Vin-a 455 says, “It was dug for a man, (therefore) he is not guilty of the death of *yakkhas* and so forth who fall into it.” In the Vinaya, *yakkhas* constantly appear as the denizens of some sphere or other, not far removed from the realm of mankind. The same is true of the *petas*, or departed ones. ³ BRAHMALI: That is, a *pācittiya* offence, according to [Bu-Pc 61](#). ⁴ Cf. above, [BD 1.126](#), where these items are grouped together under “should look about so as to be his knife-bringer.”

⁵ These are the five kinds of medicine, cf. [Vin 3.251](#).

is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Arranging a sight¹ means: in arranging a dreadful and terrifying sight, thinking, “seeing this and becoming terrified, he will die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the target person sees it and becomes terrified, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion. In arranging a lovely sight, thinking, “seeing this and then not being able to obtain it, he will wither and die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the target person sees it and then withers because of not obtaining it, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Arranging a sound means: in arranging a dreadful and terrifying sound, thinking, “hearing this and becoming terrified, he will die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the target person hears it and becomes terrified, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion. In arranging a lovely and heart-stirring² sound, thinking, “hearing this and then not being able to obtain it, he will wither and die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the target person hears it and then withers because of not obtaining it, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Arranging a smell means: in arranging a disgusting and repulsive smell, thinking, “smelling this, he will die from disgust and aversion,” there is an offence of bad conduct. When the target person smells it and experiences suffering because of disgust and aversion, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion. In arranging a lovely smell, thinking, “smelling this and then not being able to obtain it, he will wither and die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the target person smells it and then withers because of not obtaining it, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Arranging a taste means: in arranging a disgusting and repul-

¹ It is curious that the five senses are all equally powerful here, and that the last three are not grouped together under *muta*, sensed, felt, thought or imagined, as sometimes occurs in the older literature, e.g. Vin 4.2. It is also curious that these five senses have the power to cause death. Was it really believed that people died because of a bad smell or loud noise? ² *Hadayaṅgama*, cf. DN i.4.

sive taste, thinking, “tasting this, he will die from disgust and aversion,” there is an offence of bad conduct. When the target person tastes it and experiences suffering because of disgust and aversion, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion. In arranging a lovely taste, thinking, “tasting this and then not being able to obtain it, he will wither and die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the target person tastes it and then withers because of not obtaining it, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Arranging a touch means: in arranging a painful and harsh physical contact, thinking, “touched by this, he will die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. When the target person makes contact with it and experiences pain, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion. In arranging a pleasant and soft physical contact, thinking, “touched by this and then not being able to obtain it, he will wither and die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the target person is touched by it and then withers because of not obtaining it, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Arranging dhamma means: in talking about hell¹ to one destined to go to hell, thinking, “hearing this and becoming terrified, he will die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. When the target person hears it and becomes terrified, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion. In talking about heaven to someone of good behaviour,² thinking, “hearing this and being intent on it,³ he will die,” there is an offence of bad conduct. When the target person hears it, becomes intent on it and thinks, “I shall die,” and he does what is painful, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Announcement means: if, being asked, he says, “die in this way;⁴ he who dies like this receives wealth, fame or goes to heaven,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If, because of that announcement, the target person thinks, “I shall die,” and he does what is painful, there

¹ Niraya. ² Adhimutta. Cf. below, BD 1.148. ³ Kalyāṇakamma. ⁴ Evaṃ marassu.

is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

Instruction means: if, without being asked, he says, “die in this way; he who dies like this receives wealth, fame or goes to heaven,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If, because of that instruction, the target thinks, “I shall die,” and he does what is painful, there is a serious offence. If he dies, there is an offence entailing expulsion.

An arranged action means: if he makes an arrangement for before the meal or for after the meal, for the night or for the day, telling another person, “kill that person according to this arrangement,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If the other person kills that person according to that arrangement, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both. If he kills him before or after the arranged time, there is no offence for the instigator, but there is an offence entailing expulsion for the murderer.

Making a sign means: he makes a sign. If he says to another person, “when I wink, raise my eyebrow, or raise my head, at that sign kill that person,” there is an offence of bad conduct. If, at that sign, the other person kills that person, there is an offence entailing expulsion for both. If he kills him before or after the sign, there is no offence for the instigator, but there is an offence entailing expulsion for the murderer.

NON-OFFENCE CLAUSE

There is no offence if it was unintentional, for one not knowing, for one not aiming at death, for one who is insane, for the first offender.

The first section on expulsion in relation to human beings is finished

CASE RULINGS

MNEMONIC LIST

Praising, sitting down, with pestle, and with mortar;

gone forth when old,¹ a falling out,² first,³ experimental poison, /
and three with making sites, another three with bricks,
An adze, and a rafter, a platform, descent, fell off, /
Sweating, and nose treatment,
massage, and by bathing, and by smearing,
Making get up, making lie down,⁴ death through food and drink, /
Child by a lover, and co-wives, he killed the mother, the child, both,
He killed neither,⁵ crushing, heating, barren, fertile, /
Tickling, in restraining, a spirit, and sent to a predatory spirit,
Thinking it was him he gave a blow,⁶ talk on heaven, and on hell, /
Three trees at Ālavī, three others with forest about fires,
Do not keep in misery, not as you, buttermilk, and salty medicine. /

CASE DETAILS

At one time a certain monk was ill. Out of compassion the monks praised the beauty of death to him. He died. They became anxious and said, “Could it be that we have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion?” They informed the Master. He said: “You, monks, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk who was an almsgiver sat down on a

¹ *vuḍḍhapabbajitā* usually “those long gone forth, old monks.” ² OLDENBERG, Vin 3.271f. gives variant readings *vuḍḍhapabbajitā ca bhissanno*, *’jitā sinno*, and “*’jji-tassa* nocorrected to *’jjitābhisanno* and he says, “I do not know how to correct *bhissanno* or *sinno*.” The final *ā* of *’jjitā* may possibly belong to *bhissanno*, then = *abhisanno*, meaning “full of, overflowing with” (old monks, Bu-Pj 3.5.4), or a “falling out” (of meat, Bu-Pj 3.5.5). *Sinna* as past participle of *sijjati* usually means “wet with perspiration, boiled,” but it cannot mean that here. The word does not appear again in the stories below. Possibly one group has been omitted. ³ Text reads *aggam*. Oldenberg proposed an emendation to *laggam*, doubtless thinking of *vilagga* in Bu-Pj 3.5.5, but *aggam* refers to *agga* (-*kārika*) of Bu-Pj 3.5.6. ⁴ Text, *marañam*. ⁵ *ubho na miyyare*. Cf. *na miyyare* at Snp 575. ⁶ *pahari*.

bench,¹ crushing a boy who was concealed by a rag. The boy died, and the monk became anxious. ... “Monks, there is no offence entailing expulsion. But a monk should not sit down on a seat without checking it. If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct.”

BD 1.13

At one time a certain monk was preparing a seat in a refectory among the houses. When he took hold of a pestle high up, a second pestle fell down hitting² a certain boy who then died. He became anxious ... “What was your intention?”

Bu-Pj 3

“I did not intend it, Master.”

“There is no offence, monk, when it is unintentional.”

At one time a certain monk was preparing a seat in a refectory among the houses. He stepped³ on the requisites belonging to a mortar,⁴ which fell and hit⁵ a certain boy, who then died. He became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, when it is unintentional.”

¹ *Ottharivā*; this word occurs again below in the next paragraph and also at **BD 1.146** below. Vin-a 475 on this latter passage explains by *akkamitvā*, and goes on to say that a monk having fallen down was dragged along by some others, and one having got on to his stomach sat there. But cf. **BD 1.59, n. 1**, above for *akkamitvā*, meaning “kicking, making a kick at.” At Mil 121 *ottharati* is used in connection with the waves of the sea: they “flow” (so translated Sacred Books of the East xxxi.182), meaning they flow again over the spot whence they had rolled back. It there has the sense of covering over or covering up. *Pali-English Dictionary* under *ottharati* says, “see also *avattharati* “for both of which it gives much the same meanings. I think it possible that *ottharati* (as here and in next paragraph below, and again below at **BD 1.146**) and *avattharati* as at next note below, have the sense of dealing roughly with someone, even by mistake. *Avatthāsi* occurs, again, **BD 1.140**, where it also seems as if it means “hit” (with locative). Both words certainly seem to include the sense of *hard*, sitting hard enough or hitting hard enough to cause death. ² *avatthāsi*. ³ *akkamitvā pavatṭesi*. *Akkamitvā* here seems to be in its meaning of “to tread on.” We get the same expression in **Vin 3.38**, above, **BD 1.59**, where it seems to mean “rising, he knocked her over,” and I should like to add *hard*, rising hard or suddenly. See above, **BD 1.137, n. 4**. ⁴ *bhaṇḍikā*. This is a comprehensive word meaning a heap of goods, a collection. At Ja iii.41 it is variant reading for *gaṇḍikā*, which as “executioner’s block” could not make sense here. “Mortar-requisites” would include the pestle. ⁵ *ottharivā* see above, **BD 1.137, n. 4**.

At one time a father and son had gone forth among the monks. When the time was announced¹ the son said to his father, “Go, bhante, the Sangha is waiting for you,” and seizing him by the back, he pushed him away. Falling down, he died. He became anxious. ... “What was your intention?”

“I did not mean to cause his death, Master.”

“There is no offence, monk, for one who is not aiming at death.”

At one time a father and son had gone forth among the monks. When the time was announced² the son said to his father, “Go, bhante, the Sangha is waiting for you,” and meaning to cause his death he seized him by the back and pushed him away. Falling down, he died. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a father and son had gone forth among the monks. When the time was announced the son said to his father, “Go, bhante, the Sangha is waiting for you,” and meaning to cause his death he seized him by the back and pushed him away. Falling down, he did not die. He became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

At one time while a certain monk was eating some meat³ got stuck in his throat. A certain monk hit him on the neck. The meat came out together with blood, and the monk died. He became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, for one who does not mean to cause death.”

At one time while a certain monk was eating some meat got stuck in his throat. A certain monk, meaning to cause his death, hit him

¹ *kāle ārocite*. ² *kāle ārocite*. ³ *maṃsa*; again showing that the monks were not vegetarians. Cf. above, **BD 1.98**.

on the neck. The meat came out together with blood, and the monk died. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time while a certain monk was eating some meat got stuck in his throat. A certain monk, meaning to cause his death, hit him on the neck. The meat came out together with blood, but the monk did not die. He became anxious ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk who was an almsgoer received poisoned almsfood. He brought it back and gave the first portion to the monks. They died. He became anxious ... “What was your intention, monk?”

“I did not know, Master.”

“There is no offence for one who does not know.”

At one time a certain monk gave poison to a certain monk, with the purpose of investigating it. That monk died. He became anxious ... “What was your intention, monk?”

“My purpose was to investigate it, Master.”

“There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were preparing a site for a dwelling. A certain monk who was below lifted up a stone. The stone, being badly held by a second monk who was above, fell on¹ the head of the monk who was below, and he died. The second monk became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, when it is unintentional.”

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were preparing a site for a dwelling. A certain monk who was below lifted up a stone. A second monk who

¹ *avatthāsi*, cf. above, BD 1.137, n. 4.

was above, aiming to kill the one who was below, dropped the stone on his head. He died ... he did not die. The second monk became anxious ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

3.5.8
1.141
At one time the monks of Āḷavī were erecting a wall¹ for a dwelling. A certain monk who was below lifted up a burnt brick. The brick, being badly held by a second monk who was above, fell on the head of the monk who was below. He died. The second monk became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, when it is unintentional.”

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were erecting a wall for a dwelling. A certain monk who was below lifted up a burnt brick. A second monk who was above, intending to cause the death of the monk who was below, dropped the burnt brick on his head. He died ... he did not die. The second monk became anxious ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

3.5.9
At one time the monks of Āḷavī were doing building work. A certain monk who was below lifted up an adze. The adze, being badly held by a second monk who was above, fell on the head of the monk who was below. He died. The second monk became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, when it is unintentional.”

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were doing building work ... lifted up an adze. A second monk who was above, meaning to cause the death of the monk who was below, dropped the adze on his head. He died ... he did not die ... The second monk became anxious ... ” ... serious offence.”

3.5.10
¹ *Kuḍḍa*. At Vin 4.266 three kinds of walls are mentioned: *iṭṭhakā*° (of tiles or bricks, as here), *silā*° (of stones), *dāru*° (of wood).

At one time the monks of Ālavī were doing building work. A certain monk who was below lifted up a rafter. The rafter, being badly held by a monk who was above ... (*three cases as above*) ... “... serious offence.”

At one time the monks of Ālavī, doing building work, were putting together a platform.¹ A certain monk said to a second monk, “Friend, put it together by standing here.” Putting it together by standing there, he fell down and died. The first monk became anxious ... “What was your intention, monk?”

“I did not mean to cause his death, Master.”

“There is no offence for one who is not aiming at death.”

At one time the monks of Ālavī, doing building work, were putting together a platform. A certain monk, meaning to cause his death, said to second monk, “Friend, put it together by standing here.” Putting it together by standing there, he fell down and died ... fell down and did not die. The first monk became anxious ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk, having made a roof for a dwelling, was coming down. A second monk said to that monk, “Friend, come down here.” Coming down at that place, he fell down and died. The second monk became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, for one who is not aiming at death.”

At one time a certain monk, having made a roof for a dwelling, was coming down. A second monk, meaning to cause his death, said to him, “Friend, come down here.” Coming down at that place, he fell down and died ... fell down and did not die ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

¹ *Aṭṭaka*. Vin-a 466 calls it *vehāsamañca*, literally a bed above the ground, probably a platform or scaffold up a tree, such as hunters use. It is the diminutive of *aṭṭa*, a watch-tower, [Vin 3.200](#).

At one time a certain monk who was tormented by discontent climbed Mount Vulture's Peak, fell down the cliff and hit a certain basket-maker. He died, and the monk became anxious ... "There is no offence entailing expulsion. But, monks, one should not jump off. If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct."

At one time the group of six monks, having climbed Mount Vulture's Peak, threw down a stone for fun. Hitting a certain cowherd, it killed him.¹ They became anxious. ... "There is no offence entailing expulsion. But, monks, you should not throw down stones for fun. If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct."

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks made him sweat by heating him. He died. They became anxious. ... "There is no offence, monks, for one who is not aiming at death."

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks, meaning to cause his death, made him sweat by heating him. He died ... he did not die. They became anxious. ... "There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence."

At one time a certain monk had a headache.² The monks gave him medical treatment through the nose.³ He died. They became anxious. ... "There is no offence, monks, for one who is not aiming at death."

¹ *māresuṃ*. We should say "it" (the stone), but the Pali regards the men as the agents of the cowherd's death. ² *sīsābhitāpa*, literally "heat in the head," cf. [Vin 1.204](#), where Pilindavaccha is mentioned as suffering this ailment. ³ *natthuṃ adaṃsu = natthukamma* as at [Vin 1.204](#). DN-a i.98, explained *telam̐ yojetvā n° karaṇam̐*. At DN i.12 this treatment is included among the low arts by which some samaṇas and brahmins earn a wrong livelihood, but at [Vin 1.204](#) it is allowed by Gotama, with details of how best to apply the drug to be taken through the nose. Cf. Dh-p-a i.12.

At one time a certain monk had a headache. The monks, meaning to cause his death, gave him medical treatment through the nose. He died ... did not die. They became anxious. ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks massaged him. He died ... (*three cases as above*) ... “... but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks bathed him. He died ... “... but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks anointed him with oil. He died ... “... but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks made him get up.¹ He died ... “... but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks made him lie down. He died ... “... but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks gave him food ... they gave him drink. He died ... “... but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain woman whose husband was living away from home became pregnant by a lover. She said to a monk who was supported by her family, “Master, please find a method of abortion.” “All right, sister,” he said, and he gave her a method of abortion. The child died. He became anxious. ... “You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

¹ Or, “raised him” (to a sitting position).

At one time a certain man had two wives, one who was barren and one who was fertile. The barren one said to a monk who was supported by her family, "If she should bring forth a child, bhante, she will become mistress of the whole household. Master, please find a method of abortion for her." "All right, sister," he said, and he gave her a method of abortion. The child died, but the mother did not die. He became anxious ... "... expulsion."

At one time a certain man had two wives ... he gave her a method of abortion. The mother died, but the child did not die. He became anxious ... "There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence."

At one time a certain man had two wives ... he gave her a method of abortion. Both died ... neither died. He became anxious ... "There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence."

At one time a certain woman who was pregnant said to a monk who was supported by her family, "Master, please find me a method of abortion." "Well then crush¹ it, sister," he said. She crushed it and caused an abortion. He became anxious ... "... expulsion."

At one time a certain woman who was pregnant ... "Well then heat yourself, sister," he said. She heated herself and caused an abortion. He became anxious ... "... expulsion."

At one time a certain barren woman said to a monk who was supported by her family, "Master, please find me some medicine to help me become pregnant." "All right, sister," he said, and gave her some medicine. She died. He became anxious ... "There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence of bad conduct."

At one time a certain fertile woman said to a monk who was supported by her family, “Master, please find me some medicine to help me not get pregnant.” “All right, sister,” he said ... “... but there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time the group of six monks made one of the group of seventeen monks¹ laugh by tickling him with their fingers. Being unable to breathe, he died. They became anxious ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time the group of seventeen monks, while doing some work,² covered³ one of the monks of the group of six. He died. They became anxious ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk who was an exorcist⁴ killed a spirit. He became anxious. ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”⁵

At one time a certain monk sent a certain monk to a dwelling

¹ *maddassu*, crush, bruise. Cf. Ja iii.121. ¹ Cf. Vin 4.110, where this story also appears; tickling with the fingers is there said to be a *pācittiya* offence. The seventeen monks are also mentioned at Vin 4.41. At Vin 1.77 = Vin 4.128, the boy Upāli is said to have seventeen friends. See Introduction, p. xxxvi, n. 2. ² *kammaṅ karissāma*, possibly idiomatic, “we will do (for him)”, “we will have some fun.”

³ *ottharivā* = *akkamitvā*, Vin-a 475. See above, BD 1.137. ⁴ *bhūtavejjaka*; *bhūtavijjā* mentioned at DN i.9 as a “low art.” *Bhūtavidyā* (translated by R.E. Hume as “Demonology”) also occurs at Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7.2.1 = Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7.7.1.

⁵ The monk learned in exorcism, in freeing a person possessed by a *yakkha* may cut off a clay doll’s head; then the *yakkha* dies, killed by him. But he may kill not only the *yakkha* but Sakka, king of the Devas; therefore it is a grave offence. Vin-a 475. At SN i.206 some Sakka is called a *yakkha*. ks i.263, n. 3 says, “there is no tradition, revealed in the Commentary that Sakka, ruler of the Thirty[-three] Gods, is meant.” He was a (*eko*) *yakkha* belonging to Māra’s faction, SN-a i.302.

inhabited by predatory spirits.¹ The spirits killed him. He became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, for one who is not aiming at death.”

At one time a certain monk, meaning to cause his death, sent a certain monk to a dwelling inhabited by predatory spirits. The spirits killed him ... the spirits did not kill him. “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk sent a certain monk to a wilderness inhabited by beasts of prey² ... to a wilderness inhabited by robbers. The beasts of prey ... the robbers ... killed him. He became anxious ... (*three cases each time as above*) ... “... but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk, thinking he was that person, killed that person ... thinking he was that person, killed someone else ... thinking he was someone else, killed that person ... thinking he was someone else, killed someone else. He became anxious ... “... expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk was possessed by a spirit.³ Another monk gave him a blow.⁴ He died. The other monk became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, for one who is not aiming at death.”

¹ *vālayakkha*. Vin-a 475, “In this *vihāra* a predatory (*vāla*), fierce *yakkha* dwelt; it was his *vihāra*.” At AN iii.256 *vālayakkhas* are said to be one of the five dangers of Madhurā. See GS iii.188, n. 3. Mr. E.M. Hare translates *vālayakkhā* as “bestial *yakkhas*.” Cf. *yakkha* eating men and cattle at DN ii.346. Term may mean “*yakkha* in form of a beast of prey.” ² Vin-a 476: “In all of these wilds there are beasts of prey and snakes ... in all of those there are robbers.” Five kinds of wilds (*kantāra*) mentioned at Ja i.99, SN-a i.324; four kinds at Cnd 630. ³ *amanussena*: *amanussa* is a *yakkha*, a spirit, a ghost. At Vin 1.277 it is said that Kāka, a slave, was born *amanussena*. Word occurs at DN i.116, SN i.91, and also above, BD 1.74. Vin-a 298 says, they are either *yakkhas* or men who, having departed, desire to return. ⁴ Vin-a 476 “saying, ‘I will drive the *yakkha* away,’ he gives him (i.e., the monk) a blow. One should not give a person possessed by a *yakkha* a blow, but should bind a palm-leaf or protecting thread on his arm or leg.”

At one time a certain monk was possessed by a spirit. Another monk, meaning to cause his death, gave him a blow. He died ... he did not die. The other monk became anxious ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk gave a talk about heaven to a man of good behaviour. He became keen on it¹ and died. The monk became anxious ... “There is no offence, monk, for one who is not aiming at death.”

At one time a certain monk, meaning to cause his death, gave a talk about heaven to a man of good behaviour. He became keen on it and died ... he became keen on it, but did not die ... “There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk gave a talk about hell to a man destined to go to hell. Being terrified, he died ... (*the same three cases*) ... “... but there is a serious offence.”

At one time the monks of Ālavī, while doing building work, felled a tree. A certain monk said to another monk, “Friend, fell it standing here.” While he was felling it standing there, the tree fell on him and killed him ... (*three cases*) ... “... but there is a serious offence.”

At one time the group of six monks set fire to a forest. Some people were burnt and died ... (*three cases*) ... “... but there is a serious offence.”

¹ *adhimutto*. *Critical Pali Dictionary*, referring to this passage says, “impressed with the idea.” Cf. above, [BD 1.135](#).

At one time a certain monk went to the place of execution and said to the executioner: “Friend, do not keep him in misery.¹ Kill him with a single blow.” “All right, bhante,” he said, and he killed him with a single blow. He became anxious. “You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

1.149 At one time a certain monk went to the place of execution and said to the executioner: “Friend, do not keep him in misery. Kill him with a single blow.” “I will not do as you ask,” he said, and deprived him of life. He became anxious ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence of bad conduct.”²

3.5.33 At one time a certain man whose hands and feet had been cut off was in his relatives’ house surrounded by his relations. A certain monk said to those people, “Friends, do you desire his death?”

“Indeed, bhante, we do desire it.”

“Then you should make him drink buttermilk.”³

They made him drink buttermilk and he died. The monk became anxious ... “You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain man whose hands and feet had been cut off was in his family’s house, surrounded by his relations. A certain nun said to those people, “Friends, do you desire his death?”

“Indeed, honoured lady, we do desire it.”

¹ *mā yimarāṇ kilamesi*. ² Apparently not a grave offence because the executioner was not influenced by the monk’s words. The monk only transgressed in uttering the words, attempting to hasten the man’s death. ³ *takka*. Vin-a 478, “buttermilk of a cow, a buffalo, a goat, hot, cold, flavoured or unflavoured.” At [Vin 1.244](#) it is included in the five products of the cow (*pañca gorasā*).

“Then you should make him drink salty medicine.”¹

They made him drink salty medicine and he died. She became anxious. She then informed the nuns, who in turn informed the monks, who then informed the Master. He said, “Monks, that nun has fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

The third offence entailing expulsion is finished

¹ *loṇasuvīraka*. Vin-a 478, “a medicine made of all tastes.” Buddhaghosa gives a long description of the things mixed together to form it: various kinds of myrobalan (astringent and intoxicant), all the seven grains and pulses, gruel, the fruit of the plantain, and all fruits, the jungle creeper, sprouts of various trees, fish and meat, honey and molasses, rock-salt, alkaline and bitter medicines. Then, letting it mature for two or three years, it is the colour of the juice of the rose-apple and is good for various diseases (mentioned here, cf. also AN v.110), but further than that (*ca uttaram*) if decaying, it is no longer a medicine. At Vin 1.210 it is called *sovīraka*: here the lord allows the use of it to one who is sick, and to one who is not sick the use of it mixed with water as a medicine.

MONKS' EXPULSION (PĀRĀJIKĀ) 4

ORIGIN STORY

FIRST SUB-STORY

At one time¹ the Buddha, the Master, was staying near Vesālī in the hall with the peaked roof in the Great Wood. At that time a number of monks who were friends had entered the rains on the banks of the river Vaggumudā.² Just then Vajjī was short of food³ and stricken by hunger, with crops blighted and turned to straw, and it was not easy to keep oneself going by collecting alms. Then those monks thought this:

“At present Vajjī is short of food and stricken by hunger, with crops blighted and turned to straw, and it is not easy to keep oneself going by collecting alms. By what means might we, united and in harmony, have a comfortable rains and get almsfood without problems?”

Some said, “Well, friends, we could undertake work for the householders, and they will give something in return. In this way, being united and in harmony, we will spend the rains in comfort and have no problems getting almsfood.”

Some said, “Friends, there is no need to undertake work for the householders. Let us instead act as messengers for them,⁴ and they

¹ From here to towards the end of Bu-Pj 4.1.2 below, cf. Vin 4.23–25, where it is a *pācittiya* for a monk to tell of his knowledge of conditions belonging to the furthermen, even if he possessed this knowledge. If he does not possess it, it is a *pārājika* offence to speak of it, as here at Bu-Pj 4. ² Mentioned at Ud 25; it is also here said that some monks spent *vassa* on its banks. ³ Cf. above, Bu-Pj 1.2.1; Bu-Pj 1.5.5.

⁴ *dūteyyaṃ harāma*.

will give something in return. In this way, being united and in harmony, we will spend the rains in comfort and have no problems getting almsfood.”

Some said, “Friends, there is no need to undertake work for the householders, nor to act as messengers for them. Let us instead praise one another’s super-human achievements¹ to the householders: ‘Such a monk obtains the first *jhāna*, such a monk the second *jhāna*, such a monk the third, such a monk the fourth; such a monk is stream-enterer, such a monk a once-returner, such a non-returner, such an *arahant*; such a monk has the three true knowledges,² and such the six direct knowledges.’³ Then they will give to us. In this way, being united and in harmony, we will spend the rains in comfort and have no problems getting almsfood. Indeed, friends, this is the better way, that we praise one another’s super-human achievements to the householders.”

Then those monks praised one another’s super-human achievements to the householders: “Such a monk obtains the first *jhāna* ... such a monk has the six direct knowledges.” And those people thought: “It is a gain for us, it is well-gained, that such monks have come to us for the rains. Such monks as these, who are virtuous and of good character, have never before entered the rains with us.” Then they gave such food and drink to those monks that they did not even eat and drink themselves, or give to their parents, to their wives and children, to their slaves, servants and workers, to their friends and companions, or to their relatives. In this way those monks were handsome, with rounded features, bright faces and clear skin.⁴

Now it was the custom⁵ for monks who had finished keeping

¹ *uttarimanussadhamma*, on this term, see **BD1, Introduction, xxivf.** ² *tevijjo*—i.e., he has knowledge of his own previous rebirths, of the arising and passing away of beings, and of the destruction of the cankers. It is a term handed down from the Upaniṣads, where it meant knowledge of the three Vedas. ³ *chalaḥbhīṅṅo*—i.e., psychic power, clairaudience, knowledge of the thoughts of other beings, knowledge of previous rebirths, clairvoyance, and knowledge of destruction of the cankers. Cf. AN iii.15; DN i.77ff.; and see GS iii Introduction viii for these being originally five.

⁴ A stock phrase. ⁵ For the beginning of this paragraph cf. **Vin 1.158.**

the rains to go and see the Master. So when the rains was finished and the three months had elapsed, those monks put their lodging in order,¹ took their bowls and robes and departed for Vesālī. Walking by stages, they arrived at Vesālī and went to the hall with the peaked roof in the Great Wood. There they approached the Master, paid homage to him and sat down to one side.

At that time the monks who had spent the rains in that region were thin, haggard² and pale,³ their veins protruding all over their limbs.⁴ But the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā were handsome, with rounded features, bright faces and clear skin. It is the custom for Buddhas, for Masters, to exchange friendly greetings with incoming monks.⁵ And so the Master said to them:

“I hope you are keeping well,⁶ monks, I hope you are comfortable; I hope you spent the rains at ease, in concord and harmony, without dispute, and that you had no trouble getting almsfood?”

“We are keeping well, Master,⁷ we are comfortable; we spent the rains at ease, in concord and harmony, without dispute, and we had no trouble getting almsfood.”

Tathāgatas sometimes ask knowing, and knowing sometimes do not ask ... Buddhas, Masters, question the monks for two reasons, thinking, “we shall teach the *Dhamma* or lay down a training rule for the disciples.”⁸ Then the Master said to those monks:

¹ *senāsanaṃ saṃsāmetvā*, translated at *Vinaya Texts* i.326, “set their places of rest in order.” I closely follow Chalmers’ “packed away their bedding” at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.104, because I prefer “away” rather than “up” which suggests the possibility of their taking their bedding with them when vassa was over. “Places of rest” is, I think, misleading: much teaching of the laity went on during vassa, which could therefore only be regarded as a time of leisure in so far as there was no travelling from vihara to vihara. ² This is all stock-phrase. *Dubbaṅga*: CHALMERS, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.65 translates “ill-looking,” while at *Vinaya Texts* i.186 it is translated “discoloured.” ³ *uppaṇḍuppaṇḍukajāta*, CHALMERS, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.65, “jaundiced,” and *Vinaya Texts* i.186, “(... his complexion has become) more and more yellow.” ⁴ *dhamanisanthata-gatta*, CHALMERS, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.65, “their veins standing out like whipcord.” ⁵ = *Vin* 1.59 = *Vin* 1.212 = *Vin* 1.253. ⁶ = *Vin* 1.59 = *Vin* 1.212 = *Vin* 1.253. *Kacci khamaniyaṃ*, cf. *Vin* 1.204, *Vin* 1.205, where *na kkhamaṇiyo hoti* is used of a disease which had not become better. ⁷ *Bhagavā*. ⁸ = *Vin* 1.158 = *Vin* 3.6.

“In what way, monks, did you spent the rains at ease, without having any trouble getting almsfood?” Then those monks informed the Master.

“But had you really obtained those super-human achievements?”¹

“No, Master.”

The Buddha, the Master, rebuked them:

“It is unsuitable, foolish men, it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is not fitting for a recluse, it is unallowable, it is not to be done. How could you for the sake of your stomachs praise one another’s super-human achievements to householders? It would be better for your bellies to be cut open with a sharp butcher’s knife than for you to praise one another’s super-human achievements to householders. Why is that? For *that* reason, foolish men, you may incur death or death-like suffering, but not on that account would you at the breaking up of the body after death be reborn in the plane of misery, a bad destination, the abyss, hell.² But for *this* reason you might. This is not for the benefit of non-believers ...” and having thus rebuked them and given a talk on the *Dhamma*, he addressed the monks:

“Monks, there are these five great gangsters to be found in the world.³ What five? A⁴ certain great gangster thinks like this: ‘When indeed will I, with a following of a hundred or a thousand men, wander among villages, towns and the seats of kings, killing and making others kill, destroying and making others destroy, tormenting and making others torment;’ and after some time he does just that. Just so, monks, a certain bad monk thinks like this: ‘When indeed will I, with a following of a hundred or a thousand people, go on tour among villages, towns and the seats of kings, being honoured, respected, revered and worshipped by both householders and those gone forth, and obtain robes, almsfood, lodgings and medicines;’ and after some time he does just that. This is the first great gangster found existing in the world.

Again, a certain bad monk learns the *Dhamma* and training pro-

¹ *Kacci pana vo bhūtan ti.* ² Cf. above, **BD 1.36.** ³ Cf AN i.153; AN iii.128. ⁴ *idhā ti imasmim sattaloke*, Vin-a 482.

claimed by the Tathāgata and takes it as his own. This is the second great gangster found existing in the world.

Again, a certain bad monk groundlessly accuses someone who lives the spiritual life in purity of not being celibate.¹ This is the third great gangster found existing in the world.

Again, a certain bad monk takes valuable goods and requisites belonging to the Sangha—a monastery, the land of a monastery, a dwelling, the land for a dwelling, a bed, a bench, a cushion, a pillow, a brass vessel, a brass jar, a brass pot, a brass receptacle, an adze, a hatchet, an axe, a spade, a chisel, a creeper, bamboo, *muñja*-grass, *babbaja*-grass, *tiṇa*-grass, clay, wooden articles, earthenware articles²—and uses these to win over and create a following among householders. This is the fourth great gangster found existing in the world.

But in this world with its gods, its lords of death and its supreme beings, among this population with its recluses and brahmins, its gods and humans, this the greatest gangster: he who untruthfully³ and groundlessly⁴ boasts about a super-human achievement. Why is that? Monks, you have eaten the country's almsfood by theft."

Whoever should declare himself to be other than he truly
is,

¹ Vin-a 484 says, *suddhañ ca brahmacāriṃ* is a monk whose cankers are destroyed. *Parisuddhañ brahmacariyaṃ carantan* means lead the best (highest) life free from the kilesas ... *Amūlakena abrahmacariyena anuddhaṃseti*, means he censures and blames this man for a *pārājika* offence. ² At Vin 2.170 all these items are grouped into five categories of things which are not transferable by the Order or by a group or by an individual. At Vin 2.122 a brass pot is one of the three kinds of water-vessels allowed. At Vin 2.143 all kinds of brassware are allowed to the Order except weapons, all kinds of wooden articles except divans (Vin 1.192), long-armed chairs (Vin 1.192), bowls (Vin 2.112) and shoes (Vin 1.188); all kinds of earthenware except *katakas* (foot scrubbers, see *Vinaya Texts* iii.130, n. 3), and large earthen vessels to be used as huts to live in. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.156 for these references, This last item is the only one not mentioned in previous rules. At Vin 3.211 injunctions are given to monks setting out on a journey as to what to do with their wooden and earthenware articles. At Vin 1.190 it is a *dukkata* offence for monks to make foot coverings of *tiṇa*-, *muñja*- or *babbaja*-grass. ³ *Asanta*. ⁴ *Abhūta*.

Has eaten this by theft, like a cheater who has deceived,

Many¹ yellow-necks of bad qualities, uncontrolled and
Wicked, by their wicked deeds, in hell they are reborn.

Better to eat an iron ball heated like a blazing fire,
Than for the immoral and uncontrolled to eat the coun-
try's alms.

Then the Master, having rebuked the monks from the banks of the Yaggumudā in various ways for being difficult to maintain, difficult to support ... “... And, monks, this training rule should be recited thus:

PRELIMINARY RULING

If a monk falsely claims for himself a super-human achievement, knowledge and vision² worthy of the noble ones, saying: “This I know, this I see”, but after some time—whether examined or not, but having committed the offence³ and desiring purification—should say, ‘friends, not knowing I said that I know, not seeing that I see; what I said was empty and false,’ he too is expelled and not in communion.”

Thus the Master laid down this training rule for the monks

SECOND SUB-STORY

At one time a number of monks, thinking they had seen what they had not, attained what they had not, achieved what they had not,

¹ From here to end of verses = Dhp 307, Dhp 308 = It 43 = It 90 (last three lines only at It 90). I follow Mrs. Rhys Davids, translated at Sacred Books of the Buddhists VII. ² *Alamariyañanadassana*. Vin-a 489 says that the highest *ariyan* purity is knowledge and insight. *Alam* is explained *pariyattam*, sufficient, enough, so that *alam* means “intent on enough *ariyan* knowledge and insight for the destruction of the *kilesas*.” ³ *Apanna*, cf. below, Old Commentary explanation, **BD 1.160**, and Vin-a 492, “because he has fallen (*āpanno*) into defeat, therefore, putting monkdom to one side, he cannot become one to arrive at musing and so forth”—musing, etc., being given in explanation of states of further-men, see below, **BD 1.159**.

realised what they had not, declared final knowledge¹ based on overestimation.² After some time their minds inclined³ to sense desire, anger and confusion. They became anxious, thinking, “The Master has laid down a training rule; yet we ... declared final knowledge based on overestimation. Could it be that we have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion? They informed Venerable Ānanda, who informed the Master. He said: “Ānanda, these monks declared final knowledge based on overestimation, thinking they had seen what they had not ... but this is negligible.⁴”

And so, monks, this training rule should be recited thus:

FINAL RULING

If a monk falsely claims for himself a super-human achievement, knowledge and insight worthy of the noble ones, saying: “This I know, this I see,” but after some time—whether examined or not, but having committed the offence and desiring purification—should say, ‘friends, not knowing I said that I know, not seeing that I see; what I said was empty and false,’ except if it is through overestimation, he too is expelled and not in communion.”

DEFINITIONS

A means: whoever, of such kind ...

Monk means: ... this sort of **monk** is meant in this case.

Falsely means: although a certain wholesome quality is non-

¹ *Añña*. Cf. above, **BD 1.120, n. 2.** ² *Adhimāna*, pride, arrogance. ³ *Namati*, in translation; *cittam* is the subject. Cf. *SN* i.137 ⁴ *Tañ ca kho etaṃ abbohārikan ti*. Same phrase occurs again below, **BD 1.196**. Because *Vin-a* 488 says that the phrase means that “it does not belong to the business and is not a form of offence”, I take the *ti* after *abboharika* to mean that the phrase was uttered by Gotama and not by the monks. The word seems to mean “not to the point, irrelevant.” See *Points of Controversy*, p. 361, n. 4.

existent, not factual, not to be found in himself, and he does not see it or know it, he says, “I have this wholesome quality.”

A super-human achievement means: *jhāna*, emancipation, *sam-ādhī*, attainment, knowledge and insight, development of the path,¹ realisation of the fruits, abandoning the defilements, a mind without hindrances, delighting in solitude.

For himself means: either he presents these good qualities as in himself, or he presents himself as among these good qualities.

Knowledge means: the three true knowledges.

Insight means: knowledge and insight are equivalent.²

If (he) claims means: if he proclaims to a woman or a man, to a householder or one gone forth.

This I know, this I see means: “I know these qualities, I see these qualities; these qualities are in me, and I conform to these qualities.”

After some time means: the moment, the second, the instant when the claim is completed.

Examined means: he is examined in regard to what he has acknowledged: “What was attained by you, how was it attained by you, when was it attained by you, where was it attained by you? Which defilements have you destroyed? Which qualities did you gain?”

Not means: nothing being said.

Having committed the offence means: having bad desires, being habitually desirous, claiming a non-existent, non-factual super-human achievement, he has committed an offence entailing expulsion.

Desiring purification means: he desires to be a householder, a lay follower, a monastery attendant or a *sāmaṇera*.³

Friends, not knowing I said that I know, not seeing that I see

¹ *Maggabhāvanā*, or making the (four) ways (to arahanship) become. But see Old Commentary’s definition, below, **BD 1.161**. ² Repeated at Vin-a 489. ³ Vin-a 492 says, “Inasmuch as being a house-man, a lay-follower, a park-keeper, or a probationer he is able (*bhabba*) to set going the way to heaven through giving, the refuges, morality and the restraints, or the way to freedom through musing and freedom, therefore the state of a householder and so on is called pure; therefore desiring this purity, he is said to be one desiring purity.”

means: “I do not know these qualities, I do not see these qualities; these qualities are not found in me, and I do not conform to these qualities.”

What I said was empty and false, means: what I said was empty, what I said was false, what I said was untruthful;¹ I said it without knowing.

Except if it is through overestimation means: setting aside overestimation of oneself.

He too means: this is said with reference to the preceding offences entailing expulsion.

Is expelled means: just as a palm tree with the crown cut off is incapable² of further growth, just so a monk with bad desires, who is habitually desirous, having claimed a non-existent, non-factual super-human achievement, is not a recluse, not a son of the Sakyan³—he is therefore called one who **is expelled**.

Not in communion means: **communion** means: a common official action, the same recital, the same training—this is called **communion**. He does not take part in this—he is therefore called **not in communion**.

PERMUTATIONS

SUMMARY

A super-human achievement⁴ means: *jhāna*, emancipation, *sam-ādhi*, attainment, knowledge and insight, development of the path, realisation of the fruits, abandoning the defilements, a mind without hindrances, delighting in solitude.

¹ *Abhūta* ² *abhabba*. ³ Cf. **Vin 1.97**, where it is also said that the monk is not even to say that he delights in solitude. ⁴ This definition = that given above, **BD 1.159**. From here to end of **Bu-Pj 4.4.1** below = **Vin 4.25-26**.

Jhāna means: the first *jhāna*, the second *jhāna*, the third *jhāna*, the fourth *jhāna*.

Emancipation means: emptiness emancipation, signless emancipation, desireless emancipation.¹

samādhi means: emptiness *samādhi*, signless *samādhi*, desireless *samādhi*.

Attainment means: emptiness attainment, signless attainment, desireless attainment.

Knowledge and insight means: the three higher knowledges.

Development of the path means: the four focuses of mindfulness, the four right efforts, the four bases of psychic potency, the five faculties, the five powers, the seven factors of awakening, the noble eightfold path.²

Realisation of the fruits means: realisation of the fruit of stream-entry, realisation of the fruit of once-returning, realisation of the fruit of non-returning, realisation of the fruit of *arahantship*.

Abandoning the defilements means: the abandoning of sense desire, the abandoning of anger, the abandoning of confusion.³

A mind without hindrances means: the mind without sense desire, the mind without anger, the mind without confusion.

Delight in solitude means: Because of the first *jhāna* there is

¹ Vin-a 493 says that void means void of passion, hatred and confusion. "Signless" and "in which there is no hankering" are also explained with reference to these three. At Ps.ii.35 the long homily begins: "Monks, there are these three kinds of freedom: that of the void, that of the signless, that in which there is no hankering." Cf. SN iv.295 (where *appaṇihīta* is translated "aimless") Cf. Vism 658, Atthasālinī 223, where in the translation *appaṇihīta* is rendered "unhankered" and "undesired" respectively. At Mil 333, Mil 337 the translation is given as "the freedom (or concentration) in which no low aspirations remain." In translation of Ds 351, Ds 507ff. *appaṇihīta* is rendered "unaimed at." ² This is the usual order in which these thirty-seven things helpful to enlightenment, as they are called in the Commentaries, appear. But another order is sometimes given. See Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Sakya* 395 and ks V., vi. ff. ³ Cf. SN iv.251, where the definition of *nibbāna* is *ragakkhaya, dosakkhaya, mohakkhaya* (instead of *pahāna*, as above) = SN iv.252 in definition of *arahatta*. Vin-a 494 says, "passion and hatred are destroyed by the third Way, confusion by the fourth Way."

delight in solitude, because of the second *jhāna* ... because of the third *jhāna* ... because of the fourth *jhāna* there is delight in solitude.

EXPOSITION

FIRST JHĀNA

4.4.2 For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied, he knows he is going to lie; while lying, he knows he is lying; after he has lied, he knows he has lied.¹

1.163 For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when four conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied, he knows he is going to lie; while lying, he knows he is lying; after he has lied, he knows he has lied; in misrepresenting his view (of what is true).

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when five conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied ... in misrepresenting his view (of what is true); in misrepresenting his belief (of what is true).

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when six conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied ... in misrepresenting his view (of what is true); in misrepresenting his belief (of what is true); in misrepresenting his acceptance (of what is true).

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when seven conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied ... in misrepresenting his view (of what is true); in misrepresenting his belief (of what is true); in misrepresenting his acceptance (of what is true); in misrepresenting his

¹ Here are three tenses of the verb *bhaṇati*: *bhaṇissam*, *bhaṇāmi*, *bhaṇitam*. Cf. Vin 4.2ff. to end of Bu-Pj 4.4.2 below. Cf. MN i.414 where Gotama speaks to Rahula on “conscious lying.” This Rahulovada is famous as being alluded to in an Asoka Edict; see HULTZSCH, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, vol.i, 1925, p.172, p.173.

sentiment (of what is true).¹

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I am attaining the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ... in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I have attained the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ... in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I obtain the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ... in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I master the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ... in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I have realised the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ... in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

As the first jhāna has been expounded in detail, so all (below) should be expanded

OTHER INDIVIDUAL ATTAINMENTS

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the second *jhāna* ... the third *jhāna* ... the fourth *jhāna* ... I am attaining ... I have attained ... I obtain ... I master ... I have realised the fourth *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled

...

¹ These four psychological modalities are added to the three tenses of the verb *bhaṇāti*. They are *diṭṭhi*, *khanti*, *ruci*, *bhāva*, which I have translated as opinion, approval, pleasure, intention, respectively. They are, as it were, added on to the three modes of the verb, thus making seven constituents. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 400 points out a contradiction in the Parivara (Vin 5.136), which attributes eight *aṅga* (literally limbs, thus constituents) to a lie, for it adds (Vinidhaya-) *saññam*, knowledge, to the above seven. These expressions also occur at Vin 2.295; Vin 4.2ff. Cf. also Vb 245 where these with *ādāya*, a casually taken-up belief (cf. Vin 1.70), instead of *bhāva* are given in definition of *idha*, here, now. And cf. Mnd 64f. where *laddhi*, a religious belief, view, especially an heretical view, is substituted for *bhāva*. Three of these terms occur below at BD 1.305.

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the emptiness emancipation ... the signless emancipation ... the desireless emancipation¹ ... I am attaining ... I have attained ... I obtain ... I master ... I have realised the desireless emancipation,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the emptiness *samādhi* ... the signless *samādhi* ... the desireless *samādhi* ... I am attaining ... I have attained ... I obtain ... I master ... I have realised the desireless *samādhi*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the emptiness attainment² ... the signless attainment ... the desireless attainment ... I am attaining ... I have attained ... I obtain ... I master ... I have realised the desireless attainment,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the three true knowledges ... I have realised the three true knowledges,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the four focuses of mindfulness ... the four right efforts ... the four bases of psychic potency ... I have realised the four bases of psychic potency,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the five faculties ... the five powers ... I have realised the five powers,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the seven factors of awakening ... I have realised the seven factors of awakening,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the noble eightfold path ... I have realised the noble eightfold path,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the fruit of

¹ See above, [BD 1.161](#). ² Cf. [Vin 4.26ff](#).

stream-entry ... the fruit of once-returning ... the fruit of non-returning ... *arahantship* ... I have realised *arahantship*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I have given up sense desire, I have renounced sense desire, I have let go of sense desire, I have abandoned sense desire, I have relinquished sense desire, I have forsaken sense desire, I have thrown aside sense desire ... I have given up anger, I have renounced anger, I have let go of anger, I have abandoned anger, I have relinquished anger, I have forsaken anger, I have thrown aside anger ... I have given up confusion, I have renounced confusion, I have let go of confusion, I have abandoned confusion, I have relinquished confusion, I have forsaken confusion, I have thrown aside confusion,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “my mind is free from the hindrance of sense desire,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “my mind is free from the hindrance of anger ... confusion,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied he knows he is going to lie; while lying, he knows he is lying; after he has lied, he knows he has lied; in misrepresenting his view (of what is true); in misrepresenting his belief (of what is true); in misrepresenting his acceptance (of what is true); in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

The simple (permutations series) is finished

COMBINATIONS OF TWO ATTAINMENTS

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the first *jhāna* and the second *jhāna* ... the first *jhāna* and the third *jhāna* ... the first *jhāna* and the fourth *jhāna* ... the first *jhāna* and the emptiness emancipation ... the first *jhāna* and the signless emancipation ... the first *jhāna* and the desireless emancipation ... the first *jhāna* and the emptiness *samādhi* ... the first *jhāna* and the signless *samādhi* ...

the first *jhāna* and the desireless *samādhi* ... the first *jhāna* and the emptiness attainment ... the first *jhāna* and the signless attainment ... the first *jhāna* and the desireless attainment ... the first *jhāna* and the three true knowledges ... the first *jhāna* and the four focuses of mindfulness ... the first *jhāna* and the four right efforts ... the first *jhāna* and the four bases of psychic potency ... the first *jhāna* and the five faculties ... the first *jhāna* and the five powers ... the first *jhāna* and the seven factors of awakening ... the first *jhāna* and the noble eightfold path ... the first *jhāna* and the fruit of stream-entry ... the first *jhāna* and the fruit of once-returning ... the first *jhāna* and the fruit of non-returning ... the first *jhāna* and *arahantship* ... the first *jhāna* and I have given up sense desire, renounced it, let it go, abandoned it, relinquished it, forsaken it, thrown it aside ... the first *jhāna* and I have given up anger, renounced it, let it go, abandoned it, relinquished it, forsaken it, thrown it aside ... the first *jhāna* and I have given up confusion, renounced it, let it go, abandoned it, relinquished it, forsaken it, thrown it aside ... the first *jhāna* and my mind is free from the hindrance of sense desire ... the first *jhāna* and my mind is free from the hindrance of anger ... the first *jhāna* and my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion ... I am attaining the first *jhāna* and my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion ... I have attained the first *jhāna* and my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion ... I obtain the first *jhāna* and my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion ... I master the first *jhāna* and my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion ... I have realised the first *jhāna* and my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied, he knows he is going to lie; while lying, he knows he is lying; after he has lied, he knows he has lied; in misrepresenting his view (of what is true); in misrepresenting his belief (of what is true); in misrepresenting his acceptance (of what is true); in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

The permutation of one part is finished

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the second *jhāna* and the third *jhāna* ... the second *jhāna* and the fourth *jhāna* ... the second *jhāna* and my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ...

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the second *jhāna* and the first *jhāna* ... I have realised the second *jhāna* and the first *jhāna*,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled ...

The contracted permutation is finished

Thus each item is to be dealt with in the same way as the contracted permutation. In brief:

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion and I attained the first *jhāna* ... the second *jhāna* ... the third *jhāna* ... the fourth *jhāna* ... the emptiness emancipation ... my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion and it is free from the hindrance of anger,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled ...

That which is based on one item is finished

The (sections) based on two items, three items, four items, five items, six items, seven items, eight items, nine items and ten items is to be given in detail in the same way as the (section) based on one item. This is the section based on all items:

COMBINATION OF ALL ATTAINMENTS

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “I attained the first *jhāna* and the second *jhāna* and the third *jhāna* and the fourth *jhāna* and the emptiness emancipation and the signless emancipation and the desireless emancipation and the emptiness *samādhi* and the signless *samādhi* and the desireless *samādhi* and the emptiness attainment

and the signless attainment and the desireless attainment and the three true knowledges and the four focuses of mindfulness and the four right efforts and the four bases of psychic potency and the five faculties and the five powers and the seven factors of awakening and the noble eightfold path and the fruit of stream entry and the fruit of once-returning and the fruit of non-returning and *arahantship* ... I am attaining ... I have attained ... and I have given up sense desire, renounced it, let it go, abandoned it, relinquished it, forsaken it, thrown it aside; and I have given up anger, renounced it, let it go, abandoned it, relinquished it, forsaken it, thrown it aside; and I have given up confusion, renounced it, let it go, abandoned it, relinquished it, forsaken it, thrown it aside; and my mind is free from the hindrance of sense desire; and my mind is free from the hindrance of anger; and my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion,” there is an offence entailing expulsion when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied, he knows he is going to lie; while lying, he knows he is lying; after he has lied, he knows he has lied; in misrepresenting his view (of what is true); in misrepresenting his belief (of what is true); in misrepresenting his acceptance (of what is true); in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

Section based on all items is finished

MEANING TO SAY ONE THING, BUT SAYING SOMETHING ELSE

For one who deliberately lies, meaning to say, “I attained the first *jhāna*,” while actually saying,¹ “I attained the second *jhāna*,” when the listener understands there is an offence entailing expulsion when there are three characteristics; when the listener does not understand there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled ... For one who deliberately lies, meaning to say, “I attained the first *jhāna*,” while actually saying, “I attained the third *jhāna* ... the fourth

¹ *vattukama*, cf. *Vism* 522 = *Vb*-a 130. Oldenberg says, *Vin* 3.272, “the MSS. constantly read *vatthukāmo*, *vatthuvīsārakassa*” (below). “I have no doubt that I was right in correcting *vattuk*°, *vattuv*°.” This is borne out by *Vin*-a 500f.

jhāna” ... there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled ... For one who deliberately lies, meaning to say, “I attained the first *jhāna*,” while actually saying, “my mind is free of the hindrance of confusion” ... there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied ... in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

The permutation of one part based on one expanded item is finished

For one who deliberately lies, meaning to say, “I attained the second *jhāna*,” while actually saying, “I attained the third *jhāna* ... the first *jhāna*” ... there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled ...

The contracted permutation based on one expanded item; the root in brief

For one who deliberately lies, meaning to say, “My mind is free of the hindrance of confusion,” while actually saying, “I attained the first *jhāna*” ... there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled ... For one who deliberately lies, meaning to say, “My mind is free of the hindrance of confusion” ... while actually saying, “My mind is free of the hindrance of anger” ... there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled ...

The (section) based on one expanded item is finished

The (sections) based on two items, three items ... ten items are to be done just so. This is the (section) based on all items:

For one who deliberately lies, meaning to say, “I attained the first *jhāna* ... and my mind is free of the hindrance of anger,” while actually saying, “My mind is free of the hindrance of confusion,” when the listener understands there is an offence entailing expulsion when there are three characteristics; when the listener does not understand there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled ... For one who deliberately lies, meaning to say, “I attained the second *jhāna* and the

third *jhāna* and the fourth *jhāna* and the emptiness emancipation ... and *arahantship* and I have given up sense desire, renounced it, let it go, abandoned it, relinquished it, forsaken it, thrown it aside; and I have given up anger ... and I have given up confusion ... and my mind is free from the hindrance of sense desire ... of anger ... of confusion,” while actually saying, “I attained the first *jhāna*,” when the listener understands there is an offence entailing expulsion when there are three characteristics; when the listener does not understand there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled ... For one who deliberately lies, meaning to say, “I attained the third *jhāna* and the fourth *jhāna* ... and my mind is free from the hindrance of confusion and I attained the first *jhāna*,” while actually saying, “I attained the second *jhāna*” ... there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled ... For one who deliberately lies, meaning to say, “My mind is free from the hindrance of confusion and I attained the first *jhāna* and the second *jhāna* and the third *jhāna* and the fourth *jhāna* ... and my mind is free from the hindrance of sense desire,” while actually saying, “My mind is free from the hindrance of anger,” when the listener understands there is an offence entailing expulsion when there are three characteristics; when the listener does not understand there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled ...

The section based on all expanded items is finished. The expanded permutation is finished

GROSS HINTING

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “He who lived in your dwelling attained the first *jhāna* ... is attaining ... has attained ... obtains the first *jhāna* ... masters the first *jhāna* ... has realised the first *jhāna*,” when the listener understands there is a serious offence when three conditions are fulfilled; when the listener does not understand there is an offence of bad conduct when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied ... in misrep-

resenting his sentiment (of what is true) ... For one who deliberately lies, saying, “he who lived in your dwelling attained the second *jhāna* ... the third *jhāna* ... the fourth *jhāna* ... the emptiness emancipation ... *arahantship* ... is attaining *arahantship* ... has realised *arahantship*” ... bad conduct when three conditions are fulfilled ... For one who deliberately lies, saying, “he who lived in your dwelling, that monk has given up sense desire ... has given up anger ... has given up confusion, renounced it, let it go, abandoned it, relinquished it, forsaken it, thrown it aside; that monk has a mind free from sense desire ... free from anger ... free from confusion” ... bad conduct when three conditions are fulfilled ... For one who deliberately lies, saying, “he who lives in your dwelling attained the first *jhāna* in an empty dwelling ... the second *jhāna* ... the third *jhāna* ... the fourth *jhāna* ... is attaining ... has attained ... obtains the fourth *jhāna* in an empty dwelling ... masters ... has realised the fourth *jhāna* in an empty dwelling” ... bad conduct when three conditions are fulfilled ... when seven conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied ... in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

The remainder should be expanded in the same way

For one who deliberately lies, saying, “he who made use of your dwelling ... who made use of your robes ... who made use of your almsfood ... who made use of your lodgings ... who made use of your medicinal requisites for the sick ... who has made use of your dwelling ... who has made use of your robes ... who has made use of your almsfood ... who has made use of your lodgings ... who has made use of your medicinal requisites for the sick ... because of whom you gave a dwelling ... because of whom you gave robes ... because of whom you gave almsfood ... because of whom you gave lodgings ... because of whom you gave medicinal requisites for the sick ... he attained the fourth *jhāna* in an empty dwelling ... he has realised the fourth *jhāna* in an empty dwelling,” when the listener understands there is a serious offence; when the listener does not understand there is an offence of bad conduct when three conditions are fulfilled ...

when seven conditions are fulfilled: before he has lied, he knows he is going to lie; while lying, he knows he is lying; after he has lied, he knows he has lied; in misrepresenting his view (of what is true); in misrepresenting his belief (of what is true); in misrepresenting his acceptance (of what is true); in misrepresenting his sentiment (of what is true).

The abbreviated fifteen are finished

NON-OFFENCE CLAUSE

There is no offence (if one makes the claim) because of overestimation; for one not intending to make a claim; for one who is insane; for one who is deranged; for one who is overwhelmed by pain; for the first offender.¹

CASE RULINGS

MNEMONIC LIST

Because of overestimation, in the wilderness, alms, a preceptor,² behaviour, Fetters, qualities in private, a dwelling, attended on, /
Not difficult, energy, and then of death, fear friend, remorse,³ right,
By energy, by being intent on exertion,⁴ then on feeling, two on enduring, /

¹ Vin-a 502 says that the monks from the banks of the Vaggumuda were beginners, therefore there was no offence for them. ² *Upajjhā*, a short form of *upajjhāya*, found in Vin 1.94; Vin 3.35; at Vin 4.326 *upajjhā* is feminine. ³ *Vippaṭṭisārī*: “strongly remembering something against (oneself), so generally ‘remorse,’” thus GS iii.125, n. 2 (on AN iii.165 = PP 64). Cf. Vin 2.249 = AN iii.197 for the refrain: “there’s no need for remorse in thee,” which is the result of being exhorted on five scores on which no remorse ought to be set up. See GS iii.145. The word is also sometimes translated “regret, repentance.” Although I have translated *kukkuccaṃ* hoti as “was remorseful” and although *kukkucca* and *vippaṭṭisārī* are often found together, I keep “remorseful” also for *vippaṭṭisārī*, for “regret” seems not forceful enough, and “repentance” is now by Westerners associated with “repenting of a sin”—an idea foreign to Buddhism. *Vippaṭṭisārī* comes near to “bad conscience,” which is also remembering something against oneself. Words for conscience are sadly lacking in Pali, but this may be an attempt to express the idea of it, emerging in the sixth century B.C.

Five stories on a brahmin, three on declaring final knowledge,
 House, rejected sense-pleasures, then delight, set out, /
 Bones and lump are both¹ cattle-butchers,
 the morsel is a poultry butcher, the sheep-butcher is flayed,
 The pig-butcher has swords, a deer-hunter knives,
 the torturer arrows, the horse trainer needles, /
 The slanderer is sewn,
 the corrupt magistrate has testicles that are a burden,
 An adulterer is submerged in a pit,
 the eater of dung was a wicked brahmin, /
 The flayed woman was an adulteress,
 the ugly woman was a fortune-teller,
 The sweltering woman scattered coals on a co-wife,
 the beheaded one was an executioner, /
 A monk, a nun, a probationary nun,
 a novice monk, a novice nun,
 These having gone forth in the training of Kassapa
 did bad deeds just then,² /
 The Tapodā in Rājagaha, a fight,
 and on the plunging of elephants,
 The monk Sobhita, *arahant*, can recall five hundred eons.

CASE DETAILS, PART 1

At one time a certain monk declared final knowledge³ because of overestimation. He became anxious, thinking, “The Master has laid down a training rule. Could it be that I have committed an offence entailing expulsion?” He informed the Master ...

“There is no offence, monk, when it is due to overestimation.”

At one time a certain monk lived in the wilderness because he

⁴ These two on feeling, if that means physical pain, seem to be included in the next, “on giving in.” Or, and this is more likely and was suggested by Oldenberg, Vin 3.272, “two stories appear to be wanting”, i.e those corresponding to *ārāḍhanāya* and *vedanāya*. ¹ *Ubho*. ² *Tavade*. ³ *Añña*.

wanted¹ people to esteem him.² People esteemed him. He became anxious ...

“Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion. But, monks, one should not live in the wilderness because of a wish.³ If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a certain monk was going for alms because he wanted people to esteem him. People esteemed him. He became anxious ...

“Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion. But, monks, one should not go for alms because of a wish. If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct.”

4.8.3 At one time a certain monk said to another monk, “Friend, those who are pupils of our preceptor are all *arahants*.” He became anxious ... He informed the Master.

“What was your intention, monk?”

“I wanted to make a claim, Master.”

“Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

1.174 At one time a certain monk said to another monk, “Friend, those who are the students of our preceptor are all of great psychic potency, of great power.” He became anxious ...

“... but there is a serious offence.”

4.8.4 At one time a certain monk walked up and down because he wanted people to esteem him ... stood because he wanted people to esteem him ... sat because he wanted people to esteem him ... laid

¹ *Paṇidhāya*, gerund of *paṇidahati*. Vin-a 502, *patthanam katvā*, making a wish, cf. Ja i.68. For *paṇidhāya*, cf. AN iii.249 = AN iv.461, translated in *Gradual Sayings* as “set on gaining.” SN-a 1.99 on SN i.42 explains *paṇidhāya* by *ṭhapetvā*, establishing.

² Vin-a 502, “May people esteem me living in the jungle as being at the stage of arahanship, or of a learner, then I will become revered by the world, venerated, respected, worshipped. ³ *Vatthabbaṃ*, from √*vas*, to live, to dwell.

down because he wanted people to esteem him. People esteemed him. He became anxious ... He informed the Master ...

“Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion. But, monks, one should not walk up and down ... stand ... sit ... lie down because of a wish. If one does, there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a certain monk claimed a super-human achievement to another monk: “Friend, I have abandoned the fetters.” He became anxious ... He informed the Master ...

“You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk claimed a super-human achievement in private.¹ Another monk, knowing the mind of that monk, rebuked him: “Don’t speak like that, friend, you haven’t got it.” He became anxious ... He informed the Master ...

“Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a certain monk claimed a super-human achievement in private. A god rebuked him: “Bhante,² don’t speak like that, you haven’t got it.” He became anxious ... He informed the Master ...

“Monk, there is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is an offence of bad conduct.”

At one time a certain monk said to a certain lay-follower: “Friend, whatever monk lives in your dwelling is an *arahant*.” Now *he* lived in that dwelling.³ He became anxious ...

“What was your intention, monk?”

“I wanted to make a claim, Master.”

¹ According to Vin-a 503 he said, “I am an *arahan*,” but as he did this not (really) believing it in his mind (*na manasā cintitaṃ*), it was a *dukkāṭa* offence. ² Note the way a fellow-monk uses *āvuso* in addressing a monk, while a non-monk, lay people, and, as here, a *devatā*, use *bhante*, honoured sir. ³ I.e., the lay-follower’s.

“There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk said to a certain lay-follower: “Friend, the one you attend on with the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings and medicines for the sick, he is an *arahant*.” Now he was the one who was attended on with those requisites. He became anxious ...

“ ... but there is a serious offence.”

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him: “Venerable Sir, do you have any super-human achievement?”

“Friends, it is not difficult to attain.”

He became anxious and thought, “Those who are true disciples of the Master may speak thus, but I am not such a disciple.¹ Could it be that I have committed an offence entailing expulsion?” He informed the Master.

“What was your intention, monk?”

“I did not intend to make a claim, Master.”

“There is no offence for one who does not intend to make a claim.”²

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him: “Venerable Sir, do you have any super-human achievement?”

“Friends, it is not difficult to declare final knowledge.” He became anxious ... He informed the Master.

“What was your intention, monk?”

“I did not intend to make a claim, Master.”³

“There is no offence for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

¹ = below, **BD 1.180**. ² *Anullapanādhippāyassa*. Vin-a 502 says, *kohaññe icchācāre aṭhatvā*, not wanting to have his needs filled by hypocrisy (or deceit). *Critical Pali Dictionary* gives, “not intending to show off, to impose,” under *anulla*^o. ³ Vin-a 503, “it is not difficult for a virtuous man, who has set insight going to declare profound knowledge, he is competent to attain arahanship.” But this monk did not reckon himself in this category.

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him: “Venerable Sir, do you have any super-human achievement?”

“Friends, an achievement is to be reached by one who is energetic.” He became anxious ... He informed the Master ...

“There is no offence for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him, “Friend, do not be afraid.”

“Friends, I am not afraid of death.” He became anxious ...

“There is no offence for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him: “Friend, do not be afraid.”

“Friends, one who is remorseful¹ might be afraid.” He became anxious ...

“There is no offence for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him: “Venerable Sir, do you have any super-human achievement?”

“Friends, an achievement is to be reached by one who is rightly intent.”² He became anxious ...

“There is no offence for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

At one time a certain monk was ill ...

“Friends, an achievement is to be reached by one who is energetic.”³ He became anxious ...

“There is no offence for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

At one time a certain monk was ill ...

¹ *Vippaṭṭisārī*, cf. above, **BD 1.171, n. 3**. Vin-a 504, “let the monk in whom remorse arises be afraid, but I am not remorseful, the moral precepts are completely pure, why then should I be afraid of death?” ² *Sammā payuttana*. ³ As above, **BD 1.176**.

“Friends, an achievement is to be reached by one who is intent on exertion.”¹ He became anxious ...

“There is no offence for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

4.8.10

At one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him:

“We hope, friend, that you are bearing up, we hope that you are comfortable?”

1.178

“Friends, it is not possible for just anyone to endure this.” He became anxious ... He informed the Master ...

“There is no offence for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

At one time a certain monk was ill ...

“Friends, it is not possible for an ordinary person to endure this.”² He became anxious ...

“Monk, what was your intention?”

“I intended to make a claim, Master.”

“There is no offence entailing expulsion, but there is a serious offence.”

4.8.11

At one time a certain brahmin invited the monks: “Let the good sirs, the *arahants*, come.”³

They became anxious and said: “But we are not *arahants*, and yet this brahmin addresses us as if we were. What should we do?” They informed the Master.

“Monks, there is no offence in regard to what is spoken in faith.”

1.179

At one time a certain brahmin invited the monks: “Let the good sirs, the *arahants*, be seated ... Let the good sirs, the *arahants*, eat ...

¹ *Yuttayoga*. This word also occurs at Ja i.65 and is translated “devout” (*Buddhist Birth Stories*, second edition, p.178). *Yuñjati* (of which *yutta* is past participle) occurs at Ja iv.131, Ja v.369, with *ghaṭati vāyamati*, all meaning to strive, to endeavour. *Yoga* (*yogyā*) has sense of “fit for.” ² Vin-a 504, surrounding him. ³ *āyantu*, from *ā + √i* and meaning *āgacchantu*. Vin-a 504, “Whoever said this would also have said: ‘Prepare seats for all the *arahans*, give water for washing the feet, let the *arahans* wash their feet.’”

Let the good sirs, the *arahants*, be satisfied ... Let the good sirs, the *arahants*, go” ...

They became anxious and said ...

“Monks, there is no offence in regard to what is spoken in faith.”¹

At one time a certain monk claimed a super-human achievement to another monk: “Friend, I have abandoned the corruptions.” He became anxious ...

“You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk ... “Friend, I have these qualities.” He became anxious ...

“You, monk, have committed an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time a certain monk ... “Friend, I conform to these qualities.” He became anxious ...

“You, monk, have committed an offence entailing expulsion.”

At one time the relations of a certain monk said to him: “Come, bhante, live in a house.”

“Friends, one like me is incapable of living in a house.” He became anxious ...

¹ *Pasādabhaññe*. Apart from the meaning of this very rare word, it is noteworthy that it is in the locative, instead of, as is usually the case after *āpatti* and *anāpatti*, in the genitive. Vin-a 504 says, “The meaning being: instigated (*samussāhitassa*) through his own power of faith, being one who goes by faith.” Cf. for *bhaññā* (for which *Pali-English Dictionary* refers to *bhā*) Ja v.317, Ja v.318. The former of these passages reads *bhaññam* with variant reading *hamñam*, *bhuñjam*, and the latter explains by saying *bhā tiratanass’ etaṃ nāmaṃ*. But I think that here *bhaññā* derives from $\sqrt{bhāṣ}$, to speak, and not from $\sqrt{bhās}$, to shine. At AN ii.31; SN iii.72; MN iii.78 we find *Ukkalā vassa-bhaññā*. ks iii.63 translates *vassa-bhaññā* as “preachers in retreat”—i.e., during *vassa*, the rains. But SN-a ii.279 says *vasso ca Bhañño ca*, and evidently means that these are names of people in certain districts, like *Ukkala-janapada-vāsino*; while MN-a iv.136 declares this to be the case: *Vasso ca Bhañño cā ti dve janā*. Cf. *Points of Controversy* 95, n. 2. I do not, however, think that the *pasāda-bhaññe* of Vinaya above can refer to the *Bhañña* people.

“There is no offence, monk, for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

At one time the relations of a certain monk said to him: “Come, bhante, enjoy the pleasures of the senses.”

“Friends, the pleasures of the senses have been rejected by me.”¹

He became anxious ...

“There is no offence, monk, for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

At one time the relations of a certain monk said to him: “Come, bhante, enjoy yourself.”²

“Friends, I am enjoying myself with the highest enjoyment.”³

He became anxious, thinking: “Those who are true disciple of the Master may speak thus, but I am not such a disciple.⁴ Could it be that I have committed an offence entailing expulsion?” He informed the Master.

“Monk, what was your intention?”

“I did not intend to make a claim, Master.”

“There is no offence for one who does not intend to make a claim.”

At one time a number of monks entered the rains in a certain monastery, making this agreement: “Whoever sets out from this monastery first, we will know as an *arahant*.”

A certain monk thought, “let them know me as an *arahant*,” and he set out first from that monastery. He became anxious. He informed the Master ...

“You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing expulsion.”

¹ Vin-a 505, *āvaṭā ti āvāritā nivāritā paṭikkhittā ti attho*. Had they in truth been rejected he would have been an arahant. Before they attained this supreme state, monks were not indifferent to the beauties of nature, as for example some of the Theragāthā show. ² On *abhirati* and *abhiramati* see above, **BD 1.114**. ³ Vin-a 505, “the monk says, ‘Because there is no lack of exposition and questionings on the teaching, and because I enjoy this state of things, I say I am enjoying myself with the highest enjoyment.’” ⁴ =above, **BD 1.175**.

At one time¹ the Buddha, the Master, was staying at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. Now at that time Venerable Lakkhaṇa² and Venerable Mahāmoggallāna were staying on Mount Vulture's Peak. Then, in the morning, Venerable Mahāmoggallāna dressed, took his bowl and robe, approached Venerable Lakkhaṇa and said: "Friend Lakkhaṇa, let us enter Rājagaha for alms."

"Yes, friend," Venerable Lakkhaṇa replied.

Then, as he was descending from Mount Vulture's Peak, Venerable Mahāmoggallāna smiled at a certain place. Venerable Lakkhaṇa said to him: "Friend, why are you smiling?"

"This is not the right time, friend, for this question. Ask me in the presence of the Master."

Then, after their meal and after returning from alms-round, Venerable Lakkhaṇa and Venerable Mahāmoggallāna approached the Master and sat down to one side. Venerable Lakkhaṇa then said to Venerable Mahāmoggallāna:

"Just now, as the Venerable Mahāmoggallāna was descending from Mount Vulture's Peak, he smiled at a certain place. Why, friend, did you smile?"

"As I was coming down from Mount Vulture's Peak, I saw a skeleton flying through the air,³ and vultures, crows and hawks⁴ were in

¹ SN ii.254–262 from here to end of Bu-Pj 4.9.3 below. ² Vin-a 506 = SN-a ii.216, "He from among a thousand Jaṭilas (matted hair ascetics) received the 'Come, monk' for *upasampadā* ordination. He attained arahanship at the end of the Discourse on Burning. He should be called one great disciple (*eko mahā-sāvako*). Inasmuch as he is endowed with this mark and is possessed of a Brahma-like existence, he is called Lakkhaṇa. Mahā-Moggallāna, the second great disciple, attained arahanship on the seventh day after he had gone forth into homelessness." This mention of Moggallāna as second to Lakkhaṇa is curious, for in the Suttas he is only ever linked with Sāriputta. See Vin 1.33ff. for the story of the conversion of the Jaṭilas. ³ *Vehāsaḡata*, or going above ground, cf. above, BD 1.79, n. 7. ⁴ Vin-a 507 calls these *yakkha* vultures, *yakkha* crows and *yakkha* hawks, probably meaning that these birds eat flesh. Cf. the predatory *yakkhas*, above, BD 1.146.

close pursuit, striking it¹ between the ribs,² while it uttered cries of distress. Then, friend, I thought how amazing and astounding it is that such a being should exist, such a spirit, such a state of existence.”³

The monks criticized and denounced him: “Venerable Mahā-moggallāna is claiming a super-human achievement.”⁴

Then the Master addressed the monks:

Monks, there are disciples who possess vision and knowledge,⁵ such that they can see, know and witness such a thing. Previously I too have seen that being, but I didn’t speak about it. If I had, others would not have believed me and that would have been for their harm and suffering for long time. That being, monks, was a cattle butcher⁶ in this very Rājagaha. As a result of his deeds he was tormented⁷ in

¹ *Vitudenti*. Vin-a 507 reads *vituddhenti tī vinivijjhivā gacchanti vitudentī ti* (variant reading *vitudentī ti*) *vā pāṭho*. SN ii.255 reads *vitacchenti vibhajenti*, as in the cases below, with variant reading *vitudenti* for *vitacchenti* and omitting *vibhajenti*. ² *Pā-suḷa*, with variant reading *pāsula*; SN ii.255 reads *phāsula*. ³ *Attabhāvapaṭilābha*.

⁴ Omitted at SN ii.255. ⁵ *Cakkhubhūta*, *bhūta* being past participle of *bhavati*. At AN v.226 the *tathāgata* is called *cakkhubhūto nāṇabhūto* (as above) and *dhamma-bhūto brahmabhūto*, translated at GS v.157 “he has become the eye, he has become knowledge,” etc. Vin-a 508 says, *cakkhubhūtaṃ jataṃ uppannaṃ tesaṃ ti cakkhubhūtaṃ, bhūtacakkhukā uppannacakkhukā. Cakkhuṃ uppadevva viharanti dutiyapade pi es’eva nayo*. AN-a on AN v.226) (Siamese edition) says, *cakkhubhūto ti cakkhu viya bhūto nibbato. Nāṇabhūto ti nāṇasabhāvo*. (AN-a also explains *bhūta* in *dhamma°* and *brahma°* by *sabhāva*.) ⁶ Vin-a 508, “at the time of his passing from the Pit (*naraka*) his outward appearance was a mass of bones ... he has arisen as a departed one (*petā*) who is a skeleton.” Of his deeds, *tassa kamma* explained *Tassa nānācetanāhi āyūhi tassa aparāpariyakamma*. ⁷ *paccitvā*, passive of *pacati*. *Paccati* is literally to be boiled or cooked, *Pali-English Dictionary* saying, “Nearly always applied to the torture of boiling in *niraya*, where it is meant literally.” But I think that the idea (found in the active) of ripening and maturing for the next rebirth is also intended. The context brings out this point. One was not condemned to eternal damnation. Vin-a 508 also emphasises this by saying that through what remained of the result of his deeds after his reinstatement (*paṭisandhi*) in *naraka*, he took on reinstatement again-among the *petas*. I have translated *paccitvā* literally, since for lack of an English word to express the idea of being boiled to a ripeness which entails a change, it seems to me preferable to “has been punished” (KS ii.170), as this conveys the idea still less of the past deeds maturing until the individual is ready for a new rebirth.

hell for many years, for many hundreds of years, for many thousands of years, for many hundreds of thousands of years. And now, because of the remaining result of his actions, he is experiencing such a state of existence. Moggallāna spoke truly. There is no offence for Moggallāna.”¹

“As I was coming down from Mount Vulture’s Peak, I saw a lump of flesh flying through the air, and vultures, crows and hawks were in close pursuit, tearing at it and pulling it to pieces, while it uttered cries of distress.” ...

“Monks, that being was a cattle-butcher in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down from Mount Vulture’s Peak, I saw a morsel of flesh flying through the air, and vultures, crows and hawks were in close pursuit, tearing at it and pulling it to pieces,² while it uttered cries of distress.” ...

“Monks, that being was a poultry butcher³ in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down from Mount Vulture’s Peak, I saw a flayed man flying through the air, and vultures, crows and hawks were in close pursuit, tearing at him and pulling him to pieces, while he uttered cries of distress.” ...

“Monks, that being was a sheep-butcher⁴ in this very Rājagaha. ...”

¹ Omitted at SN ii.256. ² Cf. MN i.364, where the simile is possibly taken from this Vinaya passage. MN i.364 reads, *vitaccheyyumaṃ virajeyyumaṃ*, translated *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.261, “to tear and rend it.” *Virajenti* is a variant reading for *vibhajenti* at both Vin 3.105 above and SN ii.256, and it would not seem unintelligible in these contexts. ³ Vin-a 509, “at the time of his passing from the Pit (*naraka*) his outward appearance was a piece of flesh, therefore he arose as a departed one who is a piece of flesh.” ⁴ *orabbhika*, Vin-a 509, *eḷake vidhitvā*, having skinned them during his life, afterwards his appearance was that of a skinless ram’s body, and therefore he has arisen as a departed one who is flayed (*nicchavipeto*).

“As I was coming down from Mount Vulture’s Peak, I saw a man who had body hairs of swords flying through the air. Again and again those sword went in and out of his body, while he uttered cries of distress.” ...

“Monks, that being was a butcher of pigs¹ in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down ... I saw a man with body hairs of knives flying through the air. Again and again those knives went in and out of his body, while he uttered cries of distress.” ...

“Monks, that being was a deer-hunter² in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down ... I saw a man with body hairs of arrows flying through the air. Again and again those arrows ...

“Monks, that being was a torturer³ in this very Rājagaha. ...”

As I was coming down ... I saw a man with body hair of needles flying through the air. Again and again those needles ...

“Monks, that being was a horse trainer⁴ in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down ... I saw a man with body hairs of needles flying through the air. Those needles pierced his head and came out

¹ He killed the pigs with swords, thus his outward appearance is the state of having drawn swords, thus he has arisen as a departed one who has swords for hair.

² His outward appearance is a state of being struck with knives, because he killed the deer with knives. ³ *Kāraṇika*, but judge at KS ii.171, which has note “cruel to criminals.” According to the Commentaries “a man causing death, shooting with arrows,” *kaṇḍena vijjhitva*. Hence possibly the confusion, *Pali-English Dictionary*, referring only to SN ii.257, and saying, “*usu*°, however, used simply in the sense of making: arrow-maker, fletcher.” ⁴ *sārathi*. SN ii.257 reads, *sūcako* here as in the next example. Translator at KS ii.172 suggests *sūto* for *sūcako*. Both words, according to *Pali-English Dictionary*, mean charioteer or coachman, but Vin-a 509 and SN-a ii.220 (under *sūto*, with note that title in text *sūci-sārathi*) speak of horse-tamer, cow-tamer.

through his mouth, entered his mouth and came out through his breast, entered his breast and came out through his stomach, entered his stomach and came out through his thighs, entered his thighs and came out through his calves, entered his calves and came out through his feet, while he uttered cries of distress.” ...

“Monks, that being was a slanderer in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down ... I saw a man who had testicles like pots¹ flying through the air. When he walked, he had to lift his testicles on to his shoulder, when he sat down he sat on top of his testicles. Vultures, crows and hawks were in close pursuit, tearing at him and pulling him to pieces, while he uttered cries of distress.” ...

“Monks, that being was a corrupt magistrate in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down ... I saw a man, head and all, submerged in a dung-pit ...”

“Monks, that being was an adulterer in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down ... I saw a man, head and all, submerged in a dung-pit and eating dung with both hands ...”

“Monks, that being was a wicked brahmin in this very Rājagaha. At the time of Kassapa, the fully Awakened One, he invited the Sangha of monks to a meal. He filled a trough with dung, announced the time and said: ‘Sirs, eat as much as you like and take the rest away with you.’ ...”

¹ *kumbhaṇḍa*. Note word-play on *aṇḍa*. Vin-a 510 = SN-a ii.220 says, *kumbhamattā mahāghaṭappamāṇā aṇḍā ahesuṃ*, while Ja iii.147 defines as *kumbhamattarahassa-aṅgā mahodarā yakkhā*. Our Commentaries say that as he had made others suffer by his secret wrong-doing, so now he suffers in his secret organs. At DN-a i.73 a *kumbhaṇḍa* is placed on the back of a horse as a sign of instability. *Kumbhaṇḍi* at Vism 183, in connection with *latā*, creeper, translated “pumpkin.” This is evidently the secondary meaning of the word.

“As I was coming down ... I saw a flayed woman flying through the air. Vultures ... were pulling her to pieces, while she uttered cries of distress ...”

“Monks, this woman was an adulteress¹ in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down ... I saw a foul-smelling and ugly woman flying through the air. Vultures ... were pulling her to pieces ...”

“Monks, that woman was a fortune-teller² in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down ... I saw a woman who was roasting, sweltering and sooty³ flying through the air ... while she uttered cries of distress.” ...

“Monks, this woman was the chief queen of the King of Kālinga. Being the jealous sort, she threw out her rival⁴ and scattered a brazier of burning coals over her. ...”

“As I was coming down ... I saw the headless trunk of a body flying through the air. Its eyes and mouth were on its chest. Vultures ... were pulling it to pieces while it uttered cries of distress.” ...

“Monks, that being was an executioner called Hārīka⁵ in this very Rājagaha. ...”

“As I was coming down ... I saw a monk flying through the air.

¹ Inasmuch as she got her pleasures with other men, not with her own husband, she is reborn flayed so as to undergo a painful contact, being deprived of pleasant touch. Vin-a 510. ² Vin-a 511, deceiving the people by taking gifts of flowers and perfumes from them, saying, “now there will be increase for you.” ³ *upakkam okiliniṃ okiriniṃ*. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 511 says, “she fell on to a heap of coals ... therefore, she is shrivelled by the agonising fires, *okilini*, and her body inflamed, drop upon drop oozing from her body, *okirini*, and surrounded by charcoal; from below the charcoal was on both sides of her, like the red flowers of the *kiṃsuka* tree; the charcoal fell from the air on her.” ⁴ She was a dancer who had pleased the King by massaging him. ⁵ Vin-a 512, for a long time he had beheaded thieves at the king’s command. Therefore he was reborn headless.

His outer robe was ablaze and burning,¹ his bowl was ablaze and burning, his waistband was ablaze and burning, his body was ablaze and burning, and he was uttering cries of distress.” ...

“Monks, during the time of the Buddha Kassapa’s dispensation, that monk was a bad monk.”²

“As I was coming down ... I saw a nun ... I saw a probationary nun ... a novice monk ... a novice nun³ flying through the air. Her outer robe was ablaze and burning, her bowl was ablaze and burning, her waistband was ablaze and burning, her body was ablaze and burning, and she was uttering cries of distress. Then, friend, I thought how amazing and astounding it is that such a being should exist, such a spirit, such a state of existence.”

The monks criticised and denounced him: “Venerable Moggallāna is claiming a super-human achievement.”⁴

Then the Master addressed the monks:

“Monks, there are disciples who possess vision and knowledge such that they can see, know and witness such a thing. Previously, monks, I too have seen this novice nun, but I did not speak about it. If I had, others would not have believed me and that would have been for their harm and suffering for long time. During the time of Buddha Kassapa’s dispensation, that novice nun was a bad novice nun. As a result of her deeds, she was tormented in hell for many years, for many hundreds of years, for many thousands of years, for many hundreds of thousands of years. And now, because of the remaining result of her actions, she is experiencing such a state of existence. Moggallāna spoke truly. There is no offence for Moggallāna.”

Then Venerable Mahāmoggallāna addressed the monks:

¹ Quoted at MN-a.i.91, and said to refer to the monk Kapila. Vin-a mentions no names. ² He went about enjoying himself to his heart’s content, therefore he was boiled in hell for an interval between Buddhas, and then arising in a *peta*-world he arose with an existence like a monk. ³ Feminine in Table of Contents, above, **BD 1.172.** ⁴ Omitted at SN ii.261.

“Friends, this stream the Tapodā flows from a lake with beautiful water—cool, sweat and pure—with lovely and charming fords, with an abundance of fishes and turtles, and with blooming lotuses the size of wheels. And yet the Tapodā is hot.”

The monks criticised and denounced him: “How can the Venerable Mahāmoggallāna say, ‘Friends, this stream the Tapodā flows from a lake of beautiful water ... And yet this Tapodā is hot.’ Venerable Mahāmoggallāna is claiming a super-human achievement.” And they informed the Master.

“Monks, the Tapodā flows from a lake of beautiful water ... with blooming lotuses the size of wheels. But the Tapodā runs between the two great hells,¹ that is why it is hot. Moggallāna spoke truly. There is no offence for Moggallāna.”

At one time King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha was defeated in battle with the Licchavis. Then the king collected his armies and beat the Licchavis. Delight about the battle spread about: “The Licchavis were defeated by the king!”

Then the Venerable Mahāmoggallāna addressed the monks:

“Friends, the king was defeated by the Licchavis.”

The monks criticised and denounced him: “How can Venerable Moggallāna say, ‘Friends, the king was defeated by the Licchavis,’ when delight about the battle is spreading about thus: ‘The Licchavis were defeated by the king!’ The Venerable Mahāmoggallāna is claiming a super-human achievement.” They informed the Master.

“Monks, first the king was defeated by the Licchavis and then, after he had collected his army, the king beat the Licchavis. Moggallāna spoke truly. There is no offence for Moggallāna.”

Then the Venerable Mahāmoggallāna addressed the monks:

¹ Tapoda means “boiling waters.” Vin-a 512, says, “they say that the town of Rajagaha is near the world of the departed, and this Tapoda comes there between the two great red pits of the hells.” Cf. below, **BD 1.274, n. 6**. At AN v.196 Ānanda and the wanderer Kokanuda went to this river to bathe their limbs.

“Friends, after attaining an imperturbable *samādhi* on the banks of the river Sappinikā,¹ I heard the noise of elephants plunging in, emerging and trumpeting.”²

The monks criticised and denounced him: “How can Venerable Mahāmoggallāna say such a thing. He is claiming a super-human achievement.” They informed the Master.

“Monks, there is such a *samādhi*, but it is not wholly purified.”³ Moggallāna spoke truly. There is no offence for Moggallāna.”

Then the Venerable Sobhita⁴ addressed the monks: “Friends, I can recall five hundred eons.”

The monks criticised and denounced him: “How can Venerable Sobhita say, ‘I can recall five hundred eons’? He is claiming a super-human achievement.” They informed the Master.

“Monks, Sobhita has this ability, and that was just one birth. Sobhita spoke truly. There is no offence for Sobhita.”

The fourth offence entailing expulsion is finished

Venerables, the four rules entailing expulsion have been recited. If a monk commits any one of them, he is no longer in communion

¹ Mentioned also at SN i.153; AN ii.29, AN ii 176, Sappinī; at AN i.185, Sappinikā; cf. also *Vinaya Texts* i.254, n. 2. Usually translated the “Snake River.” The wanderers had a park on its banks. It was near Rājagaha. ² Vin-a 513, “plunging down into the deep water, and bathing and drinking there, and taking up water with their trunks, they mingle together and cross over.” ³ *parisuddha*. Vin-a 513f. “They say that the *thera* attained arahanship on the seventh day after he went forth, and had mastery in the eight attainments, but not having purified himself well in the obstructions to contemplation ... and rising up from musing and hearing the sound of the elephants, he heard it between the attainments. Of this he was aware.” ⁴ AN i.25 says, that he is the chief of the monks remembering his former rebirths. In his verses, Thag 165, Thag 166, he twice repeats that he remembered five hundred *kalpas* in a single night. At Atthasālinī 32 he is said to be the third in the line of *theras* who conveyed the Abhidhamma up to the time of the Third Council.

with the monks. As before,¹ so after, he is expelled and not in communion. In regard to this 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 and therefore silent. I will remember it thus.

Sexual intercourse, stealing, person, super,
the four offences entailing expulsion,
the foundation is cut² without a doubt.

The chapter on offences entailing expulsion is finished

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i.5, n. 2, says that the phrase *yathā pure tathā pacchā* “probably means that the monk is irrevocably defeated. He must remain for ever in the condition (of permanent exclusion from the Order) into which he has brought himself.” Vin-a 516 says, “as in his time as a householder, at the time when he was not (yet) ordained, and as after when he has fallen into defeat, he is not in communion; there is not for him communion with the monks at the *Uposatha* (observance-day), the *pavaraṇā* (ceremony at the end of the rains), under the rule of the *Pātimokkha*, or at the legal acts of the Order.” ² *Chejjavatthu*. See *chejja* (√ched) above, **BD 1.75**, meaning maiming.

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 1

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. Now at that time the venerable Seyyasaka¹ led the Brahma-life, dissatisfied.² Because of this he was thin, wretched, his colour bad, yellowish, the veins showing all over his body.³ The venerable Udāyin saw the venerable Seyyasaka thin, wretched, his colour bad, yellowish, his veins showing all over his body. Seeing him thus, he said to the venerable Seyyasaka: "Reverend Seyyasaka, why are you thin, wretched ... the veins showing all over your body? Perhaps it is that you, reverend Seyyasaka, lead the Brahma-life, dissatisfied?"

"It is so, your reverence," he said.

"Now then, you, reverend Seyyasaka, eat as much as you like, sleep as much as you like, bath⁴ as much as you like: eating as much as you like, sleeping as much as you like, bathing as much as you like, if dissatisfaction arises in you and passion assails⁵ your heart, then

¹ At Vin 2.7ff. he is represented as being tiresome in various ways. ² *anabhirato* see above, BD 1.114, for discussion on this term. Vin-a 517 says on this term, *vikkhittacitto kāmarāgaparilāhena pariḍayhamāno na pana gihbhāvam patthayamāno*, upset in his mind, burning with a fever of passion and sense-desires, but not wanting the household state. ³ Stock-phrase. ⁴ Vin-a 517, anointing the body with clay, rubbing on chunam. ⁵ A stock-phrase, *rāgo cittaṃ anuddhamseti*, as at MN i.26; SN i.186; AN ii.126. Vin-a 518 says, *kāmarāgo cittaṃ dhamseti padhamseti vikkhipati c'eva milāpeti ca*. MN-a 1.142 explains *anuddhamsessati* by *hiṃsissati adhibhavissati*.

emit semen using your hand.”¹

“But, your reverence, are you sure that it is suitable to act like this?”

“Yes, your reverence, I do this.”

Then the venerable Seyyasaka ate as much as he liked, slept as much as he liked, bathed as much as he liked; but having eaten as much as he liked, slept as much as he liked, bathed as much as he liked, dissatisfaction arose, and passion assailed his heart, so he emitted semen using his hand. Then in a short time the venerable Seyyasaka was nice-looking with rounded features, of a bright complexion and a clear skin. So the monks who were the friends of the venerable Seyyasaka spoke thus to the venerable Seyyasaka:

“Formerly, reverend Seyyasaka, you were thin, wretched, of a bad colour, yellowish, with the veins showing all over your body. But now, at present, you are nice-looking with rounded features, of a bright complexion and a clear skin. Why now, do you take medicine,² reverend Seyyasaka?”

“I do not take medicine, your reverences, but I am eating as much as I like, I am sleeping as much as I like, I am bathing as much as I like; then eating as much as I like, sleeping as much as I like, bathing as much as I like, if dissatisfaction arises in me and passion assails the heart, I emit semen using my hand.”

“But do you, reverend Seyyasaka, eat the gifts of faith³ with the very same hand as that which you use to emit semen?”

“Yes, your reverences,” he said.

Those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed and angry, saying:

¹ Vin-a 518, “Thus will your mind become one-pointed. The teacher is said to have taught this.” At Vin-a 517 it is said that Seyyasaka’s teacher is LālUdāyin, “an unsteady monk.” This *thera* LālUdāyin is mentioned at Dh-p-a 2.123 as having the reputation of saying the wrong thing; at Ja 1.123 as coming into conflict with Dabba the Mallian over food-tickets; and at Ja 2.164 as being extremely nervous and unable to talk. ² *bhesajjāṃ karosī*. ³ *saddhā-deyya*, Vin-a is silent, but Dh-p-a 1.81 explains as *kammaṅ ca phalaṅ ca idhalokaṅ ca paralokaṅ ca saddahitvā dinnāni*.

“How can the venerable Seyyasaka emit semen in this way?”

Then these monks, having rebuked the venerable Seyyasaka in various ways, told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the order of monks convened, asked the venerable Seyyasaka:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Seyyasaka, using your hand, emit semen?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: “It is not fit, foolish man, it is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not right, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, emit semen using your hand? Foolish man, have I not uttered *dhamma* in many ways for the stilling of passion,¹ and not for the sake of passion, taught *dhamma* for the sake of being devoid of the fetters, and not for the sake of being bound, taught *dhamma* for the sake of being without grasping,² and not for the sake of grasping? How can you, foolish man, while *dhamma* is taught by me for the sake of passionlessness, strive after passion? How can you, while *dhamma* is taught for the sake of being devoid of the fetters, strive after being bound? How can you, while *dhamma* is taught for the sake of being without grasping, strive after grasping? Foolish man, have I not taught *dhamma* in various ways for the stilling of passion, taught *dhamma* for the subduing of conceit, for the restraint of thirst, for the elimination of attachment, for the cutting through the round of becomings, for the destruction of craving, for passionlessness, for stopping, for waning? Foolish man, have I not declared in various ways the destruction of the pleasures of the senses, declared the full understanding of ideas of the pleasures of the senses, declared the restraint of the thirst for pleasures of the senses, declared the elimination of thoughts of pleasures of the senses, declared the allaying of the fever of pleasures of the senses? Foolish man, it is not for the benefit of unbelievers, nor for increase in the number of believers,

¹ = above, **BD 1.35**, except that in this second passage the lord is represented as speaking. Cf. AN ii.34. ² *Anupādāna, sa-upādāna.*

but it is, foolish man, to the detriment of unbelievers as well as of believers, and it causes wavering in some.”

Then the lord having rebuked the venerable Seyyasaka in various ways on account of his difficulty in maintaining his state ... said:

“... Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

Intentional emission of semen is a matter entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”¹

Thus this course of training for monks was made known to the lord.

Now at that time, monks, having eaten abundant food, went to sleep, thoughtless and careless. While they were sleeping, thoughtless and careless, one of them emitted semen as the result of a dream. These were remorseful and said²: “The course of training made known by the lord says that intentional emission of semen is a matter requiring a formal meeting of the Order; and because of a dream one of us (did this). Now is this intention permitted? What now if we have fallen into an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order?” They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Monks, this was the intention, but it does not apply.³ monks, this course of training should be set forth:

¹ *Sañghādisesa*. Cf. AN ii.242. Vin-a 522 says, *sañgho ādimhi c’ eva sese ca icchitabbo assā ti sañghādiseso*. This explanation was noted by CHILDERS: an offence to be dealt with by a *sañghakamma* in the beginning, *ādi* and in the remaining cases, *sesa*. See below, Old Commentary’s explanation which makes clear the first stage, the placing on probation; the second stage of sending back to the beginning of the probation; the third stage, the *mānatta* discipline; and the last stage, the rehabilitation. This type of offence is next in gravity after the *Pārājikas*. Because it cannot be settled by many people or by one man (Old Commentary) it therefore has to be settled by the Order, which presumably has to be convened for the purpose, as the above incident shows. Editor at *Vinaya Texts* i.7, n. 1, notes that, “these thirteen offences give rise to the various *sañghakammās* ... which are explained in detail in the third Khandhaka of the Cūlavagga.” ² These first sentences recur at [Vin 1.294](#). Cf. Kv 164 where the matter of this story formed the controverted point of one of the early debates on arahans. ³ =above, [BD 1.159](#), and see n. 1.

Intentional emission of semen except during a dream is an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order.”

Intentional means: a transgression committed knowingly, consciously, deliberately.¹

Semen means: there are* ten kinds of semen ...

Emission means: the removal from the place is called emission.

Except during a dream means: setting the dream aside.

Offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order means: the Order places him on probation² on account of the offence, it sends him back to the beginning,³ it inflicts the *mānatta* discipline;⁴ it rehabilitates⁵; it is not many people, it is not one man; therefore it is called an offence which in the earlier as well as the later stages (requires) a formal meeting of the Order. A synonym for this class of offence is a work;⁶ therefore, again, it is called (an offence which in the earlier as well as the later stages requires) a formal meeting of the Order.⁷

¹ = above, [BD 1.126](#), and see n. 3. ² *parivāsaṃ deti*. Cf. [Vin 2.7](#). Rules for monks placed on probation are given at [Vin 2.31ff](#). At [Vin 2.40](#) Udāyin was placed on probation for one day, since he had concealed this first *Saṅghādisesa* for one day. See *Vinaya Texts* ii.384, n. 1, for the four principal kinds of probation, and for Seyyasaka's conduct. At [Vin 1.69](#) it is said that a person who was formerly an adherent of another sect and who asks for ordination should be put on probation for four months, and the measures to be taken for the proper carrying out of this step are stated. Valid and invalid proceedings are given at [Vin 1.320ff](#). ³ I.e., of his probationary term. Cf. [Vin 2.7](#). At [Vin 2.34](#) rules for those thrown back to the beginning are given: they are the same as for those placed on probation. ⁴ This appears to be much like being placed on probation, cf. [Vin 2.35](#). At [Vin 2.45](#) Udāyin underwent *mānatta* for six days. For the correct carrying out of this discipline see below, [BD 1.328](#). ⁵ The way in which a monk should ask for rehabilitation is given at [Vin 2.39](#) and cf. below, [BD 1.328](#). ⁶ *kamma*, possibly meaning *saṅghakamma*: an act or ceremony, for the infliction of the penalty, to be performed by an assembly of monks met together in solemn conclave. Probably *kamma* has here an ancient technical meaning. ⁷ Cf. [Vin 4.225](#), the first *Bhikkhunī-saṅghādisesa*. Here “inflicts *mānatta*” is apparently substituted for “places on probation,” which is not mentioned.

(The whole of **Bu-Ss 1.3**, Vin 3.112–Vin.3.115, because of the outspokenness and crudeness which it contains, and which seems to be inseparable from early literatures, appears unsuitable for incorporation in a translation designed principally for Western readers.)

He aims at it, makes the effort, it is emitted—an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. He aims at it, makes the effort, it is not emitted—a grave offence. He aims at it, does not make the effort, it is emitted—not an offence. He aims at it, does not make the effort, it is not emitted—not an offence. He does not aim at it, he makes the effort, it is emitted—not an offence. He does not aim at it, does not make the effort, it is emitted—not an offence. He does not aim at it, does not make the effort, it is not emitted—not an offence.

There is no offence if he was dreaming, if there was no intentional emission, if he was mad, unhinged, in pain, a beginner.

MNEMONIC LIST

A dream, excrement and urine, reflection,
and about hot water,
Medicine, itching, the way, the bladder,
a hot room for bathing-purposes, making an effort,
And a novice, and asleep, the thigh,
he pressed with the fists,
In the air, firmness, he meditated on,
an aperture, he hit with a stick, /
In the stream, muddy water,
running, a twist of flowers, a lotus,
Sand, mud, water, lying down, and with the thumbs.

At one time while a certain monk was dreaming he emitted semen. He was remorseful and said: “What now if I have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order?” That monk told this matter to the lord. He said: “There is no offence for the monk because he was dreaming.”

(The reasons for not including the remainder of **BD 1.5** in this translation are the same as those for not including **BD 1.3** above.)

Told is the First Offence entailing a formal Meeting of the Order

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 2

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. At that time the venerable Udāyīn lived in the jungle. The dwelling¹ of the venerable one was lovely, good to look upon, beautiful, the inner chamber in the middle was entirely surrounded by the house; the couch and chair, the bolster and pillow were well designed, the water used for drinking and that used for washing were well placed; the cell² was well swept. Many people came to look at the dwelling of the venerable Udāyīn, and a certain brahmin together with his wife approached the venerable Udāyīn, and having approached the venerable Udāyīn, he said: "We want to see the dwelling of the good Udāyīn."

"Do look at it, brahmin," he said, and taking the key, unfastening the bolt, and opening the door,³ he entered the dwelling. The brahmin entered after the venerable Udāyīn, and the brahmin lady entered behind the brahmin. Then the venerable Udāyīn, opening some windows and closing others, going round about the inner room, and

¹ Vihāra. ² *pariveṇa*, see above, **BD 1.119, n. 1.** ³ *Kavāṭaṃ paṇāmetvā*. Cf. **Vin 1.87; Vin 2.114, Vin 2.207** and *Vinaya Texts* iii.88, where in note 1 the translator (rightly) insists that *paṇāmeti* is "to open" and not "to shut." Our passage above is further evidence that this is so. But *Pali-English Dictionary* says "*kavāṭaṃ paṇāmeti*, to shut the door." Possibly it means "to make the door lean," i.e. when open against the wall, when closed against the post.

coming up from behind, rubbed up against¹ the brahmin lady limb by limb. Then the brahmin, having exchanged greetings with the venerable Udāyin, went away. Then the brahmin, who was pleased, burst out with a cry of pleasure:² “Superb are these recluses, sons of the Sakyans; who dwell in such a jungle, superb is the revered Udāyin who dwells in such a jungle.”

Having spoken thus, the brahmin lady said to the brahmin:

“What is there superb about him? Even as you rubbed up against me limb by limb, so did this recluse Udāyin rub up against me limb by limb.”

Then the brahmin became annoyed, vexed, angry and said:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans,³ are shameless, of low morality, liars. And they pretend to be walking by *dhamma*, walking by right, leading the Brahma-life, speaking truth, virtuous, of good conduct. Among these there is no recluseship, among these there is no brahmanhood. Perished is recluseship among these, perished is brahmanhood among these. Where is recluseship among these? Where is brahmanhood among these? Fallen from recluseship are these, fallen from brahmanhood are these. How can this recluse Udāyin rub up against my wife limb by limb? It is not possible to go to the park or dwelling with wives of respectable families, with daughters of respectable families, with girls of respectable families,⁴

¹ *parāmasi*, see below, **BD 1.203**, and **n. 6**. This “rubbing up against” was not, I think, an act of deliberate familiarity or meant offensively. In the tiny cell-room Udāyin just rubbed up against the visitors, as we might rub up against people in a crowd—in a bus or train or queue. ² *attamano attamanavācaṃ nicchāresi* = MN i.32 and MN i.509 (*nicchāreyya*). Vin-a is silent. MN-a 1.151 says: *attamano ti sakamano tuṭṭhamano; pītisomanassehi va gahitamano. Attamanavācaṃ nicchāresi ti attamanatāya vācaṃ, attamanabhāvassa vā yuttavācaṃ nicchāresi. Udīrayi, pabyāharī ti vuttam hoti.* ³ As above, **BD 1.125**, and below, **BD 1.223**. ⁴ These two are probably meant to be opposed. Buddhaghosa calls *kuladhītā*, *purisantaram gatā*, and *kulakumāriyo, aniviṭṭhā* (unsettled).

with daughters-in-law¹ of respectable families, with women-slaves of respectable families. If wives of respectable families, daughters of respectable families, girls of respectable families, daughters-in-law of respectable families, women-slaves of respectable families should go to a park or dwelling, the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, may assault them.”

The monks heard this brahmin as he was grumbling, murmuring, and becoming angry. Those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed, angry and said: “How can the reverend Udāyin come into bodily contact with women-kind?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, for this reason, causing the Order of monks to be convened, asked the reverend Udāyin:

“Is it true as they say, Udāyin, that you came into bodily contact with a woman?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

Then the enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“It is not right, foolish man, it is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not fit in a recluse, it is not proper, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, come into bodily contact with a woman? Foolish man, is not *dhamma* uttered by me in various ways for the sake of stilling passion, and not for the sake of passion ... declared the allaying of the flames of the pleasures of the senses? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers ... Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, affected by desire,² with perverted³ heart,

¹ *Kulasuṇhā*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives *suṇhā* under *sunīṣa*. At *Vinaya Texts* ii.348 it is translated “sisters-in-law.” CHILDERS gives daughter-in-law. Vin-a 532 says, “brought from another family for the young men of respectable families, they are *vadhuyo*,” which is daughters-in-law. And indeed a daughter-in-law held a more important position in the social system than did a sister-in-law. ² *Otiṇṇa*, as passive: possessed by. See Old Commentary’s explanation below in **Bu-Ss 2.2.1**. The translators in *Vinaya Texts* i.7, n. 2 say, “our word ‘degraded’ has often a very similar connotation.” They render *otiṇṇa* by “degraded”. Cf. below, **BD 1.215**. ³ *Vipariṇatena*, literally changed. Cf. below, **BD 1.215**.

should come into¹ physical contact with a woman, holding her hand, or holding a braid of her hair, or rubbing against any one or other of her limbs: this is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

Whatever means: he who ...

Monk means: ... this is how monk is to be understood in this sense.

Affected by desire means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.²

Perverted means: the perverted heart is impassioned, the perverted heart is corrupt, the perverted heart is erring. And in this meaning it is to be understood that the perverted heart is impassioned.³

Woman means: a human woman, not a female *yakkha*, not a female departed one, not a female animal,⁴ even a girl born on this very day, all the more an older one.⁵

Together with means: together.

Should come into physical contact means: it is called a trans-

¹ *Samāpajjeyya* = *saṃ + āpajjati*, Sanskrit. *āpadyate* = *ā + pad*, to get into, to come into, to meet with. *Sam + ā* (as here) very often pleonastic. Although *samāpajjati* does not, in the above context, necessarily imply deliberate action, coming into physical contact with a woman was nevertheless regarded as an offence of a serious nature, because the desires possibly resulting from such a contact had to be suppressed. For in a growing vogue of monasticism the majority of members were perhaps young and middle-aged men. Cf. below, [BD 1.338](#). ² =below, [BD 1.215](#). ³ =below, [BD 1.215](#). ⁴ =below, [BD 1.215](#). ⁵ *Mahattarī*. This is comparative of *mahant*. The Sanskrit form is *mahattarā*, but Pali has *-ī*, after *therī*. Same definition occurs below, [BD 1.332](#).

gression.¹

The hand means: going up from the tip of the nail as far as the elbow.

Braid of hair means: nothing but hair,² or mixed with threads,³ or mixed with garlands,⁴ or mixed with gold coins,⁵ or mixed with gold,⁶ or mixed with pearls, or mixed with jewels.⁷

A limb means: setting to one side a hand and a braid of hair, what remains is called a limb.

Rubbing, rubbing up against, rubbing downwards, rubbing up-

¹ *Ajjhācāra*, cf. *ajjhācarati* (*adhy-ā + √car*) to practise (something bad). Used in Vinaya in the sense of a fault, a transgression; then in an erotical sense as above, and cf. below, **BD 1.216**. It could not there be used in sense of contact, for the speech, not the body, was at fault. Vin-a 533 says, “whatever is called physical contact (cf. Vin-a 547, “offensive speech”) according to that meaning it is a transgression.” Cf. also Vin-a 213, “she, because of his transgression, became pregnant.” Vin-a 19 says, “he disciplines body and speech through the restraint of transgressions of body and speech.” At **Vin 1.63** we get *adhisile sīlavipanno hoti ajjhācāre ācāravipanno hoti atiditṭhiyā ditṭhivipaṇṇo hoti*. Here *ajjhācāre* (indeclinable) means according to *Critical Pali Dictionary*, “in matter of conduct” as *adhisile* means not “in the higher morality,” but “as to a matter of morality.” *Vinaya Texts* i.184, n. 1, points out that there Buddhaghosa says that *adhisile* “is said with regard to offences against the Defeat and Formal Meeting rules, while *ajjhācāre* consists in offences against the minor rules of the Pātimokkha.” But below, **BD 1.211**, “to come into physical contact,” which above is called a transgression, is there (below) called a Formal Meeting offence. ² I.e., unmixed with threads, Vin-a 533. ³ I.e., the hair mixed with threads of five colours. ⁴ I.e., with jasmine flowers, and so on. ⁵ On *hirañña* and *suvaṇṇa* see above, **BD 1.28**. Here Vin-a 534 says that *hiraññaṃmiṣṣa* means mixed with garlands and *kahāpaṇas*; and *suvaṇṇaṃmiṣṣa* means mixed with golden *cīraka* and with *pāmaṅga*. Here *suvaṇṇacīraka* probably means gold threads or bands or fillets (cf. Ja 5.197 where *suvaṇṇacīraka* seems to mean gold brocade). On *pāmaṅga*, cf. above, **BD 1.77**. ⁶ See previous note. ⁷ With jewels strung on threads.

wards,¹ bending down, raising up, drawing to, pushing back, holding back hard, taking hard hold of, the grasp, the touch.

Rubbing is called merely rubbed. **Rubbing up against** is called moving from here and there. **Rubbing downwards** is called bringing down low. **Rubbing upwards** is called raising up high. **Bending down** is called lowering. **Bending up** is called raising up high. **Drawing to** is called pulling. **Pushing back** is called sending back. **Holding back hard**² is called holding back having taken hold of a limb. **Taking hard hold of** is called taking hold together with someone. **Grasp** is called merely taken. **Touch** means merely contact.

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: ... therefore it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there is a woman, and thinking her to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated, and rubs the woman's body with his body, rubs up against it, rubs it downwards, rubs it upwards, bends it down, raises it up, draws it to, pushes it back, holds it back hard, takes hold of it hard, grasps it, touches it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there is a woman, and being doubtful, if the monk is infatuated, and rubs the woman's body with his body, rubs up against it ... touches it, there is a grave offence.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be an eunuch, if the monk is infatuated ... grave offence.

¹ These four words: *āmasanā*, *parāmasanā*, *omasanā*, *ummasanā* are all connected with *masati* from $\sqrt{mrṣ}$, to touch. I have tried to give the force of the prefixes with *masati* by suitable prepositions. *Ā* has the force of "at," therefore *ā-masati*, to stroke at, touch at, although *ā* in itself denotes touch (contact) or a personal (close) relation with the object—so *Pali-English Dictionary*. Cf. below, **BD 1.211**. *Parā* means "over." Note the difference of *o*=*ava* and *ut* in the third and fourth words. There are similar prefixes in some of the following words, meaning "down" and "up." *Parāmasati* at **Vin 2.216** is translated by "wipes" (at *Vinaya Texts* iii.291)—i.e., wipes over, rubs over (the spoon and the dish). Cf. *parāmasati*, above, **BD 1.199**. ² *abhiniggaṇhanā*, while merely "holding back" is *niggaṇhanā*. Also cf. next, *abhinippīlanā* and *nippīlanā*.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a man ... thinking it to be an animal, if the monk is infatuated ... grave offence.

If there is an eunuch, and thinking it to be an eunuch, if the monk is infatuated, and rubs the eunuch's body ... touches it ... grave offence.

If there is an eunuch, and being doubtful ... thinking it to be a man ... thinking it to be an animal ... thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated, and rubs the eunuch's body ... touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing

If there is a man, and thinking it to be a man ... doubtful ... thinking it to be an animal ... thinking it to be a woman ... thinking it to be an eunuch, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the man's body ... touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there is an animal, and thinking it to be an animal ... doubtful ... thinking it to be a woman ... thinking it to be an eunuch ... thinking it to be a man, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the animal's body ... touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Beginning with one

If there are two women, and thinking the two women to be women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the women's bodies ... touches them, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are two women, and being doubtful whether they are two women ... thinking them to be men ... to be eunuchs ... to be animals, if the monk is infatuated and rubs with his body the bodies of the two women ... touches them, there are two grave offences.

If there are two eunuchs, and thinking the eunuchs to be two eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated and rubs their bodies ... touches them, there are two grave offences.

If there are two eunuchs, and being doubtful of their being eunuchs ... thinking them to be men ... to be animals ... to be women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the bodies of the eunuchs ... touches them, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are two men, and thinking the two men to be men, if the

monk is infatuated and rubs the two men with his body ... touches them, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are two men, and being doubtful of their being men ... thinking them to be animals ... to be women ... to be eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the two men with his body ... touches them, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are two animals, and thinking the two animals to be animals ... doubtful ... thinking them to be women ... to be eunuchs ... to be men, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the two animals with his body, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and thinking both to be women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs with his body ... touches them, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and being doubtful, if the monk is infatuated ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and thinking both to be eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated ... there are two grave offences.

If there are a woman and an eunuch and thinking both to be men, if the monk is infatuated ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and thinking both to be animals, if the monk is infatuated ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are a woman and a man, and thinking both to be women, if the monk is infatuated ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are a woman and a man, and being doubtful of both ... thinking them to be eunuchs ... to be men ... to be animals, if the monk is infatuated ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are a woman and an animal, and thinking both to be

women, if the monk is infatuated ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and being doubtful of both ... thinking them to be eunuchs ... to be men ... to be animals, if the monk is infatuated ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are an eunuch and a man, and thinking both to be eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are an eunuch and a man, and being doubtful of both ... thinking them to be men ... to be animals ... to be women, if the monk is infatuated ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are an eunuch and an animal, and thinking both are eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there are an eunuch and an animal, and being doubtful of both ... thinking them to be men ... to be animals ... to be women, if the monk is infatuated ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a man and an animal, and being doubtful of both ... thinking them to be animals ... to be women ... to be eunuchs, if the monk is infatuated ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

Beginning with two

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs with his body the woman's article of dress (worn on the body¹) touches it, there is a grave offence.²

If there are two women, and thinking the two women to be women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs with his body an article of dress belonging to the two women ... touches it, there are two grave offences.

¹ *Kāyapaṭibaddha* or ornaments, e.g. rings, Vin-a 536, clothes and flowers, Vin-a 537. Whoso takes several women, encircling them in things to be worn, commits various offences. Cf. below, **BD 1.218**. ² Cf. **Vin 4.214**.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, thinking that both are women if the monk is infatuated and rubs an article of dress of both with his body ... touches them, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there is a woman, thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs his body with the woman's article of dress ... touches it, there is a grave offence.

If there are two women ... there are two grave offences.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there is a woman, thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs (his) article of dress with the woman's article of dress ... touches it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

If there are two women ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it is a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the woman's body with something that may be thrown (aside), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women, and thinking that the two women are women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the bodies of the two women with something that may be thrown² (aside), there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, and thinking both are women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the body of each with something that may be thrown (aside), there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs the woman's article of dress with something that may be thrown (aside), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women, and thinking that the two women are women, if the monk is infatuated and rubs an article of dress belonging to the two women with something that may be thrown (aside),

¹ Cf. Vin 4.214. ² nissaggiya, cf. BD 1.129. Vin-a 540, flowers and fruits; cf. Vin 4.214.

there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and rubs something he has thrown (aside) with something of the woman's which may be thrown (aside), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and eunuch ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

Told is the Monk Repetition

^{5.2,3,5}
^{1.209} If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs the body of the monk with her body, rubs against it, rubs it down wards, rubs it upwards, bends it down, raises it up, draws it to her, pushes it back, holds it back hard, takes hard hold of it, grasps it, touches it; if desiring cohabitation, he exerts his body and recognises the contact, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are two women, and thinking them to be women, if the monk is infatuated and the women rub ... and recognises the contact, there is an offence entailing two formal meetings of the Order.

^{3.125} If there are a woman and an eunuch, and thinking both to be women, if the monk is infatuated and if both rub ... and recognises the contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs with her body the monk's article of clothing ... there is a grave offence.

If there are two women ... there are two grave offences.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk

is infatuated and the woman rubs the monk's body with, her article of dress ... there is a grave offence.

If there are two women ... there are two grave offences.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs the monk's article of dress with her article of dress ... there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women ... there are two offences of wrong doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs the monk's body with something that may be thrown (aside), if desiring cohabitation, he exerts his body and recognises the contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs the monk's article of dress with something that may be thrown (aside) ... and recognises the contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women ... there are two offences of wrong- doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there is a woman, and thinking it to be a woman, if the monk is infatuated and the woman rubs with something that may be thrown (aside) something of the monk's that may be thrown (aside), if desiring cohabitation, he exerts his body but does not recognise the contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If desiring cohabitation, he makes bodily exertion and recognises contact, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If desiring cohabitation, he makes bodily exertion but does not recognise contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If desiring cohabitation, he does not make bodily exertion but recognises contact, there is no offence. If desiring cohabitation, he does not make bodily exertion nor recognises contact, there is no offence.

If desiring emission he exerts his body and recognises contact, there is no offence. If desiring emission, he exerts the body but does not recognise contact, there is no offence. If desiring emission, he does not exert the body but recognises contact, there is no offence. If desiring emission, he does not exert the body and does not recognise contact, there is no offence.

There is no offence if it is not on purpose, not intentional, not knowing, not agreeing, if he is mad, unhinged, in pain, a beginner.¹

MNEMONIC LIST

Mother, daughter, and sister, wife, and female *yakkha*, eunuch, Asleep, dead, an animal, about a wooden doll, / Pressing up to, a bridge, a road, a tree, and a boat, and a cord, A stick, he disclosed the bowl,² in salutation, he exerted himself but did not touch.

Now at that time a certain monk stroked³ a mother⁴ for the sake of a mother's affection ... a daughter for the sake of a daughter's affection ... a sister for the sake of a sister's affection. He was remorseful, and said: "What now if I have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order?" He told this matter to the lord. He said:

¹ Vin-a 541 says that *thera* Udāyin was the first offender, therefore there was no offence for him. ² Cf. *kavāṭaṃ pañāmeti*. See BD 1.199, n. 3, above, and BD 1.213, below. ³ *Āmasi*, see above, BD 1.199, n. 4, and BD 1.203 n. 6. *Āmasi* is the word there translated by "to rub," but there it seems to call for "to stroke." ⁴ Vin-a 541 says "he strokes the mother's body, saying, 'she is my mother.'" In text *āmasi* (he stroked) is not followed by the accusative as is usually the case.

“Monk, this is not an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, it is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at one time a certain monk came into physical contact with his former wife. He was remorseful ...

“You, monk, have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

Now at that time a certain monk came into physical contact with a female *yakkha* ... with a eunuch. He was remorseful ... “Monk, it is not an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, it is a grave offence.”

Now at one time a certain monk came into physical contact with a sleeping woman. He was remorseful ... “Monk, you have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

At one time a certain monk came into physical contact with a dead woman. He was remorseful. “Monk, it is not an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, it is a grave offence.”

Now at one time a certain monk came into physical contact with a female animal¹ ... “Monk, it is not an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, it is an offence of wrong-doing.”,

Now at one time a certain monk came into physical contact with a wooden doll ... “an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at one time many women, pressing up to² a certain monk, led him about arm-in-arm. He was remorseful ... “Did you consent, monk?” he said.

“I did not consent, lord,” he said.

“It is not an offence, monk, as you did not consent,” he said.

¹ *tiracchānagatitthi*, see above, **BD 1.47, n. 4.** ² *sampiḷetvā*, pressing, pinching, or worrying.

Now at one time a certain monk, being infatuated, shook the bridge¹ upon which a woman had ascended. He was remorseful ... “... offence of wrong-doing.”

2.4.7
Now at one time a certain monk seeing a woman whom he met on the way, was infatuated, and gave her a blow on the shoulder. He was remorseful ... “... formal meeting of the Order.”

2.4.8
1.213
Now at one time a certain monk, being infatuated, shook the tree up which a woman had climbed ... the boat in which a woman had embarked. He was remorseful ... “... offence of wrong-doing.”

2.4.9
Now at one time a certain monk, being infatuated, pulled a cord² of which a woman held (the other end). He was remorseful ... “... grave offence,” he said.

Now at one time a certain monk, being infatuated, pulled a stick of which a woman held (the other end). He was remorseful ... “... grave offence,” he said.

2.4.10
Now at one time a certain monk, being infatuated, greeted³ a woman with his bowl. He was remorseful ... “... grave offence,” he said.

2.4.11
¹ Vin-a 546, whether it is a bridge for one passenger, or for waggons, if he succeeds in shaking it or not, it is a *dukkāṭa*. ² *rajjum āviñji*. ³ *pattena paṇāmesi*. In “Table of Contents,” **BD 1.211**, above, this appears as *pattam paṇāmesi*, which at **Vin 2.216** is “uncovered (or disclosed) the bowl.” The translation of this passage at *Vinaya Texts* iii.290 is not accurate; but it means “he presents the bowl with his right hand.” In the above passage it is so curious that *patta* is in the instrumental, as against the more natural accusative that I am inclined to suspect that *añjalim* should have been inserted—then meaning, “he raised his hands together with his bowl in respectful salutation of the woman.” Thus this “greeting with the hands” would be balanced just below by “greeting with the feet.” Commentary is silent. I think that there must be some confusion between *pattam paṇāmeti* and *añjalim paṇāmeti*. Cf. on *kavāṭam paṇāmeti*, above, **BD 1.199, n. 3**.

Now at one time a certain monk, infatuated by a woman who made reverence, raised his foot. He was remorseful ... “... formal meeting of the Order,” he said.

Now at one time a certain monk, saying: “I will take a woman,” exerted himself but did not touch one. He was remorseful ... “... offence of wrong-doing,” he said.

Told is the Second Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 3

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. At that time the venerable Udāyin lived in the jungle. The venerable one's dwelling was lovely, good to look upon, beautiful. At that time many women came to the park¹ in order to see the dwelling. Then those women approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached him, they said to the venerable Udāyin:

“Honoured sir, we want to see the master's dwelling.”

Then the venerable Udāyin, showing these women his dwelling and pointing out² the privies to them, spoke in praise, spoke in blame and begged and implored and asked and questioned and described and exhorted and abused. Those women who had little fear of blame,³ who were sly and who had no shame mocked at the venerable Udāyin, called out to him, laughed at him, made fun of him.⁴ But those women who had shame, upon departing complained to the monks, saying:

“Honoured sirs, this is not suitable, it is not fitting, we should not wish this spoken about even by our husbands, to say nothing of master Udāyin.”⁵

Then those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed and angry and said:

¹ OLDENBERG, Vin 3.274, suggests *araññaṃ agamaṃsu*. ² *ādissa* = *apadisitvā*, Vin-a 546. ³ *chinnikā* = *chinnaottappā*, Vin-a 546. ⁴ *uppaṇḍenti ti paṇḍako ayaṃ nāyaṃ puriso ti*. ⁵ *Kiṃ paṇ' ayyena Udāyina*

“How can the venerable Udāyin offend women with lewd words?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion and in this connection had the company of monks convened and questioned the venerable Udāyin, saying:

“Is it true as is said, Udāyin, that you offended women with lewd words?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“It is not suitable, foolish man, it is not proper, it is not becoming, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is out of place, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, offend women with lewd words? Foolish man, is not *dhamma* uttered in various ways by me for the sake of passionlessness, not for the sake of passion ... proclaimed for the allaying of the flames of pleasures of the senses? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers ... and thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk, affected by desire¹, with perverted heart,² should offend a woman with lewd words concerned with unchastity, as, for example, a youth to a young woman, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.**”

Whatever means: he who ...

Monk means: ... this is how monk is to be understood in this meaning.

Affected by desire means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.³

Perverted means: the perverted heart is impassioned, the perverted heart is corrupt, the perverted heart is erring. And in this meaning it is understood that the perverted heart is impassioned.⁴

Woman means: a human woman, not a female *yakkha*, not a female departed one, not a female animal⁵; she is intelligent, competent to know good and bad speech, what is lewd and what is not lewd.⁶

¹ See above, BD 1.201, n. 1. ² See above, BD 1.201, n. 2. ³ Cf. above, BD 1.202. ⁴ Cf. above, BD 1.202. ⁵ Cf. above, BD 1.202. ⁶ = below, BD 1.337

Lewd speech means: speech connected with privies and with unchastity.

Should offend¹ means: it is called a transgression.²

As, for example, a youth to a young woman means: a lad to a young girl, a boy of tender age to a girl of tender age, a male enjoying sense-pleasures to a female enjoying sense-pleasures.

Concerned with unchastity means: connected with unchaste things.³

A formal meeting of the Order means: ... because of this it is called a formal meeting of the Order.

Pointing out the two privies he speaks in praise, and he speaks in blame, and he begs, and he implores, and he asks, and he questions, and he describes, and he exhorts, and he abuses.

He speaks in praise means: he extols, he praises, he commends

...

He speaks in blame means: he curses, he reviles, he finds fault with ...

He begs means: he says, “give to me, you are worthy to give to me.”

He implores means: he says, “When will your mother be reconciled?⁴ When will your father be reconciled? When will your *devatās* be reconciled? When will there be a good opportunity, a good time, a good moment? When shall I have sexual intercourse with you?”

He asks means: he says, “How do you give to your husband? How do you give to a paramour?”

He questions means: he says, “They say that as you give to your husband so you give to your paramour.”

He describes means: having asked, he says: “Give thus, giving thus you will become dear and beloved to your husband.”

¹ *obhāseyyā ti avabhāseyya ... asaddhammavacanāṃ vadeyya.* ² Cf. above, **BD 1.202**, in explanation of *kāyasamāsagga*. ³ It is difficult to render into English the slight difference of meaning in the Pali: *methunupasaṃhitāhi ti methunadhamma-paṭisaṃyuttāhi*. Cf. below, **BD 1.226**. ⁴ Vin-a 548, “on the reconciliation of your mother I will indulge in sexual intercourse.”

He exhorts means: not having asked, he says: “Give thus, giving thus you will become dear and beloved to your husband.”

He abuses means: he says, “You are without sexual characteristics, you are defective in sex, you are bloodless, your blood is stagnant, you are always dressed, you are dripping, you are a deformed woman,¹ you are a female eunuch, you are a man-like woman, your sexuality is indistinct, you are a hermaphrodite.²

If it is a woman, if he is infatuated thinking her to be a woman, and if the monk, pointing out the two privies to a woman, speaks in praise, speaks in blame ... abuses, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are two women, if he is infatuated thinking them to be women, and if the monk pointing out the two privies to the two women ... it is an offence entailing two formal meetings of the Order.

If it is a woman and an eunuch, if he is infatuated thinking them both to be women, and if the monk pointing out the two privies to both ... there is an offence of wrong-doing with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there is a woman, if he is infatuated thinking her to be a woman, and if the monk leaving out (talk on) the two privies to the woman, pointing out (any part) from below the collar bone to above the knee,³ speaks in praise, and speaks in blame ... and abuses, there is a grave offence.

If there are two women ... there are two grave offences.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there is an offence of wrong-doing together with a grave offence.

If there is a woman, if he is infatuated thinking her to be a woman, and if the monk, pointing out (any part) from below the collar bone

¹ *sikharaṇī*—i.e., probably with certain defects of the pudendum. ² For these abnormalities, cf. same list at [Vin 2.271](#). ³ Cf. [Vin 4.213](#).

to above the knee to the woman, speaks in praise, speaks in blame ... abuses, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

3.3.5 If there is a woman, if he is infatuated thinking her to be a woman, if the monk, pointing out an article of clothing¹ to the woman, speaks in praise ... there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If there are two women ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If there are a woman and an eunuch ... there are two offences of wrong-doing.

3.3.6 There is no offence if he is aiming at (explaining) the meaning,² if he is aiming at (explaining) *dhamma*,³ if he is aiming at (explaining) the teaching, if he is mad, if he is a beginner.⁴

MNEMONIC LIST

3.3.4.1 Red, thick and short, matted, shaggy and long, sown,
I hope the way is at an end, faith, about a gift, about work.

1.219 At one time a certain woman was wearing a newly dyed blanket. A certain monk, being infatuated, said to this woman: "Sister, is that red thing yours⁵?" She did not understand and said:

"Yes, master, it is a newly dyed blanket."

He was remorseful and said; "What now if I have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order?" He told this matter to the lord, who said:

¹ *Kāyapaṭibaddha*, Vin-a 549 says, "a garment or a flower or an ornament," so here not necessarily article of dress. Cf. above, **BD 1.207**. ² *atthapurekkhāra dhammapurekkhāra*. *Attha* and *dhamma* taken together are sometimes rendered "the letter and the spirit" as at AN i.69; cf. "not-*dhamma* and not-*aim*" at GS 5.155. Vin-a 549 says of *attha*°, "telling the meaning of the words or reciting the commentary," and of *dhamma*°, "teaching or reciting the text (*pāḷi*)." ³ See previous note. ⁴ Vin-a 549 again says, Udāyin was the beginner. ⁵ *lohita* is both "blood" and "red."

“Monk, it is not an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, it is an offence of wrong-doing.”

At one time a certain woman was wearing a rough blanket ... said:

“Sister, is that thick, short hair¹ yours?” She did not understand and said:

“Yes, master, it is a rough blanket” ... “... offence of wrong-doing.”

At one time a certain woman was wearing a newly woven² blanket ... and said:

“Sister, is that your matted hair³?” She did not understand and said:

“Yes, master, it is a newly woven blanket.” He was remorseful ... “... offence of wrong-doing.”

At one time a certain woman was wearing a rough blanket ... and said:

“Sister, is that stiff⁴ hair yours?” ...

“Yes, master, it is a rough blanket” ... “... offence of wrong-doing.”

At one time a certain woman was wearing a mantle ... and said:

“Sister, is that long hair yours?” ... “... offence of wrong-doing.”

¹ Vin-a 550, *kakkasaloman ti rassalomaṃ bahulomaṃ*. ² *āvuta* seems to be derived from *āvayati* = *ā + vā*, to weave, a root which has been merged in *ā + vr̥* (*āvarati*), to string on, to fix on. *Āvuta* as “woven” is not given in the *Pali-English Dictionary*

³ Vin-a 550, *ākiṇṇaloman ti jaṭitalomaṃ*. ⁴ Vin-a 550, *kharaloman ti thaddhalomaṃ*.

At one time a certain woman came along having had a field sown.¹
A certain monk being infatuated said to this woman:

“Well, sister, has there been some sowing²?” She, not understanding, said:

“Yes, master, only I have not closed³ the furrow.”

He was remorseful ... “Monk, there is no offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

3.4.7
At one time a certain monk seeing a female wanderer⁴ on the road, and being infatuated, said to this female wanderer:

“I hope, sister, that there is a way at the end?”⁵

She, not understanding, said:

“Yes, monk,⁶ you will follow it.” He was remorseful ... “... grave offence.”

3.4.8
At one time a certain monk, being infatuated, said to a certain woman:

“You are faithful, sister, but you do not give to us what you give to your husband.”

“What is that, sir?” she said.

1.221
“Sexual intercourse,” he said. He was remorseful ... “... an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

¹ Note here the play of the three conjugations: (1) double causative, *vapāpetvā*, having had the sowing done, or having superintended it, (2) simple causative, *vāpitaṃ*, (3) radical verb *paṭi + vuttaṃ* = Sanskrit *praty-upta*, as noted by OLDENBERG, *Vin* 3.274, and by GEIGER, *Pali Grammar* p.72, *Pali Grammar* p.147, and not *prati-vac*, as given in *Pali-English Dictionary Vapāpeti*, *vutta* and *vāpita* are given under *vapati*, to sow. Buddhaghosa at *Vin-a* 550, who naturally attaches the word to *vap*, to sow, has two explanations; one for *udakavappa*, another for *thūlavappa*. ² See previous note. ³ See previous note. ⁴ *paribbājikā*. At *Vin* 4.92 it is a *pācittiya* for a monk to give food to one, at *Vin* 4.285 for a nun to give a robe to one. ⁵ Under *sāmsīdati* the *Pali-English Dictionary*, referring to this passage, takes it to mean that the way (*magga*) is at an end. Buddhaghosa at *Vin-a* 550 has another explanation; indeed, without him we could not understand these puns. ⁶ Note that the female wanderer addresses the monk as *bhikkhu*, while laywomen say *ayya*, master, or *bhante*, honoured sir.

At one time a certain monk, infatuated, said to a certain woman:
“You are faithful, sister, for you do not give us the highest gift.”

“What is the highest gift, sir?” she said.

“Sexual intercourse,” he said. He was remorseful ... “... an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

At one time a certain woman was doing some work. A certain monk, infatuated, said to this woman:

“Stand, sister, I will work” ... “sit, sister, I will work ... lie down, sister, I will work.” She, not understanding ... “... an offence of wrongdoing.”

Told is the Third Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 4

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. At that time the venerable Udāyin was dependent on families, and approached many families. Now at that time there was a certain woman who was a widow, beautiful, good to look upon, lovely. Then the venerable Udāyin, rising early and taking his robe and bowl, came up to this woman's dwelling and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then this woman approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached she greeted the venerable Udāyin and sat down to one side. As she was sitting to one side the venerable Udāyin rejoiced, pleased, gladdened, delighted this woman with talk on *dhamma*. Then this woman having been ... delighted with talk on *dhamma* by the venerable Udāyin, said to the venerable Udāyin:

“Do say, honoured sir, what (will be) of use¹; we are able to give to the master, that is to say, the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings and medicine for the sick.”

“It is not hard, sister, for us to come by those things, that is to say, the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicine for the sick. Give² what is hard for us to come by.”

“What is that, honoured sir?”

“Sexual intercourse,” he said.

“(Will it be) of use,³ honoured sir,” she said.

“(It will be) of use, sister.”

¹ *Yena attho*. Cf. **Vin 3.210** for the same expression. ² *Dehi*. The use of the imperative in such a connection is a very grave thing. ³ *Attho*, to balance *yena attho* above (?).

“Come, honoured sir,” she said, and entering into an inner room, taking off her cloak, she lay back on the couch. Then the venerable Udāyin approached this woman, and having approached her he said:

“Who could touch this evil-smelling wretch¹?” and he departed spitting.²

Then this woman became annoyed, vexed, angry and said:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans³ are shameless, of low morality, liars. And they pretend to be those walking by *dhamma*, walking by right, leading the Brahma-life, speaking truth, virtuous, of good conduct. Among these there is no recluseship, among these there is no brahmanhood. Perished is recluseship among these, perished is brahmanhood among these. Where is recluseship among these? Where is brahmanhood among these? Fallen from recluseship are these, fallen from brahmanhood are these. How can this recluse Udāyin, having himself begged me for sexual intercourse, say: ‘Who could touch this evil-smelling wretch’ and depart spitting? What is bad in me? What is evil-smelling in me? In what am I inferior to whom?”⁴

Other women became annoyed, vexed, angry and said: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are shameless ... How can this recluse Udāyin, having himself begged this (woman) for sexual intercourse, say: ‘Who could touch this evil-smelling wretch?’ and depart spitting? What is bad in her? What is evil-smelling in her? In what is she inferior to whom?”

The monks heard these women who were annoyed, vexed and angry. Those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed, angry and said:

¹ It is curious that *vasala* is in the masculine or neuter, but it obviously refers to the woman. Buddhaghosa sees it as a masculine here, Vin-a 551. ² *Niṭṭhuhitvā ti kheḷaṃ pātetvā*, Vin-a 551; cf. Pv-a 80, *kheḷaṃ ti nuṭṭhubhanam*. Cf. Vin 1.271 where the seṭṭhi’s wife spat out (*nuṭṭhuhitvā*) ghee into a spittoon. Cf. also Ja 1.459. Forms of this verb are *niṭṭhubhati*, *nuṭṭhubhati* and *niṭṭhuhati*. ³ As above, BD 1.125, BD 1.200.

⁴ *Kassāham kena hāyāmi*. Vin-a 551, “with regard to treasure, jewelry or beauty, to what other women am I inferior? Who is better than I am?”

“How can this venerable Udāyin speak in praise of ministering to sense-pleasures for self¹ in the presence of women-folk?”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord for this reason, on this occasion, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the venerable Udāyin, saying:

“Is it true as is said that you, Udāyin, spoke in praise of ministering to sense-pleasures for self in the presence of women-folk?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him saying:

“It is not right, foolish man, it is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is out of place, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, speak in praise of ministering to sense-pleasures for self in the presence of women-folk? Foolish man, is not *dhamma* preached by me in various ways for the stilling of passion ... the allaying of the flames of sense-pleasures declared? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers ... Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, affected by desire,² with perverted heart,³ should speak in praise of ministering to sense-pleasures for self in the presence of women-folk, saying: ‘Sister, this is the highest kind of ministration: that a woman⁴ should minister to one like me, virtuous, of good conduct, leading the Brahma-life, in this fashion⁵—meaning with what is connected with sexual intercourse—that is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the

¹ *Attahāmapāricariyāya*, Vin-a 551 says, *methunadhammasamkhā-tena kāmena pāricariyā kāmapāricariyā, attano atthāya kāmapāri-cariyā attakāmapāricariyā*. This passage is quoted at Vv-a 11, where *atta° cariyāya* is called *gāmadhamme*—i.e., low states, those belonging to the village. Note that the term *attakāma* could be used also with religious significance: see MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Buddhism* (Home University Library), second edition, p.81, and cf. GS 2.21, “he to whom the self is dear,” and KS i.102, “the soul-lover.” See also *attakāmarūpa* at Vin 1.350 = MN i.205 = MN iii.155. MN-a 2.236 and Old Commentary below give two quite different interpretations of *attakāma*, the one giving the higher and the other the lower meaning. ² Cf. above, BD 1.201, BD 1.215. ³ Cf. above, BD 1.201, BD 1.215. ⁴ *Yā*, whoever, feminine. ⁵ *Etena dhammena*. It might also mean “according to this *dhamma*” (teaching), but that it does not here is apparent from the Old Commentary’s exegesis below.

Order.”

Whatever means: ... (see Bu-Ss 3.2... competent to know) ... what is lewd and what is not lewd.

In the presence of women-folk means: in the neighbourhood of women-folk, near women-folk.

Sense-pleasures for self means: sense-pleasures for self,¹ for the sake of self, desiring for self, ministering to self.

This highest means: this highest, this best, this foremost, this utmost, this most excellent.

She² means: a noble woman,³ a brahmin woman, a merchant-class woman, a low-caste woman.⁴

One like me means: a noble man, a brahmin, a merchant-class man, a low-caste man.

Virtuous means: refraining from onslaught on creatures, refraining from taking what is not given, refraining from lying.⁵

Leading the Brahma-life means: refraining from sexual intercourse.⁶

Of good conduct means: he is of good conduct in respect of this virtue and in respect of this Brahma-life.

In this fashion means: with regard to sexual intercourse.

Should minister to means: should give pleasure to.

Connected with unchastity means: connected with unchastity.⁷

A formal meeting of the Order means: ... because of this it is called a formal meeting of the Order.

¹ *Attakāman ti attano kāmam.* ² *Yā*, translated above “a woman.” ³ Vin-a 552, “if it is said, ‘I am a noble man, you are a noble woman, a noble woman is worthy to give to a noble man, because they are of the same caste,’ it is not a *saṅghādisesa* offence. But if you say, ‘I am a noble man ... you are worthy to give me sexual intercourse,’ because you are speaking of things connected with unchastity, there is a *saṅghādisesa* offence.” ⁴ Showing that the four castes were by now recognised.

⁵ Corresponding to the first three *Pārājika* offences, with the addition of refraining from lying. Deliberate lying has appeared as a *pācittiya* offence and as a *pārājika* offence. ⁶ Corresponding to the first three *Pārājika* offences, with the addition of refraining from lying. Deliberate lying has appeared as a *pācittiya* offence and as a *pārājika* offence. ⁷ Cf. above, BD 1.216.

4.3.1 If there is a woman, if he is infatuated thinking her to be a woman, and if the monk speaks in praise, in the woman's presence, of ministering to sense-pleasures for self, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are two women, if ... thinking they are two women ... there are two offences ... a formal meeting of the Order.

If there are a woman and an eunuch, if ... thinking them both to be women ... there is an offence of wrong-doing with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

4.3.2 There is no offence if he speaks, saying: "Support¹ (us) with the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicine for the sick," if he is mad, if he is a beginner.²

MNEMONIC LIST

How can a barren woman?

4.4.1 (How) can I get a son, and be dear?

How can I be charming?

What may I give? With what shall I support (you)?

How can I go to a good bourn?

At one time a certain barren woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family: "How could I, honoured sir, bear (a child)?"

1.227 "For this, sister, give the highest gift."

"What is the highest gift, honoured sir?" she said.

"Sexual intercourse," he said.

He was remorseful ... "... a formal meeting of the Order."

4.4.2 At one time a certain fertile woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family: "How could I, honoured sir, get a son?"

¹ *upaṭṭhaha*, imperative of *upaṭṭhahati*, from *upa + √sthā*. ² Vin-a 552 again says that Udāyīn was the beginner, and therefore there was no offence for him.

“For this, sister, give the highest gift ... “... a formal meeting of the Order.”

At one time a certain woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family: “How could I, honoured sir, be dear to (my) husband?” ... “How could I, honoured sir, be charming?”

“For this, sister, give the highest gift ”... “... a formal meeting of the Order.”

At one time a certain woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family:

“What, honoured sir, may I give to the master?”

“The highest gift, sister,” he said.

“What is the highest gift, honoured sir?”

“Sexual intercourse,” he said. He was remorseful ... “... of the Order.”

At one time a certain woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family:

“With what can I, honoured sir, support the master?”

“With the highest gift, sister,” he said.

“What is the highest gift, honoured sir?” she said ... “... formal meeting of the Order.”

At one time a certain woman said to a monk dependent on (her) family:

“How can I go to a good bourn, honoured sir?”

“For this, sister, give the highest gift.”

“What is the highest gift, honoured sir?” she said ... “... formal meeting of the Order.”

Told is the fourth offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 5

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. At that time the venerable Udāyin was dependent on families at Sāvattthī, and he approached many families. When he saw a youth not (yet) a husband, or a young girl without a husband, he spoke in praise of the girl in the presence of the youth's parents, saying: "The young girl of that family is beautiful, good to look upon, lovely, she is learned, accomplished, wise, clever, energetic. This young girl is suitable for that youth."

These said: "They do not know us, honoured sir, nor who we are, nor to whom we belong. If, honoured sir, the master will induce them to give, we might convey this girl to this youth."

He spoke in praise of the youth in the presence of the girl's parents, saying: "The youth of that family is beautiful, good to look upon, lovely, he is learned, accomplished, wise, clever, energetic. That young girl is suitable for this youth."

They said: "They do not know us, honoured sir, nor who we are, nor to whom we belong, nor in what, as it were, is the girl's property.¹ But if, honoured sir, the master would beg, we might give this girl to that youth."

By this means he brought about the leading² of the bridegroom (to the bride's home), he brought about the leading away³ (from the

¹ Or, taking *vatthum* as wrong reading for *vatturū*: "we should be ashamed (*kismim viya*, cf. Vin-a 552) to speak thus for the girl('s sake)." ² *āvāha*, Vin-a 552, "The bringing of the youth from another family to the girl." ³ *vivāha*, Vin-a 553, "The sending out of the girl herself to another family."

bride's home), he caused marriages¹ to take place.

Now at that time the daughter of a certain woman who was formerly a courtesan was beautiful, good to look upon, lovely. Some disciples of Naked Ascetics coming from a distant village, said to the courtesan: "Lady, give this girl to our boy!"

She said: "Masters, I do not know you, nor who these are, nor to whom he belongs; and I will not give my only daughter to go to a distant village."

Some people said to these disciples of Naked Ascetics: "Masters, why did you come?"²

"Now we, masters, begged that courtesan for her daughter for our son; and she said, 'But, masters, I do not know you, nor who these are, nor to whom he belongs, and I will not give my only daughter to go to a distant village.'"

"Master, why did you beg the courtesan for her daughter? Certainly master Udāyin should be told, master Udāyin will induce her to give (her daughter)."

Then these disciples of Naked Ascetics approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached him, they said to the venerable Udāyin: "Now, honoured sir, we begged that courtesan ... 'distant village.' It would be good, honoured sir, if the master could induce this courtesan to give her daughter to our boy."

Then the venerable Udāyin approached that courtesan, and having approached, he said to that courtesan: "Why did you not give your daughter to these (people)?"

"But, master, I do not know them, nor who they are, nor to whom he belongs, and I will not give my only daughter to go to a distant village."

"Give her to them, I know them."

"If, honoured sir, the master knows them, I will give (her)," she

¹ *vāreyāni*, text; Vin-a 553, *vāreyyan*, with variant reading *vāreyyāni*. Vin-a 553, "begging: give your girl to our boy, or settling the day, lunar mansion, astronomic law."

² *kissa tumhe āgat' attha?* Here *attha* is second plural of *atthi*, from \sqrt{as} .

said. Then this courtesan gave her daughter to these disciples of Naked Ascetics.

55:13 Then these disciples of Naked Ascetics, taking the young girl, for a month made use of her according to her lot as a daughter-in-law¹; then afterwards they made use of her according to her lot as a female slave.² Then this young girl dispatched a messenger to her mother, saying: “I am wretched, I am miserable, I get no happiness. For a month they made use of me according to my lot as a daughter-in-law, now after that they are making use of me according to my lot as a female slave. Let my mother come for me, let her take me away.”

Then the courtesan came up to the disciples of Naked Ascetics, and having come up, she said to these disciples of Naked Ascetics, “Masters, do not make use of this young girl according to her lot as a female slave, make use of this young girl according to her lot as a daughter-in-law.”

They said: “We do not want anything to do with you,³ we want to have to do (only) with a recluse. You go away, we do not know you.”

Then this courtesan, being reproached by these followers of the Naked Ascetics, returned again to Sāvattthī. A second time this young girl dispatched a messenger to her mother, saying: “I am wretched ... take me away.” Then the courtesan approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached him, she said to the venerable Udāyin:

1.232 “Honoured sir, it is said that the young girl is wretched, miserable, she gets no happiness. For a month they made use of her according to her lot as a daughter-in-law, and now after that they are making use of her according to her lot as a female slave. Honoured sir, do say: ‘Masters, do not make use of this young girl according to her lot as a female slave, make use of this young girl according to her lot as a daughter-in-law.’”

¹ I.e., Vin-a 553, they enjoyed what she cooked, and the meals she served. ² I.e., working in the fields, throwing out sweepings, fetching water, etc. ³ *Āhārūpahāro*. Vin-a 553 says, “taking and offering, getting and giving, nothing is taken or offered by us, buying and selling with you is not our custom.”

Then the venerable Udāyin approached these disciples of the Naked Ascetics, and having approached them, he said to these disciples of the Naked Ascetics:

“Masters, do not make use of this young girl according to her lot as a female slave, make use of this young girl according to her lot as a daughter-in-law.”

They said: “We do not want anything to do with you; we want to have to do (only) with the courtesan. A recluse should be without occupation,¹ the recluse will become a model recluse.² You go away, we do not know you.”

Then the venerable Udāyin having been reproached by these disciples of Naked Ascetics, returned again to Sāvattihī. For a third time the young girl dispatched a messenger to her mother, saying: “I am wretched, take me away.” For a second time the courtesan approached the venerable Udāyin ... “... Do say: ‘Masters ... as a daughter-in-law.’”

He said: “When I went before, I was reproached by these disciples of the Naked Ascetics. Go yourself. I will not go.”

Then the courtesan became annoyed, vexed, angry and said: “May this master Udāyin be wretched, may this master Udāyin be miserable, may this master Udāyin not find happiness, even as my girl is wretched, miserable, and finds no happiness because of her evil mother-in-law, because of her evil father-in-law, because of her evil husband.” And then the young girl became annoyed, vexed, angry, saying: “May this master Udāyin be wretched, may this master Udāyin be miserable, may this master Udāyin not find happiness, even as I am wretched, miserable and find no happiness because of my

¹ *Avyāvaṭa*, a rare word. Cf. Ja 3.65 and its variant readings *ajhāvata*, *abyāvata*; Ja 6.188; DN ii.141. At Cnd 72 *apposukha* = *abyāvata anapekkha*. ² *Samaṇena bhavitabbaṃ, avyāvaṭena samaṇo assa sumano*. The word *sumano* has variant readings *sumaṇo*, *susamaṇo*; Vin-areads *sussamaṇo*. This explanation seems to show what is rare: that OLDENBERG’s text is faulty. No doubt the text could be emended: *samaṇena bhavitabbaṃ avyāvataṇa (avyāvaṭo) samaṇo assa sussamaṇo*, but the elliptical construction is perhaps intentional, and shows a popular style, which does not, however, sound very well.

evil mother-in-law, because of my evil father-in-law, because of my evil husband.”

Even other women, unhappy with their mothers-in-law, unhappy with their fathers-in-law, unhappy with their husbands, denounced¹ him, thus: “May ... be wretched ... even as we are wretched, miserable, and find no happiness because of our evil mothers-in-law, because of our evil fathers-in-law, because of our evil husbands.”

But those women who were happy with their mothers-in-law, with their fathers-in-law, and with their husbands, these prayed to² him thus: “May this master Udāyin be happy, may this master Udāyin be blest³, may this master Udāyin prosper,⁴ even as we are happy, blest and do prosper because of our good mothers-in-law, because of our good fathers-in-law, because of our good husbands.”

The monks heard some women denouncing, some women praying. Then those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed, angry and said: “How can the venerable Udāyin act as a go-between?”⁵ Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, for this reason, having had the company of monks convened, questioned the venerable Udāyin, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, Udāyin, that you acted as a go-between?”
“It is true, lord,” he said.

Then the enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: “How could you, foolish man, act as a go-between? That is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers ... Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should act as a go-between for a woman with a man in mind or for a man with a woman in mind, whether as a wife or as a mistress, that is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

¹ *oyācati* and *āyācati*. For *āyācati*. cf. DN i.240. ² *oyācati* and *āyācati*. For *āyācati*. cf. DN i.240. ³ *sajjito*, Vin-a 553 says, “endowed with all means of livelihood, beautifully adorned.” ⁴ *sukhamedho*. ⁵ *sañcarittam samāpajjati*. For note on *samāpajjati* see BD 1.201, n. 3.

At one time many men of abandoned life¹ who were amusing themselves in a pleasure grove, sent a messenger to a harlot to say, “Come, we will enjoy ourselves in the pleasure grove.”

She said: “Masters, I do not know you, nor who you are, nor to whom you belong; and I have many goods, I am well-to-do, and I will not go outside the city.”² Then the messenger told this matter to the men of abandoned life. A certain man said to these men of abandoned life:

“Masters, why do you beg this harlot? Surely master Udāyin should be told. Master Udāyin will procure (her for you).”

When he had spoken thus, a certain lay-follower said to that man: “Do not speak like that, master; it is not right for recluses, sons of the Sakyans, to act like that. Master Udāyin will not do it.”

When he had spoken thus, they said, “Will he do it, or won’t he do it?” and they made a bet. Then these men of abandoned life approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached him they said to the venerable Udāyin:

“Now we, honoured sir, amusing ourselves in the pleasure grove, sent a messenger to some harlot, saying, ‘Come, we will enjoy ourselves in the pleasure grove’ She said: ‘Masters, I do not know you, nor who you are, nor to whom you belong; and I have many goods, I am well-to-do, and I will not go outside the city.’ It would be good, honoured sir, if the master would procure this harlot (for us).”

Then the venerable Udāyin went up to this harlot, and having come up he said to this harlot: “Why do you not go among these (men)?”

“Master, I do not know them ... I will not go outside the city.”

“Go among them,” he said, “I know them.”

“If, honoured sir, the master knows them, I will go.”

Then these men of abandoned life, taking this harlot, went to the pleasure grove.

¹ Vin-533 calls them “abandoned with women,” *itthidhutta*, not necessarily leading the wild life of gambling or the wild life of drink—the other two of the three kinds of abandoned life. ² *bahinagarañ ca gantabbariñ nāharīñ gamissāmi*.

Then that lay-follower became annoyed, vexed, angry, saying: “How can master Udāyin act as a go-between for a temporary wife?”¹ The monks heard that lay-follower who was annoyed, vexed, angry. Those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed, angry, saying: “How can the venerable Udāyin act as a go-between for a temporary wife?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

“Is it true, as they say, Udāyin, that you acted as a go-between for a temporary wife?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: “How can you, foolish man, act as a go-between for a temporary wife? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers ... Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should act as a go-between for a woman with a man in mind, or for a man with a woman in mind whether as a wife or as a mistress or even as a temporary wife, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.**”

Whatever means: he who ...

Monk means: ... thus monk is to be understood in this meaning.

Should act as a go-between means: either sent by a woman he goes into a man’s presence, or sent by a man he goes into a woman’s presence.

For a woman with a man in mind means: he tells to a woman the mind of a man.

For a man with a woman in mind means: he tells to a man the mind of a woman.

¹ Cf. Buddhaghosa, who says at Vin-a 553–554 that *taṃkhaṇo* here means “for a short time”; thus *taṃkhaṇikā* may mean “a temporary wife” as in this *Saṅghādisesa* rule. See below [BD 1.236](#), for explanation of the Old Commentary.

As a wife¹ means: You will become a wife.

As a mistress means: You will become a mistress.

Even as a temporary wife² means: You will become a wife for the moment.

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order ... because of that it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

Ten (kinds of) women: protected by the mother, protected by the father, protected by the parents, protected by the brother, protected by the sister, protected by the relations, protected by the lineage, protected by *dhamma*, with protection, protected by a stick.³

Ten (kinds of) wives: one bought with money, one kept for passion, a kept woman, one who receives clothes, one who provides water, one who takes off the pad (for the burden she carries on the head), the slave and wife, the servant and wife,⁴ the flag-brought,⁵ the wife for the moment.

Protected by the mother means: the mother protects,⁶ guards,⁷ wields supremacy,⁸ has her under control.⁹

¹ Vin-a 554, “Speaking to a woman with a man in mind he speaks of being a wife. Speaking to a man with a woman in mind, he speaks of being a mistress. Further, speaking to a woman with a man in mind he speaks of wifehood, of the sure state of being a wife, of the low livelihood of a mistress, but saying this, he also says, ‘they say you will become a wife.’ In speaking to a man with a woman in mind he says, ‘You will become a lord, a husband, you will become an adulterer.’” ² *Tamkhaṇikā* and *muhuttikā* are practically synonymous. ³ MN i.286 = MN iii.46, gives the first five on this list, then *sassāmikā*, *saparidaṇḍā antamaso mālāguḷaparikkhittā*. AN v.264 gives the first five, then *dhammarakkhitā* (with variant readings to insert *gotta-rakkhitā*), *sassāmikā*, etc., as at MN i.286; MN iii.46. Vv-a 72 follows the Vinaya reading. Cf. GS 5.177, n. 2. ⁴ For explanation see below, BD 1.238. ⁵ For explanation see below, BD 1.238. ⁶ Vin-a 555, “the mother lets her go nowhere.” ⁷ Vin-a 555, “she puts her in a place so (well) guarded that other people cannot see (her).” ⁸ Vin-a 555, “restrains her from living in lodgings of her own choice, and overrules her.” ⁹ Vin-a 555, “Saying ‘do this, do not do that.’” Cf. MN i.214, where the expression *cittam vasaṃ vatteti*, “has his heart under control,” or, as at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.155, “is master of his heart.”

Protected by the father means: the father ... has her under control.

Protected by the parents means: the parents ... have her under control.

Protected by the brother means: the brother ... has her under control.

Protected by the sister means: the sister ... has her under control.

Protected by the relations means: the relations ... have her under control.

Protected by the lineage means: her own clans-people ... have her under control.

Protected by dhamma¹ means: those regarding *dhamma* ... have her under control.

With protection means: she is appropriated in the womb saying: "She is mine," even if she is betrothed.

Protected by the stick means: the stick is put by some people, and whoever goes to such-and-such a woman says: "What a stick."²

Bought with money means: having bought (her) with money, he makes her stay.

Kept for passion³, "kept for passion, means, he lives of his own free will for passion. Inasmuch as she is not only passionate, but a wife she is accepted by the man." means: the dear one makes the dear one stay.⁴

A kept woman means: giving her wealth, he makes her stay.⁵

¹ Vin-a 555, "neither lineage nor *dhamma* protects her, but she is protected by her own clans-people and by those regarding *dhamma* who, on account of one teacher, have gone forth belonging to one company." It is not the abstract but the concrete which protects her; people and not ideas, in fact, her co-religionists (*sahadhammikā*). This is an interesting heading as being a recognised kind together with nine others.

² *etako daṇḍo*. ³ Vin-a 555 ⁴ *piyo piyaṃ vāseti*. ⁵ Vin-a 555, "A country-woman comes to be a wife, having received the household implements."

One who receives clothes means: giving a garment, he makes her stay.¹

One who provides water means: having handled a bowl of water, he makes her stay.²

One who takes off the pad (for burdens she carries on the head) means: taking down the pad he makes her stay.³

A slave means: she is a slave and a wife.

A servant means: she is a servant and wife.⁴

Flag-brought means: a woman taken in a raid.⁵

A temporary wife means: a wife for a moment.

A man sends a monk saying: “Go, honoured sir, to such a one protected by the mother, and explain: ‘He says become the wife of such a one bought for money.’” If he accepts, examines and brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A man ... protected by the father, explain: ... protected by a stick, explain ... a formal meeting of the Order.

The steps in the composition

A man sends a monk saying: “Go, sir, to such and such a one protected by the mother, protected by the father and say: ‘He says, become the wife of so-and-so bought with money.’” If he accepts ... formal meeting of the Order.

A man ... protected by the mother and protected by the parents ...

¹ Vin-a 555, “receiving as much as a garment or cloak, a vagabond woman rises to be a wife.” ² Vin-a 555, plunging their two hands into one pot of water, he says: “Joined like this water, so let them not be divided.” ³ Vin-a 555, “Someone who is a gatherer of firewood and so on, and taking the pad off her head, he keeps her in the house.” In India the women put a coiled pad of cotton or some material or grass on their head, and then balance their burdens: brass vessels, long bunches of firewood, big round baskets and so on, on the pad. ⁴ Vin-a 555, “She works in the house for wages. Somebody lives a household life with her—not satisfied with his own wife.” ⁵ Vin-a 556, “Having gone with the army erecting the flag, plundering another district, she is brought back. If anyone makes her his wife, she is called flag-brought.”

protected by the mother and protected by a stick ... formal meeting of the Order.

A portion of the series

A man ... “protected by the father and protected by the parents ... protected by the father and protected by the mother” ... formal meeting of the Order.

Told is the beginning of the contracted series

A man ... “protected by a stick and protected by the mother ... protected by a stick and with protection ...” ... formal meeting of the Order.

Told is that beginning with one

That beginning with two and that beginning with three up to that beginning with nine should be done in the same way. This is that beginning with ten:

A man sends a monk saying: “Go, sir, to such a one protected by the mother and protected by the father ... and protected by a stick, and explain: ‘He says, become ...’” ... a formal meeting of the Order.

Told is the series about women bought with money

5.4.5
A man sends a monk, saying: “Go, honoured sir, to such a one protected by the mother, and explain: ‘He says, become the wife kept for passion of such a man ... the kept woman ... the temporary wife.’” If he accepts ... a formal meeting of the Order.

1.240
3.141
A man sends a monk, saying: “Go, honoured sir, to such a woman protected by the mother and protected by the father ... and protected by a stick, and explain: ‘... a temporary wife.’” If he accepts ... formal meeting of the Order.

Told is the series on the woman who is a temporary wife

A man sends a monk saying: “Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so protected by the mother: ‘He says, become the wife bought by money of such and such a man,’” If he accepts, examines her, brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A man ... ‘the wife kept for passion’ ... ‘the kept woman’ ... ‘the temporary wife’ ... formal meeting of the Order.

The steps of composition

This is that beginning with ten:

A man sends a monk, saying: “Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so protected by a stick: ‘He says, become the wife of so-and-so, bought by money, and kept for passion and ... and the temporary wife’” ... formal meeting of the Order.

A man sends a monk saying: “Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so protected by the mother: ‘It is said, become the wife bought by money of so-and-so.’” ... a formal meeting of the Order.

A man ... “to so-and-so protected by the mother and protected by the father, explain: ‘It is said, become the wives and so-and-so, bought by money and kept for passion, and ...’” ... a formal meeting of the Order.

A man ... “to so-and-so protected by the mother and protected by the father and protected by the parents, and explain: ‘He says, become the wives of so-and-so, bought with money, and kept for passion, and the kept woman and ...’” ... a formal meeting of the Order.

Increase from both (ends) is to be made thus:

A man sends a monk saying: “Go, honoured sir, to so-and-so protected by the mother and protected by the father and ... and protected by a stick and explain: ‘He says, become the wives of so-and-so, bought by money, and kept for passion ... and temporary wives.’” ... a formal meeting of the Order.

Told is the increase from both (ends)

5.4.8
1.241 The mother of a man sent a monk ... the father of a man sent a monk ... the parents of a man sent a monk ... the brother of a man sent a monk ... the sister of a man sent a monk ... the relations of a man sent a monk ... the clansmen of a man sent a monk ... the co-religionists of a man sent a monk.

5.4.9 The mother of (a girl) protected by the mother sent a monk, saying: “Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so: ‘Let her be the wife, bought by money, of so-and-so ...’” ... formal meeting of the Order.

The mother of (a girl) protected by the mother sent a monk, saying: “Go, honoured sir ... be the wife kept for passion ... the temporary wife ...” ... a formal meeting of the Order.

The steps in the composition

This is that beginning with ten:

The mother of (a girl) protected by the mother sent a monk, saying: “Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so: ‘Let her be the wife of so-and-so bought by money and the wife kept for passion and ... and the temporary wife ...’” ... a formal meeting of the Order.

5.4.10 The father of (a girl) protected by the father sent a monk ... the parents of (a girl) protected by the parents sent a monk ... the brother of (a girl) protected by the brother sent a monk ... the sister of (a girl) protected by the sister sent a monk ... the relations of (a girl) protected by the relations sent a monk ... the co-religionists of (a girl) protected by *dhamma* sent a monk ... one who was appropriated with protection sent a monk ... one who has put a stick, for protection with a stick, sent a monk, saying: “Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so: ‘Be the wife of so-and-so bought with money ... be the wife of so-and-so bought with money and the wife kept for passion ... and the temporary wife.’” ... a formal meeting of the Order.

One protected by the mother sent a monk, saying: “Go, honoured sir, explain to so-and-so: ‘I am the wife bought by money for so-and-so ...’” ... a formal meeting of the Order.

One protected by the mother ... ‘the wife kept for passion ... the temporary wife’ ... formal meeting of the Order.

The steps of composition

If one protected by a stick sends a monk, saying: “Go, sir, explain to so-and-so: ‘I am the wife for so-and-so, bought with money ... another wife kept for passion and and the temporary wife.’” If he accepts, examines, and brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

Told is the whole abbreviated series

If he accepts, examines, brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If he accepts, examines, but does not bring back, it is a grave offence. If he accepts, but does not examine and does not bring back, it is an offence of wrong-doing. If he does not accept, but examines and brings back, it is a grave offence. If he does not accept, but examines, yet does not bring back, it is an offence of wrong-doing. If he does not accept, and does not examine, but brings back, it is an offence of wrong-doing. If he does not accept, does not examine and does not bring back, it is not an offence.

If a man enjoins many monks, saying: “Go, honoured sirs, examine such and such a woman,” and if they all accept, all examine and all bring back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order for them all.

If a man ... “... examine such and such a woman,” and if they all accept, all examine, but if one makes them bring back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order for them all.

If a man ... “... examine such and such a woman,” if all accept, if one makes them examine her and if all bring back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order for them all.

If a man ... “... examine such and such woman,” if all accept, but if one makes them examine, and if one makes them bring back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order for them all.

5.4.14 A man enjoins a monk: “Go, honoured sir, examine such and such a woman.” If he accepts, examines her and brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

1.243 A man enjoins a monk: “Go, honoured sir, examine such and such a woman.” If he accepts, examines her but makes a novice bring back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A man enjoins a monk: “... such and such a woman.” If he accepts, makes a novice examine, but himself brings back, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A man enjoins a monk: “... such and such a woman.” If he accepts, makes a novice examine her, and the novice having examined, brings back alone,¹ there is a grave offence for both.²

5.4.15 Going, he procures, coming back he deceives with words—it is a grave offence. Going he deceives with words, coming back he procures—it is a grave offence. Going he procures, coming back he procures—it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

5.4.16 ¹ *bahiddhā*, not telling his teacher, the monk. ² Vin-a 559, “A grave offence for both means: the accepting, and making over the examining is a grave offence with two parts for the teacher. The accepting and the bringing back is a grave offence with two parts for the novice.”

There is no offence if it is for the Order,¹ or for a shrine,² or if he is ill;³ if he is going on business, if he is mad, if he is a beginner.

MNEMONIC LIST

Asleep, and dead, gone out,
unsexed woman, a female eunuch,
She was reconciled after having quarrelled,
and did go-between for a eunuch.

At one time a certain man enjoined a certain monk: “Go, honoured sir, examine such and such a woman.” As he was going, he asked some people: “Where is so-and-so?”

“She is asleep, honoured sir,” they said. He was remorseful, and said: “What now if I have fallen into an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order.” He told this matter to the lord. He said: “Monk, this is not an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order; it is an offence of wrong-doing.”

At one time a certain man enjoined a certain monk, saying: “Go, honoured sir, examine such and such a woman.” As he was going he asked some people: “Where is so-and-so?” “She is dead, honoured sir,” they said ... “She has gone out, honoured sir,” they said ... “That is an unsexed woman, honoured sir.” ... “That is a female eunuch,⁴

¹ Vin-a 599f., “It is not an offence if any hall for reciting the Pātimokkha belonging to the Order is left unfinished, and a lay-follower sends a monk to a female lay-follower in order to get food as wages for the workers, or if a female lay-follower goes to a lay-follower on business connected with the Order. It is the same for building a shrine.” ² I do not think a *cetiya* is necessarily a “tumulus, sepulchral monument, cairn,” as the *Pali-English Dictionary* defines it. The *cetiyas* at, e.g., the Caves of Ellora and Ajanta are certainly neither tumuli nor cairns, nor do they contain relics. Erected probably after the life-time of the Buddha, they were used as places for meditation, (\sqrt{cet} , to think), or for listening to discourses. See below, **BD 1.266**. ³ “If he goes for the sake of medicine for an invalid, sent by a lay-follower into the presence of a female lay-follower, or sent by a female lay-follower into the presence of a male lay-follower.” ⁴ *Itthipaṇḍakā*, may be name of a deformity. Cf. above, **BD 1.217**; and **Vin 2.271** (*°paṇḍikā*).

honoured sir,” they said. He was remorseful ...“offence of wrongdoing.”

At one time a certain woman, having quarrelled with her husband, went to her mother’s house. A monk, dependent on (her) family, effected a reconciliation. He was remorseful ...

“Monk, is she not one to be told ‘enough?’”¹

“She is not one to be told ‘enough,’ lord.”

“It is not an offence, monk, as she is not one to be told ‘enough’.”

At one time a certain monk acted as a go-between for a eunuch. He was remorseful. “What now if I have fallen into an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order?” He told this matter to the lord.

“Monk, it is not an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order; it is a grave offence.”

Told is the Fifth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order

¹ *alamvacanīyā*, a woman who has to be addressed with *alam* (enough), perhaps the husband’s way of divorcing, and the wife returns to her parental home. That this woman did not return to the parental home, *nālamvacanīyā*, means, according to Buddhaghosa, Vin-a 561, “she was not abandoned (by her husband). For any woman who is abandoned according to the customs of diverse districts and thus ceases to be a wife, is called *alamvacanīyā*. But this woman was not one to be told ‘enough’ (perhaps = divorce) on account of some quarrel, so that here the lord said there was no offence.”

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 6

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. At that time the monks of Āḷavī,¹ begging in company,² were having huts built with no benefactor,³ for their own advantage, and not according to measure⁴; but these were not finished. They lived intent on begging, intent on hinting⁵: "Give a man, give a servant, give an ox, give a wagon, give a knife, give a hatchet, give an axe, give a spade, give a chisel, give a creeper, give bamboo, give muñja-grass, give coarse grass, give *tiṇa*-grass, give clay." People were oppressed with the begging, oppressed with the hinting, and when they saw the monks they were perturbed, then alarmed, then they ran away, then they went by a different route,⁶ turned in another direction⁷ and closed the door; and when they saw cows they ran away, imagining them to be monks.

¹ Vin-a 561, "boys born in the kingdom of Āḷavī were called Āḷavakā, and at the time of their going forth they were known as Āḷavakā." These monks often gave trouble over new buildings, cf. above, **BD 1.148**, and **Vin 2.172**. ² OLDENBERG says, Vin 3.274, "probably we ought to read constantly *saṃyācīkāya kuṭṭiyo*." Vin-a 566 takes *saṃyācīkāya* to mean begging themselves. See below, **BD 1.254**. ³ *Assāmīkāyo ti anissariyo*, Vin-a 561, which goes on to say, "having them built without a donor," or benefactor, *dāyaka*. ⁴ *Appamāṇīkāyo*. Vin-a 561, "with this amount they will be completed," they said. So they were not limited in size, their measure increased, their measure was great. ⁵ See **Vin 3.227** ⁶ Vin-a 565, "having come to a road, then leaving it and turning back, they went taking the left side or the right." ⁷ *Aññena mukhaṃ karoti*: to direct the face towards another (quarter).

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great¹ arose from spending the rains in Rājagaha, and set out for Āḷavī. In due course he arrived at Āḷavī. There the venerable Kassapa the Great stayed in the chief shrine at Āḷavī.² Then the venerable Kassapa the Great rising early, and taking his bowl and robes, entered Āḷavī for alms. People seeing the venerable Kassapa the Great were perturbed, then alarmed, then they ran away, then they went by a different route, turned in another direction and closed the door. Then the venerable Kassapa the Great, having walked Āḷavī for alms, after having eaten and finished his meal, addressed the monks saying:

“Formerly, your reverences, Āḷavī had good alms-food, alms were easily obtained, it was easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. But now this Āḷavī is short of alms-food, alms are difficult to obtain, nor is it easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. What is the reason, what the cause that now this Āḷavī is short of alms-food, that alms are difficult to obtain, that it is not easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour?”

Then these monks told this matter to the venerable Kassapa the Great.

¹ *Mahā*. The rendering “Great” is perhaps a little misleading, for one would not think him eminent enough to be so called. The epithet was clearly given so as to distinguish him from other Kassapas. Conceivably it means that he had been in the Order longer than they had. We cannot say the “Elder” as *thera* is an elder; but Kassapa Senior might be possible. Further, I think it doubtful whether it is right to render *Mahā* as “Great” in any of the cases where it occurs as an epithet of disciples. For example, Sāriputta was never called Mahā-Sāriputta, as Moggallāna was referred to, very frequently, as Mahā-Moggallāna; and yet as far as “greatness” goes, there is little or nothing to choose between them. ² *Aggāḷave cetiye*, mentioned at [Vin 2.172](#); [SN i.185](#); [Snp p. 59](#); [Dhp-a 3.170](#). Buddhaghosa at [Snp-a 344](#) = [SN-a i.268](#) explains *aggāḷave cetiye* as *Āḷaviyaṃ aggacetiye*, and says that it was transformed into a *vihāra*. At [KS i.234](#), it is taken to be “the chief temple” at Āḷavī; in *Buddhist Suttas*, p. 56 (second edition), it is called “the temple at Aggāḷava”; while translator at *Vinaya Texts* iii.212 appears to regard it as a proper name. MR. E.M. HARE in [GS 4.147](#) translates, “at Aggāḷava, near the shrine there,” and gives no notes. It was probably a pre-Buddhist shrine. See above, [BD 1.243](#), n. 4, and below, [BD 1.266](#), n. 5. Also see B.C. LAW, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, Appendix, p. 74ff.

Then the lord having dwelt at Rājagaha for as long as he thought fit, set out on a tour for Āḷavī. Making the tour, in due course he arrived at Āḷavī. There at Āḷavī the lord dwelt in the chief shrine at Āḷavī. Then the venerable Kassapa the Great approached the lord, and having approached him, he greeted the lord and sat down to one side. Sitting to one side the venerable Kassapa the Great told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on that occasion, for that reason, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks of Āḷavī, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, begging in company, were having huts built, with no benefactor, for your own advantage, not according to measure, and that these were not completed? They say that you dwelt intent on begging, intent on hinting: ‘Give a man ...’ ... seeing cows they ran away, taking them for monks.”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “How can you, foolish men, begging in company, have huts built? ... ‘Give a man ... give clay.’ It is not foolish men, for the benefit of unbelievers,” ... having rebuked them and given *dhamma*-talk, he addressed the monks:

“Formerly,¹ monks, two brothers (who were) holy men² lived close by the river Ganges. Then, monks, Maṇikaṅṭha,³ the *nāga*-king,⁴ emerging from the river Ganges, came up to the younger holy man, and having come up and encircled the younger holy man seven times with his coils, he stood spreading his great hood above his head.⁵

¹ Cf. Ja 2.283, Maṇikaṅṭhajātaka, for this story. ² *Isi*, holy man or anchorite. *Isi* has not the great force of *ṛṣi* of the brahminical tradition, meaning a seer or inspired singer to whom the Vedas were spoken or revealed. There are interesting variations in the details of this story as described in Vinaya and Jātaka. ³ Vin-a 565, “the *nāga*-king went with a very valuable jewel able to grant all desires, adorning his throat, therefore he is called ‘jewel-throated.’” Cf. Hindu mythology, where the cow granting all desires and the jewel granting all desires were brought out from the sea at the Churning of the Ocean. ⁴ Or serpent-king ⁵ I.e., according to Vin-a 565, above the younger holy man’s head. He was practising *mettā-vihāra*, and the *nāga*-king shaded him with his hood.

Then, monks, the younger holy man, through fear of this snake, became thin, wretched, of a bad colour, yellowish, his veins showing all over his body. Monks, the elder holy man saw that the younger holy man was thin, wretched, of bad colour, yellowish, the veins showing all over his body. Seeing this, he said to the younger holy man: ‘Why are you, good sir, thin ... all over your body?’

“‘Now, the *nāga*-king, Maṇikaṇṭha, came out of the river Ganges for me, and came up to me, and having come up and having encircled me seven times with his coils, he stood spreading his great hood above my head. I, good sir, through fear of the snake, became thin ... all over my body.’

“‘But, good sir, do you not want this snake to return?’

“‘Good sir, I do not want this snake to return.’

“‘Do you, good sir, see anything of this snake?’

“‘I see, good sir, the jewelled ornament on his throat.’

“‘Then, good sir, you beg this snake for the jewel, saying: “Good sir, give me the jewel; I want the jewel.”’

“Then, monks, Maṇikaṇṭha, the *nāga*-king, emerging from the river Ganges, came up to the younger holy man and having come up he stood to one side. Monks, as he was standing to one side, the younger holy man said to Maṇikaṇṭha, the *nāga*-king: ‘Good sir, give the jewel to me, I want the jewel.’ Then Maṇikaṇṭha, the *nāga*-king, said: ‘A monk begs for the jewel, a monk wants the jewel,’ and he hurried away.

“A second time, monks, did Maṇikaṇṭha emerging ... come up to the younger holy man. Then, monks, the younger holy man saw Maṇikaṇṭha, the *nāga*-king, coming from afar, and seeing Maṇikaṇṭha, the *nāga* king, he said: ‘Good sir, give me the jewel, I want the jewel.’ Then, monks, Maṇikaṇṭha, the *nāga*-king, said: ‘A monk begs for the jewel, a monk wants the jewel.’ And then he turned away again.

“A third time, monks, Maṇikaṇṭha, the *nāga*-king, came up from the river Ganges. Then, monks, the younger holy man saw Maṇikaṇṭha, the *nāga*-king, emerging from the river Ganges, and seeing him,

he said to Maṇikaṅṭha, the *nāga*-king: ‘Good sir, give me the jewel, I want the jewel.’ Then, monks, Maṇikaṅṭha, the *nāga*-king, addressed these verses to the younger holy man:

“My food and drink is produced abundantly,
Excellently, by reason of this jewel,
I do not give it to you, you are one who asks too much,
And not for you will I come to a hermitage.

“Like a lad, his hand on a tempered sword,¹
You frighten² (me) begging for this stone,³
I do not give it to you, you are one who asks too much
And not for you will I come to a hermitage.’

“Then, monks, Maṇikaṅṭha, the *nāga*-king, said: ‘A monk begs for the jewel, a monk wants the jewel,’ and he went away; then he was gone, and did not come back again. Then, monks, the younger holy man, not seeing that beautiful snake, became increasingly thin, wretched, of a bad colour, yellowish, the veins showing all over his body. The elder holy man, seeing that the younger holy man had become increasingly thin ... the veins showing all over his body, said to the younger holy man:

“Why are you, good sir, increasingly thin ... the veins showing all over your body?’

“It is because I, good sir, do not see the beautiful snake that I become increasingly thin ... the veins showing all over my body.’

¹ *sakkharadhotipāṇi*. Ja 2.285 explained “your hand is on a sword polished on the oil- (whetting) stone.” Vin-a 566 says: *sakkharā vuccati kāḷasilā* (a dark stone) ... *sakkharadhotapāṇi, pāsāṇe dhotanisita-khaggahattho ti attho*, which seems to mean “in the hand the sword whetted and cleaned on a stone.” “As a man with a hand on a sword frightens, do you frighten begging me for the stone.” Ibid., Rouse translates this line at Ja 2.198: “Like lads who wait with tempered sword in hand” (lads, *susū* being there in the plural). ² *tāsesi*, causitive of *tasati*, to tremble, shake, to have fears. ³ Reading with Jātaka, *tāses’ imarṃ selarṃ yācamāno*, and not with Vinaya, *tāsesi marṃ ...* Jātaka Commentary says (Ja 2.285): “asking for this jewel, you frighten me like a young man who would unsheathe his gold-hilted sword and say: ‘I cut off your head.’” Vin-a 566 reads, *evam tāsesi marṃ selarṃ yācamāno, maṇiṃ yācanto ti attho*.

“Then, monks, the elder holy man addressed these verses to the younger holy man:

“Do not beg him who is dear for what you covet,
It is odious to ask for too much,
The snake, begged by a brahmin for a jewel,
Disappeared, and was not seen (again).”¹

“Monks, begging from these animals and living creatures will become hated, begging by hinting (will become) hated, how much more then (will be begging) from men?

6.1.4
3.148
“Once upon a time, monks, a certain monk lived in a certain thicket on a slope of the Himālayas. Monks, not far from the thicket was an extensive, low-lying marshy ground. Then, monks, a great flock of birds, going daily to feed in this marshy ground, entered the thicket at night to roost. Then, monks, that monk, worried by the noise of the flocking birds, came up to me, and having come up and greeted me, he sat down to one side. Sitting to one side, I said, monks, to that monk: ‘I hope, monk, you are getting on well, I hope, monk, you are keeping going, having accomplished your journey with but little fatigue. But where do you come from, monk?’

1.252
“I am getting along fairly well, lord,² I am keeping going, lord,³ and, lord,⁴ have accomplished my journey with but little fatigue. There is, lord,⁵ on the slopes of the Himālayas a large thicket, and, lord, not far from this thicket there is an extensive, low-lying marshy ground. Now, lord, a great flock of birds going daily to feed at that marshy ground goes into that thicket at night to roost. That is why I come, lord,⁶ for I am worried by the noise of that flock of birds.’

“I said: ‘Monk, do you want this flock of birds not to return?’

“I want, lord,⁷ this flock of birds not to return.’

“I said: ‘Then you, monk, going there, and penetrating this thicket three times in the first watch of the night must utter this sound:

¹ =Ja 2.285. ² Bhagavā. ³ Bhagavā. ⁴ Bhante. ⁵ Bhante. ⁶ Bhagavā.

⁷ Bhante.

‘Listen to me, good sirs, whatever birds have come to roost in this thicket, I want a feather. Good sirs, give me one feather ‘at a time.’ Three times in the middle watch ... three times in the last watch ... at a time.’ Then, monks, this monk having gone there, and having penetrated the thicket, uttered this sound three times ... in the middle watch of the night ... in the last watch of the night ... ‘at a time.’ Then, monks, that flock of birds said: ‘The monk begs for a feather, the monk wants a feather,’ and they departed from that thicket, and after they were gone, they did not come back again. Begging, monks, from these animals and living creatures will become hateful, hinting (will become) hateful, how much more then from men?

“Once upon a time, monks, the father of Raṭṭhapāla, the noble youth, addressed these verses to Raṭṭhapāla, the noble youth:

“‘Tho’ I do not know them, Raṭṭhāpāla, the many-folk,
These, meeting me, beg—why do you not beg of me?’

‘The beggar is not liked, the not-giver to beggar is not
liked,¹

Therefore I do not beg of you, do not be angry with me.’²

“Monks, if Raṭṭhapāla, the noble youth, can speak thus to his own father, how much more then can (any) person to (any other) person?

“Monks, it is difficult for householders to collect possessions, and difficult to protect their stores; how can you, foolish men, dwell intent on begging, intent on asking by hinting (for something) from among these possessions which are difficult to collect, and from among these stores which are difficult to protect, saying: ‘Give a man, give a servant, give an ox, give a wagon, give a knife, give a hatchet, give an axe, give a spade, give a chisel, give a creeper, give bamboo, give *muñja*-grass, give coarse grass, give *tiṇa*-grass, give

¹ For not giving is not liked, Vin-a 566. ² =Ja 3.352, Ja 3.353, except first line.

clay.’ This is not, foolish men, for the benefit of unbelievers ... and, monks, thus this course of training should be set forth:

“A monk begging in company¹ for having a hut built, which has no benefactor, for his own advantage, should make it according to measure. This is the measure: in length, twelve spans of a span of the accepted length²; in width seven spans inside. Monks should be brought for marking out the site. A site not involving destruction,³ and with an open space round it,⁴ should be marked out by these monks. If that monk should build a hut, begging himself for a site which involves destruction and which does not have an open space round it, or if he should not bring the monks for marking out a site, or if he should exceed the measure, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

Begging in company means: oneself begging for a man, for a servant, for an ox, for a wagon, for a knife, for a hatchet, for an axe, for a spade, for a chisel ... for *tiṇa*-grass, for clay.

A hut means: it is smeared inside or it is smeared outside, or it is smeared inside and outside.⁵

For having ... built means: building or causing to be built.

Without a benefactor means: there is not anyone who is the owner, either a woman or a man or a householder or one who has gone forth.

For his own advantage means: for the good of himself.⁶

Should make it according to measure. This is the measure: in length, twelve spans of a span of the accepted length means:

¹ Vin-a 566, “*saññācīkā* means, having themselves inaugurated is called ‘begging,’ therefore *saññācīkāya* is called begging themselves,” cf. Vin-a 561 and below, Old Commentary, *sayam yācitvā*. ² *Sugata-vidatthiyā*, see *Vinaya Texts* i.8, n. 2, for a discussion of this phrase. Vin-a 567, “a man of medium height is three spans, a builder’s cubit (*hattha*, the hand used as a measure) is one and a half cubits.” ³ *Anārambha*—i.e., to living creatures, see below, Old Commentary, **BD 1.257**. ⁴ *Saparikkamana*—i.e., accessible, good for rambling in. See below, Old Commentary, “possible for a cart drawn by a yoke of oxen to go round it.” I follow translation as at *Vinaya Texts* i.8. ⁵ =below, **BD 1.267**, in definition of *vihāra*. ⁶ Cf. below, **BD 1.268**

for the outside measure. **In width, seven inside** means: for the inside measure.

Monks should be brought for marking out a site means: that a monk building a hut, having cleared a site for a hut, approaching the Order, arranging his robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, squatting down on his heels, and saluting with his palms outstretched, should speak thus to them¹: ‘Honoured sirs, I, begging in company, for my own advantage, am desirous of building a hut, it has no benefactor; honoured sirs, I beg the Order for inspection of the site for a hut.’ A second time it should be begged for, a third time it should be begged for. If the whole Order² is able to inspect a site for a hut, it should be inspected by the whole Order. But if the whole Order is not able to inspect a site for a hut, then those monks who are experienced and competent to know what involves destruction, what does not involve destruction, what has an open space round it, what does not have an open space round it—begging these, they should depute (them).

And thus, monks, should they depute (them): the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Such and such a monk, begging in company, for his own advantage, desirous of building a hut which has no benefactor, begs the Order for inspection of the site for a hut. If it is the right time for the Order,³ the Order should depute such and such monks to inspect a site for a hut for that monk. This is the motion. Let the Order listen to me, honoured sirs. Such and such a monk ... site for a hut. The Order depute such and such monks to inspect a site for a hut for such and such a monk. If it seems good to the venerable ones to depute the inspection of a site for a hut to such and such monks for that monk, be silent; if it does not seem good, then you should speak. Such and such monks are deputed by the Order to inspect a

¹ Vin-a 569, “the Order should be spoken to thus by him.” ² I.e., all the community of a district or of a *vihāra*. ³ Vin-a 569, “for this inspection.”

site for a hut for such and such a monk. It seems good to the Order, therefore they are silent; thus do I understand.'

These monks (thus) deputed, going there, a site for a hut should be inspected, it should be known whether it involves destruction, whether it does not involve destruction, whether it has an open space round it, whether it does not have an open space round it. If it involves destruction and has not an open space round it, it should be said: Do not build here. If it does not involve destruction and has an open space round it, the Order should be told that it does not involve destruction and that it has an open space round it. The monk building the hut, going up to the Order, arranging his robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, squatting down on his heels, and saluting with his palms outstretched, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs, begging in company, am desirous of building a hut; it has no benefactor, it is for my own advantage. Honoured sirs, I beg the Order to mark out the site for a hut.' A second time it should be begged for, a third time it should be begged for. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Such and such a monk, begging in company, is desirous of building a hut, it has no benefactor, it is for his own advantage. He begs the Order to mark out a site for a hut. If it is the right time for the Order, the Order should mark out a site for a hut for such and such a monk. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Such and such a monk ... site for a hut. The Order marks out a site for a hut for such and such a monk. If the marking out of the site for a hut for such and such a monk seems good to the venerable ones, be silent; if it does not seem good, then speak. The site for a hut for such and such a monk is marked out by the Order. It seems good to the Order, therefore they are silent; thus do I understand.'

Involving destruction means: if it is the abode of ants or if it is the abode of termites or if it is the abode of rats or if it is the abode of snakes or if it is the abode of scorpions or if it is the abode of

centipedes or if it is the abode of elephants or if it is the abode of horses or if it is the abode of lions or if it is the abode of tigers or if it is the abode of leopards or if it is the abode of bears or if it is the abode of hyenas¹ or if it is the abode of any other animals or living creatures, or if it is connected with² grain or if it is connected with vegetables, or if it is connected with the slaughtering-place³ or if it is connected with the execution-block or if it is connected with a cemetery or if it is connected with a pleasure-grove or if it is connected with the king's property or if it is connected with elephant-stables or if it is connected with horses' stables or if it is connected with a prison or if it is connected with a tavern⁴ or if it is connected with a slaughter-house or if it is connected with a carriage road or if it is connected with a cross-road or if it is connected with a public rest-house or if it is connected with a meeting-place:⁵ this means **involving destruction**.

Not with an open space round it means: It is not possible to go round it even with a yoked wagon, to go round it everywhere with a ladder.⁶ This means **not with an open space round it**.

Not involving destruction means: if it is not the abode of ants nor is it the abode of termites ... it is not connected with a meeting-place. This means **not involving destruction**.

With an open space round it means: it is possible to go round it even with a yoked wagon, to go round it everywhere with a ladder. This means **with an open space round it**.

Begging in company means: oneself begging saying: Give a man ... give clay.

A hut means: it is smeared inside or it is smeared outside or it is smeared inside and outside.

¹ Cf. above, **BD 1.98**; AN iii.101; Ja 5.416. At **Vin 1.219–220** it is a *dukkaṭa* to eat the flesh of some of these animals. ² Nissita throughout. ³ For thieves, Vin-a 570. ⁴ At **Vin 4.267** nuns are forbidden to keep both such places. ⁵ Text reads, *saṃsaraṇa*; Vin-a 570 reads *sañcaraṇa*. ⁶ Vin-a 570, “a ladder having been put up by those approving of the hut, it is not possible to go round it with a ladder (to lean a ladder on every point of it).”

Should build means: he builds or he causes to be built.

If he should not bring the monks for marking out a site, or if he should exceed the measure means: not having caused the site for a hut to be marked out by a vote following upon the motion, he builds or causes to be built, exceeding the length or width by as much as even a hair's breadth, in each operation there is an offence of wrong-doing. If one lump¹ is (still) to come there is a grave offence, but when that lump has come there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.²

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: ... because of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, not involving destruction, having an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, involving

¹ Of plaster, Vin-a 571. ² Cf. below, **BD 1.268**.

destruction, having an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, not involving destruction, having an open space round it, there is no offence.

If a monk builds a hut, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, exceeding the measure, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, exceeding the measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If a monk builds a hut to (the right) measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut to (the right) measure, involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds, a hut to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there are two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, with an open space round it, there are two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the measure not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there are two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there are two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there are two offences of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, not with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a monk builds a hut, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence.

A monk commands: "Build a hut for me." If they build a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not

with an open space round it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing ... If they build a hut for him, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. But he did not command: "Let the site be marked out, and let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it." They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing ... the site having been marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. But he did not command: "Let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it." They built a hut for him, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing ... to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: "Build a hut for me," went away. But he did not command: "Let the site be marked out, and let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it." They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there are two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order together with two offences of wrong-doing ... the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: “Build a hut for me,” went away. And he commanded: “Let the site be marked out, and let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it.” They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. He heard and said: “They say that a hut was built for me, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it.” This monk should go himself or a messenger should be sent, saying:

“Let the site be marked out, and let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it.” If he should not go himself or send a messenger, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

A monk having commanded: “Build a hut for me,” ... they built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, with an open space round it. He heard ... or a messenger should be sent saying: “Let the site be marked out, and let it not involve destruction.” If he should not go himself nor send a messenger, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

A monk having commanded: ... “Let the site be marked out, and with an open space round it ... Let the site be marked out ... Let it not involve destruction, and let there be an open space round it ... Let it not involve destruction ... Let there be an open space round it” ... there is an offence of wrong-doing ... They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: “Build a hut for me,” went away. And he commanded: “Let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it.” They built a hut for him, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. He heard and said: “They say that a hut was built for me, exceeding the measure, involving destruction, not with an open space round it.” This monk should go himself or a messenger should be sent, saying: “Let it be to (the right) measure, and, not involving

destruction, and with an open space round it ... Let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction ... Let it be to (the right) measure, and with an open space round it ... Let it be to (the right) measure ... Let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it ... Let it not involve destruction ... Let it have an open space round it” ... there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: “Build a hut for me,” went away. He commanded: “Let the site be marked out, and let it be to (the right) measure, and let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it.” They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, exceeding the (right) measure involving destruction, not with an open space round it. He heard ... no offence.

A monk having commanded: “Build a hut for me,” went away. He commanded: “Let the site be marked out, and let it not involve destruction, and let there be an open space round it.” They built the hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there are three offences of wrong-doing for the builders ... involving destruction, with an open space round it: there are two offences of wrong-doing for the builders ... not involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there are two offences of wrong-doing for the builders ... not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is an offence of wrong-doing for the builders ... the site having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there are two offences of wrong-doing for the builders ... involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is an offence of wrong-doing for the builders ... not involving destruction, not with an open space round it: there is an offence of wrong-doing for the builders ... not involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: “Build a hut for me” went away. He commanded: “Let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving

destruction, and with an open space round it” ... A monk having commanded: “Build a hut for me,” went away. He commanded: “Let the site be marked out, and let it be to (the right) measure, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it” ... there is no offence.

6.3.14
1.264 A monk having commanded: “Build a hut for me,” went away. They built a hut for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. If he comes back (and finds that it is) imperfectly executed, the hut should be given by this monk to another, or being destroyed should be rebuilt. If he does not give it to another, or destroying it have it rebuilt, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order ... A monk having commanded: “Build a hut for me,” went away. They built a hut for him, the site having been marked out, to (the right) measure, not involving destruction, with an open space round it: there is no offence.

6.3.15 If he finishes¹ by himself what was imperfectly executed by himself, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If others finish what was imperfectly executed by himself, there is an offence ... of the Order. If he finishes by himself what was imperfectly executed by others, there is an offence ... of the Order. If others finish what was imperfectly executed by others, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

6.3.16 There is no offence if it is (built) in a mountain-cave² as a hut,³ as

¹ Cf. Vin 3.225, Vin 3.229. ² *leṇa*. Vin 1.206 = Vin 3.248, translated at *Vinaya Texts* ii.61, “cave dwelling-place.” At Vin 2.146 it is given as the generic term for five kinds of abode. ³ *guhā* Vin-a 573, “a hut of bricks or in a rock or of wood or of earth.” *Guhā* is mentioned at Vin 1.58 = Vin 1.96, with the four other abodes of Vin 2.146, as an allowance extra to that of dwelling at the foot of a tree. At Vin 1.107 the Order is allowed to fix upon an *Uposatha* Hall in any one of these five dwelling-places, and at Vin 1.239 the Order is allowed to keep the stores in any one of them. Cf. Vin 1.284.

a hut of *tiṇa*-grass,¹ for the good of another² except it be as a house, there is no offence in any of these circumstances,³ nor if he is out of his mind or a beginner.⁴

Told is the Sixth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that of building a hut⁵

¹ “= a seven-storied palace if (only) the covering is of leaves or of *tiṇa*-grass”, Vin-a 573. A seven-storied (*sattabhūmaka*) hut is, I suppose, conceivable, but seems hardly possible. ² “If it is built for the benefit of a preceptor or teacher or for the Order,” Vin-a 574. ³ Vin-a 574, “except it be as a house (dwelling or home, *agāra*) for himself, he has it built, saying: ‘It will become another half for the recitation of the Pātimokkha, or a hot room for bathing purposes, or a dining-room, or a warmed refectory’; in all these circumstances there is no offence. But if he says that it will become these things and that ‘I will dwell in it’ there is an offence.” ⁴ For these exemptions cf. Vin 4.48; Vin-a 574 indicates that the monks of Āḷavī were beginners.

⁵ Probably *niṭṭhitam* is omitted here by mistake.

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 7

1.266 ... at Kosambī in Ghosita's Park.¹ At that time a householder, the
s 7.1.1 supporter² of the venerable Channa,³ said to the venerable Channa:
“Do find out a site for a *vihāra*,⁴ honoured sir. I will have a *vihāra*
built for the master.”

Then the venerable Channa, clearing a site for the *vihāra*, had a
tree cut down that was used as a shrine,⁵ revered by village, revered
by little town, revered by town, revered by the country-side, revered
by the kingdom. People became vexed, annoyed, angry, saying: “How
can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a tree cut down that is
used as a shrine revered by village ... revered by the kingdom? The
3.156 recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are depriving a one-facultied thing⁶ of
life.” The monks heard these people who were vexed, annoyed, angry.
Those who were modest monks became vexed, annoyed, angry and

¹ Vin-a 574, “it was made, they say, by Ghosita, the great merchant.” ² Vin-a 574, “at the time of the bodhisatta Channa was his supporter.” ³ Cf. Vin 2.21ff.; at Vin 2.88, he took the side of the nuns in a quarrel with the monks; at Vin 2.290 the *brahmadaṇḍa* penalty was laid on him, but he attained arahanship (DN ii.154). Cf. also Vin 4.35f., Vin 4.47, Vin 4.113, Vin 4.141 and below, BD 1.309. ⁴ Vin-a 574, “not a whole *vihāra*, but one dwelling-place.” *Vihāra* originally was probably rather more than “cell,” and “cell” would most likely have been called *pariveṇa*, a monk's cell, cf. *Vinaya Texts* iii.109, and above, BD 1.119. ⁵ Vin-a 575 explains *cetiya* by *cittikata*. This is from *citti-karoti*, to honour, to esteem. Vin-a 575 further says that “a *cetiya* is for the sake of honouring: the term is used of those worthy of worship of sacred places. *Cetiya* means the honoured (or revered or selected) tree, it is a tree used (as a place) for honouring.” See above, BD 1.243, n. 4, and BD 1.247, n. 2. ⁶ With body-sensibility—i.e., sense of touch.

said:

“How can the venerable Channa have a tree cut down that was used as a shrine, revered by village ... revered by the kingdom?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, Channa, that you had a tree cut down that was used as a shrine, revered by village ... revered by the kingdom?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, have a tree cut down that was used as a shrine, revered by village ... revered by the kingdom? For, foolish man, in a tree are people having consciousness as living beings. This is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers ... Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“If there is a monk building a large¹ *vihāra* for his own advantage, having a benefactor, monks should be brought for marking out a site. A site should be marked out by these monks, not involving destruction, with an open space round it. If a monk should build a large *vihāra* on a site involving destruction, not with an open space round it, or if he should not bring monks to mark out a site, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

Large means: it is called a *vihāra* having a benefactor.²

Vihāra means: it is smeared inside or it is smeared outside or it is smeared inside and outside.³

Building means: building or causing to be built.

¹ *Mahallaka*, here not in the usual sense of “full of years,” but = *mahantabhāvo ... pamāṇmahantāya mahallakaṃ ... atthadassanatthaṃ mahallako nāma*, Vin-a 575. But see Old Commentary’s definition below. Cf. Vin 2.166, where a *vihāra* is also called *mahallaka*. ² Because then it can be made to the size of the approved measure, apparently meaning not smaller than this. ³ Cf. above, BD 1.254, where hut, *kuṭṭi*, is defined in these same terms. *Ullittālitta*, which I have rendered “smeared inside and outside,” also occurs at AN i.101 = MN iii.61, in the simile of the (wise and foolish) non-inflammable and inflammable house with gabled roofs.

Having a benefactor means: a certain person is the benefactor: a woman or a man or a householder or one who has gone forth.¹

For his own advantage means: for his own good.²

Monks should be brought for marking out a site means: that monk building a *vihāra*, clearing the site for a *vihāra* ... (see **Bu-Ss 6.2.2**) ... should say: ‘I, honoured sirs, am desirous of building a large *vihāra*, having a benefactor, for my own advantage; honoured sirs, I beg the Order to inspect the site for a *vihāra* ... this is called having an open space round it.

Large means: it is called a *vihāra* having a benefactor.

Vihāra means: it is smeared inside or it is smeared outside or it is smeared inside and outside.

Should build means: he builds or he causes to be built.

If he should not bring monks to mark out the site means: not having caused the site for a *vihāra* to be marked out by a vote following directly upon the motion, he builds or causes to be built, in each operation there is an offence of wrong-doing. If one lump (of plaster) is (still) to come, there is a grave offence; when that lump has come there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.³

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: ... on account of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If a monk builds a *vihāra*, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it ... (see **Bu-Ss 6.3.1**. *The sections which contain “exceeding the measure” and “to (the right) measure” are not repeated here*) ... the site having been marked out, involving no destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence.

A monk commanded: “Build a *vihāra* for me.” They built a *vihāra* for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction,

¹ Cf. above, **BD 1.254**. ² Cf. above, **BD 1.254**. ³ Cf. above, **BD 1.258**.

not with an open space round it ... the site not having been marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: “Build a *vihāra* for me,” went away. And he did not command: “Let there be marking out of the site, and let it not involve destruction, and let it have an open space round it.” They built a *vihāra* for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it ... the site having been marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: “Build a *vihāra* for me,” went away. And he commanded: “Let there be marking out of the site, and not involving destruction, and with an open space round it.” They built the *vihāra* for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. He heard and said: “They say that a *vihāra* was built for me, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it.” If this monk should go himself ... there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: “Build a *vihāra* for me,” went away. And he commanded: “Let there be marking out of the site, and let it not involve destruction, and let there be an open space round it.” They built a *vihāra* for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. For the builders there are three offences of wrong-doing ... the site marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence.

A monk having commanded: “Build a *vihāra* for me,” went away. They built a *vihāra* for him, the site not having been marked out, involving destruction, not with an open space round it. If he comes

back there (and finds that it is) imperfectly executed ... the site having been marked out, not involving destruction, with an open space round it, there is no offence.

⁵⁷³⁷

If he finishes by himself what was imperfectly executed by himself ... (= **Bu-Ss 6.3.15**–**Bu-Ss 6.3.16**) ... if he is a beginner.

Told is the Seventh Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that of building a vihāra

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 8

At one time¹ the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. At that time perfection had been attained by the venerable Dabba,² the Mallian,³ seven years after his birth. All that there is to be attained by a disciple had been fully attained by him⁴; for him there was nothing further to be done,⁵ no increase⁶ to (be added to) that which had been done. Then the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, as he was meditating alone and in solitude, thought: "Perfection was realised by me seven years after my birth. Whatever there is to be attained by a disciple, all this has been fully attained by me; for me there is nothing further to be done, no increase (to be added) to that which has been done. What now if I should render a service to the Order?" Then the venerable

¹ From here to **BD 1.9** below = **Vin 2.74-79**; translated at *Vinaya Texts* iii.4-18. ² Vin-a 576, "he realised arahanship in the tonsure hall"—i.e., as his curls were being cut off. Cf. *Thag 5*, and *Psalms of the Brethren*, p.10; at *AN i.24* he is called "chief among those who assign quarters." ³ The son of the *rāja* or chief of the Mallians.

⁴ Vin-a 576, "the threefold wisdom, the four branches of logical analysis, the six super-knowings, the nine other-worldly matters." ⁵ Vin-a 576. "It is said that by him there is nothing further to be done in the four true things, the four Ways, owing to the commission of the sixteenfold thing that ought to be done." ⁶ *paṭicaya*. This is translated at *Vinaya Texts* iii.4 as "nothing left that he ought to gather up as the fruit of his past labour." But this, I think, is reading more into these words than is justified. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 576 says, "there is no increasing (*vaḍḍhana*) of what ought to be done," such as cleansing (a cleaned bowl). I think that this is the right interpretation. Cf. **Vin 1.183**, **Vin 1.185**; *AN iii.376*; *AN iv.355* for phrase *katassa vā paṭicayaṃ. Pati°* as at **Vin 3.158** above is unusual.

Dabba, the Mallian, thought: “What now if I should assign lodgings to the Order, and should distribute the meals?”

8.1.2 Then the venerable, Dabba, the Mallian, rising up from his meditation at evening time, approached the lord, and having approached him and greeted him, he sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, said to the lord: “Now, lord, as I was meditating alone and in solitude, I thought: ‘... What now if I were to render a service to the Order?’ I thought of this, lord: ‘What now if I were to assign lodgings to the Order? What if I should distribute the meals?’”

“It is good, it is good, Dabba; then, you, Dabba, assign the lodgings to the Order and distribute the meals.”

“Very well, lord,” the reverend Dabba, the Mallian, answered the lord.

8.1.3 Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given *dhamma*-talk, addressed the monks: “Monks, let the Order consent that Dabba, the Mallian, should assign the lodgings, and should distribute the meals. Monks, this should be authorised thus: Dabba should first be asked and having been asked, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. If it is the right time for the Order, let the Order consent that the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, should assign the lodgings and distribute the meals. That is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. The Order agrees that the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, should assign the lodgings and distribute the meals. If it pleases the venerable ones and there is permission that the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, should assign lodgings and distribute the meals, then be silent; if it does not seem good, then you should speak. It is agreed by the Order that the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, should assign the lodgings and distribute the meals. It is agreed ... Thus do I

3.159

1.273

understand.”¹

Then the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, being so chosen, assigned one lodging in the same place for those monks who belonged to the same company. For those monks who knew the Suttantas he assigned a lodging in the same place, saying: “These will be able to chant over² the Suttantas to one another.” For those monks versed in the Vinaya rules, he assigned a lodging in the same place, saying: “They will decide upon the Vinaya with one another.” For those monks teaching *dhamma* he assigned a lodging in the same place, saying: “They will discuss *dhamma* with one another.” For those monks who were musers he assigned a lodging in the same place, saying: “They will not disturb one another.” For those monks who lived indulging in low talk³ and who were athletic he assigned a lodging in the same place, saying: “These reverend ones will live⁴ according to their pleasure.” For those monks who came in late at night⁵ he, having attained the condition of heat,⁶ assigned a lodging by this light.⁷ So much so, that the monks came in late at night on purpose, (and) they thought: “We will see the wonder of the psychic potency of the venerable Dabba, the Mallian.” And having approached the venerable Dabba,

¹ Cf. Vin 2.176, where it is said that “at that time there was no one who allotted lodgings for the Order,” and Vin 2.175, where it is said that “at that time there was no one who distributed meals for the Order.” ² N.B. *not* to read: writing was apparently very little used at this date. ³ *tiracchānakathikā*, literally talkers about animals, so: talkers on low or childish subjects. ⁴ *acchissanti ti viharissanti*, Vin-a 579. ⁵ *vikāle* ⁶ *tejodhātuṃ samāpajjitvā*. At Ud 92 Dabba is credited with this same power, which he exerted at the time of his utter waning out. This power is also ascribed to Gotama at Vin 1.25; and to Uppalavaṇṇā at Thig-a 190. See *Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon*, ii. Sacred Books of the Buddhists VIII, p.11, n. 1, where MR. WOODWARD considers that this “power over the fire-element is probably the basis of *śakti* (*suttee*) in India.” I think, however, that *suttee* is connected with *satī*, the good, virtuous wife; while *śakti* is literally ability, willpower, influence. Cf. SN i.144 and KS i.182, n. 2; also AN i.176; AN ii.165; DN iii.27, DN iii.228, DN iii.247. ⁷ Vin-a 579, “having entered upon the fourth jhāna by meditation on fire, arising from that his fingers were glowing as a result of knowledge in the six super-knowings”: the power of *iddhi*, or psychic potency, was one of the six *abhiññā*.

the Mallian, they spoke thus: “Reverend Dabba, assign a lodging to us.”

The venerable Dabba, the Mallian, spoke thus to them: “Where do your reverences desire it? Where shall I assign it?”

Then these (monks) would quote a distant place on purpose, saying: “Reverend Dabba, assign us a lodging on the Vulture’s Peak¹; your reverence, assign us a lodging on the Robber’s Cliff; your reverence, assign us a lodging on the slopes of Isigili Hill² on the Black Rock; your reverence, assign us a lodging on the slopes of Vebhāra³ at Sattapaṇṇi Cave; your reverence, assign us a lodging in Sītā’s Wood⁴ on the slopes of the Snake Pool; your reverence, assign us a lodging at the Gomata Glen; your reverence, assign us a lodging at the Tinduka Glen; your reverence, assign us a lodging at the Tapodā Glen⁵; your reverence, assign us a lodging at the Tapodā Park⁶; your reverence, assign us a lodging at Jīvaka’s Mango Grove;⁷ your reverence, assign us a lodging in the deer-park at Maddakucchi.”⁸

The venerable Dabba, the Mallian, having attained the condition of heat for these (monks) went in front of each with his finger glowing; and they by the light of the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, went behind him. The venerable Dabba, the Mallian, assigned a lodging to them and said: “This is the couch, this the bed, this the bolster, this the pillow, this a privy, that a privy, this the drinking water, that the water for washing, this the staff, this is (the form of) the Order’s agreement, this is the time it should be entered upon, this the time

¹ A mountain near Rājagaha. These place-names also occur at DN ii.116. ² *Isigilipassa*. Here at the Black Rock, Godhika took his own life, SN i.120, and Vakkali, SN iii.123. From here the other peaks round Rājagaha could be seen, MN iii.68.

³ One of the mountains near Rājagaha. See *Psalms of the Bretheren* p.45, notes, and illustrations facing p.364. ⁴ **Vin 1.182**.

⁵ The river Tapodā (hot waters) ran beneath the Vebhāra Hill. See above, **BD 1.188**, and n. 1. Samiddhi was tempted by a *devatā* as he was bathing in the Tapodā, SN i.8ff., which is very similar to the Samiddhi Jātaka, Ja 2.56. ⁶ See previous note. ⁷ A garden at Rājagaha belonging to the physician Jīvaka Komārabhacca. Mentioned at MN i.368 (cf. MN-a 3.45). The Sāmaññaphala Suttanta was spoken here, DN i.47; this is referred to at **Vin 2.287**.

⁸ At **Vin 1.105** the Bhagavan appeared to Mahākappina here and exhorted him to observe the *Uposatha*. At both SN i.27 and SN i.110 it is said that in this garden Gotama’s foot was hurt by a splinter.

it should be departed from.” Then the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, having assigned a lodging to these (men), went back again to the Bamboo Grove.¹

Now at that time the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka² were newly ordained and of little merit; they obtained whatever inferior lodgings belonged to the Order and inferior meals. At that time the people in Kājagaha wished to give the Elder monks alms-food having a specially good seasoning,³ and ghee and oil and dainties.⁴ But to the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka they gave ordinary food, unseasoned porridge of broken rice⁵ accompanied by sour gruel. These, after they had eaten and had returned from their meal, asked the Elder monks: “What did you get, your reverences, at the refectory? What did you?”

Some Elders spoke thus: “There was ghee for us, your reverences, there was oil for us, there were dainties for us.”

But the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka spoke thus: “Your reverences, there was nothing for us, (only) ordinary food, unseasoned porridge of broken rice accompanied by sour gruel.”

At that time a householder who had nice food gave to the Order in continuous food supply a meal for four monks. He, together with his wife and children, attended and served in the refectory.

¹ Vin-a 579, “talking to them with talk about the country, he did not sit down, but returned to his own dwelling.” ² Vin-a 579, “the chief men of the sixfold group.” At Vin-a 614 (on Vin 3.179) it is said that Assaji and Punabbasuka are the foremost in this group, and at MN-a 3.186, they are called “among these six, two teachers of the crowd.” ³ *abhisamkhārika piṇḍapāta*. *Abhi*° means what specially belongs to the *samkhāras*, merit-accumulating. *Pali-English Dictionary* suggests tentatively “specially prepared.” The parallel passage at Vin 2.77 omits *piṇḍapāta*. The reading there is probably defective, and has led translators of *Vinaya Texts* iii.9, to render *abhi*° as a “wishing-gift.” See *Vinaya Texts* iii.9 n. 3. ⁴ *uttaribhaṅga*; also at Vin 4.259; Ja 1.349. Ghee, oil and *uttari*° are mentioned together at Vin 2.214. ⁵ *kaṇḍajakam* = *sakuṇḍakabhattam*, a meal with husk-powder cake. Cf. Ja 5.383.

3.161 One offered boiled rice, another offered curry, another offered oil, another offered dainties. Now at that time a meal given by the householder who had nice food was apportioned for the following day to the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka. Then the householder who had nice food went to the park on some business and approached the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, and having approached the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, and greeted him, he sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, rejoiced ... gladdened with *dhamma*-talk the householder who had nice food. Then when the householder who had nice food had been rejoiced ... gladdened with *dhamma*-talk by the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, he said to the venerable Dabba, the Mallian: “For whom, honoured sir, is the meal apportioned for tomorrow in our house?”

1.277 “Householder, the food apportioned in your house for tomorrow is for the monks who are the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka.”

Then the householder who had nice food was sorry and said: “How can these depraved monks¹ enjoy themselves in our house?” And going to his house, he gave orders to a female slave, saying: “Having prepared for those who come to eat tomorrow a seat in the store-room,² serve them with porridge of broken rice accompanied by sour gruel.”

“Very well, master,” the female slave answered the householder who had nice food.

8.1.7 Then the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka said to one another: “Yesterday, your reverences, a meal was allotted to us by the householder who has nice food. Tomorrow the

¹ This acquiescence in “*pāpabhikkhū*” is curious. It reminds one of the lax monks, not uncommon in Burma at the present day, who do not keep the Vinaya precepts. There are said to be good and earnest monks who do keep them, but who are not seen about much for the very reason that they lead the good life, as intended.

² *koṭṭhaka*, a store-room for various things. At [Vin 2.153](#) a *koṭṭhaka* is allowed to the monks. It was usually built over the gateway. Here Vin-a 580, says it was outside the gateway of the *vihāra* in the Bamboo Grove. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.109 for meanings and references.

householder who has nice food, attending with his wife and children, will serve us. Some will offer boiled rice, some will offer curry, some will offer oil, some will offer dainties.” These, because of their happiness, did not sleep that night as much as they had expected.

Then the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, rising up early and setting out taking their bowls and robes, approached the dwelling of the householder who had nice food. The female slave saw the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka coming from afar; and seeing them and making ready a seat in the store-room, she said to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka: “Sit here, honoured sirs.”

Then the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka thought: “But undoubtedly the food will not be ready,¹ since we are made to sit in the store-room.”

Then the female slave came up with the porridge of broken rice accompanied by sour gruel and said: “Eat, honoured sirs.”

“But, sister, we are those who enjoy a continuous supply of food.”

“I know that the masters enjoy a continuous supply of food. But yesterday I was ordered by the householder: ‘Having prepared a seat in the store-room for those who come for a meal today, serve them with porridge of broken rice accompanied by sour gruel.’ Eat, honoured sirs,” she said.

Then the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka said: “Yesterday, your reverences, the householder who has nice things to eat went to Dabba, the Mallian,² in the park; doubtless Dabba, the Mallian, set the householder at variance with us.” These (monks) on account of their lamentations did not eat as much as was expected.

Then the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, after they had eaten and had returned from their meal, going to the park and putting aside their bowls, sat down outside

¹ *siddha*. This is past participle of (1) *sijjati*, to boil, to cook; (2) *sijjhati*, to be accomplished, (see *Pali-English Dictionary*). ² Note that the monks now drop the epithet “venerable” or “reverend” in speaking of Dabba.

the store-room of the park,¹ squatting against their outer cloaks,² silent, abashed, their shoulders bent,³ their heads lowered, brooding, speechless.⁴

Then the nun Mettiyā⁵ approached the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, and having approached them she said to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka: “I salute you, masters.” When she had spoken thus the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka did not respond. A second time ... A third time the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka did not respond.

“Do I offend against the masters? Why do the masters not respond to me?” she said.

“It is because you neglect us, sister, when we are got into difficulties by Dabba, the Mallian.”

“What can I do, masters?” she said.

“If you would like, sister, this very day you could make the lord expel Dabba, the Mallian.”

“What can I do, masters? How am I able to do that?” she said.

“Come, sister, go up to the lord, and having gone up, say to the lord: ‘Now, lord, it is not suitable, it is not becoming that this quarter which should be without fear, secure, without danger is the very quarter which is full of fear, insecure, and full of danger. Where there was a calm, now there is a gale. It seems the very water is blazing. I have been assaulted by master⁶ Dabba, the Mallian.’”

¹ Vin-a 580, “outside the door of the store-room of the *vihāra* of the Bamboo Grove.” ² *sanghāṭi-pallatthikāya*, a curious expression. *Palla*° also means “lolling,” cf. Vin 4.129. ³ *pattakkhandhā*. *Khandha* here, I think, in one of its crude meanings, of back or shoulder, and not as suggested at *Vinaya Texts* iii.13, n. 1, “faculties.” See KS i.155, n. 5. Vin-a 580 = MN-a 2.104 explains *pattakkhandhā* as *patitakkhandhā*.

⁴ All this is stock. Cf. AN iii.57; SN i.124 = MN i.258. ⁵ The following narrative down to Bu-Ss 8.1.9 = Vin 2.78–79 and is almost exactly the same as that recorded at Vin 2.124–127, except that here the monks send Vaddha to the lord to say that Dabba has assaulted Vaddha’s wife. ⁶ *ayyena*, instrumentive, therefore not “lord” (vocative) as at *Vinaya Texts* iii.14. *Ayya* was a usual way in which the laity and nuns addressed the monks, but I do not think that anyone ever addressed the lord thus.

“Very well, masters,” the nun Mettiyā answered the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, and she approached the lord. Having approached and greeted the lord, she stood to one side. As she was standing to one side, the nun Mettiyā spoke thus to the lord: “Now, lord, it is not suitable ... by master Dabba, the Mallian.”

Now the lord on this occasion and in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the venerable Dabba, the Mallian:

“Dabba, do you remember doing as the nun Mettiyā says?”

“Lord, the lord knows with regard to me,” he said. A second time ... a third time the lord said to the venerable Dabba, the Mallian ... “with regard to me.”

“Dabba, the Dabbas¹ do not give evasive answers like that. If what was done was done by you, say so; if it was not done by you, say it was not.”

“Lord, since I was born, I cannot call to mind² ever indulging in sexual intercourse even in a dream; much less so when I was awake.”

Then the lord addressed the monks, saying: “Because of this, expel the nun Mettiyā,³ and take these monks to task.”

Having spoken thus, the lord rising up from his seat entered the *vihāra*. Then these monks expelled the nun Mettiyā. Then the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka said to those monks:

“Your reverences, do not expel the nun Mettiyā; she has not committed any sin; she was urged on by us, because we were angry, displeased and wanted him out of the way.”

“But are not your reverences defaming the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, with an unfounded charge involving defeat?”

“It is so, your reverences,” they said.

¹ They are wise, Vin-a 581. ² *abhijānāmi*. ³ This is, I think, clear evidence of monkish gloss. In every case of supposed wrong-doing the lord has always asked the supposed wrong-doer “Is it true?” and has never condemned anyone without first hearing what he has to say. It is so noteworthy as to be suspicious: where a woman is involved she is given no chance to exculpate herself to the lord. See HORNER, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p. 266.

1.281 Then those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed and angry, and said: “How can the monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka defame the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, with an unfounded charge involving defeat?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that you defamed Dabba, the Mallian, with an unfounded charge involving defeat?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

Then the enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “How can you, foolish men, defame Dabba, the Mallian, with an unfounded charge involving defeat? It is not, foolish men, for the benefit of unbelievers... Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk, malignant, malicious and ill-tempered, should defame a monk with an unfounded charge involving defeat, thinking: ‘Thus perhaps may I drive him away from this Brahma-life,’ then, if afterwards he, being pressed or not being pressed, the legal question turning out to be unfounded, if the monk confesses¹ his malice, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.**”

8.2.1 **Whatever** means: who ...

Monk² means: ... in this meaning **monk** is to be understood.

Monk means: another monk.

Malignant, malicious means: angry, displeased, dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.³

1.282 **Ill-tempered** means: with this anger, with this hatred, and with this displeasure, and with this dissatisfaction he is angry.

Unfounded means: unseen,⁴ unheard, unsuspected.

¹ *paṭiṭṭhāti* with more general meaning of “to stand fast.” But here, judging by the Old Commentary, see below at end of **Bu-Ss 8.1.2**, it must mean “confess” with the sense that his words were standing on or founded in malice. The verb, however, in such meanings is followed by the locative. But *paṭi* governs the accusative.

² Accusative. ³ Cf. **Vin 4.236**, **Vin 4.238**; DN iii.238, MN i.101. ⁴ Vin-a 585, not seen by self or others, nor by the bodily eye, nor by clairvoyance.

Involving defeat means: of one of the four (headings involving defeat).

Should defame means: should reprove or should cause to reprove.¹

Thus perhaps may I drive him away from this Brahma-life means: I may drive (him) away from monkdom, I may drive (him) away from recluse-dhamma,² I may drive (him) away from the aggregates of morality, I may drive (him) away from the advantage of religious austerity.³

Afterwards means: in the moment in which he is defamed that moment, that minute, that second has passed.

Being pressed means: he is defamed in that matter in which he is pressed.

Not being pressed means: not being spoken to by anyone.

A legal question⁴ means: there are four legal questions: legal questions arising out of disputes legal questions arising out of censure, legal questions arising out of transgressions, legal questions arising out of obligations.

If the monk confesses his malice means: empty words have been spoken by me, a lie has been spoken by me, untruth has been spoken by me, it has been spoken by me not knowing.

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means ... on account of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unseen by him committing⁵ an offence involving defeat,⁶ but if he reprimands him saying: “Seen by me, you are one who has

¹ Vin-a 587, “should reprove means he reproves him himself with the words ‘you have fallen into defeat’ ... should cause to reprove means ... he enjoins another monk and this one reproves him with his (i.e. the enjoiner’s) words.” ² *samaṇa-dhamma*, explained at AN iii.371: therefore not “the ascetic’s path” as at. Ja 1.31. ³ *tapoguṇa*. ⁴ *adhikaraṇa*. = Vin 4.126 = Vin 4.238. Cf. Vin 2.88ff., where the nature of these questions is explained, and Vin 2.99ff., which explains the ways of settling these questions. At MN ii.247ff. Gotama is represented as explaining all this to Ānanda. ⁵ *ajjhāpajjanta*, present participle. ⁶ *Pārājika dhamma*.

committed¹ a matter involving defeat, you are not a (true) recluse, you are not a (true) son of the Sakyans, there is no (holding) the observance-day (ceremony),² or the ceremony held at the end of the rains,³ or the ceremony performed by a chapter of monks⁴ with you,”—for each speech⁵ there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.⁶

He is unheard by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: “Heard by me, you are ...” —for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unsuspected by him of committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: “Suspected by me, you are ...” —for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

8.3.2 He is unseen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: “Seen and heard by me, you are one who has committed an offence involving defeat ...” —for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unseen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: “Seen and suspected by me ... Seen, heard and suspected by me ...” —for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

1.28.4 He is unheard by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: “Heard and suspected by me ... Heard and seen by me ... Heard, seen and suspected by me ...” —for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unsuspected by him of committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: “Suspected and seen by me

¹ *Ajjhāpanna*, past participle. ² *Uposatha*, a chapter of monks meeting on the fifteenth day of each half-month to expound *dhamma*, **Vin 1.102**. E.M. HARE, GS 4.140, GS 4.170, gives “observance-day” for *uposatha*. ³ *Pavāraṇā*, when the monks invite one another to tell of anything seen, heard or suspected to be wrong, **Vin 1.160** and cf. **Vin 2.32**. ⁴ *Saṅghakamma*, the monks being assembled together in solemn conclave. Cf. **Vin 1.123**, **Vin 1.143**. ⁵ *Vācāya vācāya*. ⁶ Cf. below, **BD 1.292**.

... Suspected and heard by me ... Suspected, seen and heard by me ...”—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is seen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: “Heard by me ... Suspected by me ... Heard and suspected by me, you are one who has committed an offence involving defeat ...”—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is heard by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: “Suspected by me ... Seen by me ... Suspected and seen by me ...”—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is suspected by him of committing an offence involving defeat, but if he reprimands him saying: “Seen by me ... Heard by me ... Seen and heard by me ...”—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is seen by him committing an offence involving defeat; but he is in doubt as to the sight, he does not trust the sight, does not remember the sight, is confused as to the sight. He is in doubt as to what he has heard ... is confused as to what he heard. He is in doubt as to the suspicion ... he is confused as to what he suspected; yet he reprimands him saying: “Suspected and seen by me ... Suspected and heard by me ... Suspected and seen and heard by me ...”—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unseen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he causes him to be reprimanded saying: “You are seen, you are one who has committed an offence involving defeat ...”—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

He is unheard ... He is unsuspected ...

He is unseen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he causes him to be reprimanded saying: “You are seen and heard ... You are seen and suspected ... You are seen and heard and suspected ...”—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

8.3.7 He is seen by him committing an offence involving defeat, but if he causes him to be reprimanded saying: “You are heard ... You are suspected ... You are heard and suspected ...”

He is heard by him ... He is suspected by him ...

8.3.8 He is seen by him committing an offence involving defeat; he is in doubt as to the sight ... he is confused as to what he suspected, yet he causes him to be reprimanded saying: “You are suspected and seen ...” ... he is confused as to what he suspected, yet he causes him to be reprimanded saying: “You are suspected and heard ...” ... he is confused as to what he suspected, yet he causes him to be reprimanded saying: “You are suspected and seen and heard ... involving defeat ...”—for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

8.4.1 There is a view of what is pure in what is impure, a view of what is impure in what is pure, there is a view of what is impure in what is impure, a view of what is pure in what is pure.

8.4.2
1.286 If a man is impure, committing a certain offence involving defeat, even though there exist a view of purity, if he speaks desiring his expulsion, but without having gained his leave,¹ there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence requiring a formal-meeting of the Order.

If a man is impure ... if he speaks desiring his expulsion, but

¹ See [Vin 1.114](#), where it is said that no monk who has not given leave may be re-proved for an offence.

having gained his leave, it is an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order.

If a man is impure ... not having gained his leave, he spoke intending abuse, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with one of insulting speech.

If a man is impure ... having gained his leave, he spoke intending abuse, it is an offence of insulting speech.

If a man is pure, not committing a certain offence involving defeat, even though there exist a view of impurity, if he speaks desiring his expulsion, but without having gained his leave, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If a man is pure ... having gained his leave, he speaks intending his expulsion, there is no offence.

If it is a pure man ... without having gained his leave, he speaks intending abuse, it is an offence of wrong-doing with one of insulting speech.

If it is a pure man ... having gained his leave, he speaks intending abuse, it is an offence of insulting speech.

If a man is impure, committing a certain offence involving defeat, even though there exist a view as to impurity, he speaks wishing his expulsion, but not having gained his leave, there is an offence of wrong-doing ... it is not an offence ... it is an offence of wrong-doing with one of insulting speech ... it is an offence of insulting speech.

If a man is pure, not committing an offence leading to defeat, even though there exist a view as to purity ... there is an offence of wrong-doing with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order ... it is an offence requiring a formal meeting of the Order ... it is an offence of wrong-doing with one of insulting speech ... it is an offence of insulting speech.

There is no offence if there is a view as to what is impure in what is pure, if there is a view as to what is impure in what is impure, if he is mad, if he is a beginner.

Told is the Eighth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that concerned with what is unfounded

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 9

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. At that time as the monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummaja were descending from the slope of the Vulture's Peak, they saw a he-goat copulating with a nanny-goat; seeing them they said: "Look here, your reverences, let us call this he-goat Dabba, the Mallian, and this nanny-goat Mettiyā, the nun; thus we will express it: 'Formerly, your reverences, we spoke to Dabba, the Mallian, about what was heard, but now we have ourselves seen him sinning with the nun Mettiyā.'" These gave that he-goat the name of Dabba, the Mallian, and called that nanny-goat Mettiyā, the nun.

These told the monks: "Formerly, your reverences, we spoke to Dabba, the Mallian, about what was heard, but now we ourselves have seen him sinning with Mettiyā, the nun."

The monks said: "Your reverences, do not speak like that; the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, would not do that."

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. The lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the venerable Dabba, the Mallian:

"Do you remember,¹ Dabba, to have done as these monks say?"

"Lord, the lord knows with regard to me," he said.

A second time, the lord ... a third time the lord said to the venerable Dabba, the Mallian ... "knows with regard to me," he said.

"Do not, Dabba, ..." ... "... how much more when I was awake." he

¹ Cf. above, BD 1.280.

said.

Then the lord addressed the monks: “Because of this, monks, you should put questions to these monks.” Having spoken thus, the lord rising up from his seat, entered the *vihāra*.

Then these monks put questions¹ to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka. These, being questioned by the monks, told this matter to the monks.

“Did you not defame the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, your reverences, with a charge of falling into defeat, taking up some point as a pretext in a legal question really belonging to something else?”

“It is so, your reverences,” they said.

Then those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed and angry, and said: “How can the monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka defame the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, with ... to something else?”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said: “Is it true as is said, that you, monks, defamed Dabba, the Mallian, with ... to something else?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “How can you, foolish men, defame Dabba, the Mallian, with ... to something else? Foolish men, it is not for the benefit of unbelievers ... And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, malignant, malicious and ill-tempered, should defame a monk with a charge involving defeat, taking up some point as a pretext in a legal question really belonging to something else, saying: ‘Thus perhaps may I drive him away from this Brahma-life’; then, if afterwards, he, being pressed or not being pressed, the legal question turning out to belong to something different, if the monk confesses his malice and (confesses)

¹ Vin-a 598, “Where did you see Dabba with Mettiyā? ... at what time? ... where were you going then? ... Who knows you were at that time in the Bamboo Grove? ...”

having taken up some point as a pretext: it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

Whatever means: ... (= Bu-Ss 8.2) ... is angry.

In a legal question really belonging to something else means: either it is an offence of a different kind or it is a legal question of a different kind.

How is a legal question connected with a different kind of legal question? The legal question arising out of disputes may belong to something different: to a legal question arising out of censure, to a legal question arising out of transgressions, to a legal question arising out of obligations. A legal question arising out of censure ... a legal question arising out of transgressions ... a legal question arising out of obligations may belong to something different: to a legal question arising out of disputes to a legal question arising out of transgressions, to a legal question arising out of obligations. Thus a legal question may belong to a different legal question.

How is a legal question connected with a legal question? A question arising out of disputes is connected with a question arising out of disputes A question arising out of censure is connected with a question arising out of censure. A question arising out of transgression may be connected with a question arising out of transgression, or it may be connected with something else. How is a question arising out of transgression connected with something other than a question arising out of transgression? An offence involving defeat through sexual intercourse may belong to something else: to an offence involving defeat through taking something that was not given, to an offence involving defeat through taking up human form, to an offence involving defeat through claiming states of further-men. An offence involving defeat through taking something that was not given ... an offence involving defeat through taking up human form ... an offence involving defeat through claiming states of further-men may belong to something else: to an offence involving defeat through sexual in-

tercourse, to an offence involving defeat through taking something that was not given, to an offence involving defeat through taking up human form. Thus a question arising out of transgression may belong to something other than a question arising out of transgression. And how can a question arising out of transgression belong to a question arising out of transgression? An offence involving defeat through sexual intercourse may belong to an offence involving defeat through sexual intercourse ... an offence involving defeat through claiming states of further-men may belong to an offence involving defeat through claiming states of further-men. Thus does a question arising out of transgression belong to a question arising out of transgression. A question arising out of obligations may belong to a question arising out of obligations. Thus may a legal question belong to a legal question.

Taking up some point as a pretext.¹ A **pretext** means that there are ten pretexts: the pretext of birth, the pretext of name, the pretext of family, the pretext of characteristic, the pretext of offence, the pretext of a bowl, the pretext of a robe, the pretext of a teacher, the pretext of a preceptor, the precept of lodgings.

The pretext of birth means: A noble is seen committing² a matter involving defeat; seeing another noble³ he reprimands him, saying: “A noble is seen by me; you are one who has committed⁴ a matter involving defeat, you are not a (true) recluse, you are not a (true) son of the Sakyans; there is no (holding) the observance-day (ceremony) with you, or the ceremony at the termination of the rains, or the ceremony performed by a chapter of monks” — for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.⁵

A brahmin is seen ... a merchant is seen ... a low-caste man is seen ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of name means: one who is a Buddhārakkhita is

¹ *Lesā*. ² *Ajjhāpajjanta*. ³ Vin-a 601, who was a monk, he seizes the pretext of his *khattiya* birth. ⁴ *Ajjhāpanna*. ⁵ Cf. above, **BD 1.283**.

seen ... one who is a Dhammarakkhita is seen ... one who is a Saṅgharakkhita is seen committing a matter involving defeat; seeing another Saṅgharakkhita ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of family means: a Gotama is seen ... a Moggallāna is seen ... a Kaccāna is seen ... a Vāsiṭṭha is seen committing an offence involving defeat; seeing another Vāsiṭṭha ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of characteristic means: a tall man is seen ... a short man is seen ... a dark man is seen ... a fair man is seen committing an offence involving defeat ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of an offence means: one is seen committing a slight offence, and if he reprimands him for a matter involving defeat, saying: “You are not a (true) recluse ...” ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of a bowl means: one carrying a copper bowl is seen ... one carrying a bowl of hide¹ is seen ... one carrying a cracked bowl² is seen committing a matter involving defeat ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of a robe means: one wearing robes taken from the dust-heap is seen ... one wearing householders’ robes is seen committing a matter involving defeat ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of a teacher means: the pupil of such and such a one is seen committing a matter involving defeat ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of a preceptor means: the novice of such and such a one is seen committing a matter involving defeat ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

The pretext of lodgings means: a dweller in such and such lodgings is seen committing a matter involving defeat ... for each speech

¹ Vin-a 602, *sātakapatta*, “like the copper bowl it is well-turned, of beautiful hide, glossy, of black colour (literally bee-coloured), it is called a clay bowl.” ² Vin-a 602, “it was an ordinary clay bowl.”

there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

With a charge involving defeat means: one of the four ... (= Bu-Ss 8.2) ... a question arising out of obligations.

Taking up some point as a pretext means: taking up a certain pretext among these pretexts.

If the monk confesses his malice means: ... (= Bu-Ss 8.2) ... because of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A monk is seen committing an offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order; in the offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order there is a wrong view as to an offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order. If he reprimands him for a matter involving defeat, saying: "You are not a (true) recluse ... nor a ceremony performed by a chapter of monks," thus it is connected with a different kind of offence and a pretext is taken up: for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A monk is seen committing an offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order; in the offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order there is the wrong view that it is a grave offence ... there is the wrong view that it is an offence requiring expiation ... there is the wrong view that it is an offence which ought to be confessed ... there is the wrong view that it is an offence of wrong-doing ... there is the wrong view that it is an offence of evil speech. If he reprimands him ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A monk is seen committing a grave offence ... an offence requiring expiation ... an offence which ought to be confessed ... an offence of wrong-doing ... an offence of evil speech; in the evil speech there is a wrong view of evil speech. If he reprimands him ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A monk is seen committing an offence of evil speech; there is the wrong view that in the offence of evil speech there is an offence

entailing a formal meeting of the Order; there is the wrong view that in the evil speech there is a grave offence, an offence requiring expiation, an offence which ought to be confessed, an offence of wrong-doing. If he reprimands him ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

Beginning severally, the series, with this exception, should be put together

A monk is seen committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order; in the offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order there is a wrong view as to an offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order. If he causes him to be reprimanded for an offence involving defeat, saying: “You are not a (true) recluse ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

A monk is seen committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order; in the offence which entails a formal meeting of the Order there is a wrong view that it is a grave offence ... a wrong view that it is an offence of evil speech ... a monk is seen committing an offence of evil speech ... there is a wrong view that it is an offence of wrong-doing. If he causes him to be reprimanded ... for each speech there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

There is no offence if, thinking what is true,¹ he reprimands him or causes him to be reprimanded, if he is out of his mind, if he is a beginner.

Told² is the Ninth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order

¹ *Tathāsaññi*, cf. *tathāgata*, the “truth-finder.” ² *Samatta*, instead of the more usual *niṭṭhita*.

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 10

1.296 ... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place.
10.1.1 And then Devadatta¹ came up to Kokālika,² and to Kaṭamorakatissaka,
3.171 and to the son of the lady Khaṇḍā, and to Samuddadatta, and having
come up he said to Kokālika, Kaṭamorakatissaka, and the son of the
lady Khaṇḍā, and to Samuddadatta: "Now we, your reverences, will
make a schism in the Order of the recluse Gotama, a breaking of the
concord."³

When he had spoken thus Kokālika said to Devadatta: "Your reverence, the recluse Gotama has great psychic power, and great might. How can we make a schism in the Order of the recluse Gotama, a breaking of the concord?"

"Now we, your reverence, having approached the recluse Gotama, will beg for five items: 'Lord, the lord in many ways speaks in praise of desiring little, of being contented, of expunging (evil), of being punctilious, of what is gracious, of decrease (of the obstructions), of putting forth energy.'⁴ Lord, these five items are conducive in many ways to desiring little, to contentment, to expunging (evil), to being

¹ This story is given almost word for word at [Vin 2.196ff.](#) ² These schismatics appear again in [Bu-Ss 11](#). Mentioned at [Vin 4.66](#), [Vin 4.335](#). At [SN i.149=AN v.170=Snpp.123](#), Kokālika tried to defame the two chief disciples.

³ *Vinaya Texts* iii.251, "let us stir up a division in the samaṇa Gotama's saṅgha and in the body of his adherents," with note that "in *cakka-bhedam* the first word no doubt connotes 'kingship, lordship' as in *dhamma-cakka*, *cakkavatti*, etc." But it can also mean breaking a wheel, and symbolically *cakkabheda* has special meaning of "breaking up the peace, sowing discord." ⁴ = [Vin 1.45](#)=[Vin 2.2](#)=[Vin 3.21](#)=[Vin 4.213](#).

punctilious, to what is gracious, to decrease (of the obstruction), to putting forth energy.

BD 1.29

1. It were good, lord, if the monks for as long as life lasted, should be forest-dwellers; whoever should betake himself to the neighbourhood of a village, sin¹ would besmirch² him.
2. For as long as life lasts let them be beggars for alms;³ whoever should accept an invitation, sin would besmirch him.
3. For as long as life lasts let them be wearers of robes taken from the dust-heap; whoever should accept a robe given by a householder, sin would besmirch him.⁴
4. For as long as life lasts let them live at the foot of a tree;⁵ whoever should go under cover, sin would besmirch him.
5. For as long as life lasts let them not eat fish and flesh;⁶ whoever should eat fish and flesh, sin would besmirch him.”

“The recluse Gotama will not allow these things. Then we will win over the people by means of these five items.”

“It is possible, your reverence, with these five items, to make a schism in the Order of the recluse Gotama, a breaking of the concord. For, your reverence, people esteem austerity.”⁷

Then Devadatta together with his friends went up to the lord, and having gone up and greeted the lord, he sat down to one side. As he was sitting to one side, Devadatta said to the lord: “Lord, the lord in many ways speaks in praise of desiring little ... who should eat fish or flesh, sin would besmirch him.”

Bu-Ss 1

¹ *vajja*. ² *phuseyya* from *phusati* to touch, not from *phusati* to sprinkle. Vin-a 603, “let hatred touch that monk, let the lord deal with him for the offence.” ³ Those who only eat the alms received in the begging-bowl. ⁴ At Vin 1.280 it is laid down that the monks may wear either the *paṃsukula* robes or accept lay robes, as they please. ⁵ At Vin 1.152 monks are forbidden to spend *vassa* out in the open. ⁶ At Vin 1.238 and below, BD 1.298, it is laid down that fish and meat are pure for the monks if they do not see, hear or suspect that it has been killed for them. Cf. BD 1.98, BD 1.99 above, where there seems to be no offence in eating meat. ⁷ *lūkhappasanna*, cf. An ii.71, where this is one of the four types of persons who estimate by and esteem outward form. Each type is explained at Pp 53.

BD 1.29

3.172 “Enough, Devadatta,” he said. “Whoever wishes, let him be a forest-dweller; whoever wishes, let him dwell in the neighbourhood of a village; whoever wishes, let him be a beggar for alms; whoever wishes, let him accept an invitation; whoever wishes, let him wear rags taken from the dust-heap; whoever wishes, let him accept a householder’s robes. For eight months, Devadatta, lodging at the foot of a tree is permitted by me.¹ Fish and flesh are pure in respect of three points: if they are not seen, heard or suspected (to have been killed for him²).”

1.299 Then Devadatta thinking: “The lord does not allow these five items,” was joyful and exultant.³ He rose from his seat, and having greeted the lord, and paid homage to him keeping him on his right side, he departed together with his friends. Then Devadatta, entering Rājagaha, taught the people by means of the five items: “We, your reverences, having approached the recluse Gotama, begged for five items: ‘Lord, the lord in various ways speaks in praise of desiring little ... whoever should eat fish and flesh, sin would besmirch him.’ The recluse Gotama does not allow these. But we live in conformity with these five items.”

10.1.3 Then those who were men of no faith, not virtuous, and of poor enlightenment, said: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are punc-

¹ I.e., not in the four months of the rains. ² Vin-a 604, “not seen means, having killed deer and fish for the benefit of the monks, their being caught was not seen; not heard means, having killed ... of the monks, the taking (of them) was not heard”; not suspected means, if the monks see men going from a village to the jungle with nets and snares in their hands; and if on the next day they receive fish and flesh with their alms in the village they suspect: “Was not this done for the benefit of the monks?” They ask the men, who deny it, and say it was done for their own benefit. Or the monks may hear it said that men are going out to the jungle with nets and snares, or they may neither see the hunters nor hear it said they that have gone out, but simply receive fish and flesh in their begging-bowls. The same doubts assail them, and they ask if the killing took place for their benefit. But if it was not done expressly for the monks’ benefit, inasmuch as there is no doubt as to this, everything is quite in order. ³ Vin-a 606, says he was joyful and exultant because he now thought he could cause a schism.

tilious¹ and practise the expunging of evil; but the recluse Gotama is luxurious and strives after abundance.”

Then those who were faithful, virtuous, clever, enlightened people became vexed, annoyed, angry and said: “How can this Devadatta go forward with a schism in the Order of the lord, with a breaking of the concord?”

Then the monks heard these people who were vexed, annoyed, angry. Those who were modest monks were ... angry, and said: “How can this Devadatta go forward with a schism, with a breaking of the concord?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

He said: “Is it true, as is said, Devadatta, that you went forward with a schism in the Order, with a breaking of the concord?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: “How can you, foolish man, go forward with a schism in the Order, with a breaking of the concord? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers ... Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should go forward with a schism of the Order which is harmonious, or should persist in taking up some legal question leading to a dissension: that monk should be spoken to thus by the monks: ‘Do not, venerable one, go forward with a schism of the Order which is harmonious, or persist in taking up some legal question leading to a dissension. Let the venerable one be associated with the Order; for the Order is harmonious, on friendly terms, not quarrelsome, it dwells comfortably under a single rule.’² And if that monk, after he has been spoken to thus by the monks, should persist, that monk should be admonished up to three times by the monks together concerning his giving up such a course. Should he give it up after being admonished up

¹ Vin-a 607, they are *dhuta* because they are endowed with the *paṭipadā* which shakes off the *kilesas*; they are *sallekhavutti* because their course of life (*vutti*) reduces the *kilesas*. ² I.e., not Gotama’s authority, but that of the Pātimokkha rules. This word, *ekuddesa*, occurs in the *Pārājikas* in definition of *saṃvāsa*, communion.

to three times, this is good. Should he not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

10.2.1

Whatever means: he who ...

Monk means: ... in this meaning is monk to be understood.

Harmonious means: an Order belonging to the same community¹ is established within the same boundary.²

Should go forward with a schism means: saying, “How should these folk be separated, how should they be separated, how should they be at variance?” seeking a faction, he gets a group together.

A legal question leading to a dissension means: the eighteen ways of causing a division.³

Taking up means: taking.

Leading to means: kindling.

1,301

Should persist means: should not give up.

That monk means: that schismatic monk.

By the monks means: by other monks, whoever see, whoever hear; these should say: “Do not, venerable one, go forward with a schism of the Order which is harmonious, nor persist in taking up a legal question leading to a dissension. Let the venerable one be associated with the Order. The Order, harmonious, on friendly terms, not quarrelsome, dwells comfortably under a single rule.” A second time they should say ... A third time they should say ... If he gives it up, this is good. If he does not give it up, it is an offence of wrong-doing. If having heard, they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That monk, having been pulled to the middle of the Order, they are to say: “Do not, venerable one, go forward with a

¹ Vin-a 607. There is no separation as to mind. ² Vin-a 607. There is no separation as to body. Belonging to the same community means that there are none living together holding various heretical views or various religious proceedings; that there is no mental separation from those of the same mind. Within the same boundary means there is no bodily separation from those in bodily concord. For these expressions see also [Vin 1.321](#). ³ These are given at [Vin 2.204](#) and are the same as the eighteen things by which you may conclude that a monk is a speaker of what is not *dhamma*, [Vin 1.354](#). The first ten are also given at AN i.19.

schism of the Order, which is harmonious, nor persist in taking up a legal question leading to a dissension. Let the venerable one be associated with the Order. The Order, harmonious ... comfortably under a single rule." A second time they should say ... A third time they should say ... If he gives it up, that is good. If he does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

That monk should be admonished. Thus, monks, should he be admonished: the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: "Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk, so and so, proceeds with a schism of the Order which is harmonious. He does not give up this course. If it is the right time for the Order, let the Order admonish this monk, so and so, so that he may give up his course. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This monk, so and so ... does not give up his course. The Order together admonishes the monk, so and so, that he may give up his course. If it seems good to the venerable ones, together admonishing this monk, so and so, that he should give up his course, be silent; if it does not seem good, then you should speak. A second time I speak this matter ... A third time I speak this matter ... then you should speak. It has been said by the Order that the monk, so and so, should give up his course. It seems good to the Order ... Thus do I understand."

According to the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing; according to the two resolutions¹ there are grave offences;² according to the end of a resolution there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If he is committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the offence of wrong-doing according to the motion and the grave offences according to the two resolutions, subside.³

An offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: ... because of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

¹ *kammavācā*, resolution; *ñatti*, motion, cf. [Vin 1.317](#) and *Vinaya Texts* i.169, n. 2; *Vinaya Texts* ii.265, n. 2. ² *Vin-a* 609. He to whom these three offences do not seem good, should speak. ³ =below, [BD 1.307](#), [BD 1.313](#)

Thinking a legally valid act¹ to be a legally valid act, he does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Being in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, he does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Thinking an act which is not legally valid to be an act which is legally valid, he does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Thinking an act which is legally valid to be an act which is not legally valid, is an offence of wrong-doing. Being in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, is an offence of wrong-doing. Not thinking an act which is legally valid to be an act which is not legally valid, is an offence of wrong-doing.²

10.3.2
1.303

There is no offence if he has not been admonished, if he gives it up, if he is mad, out of his mind, in pain, a beginner.³

Told is the Tenth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that of a schism in the Order

¹ Vin-a 609, “a legally valid act, an act which has been repeated together.” An unlawful act is explained at [Vin 1.317f](#). It is connected with *ñatti* and *kammavācā*.

² = below, [BD 1.307](#), [BD 1.313](#). ³ = below, [BD 1.308](#), [BD 1.313](#).

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 11

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. At that time Devadatta proceeded to a schism in the Order, a breaking of the concord. The monks spoke thus: "Devadatta is not one who speaks *dhamma*, Devadatta is not one who speaks Vinaya.¹ How can this Devadatta proceed with a schism in the Order, with a breaking of the concord?" Having spoken thus, Kokālika, Kaṭamorakatissa, and the son of the lady Khaṇḍā and Samuddadatta² said to these monks:

"Do not speak thus, venerable ones; Devadatta is one who speaks *dhamma*, Devadatta is one who speaks vinaya, and Devadatta having adopted³ our desire and objective, gives expression to them; he knows that what he says for us⁴ seems also good to us."

Then those who were modest monks were ... angry, and said: "How can these monks become those throwing in their lot with⁵ and taking part in⁶ Devadatta's proceeding for a schism in the Order?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

"Is it true as they say, monks, that (these) monks are those who are throwing in their lot with and taking part in Devadatta's proceeding for a schism in the Order?"

"It is true, lord", they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks,

¹ At DN iii.135 these words occur in a kind of definition of "Tathāgata." ² The same monks as in Bu-Ss 10, above. ³ *ādāya*, literally having taken. ⁴ *jānāti no bhāsati*, Vin-a 611, he knows our desires, and so on. ⁵ *anuvattaka*, Vin-a 611, "those following him by taking up (his) opinions, pleasures, approvals." ⁶ *vaggavādaka*. "They speak words not on the side of unanimity," Vin-a 611.

how can these foolish men become those to throw in their lot with, to take part in Devadatta's proceeding for a schism in the Order? It is not, monks, for the benefit of unbelievers ... Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“If a monk has monks: one or two or three, who throw in their lot with him or take his part, and if these should speak thus: ‘Do not, venerable ones, say anything against this monk; this monk is one who speaks *dhamma*, this monk is one who speaks Vinaya; and this monk, adopting our desire and objective, gives expression to them; he knows that what he says for us seems also good to us.’ These monks should be spoken to thus by monks: ‘Do not, venerable ones, say this. This monk is not one who speaks *dhamma*, this monk is not one who speaks Vinaya. Please do not let a schism in the Order seem good to the venerable ones; let the venerable ones be at one with the Order, for the Order being harmonious and on friendly terms, not quarrelsome, dwells comfortably under one rule.’ If these monks having been spoken to by the monks should persist, then these monks should be admonished up to three times by these monks in a body, for giving up their course. If these, having been admonished up to three times, should give it up, that is good; if they should not give it up, that is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

11.2.1

If a monk means: if a schismatic monk.

Has monks means: has other monks.

Throw in their lot with means: he is one having that view, that allegiance, that objective; and these are those having that view, that allegiance, that objective.¹

1.306

Take his part means: these are standing for his sort, his faction.

One or two or three means: there are one or two or three.

If these should speak thus means: “Do not, venerable ones, speak against this monk. This monk is one who speaks *dhamma*, and this monk is one who speaks Vinaya, and this monk is one who

¹ Cf. above, [BD 1.163](#), and [DN i.187](#); [MN i.487](#).

having adopted our desire and allegiance, gives expression to them. He knows that what he says for us seems also good to us.”

These monks means: these monks who throw in their lot with.

By monks means: by other monks who see, and who hear. These should say: “Do not, venerable ones, speak thus. This monk is not one who speaks *dhamma*, and this monk is not one who speaks Vinaya. Please do not let a schism in the Order seem good to the venerable ones. Let the venerable ones be at one with the Order; for the Order being harmonious and on friendly terms, not quarrelsome, dwells comfortably under one rule.” A second time they should say ... A third time they should say ... if they give it up, that is good; if they do not give it up, it is an offence of wrong-doing.

These monks, having pulled them into the middle of the Order, should say: “Do not, venerable ones, speak thus. He is not ... under one rule.” A second time they should say ... a third time they should say ... if they give up their course it is good; if they do not give it up there is an offence of wrong-doing.

These monks should be admonished means: Thus, monks, they should be admonished ... the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: “Let the Order hear me, honoured sirs. Such and such monks, having thrown in their lot with such and such a monk, are taking his side in a proceeding for making a schism in the Order. These do not give up this course. If it is the right time for the Order, let the Order as a body admonish such and such monks about giving up this course. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me: such and such monks ... not give up the course. The Order as a body admonishes such and such monks about giving up this course. If it seems good to the venerable ones to admonish such and such monks for giving up this course, you should be silent; if it does not seem good to you, you should speak. A second time I proclaim this matter. A third time I proclaim this matter ... you should speak. Let the Order as a body admonish such and such monks for giving up this course. It seems good to the Order ... Thus do I understand.”

According to the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing; ac-

ording to two resolutions there are grave offences; at the end of the resolution there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If they are committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the offence of wrong-doing according to the motion and the grave offences according to the two resolutions, subside.¹

Two or three should be admonished together; further than that² they should not be admonished.

An offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: ... because of that it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

3:177

11:3:1

Thinking a legally valid act to be a legally valid act, they do not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Being in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, they do not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Thinking an act which is not legally valid to be an act which is legally valid, they do not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Thinking an act which is legally valid to be an act which is not a legally valid act, is an offence of wrong-doing. Being in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, is an offence of wrong-doing. Not thinking an act which is legally valid to be an act which is not legally valid, is an offence of wrong-doing.³

11:3:2

1:308

It is not an offence if they have not been admonished, if they give it up, if they are mad, out of their minds, in pain, beginners.⁴

*Told is the Eleventh Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order:
that of siding in with a schism*

¹ = above, [BD 1.302](#); below, [BD 1.313](#), [BD 1.327](#). ² *taduttari*. ³ = above, [BD 1.302](#); below, [BD 1.313](#), [BD 1.327](#). ⁴ Cf. above, [BD 1.303](#); below, [BD 1.313](#), [BD 1.327](#).

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 12

... at Kosambī in Ghosita's park. At that time the venerable Channa¹ indulged in bad habits. The monks said: "Reverend Channa, do not do that, it is not suitable."²

He said: "What do you, your reverences, think should be said to me? It is I who should tell you.³ The enlightened one is for us, *dhamma* is for us, *dhamma* is realised for us by a master.⁴ Just as a great wind blowing would raise up grass, sticks, ferns and rubbish together; or just as a mountain-born⁵ river would raise up various water plants⁶ together, so you, having gone forth from various names, from various clans, from various lineages, from various families, are raised up together. What do you, your reverences, think should be said to me? It is I who should tell you. The enlightened one is for us, *dhamma* is for us, *dhamma* is realised for us by a master."

Then those who were modest monks were ... angry, and said: "How can the venerable Channa, himself being spoken to by the

¹ = Vin 4.141. ² Also in Bu-Ss 7. ³ Vin-a 612, "I am worthy to say to you: 'Do this, do not do that. For when, as our enlightened one, mounting Kanthaka (his horse), left the household life with me, I went forth into homelessness.'" ⁴ Vin-a 612, "The fourfold true things having been penetrated for us by a master (*ayyapatta*), *dhamma* is for us. But thinking that the Order was hostile to him, he did not say, 'The Order is for us.'" ⁵ *pabbateyya*, Vin-a 612, "Its source is on a mountain." ⁶ *saṅkha-sevāla-pañaka*: *saṅkha*, a water-plant, probably unidentified; *sevāla* = *Blyxa octandra* moss; *pañaka* or *pañṇaka* a name of a water-plant, most likely a fern (so *Pali-English Dictionary*). Vin-a 612, "*saṅkha* is called the leaf and the moss, with a long root; *sevāla* is dark *sevāla* (moss); the rest are water-plants, sesame plants and seeds; and everything that is to be styled a water-plant."

monks in accordance with *dhamma*, reckon himself as one not to be spoken to?”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as they say, Channa, that you, yourself being spoken to by the monks in accordance with *dhamma*, reckon yourself as one not to be spoken to?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, yourself being spoken to by the monks in accordance with *dhamma*, reckon yourself as one not to be spoken to? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers ... Thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

If a monk is one who is difficult to speak to,¹ and if himself being spoken to by the monks according to *dhamma*² concerning the courses of training included in the exposition,³ he reckons himself as one not to be spoken to, saying: ‘Do not say anything to me, venerable ones, either good or bad, and I will not say anything to the venerable ones, either good or bad; refrain, venerable ones, from speaking to me (then) that monk should be spoken to thus by the monks: ‘Do not, venerable one, reckon yourself as one not to be spoken to; let the venerable one reckon himself as one to be spoken to; let the venerable one speak to the monks in accordance with *dhamma*,⁴ and then the monks will speak to the venerable one in accordance with *dhamma*. Thus is the multitude increased for the lord, that is to say by speaking with one

¹ *Dubbacajātika*. Vin-a 612, says that *dubbaca* means that it is impossible to speak to him. Editors *Vinaya Texts* i.12 get nearer to this in their *note* than in their translation, which reads: “refuses to listen to what is said to him.” I follow translation at GS 2.151 (of AN ii.147) and at KS ii.137 (of SN ii.206). But at GS 3.133 (AN iii.178) the reading is, “they are speakers of ill,” and at GS 5.104 (AN v.152), “of foul speech.” But Channa, above, has given no indication that his speech was evil. CHALMERS, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.69 (MN i.95), has “unruly,” but MN-a 2.66 explains: so *dukkhena vattabbo hoti*, with which cf. SN-a ii.173, *dukkham vattabbā*. ² *Sahadhammikam*, here adverbial. Vin-a 613, “according to the courses of training made known by the enlightened one.” For similar use, see Vin 1.60; Vin 4.141. ³ I.e., in the Pātimokkha, see below, Old Commentary. ⁴ *Saha dhammena*.

another, by assisting one another.¹ And if that monk when he has been spoken to by the monks should persist as before, then that monk should be admonished up to three times by the monks together for giving up his course. And if after being admonished up to three times by the monks together, he gives up his course, that is good; if he does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

If a monk is one who is difficult to speak to means: he is difficult to speak to, endowed with qualities which make him difficult to speak to,² intractable,³ incapable of being instructed.⁴

In the courses of training included in the exposition means: in the courses of training included in the Pātimokkha.

By the monks means: by other monks.

According to dhamma means: that course of training made known by the lord, this is called according to *dhamma*.

Himself being spoken to he reckons himself as one not to be spoken to, saying: “Do not, venerable ones, say anything to me, either good or bad, and I will not say anything to the venerable ones, either good or bad; refrain, venerable ones, from speaking to me” — (then) that monk means: that monk who is difficult to speak to.

By the monks means: by other monks, these see, these hear. He should be spoken to by these, saying: “Venerable one, do not reckon yourself as one not to be spoken to, let the venerable one reckon him-

¹ *Aññamañña-vuṭṭhāpanena*, translated at *Vinaya Texts* i.12, “by mutual help.” *Vuṭṭhāpeti* is also to ordain, to rehabilitate, cf. [Vin 4.226](#), [Vin 4.317](#), where *vuṭṭhāpeti* = *upasampādeti* in Old Commentary. ² Vin-a 612, “endowed with these conditions, they make a man difficult to talk to.” There are nineteen such conditions enumerated here; sixteen at MN-a 2.66. ³ *Akkhama*, Vin-a 613, “he does not submit to, does not endure the exhortation.” ⁴ *Appadakkhiṇaggāhī anusāsaniṃ*, literally a left-handed (i.e., unskilled, clumsy) taker of the teaching. They do not take the teaching with deference, but disrespectfully (cf. Vin-a 613 and MN-a 2.66), possibly also referring to the fact that they do not (depart) keeping the right side towards the teacher, which is *padakkhiṇaṃ karoti*. This whole phrase is stock, occurring at, e.g., SN ii.201; AN ii.147; AN iii.178; AN v.152; MN i.95.

3.179 self as one to be spoken to, let the venerable one speak to the monks in accordance with *dhamma*, and then the monks will speak to the venerable one in accordance with *dhamma*. Thus is the multitude increased for the lord, that is to say by speaking to one another, by assisting one another.” A second time he should be spoken to ... A third time he should be spoken to ... If he gives it up, that is good; but if he does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having heard, they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That monk, having been pulled into the middle of the assembly, should be told: “Do not, venerable one, reckon yourself as one not to be spoken to ... by ordaining one another.” A second time he should be told ... A third time he should be told ... If he gives it up, that is good; if he does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That monk should be admonished. And thus, monks, should he be admonished. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk: “Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This monk, so and so, being re-monstrated with by the monks in accordance with *dhamma*, reckons himself as one not to be spoken to: he does not give up this course. If it is the right time for the Order, let the Order admonish this monk so that he may give up this course. That is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This monk, so and so ... Thus do I understand.”

1.313 According to the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing; according to the two resolutions there are grave offences; at the end of a resolution there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If he is committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the offence of wrong-doing according to the motion and the grave offences according to the two resolutions, subside.¹

An offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: ... on account of this it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

12.3.1 Thinking a legally valid act to be a legally valid act, he does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

¹ =above, [BD 1.302](#), [BD 1.307](#); below, [BD 1.327](#).

Being in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... Not thinking an act that is legally valid to be an act that is not legally valid is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if he has not been admonished, if he gives it up, if he is mad, if he is a beginner.²

Told is the Twelfth Offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order: that concerning one to whom it is difficult to speak

¹ Cf. above, [BD 1.302](#), [BD 1.307](#); below, [BD 1.327](#). ² Cf. above, [BD 1.303](#), [BD 1.308](#); below, [BD 1.327](#).

MONKS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA) 13

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. Now at that time,¹ unscrupulous, depraved monks who were the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu² were in residence³ at Kiṭṭāgiri.⁴ They indulged in the following kinds of bad habits: they planted and caused to be planted small flowering trees; they watered them and caused them to be watered; they plucked them and caused them to be plucked; they tied them up into (garlands) and caused them to be tied up; they made and caused to be made garlands having a stalk on one side⁵; they made and caused to be made garlands having a stalk on both sides⁶; they made and caused to be made a branching flower-stalk⁷; they made and caused to be made a wreath⁸; they made and caused to be

¹ This whole passage = Vin 2.10ff. ² Vin-a 614, "they were the foremost of the sixfold group of monks" — the bad group, often giving trouble. "They say, 'alms in the countryside are now abundant, now short. Let us not live in one place but in three places.' So they chose Kāsī of the kingdom of Kosala, Aṅga of the kingdom of Magadha, and Kiṭṭāgiri. They did things not to be done and neglected the courses of training which had been set forth. So they are called 'unscrupulous, evil monks.'" At Vin-a 579 (on Vin 3.160) it is said that Mettiya and Bhummajaka are the leaders of the sixfold group. ³ *āvāsika*. Vin-a 613, *āvāso ti vihāro*. "Avāsikā are those to whom this *āvāsa* belongs, for they have the care of the new buildings and the repairs to the old: these are the residents. Those who only stay in a *vihāra* are called inmates (*nevāsika*), but these were residents (*āvāsikā*)." MN-a 3.187 defines *āvāsikā* as *nibandhavāsino*, "continual dwellers." ⁴ Vin-a 613, "that was the name of the countryside," while MN-a 3.186 says, "that was the name of the township." ⁵ *ekato-vanṇṭikamāla*. Vin-a 617, "a garland made with the stalks on one side of the flowers." ⁶ *ubhatovantikamāla*. Vin-a 617, "a garland made with the stalks of the flowers on both sides." ⁷ *manjarika*. Vin-a 617, "an arrangement of flowers."

made a garland worn round the forehead¹; they made and caused to be made an ear-ornament; they made and caused to be made a breast-plate.² These (monks) take or send garlands having a stalk on one side to wives of reputable families, to daughters of reputable families, to girls of reputable families, to daughters-in-law of reputable families, to female slaves of reputable families. They take or send garlands having a stalk on both sides; they take or send a branching flower-stalk; they take or send a wreath; they take or send a garland worn round the forehead; they take or send an ear-ornament; they take or send a breast-plate. These eat from one dish together with wives of reputable families, with daughters of reputable families, with girls of reputable families, with daughters-in-law of reputable families, with female slaves of reputable families. They drink from one beaker; they sit down on one seat; they share³ one couch; they share one mat⁴; they share one coverlet; they share one mat and coverlet. They eat at the wrong time; they drink intoxicants; they wear garlands, (use) perfumes and cosmetics; they dance and sing and play musical instruments, and they sport. They dance when she dances,⁵ they sing when she dances, they play musical instruments when she dances, they sport when she dances; they dance when she sings ... they dance when she plays musical instruments ... they dance when she sports ... they sport when she sports.

They play⁶ on a chequered board for gambling⁷; they play on a

⁸ *vidhutika*. Vin-a 617, "It is done by piercing the flowers of the Yitex negundo tree (*sinduvara*) with a needle or small stick." ¹ *vaṭamsaka*. The commentary is of no use here. Sometimes as at Vv 38 an ear-ornament=*kaṇṇikā*, Vv-a 174. But here next item, *āveḷa*=*kaṇṇikā* Vin-a 617. ² *uracchada*. Vin-a 617, "floral garlands like a *hāra* to be put on the breast." ³ Vin-a 620, "they lie down on." ⁴ *attharaṇa*, literally strewing, spreading (neutral). Hence probably a mat or rug, or even something spread over them, some cover. ⁵ Vin-a 620, "when a nautch-girl dances, they go dancing in front of her or behind her." ⁶ For these games cf. DN i.6ff., and see *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.11ff. for discussions on the terms. ⁷ *aṭṭhapada*. Vin-a 620, "they play at dice on the chequered board," having eight squares on each side.

draught-board¹; they play with imagining such boards in the air²; they play a game of keeping stepping on to diagrams³; they play with spillikans⁴; they play at dice; they play tip-cat⁵; they play brush-hand⁶; they play with a ball⁷; they play at blowing through toy-pipes made of leaves⁸; they play with a toy plough⁹; they play at turning somersaults¹⁰; they play with a toy windmill¹¹; they play with a toy measures of leaves¹²; they play with a toy cart¹³; they play with a toy bow¹⁴; they play a game of guessing at letters¹⁵; they play a mind-

¹ *dasapada*—i.e., a board with ten squares on each side. The commentary on this passage to “deformities,” below = DN-a 1.85f. ² Vin-a 620, “as they play on the dice or draught board, so they play in space.” ³ *parihārapatha*. Vin-a 62 = DN-a 1.85, “having drawn a circle with various lines on the ground, there they play avoiding the line to be avoided.” ⁴ *santikāya kīḷanti*. Vin-a 621, “putting together chessmen and little stones into heaps, they move them away and put (new ones) with the nails without letting them tremble; but if one trembles there is defeat.” ⁵ *ghaṭikena kīḷanti*, Vin-a 621, “they move about hitting a short stick with a long stick.” ⁶ *salākahatthena kīḷanti*, Vin-a 621 = moistening the brush-hand in crimson lac or in floury water, and beating it on the ground or on a wall, he says, “‘What shall it be?’ and they play showing the form required”—elephants and horses. ⁷ *akkhena kīḷanti*, Vin-a 621, *guḷena*, with a ball. *Critical Pali Dictionary* says *akkha* is a die. ⁸ *pañḅacirena kīḷanti*, Vin-a 621, “they play blowing that leafy pipe.” ⁹ *vaṅkakena kīḷanti*, Vin-a 621, “they play with the plaything, the small plough of village boys.” Variant readings *caṅgakena*, *vaṅgakena*. ¹⁰ *mokkacikāya kīḷanti*, derivation extremely obscure, see article *Pali-English Dictionary* and *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1885, p. 49. Vin-a 621 says “it is called a game of rolling about (*samparivattaka*)” (cf. Ja 2.142). “Holding a stick in the air, and putting the head on the ground, they play turning about by being upside down.” At Vin 1.275 the son of a great merchant disabled himself by playing this way. See also *Vinaya Texts* ii.184, n. ¹¹ *ciṅgulakena kīḷanti*, Vin-a 621, “a wheel that is made of the leaves of palm-trees and so on; the wheel reels round at a breath of wind—they play with this.” On *ciṅgulaka* see *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1885, p. 50. ¹² *pattāḷhakena kīḷanti*, Vin-a 621, *pattāḷhakam vuccati paṅṅanāḷikā*, and it also says, “they play measuring the leafy pipe with this sand and so on.” On the measures, *āḷhaka* and *nāḷikā*, see above, BD 1.103. ¹³ *rathakena*, Vin-a 621, with a little cart. ¹⁴ *dhanukena kīḷanti*, Vin-a 621, “with a little bow.” These last six and “tip-cat” are given as examples of childish games at MN i.266 = AN v.203 = Mil 230. ¹⁵ *akkharikāya kīḷanti*, Vin-a 621, “they play the game of recognising syllables in the air or on their backs.”

reading game¹; they play a game of mimicking deformities²; they train themselves in elephant lore³; they train themselves in horse lore⁴; they train themselves in cart lore; they train themselves in archery; they train themselves in swordsmanship; then they run in front of an elephant, they run in front of a horse and they run in front of a chariot; now they run backwards, now they run forwards,⁵ and they whistle,⁶ and they snap their fingers,⁷ and they wrestle,⁸ and they fight with fists, and having spread out their upper robes as a stage,⁹ they say to a dancing girl: “Dance here, sister,” and they applaud,¹⁰ and indulge in various bad habits.

At one time a certain monk, rising up from spending the rains among the people of Kāsī, and going to Sāvathī for the sake of seeing the lord, arrived at Kiṭāgiri. Then this monk getting up early and taking his bowl and robe entered Kiṭāgiri for alms-food. He was pleasing whether he was approaching or departing, whether he was

¹ *manesikāya*, Vin-a 621, “they play the game of knowing the mind and thoughts.”
² *yathāvajjena kiḷanti*. This means the blind, the lame, the deformed and so on: imitating that which is a deformity, they play the game of exhibiting it. ³ Vin-a 621, “they learn the learning which is to be learnt for the (craft and care) of elephants” and horses. ⁴ Vin-a 621, “they learn the learning which is to be learnt for the (craft and care) of elephants” and horses. ⁵ *dhāvanti pi ādhāvanti*, Vin-a 621, *dhāvanti pi tiparammukhā gacchantā dhāvanti. Ādhāvanti pi ti yattakaṃ dhāvanti tattakaṃ eva abhimukhā puna āgacchantā ādhāvanti.* ⁶ *usselḥenti*. So far this word appears only to come here and at the parallel passage, Vin 2.10. The translators at *Vinaya Texts* ii.349, n. 1, “are quite uncertain how to render this word.” I admit I do not agree with their rendering, “they used to exhibit signs of anger,” as I think that all these activities were entered upon in a friendly spirit. See *Pali-English Dictionary* under *seḷeti*; also MORRIS, *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1885, p. 54, who is inclined to think *usselḥeti* is connected with *seleti*, and signifies “to shout out.” Snp-a 485 (on Snp 682) explains *seḷenti* as *mukhena usselanasaddaṃ muñcanti*.
⁷ Here, and at Vin 2.10, *appoḥenti*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives only *appoḥeti*, with meaning of “to snap the fingers or clap the hands.” But at Mil 13, Mil 20 *appoḥe°* is given as a variant reading, also *appoḥthe°*. ⁸ Vin-a 622, “they make a wrestling contest.” ⁹ *raṅgamajjha*; cf. SN iv.306, Ja 4.495. ¹⁰ *nalāṭikam denti*, which *Pali-English Dictionary* says, “gives a frown.” Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 622 says, “they say, ‘Very good, sister,’ and placing their fingers on their own foreheads they then place them on her forehead.”

looking before or looking behind, whether he was drawing in or stretching out (his arm),¹ his eyes were cast down, he was possessed of pleasant behaviour.²

People seeing this monk, spoke thus:

“Who can this be like an idiot of idiots, like a fool of fools, like a very supercilious person?³ Who will go up to him and give him alms? Our masters, the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu are polite,⁴ genial, pleasant of speech, beaming with smiles, saying: ‘Come, you are welcome.’ They are not supercilious, they are easily accessible, they are the first to speak.⁵ Therefore alms should be given to these.”

A certain lay follower saw that monk wandering in Kiṭṭāgiri for alms; seeing that monk he approached him, and having approached and greeted him, he said:

“Honoured sir, are alms obtainable?”

“Alms are not obtainable, your reverence,” he said.

“Come, honoured sir, we will go to my house.”

Then the lay follower having taken this monk to his house and made him eat, said:

“Where, honoured sir, will the master go?”

“I will go to Sāvattihī, your reverence, to see the lord,” he said.

“Then, honoured sir, in my name salute the lord’s feet with your head and say: ‘Lord, the residence at Kiṭṭāgiri has been corrupted. At Kiṭṭāgiri are residing unscrupulous, depraved monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu. These indulge in the following bad habits ... they indulge in a variety of bad habits. Lord, those men who formerly had faith and were virtuous now have no faith and are not virtuous. Those who formerly were channels for gifts⁶ to the Order are now cut off; they neglect the well-behaved monks, and the

¹ From “he was pleasing” is more or less stock, cf., e.g., MN iii.35, MN iii.90; DN i.70; AN ii.104, AN ii.106, AN ii.210. ² *iriyāpatha* can mean “good behaviour” besides the postures, of which there are four. ³ *bhākuṭikaṇhākuṭiko*. Vin-a 622, “having frowned when he cast down his eyes, they say that he goes about like an angry man with his mouth clenched.” These last two words are in Pali *kuṭitamukha*, for which there are variant readings *saṅkuṭi*°, *saṅkuci*°.

⁴ *saṅha* = *nipuṇa*. “They greet a lay woman and are not like a fool of fools,” so Vin-a 622. ⁵ Cf. DN i.116 for some of these words. ⁶ *dānapatha*.

depraved monks stay on. It were good, lord, if the lord would send monks to Kiṭāgiri, so that this residence in Kiṭāgiri may be settled.”¹

“Very well, your reverence,” and that monk having answered and rising up from his seat, departed for Sāvattḥī. In due course he approached Sāvattḥī, the Jeta Grove and Anāthapindika’s park and the lord; and having approached and greeted the lord, he sat down to one side. It is usual for enlightened ones, for lords, to exchange greetings with in-coming monks. So the lord said to this monk:

“I hope, monk, that it is going well with you, I hope that you are keeping going, I hope that you have accomplished your journey with but little fatigue. And where do you come from, monk?”

“Things go well, lord, I am keeping going, lord, and I, lord, accomplished my journey with but little fatigue. Now, I, lord, having spent the rains among the people of Kāsī, and coming to Sāvattḥī for the sake of seeing the lord, arrived at Kitāgiri. Then I, lord, rising up early, and taking my bowl and robe, entered Kitāgiri for alms-food. Then, lord, a certain lay follower saw me as I was wandering in Kitāgiri for alms-food, and seeing me he approached, and having approached and greeted me, he said: ‘Are alms obtainable, honoured sir?’ ‘No, your reverence, alms are not obtainable,’ I said. ‘Come, honoured sir, we will go to my house,’ he said. Then, lord, that lay follower, taking me to his house and feeding me, said: ‘Where, honoured sir, will the master go?’ I said: ‘Your reverence, I will go to Sāvattḥī for the sake of seeing the lord.’ Then he said ... ‘may be settled.’ Therefore, lord, do I come.”

Then the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the monks:

“Monks, is it true as is said, that the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, residing in Kitāgiri, are unscrupulous and depraved and indulge in the following bad habits: they plant small

¹ *saṅṭhaheyya*; or, may be put in order, may continue, may be established.

flowering trees ... indulge in a variety of bad habits ... and those men, monks ... and the depraved monks stay on?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men indulge in this kind of bad habit, how can they plant small flowering trees or cause them to be planted? How can they water them or cause them to be watered? How can they pluck them or cause them to be plucked? How can they tie up garlands or cause them to be tied up? How can they make or cause to be made ... How can they take or send ... How can they eat ... How can they drink ... sit ... stand ... eat ... drink ... run ... dance and sing and play musical instruments and sport ... play ... train themselves ... run ... run round facing ... how can they whistle and snap their fingers and wrestle and fight with fists, and having spread out their upper robes as a stage, say to a nautch girl: 'Dance here, sister,' and applaud and indulge in a variety of bad habits? It is not, monks, for the benefit of unbelievers ..." and having rebuked them and given them talk on *dhamma*, he addressed Sāriputta and Moggallāna:

"You go, Sāriputta¹ and Moggallāna; and having gone to Kitāgiri make an act of banishment² from Kiṭāgiri against those monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu; these are fellow monks of yours."³

They said: "Lord, how can we make an act of banishment from Kitāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu? These monks are violent and rough."

"Then, Sāriputta and Moggallāna, go together with many monks."

"Very well, lord," Sāriputta and Moggallāna answered the lord.

¹ *Sāriputtā*. Use of *karotha* and later *karoma* clearly indicates that both the chief disciples are meant. Cf. *Vin* 1.351 for similar use of *Anuruddhā*. ² *pabbājaniyakamma*. This is directed against those who bring families into disrepute. ³ *saddhivihārino*. At *Vin* 2.171 the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu refused to prepare lodgings for Sāriputta and Moggallāna saying that they were men of evil desires. This Assaji is not the same as he who converted Sāriputta and Moggallāna to the teaching of the lord.

“And this, monks, is how it should be done. First, the monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu should be reproved; having been reproved they should be reminded; having been reminded they should be accused of the offence; having been accused of the offence, the Order should be informed through an experienced, competent monk: ‘Let the Order listen to me, honoured sirs. These monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu are those who bring a family into disrepute, they are of evil conduct; their evil conduct is seen and also heard, and respectable families corrupted by them are seen and also heard. If it seems the right time for the Order, let the Order make an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, so that the monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu may not be in Kiṭāgiri. This is the motion. Let the Order listen to me, honoured sirs. These monks who are ... seen and also heard. The Order issues an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu so that the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu may not be in Kiṭāgiri. If it seems good to the venerable ones to make an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu so that the monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu may not be in Kiṭāgiri, then be silent; if it does not seem good (to you) then you should speak. A second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time do I speak forth this matter: Let the Order listen to me ... should speak. By the Order there has been made an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu so that the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu may not be in Kiṭāgiri. If it seems good to the Order, then be silent; so do I understand.’”

Then¹ Sāriputta and Moggallāna, at the head of a company of monks, having gone to Kiṭāgiri made an act of banishment from Kiṭāgiri against the monks who were followers of Assaji and Punabbasu,

¹ Vin 2.13 here has some matter not given at Vin 3.183. But the story continues in Vin 2.14 as above.

so that the monks who were followers of Assaji and Punabbasu might not be in Kiṭāgiri. The act of banishment having been made by the Order, these did not conduct them selves properly,¹ nor did they become subdued,² nor did they mend their ways,³ they did not ask the monks for forgiveness,⁴ they cursed them,⁵ they reviled them,⁶ they offended by following a wrong course through desire, by following a wrong course through hatred, by following a wrong course through stupidity, by following a wrong course through fear⁷; and they went away, and they left the Order.⁸

Those who were modest monks became angry ... and annoyed, and said: “How can the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, banished by the Order, not conduct themselves properly, not

¹ Vin-a 625, “they did not do well in the eighteen duties.” ² “Through not following a suitable course they are not subdued,” Vin-a 625, and taking the variant reading *paṇṇalomā*, *pannalomā* instead of *pana na loma*, as given in the printed edition of the Vin-a *Pali-English Dictionary* says, *lomaṃ pāṭeti* means to let the hair drop, as a sign of modesty or subduedness. By this must be meant some analogy with an animal (such as a dog or cat) who, having raised the fur (*loma*), lets it fall back as a sign of good temper restored. Hence this phrase is almost certainly meant to be taken metaphorically. In Commentary, on Vin 2.5 (see Vin 2.309), where this same expression occurs, Buddhaghosa explains *lomaṃ pāṭenti* by *paṇṇalomā honti*, which means those whose down is flat, not standing up in excitement, and whose minds are therefore subdued. Cf. “he takes up the wrong course,” MN-a 3.153 on MN i.442. ³ *Na netthāraṃ vattanti*. Vin-a 625, “they did not follow the way of the overcoming of self.” Commentary on Vin 2.5, given at Vin 2.309, is fuller: *netthāraṃ vattanti ti nittharantānaṃ etan ti netthāraṃ yena sakkā nissāraṇā nittharituṃ taṃ aṭṭhārasavidhaṃ sammāvattaṃ vattanti ti attho*. Same phrase occurs at MN i.442, translated at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.316 “fails to atone,” but this rendering is, I think, too Christian in tone to fit. MN-a 3.153 on MN i.442 says: *na nitthāraṃ vattati ti nitthāraṇakavattam hi na vattati āpattivuṭṭhānatthaṃ turitaturito chandajāto na hoti.*, variant reading *nitthāra*, as at MN i.442. ⁴ Vin-a 625, “we have done badly, we will not do so again, forgive us.’ They did not ask for forgiveness.” ⁵ Vin-a 625, “They swore at those who did the commission of the Order with the ten expressions of cursing.” These are given at Dh-p-a 1.211. ⁶ Dh-p-a 1.211–212, “They made dread appear in these.” ⁷ These are the four so-called *agatis*. At DN iii.133 = AN iv.370, they occur among the nine “Impossibles” (*abhabbaṭṭhāna*) for a monk who is *khīṇāsava*. The *agati*-formula is stock; cf., e.g., Vin 1.283; Vin 2.167, Vin 2.176, Vin 2.177; Vin 3.238, Vin 3.246; DN iii.182, DN iii.228; AN i.72; AN ii.18; AN iii.274. ⁸ *vibbhamanti*. Vin-a 625 says, *ekacce gihī honti*. Cf. BD 1.60, n. 3.

become subdued, not mend their ways? Why do they not ask for forgiveness from the monks? Why do they curse and revile them? Why do they, following a wrong course through desire, hatred, stupidity and fear, go away and leave the Order?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord.¹

He asked: “Is it true as is said, monks, that the monks who are the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, having been banished by the Order, do not conduct themselves properly ... leave the Order?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying ... “And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

If a monk lives depending on a certain village or little town, and is one who brings a family into disrepute and is of depraved conduct, and if his evil conduct is seen and heard, and families corrupted by him are seen and also heard, let that monk be spoken to thus by the monks: ‘The venerable one is one who brings families into disrepute, and is of depraved conduct. The venerable one’s depraved doings are seen and heard, and families corrupted by the venerable one are seen and also heard. Let the venerable one depart from this residence; you have lived here long enough.’ And if this monk having been spoken to by the monks should say to these monks: ‘The monks are followers of desire and the monks are followers of hatred and the monks are followers of stupidity and the monks are followers of fear; they banish some for such an offence, they do not banish others’—this monk should be spoken to thus by the monks: ‘Venerable one, do not speak thus. The monks are not followers of desire and the monks are not followers of hatred and the monks are not followers of stupidity and the monks are not followers of fear. The venerable one is one who brings families into disrepute and is of depraved conduct. The depraved doings of the venerable one are seen and heard, and families corrupted by the venerable one are seen and

¹ Here at [Vin 3.184](#), the next normal step is omitted: “Then the lord on that occasion, in that connection, having convened the Order of monks, asked the monks.” This is given at parallel passage, [Vin 2.14](#).

also heard. Let the venerable one depart from this residence; the venerable one has dwelt in this residence long enough.’ If this monk, when spoken to thus by the monks, should persist as before, that monk should be admonished up to three times by the monks for giving up his course. If after being admonished up to three times, he gives up that course, it is good. If he does not give it up, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.”

13.2.1 **A monk (is dependent on) a certain village or a little town** means: a village and a little town and a city, and thus a village and a little town.

Lives depending on means: there they are dependent for the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings and medicine for the sick.

3.185 **A family** means: there are four kinds of families: a noble family, a brahmin family, a merchant family, a low-caste family.¹

1.326 **One who brings a family into disrepute** means: he brings families into disrepute by means of a flower² or a fruit³ or with chunam or clay or with a toothpick or with bamboo or with medical treatment⁴ or with going messages on foot.⁵

Of depraved conduct means: he plants or causes to be planted a little flowering tree; he waters it and causes it to be watered; he plucks it and causes it to be plucked; he ties up garlands and causes them to be tied up.

Are seen and also heard means: those who are face to face with them see; those who are absent hear.

Families corrupted by him means: formerly they had faith,

¹ = Vin 4.272. ² Vin-a 626, a monk must not steal a flower from lay followers in order to make a gift or to offer in worship at a *cetiya*, or to give to people to use in worship; and it is not right to urge people to use flowers in worship. ³ Vin-a 626, a fruit means his own property, which he can give to his parents and relations; but he must not give his own property or that of others to win favour with families, but to sick men or to lords who have arrived, or to those whose earnings are destroyed.

⁴ Vin-a 628, “here it is the art of medical treatment as explained in the Commentary on the Third *Pārājika*.” ⁵ Vin-a 626, “taking up a householder’s order—this should not be done; taking it up and going is a *dukkata* offence for each step.”

now thanks to him they are without faith; having been virtuous, now they are without virtue.

Are seen and also heard means: those who are face to face with them see; those who are absent hear.

That monk means: that monk who brings a family into disrepute.

By the monks means: by other monks; these see, these hear; it should be said by these: 'The venerable one is one who brings families into disrepute and is of depraved conduct; the venerable one's depraved conduct ... has lived here long enough.' And if the monk being spoken to thus by the monks should say: '... they do not banish others'.

This monk means: this monk against whom proceedings have been taken.

By the monks means: by other monks; these see, these hear; it should be said by these: 'Do not, venerable one, speak thus ... the venerable one has lived here long enough.' A second time should they say ... A third time should they say ... if he gives up the course that is good; if he does not give it up it is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having heard, they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That monk having been drawn into the middle of the Order, should be told: 'Do not, venerable one, speak thus ... you have lived here long enough.' A second time he should be told ... A third time he should be told ... if he gives up his course it is good, but if he does not give it up there is an offence of wrong-doing.

That monk should be admonished. The Order should be informed through an experienced, competent monk: 'Let the Order listen to me, honoured sirs. This monk, so and so banished by an act of the order, makes the monks fall into wrong courses by following desire, by following hatred, by following confusion, by following fear; and he does not give up his course. If it seems the right time to the Order, let the Order admonish this monk for the sake of giving up his course. This is the motion. Let the Order listen to me ... Thus do I understand.'

According to the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing ... grave offences subside.

An offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: the Order places him on probation on account of his offence, it sends him back to the beginning, it inflicts the *mānatta* discipline, it rehabilitates; it is not many people, it is not one man, therefore it is called an offence which in the earlier as well as in the later stages requires a formal meeting of the Order. A synonym for this class of offence is a work; therefore, again, it is called an offence which in the earlier as well as in the later stages entails a formal meeting of the Order.¹

Thinking a legally valid act to be a legally valid act, he does not give it up—there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Being in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... Not thinking an act which is legally valid to be an act which is not legally valid, is an offence of wrong-doing.²

It is not an offence if he is not admonished, if he gives it up, if he is mad, if he is a beginner.

*Told is the Thirteenth Offence entailing a Formal meeting of the Order:
that of bringing families into disrepute*

The thirteen matters which require a formal meeting of the Order have been set down, venerable ones—nine which become offences at once,³ and four which are not completed until the third admonition.⁴

If a monk offends against one or other of these, for as many days as he knowingly conceals his offence,⁵ for so many days should pro-

¹ Cf. above, BD 1.196. ² Cf. BD 1.302, BD 1.307, BD 1.313. ³ *paṭhamāpattikā*. ⁴ *yāvataṭṭhiyakkā*: name of the last four *Saṅghādisesas*, where before punishment can be inflicted, the monks must have been admonished so as to give up their wrong courses, even up to the third time. ⁵ Vin-a 629, “for as many days as he knowingly conceals his offence, saying: ‘I have fallen into such and such an offence,’ and does not tell his co-religionists.”

bation be spent by this monk, even against his will.¹ When this monk has spent his probation, a further six days are to be allowed for the monk's *mānatta* discipline. If, when the monk has performed the *mānatta* discipline, the company of monks numbers twenty, that monk may be rehabilitated.² But if the Order of monks should rehabilitate that monk when numbering less than twenty even by one, that monk is not rehabilitated and these monks are blameworthy. This is the proper course there. Now I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are pure in this matter?³ A second time I ask: I hope that you are pure in this matter? A third time I ask: I hope that you are pure in this matter? The venerable ones are pure in this matter, therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand.⁴

Told are the thirteen

THE SUMMARY OF THIS IS

Emission and bodily contact;
lewd talk and one's own pleasure,
Acting as a go-between; and a hut, and a *vihāra*;
without foundation,
And some point, and a schism, even siding in with,
Difficult to speak to, and bringing a family into disrepute—
these are the thirteen offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

Told are the thirteen sections

¹ Vin-a 629, taking up probation (*parivāsa*) it may be spent unwillingly, not under his power. ² *Abbheti*, to rehabilitate after suspension for breach of rules. ³ I.e., of being at least a group of twenty. ⁴ For this passage cf. [Vin 4.242](#).

MONKS' UNDETERMINED (ANİYATA) 1

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in Anāthapiṇḍika's park in the Jeta Grove. At that time the venerable Udāyin was dependent on families in Sāvattthī and approached many families. Now at that time the young girl of a family who was supporting the venerable Udāyin had been given (in marriage) to a boy of a certain family. Then the venerable Udāyin, getting up early and taking his bowl and robe; approached that family, and having approached them he asked the people:

“Where is (the girl) called so and so?” They said:

“Honoured sir, she was given to a boy of a certain family.” Now this family supported the venerable Udāyin. Then the venerable Udāyin approached this family, and having approached them he asked the people:

“Where is (the girl) called so and so?” They said:

“Master, she is sitting in the inner room.”

Then the venerable Udāyin approached this girl, and having approached her, he sat down together with that girl, a man and a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat,¹ conversing at the right time, speaking *dhamma* at the right time.²

Now at that time Visākhā, Migāra's mother, had many children

¹ Old Commentary, see below, **BD 1.333**, and Vin-a 631 explain that this means a seat where “it is possible to indulge in sexual intercourse.” ² Vin-a 631, “talking for a time when anyone comes and goes in their presence, then he says: ‘You should perform a seeming observance-day, you should give food to be distributed by ticket.’”

and many grandchildren.¹ The children were healthy and the grandchildren were healthy and she was considered to be auspicious.² People used to regale Visākhā first at sacrifices, festivals³ and feasts.⁴ So Visākhā, being invited, went to that family. Visākhā saw the venerable Udāyin sitting together with that girl, a man and a woman,⁵ in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat. Seeing this, she said to the venerable Udāyin:

“This is not proper, honoured sir, it is not suitable that the master should sit together with women-folk, a man and a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat. Although, honoured sir, the master has no desire for that thing,⁶ unbelieving people are difficult to convince.”⁷

But the venerable Udāyin took no heed after he had been spoken to thus by Visākhā. Then Visākhā, when she had departed, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks became annoyed, vexed, angry and said:

“How can the venerable Udāyin sit together with womenfolk, a man and a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat?” And these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, Udāyin, that you sat together with womenfolk, a man and a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: “How can you, foolish man, sit together with womenfolk, a man with a woman, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient seat? It is not, foolish man, for the benefit of unbelievers ... And thus, monks, this course of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should sit down together with a woman, the one with the other, in a secret place on a secluded, convenient

¹ Vin-a 631, “they say that she had ten sons and ten daughters ... and that her sons and her daughters each had twenty children, so that in addition to her own, she had four hundred children.” ² *Abhimaṅgalasammata*. ³ Vin-a 631, “The blessings of leading the bride to one’s own home and away from her own home”—i.e., wedding feasts. ⁴ Feasts at the beginning and at the end of the rains. ⁵ *Eko ekāya*. ⁶ *Tena dhammena*. ⁷ I.e., that he and the woman were on purely platonic terms.

seat, and if a trustworthy¹ woman lay-follower seeing him should speak concerning a certain one of three matters: either one involving defeat,² or one entailing a formal meeting of the Order,³ or one involving expiation,⁴ and the monk himself acknowledging that he was sitting down, should be dealt with according to a certain one of three matters: as to whether it is one involving defeat, or as to whether it is one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or as to whether it is one involving expiation. Or that monk should be dealt with according to what that trustworthy woman lay-follower should say. This is an undetermined matter.”⁵

Whatever means: he who ...

Monk means: this is how monk is to be understood in this sense.

Woman means: a human woman, not a female *yakkha*, not a female departed one, not a female animal, even a girl born on this very day, much more an older one.⁶

Together with means: together.⁷

A man with a woman⁸ means: there is a monk and also a woman.

A secret place means: secret from the eye, secret from the ear. Secret from the eye means: if covering the eye or raising the eyebrow or raising the head he is unable to see. Secret from the ear means: he is unable to hear ordinary speech.

A secluded seat means: it is secluded by a wall built of wattle and daub, or by a door or by a screen or by a screen wall or by a tree or by a pillar or by a sack or it is concealed by anything whatever.⁹

Convenient means: it is possible to indulge in sexual intercourse.

Should sit down means: when the woman is sitting the monk is sitting or lying close to her; when the monk is sitting the woman is sitting or lying close to him; both are sitting, or both are lying.

Trustworthy means: (a woman who) has attained the fruit,¹⁰

¹ Vin-a 632, “one who has attained the fruit of stream-entry.” ² The First Defeat. ³ The second Formal Meeting. ⁴ Bu-Pc 44, Bu-Pc 45. ⁵ It depends upon circumstances. ⁶ =above, BD 1.202. ⁷ =above, BD 1.202. ⁸ Literally one (masculine) with one (feminine). ⁹ Cf. Bu-Ay 2.2.1 and Vin 4.269. ¹⁰ Of stream-attainment, Vin-a 632.

one who possesses complete understanding,¹ one who has learned the teaching.

Female lay-follower means: one going to the enlightened one for refuge, one going to *dhamma* for refuge, one going to the Order for refuge.

Seeing means: seeing.²

Should speak concerning a certain one of three matters: either one involving defeat, or one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or one involving expiation, and the monk himself acknowledging that he was sitting down, should be dealt with according to a certain one of three matters: as to whether it is one involving defeat, or as to whether it is one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or as to whether it is one involving expiation. Or that monk should be dealt with according to what that trustworthy woman lay-follower should say.

If she should say this: “The master was seen by me sitting and indulging in sexual intercourse with a woman,” and if he acknowledges this, he should be dealt with for an offence.

If she should say this: “The master was seen by me sitting and indulging in sexual intercourse with a woman,” and if he should say this: “It is true that I was sitting but I was not indulging in sexual intercourse,” he should be dealt with for sitting down.

If she should say this: “The master was seen by me sitting and indulging in sexual intercourse with a woman,” and if he should say this: “I was not sitting but I was lying down,” he should be dealt with for lying down.

If she should say this: “The master was seen by me sitting and indulging in sexual intercourse with a woman,” and if he should say this: “I was not sitting but I was standing,” he is not to be dealt with.

If she should say this: “The master was seen by me lying down and indulging in sexual intercourse with a woman,” if he acknowledges this, he should be dealt with for an offence.

¹ Vin-a 632, “one who has penetrated the four truths.” ² *disvā ti passitvā*.

If she should say this: "The master was seen ... with a woman," and he should say this: "It is true that I was lying down but I was not indulging in sexual intercourse," he should be dealt with for lying down.

If she should say this: "The master ... with a woman," and if he should say this: "I was not lying down but I was sitting," he should be dealt with for sitting down.

3.190 If she should say this: "The master ... with a woman," and he should say this: "I was not lying down but I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: "The master was seen by me sitting together with a woman and indulging in physical contact," and if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for an offence ... "It is true that I was sitting, but I did not indulge in physical contact," he should be dealt with for sitting down ... "I was not sitting, but I was lying down," he should be dealt with for lying down ... "I was not sitting but I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: "The master was seen by me lying down together with a woman and indulging in physical contact," and if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for an offence ... "It is true that I was lying down, but I did not indulge in physical contact," he should be dealt with for lying down ... "I was not lying down but I was sitting down" ... "I was not lying down, I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: "The master was seen by me sitting together with a woman, the one with the other, in a secret place on a secluded seat suitable (for sexual intercourse)," and if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for sitting down ... "I was not sitting down, but I was lying down," he should be dealt with for lying down ... "I was not sitting down, I was standing," he should not be dealt with.

1.335 If she should say this: "The master was seen by me lying down ... on a secluded seat suitable (for sexual intercourse)," and if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for lying down ... "I was not lying down, I was sitting down," he should be dealt with for

sitting down ... “I was not lying down, I was standing,” he should not be dealt with.

Undetermined means: not determined as to whether it involves defeat, or formal meeting of the Order, or expiation.

He acknowledges going,¹ he acknowledges sitting down, he acknowledges an offence,² he should be dealt with for an offence.³ He acknowledges going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, but he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He acknowledges going, he acknowledges sitting down, but he does not acknowledge an offence, he should be dealt with for sitting down. He acknowledges going, he does not acknowledge sitting down and he does not acknowledge an offence, he should not be dealt with. He does not acknowledge going, but he acknowledges sitting down and he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He does not acknowledge going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, but he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He does not acknowledge going, but he acknowledges sitting down, though he does not acknowledge an offence, he should be dealt with for sitting down. He does not acknowledge going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, he does not acknowledge an offence, he should not be dealt with.

Told is the First Undetermined Offence

¹ Vin-a 633, “saying: ‘I am going to a secret place for the sake of sitting down.’”

² Vin-a 633, “a certain offence among the three”—i.e., either a *pārājika* or a *saṅghādisesa* or a *pācittiya*. ³ Vin-a 633, *āpattiya kārelabbo*, “he should be dealt with according to which of the three he acknowledges.”

MONKS' UNDETERMINED (ANİYATA) 2

^{1,336} At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in
^{2.1.1} the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's park. At that time the venerable
Udāyin said: "It has been forbidden by the lord to sit together with
womenfolk, a man and a woman, in a secret place on a secluded,
convenient seat," but he sat together with that young girl, the one
with the other, in a secret place, conversing at the right time, talk-
ing *dhamma* at the right time. A second time did Visākhā, Migāra's
mother, being invited, come to that family. Visākhā saw the vena-
ble Udāyin sitting together with that girl, the one with the other, in
a secret place, and seeing them she said to the venerable Udāyin:

"This, honoured sir, is not right, it is not suitable for the master
to sit together with womenfolk, a man and a woman, in a secret
place. Although, honoured sir, the master has no desire for that
thing, unbelieving people are difficult to convince."

But the venerable Udāyin took no heed after he had been spoken
to thus by Visākhā. Then Visākhā, when she had departed, told this
matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... (= **Bu-Ay 1.1**;
the words on a secluded, convenient seat are omitted here) ... "And thus,
monks, this course of training should be set forth:

**"And furthermore, if there is not a seat which is secluded and
convenient,¹ for speaking to a woman with lewd
words,² then whatever monk should sit down on such a seat to-
gether with a woman, the one with the other, in a secret place,
and a trustworthy woman lay-follower seeing him should speak
concerning a certain one of two matters: either one entailing a**

¹ *Alam.* ² Cf. **Bu-Ss 3.**

formal meeting of the Order, or one involving expiation, and the monk himself acknowledging that he was sitting down, should be dealt with according to a certain one of two matters: as to whether it is one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or as to whether it is one involving expiation. Or that monk should be dealt with according to what that trustworthy woman lay follower should say. This again is an undetermined matter.”

Vin 3,19

And furthermore, if there is not a seat which is secluded means: it is not secluded by a wall built of wattle and daub or by a door or by a screen or by a screen wall or by a tree or by a pillar or by a sack, or it is not secluded by anything whatever.¹

Bu-Ay:

Not convenient means: it is not possible to indulge in sexual intercourse.²

But sufficiently so for speaking to a woman with lewd words means: it is possible to speak to a woman with lewd words.

Whatever means: he who.

Monk means: ... this is the sense in which monk is to be understood.

On such a seat means: on a seat like that.

Woman means: a human woman, not a female *yakkha*, not a female departed one, not a female animal,³ one who is learned and competent to know good and bad speech, and what is lewd and what is not lewd.⁴

Together with means: together.⁵

Should sit down means: when the woman is sitting ...⁶

Seeing means: seeing.⁷

Should speak concerning a certain one of two matters:

Either one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or one involving expiation, and the monk himself acknowledging that he was sitting down, should be dealt with according to a certain one of two

Bu-Ay:

BD 1,33

¹ Cf. Bu-Ay 1.2.1 and Vin 4.269. ² Cf. Bu-Ay 1.2.1. ³ Cf. Bu-Ay 1.2.1. ⁴ =above, BD 1.215. ⁵ Cf. Bu-Ay 1.2.1. ⁶ Cf. Bu-Ay 1.2.1. ⁷ Cf. Bu-Ay 1.2.1.

matters: as to whether it is one entailing a formal meeting of the Order, or as to whether it is one involving expiation. Or that monk should be dealt with according to what that trustworthy woman lay-follower should say.

If she should say this: “The master was seen by me when he was sitting down and coming into¹ physical contact with a woman,” if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for an offence.

If she should say this: “The master was seen by me ... physical contact,” and if he should say: “It is true that I was sitting, but I did not come into physical contact,” he should be dealt with for sitting ... “I was not sitting, but I was lying down,” he should be dealt with for lying down ... “I was not sitting, but I was standing,” he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: “The master was seen by me lying down, and coming into physical contact with a woman,” if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for an offence ... “It is true that I was lying down, but I did not come into physical contact,” he should be dealt with for lying down ... “I was not lying down, but I was sitting down,” he should be dealt with for sitting down ... “I was not lying down, but I was standing,” he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: “The master was heard by me when he was sitting down and speaking lewd words to a woman,” if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for an offence.

If she should say this: “The master ... to a woman,” and if he should say: “It is true that I was sitting down but I did not speak lewd words to a woman,” he should be dealt with for sitting down ... “I was not sitting down but I was lying down,” he should be dealt with for lying down ... “I was not sitting down but I was standing,” he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this. “The master was heard as he was lying down and speaking lewd words to a woman” ... “but I was standing,” he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: “The master was seen by me sitting together

¹ *Samāpajjanto*. On *samāpajjati*, see above, **BD 1.201, n. 3**.

with a woman, the one with the other, in a secret place,” and if he acknowledges this he should be dealt with for sitting down ... “I was not sitting down, but I was lying down,” he should be dealt with for lying down ... “I was not sitting down, but I was standing,” he should not be dealt with.

If she should say this: “The master was seen by me lying down together with a woman, the one with the other, in a secret place,” and if he acknowledges this, he should be dealt with for lying down ... “I was not lying down, but I was sitting down,” he should be dealt with for sitting down ... “I was not sitting down, but I was standing,” he should not be dealt with.

This again means: it is called so with reference to the former.

Undetermined means: not determined as to whether it involves a formal meeting of the Order, or expiation.

He acknowledges going, he acknowledges sitting down, he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He acknowledges going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He acknowledges going, he acknowledges sitting down, he does not acknowledge an offence, he should be dealt with for sitting down. He acknowledges going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, he does not acknowledge an offence, he should not be dealt with. He does not acknowledge going, he acknowledges sitting down, he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He does not acknowledge going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, but he acknowledges an offence, he should be dealt with for an offence. He does not acknowledge going, he acknowledges sitting, he does not acknowledge an offence, he should be dealt with for sitting down. He does not acknowledge going, he does not acknowledge sitting down, he does not acknowledge an offence, he should not be dealt with.¹

Told is the First Undetermined Offence

¹ Cf. above, Bu-Ay 1.3.

Set forth, venerable ones, are the two undetermined matters. In this connection I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are pure in this matter? A second time I ask: I hope that you are pure in this matter? A third time I ask: I hope that you are pure in this matter? The venerable ones are pure in this matter, therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand.

ITS SUMMARY

Convenient and so and likewise, but not thus, such undetermined matters are well pointed out by the best of Buddhas.

Told is the Undetermined

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

This volume of the *Book of the Discipline* covers OLDENBERG's edition of the *Vinayaṭīka*, vol.3, p.195, to vol.4, p.124, and thus comprises the thirty *Nissaggiya* rules and sixty of the ninety-two *Pācittiya* rules laid down for monks.

The actual rules, *sikkhāpada*, of the Pali Pātimokkha are accessible to English readers in RHYS DAVIDS and OLDENBERG's translation,¹ and translations even earlier.² They have also all been set out in full by B.C. LAW,³ while E.J. THOMAS⁴ has given some in their entirety and has summarised others, classifying these, under their appropriate sections, where affinities are visible. This is the first translation into English of these *sikkhāpadas* complete with their attendant material.

It has been truly and helpfully observed by the editors of *Vinaya Texts*⁵ that "inside each class (of offence) the sequence of the clauses⁶ follows no invariable rule. Sometimes offences of a related character are placed together in groups, but sometimes those which would naturally come together are found scattered in quite different parts of the same class." In addition, as Oldenberg has pointed out,⁷ "it not infrequently happens that a rule refers to the one immediately preceding it."

A considerable amount of work having been done on the Pātimokkha, it will be better in this Introduction not to enlarge upon

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i.1ff., Sacred Books of the East XIII. ² DICKSON, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1876; GOGERLY, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1862; R. SPENCE HARDY, *Eastern Monachism*, 1850, in various chapters. ³ *A History of Pali Literature* i.50ff., based on *Vinaya Texts* i.1ff. ⁴ *A History of Buddhist Thought*, 16ff. ⁵ *Vinaya Texts* i.xiv. ⁶ I.e., rule, ordinance, *sutta*, *dhamma*, clause or article. ⁷ *Vin.1.xvii.*

rules, grouping of rules or sporadic appearance of rules, but to confine myself mainly to various findings arising from a study of the auxiliary material—stories, Old Commentary and *anāpatti* (no offence) clauses—surrounding each rule.

Some of these Pātimokkha rules, when read in conjunction with their attendant material, testify that, although the legal decree and the penalty for its infringement may be the culminating point, there was also a softening influence at work. For the not altogether infrequent *anujānāmi* (“I allow”) allowances, always put into the mouth of Gotama, tend to counteract any too great stringency, inexpediency or lack of clarity on the side of which the *sikkhāpada*, as first framed, may have erred.

Doubtless the *sikkhāpadas*, if isolated from their surrounding matter and viewed either as extracts from this or as the foundations on which it was later reared,¹ may be said to amount to not much more than a series of prohibitions. But on those occasions when an *anujānāmi* is present in the auxiliary material, then *anujānāmi* and *sikkhāpada*, allowance and rule, taken in association as they are intended to be, produce a balance, a middle way between the two extremes of uncompromising legal ordinance and unchecked laxity of behaviour. On such occasions the *anujānāmi* pulls against the rule, and appears as an event potent in its effect on the character of the rule, no less than on the history of its formulation.

The *Nissaggiyas* and *Pācittiyas* are arranged on the same general plan that the *Suttavibhaṅga* follows throughout. This comprises a story leading up to the formulation of a rule, *sikkhāpada*, which is laid down together with the penalty for breaking it. In some cases there follow one or more other stories showing that it was advisable to remodel the rule, and at whose conclusion the amended version of the rule is given. Next comes the Old Commentary or *Padabhājanīya*, defining the words of the rule; then cases where the penalty for breaking the rule or some lighter (never heavier) penalty is incurred; and finally, a list of cases which entail no offence against the rule.

¹ BD 1.xivf.

THE NISSAGGIYA GROUP

Each of the thirty *Nissaggiya* rules for monks has, as the penalty for breaking it, expiation of the offence, *Pācittiya*, involving forfeiture, *Nissaggiya*. This penalty is stated in the words *Nissaggiyaṃ Pācittiyaṃ*, “(an offence) involving forfeiture, to be expiated.” The forfeiture enjoined is that in respect of which the offence had been committed, for example a robe or bowl or rug. These rules are concerned both with behaviour as such and with the wrongful acquisition or unsuitable usage of things.

The form of expiation enjoined by the Old Commentary is confession¹ of the offence of wrongful acquisition. From internal evidence, *Pācittiya* is a (minor) offence to be confessed, *āpatti desetabbā*, a statement common to all the *Nissaggiyas*. But etymologically the word *Pācittiya* has nothing to do with confession. I have therefore kept to the more literal translation,² and have rendered it “offence of expiation” throughout, and the two words *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* as “offence of expiation involving forfeiture.” According to the Old Commentary, “having forfeited (the article), the offence should be confessed.” Thus the act of forfeiture should precede the expiation or confession. I will say something more below about the method in which forfeiture should be made.³

In history, the place at which an event is said to have taken place is often of some importance. It is well known that Gotama spent the greater part of his teaching life at Sāvatti and his last years at Vesālī. It is worth recalling, for the evidence contributed, that Sāvatti, with an overwhelming majority, is given as the locus of twenty-two *Nissaggiyas*, Rājagaha of three, Vesālī and Kapilavattu each of two, Ālavī of one.

As many as sixteen *Nissaggiya* rules for monks are concerned with robes, and fall into two groups, Bu-NP 1–Bu-NP 10, Bu-NP 24–Bu-NP 25; five with rugs (*santhata*), Bu-NP 11–Bu-NP 15; two with sheep’s wool, Bu-NP 16, Bu-NP 17; three with gold and silver and bartering, Bu-

¹ Cf. S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.104ff. ² See below, BD 2.3, n. 4. ³ Below, BD 2.xii.

NP 18–Bu-NP 20; two with bowls, Bu-NP 21, Bu-NP 22; one with medicine, Bu-NP 23; and the last one, Bu-NP 30, is against a monk appropriating for his own use benefits intended for the Order. There are, moreover, a few cross-sections. For example, in the matter of exchange of robes (Bu-NP 5), in the matter of washing, dyeing and beating robes (Bu-NP 4, and in the matter of washing, dyeing and beating sheep's wool (Bu-NP 17), the correct behaviour for a monk to observe towards a nun also comes under legislation; and in two of the rules connected with making rugs, sheep's wool is also the subject of legal attention.

Oddly, there is no *Nissaggiya* concerned with either lodgings or bedding, *senāsana*, or with almsfood, *piṇḍapāta*, which with robes and medicine are regarded as a monk's four indispensable requisites. There are offences regarding these which had to be confessed, and which occur in the *Pācittiya* section of the *Pātimokkha*, but evidently there are no types of offences where lodgings and almsfood had to be forfeited, in addition to their wrongful acquisition or usage being confessed.

About half the rules were formulated because the monks acquired something by means considered un-becoming, tiresome or inconvenient: they asked for too much, they pressed potential donors, for example as to the quality of the robe-material they particularly desired. The remaining half were formulated because monks did various things or used various articles in ways thought unsuitable: they had an unnecessary amount of robes or bowls, they laid aside their robes for too long, they made nuns wash their robes or their sheep's wool for them, and they carried sheep's wool so far that the laity made fun of them.

The formulation of the majority, namely of sixteen *Nissaggiya* rules, resulted, so it is recorded, from criticisms made of a monk or monks by the laity; eight from criticisms made by modest monks, three from those made by nuns, two from those made by Ānanda, and one from those made by a wanderer. With the exception of Ānanda, who complained for the sake of the Order, and not because he himself had been specially inconvenienced, these various classes of critics

put forward their complaints because they personally had been in some way adversely affected by the monks' behaviour. Thus there is a parallelism between the sources of criticism and the sections of society annoyed. Once Gotama is recorded to have heard of troublesome behaviour direct from Mahāpajāpatī while he was talking to her (Bu-NP 17), and once he came upon signs of it himself (Bu-NP 17). Four times a new rule is framed in place of one already existing, for occasions afterwards arose which showed that its scrupulous observance resulted in unfair situations.

It will be seen that the number of *Nissaggiya* rules formulated according to this reckoning is thirty-six. This means that six times the rule as originally framed had to be altered: four times, as mentioned above, in accordance with circumstances that had not been foreseen when it was first set forth (Bu-NP 1, Bu-NP 2, Bu-NP 14, Bu-NP 21), and twice when close adherence to the rule as first drafted is shown to result in occurrences so unsuitable as to provoke complaints and criticism (Bu-NP 5, Bu-NP 6).

These *Nissaggiyas* where the rule had to be altered, although never more than once, thus contain two stories, one leading up to the first, and the other to the second version of the rule. The second version must be taken to annul the validity of the first. This however had to remain in the text for the sake of historical interest, and as to some extent explanatory of the force and wisdom of the second version. Had it been omitted, the incidents showing its shortcomings and its need for revision could not have been used as testimony that such shortcomings were remediable and such revision necessary and reasonable.

In these six *Nissaggiyas* where a rule is formulated twice, the first version is always followed by the phrase, "And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord." There is no instance of this phrase occurring either after the second formulation of the rule, or in any of the remaining twenty-four *Nissaggiyas* where the rule is framed once only.

Yet in the text of the Vinaya is every rule, whether it had to be

revised or not, and every amended rule, ascribed to Gotama. The formula so very definitely attributing “to the lord” only those rules that had to be altered is to my mind somewhat inexplicable. It is not peculiar to the *Nissaggiyas*, but occurs throughout the *Vibhaṅga*. It is possible that the occurrence of this phrase points to some comparatively old stratum in the *Suttavibhaṅga*, where only those rules, so pointedly said to have been laid down “by the lord,” were genuinely prescribed by him; but that then there came a case, perhaps before, perhaps after his death, which made it clear that a revision and a more exact delimitation of the rule already formulated was wanted in the interests of reason, decency or justice.

Such revision may then in fact have been made, not by the founder, but by one of his followers or by the *saṅgha*. Or a decision may have been taken at the final recension of the “texts” to attribute all rules to the lord, so as to invest them with his authority. Even so, the mystery remains why this phrase, “And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord,” was appended only to those rules which, as the history of the Order shows, had to be altered, and not to those whose original version has been able to stand and operate down the centuries.

It is something more than coincidence, and looks like adherence to some thought-out pattern, that in the six *Nissaggiyas* where a rule is twice formulated there should occur, after its first formulation, this phrase ascribing its setting forth “to the lord,” and before its second formulation an *anujānāmi*, an “allowance.” In each case the *anujānāmi* occurs in the talk which, before the rule was revised, is reputed to have been given by Gotama to monks. Its effect is not to tighten but to mitigate the force and application of the rule as first drawn up. An *anujānāmi* however also occurs in five of the remaining twenty-four *Nissaggiyas* (Bu-NP 3, Bu-NP 15, Bu-NP 22, Bu-NP 28, Bu-NP 29), not immediately before, but some way before the rule, here of course formulated only once.

In the *Nissaggiya* group of rules, there occurs the formulation of four *dukkaṭa* offences, those of wrong-doing. Each of these is ascribed

to Gotama. Many others appear in the material placed after the Old Commentary, but it is not said of these that he was the author.

Most rare it is to find, as in **Bu-NP 1** and **Bu-NP 21**, which have several other points in common, a short story leading up to the drafting of an offence of wrong-doing placed *after* the *anāpatti* (no offence) clauses.¹ As would be expected, the story and the offence are pertinent to the matter in hand.

In **Bu-NP 6** the *anujānāmi*, which is unusually long, ends, exceptionally for the *Nissaggiya* section, in the formulation of a *dukkaṭa* offence. It immediately precedes the second drafting of the rule.

In **Bu-NP 22**, which because of some peculiarities that it contains I shall discuss more fully below, the first story introduces, not a *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* offence, but one of wrong-doing.

The occurrence of *dukkaṭa* offences in **Bu-NP 6** and **Bu-NP 22** before the final formulation of the rule, no less than their ascription to the lord, should correct the impression given at *Vinaya Texts* i.xxv that the term *dukkaṭa* “occurs only in ... the latest portion of the Piṭaka,” that is in “the Notes giving the exceptions to, and the extensions of the Rule in the Pātimokkha” (*Vinaya Texts* i.xix), which are always placed after the Old Commentary.

As a general rule, the *Padabhājanīya* states that forfeiture and confession were to be made to an Order, that is to any part of the whole Order, five monks or more,² living within one boundary, *simā*, or within one residence, *āvāsa*; or to a group, *gaṇa*³ of monks, that is to a group of from two to four monks; or to an individual monk. When the article had been forfeited and the offence confessed, the offence was to be acknowledged, in the first two instances, by “an experienced, competent monk”; in the third by the monk to whom the forfeiture and confession had been made. The forfeited article was then to be given back to the monk who, having acquired it wrongfully, had forfeited it.

The value of the *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* type of penalty was, I think,

¹ Similarly at **Bi-NP 1**. ² Sizes of a *saṅgha*, order, are given at **Vin 1.319**. ³ In the Old Commentary, the phrase *sambahulā bhikkhū* also occurs, and appears often to be a synonym for *gaṇa*. See below, **BD 2.7**, **BD 2.8**.

in the eyes of the framer or framers of the Pātimokkha rules, its deterrent effect on the commission of further similar offences, and its redemptive power for each particular offender. It was apparently held that an offence whose penalty was of this nature was annulled by confessing it and having it acknowledged, combined with this hardly more than symbolic act of forfeiting the article wrongfully acquired. This involved some formality, but evidently the offence was not considered bad enough to warrant the offender's permanent loss of the goods he had obtained improperly.

Thus it is only true that "rules were required to prevent his (*i.e.*, a monk's) acquiring a store of property,"¹ on the assumption that these rules were deterrent and preventive and not retributive and revengeful. More important is it perhaps to realise that, behind this statutory limiting of possessions, there was the conviction that greed, craving, thirst, *taṇhā*, themselves undesirable, produced further undesirable states of mind.

It is true that any great emphasis on the monastic ideal, any clear expression of it, is lacking in the Vinaya, and is to be found almost exclusively in the Suttapiṭaka.

The rules were probably, like the Rule of St. Benedict, to help the beginners, the backsliders, in their struggle towards "the lofty heights of virtue" and wisdom. Yet there is one notable occasion, in **Bu-NP 17**, when we are reminded of the end, the ideal, the thing sought, to which the Vinaya rules must be held to constitute a means of realisation. This is when the lord is shown as asking Mahāpajāpati whether the nuns are "zealous, ardent, with a self that is striving," a triad of words belonging to Sutta material. To which she answers that while monks make them wash their sheep's wool for them, it is impossible for nuns to attend to "the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher wisdom," also a Sutta triad.

Conquest in this age-old struggle on the part of certain women to escape the ties of domesticity so as to seek the "further shore" is happily expressed in verses ascribed to Sumaṅgala's mother:²

¹ E.J. THOMAS *A History of Buddhist Thought*, p.19. ² Thig.23.

“O woman well set free! how free am I,
How thoroughly free from kitchen drudgery!
Me stained and squalid ’mong my cooking-pots,
My brutal husband ranked as even less
Than the sunshades he sits and weaves away.”

Yet although references to the need for ideals and their value, and for man’s inner spiritual and mental training and the means of attaining these, may be, practically absent from the Vinaya, there is no doubt that its legal and somewhat austere character is based on a high and mature standard of morality, justice and common sense.

There are three exceptions to the *Nissaggiyas*’ customary insistence on the return of the forfeited article to the monk who had come by it unlawfully, and had forfeited it, only to be given it back again. And there are three exceptions to their usual instruction that forfeiture and confession are to be made to an Order or to a group or to an individual monk. The same three *Nissaggiyas*, **Bu-NP 18**, **Bu-NP 19**, **Bu-NP 22** share both these irregularities.

Bu-NP 18 and **Bu-NP 19** are both concerned with gold and silver, called *jātarūparajata*¹ in the one case, and *rūpiya* in the other. The Old Commentary on these *Nissaggiyas* requires a monk who has picked up gold and silver (**Bu-NP 18**), or who has entered into various transactions in which they are used (**Bu-NP 19**), to make forfeiture in the midst of the Order, *saṅghamajjhe*. It does not give the usual alternatives of forfeiting to a group or an individual. That these commodities may not be forfeited to either of these parties is precluded by the rule of **Bu-NP 18** itself, for this lays it down as an offence for a monk to have gold and silver in his possession. The *saṅgha* is more impersonal, and is, when need arises, a body of monks in their official character, with the functions of discharging legal and juridical business and of carrying out formal acts.

But although the *saṅgha* may receive the forfeited gold and silver, it may neither retain them nor return them to the monk who forfeited them. It must either hand them over to some lay person, asking

¹ On these terms see below, **BD 2.100**, n. 2.

him to bring medicines in exchange, or, failing this, the Order must appoint from among its number a “silver-remover,” *rūpiyachaddaka*, whose office it is to dispose of whatever mediums of exchange *rūpiya* and *jātarūparajata* denote.

Of the various objects with which the rules of the *Nissaggiyas* are concerned, gold and silver are the only ones which a monk might in no circumstances have in his possession. Clearly he had access to them, for his association with the laity was but little restricted.

Similarly **Bu-NP 22**, besides precluding forfeiture and confession to either a group or an individual, also debars the return of the forfeited article, here a bowl, to the monk who forfeited it. But he is to be given another bowl in its place. This is unique in the *Nissaggiyas*. It is also unique to find given in the rule itself the method of forfeiture. This is otherwise invariably and solely, found in the Old Commentary. Here the method of forfeiture enjoined in the rule appears again, though in more detailed form, in the Old Commentary.

The *sikkhāpada* of **Bu-NP 22**, after stating that a monk who, getting another new bowl in exchange for a bowl mended in less than five places, incurs an offence, proceeds to say: “That bowl must be forfeited by that (offending) monk to a *bhikkhuparisā* (company, assembly, congregation of monks). And whatever is the last bowl (*patapariyanta*) belonging to that company of monks, it should be given to that monk, with the words, ‘Monk, this is a bowl for you; it should be kept until it breaks.’”

It is interesting to find that the new bowl got in exchange for the mended bowl is subject to forfeiture only to the Order. This suggests that bowls were regarded at some time as more especially communal property than were robes,¹ or the other objects in regard to which a monk might commit an offence involving forfeiture. Yet in **Bu-NP 21**, an extra bowl, if it had been used for more than ten days, might be forfeited either to an Order or to a group or to an individual.

¹ On a monk’s death, his robes did not necessarily return to the Order. He could bequeath them to the monk who had nursed him or to a pupil. Moreover, robe-material might be presented to individual monks, if the laity so wished. See **Bu-NP 8**, **Bu-NP 9**, **Bu-NP 10**.

Nevertheless the injunction which occurs at the end of the *sikkhāpada* of **Bu-NP 22** reveals a closer concern for communal ownership and property than do the other *Nissaggiya sikkhāpadas*. In these others, although the Order, or a section of it, may receive the forfeited article, it also, with the exception of **Bu-NP 18** and **Bu-NP 19**, returns it, the community as a whole assuming no further responsibility.

At the end of **Bu-NP 21**, it is said that failure to give back a bowl that had been forfeited entails a *dukkaṭa* offence.¹ Yet in **Bu-NP 22** it appears that a bowl on being forfeited becomes an extra bowl for a company of monks and is absorbed into their stock of bowls. The result of an Order's obtaining an additional bowl in this way is that all its members are liable to profit. For their bowls, on the accretion of this extra one, may all be shuffled round. But this is not to be done haphazard. The rule has given concise directions for the right procedure, and these are followed and expanded at some length by the Old Commentary.

There is a still further way in which **Bu-NP 22** is unique among the *Nissaggiyas*. It contains three stories instead of, as is normal, one, or, as in six cases, two. This means that a chain of three connected circumstances have arisen, each of which demands jurisdiction. The curious thing is, that the first, story does not end with the formulation of a *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* offence, but with that of an offence of wrong-doing. This is to the effect that a monk must not ask for a bowl. But monks observed this precept too scrupulously. Lay people complained that, by receiving almsfood into their hands, they resembled members of other sects. So Gotama, it is said, made an "allowance" moderating the *dukkaṭa* rule, and permitting monks to ask for a bowl when theirs were broken or destroyed. But because the six monks abused this privilege, the *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* rule was formulated.

I have dwelt on **Bu-NP 22** at some length, for I think that, even as there are some grounds for holding that **Bu-Ss 12** may represent some specially ancient fragment of the *Pātimokkha*,² so likewise may

¹ Cf. end of **Bu-NP 1**, where same offence incurred by failure to give back a robe.

² See **BD 1.xxviiiif**.

this *Nissaggiya*.

In the first place, the term *bhikkhuparisā*, because it merely indicates an assembly, a company of monks, may belong to those earlier days before Gotama's followers were fully organised into a *saṅgha*, bound by the same observances and obligations, the same rules and (formal) acts, and living in the same communion.

It is possible that, in such a context, *bhikkhu* did not mean all that at some time it came to mean. Secondly, the mention of this "company of monks" as the recipient body of a forfeited bowl may point to a time when communal ownership was more actual than nominal. Thirdly, the need for stating, in the *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* rule itself, that the article wrongfully acquired must be forfeited, suggests that this-rule antedates the other *Nissaggiyas*, and belongs to a time when forfeiture was new as a penalty, and when therefore the method of carrying it out had to be plainly stated. Fourthly, one might suppose that the first story in this *Nissaggiya* purports to be recounting unsuitable behaviour in an early follower of Gotama. For the early followers, it may be presumed, entering from a more urgent sense of religion, committed less serious offences than the later, and hence incurred lighter penalties.

The appointment of two officials is mentioned in the *Nissaggiyas*, that of silver-remover (**Bu-NP 18**) and that of assigner of bowls (**Bu-NP 22**). The duty of both is to deal with the results of offences, and not with the distribution of articles, such as robes and lodgings, lawfully acquired. Appointments of officials were not of one officer for the whole *saṅgha*, but of an officer for any of those lesser sections of it which, dwelling within one boundary or residence, were, to the not negligible confusion of later historians, also called *saṅgha*. Even so, we do not know whether each of these *saṅghas* always appointed every possible official, ready to function—and a not inconsiderable number are named throughout the *Vinaya*—or if only those were appointed when occasion demanded their service. Nor do we know whether an official, once appointed, held his post permanently or temporarily.

I think it fairly safe to presume the latter. Monks travelled a great deal on the one hand, and on the other had to spend the three or four months of the rains in one residence with other monks. Had two permanent office-bearers met, and a case within their orbit arisen, a ruling would have been necessary as to which one, such as the senior or the one first arrived, was to deal with the situation. But there is no record of any such event.

It seems more likely, and the internal evidence, such as it is, points this way, that the authorised procedure for appointing the officials was prescribed as the need for this or that official was felt. Thus a similar appointment could be correctly made if and when future need arose. But if there was, for example, no occasion for a silver-remover or an assigner of bowls, which could only be because no monk had acquired gold and silver or a new bowl in exchange for one mended in less than five places, then there was no obligation to appoint a monk to fill either of these offices.

The procedure for the appointment of the officials is in each case much the same; and they have to be “agreed upon” by the entire Order affected. This well illustrates the democratic nature of the monastic institution. Two other “agreements of the monks,” *bhikkhusammuti*, are described in the *Nissaggiyas* (Bu-NP 2, Bu-NP 14), and again the responsibility for making the required agreement is shown to be vested in the whole organism, and not in any one of its members.

Some English translations of Pali words and phrases appear to have become almost traditional by now, and hence attract little critical attention. Such a phrase is “*pattacīvaraṃ ādāya*,” “taking the bowl and robe.” It is the occurrence of this phrase in Bu-NP 5, together with the mention of various sorts of robes, that has raised the question of *which* robe it is that is here referred to in the phrase.

Dialogues of the Buddha ii.162, n. 1, describes the three usual robes of a monk as the inner one worn in the residence, the upper robe put on before a monk left the monastery and went out to a village, and the outer cloak carried, and put on near the outskirts of the village. If this is a correct interpretation—and it is the one generally

accepted—the phrase *pubbaṅhasamayam nivāsetvā* would appear to mean, “having dressed in the morning in the upper robe.” This implies that the monk will already have put on his inner robe to wear in the residence, if indeed he had not slept in it, but later put on his upper robe with a view to going on his almsround. Again, the phrase *pattacīvaramm ādāya*, which as a rule immediately follows this other one, would in effect mean, “taking the outer cloak and the bowl.” I think it possible however that if the *cīvara* of this phrase did at some time come to refer exclusively to the *saṅghāṭi*, the outer cloak, it may not always have done so. For it is hard to see the sense that such an interpretation could make in **Bu-NP 5**, as I hope to show. On the other hand, the occurrence of the phrase here may be due to some later editorial addition to the story.

The nun Uppalavaṇṇā is elsewhere in the *Vinaya*¹ the focus of an alteration in the rules on jungle-dwelling for nuns. Here too another episode in her life, as this is recorded in **Bu-NP 5**, is the centre round which turn some intricate questions with regard to robes.

According to this *Nissaggiya*, Uppalavaṇṇā, in the stereotyped phrase, “having dressed in the morning and taking her bowl and robe,” *pubbaṅhasamayam nivāsetvā pattacīvaram ādāya*, had gone to Sāvattthī for almsfood. She had then used her upper robe, *uttarāsaṅga*, to tie up some meat. She next gave her inner robe, *antaravāsaka*, to the monk Udāyīn, although protesting that it was her last, her fifth robe, *idañ ca me antimam pañcimam cīvaram*. And finally it is said that on her return to the nunnery, the nuns receiving from her her bowl and robe, *pattacīvaram paṭiganhaṅgiyo*, asked her where her inner robe was.

The question is, which of the five robes allowable to a nun did she set out “taking,” and which did the nuns “receive” from her when she came back to the nunnery?

The five robes of a nun, mentioned also at **Vin 4.218**, **Vin 4.282**, are named at **Vin 2.272** as the three usual robes worn also by monks, with the addition of the vest or bodice, *saṃkacchika*, and the bathing-cloth,

¹ **Vin 3.35ff.** = **BD 1.53ff.**

and it is said that these should be pointed out to women wishing to receive the *upasampadā*. At **Vin 4.345** it is laid down as an offence of expiation for a nun to enter a village without her bodice, that is without having this on under her inner robe. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 663 assumes that Uppalavaṇṇā had on her bodice, for he says, “dressed in (*nivattha*) her bodice, and showing only the palms of her hands ... she went away,” that is from Udāyin. We know that she had had her upper robe, and suspect that it was accounted for by the phrase, “having dressed in the morning.” Likewise, on account of the phrase, “taking her bowl and robe,” she should have had her outer cloak with her. But had she in fact had this, surely she would have put it on. Yet in the narrative of her meeting with Udāyin, there is no suggestion that she was either carrying it or wearing it.

Either therefore “having dressed in the morning” refers to putting on the *inner* robe, and “taking the bowl and robe” to the *upper* robe, and not to the *saṅghāṭi*, the outer cloak; or this latter phrase is some later interpolation.

Now at **Vin 1.298** it is a *dukkāṭa* offence to enter a village wearing only the inner and the upper robes, that is without the outer cloak. This rule, be it noticed, was made in reference to monks, and I do not think that it applies to nuns.¹ For at **Vin 4.281** it is a *Pācittiya* offence for nuns, having laid aside the *cīvara*, here certainly the outer cloak, to go into the country for more than five days with only the inner and the upper robes. Therefore if, at the time to which **Bu-NP 5** purports to refer, a nun did *not* have to go into a village on her morning almsround taking her outer cloak, Uppalavaṇṇā may have “taken” merely her upper robe. She would then have returned to the nunnery dressed only in her bodice, as Buddhaghosa seems to

¹ It is too facilely said by some writers that the Vinaya for nuns is a mere copy of that for monks—e.g., H. KERN, *A Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 86; though it is probable that the Pātimokkha of the nuns was “modelled on” that of the monks; Cf. E.J. THOMAS, *A History of Indian Thought*, 15, n. 1; M. WINTERNITZ, *A History of Indian Literature* ii.24, speaking of it as “a similar code compiled later for the nuns”; MISS D. BHAGVAT, *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence*, p.18, as a “mere imitation of the former”—i.e., the Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha.

imply.

With the growing disparagement of nakedness in monks and nuns,¹ the robe the nuns “received” from her would hardly have been her bodice. Besides, this “receiving” of a bowl and robe from an incoming monk or nun came to be but a recognised, standardised act. It would thus appear possible that the discrepancy which exists may be attributable to a later interpolation of the phrase which denotes this act of respect done to a monk or nun on coming back to the residence.

If we allow that the phrase *pattacīvaraṃ ādāya*, of the beginning of the story, betrays neither the marks of interpolation nor of accredited meaning, but signifies taking the *upper* robe, then we are almost forced to see the phrase *pattacīvaraṃ paṭigaṇhantiyo*, towards the conclusion of the story, as some additional matter. For if the course of the story is carefully followed, it is impossible to identify these two *cīvara* the one with the other.

Thus an explanation of the discrepancy between whatever robes it was that these phrases are intended to signify is that this *Nissaggiya* has suffered some careless “editorial” gloss or glosses. The point itself may be small and of no particular importance. But every instance of perceptible “curling and combing”² of the texts must make us the more alive to the possibility of their patchwork nature, their composite “authorship,” to their gradual alterations and additions, and probably to their losses too.

Having taken an instance of the translation of a frequent phrase, whose latent reference has been perhaps too little questioned, and hence too easily regarded as uniformly specific, I turn now to a word, *santhata*, and the verb, *santharati* (= *saṃ* + *str*), of which it is the past participle. In this case it is owing to the comparative infrequency of these two words that their latent reference has been too little questioned on the one hand, but on the other not fully perceived to be specific.

¹ Cf. *Vin* 1.292, *Vin* 1.293, *Vin* 1.305; *Vin* 4.278; and below, *BD* 2.45, *BD* 2.134. ² A phrase I borrow from MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, “*Poems by Monks and Nuns*”, *Review of Religion*, January, 1940, p. 129.

In Bu-NP 11–Bu-NP 15, *santhata* occurs as a neuter noun,¹ meaning a rug or mat.² Because there are other words for rug, mat, carpet, ground-covering, sheet and so on, the problem before us is to find the differentiating feature peculiar to the kind of rug called *santhata*, the particular characteristic in virtue of which it was so named. For neither the Old Commentary nor Buddhaghosa describes the finished article; they concentrate instead on the process of making it. The result of the process is what in the text of the introductory stories and the *sikkhāpadas* is called a *santhata*.

The Old Commentary is very terse, but, by exclusion, informative: *santhata* means, what comes to be made having spread, not woven, *santharivā kataṃ hoti avāyimaṃ*. Thus *santharivā* in this definition needs some word to be supplied as its object, such as one representing the material used in making the article by this process known as *santharati*. Buddhaghosa, at Vin-a 684, describes the technique of what the Old Commentary, in defining *santhata*, calls *santharivā*, by saying, “it is made having spread (*santharivā*) silk³ filaments (*aṃsu*) one upon the other on a level piece of ground, having poured boiled rice (or corn) and so on over the silk filaments.”

This then is the kind of process meant by *santhata*, and it is the only one described. It seems that the basic material of which the article was being made was spread out in layers, in strata all running the same way, and not cross-wise so as to be woven, and that it was then somehow welded together by pouring boiling rice over it. The result of this operation was a *santhata*, a thing made by this process.

Childers defines the cognate noun, *santhāra*, as “layer, stratum”; and there are passages in the Vinaya and the Suttas⁴ where *santharati*,

¹ See e.g. DN ii.160, Snp 401, Snp 668; also the stock-phrase, *dhamani-santhata-gatta*, having the limbs strewn with veins. As a noun, *santhata* occurs only once elsewhere, Vv 63,5. ² Pali-English Dictionary, B.C. LAW, A History of Pali Literature i.53, “rug or mat”; E.J. THOMAS, A History of Buddhist Thought, p.19, “rug.” Vinaya Texts i.24 translates “rug or mat” and “rug”; HUBER, Journal Asiatique, 1913, p.497, “couverture”; VIDYABHUSANA, *So-sor-thar-pa*, p.20, “mat.” ³ “Silk” is not essential to the argument. This part of the Commentary is referring to Bu-NP 11, where monks thought of making *santhata* mixed with silk. In Bu-NP 12–Bu-NP 14 they were made of wool. ⁴ Vin 1.227; DN ii.84, DN iii.208; Ud 8.6; MN i.354.

used largely in connection with preparing a council-hall, must mean to spread or to strew most probably in layers, by a spreading method, of layering. This, at all events, is the view held by the commentator¹ who describes the arrangement of covering the ground with cow-dung, scents, coloured, mats, fleecy rugs, and skins of various animals, all one above (*upari*) the other. It is unfortunate that the commentator, in thus defining *santharivā*, more than once uses the word itself. In spite of this, the description is of inestimable help in arriving at a fuller understanding of what *santharati* implies.

If my hypothesis is correct, the cognate verb *attharati* (= *ā + str*) would denote the simpler act of spreading, covering, laying out, but not in layers, and as it were once only or one thing only, such as cloth (*Vin 1.254ff.*) or a bridge (*Ja i.199*). It would then follow that *santharati*, when used with reference to spreading a couch or chair or mattress or stool,² must mean not simply the act of putting out the couch or chair unurnished, but converting it into something fit to sit on or lie on. This could be done by spreading on it or under it different coverings, in layers: the sheet, *pacuttharaṇa*, the ground-covering, *bhummattharaṇa*, for example. These coverings would in no way be held together as though woven, but would be spread one on top of the other.

For the translation of *santhata* in *Bu-NP 11–Bu-NP 15* I have chosen “rug” in preference to “mat,” because it seems desirable to convey the impression that a *santhata* was something that could both be sat on and also worn wrapped round the body. The Old Commentary on *Bu-NP 15* defines *purāṇa-santhata*, an old, used or soiled *santhata*, in exactly the same terms as it uses to define *purāṇa-cīvara*, an old, used or soiled robe. Of both it says that they mean, “dressed in it once, put on once,” using for this the words *nivāseti* and *pārupati*, which usually refer to the complete dressing in the monk’s three robes. Buddhaghosa defines these words, “dressed in” and “put on,” as “sat on” and “lain on” (*Vin-a 687*). Yet on the very same page he speaks of a *santhata* “counting as a fourth robe.”

¹ MN-a iii.18; Ud-a 409. ² See below, *BD 2.238f.*

But for Buddhaghosa apparently these two definitions are not impossible of reconciliation. For in his exegesis on **Bu-NP 4** he says (Vin-a 660) that a robe is called “old” (i.e., dressed in it once, put on once) if a monk lies on it, using it as a pillow. Thus a robe, meant to be worn, could also on occasion be used to lie on.

As the Vinaya itself provides no evidence as to what exactly *santhata* means, whether it is a rug or a mat, although it describes the process by which it is made, I have followed the commentator in regarding the article as something that could either be sat on or worn. “Rug” rather more accurately than “mat” seems to cover these two usages which, by the time of Buddhaghosa at any rate, appear to have grown into the meaning of *santhata*.

The *nisīdana-santhata* of **Bu-NP 15** is not a species of *santhata*, but of *nisīdana*, and is a piece of cloth to sit upon (*nisīdana*) made with the addition of part of an old *santhata*. A *nisīdana* was so called if it had a border.¹ But the reason why a border came to be allowed, together with its correct measurements, is given at **Vin 4.170f.**, and has nothing to do with the need to add part of a *santhata* to a *nisīdana*.

THE PĀCITTIYA GROUP (Nos. 1–60)

A curious feature of the *Pācittiyas* is that the Old Commentary on these rules nowhere explains what is meant by *Pācittiya*, the offence which gives its name to this whole section. It is from the phrase *āpatti desetabbā*, occurring in the *Vibhaṅga* on each *Nissaggiya*, that we infer that *Pācittiya* is an offence to be confessed; and even as forfeiture and confession are to be made to an Order or to a group or to an individual, so we may conclude that the same holds good when the offence is one whose penalty is merely that of expiation, of confession unaccompanied by forfeiture.

By and large each *Pācittiya* is composed on the same general lines as the other classes of rules in the Sutta *Vibhaṅga*: introductory story, rule, sometimes another story, even more than one, with the

¹ **Vin 3.232, Vin 4.123, Vin 4.171.**

amended version or versions of the rule, Old Commentary, other exegetical material, and a list of no offences against the rule. There are, as in the *Nissaggiyas*, irregularities and variations from this customary pattern. These cannot be analysed until the translation of the ninety-two *Pācittiyas* is complete, and even then it will be doubtful whether they will throw any light on “the comparative age of any different parts of the Pātimokkha.”¹

One thing however we can do now, and it is not altogether unimportant. We can correct the misapprehension into which the editors of *Vinaya Texts* fell, and which I,² among others,³ have hitherto followed too uncritically. For it is not quite the case that the Old Commentary is a “word for word commentary upon”⁴ each of these rules, although undoubtedly it is nearly so. Setting aside the occasions where words are defined by themselves, but nevertheless defined, there yet remain a few distinct but notable lapses and omissions, some words of a rule not being commented upon at all. There is no attempt in the Old Commentary to explain “water (that) contains life” (Bu-Pc 20), “monk arrived first” (Bu-Pc 16), or “in destruction of” (vegetable growth) (Bu-Pc 11), although in the last case the paragraph following the Old Commentary’s definition of “vegetable growth” leads us to suppose that “destruction” means cutting, breaking and cooking.

Sāvattihī, again with a large majority, is said to be the locus of thirty-nine of these sixty *Pācittiyas*, Rājagaha of six, Kosambī of five, Vesālī and Ālavī each of four, Kapilavatthu of two and Suṃsumāragiri of one. The total of sixty-one is accounted for by the fact that, in Bu-Pc 5, the first version of the rule is reputed to have been formulated when Gotama was at Ālavī, and the second when he had moved on from there to Kosambī.

The critics, as a result of whose complaints *Pācittiya* rules for monks were made or revised, are thirty-five times shown to have been the “modest monks,” fifteen times “people,” *manussa*, to which

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i.xiv. ² BD 1.xxxiii. ³ S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, 91; M. WINTERNITZ, *A History of Indian Literature*, ii.24. ⁴ *Vinaya Texts* i.xv.

must be added the criticism of a lay-woman (Bu-Pc 7, both stories), of a man (Bu-Pc 45), of a poor workman (Bu-Pc 33), of Mahānāma Sakka (Bu-Pc 47), and of hirelings of the king (Bu-Pc 58). Four times the nuns complain, once the *titthiyas*, once a brahmin, once *upāsakā*, lay-followers.

These last, also, upon one occasion (Bu-Pc 41) are recorded to have told Gotama how monks might avoid bringing discredit on themselves from members of other sects; he laid down a rule in accordance with their representations. Once King Pasenadi thought of a device by which Gotama might know that monks had been behaving indecorously (Bu-Pc 53). Five times, it appears, Gotama discovered by direct observation or by questioning that legislation was required. By a too fastidious adherence to a rule, it is on several occasions demonstrated to be unsatisfactory, and is revised.

Thus the total number of rules appearing in these *Pācittiya*s is greater than sixty. It is not uniformly the case, as in the *Nissaggiya* section, that when a rule is amended, it is amended once only. At least three of these sixty *Pācittiya*s provide evidence of a long struggle to get the rule right. In Bu-Pc 32 the rule on a group-meal, *gaṇabhojana*, revised seven times, results finally in seven legalised exceptions being allowed to the offence, as it otherwise remains, of eating in a group. To the ruling on *paramparabhojana* (Bu-Pc 33), eating meals out of the turns in which they have been offered, four exceptions are sanctioned. Thirdly, six exceptions are made to the rule that a monk should not bathe at intervals of less than half a month (Bu-Pc 57).

A consideration of the reasons leading to the exceptions made to these, as to several other rules, reveals something of the care and vigilance needed for the smooth running of the Buddhist cenobium, impinging as it did on various elements and aspects of the society of the day. The laity were, on the one hand, not to be drained of their resources, on the other, not to be refused when they offered food, as this might result in wounding their spirit of generosity, in dashing their hope of merit, and in the loss to monks of the robe-material which the laity, at the right time of year, gave to members of the

Orders with meals. Nor were the laity to be kept waiting. At least I think that that, as much as the discourtesy of refusing the offer, made to monks who were travelling, to “eat just here,” and which looks as if the lay-people were willing to provide the meal, is at the root of two exceptions, made at **Bu-Pc 33.5**. For there are various times in *Nissaggiya* and *Pācittiya* when lay-people are recorded to be annoyed with monks for keeping them waiting.

At **Bu-Pc 33.4** it is obvious that the assigning to another monk of a meal that is expected later is a device for overcoming the rudeness, otherwise involved, of refusing food that is actually being offered. Nor, so it emerges, is it polite to refuse an invitation given to a meal by a wanderer, a *paribbājaka-samāpanna*. A naked ascetic, *ājīvaka*, had, as is stated, on Bimbisāra’s advice, asked the monks to a meal with him, but they had refused (**Bu-Pc 32.8**).

Incidentally this story reveals the necessity for keeping the friendship of the kings, on whom the success of the Order largely depended. They did much to set the fashion in faith. I have mentioned Pasenadi’s device for letting the lord know, but without himself speaking to him, that he had seen monks, *arahans* at that, sporting in the water. *Mallikā*, his queen, was of the opinion either that there was no rule against this, or that these monks did not know about it. Apparently her first surmise was right. The third mention of a king in these sixty *Pācittiyas* is again of Bimbisāra. Because monks, by bathing until after dark, kept him waiting his turn, for it appears that he did not wish to disturb them, a rule, severe compared with its cause, was formulated forbidding monks to bathe at intervals of less than half a month (**Bu-Pc 57**). But this proved deleterious to robes and lodgings. For in the hot weather, the fever weather, at a time of wind and rain, when making repairs or going on a journey, monks lay down to rest with their limbs damp from rain or sweat. And the restriction on bathing was uncomfortable for those who were ill. This is a rule whose various adjustments are the direct outcome of a tropical climate.

I think that the growing needs of the monks, as expressed for

example in the exceptions to **Bu-Pc 57**, and also in the acquisition of more and more accessories, recounted principally in the *Mahāvagga*, does not necessarily indicate soft-living and greed on their part, but a desire to keep what they had properly and cleanly, to use it as efficiently as possible, and to keep themselves in a good state of health, for this was regarded as an essential basis for leading the higher life. Four great, perpetual and destructive enemies against which man has to fight in India are the heat of the sun, the damp of the rains, the strength of the winds blowing up dust and dirt, and the persistent ravages of insects. When the Vinaya has been exhaustively studied, I believe it may as often as not be found that the desire and its sanction to acquire various objects in order to preserve others, or to lessen by making exceptions the constraint of some rules, will prove to be attributable to one or other of these forces of nature.

Illness, though not gone into in detail, is however kept in mind by the constant allusion to provisions made for the comfort of ill monks. Such provisions are usually contained in a *sikkhāpada*, or an *anujānāmi*, or both. The permission to bathe more often than once a fortnight is a case in point. Again, a monk, if ill, is allowed to eat more than one meal in succession at a public rest-house (**Bu-Pc 31**), to kindle a fire for warming himself (**Bu-Pc 56**), and a nun who is ill may receive exhortation from a monk in the nunnery instead of going to the monk's quarters (**Bu-Pc 23**).

Of these sixty *Pācittiya* rules for monks, fifteen are devoted to rules for eating, **Bu-Pc 29**, **Bu-Pc 31–Bu-Pc 43**, **Bu-Pc 46**. None occur in **Bu-Pc 61–Bu-Pc 92**. Since therefore all the *Pācittiya* ordinances falling under this head are contained in this volume, it is possible to allude to various points arising from them here; I have already drawn attention to some. Rules concerned with the exhortation of nuns are arranged exclusively in **Bu-Pc 21–Bu-Pc 24**, but as I have discussed these elsewhere,¹ I shall not do so again now. Rules regarding the army and, to all intents and purposes, robes come only within this volume. Other rules cannot be so profitably discussed until the

¹ *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p. 126ff.

Pācittiya translation is completed.

In these rules, which cannot always be fully understood unless read in conjunction alike with their introductory stories, the Old Commentary and the *anāpatti* clauses, much diverse and interesting material comes to light. It would be a long and delicate business to investigate all the ramifications, and to connect these with those other parts of the Vinaya to which they sometimes seem to refer. Merely to take two random examples from **Bu-Pc 47**. For understanding the definition of “time of giving robes” (= **Bu-Pc 32**), acquaintance with, for example, **Kd 7** is necessary. Again the fact that there is “no offence” if a monk is going to the nuns’ quarters presupposes at least a knowledge of the *Pācittiyas* concerned with the exhortation of nuns.

The rules on eating are important for monks, for taking nothing but food given in alms involved a three-fold maintenance of a correct attitude: towards the laity, towards members of other sects, and towards fellow monks. The same applies to robes, where also a monk’s behaviour towards a nun has to be taken into account. It might indeed be said that a monk’s attitude towards eating and robes epitomises his whole attitude towards the society of the day.

The *Pācittiyas* on meals and eating would provide material for an extensive essay. I have already referred to the group-meal and the out-of-turn meal,¹ that is to two ways in which, leaving aside the exceptions, a meal might not be eaten. Here I shall do no more than note down some of the more outstanding words for various kinds of meals, that is for classes of food named. Notes will be found appended to these words where they appear in the text.

1. The five kinds of meals, *pañca bhojanāni*, given in the Old Commentary on **Bu-Pc 35** as rice-gruel, food made with flour, barley, fish, meat, and mentioned in the *anāpatti* clauses of **Bu-Pc 29**, **Bu-Pc 31-Bu-Pc 33**, are used in the Old Commentary on **Bu-Pc 35** to define “soft food,” *bhojaniya*.
2. “Solid food” is defined by exclusion. In **Bu-Pc 35** it is everything

¹ Above, **BD 2.xxvii**.

except the five soft foods and food that may be eaten during a watch of the night, during seven days and during life. These last three categories seem to refer solely to medicines. In **Bu-Pc 41** solid food is everything but the five soft foods and water for cleansing the teeth.

3. Five other classes of food are given in the *anāpatti* clauses of **Bu-Pc 32**, **Bu-Pc 33**, dependent on how and when given: the regular supply of food, that allowed by ticket, that given on a day of the waxing or waning of the moon, on an observance day, and on the day after this.
4. Comparing the Old Commentary on **Bu-Pc 35** and **Bu-Pc 42**, it appears that *yāgu*, conje, ranks neither as a solid food nor as a soft food.
5. In **Bu-Pc 39** the five standard medicines, and meat and fish (two of the soft foods) with milk and curds are called “sumptuous foods,” *paṇītabhojanāni*.
6. Solid food or soft food that is not left over, *anatiritta*, and solid or soft food that is left over, *atiritta*, are mentioned in **Bu-Pc 35**.

There is nothing very special to say about the *Pācittiya* rules for robes. These receive a large share of legislation in the *Nissaggiyas*, and are given comparatively scant attention in the *Pācittiya*s. Their rules constitute two small groups: **Bu-Pc 25**, **Bu-Pc 26**, **Bu-Pc 58–Bu-Pc 60**; again, but not in this volume, **Bu-Pc 79** and **Bu-Pc 92**.

A monk incurs an offence of expiation if he gives a robe to a nun who is not a relation, except in exchange (**Bu-Pc 25** and cf. **Bu-NP 5**). This rule was the outcome of generosity on a monk’s part, not of greed. The first draft had to be revised because nuns were affronted that monks would not even exchange robes with them. Again, an offence is incurred:

1. if a monk sews a robe for a nun who is not a relation (**Bu-Pc 26**)—the result of Udāyin’s obscene design on a nun’s robe;
2. if he does not use one of the three prescribed modes of disfiguring a new robe, apparently so as to be able to recognise it

(Bu-Pc 58, and whose *anāpatti* clauses should be read in conjunction with Vin 1.254, Vin 1.255);

3. if he uses a robe after having assigned it to a member of any of the five classes of his co-religionists (Bu-Pc 59), for clearly these must be able to rely on an assignment; and
4. if he hides a robe or a bowl or various other specified requisites belonging to another monk (Bu-Pc 60).

Bu-Pc 81 should be compared with Bu-Pc 59. Bu-Pc 92 declares it an offence for a monk to have a robe made, up to the measure of a Sugata's robe, or larger. It will be noticed that Bu-Pc 25 and Bu-Pc 59 provide evidence that a monk had power to dispose of a robe in his possession, either by exchange or assignment, a point which wars against the view that the Order was the owner of the robes, even after they had been allotted or assigned to individual monks.

A set of three *Pācittiya* rules (Bu-Pc 48–Bu-Pc 50) came to be laid down for the conduct to be observed by monks in regard to an army. There is no blinking of facts, no pretence of ignoring the existence of armies as part of the structure of worldly life, either here or in various Sutta passages. Moreover, from the many military similes used to describe a man's (*puggala*, as at AN iii.91ff.) or a monk's (as at AN i.184, AN ii.116, AN ii.170, AN ii.202) successful mental purification and victorious spiritual battles, it is clear that fighting by kings, chieftains and soldiers, though never frankly condoned as in the *Gītā*, was yet on the whole not roundly censured. Two Sutta passages should however be specially remarked, the one in the *Samyutta*,¹ depicting the utter futility of war, for it settles nothing, does not stop the deed from rolling on; the other in the *Dhammapada*,² violently contrasting the use of force with the exercise of *dhamma*. *Dhamma*—conscience, duty, the moral “ought,” the disciplinary rules, the body of teaching, and it has meant all of these—is arrayed against brute force. There is no doubt as to which is found the more fitting and the more admirable.

Even had not the intentional taking of life ranked as a *Pārājika*

¹ SN i.85. ² Dhp 256, Dhp 257.

offence, there was yet the moral *sīla*, or principle, binding a monk to refrain from onslaught on creatures, and binding the laity too, but only on the fortnightly *uposatha* days. Thus, clearly, fighting by monks was condemned, and Buddhist monks could not become soldiers. In this respect they differ widely from the Western monk of the Middle Ages, who saw nothing incongruous in taking up arms.

Further, as these *Pācittiyas* show, a monk's dealings with an army were, though not forbidden outright, reduced to the minimum. For, contrary to the view sometimes put forward that Gotama and his followers were breakers of homes, it is apparent here as elsewhere in the canon that his relations were by no means inaccessible to a man once he had turned monk.

In **Bu-Pc 48**, a monk is allowed to go and see an army fighting, if there is sufficient reason. This exception is a generalisation from the particular instance of a monk's wish to visit a sick relation who was in the army. But, having gone to the army, a monk is not to stay there for more than three nights (**Bu-Pc 49**), nor while there to witness manoeuvres: sham fights, troops in array, the massing of the army, reviews (**Bu-Pc 50**). This is a group where the later "rule refers to the one immediately preceding it."¹

In all of these manoeuvres the four "wings" of an army might participate: the elephants each requiring twelve men, the horses each with three men, the chariots each with four men, the infantry with (bows and) arrows.

In the *Jātakas* there is not infrequent reference to this fourfold composition of an army. But that it should be set down in considerable detail in the Old Commentary may be ascribed to the determination that, given lucid explanations, the monks should be in no doubt as to what was an army or part of one.

In each of these three monastic rules connected with an army, it is recorded that the laity, apparently a little stung by jealousy, complain of the monks' conduct. They realise that it is because of their own poor acquirement (*alābha dulladdham* of good deeds) in the past that, in the present, they are brought into contact with fighting forces. The

¹ Vin.1.xvii.

implication seems to be that for a monk this should not be necessary or inevitable: being a monk he should be beyond the desire to witness fighting, real or sham, both because his *karma* in this respect should be worn away, and for fear lest he should engender a new bad *karma* for the future. In general terms it may be said that there is no offence if a monk sees an army or a conflict through no fault of his own, and not having gone of set purpose to see either the one or the other.

In their Introduction to *Vinaya Texts*¹ Rhys Davids and Oldenberg have drawn attention to a curious irregularity in the method of framing some of the *Pācittiya* rules. In referring to the *Pācittiyas* and the apparent “effort to arrange the offences in groups (*vagga*) of ten,” they raise the question of the three cases in which “we find regulations formulated with the utmost brevity (the offences being merely expressed by a locative case dependent upon *Pācittiyam*) at the commencement of such a *vagga*.” And they go on to say, “It seems to us, at least in the present state of our knowledge, quite impossible to draw any conclusions from such peculiarities as to the comparative age of any different parts of the *Pātimokkha*.” Now since all the *Pācittiyas* referred to fall within this volume, I will attempt to discuss them, but without necessarily, since “the present state of our knowledge” is still defective, trying to arrive at any conclusion.²

They are **Bu-Pc 1–Bu-Pc 3**, **Bu-Pc 11–Bu-Pc 13**, **Bu-Pc 51–Bu-Pc 54**. Any attempt to trace a cause for the peculiar way in which the rule in each of these *Pācittiyas* is framed must depend to some extent upon the nature of the material found within these same *Pācittiyas*. Nothing as yet can be suggested as to why they stand at the beginning of their respective *vaggas*. I would only point out, first, that in the *Bhikkhunī-Vibhaṅga* there is one *Pācittiya*, **Bu-Pc 4**, which is of this same brief type, but it does not head a *vagga*; and secondly, that the *Bhikkhu-Pācittiyas* **Bu-Pc 72**, **Bu-Pc 73**, although not of the brief type yet conform to it to the extent that, after some introductory

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i.xiv. ² There are also the seven concluding *Pācittiyas*, **Bu-Pc 86–Bu-Pc 92**, where the offence of expiation involves, not *Nissaggiya*, forfeiture, but some other penalty in respect of an article made of the wrong material or to the wrong measure.

material included in the rule and leading up to the formulation of the offence, the offence itself is expressed by a locative case dependent on *Pācittiyaṃ*. These two rules do not head their division, and its first rule is framed in the normal manner.

Leaving *Pācittiyas* **Bu-Pc 72**, **Bu-Pc 73** and *Bhikkhunī-Pācittiya* **Bi-Pc 4** to one side, I will now summarise such outstanding features as are evinced by the three groups of rules which are “formulated with the utmost brevity,” together with their attendant material.

1. In **Bu-Pc 1**, **Bu-Pc 2**, **Bu-Pc 3** (repeating **Bu-Pc 2**), **Bu-Pc 11**, **Bu-Pc 54**, not only is the key-word or words (sometimes there are two) of the rule defined, but also the words used in such a definition are themselves defined. The definition of these words I believe not to belong to the original Old Commentary, but to a revised version of it. This is not however a point peculiar to these five *Pācittiyas*; for **Bu-Pj 4** and **Bu-Pc 10** also define the words used in the definition of the words of the rule. To my mind such supplementary definitions portray a synthesis of thought, based on knowledge, which is far from primitive or tentative. Again, the very material of the rule of **Bu-Pc 11**, that it is an offence to destroy vegetable growth, may be compared with that of **Bu-Pc 10** and **Bu-Pc 20**, where it is an offence to dig the soil or to sprinkle water containing life. The sole purpose of all these three *Pācittiyas* is to preserve from harm creatures that are one-facultied. In this respect then **Bu-Pc 11** is not unique or peculiar. It may in addition be suitably compared with **Bu-Pc 10**, as much for the similarity of guiding principle as for the defining of words used in definition.

The words used to define the definitions of the key-word of **Bu-Pc 2** and **Bu-Pc 3** do not seem wholly contrived for monastic purposes. Why should “crafts,” for example, be classified as “high and low” and then catalogued?

It was impossible for monks to follow any of the crafts mentioned. Such painstaking analysis of all the ten ways in which “insulting speech” and “slander” might be made seems to point

to later days when classification and analysis had come to be in vogue.

2. I suppose that in the introductory story of **Bu-Pc 2**, the group of six monks when they jeered at the well-behaved monks about five out of ten things—birth, name, clan, work, craft—must have had in mind the social position and the occupation held by these while they were still “in the world.” For all such considerations should count as nothing once a man had become a monk. The offence was summarised as one of “insulting speech,” and not as one of probing into matters whose importance to monks should be infinitesimal. Nor can one say of Gotama’s Order that, as time went on, such considerations came to be of account, or that the richer and better-born entrants came to hold the more influential positions. This has never been the case. The influence of the members has always depended on their mental and spiritual attainments alone, or on some gift of character. This backward view, if such it is meant to be, into a monk’s past is unique in the *Pācittiya*s. But yet I cannot see that it affords any data for the comparative age of this *Pācittiya*.
3. **Bu-Pc 2** has a reference to *lekhā*. If this is writing, which, partly owing to the paucity of references alike to it and to writing-materials, is assumed to be an art of later discovery, then a clue is at once established for a comparatively late date of this *Pācittiya*, or at any rate of a portion of it; or to writing being less a “later discovery” than is hitherto assumed.
4. **Bu-Pc 1** contains a long and sophisticated analysis of the way in which an offence of expiation is incurred by the three and the seven ways of telling a conscious lie. This may be compared with the beginning of a similar analysis in **Bu-Pj 4**¹ of the incurrment of an offence involving defeat by the three and the seven ways of telling a conscious lie. The passage in **Bu-Pj 4** as it goes on is paralleled by a passage in **Bu-Pc 8**. In both **Bu-Pj 4** on the one hand and **Bu-Pc 1** and **Bu-Pc 8** on the other, this

¹ Vin 3.93ff. = BD 1.162ff.

analysis with its very different style and terminology consorts strangely with the more archaic language and the more direct modes of thought that we usually associate with the Vinaya.

5. **Bu-Pc 2** and **Bu-Pc 51** contain material belonging to Jātaka stories—but so does **Bu-Pc 5**.
6. As already noted, there is the failure of the Old Commentary on **Bu-Pc 11** to explain one of the two key-words of the rule: “in destruction of,” *pātabyatāya*.
7. **Bu-Pc 12**, with its mention in the introductory story of Channa, who, having indulged in bad habits, *anācāraṃ ācaritvā*, was being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, to my mind brings the whole question of monastic disciplinary regulation a step later in time. For it points to a period when formal proceedings had been constituted, when faults were examined, not merely expiated by confession, and when there was an apparatus for dealing with, among many other transgressions, questions of failure in habit or conduct, *ācāravipatti*. These are set out in detail in **Kd 14**. This *Pācittiya*, in striking contrast to **Bu-Ss 12**, where again the same fault is imputed to Channa, seems to have been compiled in full cognisance of these later legal proceedings.
8. **Bu-Pc 13** appears to be recording an event later in time than that recorded in **Bu-Ss 8**. In this latter, Dabba the Mallian is appointed, so it is said, to the double office of assigning lodgings and distributing meals. Between this and the compilation of the *Pācittiya* some time must have elapsed, since in the *Pācittiya* he is being accused of acting out of favouritism. The Old Commentary mentions a number of offices tenable by members of the Order, showing that it knew of the creation of these. It does not mention all. So far we know little of the chronology of these offices, but it is unlikely that they were formed during the earliest days of the Sakyan venture.
9. Now, in **Bu-Pj 3**, the gist of the offence lies in intentionally depriving a person of life. The case is cited, in the stories given

after the formulation of the rule, of one monk tickling another, who laughed so much that he died. It is here not said openly that this constitutes an offence, merely that it is not one involving defeat, because his death was not caused intentionally. Either some need to clarify the nature of this offence must have grown up, for in **Bu-Pc 52** the same story is recounted and entails an offence of expiation; or the nature of the offence was decided contemporaneously with the *Pārājika* story, but, being *Pācittiya*, was reserved for the *Pācittiya* group of rules and offences. If this is the case here, it is otherwise with **Bu-Pj 2**. For this now and again states that an offence of deliberate lying may not be such as to constitute an offence of defeat, although it may be one involving expiation (**Vin 3.59**, **Vin 3.66**).

10. **Bu-Pc 53** seems to offer little data as to its comparative age. It is unusual, however, in that no verbal reports of unsuitable behaviour are recorded to reach the lord. The framing of the rule is made to depend upon Pasenadi's belief that his "device" will arouse the required suspicions in Gotama's mind.
11. The rule framed in **Bu-Pc 54**, that "in disrespect there is an offence of expiation," is not unique. Three times a similar *Pācittiya* offence is laid down at **Vin 1.176**, in connection with the elaborate arrangements made there for holding the Pavarana ceremony. Such *Pācittiyas* are therefore part and parcel of large-scale administration and regulation, such as could only be undertaken when the Order was comparatively advanced in age and stability. But who can say whether the rule at **Bu-Pc 54** is based on these other *anādariye pācittiyas*, or they on it, or whether they are independent? All one can say is that it is not at all necessary to suppose that the bad habits that again Channa is recorded to have indulged in had anything to do with preparations for the Pavāraṇā. For a long list of "bad habits," quite unconnected with this, is given at **Bu-Ss 13**.

If the evidence of the *Pācittiyas* which are briefly stated and stand

at the head of three only out of the eight divisions of which the *Pācittiya* section is composed, appears to be on the side of their comparative lateness, it must be not forgotten that the remaining *Pācittiyas* have never been subjected to any kind of critical examination. When this has been undertaken, it may be found that some of them also, although their rules are framed in the more normal manner, show similar or different signs of comparatively late construction. What I have done here is no more than to indicate possible lines which historical inquiry into the comparative age of different parts of the Vinaya might follow.

In discussing these “brief” *Pācittiyas*, I have had occasion to mention the overlapping of *Pārājika* and *Pācittiya* material. I have cited **Bu-Pj 4** and **Bu-Pc 8**, and these are also seen to work in with one another in a still further fashion. In the former it is an offence involving defeat for a monk, out of undue estimate for himself, to boast that he has attained some state of “further-men,” when this is not a fact, *abhūta*. In the latter it is an offence of expiation for a monk to speak of attaining such a state to anyone not ordained, even though it be a fact, *bhūta*. In both cases the introductory story is identical up to this point, although **Bu-Pj 4**, before the final draft of the rule, adds material not appearing in **Bu-Pc 8**. This same long story with the two endings may in fact be the record of no more than one event, some monks averring that they had told a lie, others maintaining that they had told the truth. If so, **Bu-Pj 4** and **Bu-Pc 8** would belong to precisely the same date, suggesting that the two cases were legislated for simultaneously, although the two findings were relegated to different but appropriate parts of the *Pātimokkha*.

Judging by the great length of **Bu-Pj 4**, and the number of cases adduced and legislated for, the topic was one that was at some time of immense importance.¹ It is not therefore surprising that it figures also in the *Pācittiya* section. It suggests, as does the substance of no other rules at all, the spiritual value attached to a man becoming something more and greater than he was before.

There are still further occasions when the contents of this volume

¹ **BD 1.xxivf.**

refer to different portions of the Vinaya or are referred to by it. Under the latter heading come also certain allusions which are generally wrapped up in the phrase, *yathādhammo kāretabbo*, he should be dealt with according to the rule—that is, according to some *Nissaggiya* or *Pācittiya* rule. This indicates that such a rule had been formulated before that portion of the Vinaya referring to it had been compiled. I have drawn attention, in the notes, to any references that I have found in the contents of this volume to or from other parts of the Vinaya.

Another *Pācittiya* which betrays the marks of some later accretion is **Bu-Pc 29**. In it there is a list of eleven persons who, for a householder, were elders, *therā*, and whom he invited to a meal. It is an interesting list. It contains the names of nine out of the ten to twelve men whom Mrs. Rhys Davids considers were at the beginning of his ministry “clustering about the Leader in the Vinaya.”¹ Two therefore look like intruders into this early company: Upāli, “the Vinaya expert”²—but expert only on the assumption that by his day the discipline had had time to grow into some coherent form; and Rahula, the founder’s son. He was probably not among his father’s followers from the very beginning of his teaching, and was never a particularly satisfactory monk, although several earnest discourses were addressed to him.³

Members of Other Sects—This volume contains some interesting details about the *titthiyas*, especially, as is natural, regarding ways in which their life and that of the Sakyan followers might overlap.

1. In **Bu-NP 22**, people, jumping from the particular to the general, complained that the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, went about for almsfood to be put into their hands, like members of other sects.
2. In **Bu-NP 6**, monks coming “naked as they were” to Sāvattihī were mistaken by their co-religionists for *ājīvaka*, Naked As-

¹ *Sakya*, p.127. For further information on these early followers see *Gotama the Man*, Ch.6, and *Sakya*, Ch.7. ² *Sakya*, p.352. ³ MN 61, MN 62, MN 147.

cetics.¹

3. In **Bu-Pc 1**, Hatthaka, a monk, having been outwitted in an argument by members of other sects, *titthiyas*, resorted to unworthy methods in order to confound them. The *titthiyas* complained, and not in vain, for the modest monks heard them and asked Hatthaka if there was truth in what they had been saying. He seems to have been very cross, saying that somehow the *titthiyas* should be worsted. But the modest monks were not impressed by this declaration, and told the incident to the lord. The result was what is now the first *Pācittiya* rule. This story merely confirms what is well known: that monks and *titthiyas* debated together, and that, whatever individual monks might do or think, the considered opinion of the *saṅgha* was that *titthiyas* should not be treated contemptuously.
4. **Bu-Pc 32.8** supplies various items of interest. To begin with there is the *ājīvaka* who wanted to provide “a meal for all heretics,” *sabbapasaṅḍika-bhatta*. This shows that he thought of those who were not of his sect, although they were following a life of religion, as “heretics”; at the same time he wished to honour them by entertaining them. In accordance with this view, or so it seems, the *ājīvaka* was advised by King Bimbisāra, a relation of his, first of all to invite Gotama and his monks. He sent a messenger to the monks, but they refused the invitation, for at that time a group-meal of this nature had not been allowed. The naked ascetic then approached Gotama, whom he greeted in an amicable and friendly way, and argued that one who is gone forth, *pabbajita*, is fit or worthy, *arahati*, to accept the alms of another who is gone forth. Gotama then, as recorded, accepted, and allowed the monks to eat a group-meal at the meal-time of recluses, *samaṇa-bhatta-samaya*. Here, as not infrequently, the terms of the rule are wider than the terms used in the story leading up to its formulation. *Samaṇa* was a word of very general application, covering *ājīvaka*, as well as members of all

¹ Literally, “Men of the Livelihood”, *Buddhist India*, p.143.

- other diverse and “heretical” sects. In the Old Commentary, *samaṇa* is defined as *paribbājaka-samāpanna*, literally one who has attained to being a wanderer. *Paribbājaka*¹ was, like *samaṇa*, a word of tremendous range, although it did not, for members of Gotama’s Order themselves, include “monk” or “nun.” For,
5. In **Bu-Pc 41** (= **Vin 4.285**, and cf. **Vin 4.224**), wanderer and female wanderer are, taking their definitions in conjunction, explained as, “setting aside monk and novice, nun, female probationer and female novice, whoever (else) has attained to being a (male or female) wanderer.” It is only regrettable that the definition contains the word to be defined. In this portion of the Old Commentary too, Naked Ascetic, here and also in the rule, called *acelaka*,² although he figured in the story as an *ājīvaka*, is defined as “whoever, naked, has attained to being a wanderer.” This definition should be compared with that of *samaṇa* in **Bu-Pc 32**.
 6. **Bu-Pc 41** further tells that a monk gave almsfood, at a distribution of food, to an *ājīvaka*. All that the *ājīvaka* seems to have done by way of thanks was to tell his fellow sectarians that the food was obtained by him from a *muṇḍagahapatika* belonging to Gotama, the recluse, *samaṇa*. This curious term, possibly unique to this context, is clearly one of contempt. It means literally “little shaven householder” and would seem to imply that the *ājīvakas* despised the monks for their less austere way of living, and were not above having a sly dig at their more indulgent tendencies.

¹ The account of *paribbājaka* at *Buddhist India*, p.141, has not been superseded. ² He who is without a cloth, *cela*. JACOBI, *Jaina Sūtras*, ii.xxx-xxxii, says that “the Buddhists denote by *Acelaka* the followers of Makkhali Gosāla and his two predecessors, Kisa Samkicca and Nanda Vaccha, and have preserved an account of their religious practices in the MN 36.” Jacobi draws attention to the identity of the rules for the *acelakas* and the Jains. Gosāla’s views are set forth at DN i.53. *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.71, n. 1, calls his followers *ājīvaka*. B.M. BARUA, *The Ājīvakas*, Pt.1, p.13, summarises the position thus: “Both the Jaina and Buddhist records agree in speaking of Gosāla as a leader of the Ājivaka sect... They also agree in calling the Ājīvakas naked ascetics (*acelakas*).”

People who heard what the *ājīvaka* had said are recorded to advise the lord not to let monks, whom they call *ayya*, masters, give with their own hands to *titthiyas*, since these want to bring discredit on the Buddha, the *dhamma* and the Order.

Three points emerge from this episode with the lay-people. First, that *ājīvakas* did not live, any more than did monks, either in seclusion from the “world” or from members of other sects, including Gotama’s. Secondly, that the lay-people appear to have come to the conclusion that their representations to the lord must include more than the one sect of the *ājīvakas*, and they therefore say *titthiyas*, a term of broader application. Thirdly, that the odd intrusion of the later “triad of Buddhism” may suggest that this passage belongs to a comparatively late date, but that then, with the increasing popularity of Gotama’s Order, relations between Sakyan monks and followers of other sects were becoming somewhat strained.

This *Pācittiya*, rich in its references to members of other sects, contains yet one more. Gotama is reputed to tell Ānanda to give what surplus there is of the Order’s solid food to “those who eat scraps,” broken meats, or remains of food, *vighāsāda*. Ānanda, always showing a touching regard for women, chose as the recipients some female wanderers, *paribbājikā*. Here then is contributory evidence that wanderers were eaters of scraps, of food not otherwise wanted, and that they did not object to receiving this from Gotama’s religious followers.

7. In **Bu-NP 20** a wanderer, *paribbājaka*, is recorded to barter his costly cloth for Upananda’s outer cloak, but when he wanted to exchange the articles again Upananda refused. The wanderer complained, basing his argument on the life of the world: because householders give out of compassion to another householder, should not one who has gone forth, *pabbajita*, give to one who has gone forth? The resemblance to the *ājīvaka*’s reasoning in **Bu-Pc 32.8** cited above is quite remarkable. Upananda is rebuked both by other monks and by Gotama for bartering

with a wanderer. The wanderer's park or monastery, *ārāma*, is mentioned.¹

Sakyaputta—In this volume there are two monks who have appended to their name the epithet Sakyaputta. These are Upananda Sakyaputta, to whom there are frequent references—e.g., Bu-NP 6, Bu-NP 8–Bu-NP 10, Bu-NP 18, Bu-NP 20, Bu-NP 25, Bu-NP 27, Bu-Pc 9, Bu-Pc 42–Bu-Pc 46, Bu-Pc 59, and Hatthaka Sakyaputta, Bu-Pc 1. This epithet, which I have translated as “son of the Sakyans,” was presumably given to distinguish these men from others bearing the same name. Neither Upananda nor Hatthaka was an ornament to the Order, and thus the epithet will not have been conferred in recognition of any special ability on his part. It indicated primarily that they were Sakyans, born into the Sakyan clan or tribe, *gotta*. But it did more than this. It implied, not only that the men so described were of Sakyan descent and themselves Sakyans, but that they were also members of the religious sect known by its contemporaries as the Sakyaputta sect, its adherents being called *sakyaputtiyas*.

For Sakyans who were not monks are called, when there was need to differentiate them from others of the same name, not Sakyaputta, but Sakka. A good example is Mahānāma Sakka (Bu-Pc 47 and, e.g., AN i.26, AN i.276), a brother of Anuruddha and cousin of Gotama. There does not seem to have been any other notable Anuruddha contemporary with this brother of Mahānāma's, and so there was no occasion to append Sakka to his name. There were however other Mahānāmas,² hence the suffix Sakka for the one of Sakyan descent.

I hold it essential to translate the *putta* in Sakyaputta. Yet in saying that a Sakyan who had become a follower of Gotama's was called Sakyaputta if his own name was not sufficiently distinctive, I do not in the least wish to suggest anything mystical or comparable to the Hindu “twice born.” No more is meant than the recording of the case of a Sakyan who had become a follower of the Sakyaputta sect, or, after the Order had been fully constituted, a monk in Gotama's Order. In this way, the force of *putta* in *Sakyaputta* is double-edged.

¹ See *Buddhist India*, p. 142. ² See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*

It indicates at one and the same time a man's birth as Sakyan and his calling as religious. Moreover, the fact is emphasised that the sectarian or monastic body which he has entered is one founded by his kinsman, a member of his own clan, Gotama Sakyaputta, as he is called by members of other sects,¹ and by Assaji, recently become a follower.²

In its beginnings, the sect founded by Gotama, and which afterwards turned into an "Order,"³ was largely entered and maintained by his relations. I therefore think it advisable, in order to keep before the mind the Sakyan and not merely Gotamic influences on the origin of the monastic institution, to translate the Sakya part of the compound *Sakyaputta* as "of the Sakyans," using the plural. The same will apply to *Sakyaputtiyo*, "sons of the Sakyans," a name frequently given to Gotama's followers, whether they were of the Sakyan clan or not. By their calling, and not on account of their birth, these had become "sons" of the Sakyan leader, Sakyamuni,⁴ and of his Sakyan co-workers and co-founders.⁵ There is a commentarial support for taking the *Sakya* of the compound as a plural. For Vin-a 735 defines *Sakyaputta* as *sakyānam putto*, "son of the Sakyans," *sakyānam* being a genitive plural.

It is perhaps not always necessary, although I hold it to be correct, to insert "son," *putta*, in translations of various compounds, such as *devaputta* (e.g., AN i.278, Hatthaka *devaputta*) and *Mallaputta* (e.g., Dabba Mallaputta, Vin 3.158, Vin 4.37), it being sufficient to read merely a, or the, *deva*, and a, or the, *Mallian*.

But when a person can only be distinguished from others bearing the same name by calling him "so and so, the son of so and so," as Up-

¹ E.g., Vin 3.1. ² Vin 1.41. Assaji is recorded to refer to Gotama as *mahāsamaṇo Sakyaputto Sakyakulā pabbajito*, the great recluse, the son of the Sakyans, gone forth from a Sakyan family. ³ See S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, Ch.3. ⁴ E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha*, p. 1, n. 1, "Śākyamuni, 'the sage of the Śākyas'"; *A History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 150, "Śākyamuni, 'the recluse of the Śākyas'"; S. RADHAKRISHNAN, *Indian Philosophy*, i.351, "Śākyamuni, the sage of the Śākyas." ⁵ MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Gotama the Man*, p. 89ff.; *Sakya*, p. 115ff.; and cf. *Unknown Co-founders of Buddhism*, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1927, p. 193ff.

asena Vaṅgantaputta,¹ then the *putta* part of the name must be translated. For he was not Upasena Vanganta, but Upasena, Vanganta's son. The great exception to this is Sāriputta, where, for English translators and readers, *putta* seems to have become an integral part of his name, since it is never translated as “the son of (Rūpa-)Sari.”

As *putta* sometimes forms part of a name, so also does *mātā*, *pitā*, *dhītā*, mother, father, daughter. For example, there are Sigalamātā, Nakulamātā, Visākhā Migāramātā, Nakulapita, Suppavasa Koliyadhītā. Now Nakulamātā and Nakulapita have, in the Pali canon, no other names. They must therefore be translated as “Nakula's mother” and “Nakula's father.” I think it as necessary to translate *putta* where it means a “son” in a life of religion, as it is to translate *mātā*, *pitā*, *dhītā* and again *putta* where no such reference is intended.

There are further the terms *ayya* and *ayyaputta*; these cannot mean exactly the same thing. The former is “master” and the latter “little master,” something like our “son of the house,” the young gentleman. Again there is *seṭṭhi* and *seṭṭhiputta*. The former is variously translated as banker, merchant, great merchant, treasurer. A difference in standing is, I hold, intended by *seṭṭhiputta* (see **Bu-NP 6**), and should be shown in translations. A *seṭṭhiputta* is a young merchant, literally a son of a merchant, but he is not yet the head of the firm, for his description as *putta* means that his father is still alive. It would not be actually wrong to translate *seṭṭhiputta* as “merchant,” since he is one by occupation, but the full significance implicit in *putta* can only be brought out by regarding the word as pithy, not as pleonastic. In the same way I think that the intended implication of *putta*, when the poor workman addresses Kirapatika, in **Bu-Pc 33**, as *ayyaputta*, is that this employer, although paying the wages, was not the head of his business because his father was still living.

Dhammī kathā and **dhamma**—I have translated *dhammī kathā* often as “reasoned talk,” sometimes as “talk on *dhamma*.” In so doing, I have been guided mainly by the context. I hold that in the phrase, “then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given

¹ See below, **BD 2.83**.

dhammī kathā, addressed the monks, saying, "the lord is not supposed to have given them talk on *dhamma*, on material now found chiefly in the Suttas. I think it more probable that he was engaged in explaining to the monks such circumstances as had arisen since the first framing of a rule, and telling them why he thought its alteration justifiable. He would thus have been reasoning out the situation with them, marshalling the arguments bearing on the case.

Similarly, Gotama is sometimes shown, for example in **Bu-NP 3** and **Bu-Pc 58**, as questioning monks or hearing reports about their conduct. Then, it is said, "having given *dhammī kathā*," he framed a rule so that, given certain circumstances, they need not behave in that particular way again. In this connection **Bu-Pc 58** is interesting, for it asserts that the *dhammī kathā* given was "on what is befitting, on what is suitable." These words, (*an-*)*anulomika* and (*an-*)*anucchavika*, do not properly belong to Sutta but to Vinaya material. When they occur in the Suttas,¹ it seems uniformly the case that they are used in connection with the discipline of monks or other *samaṇas*.

On the other hand, when it is said, for example in **Bu-Pc 6**, that Anuruddha roused and delighted the woman *dhammiyā kathāya*, it would be a mistake to think that he was explaining to her the need for making or altering a rule. The context in no way suggests this; it suggests that he had given her an inspiring talk in virtue of which she became a lay-adherent.

Again, to take from among many other instances of it, the phrase as it stands in **Bu-Pc 21**. From the context it may be inferred that Gotama gave the nuns some lofty discourse to recompense their disappointment for "the merely inferior talk on *dhamma*," *parittañ ñeva dhammiṃ katham katvā*, given them by the group of six monks in place of the exhortation.²

Lest it be thought that in the *Nissaggiyas* and these *Pācittiyas* the phrase *dhammī kathā* supplants *dhamma*, it will be wise to draw attention to some of the passages where this great word occurs. In **Bu-**

¹ E.g., AN i.106, AN ii.27, AN iii.116; MN i.477; It 103; Snp 385. ² Cf. MN iii.270, where Mahāpajāpati is shown asking Gotama for exhortation, for instruction, for *dhammikathā*, "talk on *dhamma*," for the nuns.

Pc 4, the group of six monks are found making lay-followers speak *dhamma* line by line. This was made an offence. The Old Commentary on this *Pācittiya*, as well as that on **Bu-Pc 7**, by its choice of words for defining *dhamma*, makes it clear that *dhamma* as the teaching, as discourses, as great sayings, as connected with the goal, *attha*, was being considered; and neither *dhamma* as *dhammī kathā*, reasoned talk germane to the matter in hand, nor *dhamma* as *pāḷi*, the text, as it is explained in Buddhaghosa's commentary.¹ **Bu-Pc 7** traces the evolution of the circumstances in which it became permissible for a monk to teach *dhamma*, *dhammaṃ deseti*, to women. **Bu-Pc 5** confines itself to mentioning that lay-followers listened to *dhamma* spoken by, *bhāsita*, monks who were elders. This would be in accordance with part of the definition given by the Old Commentary on **Bu-Pc 4** and **Bu-Pc 7**, that *dhamma* is what is spoken by disciples.

Dhamma, for the reason stated in the Introduction to BD.1, I have left untranslated.²

Ārāma; vihāra—I have usually translated *ārāma*, not as “park,” but as “monastery”; and *vihāra* as “dwelling-place.”³ The Vinaya depicts monastic life at a fairly advanced stage, and it is reasonable to assume that the many words connected with the monks' lodgings had attained definite meanings reflecting the habits and customs induced by their way of living.

Ārāmas were doubtless originally places for enjoyment, parks. Many were handed over by rich benefactors to the Order as it grew and its increasing numbers called for larger and more fixed settlements. *Ārāmas* thus became monasteries, places made use of by monks, and intended solely for this purpose.

Vihāras too, as the monks increased in number, changed their character. The word had at some time stood for something much like an isolated *pariveṇa*, or cell, but it came to imply a row of cells, or individual dwelling-places, connected by a verandah, *pamukha*.⁴

It is curious and disappointing that the definition of *vihāra* in

¹ For Buddhaghosa's interpretations of the words used in defining *dhamma*, see Vin-a 742, and below, **BD 2.191**. ² **BD 1.lvi**. ³ For notes on these terms, see below, **BD 2.2**, **BD 2.46**.

⁴ Cf. **Bu-Pc 17.2.1**.

Bu-Pc 19 and at Vin 3.156 is so unenlightening. Neither is the word explained where other comparable terms are briefly defined in Bu-Pj 2.¹

H. KERN² has to my mind given an acceptable, though short, account of *ārāma*, *vihāra*, *pariveṇa* and *kuṭī* (hut); and S. DUTT has a learned and illuminating chapter³ on the development, interrelation and use of these quarters for monks, together with the function and character of such other words denoting habitations for monks as *sīmā*, boundary, limit; *āvāsa*, residence, settlement, colony; and *senāsana*, lodgings, bedding, “seats.” S. Dutt shows, in this chapter, that as “the communal life of the bhikkhus came to gravitate more and more towards a coenobium,” largely “brought about by the institutions of Vassa,” the rains-retreat, so there developed the means and the rules for communal, as against eremitical, dwelling.

Ekamantaṃ—The literal meaning of this is “at one side.” The word constantly occurs in the phrases, “he, or she, stood, or sat down at one side.” This implies respect accorded to a superior. In order to bring out this aspect of *ekamantaṃ*, of the respectful attitude adopted by laity towards monks, by monks to senior monks or to wiser monks, I have translated the word as “at a respectful distance.” In so doing, I am following the Commentaries. These enumerate six wrong ways of sitting, *nisajjadosa*,⁴ such as would bring discomfort and inconvenience to a person worthy of consideration and honour. The only reason why I prefer my translation to the more literal one is that it better emphasises a particular point in the manners of the day; and also when we hear of lay-people sitting down or standing by monks “at a respectful distance,” one more piece of evidence, however small, testifying to the esteem in which monks were held by the laity, is forced to contribute its weight.

Abbhantara—This is a linear measure, mentioned below on BD 2.20, BD 2.22, and which I have left untranslated for fear lest an English rendering should give a false impression.⁵

¹ See BD 1.83. ² *A Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 8off. ³ *Early Buddhist Monachism*, Ch.5. ⁴ See below, BD 2.42, n. 5. ⁵ See BD 1.lviii.

Buddhaghosa's Commentary¹ remarks that "here one *abbhantara* is twenty-eight hands (*hattha*)"; the *Critical Pali Dictionary* says no more than that it is "a certain measure of length." The *Vibhaṅga Commentary* does not include *abbhantara* among its graded linear measurements at all.² In Moggallāna's scheme of measures of length,³ although given at the very end of the scheme and looking like an afterthought, we find that twenty-eight *ratanas* equal one *abbhantara*. RHYS DAVIDS,⁴ following this scheme, describes *ratana* as "(cubit, forearm) = *hattha* = *kukku*," and says that *hattha* "is the usual word."⁵ The *Saṃyutta Commentary* explains *kukku* by *hattha*.⁶ As it is very likely that these measurements varied with time and locality, in trying to establish the length of a *Vinaya abbhantara* it will be best to consider the *hattha*, twenty-eight of which were held to compose an *abbhantara*, according to *Vinaya* interpretations.

We find *hattha* defined in the Old Commentary⁷ as "from the elbow as far as the tip of the nail," which means that *hattha*, taken as a measure of length, would comprise the hand together with the forearm.⁸ Even so, there is yet some vagueness, for the tips of the nails are not all the same distance from the elbow. We are thus left with not an exact measurement. Rhys Davids however suggested that "to the end of the little finger only is meant,"⁹ apparently on the grounds that because the span, *vidatthi*, is the basis of computation for the *ratana*, two *vidatthi* making one *ratana*, and because *vidatthi* is "the name for the ordinary span to the end of the fourth or little finger" from the end of the thumb, therefore the *hattha*, which is equivalent to the *ratana* measure, would be from the elbow as far as the nail of the little finger. This provides a straight line for measurement, and the distance is about fifteen inches. One *abbhantara*, if taken as equal to twenty-eight *hatthas*, would therefore correspond to roughly thirty-five feet. The "staff" in *Bu-Sk 58 (Vin 4.200)*, that had to measure "four hands," would be about five feet in length.

¹ Vin-a 654. ² Vb-a 343. ³ *Abhidhānappadīpikā* 194–197. ⁴ *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p.15. ⁵ *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p.15, n. 2.

⁶ SN-a iii.300. ⁷ *Vin 3.121, Vin 4.221*. ⁸ Cf. Vin-a 533. ⁹ *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p.15, p.17.

In conclusion, I very gratefully acknowledge my debt to Mrs. Rhys Davids for her unflagging interest in the preparation of this volume, and for kindly reading the proofs. Two revered *theras* of Colombo, the Venerable Rambukwella Siddhartha and the Venerable S.P. Vajirañāṇa, have given me much valuable assistance with monastic practice and Vinaya terminology.

To these in particular, and also to other friends and acquaintances in Ceylon, too numerous to mention, I would tender my warm thanks in recognition of conversations that were as instructive as they were stimulating. I am also indebted to the editor for his kind permission to reprint in this Introduction, part of an article published in 1939 in the Vesak Number of the *Ceylon Daily News*.

I. B. HORNER

Manchester, 1940.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 1

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Vesālī in the Gotamaka shrine.¹ At that time three robes were allowed to monks by the lord.² The group³ of six monks, thinking: “Three robes are

¹ *Gotamaka-cetiya*, one of the *cetiya*s or shrines of Vesālī, to the south (DN iii.9). Mentioned, with the other shrines of Vesālī, as being pleasant (DN ii.102–DN ii.103, DN ii.118; AN iv.309, SN v.159; Ud 62). AN-a 2.373 ascribes the Gotamaka-cetiya to a *yakkha* named Gotamaka. For further references to these shrines see Ud-a 322–323; *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.22off.; KS v.230, KS v.231; MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Gotama the Man*, 193; E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha as Legend and History*, 137; B.C. LAW, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 46, and Appendix; and *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ² The three robes, *ticīvara*, consisted of the inner robe or cloth, *antaravāsaka*, the upper robe or cloth, *uttarāsaṅga*, the outer cloak, *saṅghāṭi*. Permission to wear a double, *diguṇa*, outer cloak, a single, *ekacchiya*, upper robe, and a single inner robe is given at Vin 1.289, also at the Gotamaka shrine. At *Vinaya Texts* ii.212, n. 2, the three robes are described in detail, although there the *saṅghāṭi* is wrongly called the “waist cloth”.

The *antaravāsaka* is put on at the waist, and hangs down to just above the ankles, being tied with the *kāyabandhana*, a strip of cloth made into a belt or girdle (allowed at Vin 2.136). The method of putting on the *antaravāsaka* is different from that adopted by laymen, Vin 2.137. Monks take the two ends together, fold them across together in front and then fold them back again; then the garment is held in position by the belt. The *uttarāsaṅga* is the upper robe worn when a monk is in a residence. It covers him from neck to ankle, leaving one shoulder bare; it should not be worn in the same way as laymen wear their upper cloth, Vin 2.137. The *saṅghāṭi* is put on over this when the monk goes out. It may be exactly the same size as the *uttarāsaṅga*, but it consists of double cloth, since to make it two robes are woven together. It is a good protection against cold, and monks may wrap themselves in it to sleep. All these three robes are made in the patchwork fashion. Only the bathing-cloth is plain.

allowed by the lord,” entered a village in one set of robes, remained in the monastery¹ in another set of three robes, went down to bathe in another set of three robes. Those who were modest monks looked down upon,² criticised,³ spread it about,⁴ saying: “How can the group of six monks wear an extra robe?”⁵ Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that you wear an extra robe?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, wear an extra robe? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased⁶ ... And thus, monks, this rule of training⁷ should be set forth:

Whatever monk should wear an extra robe, there is an offence⁸

³ To end of **Bu-NP 1.1** below, cf. **Vin 1.289**, where the sixfold group is again recorded as offending in this way. There a reference to this *Nissaggiya* rule is implied, for it is said that monks should not wear an extra robe, and whoever does so should be dealt with *yathādhammo*, according to the rule. ¹ *ārāma*, a park, a place where one enjoys oneself, *ā+ramati*. Cf. definition of *ārāma* at **Vin 3.49** as *pupphārāma phalārāma*, flower-park, fruit-park (orchard). In Pali, however, the word has come to be used largely in connection with a residence for monks, hence a monastery. ² *ujjhāyanti* Explained at **Vin-a 296** as *avajjhāyanti avajānantā taṃ jhāyanti olokenti, lāmakato vā cintenti ti attho*, they censured, despising, they were angry, (and) looked down upon him, or the meaning is they thought (of him) as inferior. Cf. **Vin-a 770** (*ujjhāpeti*) and **SN-a i.349**. *Ujjhāyati* therefore seems to mean to think poorly of, to look down upon, to belittle someone, rather than to be irritated, angry, or to grumble. Cf. **Bu-Pc 13**, **Vin 4.38**. ³ *khīyanti*. Explained at **Vin-a 296** as *tassa avaṇṇaṃ, kathenti pakāsentī*, they speak blame (dispraise) of him, they show him up. Cf. **SN-a i.349**. Hence to speak badly of someone, to criticise. Cf. **Bu-Pc 13**, **Vin 4.38**, **Bu-Pc 79**, **Vin 4.152**, **Bu-Pc 81**, **Vin 4.154**. ⁴ *vipācentī*. Explained at **Vin-a 296** as *vitthārikaṃ karonti sabbattha pattharanti*, they make wide-spread, they spread everywhere. Hence to speak disparagingly, to spread ill-fame. Cf. **SN-a i.349**. These three words occur frequently in *Vinaya*, but only once I think otherwise in the Canon, at **SN i.232**. ⁵ *atirekacivara*. ⁶ *appasannānaṃ pasādāya*. *Pasāda*, *prasāda* (Sanskrit) is “pleasing.” Cf. *buddhe pasannā* of **SN i.34**, pleased with the Buddha, and therefore become his followers, i.e. converted. Thus “pleasing” has the sense of “converting.” ⁷ *sikkhāpada*. *Paḍa* is a sentence, rule, regulation, ordinance, which indicates a training. Here *paḍa* is rule; *sikkhā* is training, Hence a rule of, or for, training. ⁸ Although no word for “offence” occurs in these rules, the terms themselves—e.g. *pācittiya*, *dukkata*—imply “offence.”

of expiation¹ involving forfeiture.”²

Thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down³ by the lord.

At that time⁴ an extra robe accrued to⁵ the venerable Ānanda; and the venerable Ānanda was desirous of giving that robe to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable Sāriputta was staying at Sāketa. Then it occurred to the venerable Ānanda: “A rule of training laid down by the lord is that an extra robe should not be worn. And this extra robe has accrued to me, and I am desirous of giving this robe to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable Sāriputta is staying at

¹ *pācittiya*. E.J. THOMAS, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p.18, n. 3, says that “this translation depends on the derivation of *pācittiya* from Sanskrit *prāyaścittika*, but this is not the term used in the Sanskrit versions of the Pātimokkha, which have *pā-tayantika* and *pāyantika*.” *Vinaya Texts* i.32 and GEIGER, *Pali Literatur und Sprache* § 27, incline to etymology *prāyaścittika*. Geiger points out that Sylvain Lévi derives it from *prāk-citta*, which +ika is the derivation to which the *Pali-English Dictionary* inclines. *Pācittiya* as *prāyaścittika* means literally “in repentance, in compensation, in expiation.” Expiation is not, however, enjoined in these rules, but confession. Thus in reality *pācittiya* means a (minor) offence to be confessed. But since the term *pācittiya* has etymologically nothing to do with confession, I have kept to the more literal rendering, of “expiation.” B.C. LAW, *History of Pali Literature*, i.46ff., speaks of *Pācittiya* offences as those “for which some expiation was laid down ... requiring repentance ... requiring confession and absolution.”

At *Vin 1.254* five things are allowed to the monks after the ceremonial making of the *kaṭhina* cloth, one being to have as many robes as are wanted. This appears to be a relaxation of the above rule. ² *nissaggiya*. The thing to be forfeited or given up was that in respect of which the offence had been committed.

The name of this class of offence, *Nissaggiya Pācittiya*, means that, besides confessing the offence, there is an object wrongfully acquired which has to be forfeited. In the next class of offence, *Pācittiya*, there is no such object which needs to be forfeited. To mark the distinction between these two classes of offence (*Nissaggiya Pācittiya*, and *Pācittiya*), as also their connection, in translating *nissaggiya pācittiya* I have put *nissaggiya*, “involving forfeiture,” in the secondary position, although in the Pali it stands before *pācittiya*. ³ *paññatta*. The primary sense, “made known,” is now lost. The word is now used in its secondary sense of established, given, passed, laid down. ⁴ = *Vin 1.289*. Also cf. below, *Bu-NP 21*, where the same story is told in the same words about an extra bowl. ⁵ *uppannaṃ hoti*, literally there came to be arisen to, produced for, or born to. Cf. below, *BD 2.24*, *BD 2.90*, *BD 2.99*, *BD 2.114*.

Sāketa. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

“But, Ānanda, how long before Sāriputta will come (here)?”

“Lord, on the ninth or tenth day,” he said.

Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk,¹ addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, I allow you to wear an extra robe for at most ten days. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“When the robe-material is settled,² when a monk’s³ *kaṭhina*⁴ (privileges)⁵ have been removed,⁶ an extra robe may be worn for at most ten days. For him who exceeds that (period), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

¹ *dhammī kathā*. In this and similar contexts this does not mean talk on *dhamma*, on the doctrine as expounded in the Suttas, so much as any good, reasonable talk relevant to the matter in hand. Thus here the lord, it may be supposed, would have reasoned with the monks and have explained to them the causes and conditions leading him to modify the rule as originally laid down. Cf. Vin-a 637. ² *niṭṭhita*, established, closed, settled, finished, ready to wear, or “done for.” For this last see *Vinaya Texts* i.19 in note. That *niṭṭhita* has the two meanings of “made” and “done for” is borne out by the Old Commentary. HUBER, J.Bu-As, 1913, Nov–Dec, p. 490, has “*si un bhikṣu a les trois robes au complet*,” and doubtless the meaning here is that the robes have been distributed and each monk has his set of three robes made up and ready to wear. ³ *bhikkhunā*, instrumental used for genitive. ⁴ The *kaṭhina* cloth is the cotton cloth supplied annually, after the rains, by the laity to the monks for making robes. *Kaṭhina* refers to a specially ceremonial cloth, for it is made with special ceremony at the end of the rains. The *kaṭhina* cloth should be brought at dawn, offered to the Order, cut by the monks, sewn and dyed. All this must be done on the same day. Then it is taken to a *sīmā*, boundary, and with formulae is offered by the Order to one monk. Ways in which *kaṭhina* comes to be made, *atthata*, and not made, *anatthata*, are given at Vin 1.254f. The *kaṭhina* cloth brings certain privileges, which, however, last only four months. It loses its quality automatically at the end of the season, as well as in other ways. A monk can wear *kaṭhina* cloth for any length of days as long as the *kaṭhina* quality is there. If it is not *kaṭhina* cloth, he can wear an extra robe for only ten days. On *atthata* cf. also below, BD 2.26, n. 3.

⁵ Five things were allowable to monks when the *kaṭhina* cloth had been (formally) made, *atthata*, Vin 1.254. ⁶ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2976.)

When the robe-material is settled means: the robe-material is made up¹ for a monk, or lost² or destroyed³ or burnt, or an expectation of robe-material is disappointed.⁴

When the *kaṭhina* (privileges) have been removed means: they come to be removed because of a certain one of eight grounds,⁵ or they come to be removed before the time by the Order.

For at most ten days means: it may be worn for ten days at the maximum.

An extra robe means: one that is not allotted,⁶ not assigned.⁷

Robe-material means: any one robe-material of the six (kinds

¹ *kata*; cf. *katacīvara* at Vin 1.256, a robe that is made up, finished, ready to wear, opposed to *cīvara*, robe-material, probably meaning not ready to wear, and *vipakatacīvara*, a robe or robe-material that is imperfectly executed, thus not ready to wear. Vin-a 638 says that *kata* means that it is finished by means of a needle.

² Vin-a 638, “carried off by thieves.” On removal of *kaṭhina* privileges owing to loss of the robe-material, see Vin 1.255ff. ³ Vin-a 638, “destroyed by white ants.”

⁴ *cīvarāsā upacchinnā*. On a monk going away with the expectation of a robe and the removal of his *kaṭhina* privileges on various grounds, see Vin 1.259ff. Vin-a 638 says that “longing for a robe arises and is cut off. These are impediments to getting robes settled.” The last four cases mean that a monk’s responsibility for a robe is gone.

⁵ Given at Vin 1.255, also at Vin-a 638. See above, BD 2.5, n. 3, and *Vinaya Texts* ii.157 for a discussion of the validity of these grounds or reasons, *mātikā*, for removal. They are as follows: the ground depending on (the monk) having gone away, on (his robe being) settled, on his having resolved (not to have it finished), on (his robe) being lost, on his having heard (that the privileges are removed in a certain residence), on the lapse of an expectation (that a special gift of a robe would be made to him), on his having gone beyond the boundary (of the community to which the *kaṭhina* cloth was given), on the general removal (of the *kaṭhina* privileges of the whole Order). Removal means that the quality of *kaṭhina* will disappear (see above, BD 2.5, n. 1).

⁶ *anadhiṭṭhita*. This means a robe used by a certain monk himself, rather than one not yet designated for a particular monk, and thus still at the disposal of the Order, not disposed of, not allotted. See Vin-a 642ff. Cf. *niṭṭhita* in connection with robes, translated above as “settled.” Also see note on *adhiṭṭhāna*, BD 1.128. *Critical Pali Dictionary* gives *adhiṭṭhita* as “determined” for a similar Vinaya passage.

⁷ *avikappita*, possibly meaning kept and given to another monk. At Vin 1.289 monks are allowed to assign an extra robe; then presumably it ceases to be “extra.” On the allowance to allot, not to assign (*adhiṭṭhātum na vikappetum*) various articles, see Vin 1.296f.

of) robe-materials¹ (including) the least one fit for assignment.²

For him who exceeds that period there is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited on the eleventh day at sunrise; it should be forfeited to the Order,³ or to a group⁴ or to an individual. And thus, monks, it should be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak⁵ thus: ‘Honoured sirs, this robe is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the Order.’ Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed.⁶ The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk; the robe forfeited⁷ should be given back⁸ (with the words): ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This robe of the monk so

¹ At Vin 1.281 six kinds of robes were permitted to the monks: made of linen, cotton, silk, wool, coarse hemp, canvas. At Vin 1.58, Vin 1.96 these six are called benefits extra to rag-robes. Cf. below, BD 2.40, BD 2.48, and Vin 4.60. ² *vikappanupaga-pacchima*. Pali-English Dictionary explains *vikappanupaga* as “according to option,” under *upaga*. But *vikappana* is a technical term meaning the assignment of robes. The meaning of *pacchima*, according to the Commentary, is “the least”—i.e., the smallest in measurement according to the assignment or apportioning of the robes. For Vin-a 639 says, “having pointed out the kinds of robes, i.e., the six kinds, as in note above), now, in order to point out the measure, he says *vikap° pacchimarā*. Its measure is two spans in length, one span in width. Thus the text says, ‘Monks, the least robe that I allow you to assign is one that is eight finger-breadths in length and four finger-breadths wide according to the finger-breadth of the accepted standard’” (*sugataṅgula*, cf. Vin 4.168). The ‘text’ quoted by Buddhaghosa is Vin 1.297. Cf. below, BD 2.40, BD 2.48, BD 2.140. ³ *saṅgha*, five or more monks; see Vin 1.319.

⁴ *gaṇa*; two to four monks. ⁵ passive construction, literally “the Order should be spoken to.” ⁶ *āpatti desetabbā*. Vin-a 640, having greeted the Order (as above) the monk says, ‘I, reverend sirs, having fallen into such and such an offence, that I confess.’ If there is one robe it constitutes one offence of expiation involving forfeiture; if there are two (robes) there are two (such offences); if there are many (robes) there is a multiplicity (of such offences). He should forfeit his robe or robes saying, ‘Here is a robe (are robes) to be forfeited for transgressing the ten days. I forfeit it (them) to the Order.’ The same procedure is required if forfeiting them to a group or to one monk. The offending monk then says that he sees his offence, and is exhorted to restrain himself in the future. ⁷ *nissaṭṭha-cīvara*, *nissaṭṭha* being past participle of *nissajjati*. ⁸ *dātabbarā*.

and so, which had to be forfeited, is forfeited (by him) to the Order. If it seems right¹ to the Order, the Order should give back this robe to the monk so and so.’

That monk, approaching two or three² monks, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder ... joined palms, should speak thus: ‘Honoured sirs, this robe is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the venerable ones.’ Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk; the robe forfeited should be given back (with the words): ‘Let the venerable ones listen to me. This robe of the monk so and so, which had to be forfeited, is forfeited (by him) to the venerable ones. If it seems right to the venerable ones, let the venerable ones give back this robe to the monk so and so.’

That monk, approaching one monk, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus to him: ‘Your reverence,³ this robe is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the venerable one.’ Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by this monk; the robe forfeited should be given back (with the words): ‘I will give back this robe to the venerable one.’

If he⁴ thinks⁵ that ten days have elapsed when they have done so, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether ten days have elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he does not think that ten days have

¹ *pattakalla* = *pattakāla*, having attained the (right) time. ² *sambahulā bhikkhū* in Vinaya almost always means a *gaṇa*—i.e., two to four monks. In the Suttapiṭaka the expression means “many monks.” Yet at [Vin 2.15](#) *sambahulā therā bhikkhū* apparently include eleven *theras*, and at [Vin 1.300](#) *sambahulā therā* include five elders; thus in these two passages *sambahulā* should be translated by “several, a number of.”

³ *āvuso*; in preceding cases *bhante*. ⁴ i.e. a monk. ⁵ *saññī*, or “is aware.” It has been suggested to me that the first two cases (excluding that of “is in doubt”) are more definite in meaning than the later ones, and that therefore these first two might be translated by “is aware” and “is not aware,” and the others by “thinks” and “does not think.” But the Pali word is the same throughout.

elapsed when they have done so, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one¹ is allotted² when it is not allotted, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is assigned when it is not assigned, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is bestowed when it is not bestowed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is lost when it is not lost, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is burnt when it is not burnt, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.³ If he thinks that the ten days have elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether the ten days have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the ten days have not elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is no offence.

BD 2.10

There is no offence if, within ten days, it is allotted,⁴ assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt,⁵ if they tear it from him,⁶ if they take it on trust⁷; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.⁸

¹ i.e. an extra robe. ² This and the next six cases = below, Vin 3.251 (without the “assigned” clause), Vin 3.262. ³ *dukkāṭa*, also to be confessed. ⁴ *adhiṭṭheti*, according to *Critical Pali Dictionary* to employ, adopt, keep for oneself. ⁵ These clauses indicate that the monk has lost responsibility for the robe. ⁶ *acchinditvā gaṇhanti*. This phrase appears to be a substitute for *vilumpati*, to steal, which as *avilutte viluttasaññī* occurs immediately after “burnt” in the preceding paragraph. ⁷ *vissāsaṃ gaṇhanti*. At Vin 1.296 things are allowed to be taken on trust from a monk endowed with five qualities: he must be an acquaintance and a friend, alive, he must have spoken about the thing taken, and must know that he will be pleased with the monk for taking it. Cf. also Vin 1.308 for various cases where a robe taken on trust is said to be rightly taken or wrongly taken. ⁸ Cf. Bu-NP 2, Bu-NP 3, Bu-NP 28; and cf. Bu-NP 1, where for “burnt” we get “broken” (of a bowl).

Bu-NP

D 2.11
3.198
Then¹ the group of six monks did not give back a robe that had been forfeited. They told this matter to the lord. He said: “Monks, a robe that has been forfeited is not not to be given back.² Whosoever should not give it back, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

¹ *tena kho pana samayena*, very likely equivalent here to *atha*, then, for in this and similar contexts it does not mean so much “at one time,” as at the more definite “then”—i.e., at a time (shortly) after the rule had been laid down, but marking a continuation of the story which led up to and included the formulation of the rule.

² *na nisaṭṭhacāvaram na dātabbam*; cf. below, **BD 2.117**, and **Vin 4.245**, where the same thing (using the double negative) is said of a bowl.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 2

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time monks, entrusting robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe¹; these robes, deposited for a long time, became soiled²; the monks dried them in the sun. The venerable Ānanda, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw these monks drying these robes in the sun. Seeing these monks he came up to them, and having come up he said to these monks:

“Your reverences, whose are these robes that are soiled?” Then these monks told this matter to the venerable Ānanda. The venerable Ānanda looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the monks, entrusting robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe?”³ Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks, entrusting robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only)

¹ That is with the *antaravāsaka*, the inner robe, and the *uttarāsaṅga*, the upper robe or garment. The two together are called *santaruttara*—i.e., *sa-antar'-uttara*, the inner one with the upper one. They did not wear the outer cloak, Vin-a 652. For notes on the three robes see above, **BD 2.1, n. 2**. This rule is in opposition to the previous one, where monks wore more than the prescribed number of robes; here they wear less than the right number. See also **Bi-Pc 24**. ² Vin-a 651, “having black and white circles on the places which had been touched by the perspiration.”

³ At **Vin 1.298** Ānanda himself, though through thoughtlessness, entered a village without his outer cloak.

an inner and an upper robe?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men, having entrusted robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“When the robe-material is settled, when a monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) have been removed, if this monk should be away, separated from his three robes,¹ even for one night, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”²

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

At that time a certain monk became ill in Kosambī. Relations sent a messenger to this monk, saying: “Let the revered sir³ come, we will nurse (him).” The monks said: “Go, your reverence, relations will nurse you.” He said:

“Your reverences, a rule of training laid down by the lord is that

¹ *ticivarena vippavaseyya*. Cf. **Vin 2.123**, where it is a *dukkaṭa*, offence for a monk to be separated from his *nisīdana*, piece of cloth for sitting on, for four months.

² At **Vin 1.254** the five privileges allowable to monks after the ceremonial making of the *kaṭhina*-cloth, *atthatakaṭhina*, include one called *asamādānacāra*, translated, at *Vinaya Texts* ii.151, in accordance with Buddhaghosa’s explanation, as “going for alms without wearing the usual set of three robes,” a relaxation of the above rule.

At **Vin 1.298** it is a *dukkaṭa* offence for a monk to enter a village wearing (only) his inner and upper robes. But because Ānanda thoughtlessly did so on one occasion, the lord is reputed to have put forward five reasons for laying aside the outer cloak, five (identical) reasons for laying aside the upper and inner robes, and five (partly identical and partly different) reasons for laying aside the cloth for the rains. It is not said which reason covered Ānanda’s lapse. When monks are staying in lodgings in the jungles they are allowed to lay aside one of the three robes in a house; but then it came about that if they are away from that robe for more than six nights, there is an offence; see **Bu-NP 29**. ³ *bhaddanto*, an honorific title. Cf. below, **BD 2.80**, where an ill monk is allowed to travel without a rug, *santhata*, if he has the agreement of the Order as to the rug.

one should not be away, separated from the three robes; but I am ill, I am not able to set out taking the three robes. I will not go.”

They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to give a monk who is ill the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes.¹ And thus, monks, should it be given: That monk who is ill, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: ‘I, honoured sirs, am ill, I am not able to set out taking the three robes. Thus I, honoured sirs, request the Order for the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes.’ A second time it should be requested, a third time it should be requested. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk so and so is ill, he is not able to set out taking the three robes. He requests the Order for the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order give this monk so and so the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me ... the three robes. The Order gives the monk so and so the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes. If the giving to the monk so and so of the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes, is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. Agreement (to

¹ *ticivarena avippavasasammutiṃ*. This means that by convention, by agreement among other monks, the one who is ill is regarded as not separated from his three robes, although in fact he is separated from them and goes away without them. On account of this agreement, *sammuti*, the separation, being regarded as no separation, does not count as an offence. Cf. also *sammuti* at, e.g., [Bu-NP 14](#); [Vin 1.283f](#). The government is by democracy, for the monks agree among themselves. At [Vin 1.298](#) the illness of a monk is one of the reasons “allowed” for his laying aside his outer cloak. See [Vin 1.109f](#). for agreement to, and removal of, *ticivarena avippavāsa* in connection with *sīmā*, boundary.

be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes, is given by the Order to the monk so and so, and it is pleasing to the venerable ones; therefore they are silent, so do I understand this.’ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“When the robe-material is settled, when a monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) have been removed, if this monk should be away, separated from the three robes, even for one night, except on the agreement of the monks,¹ there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

When the robe-material is settled means: the robe-material is made up for a monk, or lost or destroyed or burnt, or an expectation of robe-material is disappointed.²

When the *kaṭhina* (privileges) have been removed means: they come to be removed because of a certain one of eight grounds, or they come to be removed before the time by the Order.³

If this monk should be away, separated from the three robes, even for one night means: without the outer cloak, or without the upper robe, or without the inner robe.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks.

There is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited at sunrise; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited ... ‘Honoured sirs, these three robes were away, separated from me for a night, without the agreement of the monks (and) are to be forfeited. I forfeit them to the Order ...’ ‘... should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.’

A village having one precinct,⁴ various precincts, a dwelling having one precinct, various precincts; a stable⁵ having one precinct, var-

¹ Cf. rule in Bu-NP 29. ² Cf. Bu-NP 1.3.1. ³ Cf. Bu-NP 1.3.1 ⁴ *ekupacāra*; cf. Vin 3.46, *gāmupacāra*. ⁵ *uddosita*; Vin-a 654 explained, *yānādīnaṃ bhaṇḍānaṃ sālā*, a room for such implements as waggons, etc.

ious precincts; a watch-tower¹ having one precinct, various precincts; a quadrangular building² having one precinct, various precincts; a long house³ having one precinct, various precincts; a mansion⁴ having one precinct, various precincts; a boat having one precinct, various precincts; a caravan having one precinct, various precincts; a field having one precinct, various precincts; a threshing-floor⁵ having one precinct, various precincts; a monastery⁶ having one precinct, various precincts; a dwelling-place⁷ having one precinct, various precincts; the foot of a tree having one precinct, various precincts; an open space having one precinct, various precincts.

BD 2.17

A village having one precinct means: a village comes to be for one family⁸ and is enclosed⁹: laying aside the robe within the village, he should remain¹⁰ within the village. It is not enclosed¹¹: he should

Bu-NP

¹ *aṭṭa*; Vin-a 654 explained, “it is made with bricks for warding off hostile kings, and thick walls, and is four or five storeys high.” Cf. Vb-a 366. ² *māla* (or *māla*). Cf. Vin 1.140; DN i.2; Snp p.104. Snp-a 447 calls *maṇḍalamālaṃ*, a *mandapaṃ*, or pavilion. At Vibhaṅga 251 this and the preceding building (*aṭṭa*) and the following one (*pāsāda*) are included in the definition of *senāsana*, lodgings. Vin-a 654 says that *māla* is *ekakūṭasaṅgahīto caturassapāsādo*, a quadrangular building comprised under one roof. Vb-a 366 quotes this definition, while saying that *māla* is like an eating-hall, a pavilion. This and the next two, *pāsāda* and *hammiya*, occur, as *māla*, *pāsāya*, *hammiya* at *Āyaraṅgasutta* 2.7.1, and are translated by JACOBI in *Jaina Sūtras* 1.105 as loft, platform, roof. See his note on *māla*, *loc. cit.* But from the Commentary, it seems that *māla* and *pāsāda* are two different styles of houses, the one square, the other long, while *hammiya* is a larger type of house. ³ *pāsādo ti dīghapāsādo*, Vin-a 654. *Pāsāda* has also been defined as the big buildings of kings; cf. below, BD 2.130, the *pāsāda* of King Bimbisāra. If a *pāsāda* type of building is built by other people, then it is called a *hammiya*. ⁴ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2977.) ⁵ *karaṇa*; here, in *dhaññākaraṇa*, seems to mean preparing the doing. Vin-a 654 explains by *khala*, corn ready for threshing, or the threshing-floor. ⁶ Vin-a 654, “a flower-park or an orchard.” ⁷ *vihāra*. ⁸ Vin-a 652, “it is the village of one ruler or headman.” ⁹ Vin-a 652, “it is enclosed by a wall or by a fence or by a ditch.” ¹⁰ *vatthabbaṃ*. In this meaning cf. Vin 2.8. Vin-a 652, “he ought to wait in a place of his own choosing within the village until the sun rises.” ¹¹ Vin-a 652, “it is shown by this that there are various precincts to this same village.”

2.18 remain in the same house¹ as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.²

A village comes to be for various families,³ and is enclosed: he should remain in the same house as that in which the robe was laid aside—either in the hall or at the entrance⁴—or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. Or if, going to the hall, laying aside the robe within a reach of the hand, either he should remain in the hall or at the entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. The robe being laid aside in the hall, he should either remain in the hall or at the entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same house as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

2.3.4 A dwelling comes to be for one family, and is enclosed; there are various rooms, various inner rooms⁵: laying aside the robe within the dwelling, he should remain within the dwelling. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same room as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

0.2.19 A dwelling comes to be for various families, it is enclosed and there are various rooms, various inner rooms: he should remain in the same room as that in which the robe was laid aside, or at the main entrance,⁶ or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same room as that

¹ Vin-a 652, “the definition of a house is that, it is the dwelling of one family, etc.”

² *hatthapāsa*. Vin-a 652 says that the robe should not be moved for more than two and a half linear measures—i.e., *ratana*. Cf. Vb-a 343, *dve vidatthiyo ratanaṃ*. A *vidatthi* is a span of twelve fingers’ breadth. Cf. also Vin 3.149. Vin-a 652 proceeds, “having gone beyond this measure, if the monk by psychic potency waits in the air until the sun rises, there is an offence involving forfeiture.” *Hatthapāsa*, a reach of the hand, arm’s length, is a technical term, always used in the Vinaya to denote a distance of two and a half cubits around oneself. ³ Vin-a 652, “it is a village belonging to various rulers and headmen, like Vesāli and Kusināra, etc.”

⁴ *dvāramūle* = *nagaradvārassa samīpe*, Vin-a 652. ⁵ There is not much difference between *gabbha*, “room,” and *ovāraka*, “inner room,” but the latter is usually a bedroom, sleeping-apartment. ⁶ Vin-a 654, *dvāramūle* = *gharadvāramūle*.

in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

A stable comes to be for one family, and is enclosed; there are various rooms, various inner rooms: laying aside the robe within the stable, he should remain within the stable. It is not enclosed: ... (See **Bu-NP 2.3.4**) ... A stable comes to be for various families ... It is not enclosed ... or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

A watch tower comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the watch-tower, he should remain within the watch-tower. A watch-tower comes to be for various families; there are various rooms, various inner rooms; he should remain in the same inner room as that in which the robe was laid aside or at the main entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

A quadrangular building comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the quadrangular building (See **Bu-NP 2.3.6**) ... A quadrangular building comes to be for various families ... from the reach of the hand.

A long house comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the long house. ... A long house comes to be for various families ... from the reach of the hand.

A mansion comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the mansion. ... A mansion comes to be for various families ... from the reach of the hand.

A boat comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the boat. ... A boat comes to be for various families; there are various

Bu-NP

Vin 3.2

Bu-NP

Bu-NP

Bu-NP

Bu-NP

Bu-NP

BD 2.2

rooms, various inner rooms¹; he should remain in the same inner room as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

2,3,11 A caravan comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe in the caravan, seven *abbhantaras*² should not be removed before or behind, an *abbhantara* should not be removed from the side. A caravan comes to be for various families: laying aside a robe in the caravan, it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

2,3,12 A field comes to be for one family, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe within the field, he should remain within the field. It is not enclosed: it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.³ A field comes to be for various families, and is enclosed. Laying aside the robe within the field, he should either remain at the main entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.⁴ It is not enclosed: it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

2,3,13 A threshing-floor comes to be for one family, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe on the threshing-floor, he should remain on the threshing-floor. It is not enclosed: it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. A threshing-floor comes to be for various families, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe on the threshing-floor, he should either remain at the gate, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

2,3,14 A monastery comes to be for one family, and is enclosed.⁵ ... (See

¹ Cf. the “ocean-going ship” of AN iv.127 = SN iii.155, and the one at Ja 5.75 which took five hundred passengers. Thus the Indians at the time of the compilation of these works were not apparently ignorant of quite large-scale shipbuilding. ² *abbhantara* also at Vin 1.111. Vin-a 654 says, “here one *abbhantara* is twenty-eight hands.” See BD 2, Introduction, p. 50. ³ Vin-a 654, “of the field.” ⁴ Variant readings at Vin 3.276 suggest some difficulty, even as though there were some omission. ⁵ At Vin 2.154 monks were allowed to enclose their *ārāmas* (monasteries) with bamboo fences, thorn fences and ditches.

Bu-NP 2.3.13) ... It is not enclosed. ... A monastery comes to be for various families: ... It is not enclosed; it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

A dwelling-place comes to be for one family, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe within the dwelling-place, he should remain within the dwelling-place. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same dwelling-place as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. A dwelling-place comes to be for various families, and is enclosed: he should remain in the same dwelling-place as that in which the robe was laid aside for at the main entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same dwelling-place as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

A foot of a tree comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe in the shade, if he spreads it entirely in the shade at the time of mid-day, he must remain in the shade.¹ A foot of a tree comes to be for various families; it must not be removed from the reach of the hand.

An open space having one precinct means: in a jungle where there are no villages,² the same precinct is seven *abbhantaras* all round³; beyond that there are different precincts.⁴

¹ The area is that to which the mid-day shadow spreads. People used to live at the foot of trees. *Mūla*, foot, is literally root. ² Cf. definition of “jungle” at Vin 3.46, Vin 3.51. ³ = Vin 1.111. Vin-a 655 says, “standing in the middle there are seven *abbhantaras* extending to all quarters; sitting in the middle he guards the robe put down on the boundary of the eastern or western quarter. But if at the time of sunrise he goes as much as a hair’s breadth to the eastern quarter, the robe is to be forfeited in the western quarter. But at the time of *uposatha*, beginning with the monks sitting at the outer circle of the congregation, the boundary of the seven *abbhantaras* should be removed, so that the boundary increases to the size to which the Order increases.” ⁴ Thus, in order to be in the same precinct as the robe, he has to be within seven *abbhantaras* of it.

If he thinks that he is away, separated when he is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether he is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that he is not away, separated, when he is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is taken away¹ when it is not taken away ... If he thinks that it is bestowed when it is not bestowed ... If he thinks that it is lost when it is not lost ... If he thinks that it is destroyed when it is not destroyed ... If he thinks that it is burnt when it is not burnt ... If he thinks that it is stolen when it is not stolen, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is away, separated, when he is not away, separated, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not away, separated, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not away, separated, when he is not away, separated, there is no offence.

There is no offence if before sunrise² it is taken away, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt; if they tear it from him; if they take it on trust³; if there is the agreement of the monks,⁴ if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.⁵

¹ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2973.) ² *anto aruṇe* = *anto-arunagga*, “the time before sunset,” so *Critical Pali Dictionary*. ³ Cf. **Bu-NP 1**, **Bu-NP 3**, **Bu-NP 21** (“broken” = **Vin 4.245**), **Bu-NP 27**, **Bu-NP 29**. ⁴ All these clauses show that in some way the monk’s responsibility for the robe had gone. ⁵ Cf. below, **BD 2.159**.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 3

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time a robe¹ accrued to² a certain monk not at the right time.³ The robe, as they made it, did not suffice for him. Then that monk, pulling out that robe, smoothed it again and again.⁴ The lord, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw this monk pulling out this robe and smoothing it again and again, and seeing him he approached this monk, and having approached he said to this monk:

“Why, monk, do you, pulling out this robe, smooth it again and again?”

“Lord, this robe which accrued to me not at the right time, as they made it does not suffice for me, therefore do I, pulling out this robe, smooth it again and again.”

“But, monk, is there for you an expectation of a robe?”⁵

“There is, lord,” he said.

Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, I allow you, having accepted a robe not at the right time, to lay it aside in the expectation of a robe.”⁶

¹ *cīvara* means both the made-up robe and the robe-material or robe-cloth. ² *uppannam hoti*. Cf. above, **BD 2.4, n. 3**; below, **BD 2.90, BD 2.99**. ³ *akalacīvara*. Also at **Vin 4.245, Vin 4.246, Vin 4.284, Vin 4.287**. ⁴ *Vin-a 658*, “thinking, if one gets rid of the creases, it will be big (enough for me), sprinkling it with water, treading upon it with his feet, pulling it out with his hands and taking it up, he rubbed it across his back ... but dried by the sun, it (i.e., the robe-material) became as small as before, so he did this again.” ⁵ *cīvarapaccāsā*. Cf. *cīvarāsā* at **Vin 1.259ff.**, and *bhattapaccāsā* at **Vin 4.77**. ⁶ Cf. **Bu-NP 2**, where monks are not allowed to wear extra robes.

Then monks said: “It is allowed by the lord, if a robe has been accepted not at the right time, to lay it aside in the expectation of a robe.” These, accepting robes not at the right time, laid them aside for more than a month. These robes, tied up in bundles, remained on a bamboo for hanging up robes.¹ Then the venerable Ānanda, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw these robes tied up in bundles that remained on the bamboo for hanging up robes. Seeing them, he addressed the monks thus:

“Your reverences, whose are these robes, tied up in bundles, that remain on the bamboo for hanging up robes?”

“Your reverence, they are our robes, given not at the right time, that are laid aside in the expectation of robes.”

“But for how long, your reverences, have these robes been laid aside?”

“For more than a month, your reverence,” they said. Then the venerable Ānanda looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these monks, having accepted robe-material not at the right time, lay it aside for more than a month?”

Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks having accepted robe-material not at the right time, laid it aside for more than a month?” “It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men, having accepted robe material not at the right time, lay it aside for more than a month? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus also, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“When the robe-material is settled, when a monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) have been removed, if robe-material should accrue to the monk not at the right time, it may be accepted by that monk if he so wish. Having accepted it, it should be made up quickly.

¹ *cīvaravaṃsa*, with *cīvararajju* allowed at [Vin 1.286](#), [Vin 2.121](#). Cf. below, [BD 2.152](#).

But if it is not sufficient for him, that robe-material may be laid aside by that monk for a month at most, should he have any expectation that the deficiency may be supplied.¹ If he should lay it aside for longer than that, even with the expectation (of the deficiency being supplied), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

Vin 3.2

When the robe-material is settled means: ... (See **Bu-NP 2.3**) ... or they are removed before the time by the Order.

Bu-NP

If robe-material (should accrue) not at the right time means: some that has accrued during the eleven months² when the *kaṭhina* cloth is not (formally) made³; some that has accrued during the seven months when the *kaṭhina* cloth is (formally) made, even a gift (of material) offered⁴ at the right time; this means robe-material (accruing) not at the right time.

BD 2.2

Should accrue means: should accrue from the Order or from a group or from a relation or from a friend, or as rag-ropes, or by means of his own property.⁵

If he so wish means: himself desiring, it may be accepted.

Having accepted it, it should be made up quickly means: it should be made up within ten days.

¹ Literally “for the completion of,” *pāripūriyā*. ² Vin-a 658, “setting aside one last month of the rainy season (*kattika*), there remain eleven months.” ³ *atthata*, from *attharati*, literally “to spread out.” Not however, to be taken literally here, but as the ceremony of making the robes at the end of the rains. See *Vinaya Texts* ii.148 note for very interesting remarks on distributing the robes, and above, **BD 2.5, n. 1**.

These curious expressions, “during the eleven, during the seven months,” mean, I think, that, in the case of the eleven, the *kaṭhina* cloth is only distributed in the month following the termination of the rains; therefore there would be eleven months when it is not made. In the case of the seven months, it is probably meant that no making of robes takes place during the rains, but that in unusual circumstances robe-material might be given to a monk during the remaining seven months of the year. Vin-a 658 says that the four months of the rainy season (*kattika*) are in the winter; thus setting aside five months (i.e., these, with the one remaining over after “eleven months”), there remain seven. Cf. Vin-a 729. Cf. above, **BD 2.5, n. 3**; below, **BD 2.154, n. 3**. ⁴ *ādisa*; Vin-a 658, *uddisitvā*. ⁵ Cf. below, **BD 2.91**.

But if it is not sufficient for him means: if it is not enough to be worn.

That robe-material may be laid aside ... for a month at most¹ means: it may be laid aside for a month at the maximum.²

That the deficiency may be supplied means: for the sake of supplying the deficiency.

Any expectation means: there is expectation from the Order or from a group or from a relation or from a friend, or as to rag-ropes, or by means of his own property.³

If he should lay it aside for longer than that, even with the expectation (of the deficiency being supplied) means: if a robe that was expected accrues on the very day that the first robe⁴ accrues, he should have it made up within ten days. ... If a robe that was expected accrues two days ... three days ... four days ... five days ... six days ... seven days ... eight days ... nine days ... ten days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within ten days. If a robe that was expected accrues eleven days ... twelve days ... thirteen days ... fourteen days ... fifteen days ... sixteen days ... seventeen days ... eighteen days ... nineteen days ... twenty days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within ten days ... twenty-one days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within nine days ... twenty-two ... twenty-three ... twenty-four ... twenty-five ... twenty-six days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within four days. If a robe that was expected accrues twenty-seven ... twenty-eight ... twenty-nine days ... he should have it made up within one day. If a robe that was expected accrues thirty days after the first robe accrues, on that same day it should be al-

¹ *pārāmaṃ ... paramatā.* ² *pārāmaṃ ... paramatā.* ³ Vin-a 658, "on a certain day the Order or a group will receive robes, and there will be a robe for me; ... a robe has been ordered for me by my relations, by a friend; when these come they will give the robes. ... I will get a robe from the dust-heap, ... by my own property, meaning cotton threads, etc." This last must mean that if he has the means of sewing the robes together, he may do so. Cf. below, **BD 2.91.** ⁴ *mūlacīvara*, as opposed to *paccāsā-cīvara*, the robe that was expected (Vin-a 659).

lotted, assigned, bestowed. But should it not be allotted or assigned or bestowed, it is to be forfeited on the thirty-first day at sunrise; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ... ‘This robe, honoured sirs, (given) not at the right time, is to be forfeited by me, the month having elapsed. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ... ‘The Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.’

Vin 3.2

If the robe that was expected accrues but is different from the first robe that has accrued, and there are some nights over,¹ it should not be caused to be made up unwillingly.² If he thinks that a month has elapsed when it has elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether a month has elapsed ... If he does not think that a month has elapsed when it has elapsed ... If he thinks that one is allotted when it is not allotted ... If he thinks that one is assigned when it is not assigned ... If he thinks that one is bestowed when it is not bestowed ... If he thinks that one is lost when it is not lost ... If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed ... If he thinks that one is burnt when it is not burnt ... If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a month has elapsed when it has not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a month has not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a month has not elapsed when it has not elapsed, there is no offence.

Bu-NP

BD 2.2

¹ I.e., the month not being finished (Vin-a 659). ² *akāma*. Vin-a 659, “if the first robe is soft and the robe that was expected is coarse and it is impossible to mix them, and there are nights, though not a month, remaining, the robe should not be caused to be made up unwillingly. But taking another robe that was expected, this should be made up after an interval, and the robe that was expected should be assigned as a cloth used for water-strainers.”

Bu-NP

There is no offence if within a month it is allotted, assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear it from him, if they take it on trust; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

¹ Cf. Bu-NP 1, Bu-NP 2, Bu-NP 28, Bu-NP 29; and Bu-NP 21 = Vin 4.245 (“broken” instead of “burnt”).

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 4

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time¹ the former wife of the venerable Udāyin had gone forth among the nuns. She frequently came to the venerable Udāyin, and the venerable Udāyin frequently went to this nun. Now at that time the venerable Udāyin used to participate in a meal with this nun. Then the venerable Udāyin, dressing in the morning,² taking his bowl and robe, approached this nun, and having approached and disclosed his private parts in front of this nun, he sat down on a seat. And further, the nun having disclosed her private parts in front of the venerable Udāyin, sat down on a seat. Then the venerable Udāyin, impassioned, looked at and thought about³ this nun's private parts and emitted semen. Then the venerable Udāyin said to this nun:

“Go, sister, fetch water, I will wash the inner robe.”

“Give⁴ it (to me), master, I will wash it myself,” and she took hold of one part with her mouth and placed one part on her private parts. Because of this she conceived a child. The nuns spoke thus:

“This nun is one who does not lead the Brahma-life, (because) she is pregnant.”

(She, sayin,) “Ladies,⁵ I am not one who does not lead the Brahma-life,” told this matter to the nuns.

The nuns looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can master Udāyin get a soiled robe⁶ washed by a nun?” Then

¹ Opening phrases are the same as those of Bu-Pc 30. ² *pubbaṅha* and *aparaṅha* are the morning and the afternoon. Cf. Kp-a 105. ³ *upanijjhāyati* has sense of “to look at (eagerly)” and “to reflect on.” ⁴ *āharati* has sense of “to give” here.

⁵ *ayye*. ⁶ *purāṇa-cīvara*, literally “old robe.”

these nuns told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Udāyin get a soiled robe washed by a nun?”
Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, got a soiled robe washed by a nun?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

“Was she a relation of yours, Udāyin, or not a relation?”

“She was not a relation, lord,” he said.

“Foolish man,¹ one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is pleasant or what is unpleasant for a woman who is not a relation. Thus you, foolish man, will get a soiled robe washed by a nun who is not a relation. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

**“Whatever monk should get a soiled robe washed or dyed² or beaten³ by a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of ex-
piation involving forfeiture.”⁴**

4.2.1

Whatever means: he who ...

(A nun) who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother’s side or on the father’s side back through seven generations.⁵

2.32

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.⁶

¹ Oldenberg’s edition has *moghapuriso*; but see Sinhalese edition, and also below, **BD 2.39, BD 2.44**, where the vocative, *moghapurisa*, occurs in similar contexts. ² Six kinds of dyes allowed at **Vin 1.286**. ³ At **Vin 1.286** monks are allowed to beat, *ākōṭeti*, with the hands robe-material that has become harsh. ⁴ Cf. **Bu-NP 17** for both “rule” and Old Commentary. ⁵ Cf. below, **Bu-NP 6.3.1**. This definition = **Vin 3.212, Vin 3.214, Vin 3.216, Vin 3.219, Vin 3.235; Vin 4.60, Vin 4.61**. ⁶ = below, **BD 2.40, BD 2.96**, and *passim*. Vin-a 660, “she is ordained by a motion of the Order of nuns where the resolution is put three times and followed by the decision (as the fourth item, *ñatticatuttha*), then she is ordained in the same way by the Order of monks. Therefore she is ordained by eight Vinaya acts.”

A soiled robe means: dressed in¹ it once, put on² once.

Wash means: he gives an order³—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If washed, it is to be forfeited.

Dye means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If dyed, it is to be forfeited.

Beat means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If once having given a blow with the palm (of the hand) or a blow with a club, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘Honoured sirs, this soiled robe which I had washed by a nun who is not a relation, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ... ‘... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.’”

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.⁴ If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her beat (his) soiled

¹ *nivāttha*, past participle of *nivāseti*. It refers to the *antaravāsaka*, the inner or under robe that hangs down from the waist, and to the *uttarāsaṅga*, upper robe; also to the cloths for the rains (Bu-NP 24), to garments worn by members of other sects (Vin 1.305f.), to garments called *akkaṇāla* and *poṭṭhaka* (Vin 1.306f.), to nuns’ vests (Vin-a 663), to a laywoman’s outer cloak, *sāṭaka*, Vin 4.18. ² *pāruta*, past participle of *pārupati*. It refers to the *saṅghāṭi*, outer cloak; also to a (costly) *paṭa*, or cloth (below, BD 2.109), and to *vihāracīvara*, and other things that a monk may put on, *pārupitum*, to cover the body if the robes are stolen or lost (Bu-NP 6). Thus, for a monk, both *nivāseti* and *pārupati* are required to indicate the putting on or dressing in the complete set of three robes. Cf. Vin 4.281f., where the two words occur in connection with the five kinds of robes a nun should wear. See below, BD 2.88, where “old rug,” *purāṇasanthata*, is defined as is “soiled robe,” *purāṇa-cīvara*, above.

³ Vin-a 660, “the nun who was ordered prepares an oven, collects sticks, makes a fire, fetches water, until, having washed it, she holds it up: there is an offence of wrong-doing in each action for the monk.” ⁴ *nissaggiyena āpatti dukkaṭassa*; probably *pācittiya* omitted merely for the sake of brevity.

robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye, makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her wash (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her beat, makes her wash (his) soiled robe, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat, makes her wash (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat, makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat, makes her wash, makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he is in doubt as to whether she is not a relation ... If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is not a relation ... If he makes her wash another's soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes her wash a sheet (used as) a piece of cloth for sitting

on,¹ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes a woman who has been ordained by one (Order only) wash it,² there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence.

There is no offence when a female relation is washing it if a woman assistant who is not a relation is (helping); if she washes it unasked³; if he makes her wash an unused one; if he makes her wash another requisite,⁴ except the robe; if it is (washed) by a female probationer, by a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.⁵

¹ A compound word in Pali, *nisīdana-paccattharaṇa*. *Nisīdana* is a piece of cloth for sitting on; *paccattharaṇa* is the bed-clothes, really a piece of cloth for covering a bed or chair, thus a sheet. Cf. below, **BD 2.46, n. 3**. At **Vin 1.295** a *nisīdana* was found to be too small to protect the whole lodging; to meet this difficulty the lord is reputed to have allowed a *paccattharaṇa*, made as large as one wishes. It looks therefore as if *nisīdana-paccattharaṇa* is either a sheet that is a piece of cloth to sit upon, although larger than a mere “piece of cloth to sit upon,” the mere *nisīdana*; or that it is a sheet used as, or instead of, a piece of cloth for sitting on. Cf. *nisīdana-santhata*, in **Bu-NP 15**, and both in Introduction. ² Vin-a 662, “causing it to be washed by one who was ordained (only) in the presence of the nuns is an offence of wrong-doing, and it is the same for one who has been ordained (only) in the presence of the monks; five hundred Sakyan women were ordained in the presence of the monks.”

³ Vin-a 662, “if she has come for the Exposition and the Exhortation, seeing the soiled robe and taking it from the place where it was put, she says: ‘Give it, master, I will wash it,’ and when it is brought she washes it and moreover dyes it and beats it—this is called ‘she washes it unasked’ (*avuttā*). If she hears a monk ordering a youth or a novice to wash the robe, she says: ‘Bring it, master, I will wash it,’ and she washes it, or taking it for a time, having washed it and dyed it, she then gives it back—this is called ‘she washes it unasked.’” ⁴ Vin-a 662, “a sandal, bowl, shoulder-strap, girdle, couch, chair, straw mat.” ⁵ Cf. below, **BD 2.97f**.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 5

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. At that time the nun Uppalavaṇṇā¹ was staying at Sāvattī. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, dressing in the morning and taking her bowl and robe, entered Sāvattī for alms-food. Having wandered about Sāvattī for alms-food, returning from her alms-gathering after her meal,² she approached the Blind Men's Grove³ for the mid-day rest; having plunged into the Blind Men's Grove she sat down at the foot of a tree for the mid-day rest. Now at that time some thieves, having done their deeds,⁴ having killed a cow⁵ and taken the flesh, entered the Blind Men's Grove. Then the robber-chief saw the nun Uppalavaṇṇā as she was sitting at the foot of the tree for the mid-day rest, and seeing her, it occurred to him: "If my sons and brothers see this nun they will trouble her," and he went by a different way.⁶

¹ Vin 3.35 tells the story of the rape of Uppalavaṇṇā by a brahmin youth; see BD 1.53, n. 5. ² *pacchābhatta*; *bhatta* usually means cooked rice. As this is the main thing put into the bowl, it has come to mean the whole meal. ³ Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* 1.111, says, "'Blind,' usually, but wrongly, translated 'Dark.'" He gives the story accounting for the name of this Grove, an episode that must have taken place before the rape of Uppalavaṇṇā, as it is said (Dhp-a 2.49, Dhp-a 2.52) that after that time nuns were not to stay in this Grove. Vin-a 662 also says that Uppalavaṇṇā entered the Blind Men's Grove, because the rule of training had not then been laid down. Those who translate *andhavana* as "Dark Grove" think of it, rightly or wrongly, as a Grove where, because it is so dark, it is impossible to see anything. ⁴ *kata-kammā*—i.e., committed thefts. Said of *māṇava* (Commentary: *cora*, thief) at AN iii.102, and of *cora* at Vism 180, Ja 3.34. ⁵ The cow was probably not so sacred then as now, and the cattle-thief common in those days. ⁶ Vin-a 662, "It is said that formerly the robber-chief knew the *therī*, therefore seeing her as he went in front of the robbers, he said: 'Do not go there, all come here,' and taking them he went by another way."

Then that robber-chief, taking the best meats of the cooked meat, tying (them up) in a leaf-packet, and hanging it up on a tree near the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, said: “Whatever recluse or brahmin sees it, it is given (to him), let him take it,”¹ and having spoken thus, he departed. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, arising from contemplation,² heard these words of that robber-chief as he was speaking.³ Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, taking that meat, went to the nunnery. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, having prepared⁴ that meat at the end of that night, tying it up into a bundle with her upper robe,⁵ rising in the air,⁶ reappeared in the Bamboo Grove.

Now at that time the lord was visiting the village for alms-food, and the venerable Udāyin came to be the one left behind as guardian of the dwelling. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached, she said to the venerable Udāyin:

“Where, honoured sir, is the lord?”

He said, “Sister, the lord has entered the village for alms-food.”

“Give this meat to the lord, honoured sir,” she said.

“You, sister, have pleased the lord with this meat; if you were to give me your inner robe, likewise would I become pleased with the inner robe.”⁷

“But we women, honoured sir, get things with difficulty. This is

¹ By these words the meat was made *kappiya*, allowable, and became a gift that might be taken. ² On *samādhi* as a term in Hindu philosophy, see RADHAKRISHNAN, *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, 49–52. It is there rendered as “unification,” “identification,” “ecstatic consciousness.” It is possible that the “sense of immediate contact with ultimate reality, of the unification of the different sides of our nature,” was not absent from the Early Buddhist conception of *samādhi*. ³ Vin-a 663, “It is said that the *therī* arose from contemplation at the appointed time: he spoke (the words reported above) at that very moment, and she heard and thought, “There is no other *samaṇa* or brahmin here but me.” ⁴ *sampādetvā*, possibly “roasted.” ⁵ = Vin 4.162. ⁶ On *vehāmsa* as “above the ground” see BD 1.79, n. 6. ⁷ Vin-a 663, Udāyin is filled with lust and greed.

my last, (my) fifth robe.¹ I shall not give it to you,” she said.

“It is as if, sister, a man giving an elephant should caparison² its girth,³ yet even so do you, sister, (though) giving meat to the lord, not give⁴ me your inner robe.”⁵

Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, being pressed by the venerable Udāyin, giving him her inner robe, went to the nunnery. The nuns, taking the nun Uppalavaṇṇā’s bowl and robe, said to the nun Uppalavaṇṇā:

“Lady, where is your inner robe?”

The nun Uppalavaṇṇā told this matter to the nuns. The nuns looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Udāyin accept a robe from a nun? Women come by things with difficulty.” And then these nuns told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Udāyin accept a robe from a nun?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, accepted a robe from a nun?”

“It is true, lord.”

“Is she a relation of yours, Udāyin, or not a relation?”

¹ Vin-a 663, she did not speak from greed, for “in those who have destroyed the cankers there is no greed”; but there was no robe left over of the five that were to be worn by nuns. These five, as *pañca cīvārani*, are referred to at [Vin 4.281f](#). At [Vin 2.272](#) it is said that the three usual robes, the vest, *samkacchika*, and the bathing-cloth, should be pointed out to women who wish to receive the *upasampadā* ordination. Nuns were also allowed indoors robes or cloths, *āvathacīvara* ([Vin 2.217](#)), but apparently such things were handed from nun to nun as need arose ([Vin 4.303](#)).

² *sajjeyya*. *Sajjeti* is to send out, to prepare, equip, fit up, decorate, deck out, and came to mean to give. ³ *kaccha*, here accusative plural. It is the girth or middle of an animal. If a present of an elephant is being made, a decorated cloth to be tied round his middle should also be given. ⁴ *sajjeyya*. *Sajjeti* is to send out, to prepare, equip, fit up, decorate, deck out, and came to mean to give. ⁵ Here there is a parallelism between *kaccha*, an accessory of the elephant, and *antaravāsaka*, the inner robe, which Udāyin thought might accompany the gift of meat. The meat had been wrapped up in the nun’s upper robe, and it is to be presumed that she was in consequence going about in her inner robe; see [BD 2.xviii](#).

“She is not a relation, lord,” he said.

“Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right¹ or what is wrong for a woman who is not a relation.² Thus you, foolish man, will accept a robe from the hand of a nun who is not a relation. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should accept a robe from the hand of a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Then scrupulous monks did not accept exchange of robes³ with nuns. The nuns ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the masters not accept exchange of robes with us?”

Monks heard these nuns who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, I allow you to accept exchange among these five (classes of people)⁴: a monk, a nun, a female probationer, a male novice, a female novice. I allow you, monks, to accept exchange among these five (classes of people). And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should accept a robe from the hand of a nun who is not a relation, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.**”⁵

¹ *santa*, meaning “right” or “existent.” ² Cf. below, **BD 2.44**, and **Vin 4.59**. Also above, **BD 2.31**, where, however, we get *pāsādika* and *apāsādika*, pleasant and unpleasant, instead of *santa* and *asanta*, right and wrong. ³ *pārivattakacīvara*. Cf. *parivatteti* barter, **BD 2.55**, below. ⁴ Vin-a 663, “among these five (kinds of) co-religionists having the same faith, the same morality, the same views.” ⁵ At **Vin 4.60** it is a *pācittiya* to give (*dātuṃ*) a robe to a nun who is not related, except in exchange.

Whatever means: ... (See **Bu-NP 4.2.1**) ...

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.¹

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.²

Except in exchange means: without an exchange.

He accepts: in the action there is an offence of wrong-doing; it should be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe, accepted from the hand of a nun who is not a relation, is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation, (and) accepts a robe, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether the woman is not a relation, (and) accepts a robe, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation invoking forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is not a relation, (and) accepts a robe, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he accepts a robe, except in exchange, from the hand of a woman ordained by one (Order only),³ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a woman is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence.

There is no offence if she is a relation; if there is an exchange; if there is a large thing for a small thing, or a small thing for a large

¹ = above, **BD 2.32**, below, **BD 2.96**, and **Vin 4.52**, **Vin 4.55**, **Vin 4.57**, **Vin 4.60**, *passim*.

² = above, **BD 2.7**, and see there n. 4; see also below, **BD 2.48**, **BD 2.140**. ³ **Vin-a 664**, "taking from the hand of a woman ordained in the presence of nuns (only), is an offence of wrong-doing; but from one ordained in the presence of monks (only), is an offence of expiation."

thing¹; if a monk takes it on trust²; if he takes it for the time being; if he takes another requisite, except the robe; if she is a female probationer, a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Vin-a 664, “if bartering a precious sandal, a robe, shoulder-strap, waist-band, for a robe of little value, he accepts that robe, there is no offence.” ² At [Vin 4.60](#) it is the nun who may take on trust, the monk giving.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 6

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans,¹ came to be skilled² in giving *dhamma*-talk.³ Now at that time a certain son of a (great) merchant⁴ approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached and greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance.⁵ As he was sitting at a respectful distance, the venerable

¹ He had a novice, Kaṇḍaka, who behaved badly, *Vin* 1.79, *Vin* 1.85. At *Vin* 1.153, having promised Pasenadi to spend the rains with him, he went to another place; and at *Vin* 1.300, having spent the rains at one place, he accepted a share of robes at others. At *Vin* 2.165, coming late to a meal, he made a monk get up and give him his place. At *Vin* 2.168 he took two lodgings, and is also called a "maker of strife, quarrelsome." He is mentioned in *Bu-NP* 8, *Bu-NP* 9, *Bu-NP* 10, *Bu-NP* 18, *Bu-NP* 20, *Bu-NP* 25, *Bu-NP* 27, and in various *Pācittiyas*. ² *paṭṭho*, probably for *paddho*. *Vin*-a 665 says, *paṭṭho ti cheko samattho paṭṭibalo*. ³ *dhammī kathā*. Here, more a talk on religious or philosophical matters than the "reasoned talk" given by the lord before modifying one of the rules. See above, *BD* 2.4, *BD* 2.14. ⁴ *setṭhiputta*. *Setṭhi* is a banker and a trader combined, hence a merchant, head of a guild. He is primarily a merchant, and a banker only because a merchant, and because there were no banks in those days. *Setṭhi-putta* indicates that the father was still alive, so that his son, the *setṭhiputta*, is not yet head of the firm, but will be on the death of his father. He would then become a *setṭhi*. ⁵ *ekamantaṃ nisīdi*, literally sat down to one side, or end. In sitting down in the presence of an honoured person, care should be taken not to sit down in any of the six wrong ways, or *nisajjadosa*. These are *atidūra*, *accādsanna*, *uparivāta*, *unnatappadesa*, *atisammukha*, *atipacchā*, too far, too near, to windward, on a higher seat, too much in front, too much behind; see *Vin*-a 129 = *MN*-a 1.110; *Ud*-a 53 (abbreviated); *SN*-a i.16 for similar six wrong ways of standing; and *cf.* *SN*-a ii.86 for a different set of six *nisajjadosa*. To consider all these difficulties, and to sit down so as to cause no discomfort to the honoured person, is *ekamantaṃ nisīdi*.

Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, gladdened ... and delighted that son of a (great) merchant with *dhamma*-talk. And then the son of the (great) merchant, having been gladdened ... and delighted by the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with *dhamma*-talk, said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

“Honoured sir, do let me know what will be of use.¹ We are able to give to the master, that is to say of the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings and medicine for the sick.”²

“If you, sir, are desirous of giving something to me, give (me) one cloth from these,”³ he said.

“Wait, honoured sir, until I go to the house; having gone to the house I will send either one cloth from these or something better than these.”

A second time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to the son of the (great) merchant ... A third time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to the son of the (great) merchant: “If you, sir, are desirous of giving something to me, give (me) one cloth from these.”

“Now, honoured sir, for us who are sons of respectable families, it is awkward⁴ to go out with (only) one piece of cloth. Wait, honoured sir, until I go to the house; having gone to the house I will send either one cloth from these or something better than these.”

“What is the good, sir, of your offering without desire to give, because even after you have offered you do not give?”

Then that son of the (great) merchant, being pressed by the ven-

¹ *yena attho*. Cf. **BD 1.222** for same expression. ² Genitive or dative plural used here instead of accusative plural, which usually goes with *dātuṃ*, to give. ³ *ito*.

This refers to the two pieces of cloth that a man would ordinarily wear, as is done today in India, except in the Punjab: the *dhoti* and the *chaddar*, the one put on at the waist, and the other to cover the top part of the body. The son of the merchant, in this story, presumably had on no more than the customary two pieces of cloth, so that if he gave one away, he would have to go partially naked. So he said, “Wait.”

⁴ *kismim viya* = *kim viya*, it is what? it is like what? There is no English expression to render this exactly, but in most Indian languages there is something of the sort. The origin of the expression is obscure. Cf. “it is awkward to go empty-handed,” *kismim viya rittahattham gantuṃ*, below, **BD 2.321, and n. 4**.

erable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, giving one cloth, went away.

6.1.2

People, seeing the son of a (great) merchant, spoke thus:

“Why do you, master, come with (only) one cloth?” Then this son of a (great) merchant told this matter to these people. The people looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented; among them it is not easy to make reasonable requests.¹ How can they take a cloth when a reasonable request was made by the son of a (great) merchant?”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, ask the son of a (great) merchant for a robe?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, asked the son of the (great) merchant for a robe?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

“Is he a relation of yours, Upananda, or not a relation?”

“He is not a relation, lord,” he said.

“Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for one who is not a relation.² Thus you, foolish man, will ask a son of a (great) merchant for a robe. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

2.45

“Whatever monk should ask a man or a woman householder who is not a relation (of his) for a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

¹ *dhammanimantana*, a request such as could reasonably be made by a pious man to a good monk, a request made to religious people in a suitable way. Here the monk presumed on the request made him by the merchant's son. ² Cf. above, **BD 2.39**.

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time several monks¹ were going along the high-road from Sāketa to Sāvattthī. Midway on the road, thieves issuing forth, plundered these monks.² Then these monks said:

“It is forbidden by the lord to ask a man or woman householder who is not a relation for a robe.” And being scrupulous, they did not ask, (but) going naked as they were to Sāvattthī, they saluted the monks respectfully. The monks said:

“Your reverences, these Naked Ascetics³ are very good because they respectfully salute these monks.”⁴

They said: “Your reverences, we are not Naked Ascetics, we are monks.”

The monks said to the venerable Upāli: “If so,⁵ reverend Upāli, question these.”⁶

Then the venerable Upāli, having questioned these monks,⁷ said to the monks: “These are monks, your reverences; give them robes.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can monks come naked? Should they not come covered up with grass or leaves?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, one whose robe is stolen or one whose robe is destroyed, to ask a man or woman householder who is not a relation (of his) for a robe. If there is for the Order at the first residence⁸

¹ *sambahulā*, bhikkhū, or “two or three” or “many monks”; see above, **BD 2.8, n. 6.**

² Vin-a 665, “they stole their bowls and robes.” ³ *ājīvakā*. ⁴ Or, “these Naked Ascetics who respectfully salute these monks are very good.” ⁵ *iñgha*. ⁶ Vin-a 665, “ask them for the sake of knowing their status as monks.” ⁷ Vin-a 665, “he asked them about the *pabbajjā* and the *upasampadā* ordinations, and about bowls and robes.” ⁸ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2978.)

which he approaches either a robe in the dwelling-place¹ or a bed-cover² or a ground-covering³ or a mattress-cover,⁴ (I allow) him to take it to put on, if he says, 'Getting (a robe), I will replace⁵ it.' But if there is not for the Order either a robe in the dwelling-place or a bed-cover or a ground-covering or a mattress-cover, then he should come covered up with grass or leaves; but he should not come naked. Who should so come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁶ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should ask a man or woman householder who is not a relation (of his) for a robe, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. This is the right

¹ *vihāracīvara*. As far as I know the word occurs only here. Vin-a 666 says, “people having had a residence erected, thinking, ‘Let the four requisites belonging to us be of use (to the monks),’ making ready sets of three robes and depositing them in the residence that they have erected—this is what is called a *vihāracīvara*.” It thus seems to be a robe put by in case of need in a residence, and more specifically in the *vihāra*, or dwelling-place portion of it—i.e., not in the refectory or any of the other rooms used together by the community. ² *uttarattharaṇa*. This is a cover for a bed or chair, used out of respect for the person who uses the bed or chair, so as to prevent his clothes from being soiled. Vin-a 666 says that it is called a sheet for spreading on or over a couch, *uttarattharaṇan ti mañcakassa upari attharaṇakaṃ paccattharaṇaṃ vuccati*. At Vin-a 776 *uttarattharaṇa* is called a sheet that may be spread over couches and chairs, *uttarattharaṇan ti nāma mañcapīṭhānam upari attharitabbakaṃ paccattharaṇaṃ*. On *paccattharaṇa* see above, **BD 2.34, n. 1**. ³ *bhummattharaṇa*. Vin-a 666, “when the earth is prepared, they cover it for the sake of preserving its texture with carpets; spreading out a straw mat above this they walk up and down” At Vin-a 776 *bhummattharaṇa* is called a mat for sitting or lying on, *kaṭṭusāraka*, that may be spread on the ground. Cf. below, **BD 2.73**. ⁴ *bhisi-chavi*. Vin-a 666, “the outer skin (*chavi*) of a mattress for a couch or a mattress for a chair.” *Bhisi*, a mattress, may mean a door-rug, something thick for wiping the feet, or a cushion. In fact, anything like a mattress afterwards came to be called *bhisi*. At **Vin 4.40** (=below, **BD 2.240**) five materials are given of which a *bhisi* might lawfully be made. See also *Vinaya Texts* ii.210, n. ⁵ *odahissāmi*. Vin-a 667 explains by *puna ṭhapessāmi*, “I will deposit again.” ⁶ Cf. **Vin 1.305**: whatever monk adopts nakedness, the adoption of members of other sects, there is a grave offence; Visākhā’s strictures on nakedness for monks and nuns, **Vin 1.292**, **Vin 1.293**; and **Bu-NP 24** below. At the root of the desire that monks should be clothed was the need, lay and monastic, to differentiate between *bhikkhus* and *titthiyas*, or those of them who were Naked Ascetics.

time in this case: if a monk becomes one whose robe is stolen or whose robe is destroyed; in this case this is the right time.”

Whatever means: he who ...

Monk means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.¹

A householder means: he who lives in a house.²

A woman householder means: she who lives in a house.³

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.⁴

Except at the right time means: setting the right time to one side.

One whose robe is stolen means: a monk's robe becomes stolen⁵ by kings or by thieves or by rogues, or it becomes stolen by anyone whatsoever.

One whose robe is destroyed means: a monk's robe becomes burnt by fire, or it becomes carried away by water,⁶ or it becomes eaten by rats and white ants, or it becomes worn by use.

If he asks, except at the right time, there is an offence of wrongdoing in the action; it is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'This robe, honoured sirs, asked for by me from a householder who is not a relation, except at the right time, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.31**; below, **BD 2.55**. ² Cf. below, **BD 2.55**. *Ajjhāvasati* is, according to *Critical Pali Dictionary*, "to dwell in (as an owner)." ³ Cf. below, **BD 2.55**. *Ajjhāvasati* is, according to *Critical Pali Dictionary*, "to dwell in (as an owner)." ⁴ Cf. above, **BD 2.7 and n. 4**; **BD 2.40**, and below, **BD 2.140**. ⁵ Here presumably with the sense of "taken forcibly." ⁶ *udakena vuḷham*; cf. **Vin 1.32**. Sinhalese edition has *vūḷham*, which I understand to be the correct form.

If he thinks that a man (or woman) is not a relation when he is not a relation, (and) asks for a robe except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether a man is not a relation (and) asks for a robe except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is not a relation, (and) asks for a robe except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is not a relation when he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a man is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is a relation, there is no offence.

There is no offence if it is at the right time; if they belong to relations; if they are invited¹; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property²; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Vin-a 667 seems to take *nātakānaṃ pavāritānaṃ* together—i.e., without the comma of the text. Commentary says “if they are for relations who are invited”; and later *pavāritānaṃ* is taken up again, “whoever having invited, but who owing to foolishness or forgetfulness, does not give, should be asked ... If he says, ‘I invite you to my house,’ going to his house you should sit down for as long as desirable, or lie down, but take nothing. If he says, ‘I invite you to whatever is in my house,’ you should ask for what is allowable there.” Cf. below, **BD 1.52, BD 1.57.** ² Vin-a 667, “if he asks for a robe by means of utensils allowable to monks (*kappiyabhaṇḍa*), if it is by an allowable procedure (*kappiyavohārena*).” Cf. above, **BD 2.27, n. 3.**

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 7

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time the group of six monks having come up to monks whose robes had been stolen, said: "Your reverences, one whose robe has been stolen or one whose robe has been destroyed is allowed by the lord to ask for a robe from a man or woman householder who is not a relation¹; your reverences, ask (them) for a robe."

They said: "No, we don't want² (one), your reverences, a robe has been obtained by us."

"We are asking for the venerable ones," they said.

"Do ask (them), your reverences."

Then the group of six monks, having approached householders, said:

"Sirs, monks are coming whose robes have been stolen; give them robes," (and) they asked for many robes. At that time a certain man who was sitting in a village assembly hall³ said to another man:

"Master,⁴ monks are coming whose robes have been stolen; I gave them a robe."

Then he said: "I also gave (to them)."

Then another man said: "I also gave (to them)."

These men ... spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation,⁵ ask for many robes? Will the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, deal in the cloth trade⁶ or will they set up a shop⁷?"

¹ Bu-NP 6. ² *alam*. ³ *sabhāyaṃ nisinno*. ⁴ *ayyo*, not *ayye*, indicates affection and familiarity along with respect. ⁵ They do not care for moderation, do not think of it, or have forgotten it. ⁶ This is simply a rebuke. ⁷ Cf. below, BD 2.113, and Vin 2.291.

The monks heard these men who ... spread it about.

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the group of six monks, not knowing moderation, ask for many robes?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, not knowing moderation, asked for many robes?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, not knowing moderation, ask for many robes? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“If a man or a woman householder who is not a relation, asking (a monk), should invite¹ him (to take material for) many robes, then at most (material for) an inner and an upper robe² should be accepted as robe-material by that monk; if he should accept more than that, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

Him means: the monk whose robe has been stolen.

A man who is not a relation means: ... (See **Bu-NP 6.3.1**) ... she who lives in a house.

(For) many robes³ means: (for) abundant robes.⁴

Asking, should invite means: he says, “Take just as much as you want.”

At most (material for) an inner and an upper robe should be accepted as robe-material by that monk means: if the three

¹ *abhihaṭṭhum pavādreyya*. See *Vinaya Texts* ii.440 for note on this phrase. It is there found that *abhihaṭṭhum* (in spite of the spelling with -ṭṭh-) is a gerund from *abhi-har*, like Prakrit *abhihaṭṭum*. This is confirmed by Vin-a 668, MN-a 2.264 (on MN i.222) = AN-a (on AN v.350) = SN-a iii.54 (on SN iv.190) which explain *abhihaṭṭhum* by *abhiharitvā*. The phrase *abhihaṭṭhum pavāreti* is followed by the instrumental, the sense of *pavāreti* being to “present with, to supply with, to invite with.” Here “to invite” seems the best translation, as the choice of the amount is made to rest with the monk. Also Vin-a 668 says that the term means “to make to like,” as well as *niman-teti*, to request, or invite. *Critical Pali Dictionary* suggests that *abhiharati + pavāreti* means to bring out and offer (food, etc.). ² *santaruttara*; see above, **BD 2.12, n. 1**.

³ *bahūhi ... bahukehi*. ⁴ *bahūhi ... bahukehi*.

(robes) come to be destroyed, two may be accepted; if two are destroyed, one may be accepted; if one is destroyed nothing may be accepted.

If he should accept more than that means: if he asks for more than that there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘Honoured sirs, having gone up to a householder who is not a relation, this robe material asked for by me more than that (which I should ask for), is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ... ‘... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.’

Vin 3.2

If he thinks that a man is not a relation when is he not a relation (and) asks for robe-material more than that (which he should ask for), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not a relation ... (See **Bu-NP 6.2**) ... is no offence.

Bu-NP

There is no offence if, saying: ‘I will take the remainder,’ taking it he goes away; if they give the remainder, saying: ‘Let it be only for you’; if they do not give because (a robe was) stolen¹; if they do not give because (a robe was) destroyed; if they belong to relations²; if they are invited; if it is by means of his own property³; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

Bu-NP

¹ Vin-a 669, “they give on account of his being learned and so on” (and not because he was robbed). ² Cf. above, **BD 2.49**. ³ Cf. above, **BD 2.27**, **BD 2.49**.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 8

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time¹ a certain man said to his wife: "I will present² master Upananda³ with a robe." A certain monk who was going for alms heard the words of this man as he was speaking. Then this monk approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"You, reverend Upananda, are of great merit⁴; on a certain occasion a certain man said to his wife: 'I will present master Upananda with a robe.'"

"Your reverence, he is my supporter," he said.

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached this man, and having approached he said to this man:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, sir, desire to present me with a robe?"

"Did I not also think, master: I will present master Upananda with a robe?"

"If you, sir, desire to present me with a robe, present me with a robe like this. What shall I do with one presented that I cannot make use of?"

Then that man ... spread it about, saying: "These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented. It is not easy to present them with a robe. How can master Upananda, before

¹ Cf. Bu-NP 9 ² *acchādeti* has sense of to give so as to clothe or cover. ³ See also Bu-NP 6. ⁴ Same thing said to Upananda at Vin 1.300, and Vin 3.217, Vin 3.257 (BD 2.58, BD 2.145, below).

being invited by me, approaching me, put forward a consideration¹ with regard to a robe?”

Monks heard that man who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, before being invited, approaching a householder, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, before being invited, approaching a householder, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

“Is he a relation of yours, Upananda, or not a relation?”

“He is not a relation, lord,” he said.

“Foolish man, one who is not a relation² does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for one who is not a relation.³ Thus you, foolish man, before being invited, approaching a householder who is not a relation, will put forward a consideration with regard to a robe. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“In case a robe-fund⁴ comes to be laid by for a monk by a man or a woman householder who is not a relation (of his), thinking: ‘I will present the monk so and so with a robe, having got the robe in exchange for this robe-fund’—then if that monk, out of desire for something fine, approaching before being invited, should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe, saying: ‘Indeed it would be well; do let the venerable one,⁵ having got a robe like this or like that in exchange for this robe-fund, present it to me,’

¹ *vikappam āpajjissati*. Cf. below, **BD 2.145**, where again Upananda is greedy about robes. ² Cf. below, **BD 2.147**. ³ Cf. above, **BD 2.39**, **BD 2.44**, and below, **BD 2.59**, **BD 2.147**. ⁴ *cīvaracetāpana*. A robe-fund consisted of things for barter. This passage is complicated by the various meanings, brought out by the Old Commentary, (see below), which appear to be attached to the cognate forms, °*cetāpana*, °*cetāpanena*, and °*cetāpetvā*. Vin-a 670, *cīvaracetāpanan ti cīvaramūlaṃ*. ⁵ *āyasmā*, perhaps here “gentleman”—or “lady”; certainly it is an honorific title. Cf. below, **BD 2.148**

there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

For a monk¹ means: for the good of a monk, making a monk an object, being desirous of presenting to a monk.

A man who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.²

A householder means: he who lives in a house.³

A woman householder means: she who lives in a house.

Robe-fund means: gold or a gold coin⁴ or a pearl or a jewel or a coral or a ploughshare⁵ or a (piece of) cloth⁶ or thread or cotton.

For this robe-fund means: for what is present.⁷

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.⁸

I will present means: I will give.

Then if that monk means: that monk for whom the robe-fund comes to be laid by.

Before being invited means: before it was said (to him): ‘What kind of robe do you want, honoured sir? What kind of robe shall I get in exchange for you?’

Approaching means: going to the house, approaching (him) anywhere.

Should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe means: ‘Let it be long or wide or rough⁹ or soft.’

For this robe-fund means: for what is present.

Like this or like that means: long or wide or rough or soft.

¹ Cf. this portion of the Old Commentary, with that on **Bu-NP 8** and **Bu-NP 27**. ² See above, **BD 2.31**, **BD 2.47**. ³ Cf. above, **BD 2.47**. ⁴ For one on *hirañña*, unwrought gold, and *suvanna*, wrought gold, see **BD 1.28**. ⁵ *phāla*. At **SN i.169**, **Sn p.13** and **Sn p.77**, this means “plough-share.” Cf. **Vin 1.225**. ⁶ *paṭaka* seems connected with *paṭa*. ⁷ *paccupaṭṭhita*, present, ready, at hand. ⁸ *parivatteti*; also means to turn over, to deal with, to change. Cf. *pārivattakāvara*, exchange of robes, at **BD 2.39**, above. At **Vin 2.174** monks are allowed to barter valuable woollen garments and valuable cotton garments, or cloths, *kambala* and *dussa*, for increasing (the accessories of lodgings). ⁹ *appitaṃ*, of a close weave, solid. But, as opposed to “soft,” it must here mean harsh or rough. **Vin-a 727** explains it by *ghana*, solid, compact, massive. Cf. below, **BD 2.145**.

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.

Present (it) means: give (it).

Out of desire for something fine means: wanting what is good, wanting what is costly.

If according to what he says, he gets in exchange one that is long or wide or rough or soft, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, before I was invited (to take) this robe, approaching a householder who was not a relation, I put forward a consideration with regard to a robe; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that a man is not a relation when he is not a relation, (and) before being invited, approaching a householder, puts forward a consideration regarding a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether the man is not a relation, (and) before being invited, approaching a householder, puts forward a consideration with regard to a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is not a relation, (and) before being invited, approaching a householder, puts forward a consideration with regard to a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is not a relation when he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a man is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is a relation, there is no offence.

There is no offence if they belong to relations,¹ if they are invited; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property; if he gets something of small value in exchange while he desires to get something costly in exchange; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. [BD 2.49](#), [BD 2.52](#).

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 9

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time¹ a certain man said to another man: "I will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with a robe." Then he² said: "I also will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with a robe." A certain monk who was going for alms heard this conversation of these men. Then this monk approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"You, reverend Upananda, are of great merit; on a certain occasion a certain man said to another man: 'I will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with a robe.' Then he said: 'I also will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans with a robe.'" 'Your reverence, these (men) are my supporters.' Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached these men, and having approached, he said to these men:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, sirs, desire to present me with robes?"

"Did we not think, master: 'We will present master Upananda with robes?'"

"If you, sirs, desire to present me with robes, present me with a robe like this. What shall I do with ones presented that I cannot make use of?"

Then these men ... spread it about, saying:

"These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented. It is not easy to present them with robes. How can

¹ Cf. Bu-NP 8 ² The other man.

master Upananda, before being invited by us, approaching, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?"

BD 2.59

Monks heard these men who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, before being invited, approaching householders, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, before being invited, approaching householders, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?" "It is true, lord," he said.

"Are they relations of yours, Upananda, or not relations?"

"They are not relations, lord," he said.

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for those who are not relations.¹ Thus you, foolish man, before being invited, approaching householders who are not relations, will put forward a consideration with regard to a robe. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"In case various robe-funds come to be laid by for a monk by two men householders or by (two) women householders who are not relations (of his), thinking: 'We will present the monk so and so with robes, having got various robes in exchange for the various robe-funds.' Then if that monk, out of desire for something fine, approaching before being invited, should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe, saying: 'Indeed it would be well; do let the venerable ones, having got a robe like this or like that in exchange for the various robe-funds, present it to me, the two together with one,'² there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

Vin 3.21

¹ Cf. above, BD 2.39, BD 2.44, BD 2.59. ² *Ubho'va santā, ekenā ti*. The Commentary says nothing, but see Old Commentary below. It means that the two men should combine and put their funds together so that there should be two funds which could then be exchanged for one (good) cloth or robe, and the two men present the monk with one robe.

For a monk¹ means: ... (See **Bu-NP 8.2.2**) ... being desirous of presenting to a monk.

By two^{2 3} means: by two.

Men who are not relations means: ... back through seven generations.⁴

Men householders mean: they who live in a house.

Women householders mean: they who live in a house.

Robe-funds mean: gold or gold coins or pearls or jewels or corals or ploughshares or cloths or threads or cottons.⁵

For these various robe-funds means: for these (things) that are present.

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.

We will present means: we will give.

Then if that monk means: that monk for whom the robe-funds have come to be laid by.

Before being invited means: ... '... what kind of robe shall we get in exchange for you?'

Approaching ... should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe means: 'Let it be long ...'

For these various robe-funds means: for these (things) that are present.

Like this ... present (it) means: give (it).

The two together with one means: two people for one (robe).⁶

Out of desire for something fine means: wanting what is good, wanting what is costly.

If, according to what he says, they get in exchange one that is long or wide or rough or soft, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action ... (See **Bu-NP 8.2.1-Bu-NP.8.2.3**; *instead of* a householder

¹ Cf. this portion of the Old Commentary, with that on previous *Nissaggiya*. ² *ubhinnam*, (more properly 'both') ... *dvinnam*. ³ *ubhinnam*, (more properly 'both') ... *dvinnam*. ⁴ Cf. above, **BD 2.39**, **BD 2.44**, **BD 2.54**. ⁵ Cf. above, **BD 2.55**, where these items are given in the singular, since only one robe-fund is being defined. ⁶ *dve pi janā ekena*, two people with one (fine robe instead of with two more ordinary ones).

who is not a relation, ... a householder *read* householders who are not relations ... householders) ... if he gets something of small value in exchange while they desire to get something costly in exchange; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 10

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a chief minister,¹ the supporter of the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sent a robe-fund² by a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, saying: "Having got a robe in exchange for this robe-fund, present master Upananda with a robe."

Then that messenger approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans: "Honoured sir, this robe-fund was brought for the venerable one; let the venerable one accept this robe-fund."

When he had spoken thus, the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to that messenger: "Sir, we do not accept a robe-fund; but we accept a robe if it is at the right time and if it is allowable."³

When he had spoken thus, that messenger said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans: "But is there someone who is the venerable one's attendant⁴?"

At that time a certain lay-follower went to the monastery on some business or other. Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to that messenger: "Sir, this lay-follower is the monks' attendant."

¹ *mahāmatta* is at **BD 1.74** included in definition of "kings." ² See **Bu-NP 8** and **Bu-NP 9**. ³ *kappiya*—i.e., something that is made allowable for the monks to take because it has been given, and so made legally acceptable. See **Vin 1.206**. ⁴ *veyyāvaccakara*, usually a lay-attendant in little better position than a servant. **Vin-a 672** explains by *kiccakaro kappiyakārako*, one who makes something legally allowable (to the monks by offering it to them).

Then that messenger, informing¹ that lay-follower, approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

“Honoured sir, the person whom the venerable one has pointed out as an attendant has been instructed² by me; let the venerable one approach (him) at the right time (and) he will present you with a robe.”

Then the chief minister sent a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to say: “Let the master make use of this robe; we want this robe made use of by the master.”

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, did not say anything to that lay-follower. A second time the chief minister sent a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to say: “Let the master make use of ... by the master. “A second time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, did not say anything to that lay-follower. A third time the chief minister sent a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to say: “Let the master make use of ... by the master.”

Now at that time there came to be a meeting-day for the townspeople,³ and an agreement was made by the townspeople that: Whoever comes the last pays fifty.⁴ Then the venerable Upananda, the son of

¹ *saññāpetvā* = *jānāpetvā*, Vin-a 672. ² *saññatto* = *añatto*, Vin-a 672. ³ *negamassa samayo hoti*. *Negama* also occurs at Vin 1.268. The word comes from *nigama*, which is from *nadī-gāma*. Originally things were sent by water rather than by land, so that villages on rivers (*nadī-gāma*) would become the centres of trade. In India all important cities are on a river. Thus *nadī-gāma* is an important place, a town even, which may or may not be the seat of a king (*rājadhāni*). If a *gāma*, village, becomes very big, it is called *naḡara*, town. If not so big, then it is a *pura*. This is usually a fortified town. Villages and towns run in this order: *gāma*, village; *nigama*, a river-side and hence important village or little town; *pura*, a fortified town, in which kings may live; *naḡara*, a town (this may contain a fortified portion, but may spread outside it); *rājadhāni*, seat of a king. ⁴ *paññāsaṃ bandho*. Buddhaghosa is doubtful of the reading; there is also the variant reading *baddho*, which is synonymous with *jīto* or *jīno* below. Vin-a 672 says “the fine (or punishment, *daṇḍa*) is fifty *kahāpaṇas*.”

the Sakyans, approached that lay-follower, and having approached, he said to that lay-follower:

“Sir, I want the robe.”

“Honoured sir, wait this day¹ (only). Today there comes to be a meeting-day for the townspeople, and an agreement was made by the townspeople that: Whoever comes last pays fifty.”

“Sir, give me the robe this very day,”² he said, and he took hold of his waist-band.³ Then that lay-follower, being pressed by the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having got a robe in exchange for the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, went the last. People said to this lay-follower: “Why do you, master, come the last? You have lost fifty.”⁴ Then that lay-follower told this matter to those people. The people ... spread it about, saying:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented; amongst them it is not easy to render a service. How can they, being told by a lay-follower: ‘Honoured sir, wait this day (only),’ not wait?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, being told by a lay-follower: ‘Honoured sir, wait this day (only),’ not wait?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, being told by a lay-follower: ‘Honoured sir, wait this day (only),’ did not wait?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, being told by a lay-follower: ‘Honoured

¹ *ajjuṇho*. Vin-a 672 explains by *ajja ekam divasaṃ*. It is therefore more likely to mean “(only) this day (the rest of the present day-and-night)” as given in the *Critical Pali Dictionary*, than “this moonlight night” of the *Pali-English Dictionary* ² *ajj’eva*. ³ *ovaṭṭikāya pāramasi*. *Ovaṭṭikā* can also mean a bracelet and a patch. See *Vinaya Texts* ii.153, n. 3; MORRIS, *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1887, p.156. *Pāramasi*, translated at **BD 1.203** as “rubs up against” is here explained by Vin-a 672 as *gaṇhi*, took hold. ⁴ *paññāsaṃ jīno ’si*. OLDENBERG, *Vinaya Texts* iii.277 says, “Probably we ought to read *jīno ’si*.” Vin-a 672 has the reading *jito ’si*. *Jīyati*, one of whose meanings is “to lose,” is in Pali both the passive of √*ji* and the present middle of √*jya*, (*ji*), therefore it can have *jita* or *jīna* as past participles.

sir, wait this day (only),’ not wait? Foolish man, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“In case a king or one in the service of a king¹ or a brahmin or a householder should send a robe-fund for a monk by a messenger, saying: ‘Having got a robe in exchange for this robe-fund, present the monk so and so with a robe’; then if this messenger should approach the monk and say: ‘Honoured sir, this robe-fund was brought for the venerable one; let the venerable one accept this robe-fund,’ then the messenger should be spoken to thus by this monk: ‘Sir, we do not accept a robe-fund, but we accept a robe if it is at the right time and if it is allowable.’ If this messenger should say to the monk: ‘But is there someone who is the venerable one’s attendant?’, then, monks,² an attendant should be pointed out by the monk in need of a robe—either one who is engaged in the monastery³ or a lay-follower—saying: ‘This is the monks’ attendant.’ If this messenger, instructing this attendant, approaching that monk, should speak thus: ‘Honoured sir, I have instructed the person whom the venerable one pointed out as an attendant; let the venerable one approach at the right time, (and) he will present you with a robe’; then, monks, if that monk is in need of a robe, approaching that attendant, he should state⁴ and remind him two or three times, saying: ‘Sir, I am in need of a robe.’ If while stating and reminding two or three times, he succeeds in obtaining⁵ that robe, that is good. If he does not succeed

¹ *rājabhogga*. *Pali-English Dictionary* seems to see in this the meaning of “Of royal power, entitled to the throne, as a designation of class.” It says, under article for *bhogga*, and quoting this passage, that *rājabhogga* “takes the place of the usual *khattiya*.” I think, however, that the reference is back to the chief minister, who has already appeared in this episode. Cf. also below, Old Commentary, **BD 2.67**. ² *Vinaya Texts* i.23, n. 1, “this word of address is most noteworthy ... It must be meant as an address by the Buddha himself to the brethren.” Cf. also **Bu-Pc 71**, where *bhikkhave* again occurs in the *sikkhāpada*, rule. ³ *ārāmika*, one who is employed in petty or menial works in a monastery, an attendant in a monastery. Nowadays such a man receives food there. ⁴ *codetabbo*, here to request or state, but “state” is chosen for the translation, since monks were not allowed to make a request. ⁵ *abhinipphādeti*.

in obtaining it, he should stand silently¹ for it four times, five times, six times at the utmost. If he succeeds in obtaining that robe, standing silently for it, four times, five times, six times at the utmost, that is good. If he, exerting himself² further than that, succeeds in obtaining that robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he does not succeed in obtaining it, he should either go himself to where the robe-fund was brought from for him,³ or a messenger should be sent to say: “That robe-fund which you, sirs, sent for a monk, is not of any use to that monk.⁴ Let the gentlemen make use of their own,⁵ let your own things be not lost.”⁶ This is the proper course in this case.”

For a monk means: for the good of a monk, making a monk his object, being desirous of presenting to a monk.

A king means: he who rules a kingdom.

One in the king’s service means: whoever is in the king’s pay.⁷

A brahmin means: a brahmin by birth.

A householder means: excepting the king and he who is in the king’s service and the brahmin, he who remains is called a householder.⁸

A robe-fund means: gold or a gold coin or a pearl or a jewel.⁹

For this robe-fund means: for what is present.

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.

Present means: give.

If that messenger, approaching that monk, should say : ‘Honoured sir, this robe-fund was brought for the venerable one, let the

¹ The silent mode of asking came to be the only one allowed to the monks. But here they are permitted to express their wants in words before they begin their silent standing. ² *vāyamamāna*. ³ According to Vin-a 674 if a monk neither goes himself nor sends a messenger, he falls into an offence of wrong-doing for breaking a custom (*vattabheda*). ⁴ *na taṃ tassa bhikkhuno kiñci atthaṃ anubhoti*. ⁵ *yuñjant’ āyasmanto sakaṃ*, or “let the gentlemen have the benefit of their own things.” ⁶ *mā vo sakaṃ vinas(s)ā ti*. ⁷ *rañño bhattavetanāhāro*, living on a salary and food from a king. ⁸ Cf. earlier definitions of a “householder” as “he who lives in a house,” above, **BD 1.47**, **BD 1.55**, **BD 1.60**. ⁹ Cf. earlier and longer definitions of “robe-fund” at **BD 2.55**, **BD 2.60**.

venerable one accept this robe-fund,' then this messenger should be spoken to thus by this monk: ... '... is the monks' attendant.' He should not say: 'Give it to him,' or 'He will deposit it,' or 'He will barter it,' or 'He will get it in exchange.'

If this messenger, instructing this attendant, approaching that monk, should speak thus: 'Honoured sir, I have instructed the person whom the venerable one pointed out as an attendant; let the venerable one approach at the right time (and) he will present you with a robe'; then, monks, if that monk is in need of a robe, approaching that attendant, he should state and remind him two or three times, saying: 'Sir, I am in need of a robe.' He should not say: 'Give me a robe,' 'Fetch me a robe,' 'Barter a robe for me,' 'Get a robe in exchange for me.' A second time he should say ... A third time he should say ...

If ... he succeeds in obtaining (that robe), that is good. If he does not succeed in obtaining it, going there, he should stand silently for it; he should not sit down on a seat, he should not accept food, he should not teach dhamma¹; being asked, 'Why did you come?' he should say: 'You know it, sir.' If he either sits down on a seat or accepts food or teaches *dhamma*, he loses an opportunity.² A second time he may stand. A third time he may stand. Having stated four times, he may stand four times. Having stated five times, he may stand twice. Having stated six times, he may not stand.³

If he, exerting himself further than that, succeeds in obtaining that robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe obtained by me, by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it

¹ *na dhammo bhāsitaḥ*. Vin-a 673 says that if asked to recite a piece of the text (or a blessing, at the beginning of a ceremony) or a grace (at the end of a meal), he should not say anything. ² *ṭhānaṃ bhanjati*—i.e., to go and stand. Vin-a 673 *ṭhānaṃ* = *āgatakāraṇaṃ*—i.e., the reason or occasion for which he came (namely, to acquire a robe). ³ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2978.)

to the Order.’ ... ‘... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the monk so and so.’

If he does not succeed in obtaining it, he should either go himself to where the robe-fund was brought from for him, or a messenger should be sent to say: ‘That robe-fund which you, sirs, sent for a monk, is not of any use to that monk. Let the gentlemen make use of their own, let your own things be not lost.’

This is the proper course¹ in this case means: this is the appropriate course² in this case.

If he succeeds in obtaining it by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, thinking that they are more, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he succeeds in obtaining it by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, but is in doubt (as to the number of times), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he succeeds in obtaining it by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, thinking them to be less, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, stating less than three times, standing less than six times, he thinks them to be more, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If stating less than three times, standing less than six times, he is in doubt (as to the number), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, stating less than three times, standing less than six times, he thinks them to be less, there is no offence.

There is no offence in stating three times, in standing six times; in stating less than three times, in standing less than six times; if himself not stating, he gives; if stating, the owners give; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The First Division: that on Kaṭhina-cloth³

¹ “Proper course” is *sāmīci*, etiquette, courtesy; “appropriate course” is *anudhammatā*, custom; used with regard to the monks. *Dhamma* here means good social manners and customs. *Anudhammatā* is a synonym for *sāmīci*. ² See previous note. ³ *kaṭhinavagga*. Cf. the *Kaṭhinakkhandhaka*, *Vin* 1.253-265.

THIS IS ITS KEY¹

Ten (nights), one night, and a month,
and washing, acceptance,
Three about those who are not relations, of two,
and by means of a messenger.

Vin 3.2

¹ *uddāna*, something like a mnemonic verse, an abbreviation, in which only a leading word of each rule is given, and simply to help the memory of the monk who is reciting the rules. All the teaching was oral.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 11

11.1.1 ... at Ālavī in the chief shrine at Ālavī.¹ At that time the group of
D 2.71 six monks, approaching silk-makers,² said: "Sirs, hatch³ many silk-
worms, and give them to us, for we want to make a rug⁴ mixed with
silk." These looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, approaching us, speak thus: 'Sirs, hatch ... mixed with silk'? It is a loss for us, it is ill-gotten for us that we, for the sake of livelihood, for the sake of wife and children, are bringing (these) many small creatures into destruction."

Monks heard these men who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks, approaching silk-makers, say: 'Sirs, hatch ... a rug mixed with silk?'" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, approaching silk-makers, spoke thus: 'Sirs, hatch ... a rug mixed with silk?'"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, approaching silk-makers, speak thus: 'Sirs, hatch ... a rug mixed with silk'? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monks should cause a rug to be made mixed with

¹ Cf. **BD 1.247**. ² *kosiyakāraka*, those preparing the raw silk, raising silk-worms (*kosakāraka*), rather than silk-weavers. ³ *pacatha*, literally boil or cook. ⁴ *santhata*, something that is spread: a rug, mat or a sheet. See **BD 1.247**.

silk, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

Whatever means: he who ...

Monk means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

A rug means: it is made “having spread,” not woven.¹

Should cause to be made means: if he makes it or causes it to be made mixing it with one silken filament,² there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ... ‘Honoured sirs, this rug, which I had made mixed with silk, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ... ‘... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this rug to the venerable one.’

Bu-NP

Vin 3,2

Bu-NP

If what was incompletely executed by himself, he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If what was incompletely executed by others, he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by others, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, acquiring what was made for another, he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.³

BD 2,7

There is no offence if he makes a canopy⁴ or a ground-covering⁵

¹ I.e., having spread out the material, or by the spreading method; see **BD 2, Introduction, p. xxii**. ² *amsu* is really the technical name of those small particles of which a thread is composed, not the thread itself. ³ =below, **Vin 3.227, Vin 3.229, Vin 3.233, and Vin 4.167, Vin 4.171**. ⁴ Nowadays a canopy would be used for putting over shrines. ⁵ Cf. **BD 2.46**, above.

or a screen-wall¹ or a mattress² or a squatting mat³; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Such as a wall made up of cloth. Word occurs at [Vin 3.189](#), [Vin 4.269](#), [Ja 2.88](#).

² *bhisi*; see above, [BD 2.47](#). ³ *bimbohana*, such as monks in Ceylon use nowadays in the hall where the *uposatha* is held and the *upasampadā* conferred. They are usually padded. These items recur below at [BD 2.78](#), [BD 2.82](#), [BD 2.89](#), and [Vin 4.171](#), [Vin 4.279](#).

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 12

... at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the Hall of the Peaked Roof. At that time the group of six monks had a rug¹ made of pure black sheep's² wool. People, engaged in touring the dwelling-place, seeing them ... spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool, like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, had a rug made of pure black sheep's wool?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monk should cause a rug to be made of pure black sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

¹ *santhata*, see above, **BD 2.71, n. 4.** ² *eḷaka*, a ram, a wild goat, according to *Pali-English Dictionary* and CHILDERS. *Eḍaka* (Sanskrit) is a kind of sheep, a ram, a wild goat, according to MONIER-WILLIAMS. *Aja* is certainly a goat. The compound *aj-eḷaka* sometimes occurs, as at DN i.5, seeming to mean the goats and the sheep. In India, the goat and the sheep closely resemble one another: the tails of the former stick up, those of the latter hang down; but the colour and texture of their hair, or wool (*loma*), are similar.

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Black means: there are two (kinds of) black: black by nature or dyed black.

3.226

A rug means: it is made “having spread,” not woven.

Should cause to be made means: if he makes it or causes it to be made, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited ... to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ... ‘... this rug which I, honoured sirs, had made of pure black sheep’s wool ...’ ... if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

¹ Cf. Bu-NP 11.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 13

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time the group of six monks said: "It is forbidden by the lord to have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool."¹ And these, taking only a little white for the seam,² all the same³ had a rug made of pure black sheep's wool. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks, taking only a little white for the seam, all the same have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, taking only a little white for the seam, all the same had a rug made of pure black sheep's wool?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, taking ... pure black sheep's wool? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"When a new rug is made for a monk, two portions of pure black sheep's wool may be taken, the third of white, the fourth

¹ Bu-NP 12 ² *anta*. Vin-a 684, "applying (or bringing) white to it, making as it were a border at the edge (*anta*) of the sheet." ³ *tath'eva*, or "as before."

of reddish brown colours.¹ If a monk should cause a new rug to be made not taking two portions of pure black sheep's wool, the third of white, the fourth of reddish brown colours, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

New means: it is so called with reference to the making.

A rug means: it is made "having spread," not woven.²

Is being made means: making or causing to be made.

Two portions of pure black sheep's wool may be taken means: being brought, two *tulā* weights³ may be taken.

The third of white means: a *tulā* weight of white.

The fourth of reddish brown colours means: a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours.

If a monk ... not taking two portions of pure black sheep's wool, the third of white, the fourth of reddish brown colours means: if he makes or causes a new rug to be made not taking a *tulā*, weight of white, a *tulā*, weight of reddish brown colours, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action; it should be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to ... an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this rug which I caused to be made not taking a *tulā* weight of white, a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... the Order should give back ... let them give back ... I will give back this rug to the venerable one.'

If what was incompletely executed by himself, he has finished by

¹ *gocariyānan ti kapilavaṇṇānaṃ*, Vin-a 684, which seems to indicate "the colour of oxen," although *cariya* does not mean *vaṇṇa*, colour. *Vinaya Texts* i.25, n. 2, says, "This is deliberately chosen as an ugly mixture, which would lessen the commercial value of the rug." It might also be a preventive of unsuitable pride in a fine article. But I think that this rule should be regarded as a continuation of the previous one (Bu-NP 12), expanding it, and giving the detail necessary for carrying it out properly. The monks had nothing to do with the "commercial value" of things, but it was important that they should not behave like those leading the household life.

² See above, BD 2.72, note, and BD 2.75. ³ *tulā*, literally balance, a measure of weight.

himself ... (See **Bu-NP 11.2.2**) ... he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if he makes it taking a *tulā* weight of white, a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours; if he makes it taking more of white, more of reddish brown colours; if he makes it taking only of white, only of reddish brown colours; if he makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat¹; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

BD 2.7

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.73**, and notes.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 14

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time monks had a rug made every year. They were intent on begging, intent on hinting,¹ saying: "Give sheep's wool, we want sheep's wool." People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a rug made every year? How can they be intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: 'Give sheep's wool, we want sheep's wool'? For, (although) our children soil and wet them² and they are eaten by rats, our rugs once made last for five or six years. But these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a rug made every year; they are intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: 'Give sheep's wool, we want sheep's wool.'"

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can monks have a rug made every year? How can they be intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: '... we want sheep's wool?'" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, have a rug made every year, that you are intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: '... we want sheep's wool?'"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can these foolish men have a rug made every year? How can they be intent on begging, intent on hinting ... '... we want sheep's wool'? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

¹ =BD 1.246. ² Cf. Vin 4.129.

“A new rug which a monk has had made should be used for six years. If, within the six years, whether he has got rid of or has not got rid of that (former) rug, he should have a new rug made, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time a certain monk became ill in Kosambī. Relations sent a messenger to this monk, saying: “Let the revered sir¹ come, we will nurse (him).” Monks spoke thus: “Go, your reverence, relations will nurse you.” He said:

“Your reverences, a rule of training laid down by the lord is that a new rug which a monk has had made should be used for six years; but I am ill, I am not able to set out taking a rug, and without a rug there comes to be no comfort for me. I will not go.”

They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to give a monk who is ill the agreement as to a rug.² And thus, monks, should it be given: That monk who is ill, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: ‘I, honoured sirs, am ill; I am not able to set out taking a rug. Thus I, honoured sirs, request the Order for the agreement as to a rug.’ A second time it should be requested, a third time it should be requested. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk so and so is ill. He is not able to set out making a rug. He requests the Order for the agreement as to a rug. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order give this monk

¹ *bhaddanto*. Cf. above, **BD 2.13ff.**, where an ill monk is allowed to travel without his three robes, if he has the formal agreement of the Order to be regarded as not away, separated from them. ² *santhata-sammuti*. Vin-a 685 says that he may have a new rug made at the place to which he goes (thereby not waiting for the six years to elapse). Cf. **Bu-NP 2**.

3,229 so and so the agreement as to a rug. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk ... requests the Order for the agreement as to a rug. The Order gives to the monk so and so the agreement as to a rug. If the giving to the monk so and so of the agreement as to a rug is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it does not seem right, they should speak. Agreement as to a rug is given by the Order to the monk so and so; it is pleasing ... So do I understand this.' And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“A new rug which a monk has had made should last for six years. If, within the six years, whether he has got rid of or has not got rid of that (former) rug, he should have a new rug made, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

14,3,1 **New** means: ... not woven.

Has had made means: making or causing to be made.

Should be used for six years means: it should be used for six years at the minimum.

If within six years means: in less than six years.

Getting rid of ... that (former) rug means: giving it to others.

Not getting rid of means: not giving it to anyone.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks, if he makes or causes another new rug to be made, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this rug, which I had made for me less than six years ago without the agreement of the monks, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this rug to the venerable one.'

2,8,2 If what was incompletely executed by himself, he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture ... if he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by others,

there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.¹

There is no offence if he makes one after six years; if he makes one after more than six years; if he makes it or causes it to be made for another; if, acquiring what was made for another, he makes use of it; if he makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat²; if there is the agreement of the monks; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

Vin 3,2

¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.72](#). ² Cf. above, [BD 2.73](#).

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 15

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Then the lord addressed the monks, saying: "Monks, I want to go into solitary retreat for three months. I am not to be approached by anyone except the one who brings the alms-food."¹

"Very well, lord," these monks answered the lord, and accordingly no one here went up to the lord except the one who brought the alms-food. Now at that time an agreement was made by the Order at Sāvattthī, saying: "Your reverences, the lord wishes to go into solitary retreat for three months. The lord should not be approached by anyone except the one who brings the alms-food. Whoever approaches the lord should be made to confess² an offence of expiation."

Then the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta,³ approached the lord together with his followers, and having approached and greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. Now it is the custom for enlightened ones, for lords, to exchange friendly greetings with in-coming monks. The lord said to the venerable Upasena,

¹ At SN v.325 the lord dwelt in solitude for three months; at Vin 3.68, SN v.12, SN v.320 for two weeks. ² *desāpetabbo*. ³ Referred to at Vin 1.59, Ja 2.449 for ordaining his *saddhi-vihārika* only a year after his own ordination. At AN i.24 he is called chief among those who are altogether charming (*samanta-pāsādika*, which is also the title of the Vinaya Commentary). Both these points are referred to at *Psalms of the Brethren* 261f. He was younger brother to Sāriputta, and had three sisters, Cālā, Upacālā, Sīsupacālā, their mother being Rūpasārī, and his father Vaṅganta; cf. Dhpa 2.84, where Sāriputta's father is also said to be Vaṅganta; and *Psalms of the Sisters*, p. 96, where the three sisters are said to be junior to Sāriputta. See also Thag 576, Tha-ap 62 for his verses; Ud 46, where he says that he is of great psychic power and majesty; and see *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*.

the son of Vaṅganta, as he was sitting at a respectful distance:

“Upasena, I hope things go well with you, I hope you are keeping going, I hope you have come here with but little fatigue on the journey?”

“Lord, things go well with us, lord, we keep ourselves going, we have come here with but little fatigue on the journey, lord.”

Now at that time the monk who was the fellow-resident of the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, was sitting not far from the lord. Then the lord said to this monk: “Monk, are rag-robes pleasing to you?”

“Rag-robes are not pleasing to me, lord,” he said.

“Then how is it, monk, that you are one who wears rag-robes?”

“Lord, my preceptor is one who wears rag-robes, therefore am I also one who wears rag-robes.” Then the lord said to the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta:

“And is this crowd¹ agreeable to you, Upasena? How is it that you lead² the crowd, Upasena?”

He said: “Lord, I say to whoever asks me for the *upasampadā* ordination: ‘Your reverence, I am a jungle-dweller, an almsman,³ one who wears rag-robes.⁴ If you also will become a jungle-dweller, an almsman, one who wears rag-robes, then will I confer the *upasampadā* ordination upon you.’ If he promises me, I confer the *upasampadā* ordination, but if he does not promise me I do not confer the *upasampadā* ordination. I say to whoever asks me for help⁵: ‘Your reverence, I am a jungle-dweller, an almsman, one who wears rag-robes. If you also will become a jungle-dweller, an almsman, one who wears rag-robes, then I will give you help.’ If he promises me, I give help; but if he does not promise me, I do not give help. Thus do I, lord, lead the crowd.”

“Good, Upasena, good; it is good, Upasena, that you lead the crowd.”

¹ *parisā*. ² *vinesi*. ³ *piṇḍapḍātika*. This I think is a word that may be correctly rendered by “almsman,” “beggar for alms.” See **BD 1, Introduction, p. xii**, and *Vism* 66.

⁴ These three *aṅga* (practices) are explained in detail at *Vism* 59ff. Sometimes combined with *tecīvara*, a wearer of the three robes, as e.g. at **Vin 1.253**, *MN* i.214.

⁵ *nissaga*.

But do you know, Upasena, of the Order's agreement at Sāvattthī?"

"Lord, I do not know the Order's agreement at Sāvattthī."

"At Sāvattthī, Upasena, an agreement was made by the Order: 'Your reverences, the lord wishes to go into solitary retreat for three months. The lord should not be approached by anyone except the one who brings the alms-food. Whoever approaches the lord should be made to confess an offence of expiation.'"

"Lord, the Order at Sāvattthī will be well known for its own agreement; we will not lay down what is not (yet) laid down, nor will we abolish what has been laid down, but we will dwell in conformity with and according to the rules of training which have been laid down."

"That is very good, Upasena; what is not (yet) laid down should not be laid down, nor should what is laid down be abolished, but one should dwell in conformity with and according to the rules of training which have been laid down. Upasena, I allow those monks who are jungle-dwellers, who are almsmen, who wear rag-robcs to come up for the sake of seeing me, if they wish to."

At that time several monks¹ who came to be standing outside the gateway,² said: "We will make the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, confess to an offence of expiation." Then the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, rising up from his seat with his followers, greeting the lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then those monks said to the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta: "Do you, reverend Upasena, know of the Order's agreement at Sāvattthī?"

"But, your reverences, the lord said to me: 'But do you know of the Order's agreement at Sāvattthī? ... according to the rules of training which have been laid down.' Your reverences, it is allowed by the lord, who said: 'Those monks who are jungle-dwellers, who are almsmen, who wear rag-robcs may come up for the sake of seeing me, if they wish to.'"

Then these monks said: "What the venerable Upasena says is true; what has not yet been laid down should not be laid down, nor

¹ *sambahulā bhikkhū*, see above, **BD 2.8, n. 6.** ² *dvārakoṭṭhaka*, or the (store-)room over or by the gate.

should what has been laid down be abolished, but one should dwell in conformity with and according to the rules of training that have been laid down.”

Then monks heard: “They say it was allowed by the lord, saying: “Those monks who are jungle-dwellers, who are almsmen, who wear rag-robles may come up for the sake of seeing me, if they wish to.” These, longing for a sight of the lord, discarding their rugs,¹ took upon themselves the practice of jungle-dwellers, the practice of those who are almsmen, the practice of those who wear rag-robles.² Then the lord as he was engaged in touring the lodgings together with several monks,³ saw here and there discarded rugs, and seeing them, he addressed the monks, saying:

“How is it, monks, that there are these discarded rugs here and there?”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“On account of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training for monks based on ten grounds: for the excellence of the Order, for the comfort of the Order ...⁴ ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“When, (with the addition of part of) a rug, (a piece of) cloth

¹ See above, **BD 2.71, n. 4**. It is on this passage that Vin-a 687 says “their *santhata* (rugs) counting as a fourth robe.” Reference to a fourth robe, *catutthaka cīvara*, is made at Vism 65, to be worn principally apparently for the purpose of washing and dyeing the three usual robes, and as either an inner or an outer robe. ² These three *aṅgas* appear as *dhūtaguṇa* (together with that of *sapadānacārika*, continuous alms-begging) at **Vin 3.15 (= BD 1.26)**, and together with others at Vism 59ff. Cf. also **Vin 1.253, Vin 2.299** (with *tecīvarika*) and **Vin 2.32**. At AN iii.391 the three ways of living given above occur with *gāmantavihārī*, one who dwells in village-outskirts, *nemantanika*, the guest, and *gaha-paticīvaradhara*, the wearer of robes given by a householder. If any one of these does not behave suitably he is *ten’aṅgena gārayho*, blameworthy as to that attribute (which he has taken on himself)—*aṅga* being a technical term covering these various modes of scrupulous living. ³ See above, **BD 2.8, n. 6**. ⁴ = **Vin 3.21 (BD 1.37f.)**; AN i.98, AN i.100; AN v.70.

to sit upon¹ is being made for a monk, (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span² must be taken from all round an old rug in order to disfigure³ it. If a monk should have made (with the addition of part of) a rug, a new (piece of) cloth to sit upon without taking (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

A (piece of) cloth to sit upon means: it is so called if it has a border.⁴

A rug means: it is made “having spread,” not woven.⁵

Is being made means: making or causing to be made.

Old rug means: dressed in it once, put on once.⁶ (A piece) the breadth of the accepted span must be taken from all round in order to disfigure it means: cutting a circle or square so that it may become firm,⁷ it should be “spread” in one quarter or it should be “spread” having been unravelled.

If a monk ... without taking (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug means: if without having

¹ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2979.) ² *sugatavidatthī*, see **BD 1.253**. ³ *dubbaṇṇakaraṇāya*, occurring also below, **BD 2.407**, in **Bu-Pc 58**.

⁴ *sadasaṃ vuccati*. Cf. *Vin iv.123*, *Vin iv.171*. *Sadasa*=*sa*+*dasā*. At **Vin 2.301-307** we get the opposite (adjective), *adasaka*, again qualifying *nisīdana*, and where an unbordered, *adasaka*, *nisīdana* is not allowed (even if it is of the right size). At **Vin 4.170**, **Vin 4.171** the right size is prescribed for the *nisīdana*, a border is allowed, and it is said that this border should be a span; if these measurements are exceeded the *nisīdana* should be cut down (to the proper size) on acquisition. At the Council of Vesālī, **Vin 2.294ff.**, it is said that a piece of cloth to sit upon that has no border is not allowable, because a monk who had one of this nature would incur the *pācittiya* offence involving cutting down (i.e., **Bu-Pc 89**), **Vin 2.307**. All the ten matters, *vatthu*, whose allowability is being questioned at the Council are explained, see **Vin 2.300f.**, except this one and the one concerning gold and silver (**Bu-NP 18**). ⁵ Cf. above, **BD 2.72**, **BD 2.75**, **BD 2.77**. ⁶ = definition of soiled, or old, robe, above, **BD 2.32**. Thus the words used are those which usually refer to the putting on of the set of three robes: *nivattha* and *pāruta*. Buddhaghosa at *Vin-a 687*, in explaining their meaning in the above passage, defines them as *nisinna* and *nipanna* respectively, sat on and lain on. See **BD 2, Introduction, p.xxiv**. ⁷ *thirabhāvāya*.

taken (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug, he makes or has made, (with the addition of part of) a rug, a new (piece of) cloth to sit upon, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action; it should be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to ... an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this (piece of) cloth to sit upon having been made (with the addition of part of) a rug, (but) without having taken (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back to the venerable one.'

BD 2.8

If what was incompletely executed by himself he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture ... (See **Bu-NP 11.2.2**) ... if he makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if he makes it having taken (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug; if, failing to get it, he makes it having taken a smaller (piece)¹; if, failing to get it, he makes it not having taken (any portion)²; if acquiring what was made for another, he makes use of it; if he makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat³; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

Vin 3.2

¹ *alabhanto thokataram ādiyitvā karoti*. Buddhaghosa is silent. ² *alabhanto anādiyitvā karoti*. ³ Cf. above, **BD 2.73**, **BD 2.75**, **BD 2.78**, **BD 2.82**; and **Vin 4.171ff.**

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 16

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time as a certain monk was in the country of the Kosalas¹ going to Sāvattthī, (some) sheep's wool² accrued³ (to him) on the way. Then that monk went along tying up that sheep's wool into a bundle with his upper robe.⁴ People, seeing this monk, made fun of him, saying: "For how much have you bought (it), honoured sir, how great will the profit become?"

This monk, being made fun of by these people, became ashamed.⁵ Then that monk, going to Sāvattthī, threw down⁶ the sheep's wool even as he was standing.⁷ Monks said to this monk: "Why do you, your reverence, throw down this sheep's wool even as you are standing?"

"Because I, your reverences, was made fun of by (some) people on account of this sheep's wool."

"But from how far have you, your reverence, conveyed this sheep's wool?"

"For more than three *yojanas*,⁸ your reverences," he said. Then those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can

¹ Sāvattthī was the capital of the Kosala country. ² *eḷakalomāni*. ³ *uppajjimsu*; *uppajjati* is usually "arises, is produced, is born"; cf. above, **BD 2.4**, **BD 2.24**, below, **BD 2.99**, **BD 2.153**. ⁴ Cf. above, **BD 2.37**. ⁵ *mañku*, literally staggered or shocked. See AN v.5. ⁶ *āsumbhi*. ⁷ *ṭhitako 'va*. Vin-a 687 says, "as men bringing a large burden of wood from the jungle, being weary, let it drop (*pātentī*) even as they are standing (*ṭhitakā 'va*), so he let it drop." ⁸ See RHYS DAVIDS, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p.16, for "Tabulated Statement of Passages on the length of the *Yojana*." His tentative conclusion is that in fifth-century Pali literature the *yojana* means between seven and eight miles. CHILDERS reckoned twelve miles to a *yojana*. See also E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha as Legend and History*, 1927, p.17. An ascending scale of measures of length is given at Vb-a 343.

this monk convey sheep's wool for more than three *yojanas*?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, conveyed sheep's wool for more than three *yojanas*?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, convey sheep's wool for more than three *yojanas*? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"Sheep's wool may accrue to a monk as he is going along a road. It may be accepted by that monk, if he likes; but having accepted it, it should be conveyed in his (own) hands for three *yojanas* at the utmost, if there are no carriers. If he should convey it further than that, even if there are no carriers, there is an offence of ex-piation involving forfeiture."

Vin 3.2

To a monk as he is going along a road means: as he is going on a roadway.¹

Bu-NP

Sheep's wool may accrue means: it may accrue from the Order or from a group or from a relation or from a friend or as rag-robbs or by means of his own property.²

If he likes means: if he wishes.

It may be accepted ... but having accepted it, it should be conveyed in his (own) hands for three *yojanas* at the utmost means: it should be conveyed in his (own) hands for three *yojanas* at the maximum.

If there are no carriers means: if there is no one who is a carrier, neither a woman nor a man, nor a householder nor one who has gone forth.

If he should convey it further than that, even if there are no carriers means: if he makes the first foot go beyond three *yojanas*, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes the second foot go

¹ *pantha*. ² Cf. above, **BD 2.27**.

beyond, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If standing within three *yojanas* he lets it drop beyond the three *yojanas*, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes it go beyond three *yojanas*, placing it in a vehicle or a bundle of another (person) without (his) knowing it, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited ... to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this sheep's wool, made by me to go beyond three *yojanas*, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this sheep's wool to the venerable one.'

If he makes it go beyond more than three *yojanas* thinking them to be more, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, being in doubt, he makes it go beyond more than three *yojanas*, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes it go beyond more than three *yojanas* thinking them to be less, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is less than three *yojanas* when it is more, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than three *yojanas*, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is less than three *yojanas* when it is less, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he conveys it for three *yojanas*; if he conveys it for less than three *yojanas*; if he conveys it for three *yojanas* and conveys it back; if desiring a habitation, going three *yojanas*, he conveys it beyond that¹; if he conveys something stolen that he has got back²; if he conveys something destroyed that he has got back; if

¹ Vin-a 688 says, "going where he is unable to receive the recitation and interrogation (of the Pātimokkha) or necessities and so on, he goes elsewhere beyond that. Elsewhere beyond that means, there is no offence in so conveying it for a hundred *yojanas*." ² Vin-a 688, "thieves stealing it (from him), knowing its uselessness give it back." This means that thieves took his sheep's wool when he had done perhaps two and a half *yojanas*; he retraces his steps and they return him the wool as it is of no value for them; he goes a *yojana* in order to reach his *vihāra*. Thus he would have done three and a half *yojanas*, but the part of the journey due to the robbing incident does not count.

he makes another convey goods tied up in a bundle¹; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *katabhaṇḍa*; cf. below, **BD 2.98**. Vin-a 689 says “goods tied up (*katam bhaṇḍam*) in a blanket, fleecy cover, sheet and so on, anything even if it is tied up only with a thread.”

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 17

... among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery.¹ At that time the group of six monks had sheep's wool washed and dyed and combed by nuns. The nuns, through washing, dyeing, combing the sheep's wool, neglected² the exposition, the interrogation, the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher insight.³ Then Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid approached the lord, and having approached, greeting the lord, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, the lord spoke thus to Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid:

“Gotami, I hope that the nuns are zealous, ardent, (with) a self

¹ Besides the Nigrodhārāma at Kapilavatthu, there was another at Rājagaha, mentioned, e.g., at DN ii.116. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* says that the one at Kapilavatthu was given to the Order by a Sakyan named Nigrodha. If the evidence for this were stronger, it would have been translated “Nigrodha’s monastery.” ² Cf. Vin 1.190, where these same five items are again connected with *riñcati*, to neglect.

³ *adhisīla*, *adhicitta*, *adhipañña*, given at DN iii.219 as the “three trainings.” The descriptions given at AN i.235 and of *adhicittam-anuyutta* at AN i.254ff. to my mind make it quite clear that *adhi-* points to the higher states of morality, thought and insight, and therefore should not be translated, as would also be possible, by “as to” morality, etc. E.M. HARE, at GS 3.310, translates “further virtue, further thought, further insight.” Moreover the exposition and the interrogation were not “as to” morality, thought and insight. The exposition (*uddesa*) was the recital of the Pātimokkha rules, and the interrogation (*paripuccha*) was the asking of all present at the fortnightly recitals if they had seen, heard or suspected any offence.

that is striving?”¹

“Whence, lord, is there zeal in the nuns? The masters, the group of six monks, have sheep’s wool washed and dyed and combed by nuns. The nuns ... neglect the exposition, the interrogation, the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher insight.”

Then the lord ... gladdened Mahāpajāpati the Gotamid with *dhamma* talk. Then Mahāpajāpati the Gotamid ... gladdened by the lord with *dhamma* talk, greeting the lord, departed keeping her right side towards him. Then the lord, in this connection, on this occasion, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the group of six monks:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, had sheep’s wool washed and dyed and combed by nuns?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

“Were they relations of yours, monks, or not relations?”

“They were not relations, lord,” they said.

“Foolish men, those who are not relations do not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is pleasant or what is unpleasant to those who are not relations. Thus you, foolish men, will have sheep’s wool washed and dyed and combed by nuns who are not relations? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should have sheep’s wool washed or dyed or combed by a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”²

Whatever³ means: he who ...

¹ *pahitatta*. I take this translation from MRS. RHYS DAVIDS’S *The Birth of Indian Psychology and its Development in Buddhism*, p. 347, “the self bedriven”; p. 350, “the man who is *pahittatto*, he who has the self that has striven.” The commentarial exegesis is usually, if not always, *pesitatta*, the self expunged, an exegesis in line with the editors’ desire for cessation and waning of the individual self. They were wrongly, though possibly deliberately, deriving *pahitatta* from *pahiṇati*, to send, instead of from *padahati*, to strive. ² Cf. Bu-NP 4, which is referred to under the name of *purāṇa-cīvarasikkhāpada* at Vin-a 689. ³ From here to end of this *Nissaggiya*, cf. Bu-NP 4.2.2.

Monk means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

(A nun) who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Wash means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrongdoing. If washed, it is to be forfeited.¹

Dye means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrongdoing. If dyed, it is to be forfeited.

Comb means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrongdoing. If combed it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited ... to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this sheep's wool, caused by me to be washed by a nun who is not a relation, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this sheep's wool to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her comb sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye, makes her comb sheep's wool, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her comb sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence

¹ In the plural, since animals' hair or wool, *lomāni*, is thought of as a plural in Pali.

involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her wash sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her comb, makes her wash sheep's wool, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb, makes her wash sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb, makes her dye sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb, makes her wash, makes her dye sheep's wool, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he is in doubt as to whether a woman is not a relation ... If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is not a relation ... If he makes her wash another's sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes a woman who has been ordained by one (Order only) wash it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a woman is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence.

There is no offence if a female relation is washing it when a woman assistant who is not a relation is (helping); if she washes it unasked; if he makes her wash unused goods tied up in a bundle¹;

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.93**, on *katabhaṇḍa*.

if it is (washed) by a female probationer, by a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.34**.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 18

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time the venerable Upananda,¹ the son of the Sakyans, was dependent as a regular diner on a certain family in Rājagaha. When solid food or soft food came to² that family, a portion from that was set aside for the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. Now at that time meat came one evening to that family, a portion from that was set aside for the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. A young boy belonging to that family, getting up in the night towards morning, cried: "Give me meat." Then the man spoke thus to his wife:

"Give the boy the master's portion, having got another (portion) in exchange, we will give that to the master."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, dressing in the morning and taking his bowl and robe, approached the family, and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. Then that man approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans; having approached, having greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting at a respectful distance, that man spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"Yesterday evening, honoured sir, (some) meat came, a portion from that was set aside for the master. This young boy, honoured sir, got up in the night towards morning and cried: 'Give me meat,' and the master's portion was given to the boy. What could you get with a

¹ See above, **BD 2.42**, below, **BD 2.109**. ² *uppajjati*, cf. above, **BD 2.4**, **BD 2.24**, **BD 2.90**, below, **BD 2.153**.

kahāpaṇa,¹ honoured sir?”

“(The use of) *kahāpaṇas* is given up by me, sir,” he said.

“Yes, honoured sir, it is given up.”

“Nevertheless give me a *kahāpaṇa*, sir,” he said. Then that man having given the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, a *kahāpaṇa*, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“As we accept gold and silver,² so do these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, accept gold and silver.”

Monks heard that man who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, accept gold and silver?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, accepted gold and silver?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, accept gold and silver?”

It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should take gold and silver,³ or should get another to take it (for him), or should consent to its being kept in deposit⁴ (for him), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

¹ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2974.) ² (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2975.) ³ *jātarūparajata*. Cf. next note above. At Vin 1.245 the lord is recorded to say, “I do not say, monks, that in any way may gold and silver be consented to, may be looked about for.” The Cūḷavagga, in the account of the Council of Vesālī, Vin 2.294ff., includes the acceptance of gold and silver (*jātarūparajata*) by monks as the last of the ten matters questioned, but ruled not to be permissible. At DN i.5 an ordinary man might say of Gotama that he is one who refrains from accepting *jātarūparajata*. ⁴ *upanikkhattaṃ vā sādhiyeyya*. See RHYS DAVIDS, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p. 7, and *Vinaya Texts* i.26, n. 4.

Gold¹ means: it is called the colour of the teacher.²

Silver³ means: the *kahāpaṇa*,⁴ the *masaka*⁵ of copper,⁶ the *māsaka* of wood,⁷ the *māsaka* of lac,⁸ used in business.⁹

Should take means: if he himself takes, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Should get another to take it (for him) means: if he causes another to take it, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Should consent to its being kept in deposit means: if he says: ‘Let this come to be for the master,’ or consents to its being kept in deposit, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited in the midst of the Order. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: ‘I, honoured sirs, accepted gold and silver,¹⁰ this is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.’¹¹ Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed.

¹ *jātarūpa*. ² *satthuvaṇṇa*. ³ *rajata*. ⁴ See **BD 1.28, n. 1**; **BD 1.71, n. 2**; and above, **BD 2.100, n. 1**. ⁵ See **BD 1.71, n. 2**, and **BD 1.72**. ⁶ *lohamāsaka*. Vin-a 689 says that it is a *māsaka* (bean) made up of copper and bronze (*tamba*), etc. ⁷ *dārumāsaka*. Vin-a 689 says that this is a *māsaka* made up of strong, durable wood, or of a piece of bamboo, or even of palm leaves, cutting a figure or engraving into it (*rūpaṃ chinditvā*). ⁸ *jatumāsaka*. Vin-a 690 says that this is a *māsaka* made with lac or with resin, on to which a figure has been embossed or introduced (literally caused to be raised up *samuṭṭhāpetvā*).

It is interesting to note the present-day usage in force in some parts of Tibet: J. HANBURY-TRACY, *Black River of Tibet*, p.73, “a collection of shells, short lengths of polished wood with curious markings, bean-pods and round discs. These were the tallies used in tax-collecting.” And **BD 2.74**, “in some parts of Tibet lumps of silver, in the shape of ponies’ hooves, are used for money.” ⁹ *ye vohāraṃ gacchanti*. Vin-a 690 says that in all districts where there is business every kind is included, even if made of bone, of hide, of fruit, of seeds of trees, or whether a figure has been raised up on it or not. This passage goes on to say that the things which involve forfeiture are silver, gold, a gold *māsaka*, a silver *māsaka*; the things that involve an offence of wrong-doing are pearls and other gems, the seven sorts of grain, slaves, fields, flower-parks and orchards; the things that are allowable include thread, a plough-share, cloth, cotton, cooked pulses, and oil, ghee, butter, honey, molasses as medicine. ¹⁰ *rūpiya*. ¹¹ Vin-a 691 points out that as *rūpiya* is not legally allowed (*akappiya*), neither a group nor an individual may possess it, but only the Order. Therefore it can only be forfeited to the Order.

The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk. If an attendant of a monastery or a lay-follower comes there, he should be told: 'Sir, find out about this.' If he says: 'What could be got with this?' he should not be told: 'Bring this or that'; oil or ghee or honey or molasses may be mentioned as allowable. If he brings what is allowable, having got it in exchange for this, it may be made use of by all except the one who accepted the gold and silver. If he can undertake to do this in this way,¹ it is well. But if he cannot undertake to do it, he should be told: 'Sir, remove this.'² If he removes it, it is well. But if he does not remove it, a monk endowed with five qualities³ should be agreed upon as silver-remover⁴: 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,⁵ and one who would know what is removed and what is not removed. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon: First, the monk is to be requested. Having been requested, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon the monk so and so as silver-remover. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order agrees upon the monk so and so as silver-remover. If it is pleasing to the venerable ones to agree upon the monk so and so as silver-remover, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. The monk

¹ *evaṃ ce taṃ labhetha*—i.e., to procure what is allowable. This comprises the four medicines (oil, ghee, etc.) mentioned above. Note that the fifth medicine, butter, is absent here. ² *imaṃ chaḍḍehi*. If he cannot go and exchange the *rūpiya* for something allowable, the *rūpiya* should be removed, since it is not allowable. ³ *Pañcaḥ aṅgehi samannāgato*. Here the qualities are as follows in the text. Another group of qualities are detailed at AN i.162 = SN i.99; these are the constituents of morality, of concentration, of wisdom, of freedom, of freedom by knowledge and insight that are possessed by the adept (*asekha*)—i.e., the arahān. Cf. below, BD 2.122. ⁴ *rūpiya-chaḍḍaka*. I think that to translate this term as "bullion-remover," as at *Vinaya Texts* i.26, n. 4, gives a false notion of the extent of any largesse that a monk might have received. Cf. Thag 620 *pupphacchaddaka*, a scavenger of flowers, and Vin 4.6, where this is given as one of the low types of work. ⁵ These are the four *agatis*, see

so and so is agreed upon by the Order as silver-remover, and it is right ... Thus do I understand this.’ It is to be removed by the monk agreed upon making no sign.¹ If, making a sign, he lets it drop, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is gold and silver, (and) accepts gold and silver, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is gold and silver, (and) accepts gold and silver, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is gold and silver, (and) accepts gold and silver, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, taking² it or causing (another, to take it within a monastery or within a house,³ he lays it aside, thinking, ‘It will be for him who will take it’⁴; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ The silver-remover must avoid drawing attention to the place where he throws down the rūpiya. ² *uggahetvā*. ³ *ajjha-āvasatha*. At **Vin 4.69ff.** *āvasatha* is a “public rest-house.” But cf. *ajjhāvasati*, to inhabit, to dwell in a house, above, **BD 2.47, n. 5**. ⁴ *yassa bhavissati so harissati*. Probably a monk, whether accepting rūpiya from a lay-person visiting a monastery, or from a lay person whose house he is visiting, should lay it aside at once, so that either the owner may take it again, or someone else may pick it up. Cf. **Vin 4.162ff.** in reference to a jewel—not given to a monk but picked up by a monk. At all events, in laying it aside, the monk’s responsibility ceases, and he cannot be accused of committing an offence. To be allowed to accept rūpiya at all must be attributed to the courtesy that the monks must display towards the laity: by accepting gifts they confer a boon upon the donors. In view of the *anāpatti* (no offence) clause, the *sikkhāpada* (rule) clause even more strongly suggests not that a monk must not take or cause rūpiya to be taken at all, but that he must not take it or cause it to be taken for him with a view to keeping and using it or putting it by in deposit.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 19

19.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
2.106 at that time the group of six monks engaged in¹ various transactions
in which gold and silver was used.² People ... spread it about saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used, like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, engaged in various transactions in which gold and silver is used?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “How can you, foolish men, engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

19.2.1 ¹ *samāpajjati*, or “came into,” see **BD 1.2.01, n. 3.** ² *rūpiya-samvohāra*, which Vin-a 696 explains as *jātarūparajata-panvattana*, (involving) the exchange of gold and silver. On *rūpiya*, *jātarūpa* and *rajata*, see above, **BD 2.100, n. 2.**

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Various means: shaped¹ and unshaped and (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped.

Shaped means: intended (as an ornament) for the head, intended (as an ornament) for the neck, intended (as an ornament) for the hand, intended (as an ornament) for the foot, intended (as an ornament) for the hips.

Unshaped means: it is called shaped in a mass.²

(Partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped means: both of these.

Gold and silver³ means: what is the colour of the teacher,⁴ the *kahāpaṇa*, the *māsaka* of copper, the *māsaka* of wood, the *māsaka* of lac, used in business.⁵

Should engage in means: if he gets shaped in exchange for shaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets unshaped in exchange for shaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped in exchange for shaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets shaped in exchange for unshaped ... If he gets unshaped in exchange for unshaped ... If he gets (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped in exchange for unshaped ... If he gets shaped in exchange for (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped ... If he gets unshaped in exchange for (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped ... If he gets (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped in exchange for (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped ... If he gets (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped in exchange for (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. It is to be forfeited in the midst of the Order. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs, engaged in various trans-

¹ *kata*. This means made up into some definite object, an earring or another ornament, for instance, as opposed to *akata*, unshaped—i.e., still a *ghana*, a (shapeless) mass. ² *ghanakata*. ³ *rūpiya*. ⁴ *satthuvaṇṇa*, see above, **BD 2.100, n. 2**. ⁵ This definition of *rūpiya* covers those of *jātarūpa* and *rajata* at **Vin 3.238**, thus giving the impression that *rūpiya* is a generic term for *jātarūpa* and *rajata*. See above, **BD 2.100, n. 2**.

actions in which gold and silver are used; this is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk. If an attendant of a monastery or a lay-follower comes there ... (See **Bu-NP 18.2**; *instead of*: except by the one who accepted gold and silver ... and accepts gold and silver *read*: except by the one who got gold and silver in exchange ... and gets gold and silver in exchange) ... If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, (and) gets gold and silver in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not gold and silver, (and) gets gold and silver in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, (and) gets gold and silver in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

¹ This is the only *anāpatti* paragraph in the thirty *Nissaggiyas* where nothing more than these two invariable exemptions are given.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 20

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at the time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, came to be skilled¹ in robe-making. He, making an outer cloak of cloth rags,² making it well-dyed, well-worked, clothed himself in it. Then a certain wandering student,³ having clothed himself in a costly cloth,⁴ approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he said:

“Your reverence, this outer cloak of yours is beautiful, give it to me for (this) cloth.”

“Find out about it,⁵ your reverence,” he said.

“Yes, your reverence, I know (about it).”

“Very well, then, your reverence,” he said and gave (it to him).

Then that wandering student, clothing himself in that outer cloak, went to the wandering students' monastery.⁶ The wandering stu-

¹ *paṭṭho*, to be read throughout as *paddha*, also said of Upananda at [Vin 3.210](#), of Udāyīn at [Vin 4.60](#). See [Vin-a 665](#). ² *paṭa-pilotikā*, cf. [SN ii.219](#). ³ *paribbājaka*, a wanderer, wandering student, wandering teacher. See RHYSDAVIDS, *Buddhist India*, pp.141ff.; B.M. BARUA, *Pre-Buddhist Indian Philosophy*, p.192, and *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ⁴ *paṭa*, or cloak or garment. ⁵ *jānāhi*. I think that the point of this injunction must be that when the wandering student wished to exchange the garments again (see just below), Upananda refused to do so because he was not going to be “taken in,” and get back the outer cloak which he had managed to barter with the student. For, according to Buddhaghosa ([Vin-a 699](#)), his outer cloak was *dubbala* (worn). ⁶ Special places were given for the accommodation of the wanderers, where they could meet with one another and enter into discussions during their travels. Also, like the Sakyaputtiyas, they did not go on tour during the three months of the rains.

dents spoke thus to this wandering student: “This outer cloak of yours is beautiful, your reverence. Where did you get it?”

“It was in exchange for my cloth, your reverences.”

“But, your reverence, this outer cloak will do¹ for you for some time (only). That cloth was better for you.”

Then that wandering student, thinking: “What the wandering students said is true. This outer cloak will do for me for some time (only). That cloth was better for me,” approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached he spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans: “Your reverence, here is your outer cloak, give the cloth to me.”

“But, your reverence, did I not say to you, ‘Find out about it’? I will not give it,” he said.

Then that wandering student ... spread it about, saying: “Even householders give back to a householder if he regrets²; but why will one who has gone forth not give back to one who has gone forth?”

Monks heard that wandering student who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, engage in bartering³ together with a wandering student?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, engaged in bartering together with a wandering student?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, engage in bartering together with a wandering student? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should engage in various kinds of bartering,

¹ *bhavissati*. ² *vippaṭṭisāri*. Here it means if he regrets what he has bartered and wants it back again. ³ *kayavikkaya*, or “buying and selling.” *Cetāpeti*, to get in exchange, and *parivatteti*, to exchange or barter (cf. above, **BD 2.60**, **BD 2.67**, where the one is defined by the other), also imply a bartering. Here there was no buying and selling, only an exchange of articles.

there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”¹

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Various means: the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicine for the sick, and even a lump of chunam and a toothpick and unwoven thread.²

Should engage in ... bartering means: if he transgresses,³ saying: ‘Give this for that, take this for that, barter this for that, get this in exchange for that,’⁴ there is an offence of wrong-doing. Inasmuch as it is bartered—one’s own goods gone to the hands of another, another’s goods gone to one’s own hands—it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited ... to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘I, honoured sirs, engaged in various kinds of bartering; this is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ... ‘... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back (these goods) to the venerable one.’

If he thinks that it is bartering when it is bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.⁵ If he is in doubt as to whether it is bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not bartering when it is bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is bartering when it is not bartering, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not bartering, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not bartering when it is not bartering, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he asks the value, points it out to one who

¹ At DN 1.5 it is said that an ordinary man might say of Gotama, in speaking praise of him, that he refrains from *kayavikkaya*, bartering. ² = below, BD 2.161 = Vin 4.154 in definition of *lābho*. The last three items occur again below, BD 2.149. ³ *ajjhācarati*; cf. BD 1.202, n. 3. ⁴ Cf. below, BD 2.135. ⁵ There must, I think, be a clause omitted: ‘and engages in bartering.’ Otherwise there is no sense in the offence.

makes it legally allowable,¹ saying: ‘This is ours, and we want this and that’; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Second Division: that on Silk

THIS IS ITS KEY

Two portions on silk and pure, for six years, a rug,
And two on (sheep’s) wool, on taking, both the various kinds.²

¹ A *kappiyakāraka* makes a thing allowable by giving it. Vin-a 701, “saying, ‘my utensils are valuable, give your bowl to another.’” ² I.e., *rūpiyasamvohāra* (Bu-NP 19), and *kayavikkaya* (Bu-NP 20). In the former there was not bartering, but payment in some kind of medium of exchange; in the latter there was exchange and barter, giving and taking.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 21

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks made a hoard of many bowls.¹ People, engaged in touring the dwelling-place² and seeing (this hoard), looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, make a hoard of many bowls? Will these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, do a trade in bowls or will they set up an earthenware shop?³” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks keep an extra bowl?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, keep an extra bowl?”

“It is true, lord.” The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, keep an extra bowl? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should keep an extra bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

¹ Cf. Vin 4.243. ² *vihāra*. The laity visited the special *vihāras* which they themselves supported. This form of interest in the Order's well-being must have given an added reason for visiting *vihāras*, like our own way of visiting some charitable or other institution in which we are interested. ³ Cf. above, BD 2.50.

Now at that time¹ an extra bowl had accrued to² the venerable Ānanda, and the venerable Ānanda became desirous of giving this bowl to the venerable Sāriputta; but the venerable Sāriputta was staying at Sāketa. Then it occurred to the venerable Ānanda: “A rule of training laid down by the lord is that an extra bowl should not be kept. And this extra bowl has accrued to me, and I am desirous of giving this bowl to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable Sāriputta is staying at Sāketa. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

“But, how long, Ānanda, before Sāriputta will come (here)?”

“On the ninth or tenth day, lord,” he said.

Then the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to keep an extra bowl for at most ten days. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**An extra bowl may be kept for at most ten days. For him who exceeds that (period), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.**”³

For at most ten days means: it may be kept for ten days at the maximum.⁴

An extra bowl means: one that is not allotted, not assigned.⁵

A bowl⁶ means: there are two kinds of bowls: an iron bowl, a clay bowl.⁷ There are three sizes⁸ for a bowl: a large bowl, a medium-sized

¹ Cf. **Bu-NP 1**, where the same story is told in the same words about keeping an extra robe. See above, **BD 2.4**. ² *uppanno hoti*. ³ At **Vin 4.243** the rule is that a hoard of bowls should not be made. There the group of six nuns, as here the group of six monks, are recorded to have made a hoard. There seems some discrepancy between a hoard and an extra bowl. The rule in this **Bu-NP 21** may have been altered from “a hoard” to “an extra bowl” to balance that against wearing an extra robe, **Bu-NP 1**. ⁴ Cf. above, **BD 2.6**. ⁵ = definition of “extra robe” at **BD 2.7** above, and of *sannicayaṃ kareyya* at **Vin 4.244**. ⁶ This definition of *patta* = **Vin 4.123**, **Vin 4.243**. ⁷ At **Vin 2.112** these two kinds of bowls are “allowed” (*anuñāmi*). Whoever uses a wooden bowl, a golden or a silver one or one of eight other kinds mentioned there, commits a *dukkata* offence. ⁸ *vaṇṇā ti pamāṇāni*, **Vin-a 702**.

bowl, a small¹ bowl. A large bowl means that it takes half an *āl̥haka* measure² of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry.³ A medium-sized bowl means that it takes a *nāl̥ika* measure of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry. A small bowl means that it takes a *pattha* measure of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry. (A bowl) greater than that⁴ is not a bowl, (a bowl) smaller (than that) is not a bowl.

For him who exceeds (that period), there is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited on the eleventh day at sunrise. It should be forfeited to ... an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: ‘Honoured sirs, this bowl is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the Order.’ Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk; the bowl forfeited should be given (back with the words): ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This bowl of the monk so and so, which had to be forfeited, is forfeited (by him) to the Order. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should give back this bowl to the monk so and so.’

¹ *omaka*, inferior, insignificant. RHYS DAVIDS, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p.19, calls these “high, middle and low bowls.” ² For these measures, *āl̥haka*, *nāl̥ika* and *pattha*, see RHYS DAVIDS, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, pp.18–20, and BD 1.12, n. 2; BD 1.103, n. 1. ³ *tadupiya vyañjana*. On *tadupiya* see TRENCKNER, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1908, p.131ff., *Commentary on Mil* 9. He says it is “perhaps properly a Vinaya word.” But it occurs, as he mentions, at SN iii.146, *tadupiyañca sūpeyyam*, translated KS iii.124 “broth for seasoning thereto.” At MN ii.54 we get the same phrase, translated *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 2.28 “with curry-stuffs to match.” MN-a 3.287 explains it as *tadanurūpa-telaphānitadīni*, while Vin-a 703 says: *tassa odanassa anurūpaṃ maccha-maṃsa-saka-phala-kaḷirādi byañjanam*, curry of fish, meat, vegetables, fruits, bamboo-tips suitable to this boiled rice. At Ja 2.160 there is the expression *na ca pañña tadupikā*, which is explained to mean, ‘But your wisdom does not match (*tadupikā*), does not correspond to (*anucchavikā*) your body’ (which was large). ⁴ *tato ukkaṭṭho apatto, omako apatto*. On *apattaka*, see below, BD 2.123.

That monk, approaching two or three monks ... (See Bu-NP 1.3–Bu-NP 1.4) ... ‘... I will give back this bowl to the venerable one.’ ...

... If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is broken¹ when it is not broken, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the bowl which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the ten days have elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether the ten days have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the ten days have not elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is no offence.

There is no offence if within ten days it is allotted, assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, broken, if they tear it from him, if they take it on trust; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.²

^{21.4.1} Then the group of six monks did not give back a bowl that had
^{2.117} been forfeited. They told this matter to the lord. He said: “Monks, a bowl that has been forfeited is not not to be given back. Whosoever should not give it back, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”³

¹ In Bu-NP 1, Bu-NP 2, Bu-NP 3, Bu-NP 28 we get “burnt,” of a robe. ² Cf. Bu-NP 1, Bu-NP 2, Bu-NP 3, Bu-NP 28 (“burnt”), and Vin 4.245 (“broken”). ³ See Bu-NP 1, where a similar story is told of a robe that had been forfeited; and Vin 4.245, again a bowl.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (*NISSAGGIYA*) 22

... among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery.¹ Now at that time monks were invited by a certain potter who said: "If these masters need a bowl, I (can supply them) with a bowl."² Now at that time monks, not knowing moderation, asked for many bowls. They asked for large bowls for those who had small bowls, they asked for small bowls for those who had large bowls. Then that potter, making many bowls for the monks, could not make other goods for sale,³ and he could not keep himself going and his wife and children suffered. People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls? This (man), making many bowls for these (monks), is not able to make other goods for sale, and he cannot keep himself going and his wife and children suffer."

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can these monks, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls? Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Monks, is it true, as is said, that monks, not knowing moderation, asked for many bowls?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not

¹ See above, **BD 2.94**. ² *yesam ayyānaṃ pattaṇa attho ahaṃ pattaṇā ti*. For rest of this par. cf. **Bu-Pc 86**. ³ *vikkāyikaṃ*, or "for giving away"—i.e., in exchange or barter; see above, **BD 2.110**. Cf. **Ja 1.201**.

(yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a bowl is not to be asked for. Whoever should ask (for one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”¹

Now at that time a certain monk’s bowl became broken.² Then it occurred to that monk: “Asking for a bowl is forbidden by the lord,” and being scrupulous; he did not ask (for one); he went about for alms-food (to be put) into his hands.³ People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, go about for alms-food (to be put) into their hands, like followers of other sects?”⁴ Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow you, monks, when a bowl is destroyed or when a bowl is broken, to ask for a bowl.”

Now at that time the group of six monks said: “It is allowed by the lord to ask for a bowl when a bowl is destroyed or when a bowl is broken”; and these, because (their bowls) were a little broken and a little chipped⁵ and a little scratched,⁶ asked for many bowls. Then

¹ Note that Gotama is not here laying down a *nissaggiya pācittiya*, but a *dukkha*, rule. Because of it a monk, following the injunction scrupulously, arouses the criticism of the laity, and an “allowance,” an *anujānāmi*, is given (in **Bu-NP 22.1.2**). Then the group of six monks transgress the allowance; this leads to the formulation of the *nissaggiya pācittiya* (in **Bu-NP 22.1.3**).

² Examples of ways in which bowls got broken given at **Vin 2.113f**. ³ *hatthesu piṇḍaya carati*. See **Vin 1.90**, where this expression occurs again, and again people complain that those ordained as monks are like *titthiyas*. Cf. also **Vin 2.114**, *tumbakaṭāhe piṇḍaya caranti*, they went for alms-food (to be put) into a gourd; and **Vin 2.115**, *ghaṭikaṭāhe*, into a water-pot (or skull).

⁴ This wish to differentiate between *Sakya*puttiyas and *titthiyas* shows the interest taken by lay people in the former, according to the texts, and a certain desire that their behaviour should be suitable. Monks were not to ape householders on the one hand—e.g., above, **BD 2.74**, **BD 2.106**; now and at **Vin 1.90**, **Vin 2.114**, **Vin 2.115**, they are not to look like *titthiyas*. ⁵ *appamattakena khaṇḍena*. ⁶ *vilikhitamattena*.

that potter, making many bowls, as before,¹ for the monks, was not able to make other goods for sale, and he did not keep himself going and his wife and children suffered. As before, people ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls? This (man) making many bowls for these (monks), is not able to make other goods for sale, and he does not keep himself going and his wife and children suffer.” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks, when their bowls are a little broken and a little chipped and a little scratched, ask for many bowls?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, when your bowls were a little broken ... asked for many bowls?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, when your bowls are a little broken ... ask for many bowls? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not yet pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

**“Whatever monk should get another new bowl in exchange for a bowl mended² in less than five places, there is an offence of ex-
piation involving forfeiture. That bowl is to be forfeited by that
monk to the company of monks, and whatever is the last bowl³
belonging to that company of monks, that should be given to this
monk with the words: ‘Monk, this is a bowl for you; it should be
kept until it breaks.’⁴ That is the proper course in this case.”**

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

¹ *tath’ eva*, “in that very way,” thus “as before.” ² *bandhanena*, from *bandhati*, to tie together, to unite; and not from *bhinda*, to break, as appears to have been thought at *Vinaya Texts* i.27. *Critical Pali Dictionary* says, “without bands, esp. not riveted (said of alms-bowls).” ³ *pattapariyanta*. *Vin-a* 708 says, “the bowl that remains at the end (*pariyante*) after this handing over.” ⁴ *bhedanāya*, √*bhid*. Cf. phrase *kāyassa bhedā*, on the breaking up of the body.

A bowl mended in less than five places means: it is not mended, or it is mended in one (place), or it is mended in two (places), or it is mended in three (places), or it is mended in four (places). A bowl with no room for mends means: its rim is not two finger-lengths¹ (in breadth). A bowl with room for mends means: its rim is two finger-lengths (in breadth).

New bowl means: it is so called with reference to the asking for (it).²

Should get in exchange means: he asks for (it). There is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited in the midst of the Order. All should come together taking each the bowl in his keeping.³ An inferior bowl should not be in his keeping if he hopes, 'I shall receive a costly bowl.' If an inferior bowl is in his keeping, and he hopes, 'I shall receive a costly bowl,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited. That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should say: 'Honoured sirs, this bowl, got in exchange by me for a bowl mended in less than five places, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk. A monk endowed with five qualities should be agreed upon as

¹ *dvaṅgulā*, as at [Vin 2.294](#), Thig.60. Vin-a 708, commenting upon *dvaṅgulā rāji na hoti*, says that there is not a rim measuring two finger-lengths below the upper circumference. Cf. Vb-a 343, *sattadhaññamāsappamaṇaṃ ekam angulaṃ*. ² Cf. above, [BD 2.77](#), for definition of "new *santhata*." ³ *adhitt̥hita-patta*. *Adhitt̥hita*, from *adhitt̥thati* (or *adhitt̥thahati* or *adhitt̥theti*). This variety of spelling is paralleled by variety of meaning. *Critical Pali Dictionary*, referring to the above passage, says that *adhitt̥hitapatta* is "the obligatory alms-bowl." *Adhitt̥hita*, besides meaning "allotted," as hitherto rendered, also means "taken in use, taken in possession." "Allotted bowl" would not be right here, since the "assigner of bowls" is yet to be agreed upon or appointed, which occurs just below. And he is appointed precisely to remedy any tendency of monks to carry an inferior bowl to the meeting of the Order, as though it were his usual one, hoping to get a costly one in its place.

assigner of bowls¹: 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,² and one who would know what is taken and what is not taken. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon. First, the monk is to be requested. Having been requested, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon the monk so and so as assigner of bowls. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order agrees upon the monk so and so as assigner of bowls. If it is pleasing to the venerable ones to agree upon the monk so and so as assigner of bowls, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. The monk so and so is agreed upon by the Order as assigner of bowls, and it is right ... So do I understand.’ The monk agreed upon should make the bowl pass. He should say to an elder³: ‘Honoured sir, let the elder take the bowl.’⁴ If the elder takes it, the elder’s bowl should be passed to a second.⁵ He should not take it out of regard⁶ for him.⁷ For whoever should not take it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. It should not be made to pass to one

Vin 3.2

BD 2.12

¹ *pattagāhāpaka*, agent noun from causative *gāhāpeti* = to make to take, but here “to invite to take,” to say: “be so good as to receive,” “to make the bowl pass from one monk to another.” Cf. Vin 2.177, where it is said that there was no *pattagāhāpaka* at that time; and AN iii.275, where many of the officials of the Order are mentioned, and are recommended not to be appointed if they follow the four *agatis*, and cannot make a proper discrimination in their province. ² On the *agatis* see BD 1.323, n. 7, and cf. above, BD 2.104. Also cf. Vin 1.283 for “receiver of robes” and Vin 2.167 for “assigner of lodgings,” and above, BD 2.104, for “silver-remover.” ³ Vin-a 708, “pointing out what is commendable in the bowl, he should say, “This bowl is of the right measure, it is nice and it is suitable for an elder. Take it.” ⁴ I.e., the new bowl just put at the disposal of the Order. ⁵ To a second elder, according to age. ⁶ *anuddayatāya*, explained as *anukampāya* (pity, compassion) at Vin-a 708. But for whoever is contented and says, “What good is another bowl to me?” and does not take it, there is no offence. ⁷ I.e., the elder.

who has what is not a bowl.¹ In this way the bowl should be made to pass down to the youngest member of the Order.²

And whatever is the last bowl belonging to the company of monks should be given to this monk³ with the words⁴: ‘Monk, this is a bowl for you; it should be kept until it breaks’ means: This bowl should not be laid aside by that monk in what is not the right place⁵; it should not be used for improper purposes⁶; it should not be given away⁷ with the words: ‘How can this bowl be lost or destroyed or broken?’ If it is laid aside in the wrong place or used for improper purposes or given away, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

This is the proper course in this case means: this is the appropriate course in this case.

If he gets an unmended bowl in exchange for an unmended bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets a bowl that is mended in one place ... in two places ... in three places ... in four places in exchange for an unmended bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets an unmended bowl ... a bowl that is mended in one place ... in two places ... in three places ... in four places in exchange for a bowl that is mended in one place, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets an unmended bowl ... a bowl that is mended in one place ... in two places ... in three places ... in four places in exchange for a bowl that is mended in

¹ *apattaka*. See Bu-NP 21.3, above, BD 2.115, on *apatta*. At Vin 1.90 it is said that one who is *apattako* is not to be ordained. *Apattaka* means either one who uses what is not a bowl—e.g., gourds and water-pots—or one who has not a bowl—e.g., a *tittiya* who uses his hands to receive alms-food (Vin 2.114, Vin 2.115). Cf. *acivaraka* at Vin 1.90, which seems to mean one who has not a robe and who therefore went naked. At Vin 1.93 monks are to be asked at the ordination ceremony whether they are complete as to bowl and robes. ² Everyone receives another bowl, so that the former bowl of the youngest member of the community remains free. ³ I.e., the one who had to forfeit his bowl. ⁴ Doubtless spoken by the “assigner of bowls.” ⁵ *adese*, on a bench or couch or peg to hang a sunshade on. It is to be laid aside on a stand or stool, Vin-a 709. *Dukkaṭa* offences for putting bowls away in various wrong ways and places are given at Vin 2.113f. ⁶ I.e., for cooking, colouring or boiling rice-gruel. ⁷ *na vissajjetabbu ti aññassa na dātabbo*, Vin-a 709.

two places ... in three places ... in four places, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

If he gets a bowl with no room for mends in exchange for an unmended bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets a bowl that has room for one mend in exchange for an unmended bowl ... If he gets a bowl that has room for four mends in exchange for a bowl that is mended in four places, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

If he gets an unmended bowl in exchange for a bowl that has no room for mends, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture ... If he gets a bowl mended in four places in exchange for a bowl that has room for four mends, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

If he gets a bowl with no room for mends in exchange for a bowl that has no room for mends ... If he gets a bowl that has room for four mends in exchange for a bowl that has room for four mends, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

There is no offence if the bowl is destroyed, if the bowl is broken, if they belong to relations, if they are invited, if it is for another, if it is by means of his own property; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.49](#), [BD 2.52](#), [BD 2.57](#).

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 23

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery.¹ Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha,² desiring to make a cave,³ had a (mountain) slope cleared near Rājagaha. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the venerable Pilindavaccha, and having approached and greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the venerable Pilindavaccha:

“What, honoured sir, is the elder having made?”

“Sire, desiring to make a cave, I am having a (mountain) slope cleared,” he said.

“Honoured sir, does the master require an attendant for the monastery?”

“Sire, an attendant for a monastery is not prescribed by the lord.”

“Well, honoured sir, asking the lord, you must tell him of me.”

“Very well, Sire,” the venerable Pilindavaccha answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha.

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha taught, roused and gladdened King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha with *dhamma*-talk. And when King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha had been taught, roused and gladdened with *dhamma*-talk by the venerable Pilindavaccha, rising up from his seat, greeting the venerable Pilindavaccha, he departed, keeping his right side towards him.

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha sent a messenger to the lord, to say: “Lord, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha desires to present

¹ = Vin 1.206-209. ² Cf. BD 1.112. ³ *leṇa*.

an attendant for a monastery. Now, lord, what line of conduct is to be followed?”

Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “Monks, I allow an attendant for a monastery.”

Then a second time did King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approach the venerable Pilindavaccha, and having approached and greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the venerable Pilindavaccha:

“Honoured sir, has the lord prescribed an attendant for a monastery?”

“Yes, Sire,” he said.

“Well, honoured sir, I will give the master an attendant for the monastery.”

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, promising the venerable Pilindavaccha an attendant for the monastery, forgetting (but) remembering after a time, addressed a chief minister who was concerned with all the affairs,¹ saying: “My good man,² has that attendant for the monastery whom I promised, been given to the master?”

“Your Majesty,³ an attendant for the monastery has not been given to the master.”

“My good man, how long is it since it was considered?”

“Then that chief minister, counting up the days, spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: “It is five hundred days,⁴ your Majesty.”

“Well then, give five hundred attendants for the monastery to the master.”

“Very well, your Majesty,” and the chief minister, replying thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, made over to the venerable Pilindavaccha five hundred attendants for the monastery, and a distinct village established itself. They even called it “The Village of the

¹ *sabbatthaka mahāmatta*. ² *bhaṇe*. ³ *deva*. ⁴ “five hundred,” of course, only means “many, several.”

Monastery Attendants,”¹ and they called it Pilinda Village.²

Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha came to be dependent (for alms) on the families in this village. Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Pilinda Village for alms-food. Now at that time there came to be a festival in this village; young girls³ wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, were celebrating it. Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, as he was going about in Pilinda Village on continuous alms-begging, came up to the dwelling of a certain attendant of the monastery, and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Now at that time, the daughter of the monastery attendant’s wife, seeing other little girls wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, cried and said: “Give me a garland, give me an ornament.”

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha said to that monastery attendant’s wife: “Why is this little girl crying?”

“Honoured sir, this little girl is crying because, having seen other little girls wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, she says: ‘Give me a garland, give me an ornament.’ Whence is there a garland for us who are poor, whence is there an ornament?”

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, taking a roll of grass,⁴ said to that monastery attendant’s wife: “Now set⁵ this roll of grass on this little girl’s head.” Then that monastery attendant’s wife, taking that roll of grass, set it on the little girl’s head; it became a golden chaplet,⁶

¹ Ārāmikagamaka. ² Pilindagāmaka. ³ *dārikā*, with variant reading *dārakā*. Oldenberg at Vin 3.278, referring to this passage and to the one immediately following, says, ‘I think we ought to read *dārakā*, *dārake*.’ See also his notes at Vin 3.382. I think, however, that it is not necessary to take the reading *dārakā*. The point probably is that the daughter of the monastery attendant’s wife was jealous of “other little girls,” rather than of the children in general. ⁴ *tiṅaṇḍupakan ti tiṅacumbaṭakam*, Vin-a 709. This is the circular roll or coil of grass (or cloth) which Indians put on the head when they are carrying baskets, water-vessels, etc., on the head. One type of wife, Vin 3.139, is called *obhatacumbaṭa*, one from whom the pad (for the burdens she carries on her head) is taken. At Ja 1.208 we get the word *cumbaṭakalaha*, a quarrel about a head-pad. ⁵ *paṭimuñca*. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 709 says *paṭimuñci ti ṭhapesi*. ⁶ *suvanṇamālā*; Vin-a 709 says a chaplet of golden lotuses.

beautiful, good to look upon, charming; there was no golden chaplet like it in the women's quarters of the king. People said to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

“Your Majesty, in the house of a certain monastery attendant there is a golden chaplet, beautiful, good to look upon, charming; there is no golden chaplet like it in the women's quarters of your Majesty. As he is poor, where (could he have got it) from? Undoubtedly it was taken by theft.”

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha had that monastery attendant's family imprisoned. A second time did the venerable Pilindavaccha, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, enter Pilinda Village for alms-food. As he was going about in Pilinda Village on continuous alms-begging, he came up to that monastery attendant's dwelling, and having come up, he asked the neighbours: “Where has this monastery attendant's family gone?”

“Honoured sir, they have been imprisoned by the king on account of that golden chaplet,” they said.

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha went up to the residence of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, and having gone up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the venerable Pilindavaccha, and having approached and greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Pilindavaccha said to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: “How is it, Sire, that the monastery attendant's family is imprisoned?”

“Honoured sir, in that monastery attendant's house there was a golden chaplet, beautiful, good to look upon, charming; there is no golden chaplet like it in our women's quarters. Where (could he have got it) from, as he is poor? Undoubtedly it was taken by theft.”

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha exercised volitional force,¹ and

¹ *adhimucci* = *adhittḥāsi*, Vin-a 709. *Critical Pali Dictionary*, under both *adhimuccati* and *adhittḥati* gives “to make a (magical) act of volition.” Literally hyper-released, hyper-persisted. Cf. **BD 1.128, n. 3**.

said: “The palace¹ of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha is golden,” and it became made all of gold.² He said: “Now, Sire, from where have you got so much gold?”

Saying, “I understand, honoured sir, this is the master’s majesty of psychic potency,” he set free the monastery attendant’s family. People, delighted, full of satisfaction because they heard that a state of further-men, a wonder of psychic potency had been shown by master Pilindavaccha to the king and his retinue, presented the five kinds of medicine to the venerable Pilindavaccha, that is to say ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses. Now the venerable Pilindavaccha was customarily a receiver,³ so when he received the five kinds of medicine he gave them away among his company. And his company came to live in abundance; whatever they received, filling pots and pitchers, they put them away, and filling water-strainers and bags, they hung them up⁴ in the windows. These (pots, etc.) were leaking,⁵ and the dwelling-places became beset and overrun⁶ by rats. People seeing (this) as they were engaged in touring the dwelling-places, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are storing up goods indoors,⁷ like King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha.” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can monks strive after abundance such as this?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks strive after abundance such as this?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

¹ *pāsāda*, see above, **BD 2.16, n. 5.** ² Mentioned at Kv 608. ³ *lābhin*. He usually got plenty of alms-food, etc., and so did not need the extra amount. ⁴ *laggeti*, or perhaps “packed.” Cf. **Vin 2.152**, where monks *thavikāyo laggenti*, hung up or packed up their bags at the foot of beds and chairs. ⁵ *olīnavilīnāni tiṭṭhanti*, were sticking and melting, hence they let through their contents, and hence there came to be rats. The Colombo and Siamese editions of Vin-a read *heṭṭhā ca abhato-passtsu ca gaḷitāni*, leaking through the bottom and the sides. ⁶ *okiṇṇavikiṇṇā*. ⁷ *antokoṭṭhāgārikā*. At Ja 3.364, *mahicchā ime samaṇā anto°*.

“Monks, how can these foolish men strive after abundance such as this? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:¹

“Those medicines which may be partaken of² by ill monks, that is to say, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses: accepting these, they may be used as a store for at most seven days. For him who exceeds that (period), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”³

Those medicines which are partaken of by ill monks means: **ghee**⁴ is called ghee from cows or ghee from she-goats or ghee from buffaloes; ghee from those whose meat is suitable. **Fresh butter** means: fresh butter from just these. **Oil** means: sesamum oil, oil of mustard seeds, oil containing honey,⁵ oil of the castor-oil plant, oil from tallow.⁶ **Honey** means: honey of bees.⁷ **Molasses** means: what is produced from sugar-cane.

Accepting these, they may be used as a store for at most seven days means: they may be used for seven days at the maximum.

For him who exceeds that (period) there is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited on the eighth day at sunrise. It should be forfeited to ... an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘Honoured sirs, seven days having elapsed, this medicine of mine is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ...

¹ At Vin 1.209 instead of this paragraph read, “having rebuked them and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:” ² *paṭisāyaniyānī ti paṭisāyitabbānī paribhuñjītabbānī ti attho*, Vin-a 710. ³ Vin 1.209, “exceeding that (time) is a matter to be dealt with according to the rule.” From beginning of Bu-NP 23 to here = Vin 1.206-209. Cf. Bu-Pc 38 for rule against eating food that has been stored. The Gandharajāṭaka (Ja 3.363) was told in reference to this rule.

Beginning with the above rule, the order of the Nissaggiyas which follow is different in the Pali, Sanskrit and Chinese texts. See *Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādīns*, ed. FINOT, J. Bu-As, Nov-Dec, 1913, p. 39 (=499). ⁴ = Vin 4.88, to “sugar-cane,” below. ⁵ *madhukatela*, or “of the honey-tree,” *madhuka* being the tree *Bassia latifolia*. *Madhukapuppharasa*, not allowed at Vin 1.246; translated at *Vinaya Texts* ii.133 “liquorice-juice.” ⁶ *vasā*. At Vin-a 714 five kinds of *vasā* are given: that from bears, fish, alligators, pigs, donkeys. ⁷ *makkhikāmadhu*. The bee is called *madhumakkhikā*.

'... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ...
May I give back this medicine to the venerable one?'

If he thinks that seven days have elapsed when they have elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether the seven days have elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that the seven days have elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is allotted¹ when it is not allotted, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is bestowed when it is not bestowed ... If he thinks that it is lost when it is not lost ... If he thinks that it is destroyed when it is not destroyed ... If he thinks that it is burnt when it is not burnt, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Acquiring something that has been forfeited,² it must not be made use of for bodily enjoyment,³ it must not be consumed, it may be done into⁴ a lamp or black colour,⁵ it may be made use of by another monk for bodily enjoyment, it must not be consumed (by him). If he thinks that the seven days have not elapsed when they have elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether the seven days have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the seven days have not elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is no offence.

There is no offence if within seven days it is allotted, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt; if they tear it from them; if they take it on trust;

¹ This and the next five cases = Vin 3.197, Vin 3.262, except that *avikappita*, assigned, does not occur above. For *adhiṭṭhita* see above, BD 2.7, n. 1. ² *nissaṭṭha*, cf. above, BD 2.8. ³ Such as anointing the limbs. ⁴ *upanetabbam*, from *upa* + *√nī*, to bring to. ⁵ *kālavaṇṇe*. Exact significance unknown, but with *padīpa* (lamp) is another use for oil, since Vin-a 718 uses the verb *makkheti*.

if it is sacrificed, renounced, given up¹ to one who is not ordained; if one devoid of longing,² giving (and) acquiring, makes use of it; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ At [Vin 3.96](#) and [MN 1.37](#) *catto vanto mutto pahīno*. Vin-a 719, “if the medicine is sacrificed, renounced, given up for the sake of one’s mind, the mind is sacrificed, renounced, given up, then the man is called devoid of longing as to his mind; it means, thus being devoid of longing, giving to a *sāmaṇera* (novice).” ² *anapekkha*.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 24

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a cloth for the rains¹ came to be allowed to monks by the lord.² The group of six monks, saying: "A cloth for the rains is allowed by the lord," looked about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand, they put them on, (but going) naked because the cloths for the rains were old, they let their bodies get wet with the rain. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks look about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand put them on, (but) because the cloths for the rains are old, (going) naked,³ let their bodies get wet with the rain?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

¹ *vassikasāṭīkā*. These are cloth garments used instead of the robes, for these had been found to become wet and heavy during the rains, [Vin 1.253](#). At [Vin 2.177](#) we get *sāṭiya-* (= *sāṭika-*) *gāhāpaka*, translated at *Vinaya Texts* iii.223 "receiver of undergarments." But *gāhāpaka* is "assigner," see above, [BD 2.122, n. 1](#). *Udakasāṭika* occurs at e.g. [Vin 1.294](#), [Vin 4.278–279](#), meaning bathing-cloths (for nuns). This was not a cloth that was put on on top of or under the robes, but was worn instead of them. In the same way the *vassikasāṭīkā* were worn by monks to save the robes and the discomfort of wearing wet robes. At [Vin 4.172](#) the group of six monks had their *vassikasāṭīkā* made to an unsuitable measure. The right measure was therefore prescribed, and was to be in length six spans of the accepted length, in breadth two and a half spans. As editor of *Vinaya Texts* ii.225, note (*q.v.*) observes: "this is just enough to go round the loins from the waist half down to the knee." At [Vin 4.173](#) *vassikasāṭīkā* are defined as "for the four months of the rains," while at [Vin 1.297](#) it is allowed to allot cloths for the rains during the four months of the rains, after that time to assign them. ² [Vin 1.294](#); the giving of *vassikasāṭīkā* was one of the eight boons conferred upon *Visākhā*. ³ Cf. above, [BD 2.45](#), where monks complained of monks going naked.

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, looking about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand put them on, (but) because the cloths for the rains were old, (going) naked, you let your bodies get wet with the rain?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, looking about before-hand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand put them on, (but) because the cloths for the rains were old, (going) naked, let your bodies get wet with the rain? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“If he thinks, ‘A month of the hot weather remains,’ robe material as a cloth for the rains should be looked about for by that monk. If he thinks, ‘Half a month of the hot weather remains,’ making it, it should be put on. If he thinks, ‘More than a month of the hot weather remains,’ and should look about for robe material as a cloth for the rains; if he thinks, ‘More than half a month of the hot weather remains,’ and making it, should put it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

If he thinks, ‘A month of the hot weather remains,’ robe material as a cloth for the rains should be looked about for by that monk means: having approached those people who formerly gave robe material as cloths for the rains, he may speak to them thus: ‘It is the time for robe-material as cloths for the rains, it is the season for robe-material as cloths for the rains, and other people are giving robe-material as cloths for the rains.’ He should not say, ‘Give me robe-material as a cloth for the rains, bring me robe-material as a cloth for the rains, barter¹ robe-material for me as a cloth for the rains, get in exchange robe-material for me as a cloth for the rains.’

If he thinks, ‘Half a month of the hot weather remains,’ mak-

¹ *parivattetha*. Cf. above, **BD 2.60**, **BD 2.67**, **BD 2.111**.

ing it, it should be put on means: making it in the half month of the hot weather remaining, it should be put on.

If he thinks, 'More than a month of the hot weather remains' means: if he looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains while over a month of the hot weather remains,¹ there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

If he thinks, 'More than half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it he puts it on while more than half a month of the hot weather remains, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited to ... an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe-material as a cloth for the rains was looked about for by me while more than a month of the hot weather remained; making it, it was put on² while more than half a month of the hot weather remained; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this cloth for the rains to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that more than a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, and looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether more than a month of the hot weather remains, and looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that less than a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, and looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that more than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, (and) making it, puts it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether more than half a month of the hot weather remains, (and) making it, puts it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that less than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, (and) making it, puts it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If (going) naked, although there is a cloth for the rains, he lets his

¹ *atirekamāse sese gimhāne.* ² *paridahita* here replaces a past participle of *nivāseti*, otherwise used in this story.

body get wet with the rain, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹ If he thinks that more than a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether less than a month of the hot weather remains, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that less than a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is no offence. If he thinks that more than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether less than half a month of the hot weather remains, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that less than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is no offence.

Vin 3.2

There is no offence if, thinking, 'A month of the hot weather remains,' he looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains; if, thinking, 'Half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it, he puts it on; if, thinking, 'Less than a month of the hot weather remains,' he looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains; if, thinking, 'Less than half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it, he puts it on; if the cloth for the rains that has been looked for is worn out during the rains²; if the cloth for the rains that has been put on is worn out during the rains; washing them, they should be laid aside, they should be put on (again) at the right season. (There is no offence) if the robe-material is stolen,³ if the robe-material is destroyed,⁴ if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

BD 2.15

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.45, n. 3.** ² *vassam ukkaḍḍhiyyati*. Vin-a 721 gives *khepetvā khepeti* perhaps meaning "to cause to waste." *Ukkaḍḍhiyyati* is perhaps "worn out," cf. *karṣita*, from $\sqrt{\text{krṣ}}$, one of whose meanings is given as "worn out" in Monier-Williams' *Dictionary*. *Avakarṣati* (*ava-krṣ*) can also mean "to take off." *Kshāpayati* given by Monier-Williams as "to destroy, ruin, make an end of, finish." ³ *acchinnacīvarassā ti etaṃ vassikasāṭīkam sandhāya vuttaṃ*, Vin-a 723. It might be stolen by thieves when the monks were bathing. ⁴ *naṭṭhacīvara*, see above, **BD 2.47, BD 2.48.**

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 25

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans,¹ said to the monk who shared his brother's cell: "Come, your reverence, we will set out on a tour of the country."

"I will not go, honoured sir," he said, "my robe is worn thin."²

"Come, your reverence, I will give you a robe," he said and he gave him a robe. Then that monk heard: "It is said that the lord will set out on a tour of the country." Then it occurred to that monk: "I will not set out on a tour of the country with the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans; I will set out on a tour of the country with the lord."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to that monk: "Come now, your reverence, we will set out on a tour of the country."

"I will not set out on a tour of the country with you, honoured sir, I will set out on a tour of the country with the lord."

"But that robe, your reverence, which I gave you, that will set out on a tour of the country with me," he said, and angry and displeased,³ he tore it away.⁴ Then that monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, himself having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, tear it away?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, yourself having given a

¹ See above, Bu-NP 6, Bu-NP 18, Bu-NP 20. ² *dubbala*. ³ *kupito anattamano*, said of Devadatta at Vin 2.189. ⁴ Vin-a 723, by force, *balakkārena aggahesi*.

robe to a monk, angry and displeased, tore it away?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, yourself having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, tear it away? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, himself having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, should tear it away or should cause it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”¹

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

To a monk means: to another monk.

Himself means: himself² having given.

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.³

Angry, displeased means: dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.⁴

Should tear it away means: if he tears it away himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Should cause it to be torn away means: if he commands another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If having commanded once, he then tears many away,⁵ it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited to ... an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘Honoured sirs, having myself given this robe to a monk, it was torn away by me; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ... ‘... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.’

Having given a robe to one who is ordained thinking that he is

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 81. ² *sāmaṇi* explained by *sayamī*. ³ Cf. above, BD 2.7, BD 2.40, BD 2.48.

⁴ Cf. BD 1.281; Vin 4.236; MN 1.101. ⁵ Vin-a 723, “if he commands, ‘take robe-material,’ there is an offence of wrong-doing; if, having commanded, he says, ‘take many,’ there is an offence of expiation. If he says, ‘take the outer cloak, the inner and the upper robes,’ for each speech there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he says, ‘take everything given by me,’ for one speech made there are many offences.”

ordained, if angry and displeased, he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether one is ordained, (then if) angry and displeased he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Having given a robe to one who is ordained thinking that he is not ordained, if angry and displeased, he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Having given another requisite, if angry and displeased, he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Having given a robe or another requisite to one who is not ordained, (then if) angry and displeased, he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether one is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if he gives it or takes (from him) in a friendly manner²; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Here text is surely corrupt, for instead of *āpatti dukkaṭassa* it should read *anāpatti*. Oldenberg gives no variant reading. ² *vissasanto*, putting his trust in him. Text reads *vissāsanto*; Sinhalese edition *vissasanto*, which is rather more correct, being from *viśvasiti*.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (*NISSAGGIYA*) 26

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. At that time the group of six monks, at the time of robe-making, asked for much yarn,¹ so that when the robe-material was made much yarn came to be over. Then it occurred to the group of six monks: "Now then, your reverences, let us, asking for more yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers." Then the group of six monks, asking for more yarn, had robe-material woven by weavers, but when the robe-material was woven much yarn came to be over. A second time did the group of six monks, asking for more yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers, but when the robe-material was woven much yarn came to be over. A third time did the group of six monks, asking for more yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers. People ... spread it about, saying:

"How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, themselves asking for yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers?"

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks, themselves asking for yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, yourselves asking for yarn, had robe-material woven by weavers?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, yourselves asking for yarn, have robe-

¹ *sutta*, yarn or thread.

material woven by weavers? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, himself asking for yarn, should have robe-material woven by weavers, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Himself means: himself asking.

Yarn means: the six (kinds of) yarn¹: linen, cotton, silk, wool,² coarse hempen cloth,³ canvas.⁴

By weavers⁵ means: if he has it woven by weavers⁶ there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to ... an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘Honoured sirs, this robe caused by me to be woven by weavers, having myself asked for the yarn, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ... ‘... the Order should give back ... let the

¹ These are the six kinds of thread for making the six kinds of robe-materials that are allowable to monks. These latter are given in this order at e.g. Vin 1.58 = Vin 1.96, and especially see Vin 1.281, where they are allowed. The six kinds of robe-materials or robes are referred to at e.g. Vin 3.210, Vin 3.213. ² Vin-a 724, yarn of sheep’s wool.

³ The wearing of *sāṇa* was one of the practices adopted by wanderers belonging to other sects, DN i.166, DN iii.41, AN i.240, MN i.78, Pp 55. The commentaries explain *sāṇa* by using the word itself, as either *sāṇavākasutta* (Vin-a 724, yarn of the bark of *sāṇa*), *sāṇa-vācchelāni* (DN-a 356 = AN-a 2.354, garments of ...), *sāṇavāka-mayaṃ* (SN-a i.159, made of ...). *Sāṇa* was probably a plant, see next note below. At SN ii.202 Kassapa insisted on wearing, and at SN ii.222 accepted from the lord his own, *sāṇāni paṃsukūlāni*, coarse hempen rag-robes. ⁴ *bhaṅga*. Vin-a 724, Vin-a 1119 give two meanings: (1) thread made of bark, (2) thread mixed with these five other threads.

See JOGES CHANDRA RAY, IHQ. xv.2, 1939, p.197, “the inner bark of the plant yields a strong fibre, fit for strings and ropes, and a coarse cloth, canvas, is woven.” In identifying *Bhaṅgā* with *Soma*, the relation of *bhaṅga* to *sāṇa* is also brought out, for, according to the lexicographers quoted by Chandra Ray, they also are identical; and the commentarial explanations, that *sāṇāni* are said to be of bark, are illuminated. I am indebted to this article for the suggestion that “canvas” is a possible translation of *bhaṅga*. ⁵ *tantavāya*. ⁶ *pesakāra*. Cf. Vin 4.7. Monier-Williams: “*peśaskārī*, f., Ved. a woman who weaves artistically or embroiders.”

venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it was caused to be woven when it was caused to be woven, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it was caused to be woven, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it was not caused to be woven when it was caused to be woven, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it was caused to be woven when it was not caused to be woven, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it was not caused to be woven, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was not caused to be woven when it was not caused to be woven, there is no offence.

It is no offence to sew a robe¹ to a binding,² to a belt,³ to a shoulder-strap,⁴ to a bag for carrying the bowl in,⁵ to a water-strainer⁶; if it belongs to relations; if they are invited; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property⁷; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Vin-a 727 says that there is no offence in asking for thread (or yarn) to sew a robe.

² *Āyoga*. At Vin 2.135 the use of *āyoga* is allowed to monks. The word is translated at *Vinaya Texts* iii.141 as "handicraft." But I think that because the monks ask how an *āyoga* should be made (omitted at *Vinaya Texts* iii.141), and are allowed the apparatus belonging to a loom, *āyoga* should be rendered "bandage" or "binding" in that passage. Cf. Vv 33 (p.30), where *āyogapaṭṭa* (preceded by *aṃsavaṭṭaka* and that by *kāyabandhana*) means "strip, bandage." ³ *kāyabandhana*. At Vin 2.136 belts or waist-bands were allowed to monks. ⁴ *aṃsabandhaka*. At Vin 1.204, Vin 2.114 shoulder-straps are allowed to monks. ⁵ *pattatthavikā*; allowed at Vin 2.114. ⁶ Allowed at Vin 2.118. These five articles are mentioned together again as not giving rise to an offence at Vin 4.170. ⁷ Cf. above, BD 2.27, BD 2.49, BD 2.52, BD 2.57, BD 2.125.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 27

27.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that
2.145 time a certain man, going off on a journey,¹ said to his wife:

“Weighing² yarn, give it to a certain weaver; getting him to weave robe-material, take care of it; when I come back I will present³ master Upananda⁴ with robe-material.”

A certain monk, as he was going for alms, heard this man as he was speaking thus. Then this monk approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached he spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

“You, reverend Upananda, are of great merit,⁵ for at a certain place a certain man, going off on a journey, said to his wife: ‘Weighing yarn ... I will present master Upananda with robe-material.’”

“Sir, he is my supporter,” he said. For this very weaver was the supporter of the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached this weaver, and having approached he spoke thus to the weaver:

“Sir, this robe-material is being specially woven for me; make it long and wide and rough,⁶ make it evenly woven⁷ and well woven⁸

2.146

¹ *pavāsaṃ gacchanto*. ² *dhārayitva ti tuletvā*, Vin-a 727. *Tuleti* is to weigh. ³ *acchādeti*, see above, BD 2.53, n. 2. ⁴ Cf. Bu-NP 6, Bu-NP 18, Bu-NP 20, Bu-NP 25.

⁵ Same thing said to Upananda at Vin 1.300 and Vin 3.215, Vin 3.217 (BD 2.53, BD 2.58, above). ⁶ Here “soft,” the opposite of “rough,” is omitted. Cf. above, BD 2.56. ⁷ *su-vīta*. Vin-a 727, *sabbaṭṭhanesu samam katvā*, making it level (or even) everywhere.

⁸ *suppavāyita*. Vin-a 727, *sabbaṭṭhānesu samam katvā tante pasāritaṃ*, making it level everywhere, it is stretched on a loom. Really *suppavāyita* is a synonym for *suvīta*.

and well scraped¹ and well combed.”²

“Honoured sir, having weighed this yarn, they gave it to me, saying, ‘Weave robe-material with this yarn.’ Honoured sir, I am not able to make it long or wide or rough, but I am able, honoured sir, to make it evenly woven and well woven and well scraped and well combed.”

“You, if you please, sir, make it long and wide and rough; there will not come to be a shortage³ of this yarn.”

Then that weaver, as soon as the yarn had been brought,⁴ setting it up on the loom, went up to that woman, and having gone up he said to that woman: “The master wants yarn.”

“Were not you, master, told by me: ‘Weave robe-material with that yarn?’”

“It is true that I, lady, was told by you: ‘Weave robe-material with this yarn’; but master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to me: ‘You, if you please, sir, make it long and wide and rough; there will not come to be a shortage of this yarn.’”

Then that woman gave a second time⁵ just as much yarn as she had given at first. Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, heard it said that “The man is come back from his journey.” Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached that man’s dwelling and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. Then that man approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached and greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, that man said to his wife: “Is that robe-material woven?”

“Yes, master, that robe-material is woven.”

¹ *suvillekhita*. Vin-a 727 says *lekhanīyā suṭṭhu vilikhitaṃ*. Perhaps it means that the yarn is well scraped so as to remove any rough bits, but the meaning of *lekhanī* is doubtful. ² *suvitacchita*. Vin-a 727 says, *kocchena suṭṭhu vitacchitaṃ suviniddhotan ti attho*. Pali-English Dictionary gives “well-carded” for *suvitacchita*. *Koccha* is a comb. ³ *paṭibaddhan ti vekallaṃ*. Vin-a 727–728, perhaps “a refusal, a holding back, an obstruction with regard to.” ⁴ *yathābhatāṃ suttāṃ*. See meanings of *yathābhatāṃ* in Pali-English Dictionary. ⁵ *pacchā*, afterwards.

“Bring it, I will present master Upananda with robe-material.” Then that woman bringing that robe-material and giving it to her husband, told him this matter. Then that man, giving that robe-material to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented; it is not easy to present them with robe-material. How can master Upananda, before being invited by me, going up to a householder’s weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material?”¹

Monks heard that man who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, before being invited, going up to a householder’s weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, before being invited, going up to a householder’s weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

“Is he a relation of yours, Upananda, or not a relation?”

“He is not a relation, lord.”

“Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for one who is not a relation. Thus will you, foolish man, before being invited, going up to a householder’s weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“A man or a woman householder who is not a relation may cause robe-material to be woven by weavers for a monk. Then if that monk, before being invited, going up to the weavers, should put forward a consideration with regard to the robe-material, saying: ‘Now sirs, this robe-material is being specially woven for

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.53**.

me. Make it long and wide and rough, and make it evenly woven and well woven and well scraped and well combed. If you do so we could give the venerable ones¹ something or other in addition.’² And if the monk, speaking thus, should give something or other in addition, even as little as the contents of a begging-bowl,³ there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

For a monk⁴ means: for the good of a monk, making a monk an object, being desirous of presenting to a monk.

A man who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother’s side or on the father’s side back through seven generations.

A householder means: he who lives in a house.

A woman householder means: she who lives in a house.

By weavers means: by weavers.⁵

Robe-material means: any one robe-material of the six (kinds of) robe-material including the least one fit for assignment.⁶

May cause to be woven means: causes to be woven.

If that monk means: the particular monk for whom the robe-material is being woven.

Before being invited means: before it was said (to him): ‘What kind of robe-material do you want, honoured sir? What kind of robe-material shall I have woven for you?’

Going up to the weavers means: going to the house, approaching (them) anywhere.

Should put forward a consideration with regard to the robe-material means: he says: ‘Now sirs, this robe-material is being specially woven for me. Make it long and wide and rough, and make it evenly woven and well woven and well scraped and well combed. If

¹ *āyasmantānaṃ*. Polite, perhaps here cajoling, form of address. Cf. above, BD 2.54.

² *Anupadajjeyyāma*. ³ *piṇḍapātamaṭṭaṃ*; *piṇḍapāta* is the alms-food, but enough was usually received for the daily meal to fill a begging-bowl. See Old Commentary, below. ⁴ For the remainder of this *Nissaggiya* cf. Bu-NP 8.2. ⁵ *tantavāyehi ti pesakārehi*, cf. above, BD 2.143. ⁶ Cf. above, BD 2.40, BD 2.48, BD 2.140.

you do so we could give the venerable ones something or other in addition.’

And if the monk, speaking thus, should give something or other in addition, even as little as the contents of a begging-bowl means: the contents of a begging-bowl are called conjeṃ and rice¹ and solid food and a lump of chunam² and a tooth-pick and unwoven thread, and he even speaks *dhamma*.³

If according to what he says, he makes it long or wide or rough, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to ... an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘Honoured sirs, before I was invited (to take) this robe-material, approaching the weavers of a householder who is not a relation, I put forward a consideration with regard to the robe-material; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ... ‘... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.’

If, before being invited, going up to the weavers of a householder, thinking that he is not a relation when he is not a relation, he puts forward a consideration with regard to robe-material, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, being in doubt as to whether he is not a relation, before being invited, going up to the weavers of a householder, he puts forward a consideration with regard to robe-material, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, before being invited, going up to the weavers of a householder, thinking that he is a relation when he is not a relation, he puts forward a consideration with regard to robe-material, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that he is not a relation when he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is a relation when he is a relation,

¹ *bhatta*; cf. Vin 4.129. More usually *bhojaniya* is combined with, the next, *khādaniya*.

² This and the next two occur together at Vin 3.241, Vin 3.266; Vin 4.154. ³ Vin-a 728, “he gives *dhamma*-talk” — i.e., perhaps a blessing, good words — for as the text shows, a monk can give things of the mind (*dhamma-dāna*, the best of gifts, AN i.91) besides material things.

there is no offence.

There is no offence if it belongs to relations; if they are invited; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property; if desirous of having costly (robe-material) woven he has (robe-material) costing little woven; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 28

28.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
2.151 at that time a certain chief minister, going on a journey, sent a messenger to the monks, saying: "Let the revered sirs come, I will give a rains-residence (gift)." ¹ The monks, thinking: "A rains-residence (gift) at the end of the rains is allowed by the lord," ² being scrupulous, did not go. ³ The chief minister ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the revered ones not come ⁴ when a messenger was sent by me? Well, I am going with the army, life is uncertain, death is uncertain." ⁵

Monks heard that chief minister who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

¹ *vassāvāsika*. BURLINGAME, *Buddhist Legends*, i.228, renders, "food of the season of the rains"; BURLINGAME, *Buddhist Legends*, ii.8, "lodging during the season of the rains," but neither of these can be meant here, since the rule is concerned with robes. It means rather something connected with the rains-(*vassa*-)residence (*āvāsa*), which may be food, clothing or lodgings, as the story demands. *Vassāvāsa* occurs at [Vin 1.153](#). ² Cf. [Vin 1.153ff](#). ³ It seems that the minister must have been offering his gift during the rains—i.e., at a time when the monks must travel as little as possible—and not at the end of the rains. Otherwise the scrupulous monks could have gone, and no complaints would have been raised. ⁴ Cf. above, [BD 2.64](#), where Upananda did not wait when bidden by a layman to do so. ⁵ *dujjanam jīvitam dujjanam, maraṇam*.

“I allow you, monks, having accepted a special robe,¹ to lay it aside.”

Now at that time monks said: “It is allowed by the lord, accepting a special robe, to lay it aside.” These accepting special robes, let the robe-season² pass. These robes tied up in bundles, remained on a bamboo for hanging up robes.³ Then the venerable Ānanda, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw these robes tied up in bundles, that remained on the bamboo for hanging up robes; seeing them he said to the monks:

“Your reverences, whose are these robes, tied up in bundles, that remain on the bamboo for hanging up robes?”

“Your reverence, they are our special robes,” they said.

“But for how long, your reverences, have these robes been laid aside?”

Then these monks told the venerable Ānanda when they had been laid aside. The venerable Ānanda ... spread it about, saying:

“How can these monks, having accepted a special robe, let the

¹ *acceka-cīvara*, explained at Vin-a 729 as *accāyika-cīvara*. Cf. Vin 4.166, *accāyike karaṇīye*, “if there is something urgent (special) to be done” See *Vinaya Texts* i.29, n. 3, where it is said “‘special robe’ is no doubt an inadequate rendering; but we have chosen it in reference to the special circumstances in which the donation is made, and in default of a better translation.” *Critical Pali Dictionary* says of *acceka-cīvara* that it is “a robe presented to a priest [sic] not at the usual time,” and of *accāyika* (Sanskrit *ātṛyayika*) that it is “not suffering delay, urgent, pressing.” An “exceptional” or “emergency” robe might be a suitable translation, if it is remembered that it is the donor who is in an emergency, who is pressed for time, and who because of some exceptional or unusual circumstances, wants to make his gift without delay, and so gain the “merit” for his act of giving. Here the chief minister wanted to make his gift before he went into the army and faced the uncertainties of life and death. See Old Commentary, below and Vin-a 729 which correlate *acceka-cīvara* with *vassāvāsika*, as though a robe given to meet some emergency implies a robe given at an unusual time—i.e., here during the rains. The robe therefore is “special,” both in regard to the reason for giving it, and in regard to the time at which it was given.

² *cīvarakālasamaya*, see Old Commentary, below. This robe-season is the usual time for accepting, distributing and settling robe-material. Cf. also Bu-NP 1 and *Vinaya Texts* i.18, n. The word occurs again at Vin 4.286. ³ Cf. above, BD 2.25.

robe-season pass?” Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks, having accepted a special robe, let the robe-season pass?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

How, monks, can these foolish men, having accepted a special robe, let the robe-season pass? Monks, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“If a special robe should accrue¹ to a monk ten days before the full moon of the (first) Kattika, three months (of the rains having passed),² it may be accepted by that monk if he thinks of it (as something) special³; having accepted it, it should be laid aside until the robe-season. But if he should lay it aside for longer than that, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

Ten days before means: ten days before the ceremony held at the end of the rains.⁴

The full moon of Kattika, three months (of the rains having passed) means: the ceremony held at the end of the rains is called Kattika.

A special robe means: one is desirous of going with the army,

¹ *uppajjeyya*, literally should arise, should be produced for. See above, **BD 2.4**, **BD 2.24**, **BD 2.90**, **BD 2.99**, **BD 2.114**. ² *kattikatemāsipuṇṇamā*. Kattika (Sanskrit *kārttika*) is the month is the month October–November, when the full moon (*puṇṇamā*) is near the Pleiades. This month is the last of the five months of the rains. The full moon of Assayaṅga is called *kattikatemāsini*; the full moon of Kattika (the last month of the rains) is called *kattikatemāsini*. Thus there were two full moons in Kattika. *Kattikatemāsipuṇṇamā* might be translated: “The full moon of Kattika, three months (of the rains having passed”; or even “three months of the year having passed,” if the year were reckoned to begin at the first month of the rains, Āsāḷha). Cf. **Bu-NP 29** below, **BD 2.157**, for *kattikacātumāsini*. ³ *accekaṃ maññamānena*. ⁴ *pavāraṇā*, held to inquire whether any fault can be laid to the charge of any monk or nun in respect of what has been seen, heard, or suspected. Cf. **Vin 1.160**, **Vin 2.32**; **BD 1.283**, **BD 1.292**; and HORNER, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, pp. 133ff.

or one comes to be going on a journey, or one comes to be ill, or a woman becomes pregnant, or faith comes to be arisen in one who was without faith, or pleasing comes to be arisen for one who was not pleased.¹ If such a one should send a messenger to the monks saying: ‘Let the revered sirs come, I will give a rains-residence (gift),’ this means a special robe.

It may be accepted by that monk if he thinks of it (as something) special; having accepted it, it should be laid aside until the robe-season means: making a sign,² it must be laid aside; this is a special robe.

The robe-season means: if the *kaṭhina* cloth has not been (formally) made then the last month of the rains; if it has been (formally) made, it is five months.³

If he should lay it aside for longer than that means: if the *kaṭhina* cloth has not been (formally) made, and he lets the last day of the rains pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If the *kaṭhina* cloth has been (formally) made and he lets the day for removing the *kaṭhina* (privileges)⁴ pass, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited ... to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘Honoured sirs, letting pass the robe-season, this special robe of mine is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ... ‘... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this special robe to the venerable one.’

If he thinks that it is a special robe when it is a special robe, and lets the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a special robe and lets the robe season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not a special robe when it is a special robe and lets the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is allotted when it is not

¹ *appasannassa vā pasādo uppanno hoti*. Cf. above, **BD 2.3, n. 1**, on the recurring expression: *n’ etaṃ bhikkhave appasannānaṃ vā pasādāya*, “it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased.” ² *saññānaṃ katvā*. Vin-a 729, *kiñci nimittaṃ katvā*, “making some mark,” presumably on the robe. ³ = **Vin 4.286f**. Cf. **BD 2.5, n. 1, BD 2.26, n. 3** above on *atthata*, formally made. ⁴ *kaṭhinuddhāradivasa*, cf. above, p. 5, n. 3.

allotted,¹ there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is assigned when it is not assigned ... If he thinks that one is bestowed when it is not bestowed ... If he thinks that one is lost when it is not lost ... If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed ... If he thinks that one is burnt when it is not burnt ... If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen and lets the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a special robe when it is not a special robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a special robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a special robe when it is not a special robe, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, within the season, it is allotted, assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear it (from him), if they take it on trust; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.²

¹ This and the next six cases = Vin 3.197, Vin 3.251, see above. ² Cf. Bu-NP 1, Bu-NP 2, Bu-NP 3, Bu-NP 21, Bu-NP 9.

MONKS' FORFEITURE (*NISSAGGIYA*) 29

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks who had finished keeping the rains were staying in lodgings in the jungles. Thieves (of the kind who attack monks in the month) of Kattika¹ attacked them, saying: "The monks have received possessions."² They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: "I allow you, monks, when staying in lodgings in the jungles, to lay aside one of the three robes inside a house."³

Now at that time monks thought: "It is allowed by the lord when staying in lodgings in the jungles to lay aside one of the three robes inside a house." These, laying aside one of the three robes inside a house, were away for more than six nights. These robes were lost and destroyed and burnt and eaten by rats. The monks became badly dressed, wearing shabby robes. (Other) monks spoke thus:

"How is it that you, your reverences, are badly dressed, wearing shabby robes?" Then these monks told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can these monks, laying aside one of the three robes inside a house, be away for more than six nights?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks laying aside one of the

¹ *kattikacorakā*. Vin-a 730, *kattikamāse corā*—i.e., after the distribution of the robes.

² *laddhalābhā*. ³ So as to be guarded, Vin-a 730. Cf. Bu-NP 2 above, and notes, where an ill monk may be away without his set of three robes for more than a night, if he has the agreement of the monks.

three robes inside a house were away for more than six nights?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men, laying aside one of the three robes inside a house, be away for more than six nights? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Having spent the rains up to the full moon of Kattika,¹ in case a monk who is staying in such lodgings as those jungle lodgings which are held to be dangerous and frightening, so desires, he may lay aside one of his three robes inside a house; and should there be any reason for that monk to be away, separated from that robe, that monk may be away, separated from that robe for at most six nights. Should he be away, separated (from it) for longer than that, except on the agreement of the monks,² there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.**”

^{29.2.1} **Having spent the rains** means: when they have finished (keeping) the rains.

The full moon of Kattika means: it is called the (night of) Kattika-cātumāsini.³

Those jungle lodgings means: the last lodging called “jungle” is five hundred *dhanu* measures⁴ (away from the village).⁵

^{2.158} **Dangerous⁶** means: if, in a monastery, in the precincts of a monastery, a place where thieves are halting is seen, a place where they are

¹ *Kattikapuṇṇamā*, see Old Commentary, below. This is the next full moon to that meant in the last *Nissaggiya*—i.e., it is the last full moon of Kattika (and of the rains); see Vin-a 658, Vin-a 730 and above, **BD 2.153, n. 2.** ² Probably the same kind of agreement as in *Bu-NP 2*—i.e., the agreement to be regarded as *not* away, separated from the robe, although in fact the monk was away from it. ³ See above, **BD 2.153, n. 2.** *Vinaya Texts* i.324 says: “the epithet *cātumāsini* refers to the Vedic Cāturmāsya festival, which falls upon that day” (i.e., the full moon day in the month of Kattika). This day, or night, “is called *Komudī* (from *kumuda*, a white water-lily), because that flower is supposed to bloom then,” *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.66, note. ⁴ *dhanu*s is a measure of length; according to Monier-Williams it is equivalent to four *hastas*, or ½₂₀₀₀ *gavyūti*. ⁵ So Vin-a 731. ⁶ Cf. below, **BD 2.290**, and MN-a 2.109.

resting¹ is seen, a place where they are sitting down is seen, a place where they are lying down is seen.

Frightening² means: if, in a monastery, in the precincts of a monastery, people injured by thieves are seen, (people) plundered are seen, (people) beaten down are seen.

In case a monk is staying in such lodgings means: a monk staying in lodgings like these.

Desires means: wanting.

One of his three robes means: the outer cloak or the upper robe or the inner robe.³

May lay aside inside a house means: he may lay it aside in the neighbourhood in a food-village.⁴

And should there be any reason for that monk to be away, separated from that robe means: should there be a reason, should there be (something) to be done.⁵

That monk may be away, separated from that robe for at most six nights means: he may be away, separated (from it) for six nights at the maximum.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks.

Should he be away, separated (from it) for longer than that means: it is to be forfeited at sunrise on the seventh day. It should be forfeited to ... an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, having been away, separated from this robe of mine, for more than six nights, except on the agreement of the monks, it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it is more when it is more than six nights, (and) is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to

¹ *ṭhitokāsa*. ² Cf. below, **BD 2.290**, and **MN-a 2.109**. ³ See above, **BD 2.1, n. 2**.

⁴ *gocara-gāma*, Vin-a 731 says: "in the neighbourhood of his jungle lodging." Cf. Pv-a 12.42. It is a village where food is given to monks; *gocara* meaning pasturage or grazing. ⁵ *karaṇīya*.

whether it is more than six nights, and is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is less when it is more than six nights, (and) is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that (the robe) is taken away when it is not taken away¹ ... If he thinks that it is bestowed when it is not bestowed ... If he thinks that it is lost when it is not lost ... If he thinks that it is destroyed when it is not destroyed ... If he thinks that it is burnt when it is not burnt ... If he thinks that it is stolen when it is not stolen, (and) is away except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is more, when it is less than six nights, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than six nights, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is less when it is less than six nights, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is away, separated for six nights; if he is away, separated for less than six nights; if, being away, separated for six nights, entering the village-boundary and staying (there) he departs again; if, within six nights, the (robe) is taken away, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear it from him, if they take it on trust; if there is the agreement of the monks; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.²

3.265

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.22, n. 3.** ² Cf. above, **BD 2.23.**

MONKS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 30

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery.¹ Now at that time at Sāvattthī robes and food were prepared for² the Order by a certain guild,³ saying: "Having offered them food,⁴ we will present them with robe-material." Then the group of six monks approached that guild, and having approached they said to that guild: "Sirs, give these robes to us."

"Honoured sirs, we will not give; alms-food with robes are got ready by us every year for the Order."

"Sirs, many are the Order's benefactors, many are the Order's devotees.⁵ We are here, depending on you, looking to you, but if you will not give to us, then who is there⁶ who will give to us? Sirs, give these robes to us."

Then that guild, being pressed by the group of six monks, giving the group of six monks as much robe-material as was prepared, served the Order with a meal. Those monks who knew that robe-material and a meal were prepared for the Order, and did not know that (it) was given to the group of six monks, spoke thus:

"Sirs, dedicate⁷ robe-material to the Order."

¹ = Bu-Pc 82, Vin 4.155, except that there the offence is procuring something for another person, and not, as here, for oneself. Cf. Bu-Pc 81. ² *paṭiyattam*. ³ *pūja*, or group. ⁴ *bhojtvā*. ⁵ *bhattā*, with variant reading *kattā* (see Vin 3.279), and Sinhalese edition *bhaddā*. Vin-a 732 reads *bhadrā*, taking it = *bhadrāni* = *lābhamukhāni* (with variant readings *bhaddā*, *bhattā* ... *bhattāni*). It therefore looks more as if a "devotee" were meant than a "meal," especially in conjunction with *dāyakā*, benefactors. ⁶ *ko carahi*. ⁷ *oṇojethā ti detha*, Vin-a 732; cf. Vin 1.39, AN iv.210, Mil 236, where *oṇojeti* seems to imply a rite of cleansing by water (*udakam oṇojtvā*) and also a ceremonial giving, implied by the presence of *bhinkāra*, a ceremonial vessel used in donations.

“Honoured sirs, there is none; the masters, the group of six monks, appropriated¹ to themselves as much robe-material as was prepared.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the group of six monks knowingly² appropriate to themselves an apportioned³ benefit belonging to the Order?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, knowingly appropriated to yourselves an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, knowingly appropriate to yourselves an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should knowingly appropriate to himself an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

30.2.1

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

3.266

He knows⁴ means: either he knows by himself or others tell him or (someone) tells (him).

Belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to (it).⁵

2.162

A benefit means: the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicine for the sick, and even a lump of chunam and a toothpick and unwoven thread.⁶

Apportioned means: it has been expressly said,⁷ “we will give, we will make.”

If he appropriates to himself, in the action there is an offence of

¹ *pariṇāmesuṃ*, causative of *pariṇamati*. ² *jānaṃ*. ³ *pariṇata*. This is derived from the same root as *pariṇāmeti*; its indicative is *pariṇamati*. Vin-a 733 says *ninna poṇa pabbhāra*, bending to, leading to, sloping to. ⁴ *jānāti*, indicative, instead of the *jānaṃ*, participle, of the Rule. ⁵ Cf. Vin 4.43. ⁶ Cf. above, BD 2.111, BD 2.149, and Vin 4.154. ⁷ *vācā bhinnā hoti*; cf. *vācaṃ bhindeyya* at Vin 1.157, “uttering a word,” Vinaya Texts i.326.

wrong-doing; it is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to ... an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this apportioned benefit belonging to the Order, knowingly appropriated by me to myself, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' ... '... the Order should give back ... let the venerable ones give back ... I will give back this benefit to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it was apportioned when it was apportioned (and) appropriates it to himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it was apportioned (and) appropriates it to himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it was not apportioned when it was apportioned (and) appropriates it to himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he appropriates what was apportioned to the Order for another (part of the) Order¹ or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to a shrine for another shrine or for an Order or for an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to an individual for another individual or for an Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was apportioned when it was not apportioned, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it was not apportioned, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was not apportioned when it was not apportioned, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he himself being asked, 'Where do we give?' says, 'Give wherever your gift would be used² or could be mended³ or should be for a long time or when for you the mind is peaceful⁴'; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The third Division: that on Bowls

¹ Vin-a 733, for the Order in one *vihāra*. *Śaṅgha* means, not the whole Order, but five or more monks (see above, **BD 2.7, n. 5**) staying in various districts and *vihāras*.

² *paribhogam labheyya*, literally might receive use. ³ *paṭisaṃkhāram labheyya*.

⁴ *tumhākam cittam pasīdati*.

THIS IS ITS KEY

Two on bowls, and on medicine,
for the rains, the fifth on a gift,
Oneself, causing to be woven, a special robe,
dangerous, and for the Order.

Venerable ones, recited are the thirty rules for offences of expiation involving forfeiture. Concerning them, I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The venerable ones are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent, thus do I understand this.

*Told are the Offences of Expiation involving Forfeiture*¹

3.267

¹ Here ends Oldenberg's *Vinayapiṭaka*, vol.iii.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 1

At that time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time Hatthaka,¹ the son of the Sakyans,² came to be overthrown in debate.³ He, talking with followers of sects holding other views, having denied, acknowledged, having acknowledged, denied, he shelved the question by (asking) another,⁴ he told a conscious lie,⁵ having made a rendezvous,⁶ he deceived with words.⁷ The followers of sects holding other views looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can this Hatthaka, the son of the Sakyans, talking together with us, having denied, acknowledge, having acknowledged, deny, shelve the question by (asking) another, tell a conscious lie, having made a rendezvous, deceive with words?”

¹ Probably not the Hatthaka of Ālavī, see AN i.26, AN i.88, AN i.136, also AN i.278 (*devaputta*), AN iv.218. But probably the same as the Hatthaka concerning whom Dhp 264 (*na muṇḍakena samaṇo*) was uttered. For Dhp-a 3.390, which, though longer, is very similar to Vin-a 736, says that whenever Hatthaka was defeated in argument he would make another appointment with his opponents, then precede them to the appointed place and say: “The followers of other sects are so frightened of me that they dare not meet me; this is like a defeat on their part.” This fits in well with Vinaya story told above. ² Vin-a 735, *Sakyānaṃ putto ti Sakyaputto*. ³ *vādakkhitto*. ⁴ *aññaṃ aññaṃ paṭicarati*. Vin-a 735 says, *añña kāraṇena aññaṃ kāraṇaṃ paṭicarati paṭicchādeti ajjhottharati*, he answered one question by another, hid it, covered it up. Cf. DN i.94, AN i.187, AN i.198, MN i.250, Vin 4.35. “To meet one question with an answer of quite different contents” (*Critical Pali Dictionary*), but at Vin 4.35 Channa meets questions by putting other questions. ⁵ *sampajānamusā bhāsati*. ⁶ *samketam katvā*. Cf. Vin 3.53, Vin 3.78. ⁷ *visamvādeti*. Forestalling his opponents at the rendezvous, he said that they were defeated.

Monks heard these followers of sects holding other views who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Then these monks approached Hatthaka, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, they spoke thus to Hatthaka, the son of the Sakyans:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, reverend Hatthaka, talking together with followers of sects holding other views, having denied, acknowledged ... deceived with words?”

“Your reverences, these followers of sects holding other views should be vanquished in some way; victory should not be given to them thus.”

Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can this Hatthaka, the son of the Sakyans, talking together with followers of sects holding other views, having denied, acknowledge, having acknowledged, deny, shelve the question by (asking) another, tell a conscious lie, having made a rendezvous, deceive with words?”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned Hatthaka, the son of the Sakyans:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Hatthaka, talking together with followers of sects holding other views, having denied, acknowledged ... deceived with words?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, talking together with followers of sects holding other views, having denied, acknowledge ... having made a rendezvous, deceive with words? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“In telling a conscious lie,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”²

Telling a conscious lie means: the words, the utterance, the speech, the talk, the language, the intimation, the un-ariyan statements³ of one intent upon deceiving with words, saying: “I have seen what I have not seen, heard what I have not heard, sensed⁴ what I have not sensed, cognised what I have not cognised.⁵ I have not seen what I have seen, not heard what I have heard, not sensed what I have sensed, not cognised what I have cognised.”

Not seen means: not seen by the eye. **Not heard** means: not heard

¹ *sampajānamusāvāde*. Cf. Vin 3.59, Vin 3.66, Vin 3.93f., where this rule has been anticipated; and see BD 1.xxv, Bu-Pj 4 for offences involving defeat for telling a conscious lie. Here Kankhā-vitaranī, *Simon Hewavitarne Bequest*, p. 83, says that all conscious lying is a *pācittiya*. It, however (p. 82), draws attention to the fact that the conscious lie of claiming a state of further-men is a *pārājika* (4); that falsely to accuse someone of a *pārājika* is a *saṅghādisesa* (8); that unfoundedly to accuse someone of a *saṅghādisesa* is a *pācittiya* (76); that falsely to accuse someone of a failure in morality is a *dukkaṭa* (Bu-Pc 76, Vin 4.148). ² *pācittiya*. See above, BD 2.3, n. 4.

³ *anariya-vohārā*. The above eight are enumerated at Vin 5.125, DN iii.232, AN ii.246, Vb 376. ⁴ *amutaṃ mutaṃ me*. *Mutaṃ* translated at *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.127 “felt,” *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.223 “thought of,” *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.3 and GS 2.251 “sensed,” *Sacred Books of the East X*, 2nd edition, p.198 “thought.” GEIGER, *Pali Literature*, gives “*gedacht*.” The Old Commentary’s definition of *muta* shows that the sense-functions of nose, tongue and body had been differentiated by the time that it was compiled. Hence I have translated *muta* by “sensed” and not by “thought,” although etymologically “thought” may be more correct. Possibly *muta*, as a term covering these three sense-functions, dates from a time prior to their differentiation. That *muta* does not include the sense-functions of the eye and ear suggests that these were recognised earlier than the others, their specific terminology emerging earlier. Cf. Vin-a 736; and *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, 2nd edition, p. 221, n. 1, for *muta* pointing to an older tradition of a time when the five senses had not been co-ordinated. ⁵ *diṭṭha-suta-muta-viññāta*, combined at DN iii.232, MN ii.231, MN iii.29, Snp 1086, Snp 1122, Ds 961, It 121. At eight Sutta-nipāta passages *d°*, *s°*, *m°* are combined, sometimes with other items, but not with *v°*. The first three may therefore belong to some old tradition, originally threefold, *viññāta* being added later with the rise of interest in mind, *manas*, of which *viññāta* is here a function. See SN i.270 = Thag 1216, where *d°*, *s°*, *m°* are combined with *paṭigha*; and cf. SN-a i.270. See also *Psalms of the Brethren* 398, n. 9, KS i.237, n. 1; and *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, 2nd edition, p. 221, n. 1, for Upaniṣad references.

by the ear. **Not sensed** means: not smelt by the nose, not tasted by the tongue, not felt¹ by the body. **Not cognised** means: not cognised by the mind.

Seen means: seen by the eye. **Heard** means: heard by the ear. **Sensed** means: smelt by the nose, tasted by the tongue, felt by the body. **Cognised** means: cognised by the mind.

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie² that, “In three ways I have seen what I have not seen”: before he has lied he knows, “I am going to lie”; while lying he knows, “I am lying”; having lied he knows, “I lied.”

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In four ways I have seen what I have not seen”: before he has lied he knows, “I am going to lie”; while lying he knows, “I am lying”; having lied he knows, “I lied,” misrepresenting his opinion.

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In five ways ... I lied,” misrepresenting his opinion, misrepresenting his approval.

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In six ways ... I lied,” misrepresenting his opinion, misrepresenting his approval, misrepresenting his pleasure.

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In seven ways ... I lied,” misrepresenting his opinion, misrepresenting his approval, misrepresenting his pleasure, misrepresenting his intention.

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In three ways I have heard what I have not heard” ... “... sensed what I have not sensed” ... “... cognised what I have not cognised”: before he has lied he knows, “I am going to lie”; while lying he knows, “I am lying”; having lied he knows, “I lied.”

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In four ways ... in five ways ... in six ways ... in seven ways ...” misrepresenting his intention.

¹ *phuṭṭham*. ² From here to end of **Bu-Pc 1.2.6** cf. **BD 1.162–171**.

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In three ways I have seen and heard what I have not seen ... for telling the conscious lie that, “In three ways I have seen and sensed what I have not seen” ... “... I have seen and cognised what I have not seen” ... “... I have seen and heard and sensed what I have not seen” ... “... I have seen and heard and cognised what I have not seen” ... “... I have seen and heard and sensed and cognised what I have not seen.”

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In three ways I have heard and sensed what I have not heard” ... “... I have heard and cognised what I have not heard” ... “... I have heard and seen what I have not heard” ... “... I have heard and sensed and cognised and seen what I have not heard.”

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In three ways I have sensed and cognised what I have not sensed” ... “... I have sensed and cognised and heard and seen what I have not sensed.”

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In three ways I have cognised and seen what I have not cognised” ... “... In three ways I have cognised and seen and heard and sensed what I have not cognised.”

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In three ways I have seen what I have not seen ... heard what I have not heard ... sensed what I have not sensed ... cognised what I have not cognised.”

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In three ways I have seen what I have heard ... I have seen what I have sensed ... I have seen what I have cognised.”

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that, “In three ways I have seen what I have heard and what I have sensed ... I have seen what I have heard and what I have cognised ... I have seen

what I have heard and what I have sensed and what I have cognised”
 ... “... I have cognised what I have seen and what I have heard and
 what I have sensed.”

C1.2.6

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that,
 “In three ways he is in doubt as to what he has seen: he does not
 trust what he has seen, he does not remember what he has seen,
 he becomes confused as to what he has seen.¹ He is in doubt as to
 what he has heard: he does not trust what he has heard, he does not
 remember what he has heard, he becomes confused as to what he
 has heard. He is in doubt as to what he has sensed ... He is in doubt
 as to what he has cognised ... he becomes confused as to what he
 has cognised, saying: ‘It was cognised and seen by me’; he becomes
 confused as to what he has cognised, saying: ‘It was cognised and
 heard by me’; he becomes confused as to what he has cognised, saying:
 ‘It was cognised and sensed by me’; he becomes confused as to what
 he has cognised, saying: ‘It was cognised and seen and heard by me’;
 he becomes confused as to what he has cognised, saying: ‘It was
 cognised and seen and sensed by me’; he becomes confused as to
 what he has cognised, saying: ‘It was cognised and seen and heard
 and sensed by me.’”

2.170

There is an offence of expiation for telling the conscious lie that,
 “In four ways ... in five ways ... in six ways ... in seven ways he is
 confused as to what he has cognised, saying: ‘It was cognised and
 seen and heard and sensed by me.’” (These are the seven ways): be-
 fore he has lied he knows, “I am going to lie”; while he is lying he
 knows, “I am lying”; having lied he knows, “I lied,” misrepresent-
 ing his opinion, misrepresenting his approval, misrepresenting his
 pleasure, misrepresenting his intention

C1.2.7

There is no offence if he speaks in jest,² if he speaks in fun. **He
 speaks in jest** means he speaks in haste³; **he speaks in fun** means,

¹ Cf. BD 1.284. ² *davā*. ³ *śahasā*; Vin-a 737, without considering or reflecting.

saying: ‘I will speak of this,’ he speaks of that¹; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The First

¹ As saying *cīvaraṃ* for *cīraṃ*, Vin-a 737. It is very unusual, if not unique, for commentarial exegesis to occur in the “no offence” paragraph.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 2

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time, the group of six monks, quarrelling with well behaved monks, insulted the well behaved monks; they jeered at them, they scoffed at them about birth and name and clan and work and craft and disease and distinguishing mark and passion¹ and attainment² and low mode of address.³ Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks, quarrelling with well behaved monks, insult the well behaved monks? How can they jeer at them, scoff at them about birth ... low mode of address?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, quarrelling with well behaved monks, insulted the well behaved monks, jeered at them ... about low mode of address?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “How can you, foolish men, quarrelling with well behaved monks, insult the well behaved monks, jeer at them, scoff at them about ... low mode of

¹ *kilesa*. ² *āpatti*. ³ *akkosa*. *Critical Pali Dictionary* gives “abuse, scolding, reviling,” and *Pali-English Dictionary* “shouting at, abuse, insult, reproach, reviling.” But from the distinction drawn by the Old Commentary, below, **BD 2.177**, between *hīna* and *ukkaṭṭha akkosa*, these words must mean the ways in which you accost or address a person, either with insult or with respect. That the word *akkosa* came to mean “cursing” is evident from the compound *akkosavatthu*, (the ten) ways of cursing, referred to at Ja 1.191, which is founded on this Vinaya story. These ways are also referred to at Vin-a 625; Snp-a 364, Snp-a 467; and Dh-p-a 1.212 = Snp-a 342, where ten curses are enumerated. These vary somewhat from those given below in the Old Commentary.

address? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them and given *dhamma*-talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Formerly, monks, at Takkasilā,¹ Nandivīsāla was the name of an ox belonging to a certain brahmin. Then, monks, Nandivīsāla, the ox, spoke thus to the brahmin: ‘Brahmin, you go, bet a thousand² with the great merchant,³ saying: “My ox will draw a hundred carts tied together.”’ Then, monks, that brahmin made a bet of a thousand with the great merchant, saying: ‘My ox will draw a hundred carts tied together.’ Then, monks, that brahmin having tied together a hundred carts, having yoked Nandivīsāla, the ox, spoke thus: ‘Go, hornless one,⁴ let the hornless one pull them along.’⁵ Then, monks, Nandivīsāla, the ox, stood just where he was. Then, monks, that brahmin, having suffered the loss⁶ of a thousand, was overcome by grief.⁷ Then, monks, Nandivīsāla, the ox, spoke thus to the brahmin: ‘Why are you, brahmin, overcome by grief?’

‘Because I, good sir,⁸ suffered the loss of a thousand through you.’

‘But why do you, brahmin, bring me, who am not hornless, into disgrace with words of deceit?’⁹ Brahmin, you go, bet two thousand with the great merchant, saying: “My ox will draw a hundred carts tied together,” but do not bring me, who am not hornless, into disgrace with words of deceit.’

Then, monks, that brahmin bet two thousand with the great merchant, saying: ‘My ox will draw a hundred carts tied together.’ Then, monks, that brahmin having tied together a hundred carts, having yoked Nandivīsāla, the ox, spoke thus: ‘Go, good creature,¹⁰ let the good creature pull them along.’ Then, monks, Nandivīsāla, the ox, drew the hundred carts tied together.

¹ Modern Taxila. Story given again, with slight variations, at Ja 1.191. ² “Pieces,” probably *kahāpaṇas* to be understood. ³ *seṭṭhi*, see above, BD 2.42, n. 4. ⁴ *kūṭa*, not horned, therefore harmless. Jātaka Translation has “rascal.” Such maimed beasts had not a good reputation for work, Vism 268, Vism 269. *Kūṭa* also means false, deceitful. ⁵ *vahassu*. ⁶ *parājita*, with instrumental ⁷ *pajjhāyi*. ⁸ *bho*. ⁹ *kūṭavāda*, or “words about being hornless.” ¹⁰ *bhadra*.

Speak only words of kindness,¹
never words unkind.
For him who spoke him fair, he moved
A heavy load, and brought him wealth, for love.

in 4.6

At that time, monks, jeering and scoffing were not liked by me, so however could jeering and scoffing become liked now? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**In insulting speech² there is an offence of expiation.**”

2.2.1

Insulting speech means: he insults in ten ways: about birth and name and clan and work and craft and disease find distinguishing mark and passion and attainment and mode of address.

Birth means: there are two kinds of birth: low birth and high birth. **Low birth** means: birth as (a member of) a despised class,³

¹ *manāpa*. Ja 1.193 reads *manuñña* throughout. This seems to be a later word, see *Pali-English Dictionary* references. ² *omasavāde*. ³ *caṇḍāla*. These five kinds of birth occur again at e.g. MN ii.152, MN ii.183, MN iii.169, SN i.93, AN i.107, AN ii.85, Pp 51.

birth as a bamboo-plaiter,¹ birth as a hunter,² birth as a cartwright,³ birth as a refuse-scavenger⁴—this means low birth. **High birth** means: birth as a noble, birth as a brahmin—this means high birth.

Name means: there are two (kinds of) name: low name and high name. **Low name** means: Avakaṇṇaka,⁵ Javakaṇṇaka, Dhaniṭṭhaka, Savitṭhaka, Kulavaḍḍhaka, or what is disdained,⁶ disregarded,⁷ scorned,⁸ treated with contempt,⁹ despised¹⁰ in these districts—this means

¹ Or basket-weaver, *veṇa*. Vin-a 738 says *veṇajāti ti tacchakajāti veṇukārajāti* (with variant reading *veḷu*°), birth as a *veṇa* means birth as a carpenter, birth as a bamboo-worker. At Ja 5.306, *veṇi* is explained by *tacchikā*, a female carpenter. SN-a i.162 = AN-a 2.175 paraphrase *vena* by *vilivākāra*, a worker in bamboo, basket-maker. *The Questions of King Milinda* 2.211 (Sacred Books of the East) has “savages,” and see *loc. cit.*, n. 2. ² *nesāda*. Vin-a 738 = SN-a i.162 = AN-a 2.175 = Pu-a 227 explain by *migaluddaka*, a hunter or trapper. *The Questions of King Milinda*, 2.211 has “wild men of the woods,” with note that Sinhalese simply says “Weddahs, the well-known, interesting wild men of Ceylon.” ³ *rathakāra*, or carriage builder, chariot maker. Vin-a 738 = SN-a i.162 = AN-a 2.175 = Pu-a 227 = Ja 4.174 explain by *cammakāra*, usually a leather-worker. *Cammakāra* occurs below, BD 2.176, among the low crafts, while *rathakāra* is among the low kinds of birth; but there seems to be no correspondence between the kinds of low birth and the kinds of low craft, such as would enable one to say that a man of such-and-such a birth follows such-and-such a trade or craft. See *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.100, *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.102, which distinguishes those who are low by birth and those who follow low occupations, and which draws the inference that there “was no hard-and-fast line, determined by birth, for those who gained their living by these trades.” Mil 331, in a long list of people, gives both *rathakāra* and *cammakāra*, as though these represented two different types of occupation. I therefore think that at all events at some time these two words had two distinct meanings. ⁴ *pukkusa*. Vin-a 738 = SN-a i.162 = AN-a 2.175 paraphrase as *pupphacchaḍḍaka*, literally a scavenger of flowers, see below, BD 2.175. On Pukkusa as a proper name see *Dialogues of the Buddha* 2.141, n., and *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* Sometimes, as at AN i.162, AN iii.214, we get *caṇḍāla-pukkusa*. For note on the insertion of the three other kinds of birth (*veṇakāra*, *nesāda*, *rathakāra*) between *caṇḍāla* and *pukkusa* see *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.100. Here also the *hereditary* nature of these, as occupations, is discussed. It is clear that none of the five is included under *sūdra*, the lowest of the four *vaṇṇa* (colour, caste) or *kula* (family), from which the caste-system probably derived. ⁵ These five are, according to Vin-a 738, the names of slaves. *Kulavaḍḍhaka* look as though they were of caste on one side only, *kula + aḍḍhaka*, thus not of good family; or that they were low caste people trying to become higher caste people, *kula + vaḍḍhaka*. ⁶ *oññāta*. ⁷ *avaññāta*. ⁸ *hilita*. ⁹ *paribhūta*. ¹⁰ *acittikata*.

low name. **High name** means: connected with the enlightened one,¹ connected with *dhamma*, connected with the Order, or what is not disdained, not disregarded, not scorned, not treated with contempt, what is esteemed in these districts—this means high name.

Clan² means: there are two (kinds of) clan: low clan and high clan. **Low clan** means: a Kosiya clan,³ a Bharadvāja clan,⁴ or what is disdained, disregarded, scorned, treated with contempt, despised in these districts—this means low clan. **High clan** means: a Gotama⁵ clan, a Moggallāna clan, a Kaccāyana clan,⁶ a Vāsīṭṭha clan,⁷ or what is not disdained ... what is esteemed in these districts—this means high clan.

Work means: there are two (kinds of) work: low work and high work. **Low work** means: work of a store-room (keeper),⁸ work of a flower-scavenger,⁹ or what is disdained ... despised in these districts—this means low work. **High work** means: agriculture,¹⁰ trade,¹¹ cattle-keeping,¹² or what is not disdained ... what is esteemed in these

¹ *buddha-dhamma-saṅgha-paṭisaṃyutta*, not *Buddharakkhita*, etc., as at **BD 2.179** below and **Vin 3.169**. ² *gotta*. ³ A brahmin clan; see *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ⁴ Another brahmin clan; see *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ⁵ Cf. **DN ii.3**. These four clan or family names occur at **Vin 3.169**. ⁶ See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ⁷ See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ⁸ *koṭṭhakakamma*. *Vin-a 739* paraphrases as *tacchakakamma*, carpenter's work. At **Ja 5.306** *veṇī*, female bamboo-worker, is explained by *tacchikā*. *Koṭṭhaka* is usually the store-room itself. ⁹ *pupphacchaddakakamma*, the work of the person whose duty it was to remove dead flowers which had been offered at shrines but not removed by the devotees themselves. It was a low hereditary trade to which, e.g., *Sunīta* belonged, see *Psalm of the Bretheren*, p.271 and verse 620, where he says that he was born in a low family (*nīca kula*). ¹⁰ *kasi*. This and the two following occur at **MN i.85**, **Mil 178**. *Kasikamma* translated at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.60 "being an estate-agent." ¹¹ *vāṇi-jjā*, translated at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.60 "purveyor," and explained at **MN-a 2.56** as trade on water and trade on land. ¹² *Gorakkhā*, translated at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.60 "herd-manager." **MN-a 2.56** explains it as "minding cows for self or others, there is work and livelihood by bartering (*vikkaya*, or selling) the five products of the cow," while **MN-a 3.435**=**SnP-a 466** explains it by *khettarakkha kasikamma*, minding the fields, agriculture, and says that *go* is a name for *paṭhavī*, the earth. I see, however, no reason for adopting this interpretation here. These three types of work are mentioned at **Pv 1.5**.

districts¹—this means high work.

Craft² means: there are two (kinds of) craft: low craft and high craft. **Low craft** means: the craft of the basket-maker,³ the potter's craft, the weaver's craft, the leather-worker's⁴ craft, the barber's craft, or what is disdained ... despised in these districts—this means low craft. **High craft** means: reckoning on the fingers,⁵ calculation,⁶ writing,⁷ what is not disdained ... what is esteemed in these districts—this means high craft.

¹ These examples of despised and esteemed work are not monks' but lay-people's work. This looks like a fragment of original Sakya "left in" from a time when the Founder had the lay-people in mind as well as monks and nuns. ² *sippa*, craft or occupation. Eight are mentioned at MN i.85; another list is at Ud 31–Ud 32. At DN i.51 all the crafts, except the leather-worker's, termed "low" by Vinaya above, are enumerated under ordinary (*puthu*) crafts. Here also are included those who follow the crafts of "calculation" and "counting on the fingers" (*gaṇaka*, *muddika*, see below, notes 4 and 5, termed "high crafts" above. ³ *naḷakāra*, worker in reeds or rushes. ⁴ *cammakāra*, see above, BD 2.173, n. 7. ⁵ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2980.) ⁶ *ganaṇā*. Word occurs, e.g., at DN i.11, MN i.85, Ud 31, Vin 1.77 = Vin 4.128, Mil 59, Mil 78; see previous note. According to *Critical Pali Dictionary* *ganaṇā* means "the counting (of numbers) in unbroken series," in contradistinction to the last, as noticed by RHYS DAVIDS, *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.22, n. 1. Vin-a 739 = DN-a 1.95 = MN-a 2.56 = Ud-a 205 explain by *acchiddaka* (variant readings *acchinnaka*-, *acchindaka*-) *ganaṇā*. At Vin 1.77 = Vin 4.128 both *ganaṇā* and *lekhā* are considered unsuitable occupations for the boy Upāli to study. At DN i.11 and Ud 31–Ud 32 *muddā* and *ganaṇā* are followed by *saṅkhānā*, reckoning, with *lekhā* coming next to this. See *Sacred Books of the Buddhists* 8.38 and notes, and *The Questions of King Milinda* 1.91, n. 2. ⁷ *lekhā*. Word occurs at Ud 32, Mil 59, Mil 178; see above, BD 2.176, n. 4. Also at Vin 1.77 = Vin 4.128 (see previous note). At Vin 3.76 we find: "He praises by means of writing (*lekhāya*) means: if he cuts a writing there is a *dukkata* offence for each syllable (*akkharakkharāya*)," while at Vin 4.305 there is no offence for a nun to learn what is written. Vin-a 739 explains by *akkharatekhā*, writing, tracing, scratching or engraving syllables, as on a piece of metal, wood, a leaf or clay; see Vin-a 452. Some such process was probably known in India before writing as we understand it. Ud-a 205 says that the craft of writing (*lekhā-sippa*) is "the craft of writing (*likhana*) syllables in various ways, or the knowledge of writing (*likhā*)." See BD 1.131, n. 1. These *sippāni*, like the *kammāni* above, BD 2.175, were not intended to be followed by monks, and the distinction between "high" and "low" is probably mainly for the laity, although it gives the monks a guide as to the social standing of the laity.

All **diseases** are low, except that diabetes¹ is a high (kind of) disease.

Distinguishing mark² means: there are two (kinds of) distinguishing mark: low distinguishing mark and high distinguishing mark. **Low distinguishing mark** means: (being) very tall, very short, very dark, very fair—this means low distinguishing mark. **High distinguishing mark** means: not (being) very tall, very short, very dark, very fair—this means high distinguishing mark.

All **passions**³ are low.

All **attainments**⁴ are low, except that stream-attainment and higher attainment⁵ are high.

Mode of address⁶ means: there are two modes of address: low mode of address and high mode of address. **Low mode of address** means: he says, “You are a camel, you are a ram, you are an ox, you are an ass, you are an animal, you are (destined) for a state of woe,⁷ a good bourn is not for you, but a bad bourn is to be expected for you,” or by adding *ya* or *bha* (to the end of his name),⁸ or by calling him male and female⁹—this means low mode of address. **High mode of address** means: he says, “You are learned, you are experienced, you are wise, you are clever, you are a speaker of *dhamma*,¹⁰ a bad bourn is not for you, but a good bourn is to be expected for you”—this means high mode of address.

¹ *madhumeha*. Pali-English Dictionary suggests diabetes, and it is so translated at GS 5.75. ² *liṅga*, or characteristic. Cf. Vin 3.169. ³ *kilesa*. ⁴ At Vin 2.93 *sota-* and *sam-āpatti* are called *āpattis* not subject to legal question. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.44, n. The play on the words *āpatti*, *sot-āpatti*, *sam-āpatti* cannot well be reproduced in English if we regard *āpatti* in its more secondary sense of “fault, transgression, offence,” as seems to be the usual meaning in *Vinaya*, and as the translators of DN iii.212, AN i.84, AN i.94, Ds 1329 take it. When *āpatti* is combined with *sota-* and *sam-* it has the more primary meaning of acquiring, obtaining, entering into a relationship with. On *āpatti* as an offence, see *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, 2nd edition, p.321. ⁵ *sam-āpatti*. For note on the *samāpattis* see *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, 2nd edition, p.321, n. ⁶ See above, BD 2.171, n. 3. ⁷ *nerayika*. ⁸ *yakārena vā bhakārena vā*—i.e., as a diminutive and therefore as a disparaging ending. ⁹ *kāṭakoṭacikā*. ¹⁰ Inclusion here is characteristic of the respect in which the *dhamma-kaṭhika* was held.

If one who is ordained, desiring to jeer at, desiring to scoff at, desiring to shame¹ one who is ordained speaks of a low thing—(a member of) a despised class, a bamboo-plaiter, a hunter, a cartwright, a refuse-scavenger, with low words and says: “You are (a member of) a despised class, you are a bamboo-plaiter, you are a hunter, you are a cartwright, you are a refuse-scavenger,” for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring to jeer at ... desiring to shame one who is ordained speaks of a high thing—a noble, a brahmin, with low words and says: “You are (a member of) a despised class ... you are a refuse-scavenger,” for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring to jeer at ... desiring to shame one who is ordained speaks of a low thing—(a member of) a despised class ... a refuse-scavenger, with high words and says: “You are a noble, you are a brahmin,” for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring to jeer at ... desiring to shame one who is ordained speaks of a high thing—a noble, a brahmin, with high words and says: “You are a noble, you are a brahmin,” for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring to jeer at ... desiring to shame one who is ordained speaks of a low thing—an Avakaṇṇaka, a Javakaṇṇaka, a Dhaniṭṭhaka, a Saviṭṭhaka, a Kulavaḍḍhaka, with low words, for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame one who is ordained speaks of a high thing—a Buddharakkhita, a Dhammarakkhita, a Saṅgharakkhita² with low words and says: “You are an Avakaṇṇaka ... you are a Kulavaḍḍhaka,” for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame one who is ordained speaks of a low thing with high words ... speaks of a high thing with

¹ *maṅkuṃ kattukāmo*. Cf. SN v.74, Dhṃ 249, Vin 2.118, and HARDY, A.v., p. v. ² Cf. BD 1.292, and above, BD 2.174, which reads *buddha-dhamma-saṅgha-paṭisaṃyutta*.

high words ... for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a low thing—a Kosiya, a Bhāradvāja with low words ... speaks of a high thing—a Gotama, a Moggallāna, a Kaccāyana, a Vāsiṭṭha with low words ... speaks of a low thing with high words ... speaks of a high thing with high words ... there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a low thing—a store-room keeper, a flower-scavenger with low words ... speaks of a high thing—a cultivator,¹ a trader,² a cattle-keeper³ with low words ... speaks of a low thing with high words ... speaks of a high thing with high words ... there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a low thing—a basket-maker, a potter, a weaver, a leather-worker, a barber with low words ... if he speaks of a high thing—a reckoner,⁴ an arithmetician,⁵ a scribe⁶ with low words ... speaks of a low thing with high words ... speaks of a high thing with high words ... there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a low thing—one afflicted with leprosy, with boils, with eczema, with consumption, with epilepsy⁷ with low words ... if he speaks of a high thing—one afflicted with diabetes with low words ... if he speaks of a low thing with high words ... if he speaks of a high thing with high words ... there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a low

¹ *kassaka*, or husbandman, ploughman; not as above, **BD 2.175**, agriculture or ploughing, *kasi*. ² *vāṇija*; not *vāṇijjā*, trading, trade, as above, **BD 2.175**. ³ Presumably this, in the accusative *gorakkhaṃ*, is in the nominative *gorakkha* here, and not *gorakkhā* as above, **BD 2.175**. ⁴ *muddika*, so translated at *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.68. At DN i.51 *muddika* is included under ordinary (*puthu*) crafts. Word occurs at SN iv.376, translated KS iv.267 “ready-reckoner.” SN-a iii.113 defines as one who is good at computing by reckoning on the fingers. Above, **BD 2.176**, we had *muddā*.

⁵ *gaṇaka*, or computer, accountant; also an ordinary craft at DN i.51. Word also occurs at SN iv.376, translated KS iv.267 “accountant.” SN-a iii.113 says it means one who is good at computing in unbroken series. Above, **BD 2.176**, we had *gaṇanā*.

⁶ *lekhaka*, clerk or scribe, not mentioned at DN i.51. But see Mil 42. ⁷ These are all included in list of diseases at **Vin 2.271**, AN v.110, Mnd 17, Mnd 47, Cnd 304.

thing—(being) very tall, very short, very dark, very fair, with low words—speaks of a high thing—not (being) very tall, not very short, not very dark, not very fair with low words ... speaks of a low thing with high words ... speaks of a high thing with high words ... of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a low thing ... of one obsessed¹ by passion, of one obsessed by hatred, of one obsessed by confusion with low words ... speaks of a high thing—of one without passion, of one without hatred, of one without confusion with low words ... speaks of a low thing with high words ... speaks of a high thing with high words ... of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a low thing with low words—of being guilty of an offence of defeat,² of being guilty of an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, of being guilty of a grave offence, of being guilty of an offence of expiation, of being guilty of an offence which ought to be confessed, of being guilty of an offence of wrong-doing, of being guilty of an offence of wrong speech ... speaks of a high thing—a stream-attainer with low words ... speaks of a low thing with high words ... speaks of a high thing with high words ... there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a low thing—a camel, a ram, an ox, an ass, an animal, one (destined) for a state of woe, and says, “You are a camel ... you are (destined) for a state of woe, a good bourn is not for you but a bad bourn is to be expected for you,” for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a high thing—a learned person, an experienced, wise, clever person, one who is a speaker of *dhamma* with low words, and says, “You are a camel ... but a bad bourn is to be expected for you,” for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a low thing—a camel ... one (destined) for a state of woe with high words, and says, “You are learned, you are experienced, you are wise, you

¹ *pariyuṭṭhita*. ² Cf. *Vin* 3.164.

are clever, you are a speaker of *dhamma*, a bad bourn is not for you but a good bourn is to be expected for you,” for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks of a high thing—a learned person ... and says, “... but a good bourn is to be expected for you,” for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame one who is ordained, speaks thus, saying: “There are here some (members of) despised classes, bamboo-plaiters, hunters, cartwrights, refuse-scavengers,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks thus, saying: “There are here some nobles and brahmins,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame ... speaks thus, saying: “There are here some Avakaṇṇakas, Javakaṇṇakas, Dhaniṭṭhakas, Saviṭṭhakas, Kulavaḍḍhakas ... Buddharakkhitas, Dhammarakkhitas, Saṅgharakkhitas ... Kosiyas, Bhāradvājas ... Gotamas, Moggallānas, Kaccānas, Vāsiṭṭhas ... store-room (keepers),¹ flower-scavengers ... cultivators, traders, cattle-keepers ... basket-makers, potters, weavers, leather-workers, barbers ... reckoners, arithmeticians, scribes ... those afflicted by leprosy, by boils, by eczema, by consumption, by epilepsy ... those afflicted by diabetes ... (those who are) very tall, very short, very dark, very fair ... (those who are) not very tall, not very short, not very dark, not very fair ... (those who are) obsessed by passion, obsessed by hatred, obsessed by confusion ... (those who are) without passion, without hatred, without confusion ... (those who are) guilty of an offence involving defeat ... guilty of an offence of wrong speech ... (those who are) stream-attainers ... camels, rams, oxen, asses, animals, (those destined) for a state of woe, a good bourn is not for these, but a bad bourn is to be expected for these ... learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of *dhamma*, a bad bourn

¹ *koṭṭhakā*; cf. above, **BD 2.175**, where we had *koṭṭhakakamma*.

is not for these, but a good bourn is to be expected for these,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame one who has been ordained, speaks thus, saying: “What now if these are (members of) a despised class, bamboo-plaiters, hunters, cartwrights, refuse-scavengers?” ... saying: “What now if these are learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of *dhamma*?”, for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame one who has been ordained, speaks thus, saying: “We are not (members of) a despised class, bamboo-plaiters, hunters, cartwrights, refuse-scavengers” ... saying, “We are not learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of *dhamma*, a bad bourn is not for us, but a good bourn is to be expected for us,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame one who is not ordained,¹ speaks of a low thing with low words, of a high thing with low words, of a low thing with high words, of a high thing with high words, of a learned person, of an experienced, wise, clever person, of a speaker of *dhamma*, saying: “You are learned, you are experienced, you are wise, you are clever, you are a speaker of *dhamma*, a bad bourn is not for you but a good bourn is to be expected for you,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one who is ordained, desiring ... to shame one who is not ordained, speaks thus: “There are here some members of low castes ..., we are not learned people, experienced, wise, clever people, not speakers of *dhamma*, a bad bourn is not for us, but a good bourn is to be expected for us,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

¹ *Kankhā-vitarāṇi*, **BD 2.83**, says that here it is meant that nuns also are “not ordained.”

If one who is ordained, not desiring to jeer at, not desiring to scoff at, not desiring to shame one who is ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks of a low thing—of a (member of a) despised class, a bamboo-plaiter, a hunter, a cartwright, a refuse-scavenger with low words, and says: “You are (a member of) a despised class ... you are a refuse-scavenger,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech.

If one who is ordained, desiring not ... to shame one who is ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks of a high thing—a noble, a brahmin with low words, and says: “You are (a member of) a despised class ... you are a refuse-scavenger” ... speaks of a low thing with high words ... speaks of a high thing with high words—of a noble, a brahmin, and says: “You are a noble, you are a brahmin,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech.

If one who is ordained, not desiring ... to shame one who is ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks of a low thing with low words ... speaks of a high thing with low words ... speaks of a low thing with high words ... speaks of a high thing with high words—of a learned person ...” ... but a good bourn is to be expected for you,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech.

If one who is ordained, not desiring ... to shame one who is ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks thus: “There are here some (members of a) despised class ... we are not learned people, experienced, wise, clever people, we are not speakers of *dhamma*, a bad bourn is not for us, but a good bourn is to be expected for us,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech.

If one who is ordained, not desiring ... to shame one who is not ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks of a low thing with low words ... of a high thing with low words ... of a low thing with high words ... of a high thing with high words—of a learned person ... “... but a good bourn is to be expected for you,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech.

If one who is ordained, not desiring ... to shame one who is not ordained, (but having) a fondness for joking, speaks thus: “There are here some (members of a) despised class ... we are not learned people, experienced, wise, clever people, we are not speakers of *dhamma*, a bad bourn is not for us, but a good bourn is to be expected for us,” for each sentence there is an offence of wrong speech.

There is no offence if he is aiming at (explaining) the goal, if he is aiming at (explaining) *dhamma*, if he is aiming at (explaining) the teaching,¹ if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The second

¹ = Vin 3.130 (BD 1.218) = Vin 4.277. Vin-a 740 “praising the goal.”

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 3

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks brought slander¹ against monks for quarrelling, for disputing, for engaging in contention²; hearing of this they were proclaimed for that and this dissension; hearing of that they were proclaimed³ for this and that dissension, so that quarrels that had not arisen arose, and also quarrels that had arisen rolled on for becoming more, for expansion. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks bring slander against monks for quarrelling, (so that) hearing of this ... they were proclaimed ... for expansion.”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, brought slander against monks for quarrelling, (so that) hearing of this ... they were proclaimed ... for expansion?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, bring slander against monks for quarrelling, (so that) hearing of this ... they were proclaimed ... for expansion. It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increase in those who are pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“In slander by monks,⁴ there is an offence of expiation.”

¹ *pesuññaṃ upasamharanti.* ² These three words are defined at **Vin 4.150** as “engaging in legal questions,” so it may be supposed that the “quarrels,” etc., were of a doctrinal rather than of a personal nature. ³ *akkhāyanti.* ⁴ *bhikkhupesūñṇe.*

Slander means: slander comes to be in two ways: making dear¹ or desiring dissension.

One brings slander in ten ways: on account of birth² and on account of name and on account of clan and on account of work and on account of craft and on account of disease and on account of distinguishing mark and on account of passion and on account of attainment and on account of mode of address.

Birth means³: there are two (kinds of) birth: low birth and high birth. **Low birth** means: birth as (a member of) a despised class, birth as a bamboo-plaiter, birth as a hunter, birth as a cartwright, birth as a scavenger of refuse—this means low birth. **High birth** means: birth as a noble, birth as a brahmin—this means high birth ... **Mode of address** means: there are two modes of address: low mode of address and high mode of address. **Low mode of address** means: he says, “You are a camel ...” ... by calling him male and female—this means low mode of address. **High mode of address** means: he says, “You are learned ... a good bourn is to be expected for you”—this means high mode of address.

One who is ordained, hearing of one who is ordained, brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: “So and so calls him ‘a (member of a) despised class,⁴ a bamboo-plaiter, a hunter, a cartwright, a refuse-scavenger,’” for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

One who is ordained, hearing of one who is ordained, brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: “So and so calls him ‘a noble, a brahmin’” ... “So and so calls him ‘an Avakaṇṇaka, a Javakaṇṇaka, a Dhaniṭṭhaka, a Savitṭhaka, a Kulavaḍḍhaka’” ... saying: “So and so calls him ‘a camel, a ram, an ox, an ass, an animal, one (destined) for a state of woe, a good bourn is not for him, but

¹ *piyakamyassa*. Vin-a 740, “he says, ‘Thus will I become dear to him,’ desiring to be dear himself.” ² Cf. above, **BD 2.171**; here ablative is used throughout. ³ For the rest of this *pācittiya*, cf. **Bu-Pc 2**. ⁴ For this passage, cf. above, **BD 2.178f**.

a bad bourn is to be expected for him,' ... saying: "So and so calls him 'learned, experienced, wise, clever, a speaker of *dhamma*, a bad bourn is not for him, but a good bourn is to be expected for him,'" for each sentence there is an offence of expiation.

One who is ordained, hearing of one who is ordained, brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: "So and so says that 'there are here some (members of a) despised class, bamboo-plaiters, hunters, cart-wrights, refuse-scavengers,' he does not say anything else, he says just this," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

One who is ordained ... brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: "So and so says that 'there are here some nobles, brahmins,' he does not say anything else, he says just this" ... "So and so says that, 'There are here some learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of *dhamma*, there is no bad bourn for these, but a good bourn is to be expected for these,' he does not say anything else, he just says this," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

One who is ordained ... brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: "So and so says, 'What now if these are (members of a) despised class, bamboo-plaiters, hunters, cartwrights, refuse-scavengers?' he does not say anything else, he says just this" ... "So and so says, 'What now if these are learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of *dhamma*? He does not say anything else, he says just this," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

One who is ordained ... brings a slander against the one who is ordained, saying: "So and so says, 'We are (members of a) despised class'" ... So and so says, 'We are not learned, experienced, wise, clever people, speakers of *dhamma*, a bad bourn is not for us, but a good bourn is to be expected for us,' he does not say anything else, he says just this," for each sentence there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one who is ordained, hearing of one who is ordained, brings a slander against the one who is ordained, for each sentence there is

an offence of expiation. If one who is ordained, hearing of one who is ordained, brings a slander against one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If one who is ordained, hearing of one who is not ordained, brings a slander against one who is ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If one who is ordained, hearing of one who is not ordained, brings a slander against the one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if he is not making dear, if he is not desiring dissension, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Third

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 4

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time, the group of six monks made lay-followers speak *dhamma* line by line¹; the lay-followers were disrespectful, not deferential towards the monks, they did not live in harmony.² Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks make lay-followers speak *dhamma* line by line? The lay-followers are disrespectful ... they do not live in harmony.”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, made lay-followers speak *dhamma* line by line, (and that) lay-followers ... in harmony?”

“It is true, lord.” The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, make lay-followers speak *dhamma* line by line, (so that) lay-followers ... in harmony? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increase in those who are pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should make one who is not ordained speak *dhamma* line by line, there is an offence of expiation.”

¹ *padaso*. Vin-a 741, *padam* = *koṭṭhāsam*. Commentary also calls *pada* a fourth part of a verse (*gāthāpada*), the others being *anupada*, *anvakkhara*, *anuvyañjana*. Cf. MN-a 1.2, where is given the number of *padas* and *akkharas* of which Majjhima is said to consist; see W.A. DE SILVA, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts*, i.xx., who also says, “eight letters (*akkhara*) are a *Pada*, four *Pada*, a *Gāthā*.” ² Cf. AN iii.14.

Not ordained means: setting aside monk and nun, the rest are called not ordained.

A line, the next line, every syllable, the next phrase. **A line**¹ means: starting together they end together.² **The next line**³ means: starting singly they end together.⁴ **Every syllable**⁵ means: saying “form is impermanent” (*rūpaṃ aniccaṃ*) he drops the *rū*.⁶ **The next phrase**⁷ means: while saying “form is impermanent,” he⁸ utters the sound, “feelings are impermanent.” Whatever is line and whatever is next line and whatever is every syllable and whatever is next phrase, all this means **dhamma line by line**.

Dhamma means: spoken by the enlightened one,⁹ spoken by disciples,¹⁰ spoken to holy men,¹¹ spoken by *devatās*,¹² connected

¹ *pada*, see above, **BD 2.190, n. 1**. ² *ekato paṭṭhapetvā ekato osāpenti*. Vin-a 741 says that beginning every line together with a novice, so it is ended together. ³ *anupada*. Vin-a 741 says *dutiya-pada*. Vin-a 's assumption is that a *thera* and a novice are reciting a verse, Dh 1 being cited. ⁴ *paṭekkaṃ paṭṭhapetvā ekato osāpenti*. A *thera* says the first line alone and a novice says the second line together with him, Vin-a 741. ⁵ *anvakkhara*. On *akkhara* see **BD 1.132, n. 1**. Vin-a 741 says, *anvakkharan ti ekekaṃ akkharan*. ⁶ *run ti opāpeti*, he drops *run*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives “sound-particle” for *run*. Cf. Ja 1.418, *sā run ti saddaṃ akāsi*. Variant readings of text are *ruppaṃ, rūpaṃ*; of Vin-a , *rū*. The Sinhalese version of Vinaya reads, *rūpan ti osāpeti*, he ends at *rūpaṃ*; he thus drops (*opāpeti*) *aniccaṃ*, which is not the same as dropping a single syllable out of one word, and which seems to be the offence. ⁷ *anubyañjana*. The offence here is for a *thera* and a novice to say “form” and “feelings” simultaneously, instead of the latter waiting to begin his line until the former has finished his. ⁸ The novice, see Vin-a 741-742. ⁹ Vin-a 742 says, “the whole Vinaya-piṭaka, Abhidhammapiṭaka, Dhammapada, Cariya-piṭaka, Udāna, Itivuttaka, Jātaka, Suttanipāta, Vimānavatthu, Petavatthu, the Brahmajālā and other Suttas.” ¹⁰ Vin-a 742 says, “spoken by disciples belonging to the fourfold congregation: the Anaṅgaṇa, Sammādiṭṭhi, Anumāna, Cūḷavedalla, Mahāvedalla Suttas and others,” all Majjhima Suttas. MN-a 2.67 records that the ancients call the Anumāna the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha. ¹¹ *Isibhāsita*. Vin-a 742 says, “spoken to wanderers outside (the Sakyaputtiya Orders): the whole of the Paribbājakavagga,” in the Majjhima. ¹² Vin-a 742 says, “spoken by (or with) *devas*: the *Devatāsaṃyutta*, *Devaputtasaṃyutta*, *Mārasaṃyutta*, *Brahmasaṃyutta*, *Sakkasaṃyutta*,” of the *Saṃyuttanikāya*.

with the goal,¹ connected with *dhamma*.²

Should make speak³ means: he makes (him) speak by line, for every line there is an offence of expiation. He makes (him) speak by syllable, for every syllable there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained (and) makes him speak *dhamma* line by line, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained (and) makes him speak *dhamma* line by line, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained (and) makes him speak *dhamma* line by line, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained, there is no offence.

There is no offence in making (him) recite it together,⁴ in studying it together,⁵ if while speaking he drops a phrase⁶ usually familiar,⁷ if he drops it while expounding,⁸ if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fourth

¹ *atthupasamhito ti atthakathānissito*; so Vin-a 742, meaning apparently what is connected with the Commentary—a far cry from *attha* as originally the goal, the aim, the thing sought. ² *dhammupasamhito ti pālīnissito*; so Vin-a 742, thus identifying *dhamma* with the text. This definition of *dhamma* occurs again below, **BD 2.206**. Again not the earlier meaning of *dhamma*. ³ Below, **BD 2.206**, where same explanation is given for *deseyya*, should teach. According to Vin-a 742–Vin-a 743 it is an offence to speak line by line any matter included at the three Councils; also various suttas, named, but not so included; and various other compilations, enumerated, and called *abuddhavaṇṇa*. ⁴ Vin-a 743, if taking an exposition with an unordained person, he speaks it with him. ⁵ With one who is not ordained, so Vin-a 743. ⁶ Text, *gandha*; Vin-a 743 *gantha* with variant reading *gaṇṭha*. ⁷ Vin-a 743 says that “if the half-line of a verse does not come (to him), but the rest comes, this is called *yebhuyyena paṇṇagantho*.” ⁸ I.e., a sutta, so Vin-a 744.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 5

... at Ālavī in the chief shrine at Ālavī.¹ Now at that time lay-followers came to the monastery for the sake of hearing *dhamma*. When *dhamma* had been spoken, the monks who were elders went to their own dwelling-place,² (but) the monks who were novices lay down in a sleeping-place³ just there in the attendance hall⁴ together with the lay-followers, careless, thoughtless, naked, mumbling,⁵ snoring.⁶ The lay-followers⁷ looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the revered sirs lie down in a sleeping-place careless, thoughtless, naked, mumbling, snoring?”

Monks heard these lay-followers who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these monks lie down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained?”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks lay down in a sleeping-

¹ See BD 1.247, for Ālavī; and Ja 1.160, for this story. ² *yathāvihāra*. ³ *seyyarū kappeti*. It is clear from Old Commentary below that *seyyā* is to be taken as a separate word; hence I have added “in a sleeping-place.” There is the verb *nipajjati*, to lie down, but not necessarily in a recognised sleeping-place. ⁴ *upaṭṭhānasālā*. Monks and laymen can stay here for a night. The *upaṭṭhānasālā* means a hall where help and support is given, food and so on, by the *dāyakas* or benefactors, for the monks who come from outside. It is like the *dānasālā*, of the present day in Ceylon. ⁵ *vikū-jamānā*, which Vin-a 744 paraphrases as *vippalapamānā*. ⁶ *kākacchamānā*, which Vin-a 744 says is like making the noise of a crow, in the nose, emitting senseless noises. Also at AN iii.299. ⁷ I.e., the first-mentioned ones, Vin-a 744.

place with one who is not ordained?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men lie down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should lie down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Then the lord,¹ having stayed at Āḷavī for as long as he found suitable, set out on tour for Kosambī. Going along on tour, he arrived in due course at Kosambī. The lord stayed there at Kosambī in the Badarikā monastery.² Monks spoke thus to the venerable Rāhula:

“Reverend Rāhula, a rule of training laid down by the lord says that there should be no lying down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained. Reverend Rāhula, find a sleeping-place.”³

Then the venerable Rāhula, not obtaining a sleeping-place, lay down in a privy. Then the lord, getting up in the night towards morning, approached this privy, and having approached, he coughed and the venerable Rāhula also coughed.

“Who is here?” he said.

“It is I, lord, Rahula,” he said.

“Why are you sitting there, Rahula?”

Then the venerable Rahula told this matter to the lord. Then the

¹ Again, cf. Ja 1.160–Ja 1.161, where this story is given in greater detail. The sudden appearance of Rāhula in the Vinaya version gives the appearance of material left out. ² One of the four establishments for the Order at Kosambī. ³ According to Ja 1.161, before this rule was laid down, the monks had always welcomed Rāhula as though the place were his own. But from the day that it was laid down they would not give him a resting-place, for fear of transgressing.

lord in this connection, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk,¹ addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to lie down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained for two or three nights. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should lie down in a sleeping-place with one who is not ordained for more than two or three nights, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Not ordained means: setting aside monk, the rest are called not ordained.²

More than two or three nights means: exceeding two or three nights.

With means: together with.

Sleeping-place³ means: if it is fully covered,⁴ if it is fully closed round, if it is partially covered, if it is partially closed round.

Should lie down in a sleeping-place means: if at sunset on the fourth day a monk lies down⁵ while one who is not ordained is lying down, there is an offence of expiation. If one who is not ordained lies down while a monk is lying down,⁶ there is an offence of expiation. Or if both lie down, there is an offence of expiation. If getting up, they lie down again, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is not ordained (and) lies down in a sleeping-place for more than two or three nights, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether one is

¹ At Ja 1.161, Sāriputta is reprimanded by the lord, because if he did not know about Rāhula, what would he know about other youths? But in the Vinaya version Rāhula, judging by the prefix *āyasmā* to his name, is considered as ordained. It was not therefore that ordained monks should not lie down with him, but that he should not lie down with unordained persons. ² Cf. above, BD 2.191, where we get “setting aside monk and nun.” ³ *seyyā*. In the rule only the phrase *seyyam kappeyya* occurs; this is explained next. Another definition of *seyyā*, occurs below, BD 2.244. ⁴ I.e., by a roof. ⁵ *nipajjati*. ⁶ *Monks’ nipanne*, variant readings given at Vin 4.355.

not ordained (and) lies down in a sleeping-place for more than two or three nights, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is not ordained (and) lies down in a sleeping-place for more than two or three nights, there is an offence of expiation. If it is half covered, half closed round, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether one is ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is ordained, there is no offence.

533 There is no offence if he stays for two or three nights; if he stays for less than two or three nights; if having stayed for two nights, departing before dawn on the third night, he stays again¹; if it is fully covered (but) not fully closed round; if it is fully closed round (but) not fully covered; if it is partially uncovered, partially not closed round; if the monk sits down while one who is not ordained is lying down; if one who is not ordained sits down while the monk is lying down; or if both sit down; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fifth

¹ Cf. below, **BD 2.378**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 6

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Anuruddha, going to Sāvattḥī through the country of Kosala, in the evening arrived at a certain village. Now at that time a rest-house¹ in that village had been made ready by a certain woman. Then the venerable Anuruddha approached that woman,² and having approached he spoke thus to that woman:

"Sister, if it does not inconvenience you, we would stay for one night in the rest-house." "Do stay, honoured sir," she said. But other travellers came up to that woman, and having come up, they spoke thus to that woman:

"Lady, if it does not inconvenience you, we would stay for one night in the rest-house."

"But this master, the recluse, arrived first. If he allows it, do stay," she said.

Then these travellers approached the venerable Anuruddha, and having approached, they spoke thus to the venerable Anuruddha:

"If it does not inconvenience you, honoured sir, we would stay for one night in the rest-house."

"Do stay, sirs," he said.

Then that woman, on account of his appearance, fell in love with the venerable Anuruddha. Then that woman approached the venerable Anuruddha, and having approached, she spoke thus to the venerable Anuruddha:

¹ *āvasathāgāraṇ ti āgantukānaṃ vasaṇāgāraṃ*, a dwelling-house for those coming in, Vin-a 750. Cf. *āvasatha-piṇḍa*, below, **BD 2.303**. ² Vin-a 750 says that he had heard of this resting-place from other people.

“Honoured sir, the master will not be comfortable, crowded with these people. Honoured sir, it would be good if I were to prepare a couch within for the master.”

The venerable Anuruddha consented by becoming silent.

Then that woman, having prepared a couch within for the venerable Anuruddha, having decked herself up in ornaments,¹ smelling of perfumes, approached the venerable Anuruddha, and having approached she spoke thus to the venerable Anuruddha:

“Honoured sir, the master is beautiful, good to look upon, charming; I also am beautiful, good to look upon, charming. It were good, honoured sir, if I were to become the master’s wife.”

When she had spoken thus, the venerable Anuruddha was silent. A second time ... A third time that woman spoke thus to the venerable Anuruddha:

“Honoured sir, the master is beautiful, good to look upon, charming; I also am beautiful, good to look upon, charming. Pray, honoured sir, let the master take me as well as all the wealth.”

A third time the venerable Anuruddha became silent. Then that woman, having slipped off² her outer cloak, walked up and down before the venerable Anuruddha, then she stood, then she sat down, then she lay down. Then the venerable Anuruddha, keeping control over (his) faculties,³ neither so much as looked at that woman nor addressed her. Then that woman said:

“Indeed it is wonderful, good sir, indeed it is marvellous, good sir, many men send for me with a hundred⁴ or a thousand,⁵ but this recluse, being himself begged by me does not desire to take me as well as all the wealth,” and dressing in her outer cloak, saluting the feet of the venerable Anuruddha with her head, she spoke thus to the venerable Anuruddha:

“Honoured sir, a transgression has overcome⁶ me, in that I acted

¹ Cf. Vin 4.161. ² *nikkhipitvā, ni + khipati*, to put down or off. ³ *okkhipitvā, ava + khipati*, to cast or throw down; figuratively usually applied to the eyes, and thence to the other senses; thus meaning to control, to have under control. Cf. AN iv.254, where Anuruddha again *indriyāni okkhipi*. ⁴ *kahāpaṇas* presumably.

⁵ *kahāpaṇas* presumably. ⁶ Following passage = DN i.85. Cf. also MN i.438.

thus, foolish, misguided,¹ wrong that I was. Honoured sir, let the master acknowledge for me the transgression as a transgression for the sake of restraint in the future.”

“Truly, sister, a transgression overcame you in that you acted thus, foolish, misguided, wrong that you were. But if you, sister, seeing the transgression as a transgression, confess² according to the rule, we acknowledge it for you; for, sister, in the discipline of the noble, this is growth³: whoever, seeing a transgression as a transgression, confesses according to the rule, and⁴ attains restraint in the future.”

Then that woman, at the end of that night, having with her own hands satisfied and served the venerable Anuruddha with abundant food, both solid and soft, greeting the venerable Anuruddha when he had eaten and removed his hand from the bowl, sat down at a respectful distance. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Anuruddha gladdened, roused, pleased, delighted that woman with talk on *dhamma*. Then that woman, gladdened, roused, pleased, delighted by the venerable Anuruddha with talk on *dhamma*, said to the venerable Anuruddha:

“Excellent, honoured sir, it is excellent, honoured sir; even as one, honoured sir, would set upright what is overturned, or would uncover what is hidden, or would point out the way to one who is astray, or would bring out an oil lamp into the darkness, so that those with eyes could see forms—even so has *dhamma* been explained in many a figure by master Anuruddha. Honoured sir, I myself go to the lord as refuge, to *dhamma* and to the Order of monks; let the master receive me as a lay-follower from this day forth, so long as life lasts, as one gone for refuge.”⁵

Then the venerable Anuruddha, having gone to Sāvattihī, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Anuruddha lie down in a sleeping-place with a woman?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord ...

¹ *mūḷha*, or erring, infatuated, blind. ² *paṭikarosi*. Above, BD 2.8, the word translated “confess” was *deseti*. ³ *Vuddhi h’esā ariyassa vinaye*. ⁴ *ca* omitted at DN i.85.

⁵ A stock formula—e.g., DN i.85; AN i.56.

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Anuruddha, lay down in a sleeping-place with a woman?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, Anuruddha, lie down in a sleeping-place with a woman¹? Anuruddha, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth :

“Whatever monk should lie down in a sleeping-place with a woman, there is an offence of expiation.”

6.2.1

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Woman means: a human woman, not a female *yakkha*, not a female departed one, not a female animal, even a little girl born this very day, all the more an older one.²

With means: together.³

14.20

Sleeping-place means: if it is fully covered, if it is fully closed round, if it is partially covered, if it is partially closed round.⁴

2.202

Should lie down in a sleeping-place means: if at sunset a monk lies down when a woman is lying down, there is an offence of expiation. If a woman lies down when a monk is lying down, there is an offence of expiation. Or if both lie down there is an offence of expiation. If getting up, they lie down again, there is an offence of expiation.⁵

6.2.2

If he thinks that it is a woman⁶ when it is a woman (and) lies down in a sleeping-place with (her), there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a woman (and) lies down in a sleeping-place with (her), there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is a woman (and) lies down in a sleeping-place

¹ This seems unfair, as Anuruddha is shown not to have lain down with the woman. He was a cousin to Gotama, and one of his most eminent disciples. At AN i.23 he is called chief of those of deva-like sight, a gift he highly prized; see MN i.213. ² Cf. BD 1.202, BD 1.332. ³ *sahā ti ekato*. ⁴ Cf. above, BD 2.196. ⁵ Cf. above, BD 2.196; Vin 4.138. ⁶ Cf. below, BD 2.206, BD 2.358.

with (her), there is an offence of expiation. If it is half covered, half closed round, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he lies down in a sleeping-place with a female *yakkha* or with a female departed one or with a eunuch or with a female animal, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹ If he thinks that it is a woman when it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is not a woman, there is no offence.

There is no offence if it is fully covered (but) not fully closed round, if it is fully closed round (but) not fully covered, if it is partially uncovered, partially not closed round, if the monk sits down while the woman is lying down, if the woman sits down while the monk is lying down, or if both sit down; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.²

The Sixth

¹ Cf. below, [BD 2.207](#), [BD 2.358](#). ² Cf. above, [BD 2.197](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 7

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Udāyin frequented families, and he approached many families. Then the venerable Udāyin, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, went up to a certain family. Now at that time the house-wife¹ was sitting at the entrance-door,² and the daughter-in-law of the house³ was sitting at the door of the living-room.⁴ Then the venerable Udāyin went up to the house-wife, and having gone up he gave *dhamma* privately⁵ to the house-wife. Then the daughter-in-law of the house thought thus:

“What now, is this recluse the mother-in-law's lover, or is he speaking offensively?”

Then the venerable Udāyin, having given *dhamma* privately to the house-wife, approached the daughter-in-law of the house, and having approached he gave *dhamma* privately to the daughter-in-law of the house. Then the house-wife thought:

“What now, is this recluse the lover of the daughter-in-law of the house, or is he speaking offensively?”

Then the venerable Udāyin, having given *dhamma* privately to the daughter-in-law of the house, departed. Then the house-wife said to the daughter-in-law of the house:

“Well now, what did this recluse say to you?”

“Lady, he taught *dhamma* to me⁶; but what did he say to the lady?”

¹ *gharaṇī* = *gharasāminī*, Vin-a 750 = Pv-a 174. Cf. *kulagharaṇī* at SN i.201; *gharaṇī* at Vin 1.271, Pv 3.1.9. ² *nivesanadvāre ti nivesanassa mahādvāre*, Vin-a 750.

³ *gharasuṇhā*. ⁴ *āvasathadvāre ti ovarakadvāre*, Vin-a 750. ⁵ *upakaṇṇake*, literally into the ear. ⁶ *me* the first time, *mayham* the second.

“He also taught *dhamma* to me,”¹ she said.

These (women) looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can master Udāyin teach *dhamma* privately? Should not *dhamma* be given clearly² and openly?”

Monks heard these women who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Udāyin teach *dhamma* to women?”³

Then these monks told this matter to the lord ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, taught *dhamma* to women?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, teach *dhamma* to women? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should teach *dhamma* to women, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time female lay-followers, seeing monks, spoke thus:

“Please, masters, teach *dhamma*.”

“Sisters, it is not allowable to teach *dhamma* to women.”

“Please, masters, teach *dhamma* in five or six sentences,⁴ it is possible to learn *dhamma* in a few (sentences).”

“Sisters, it is not allowable to teach *dhamma* to women,” and being scrupulous, they did not teach. The female lay-followers looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

¹ me the first time, *mayham* the second. ² *vissattkena*, which *Pali-English Dictionary*, quoting *Vin 2.99* (*vissatṭhena*), calls “in confidence.” *Vin-a 750* says, *vissatṭhenaṅ ti suniggaṭṭena saddena*. ³ Note how the emphasis is shifted from “privately” to “to women”; probably such a shifting bears the mark of a later editorial hand, when women no longer occupied the comparatively high place that was theirs under early Buddhism. ⁴ *vācā*, or word, saying, speech.

“How can these masters, being asked by us, not teach *dhamma*?”

Monks heard these female lay-followers who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, I allow you to teach *dhamma* to women in five or six sentences. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should teach *dhamma* to women in more than five or six sentences, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time the group of six monks thought: “It is allowed by the lord to teach *dhamma* to women in five or six sentences”; and these, making an unlearned man¹ sit down near by, taught *dhamma* to women in more than five or six sentences. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the group of six monks, making an unlearned man sit down near by, teach *dhamma* to women in more than five or six sentences?”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks ... to women?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men ... to women? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should teach *dhamma* to women in more than five or six sentences, except a learned man² (be present), there is offence of expiation.**”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

¹ *aviññum purisaviggaham*. ² *viññunā purisaviggahena*. Vin-a 750 says, “not a *yakkha*, not a departed one, not an animal.”

Woman means: a human woman, not a female *yakkha*, not a female departed one, not a female animal, one who is learned, competent to know good speech and bad speech, what is lewd and what is not lewd.¹

In more than five or six sentences means: exceeding five or six sentences.

Dhamma means: spoken by the enlightened one, spoken by disciples, spoken to holy men, spoken by *devatās*, connected with the goal, connected with *dhamma*.²

Should teach means: if he teaches by line, for every line there is an offence of expiation. If he teaches by syllable, for every syllable there is an offence of expiation.³

Except a learned man (be present) means: setting aside a learned man.

A learned man means: one who is competent to know good speech and bad speech, what is lewd and what is not lewd.

If he thinks that it is a woman⁴ when it is a woman (and) teaches *dhamma* in more than five or six sentences, except a learned man (be present), there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a woman (and) ... except a learned man (be present), there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is a woman ... except a learned man (be present), there is an offence of expiation. If he teaches *dhamma* in more than five or six sentences to a female *yakkha* or to a female departed one or to a eunuch or to an animal in woman's form, except a learned man (be present), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a woman when it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is not a woman, there is no offence.

¹ =BD 1.215, BD 1.337. ² =above, BD 2.192. ³ Cf. above, BD 2.192, where there is the same explanation for *vāceyya* as here for *deseyya*. ⁴ Cf. above, BD 2.202, below, BD 2.358.

There is no offence if a learned man (be present); if he teaches *dhamma* in five or six sentences; if he teaches *dhamma* in less than five or six sentences; if he teaches having risen, having sat down again; if the woman having risen sits down again, and he teaches at that (moment)¹; if he is teaching a different woman; if she asks a question; if (she) having asked a question, he speaks; if talking for the good of another, a woman hears²; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Seventh

¹ *tasmim deseti*; Vin-a 751, *tasmim khaṇe deseti*. ² Cf. **BD 2.272**, **BD 2.275**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 8

... at Vesālī in the pavilion of the Gabled Hall in the Great Grove. Now at that time¹ many monks who were friends and companions went for the rains to the banks of the river Vaggumudā. At that time Vajji was short of alms-food, which was difficult to obtain; it was suffering from a famine, and food-tickets were being issued. Nor was it easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. Then these monks said to one another:

“At present Vajjī is short of alms-food ... Nor is it easy to keep oneself going by gleaning or by favour. What now if we, by some strategem, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, should spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food?”

Some spoke thus: “Look, your reverences, we could superintend the business of householders, thus they will think to give to us; thus we, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, will spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food.”

Some spoke thus: “Enough, your reverences, of super-intending the business of householders. Look, your reverences, we will execute householders' commissions, thus they will think to give to us; thus we, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, will spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food.”

Some spoke thus: “Enough, your reverences, of super-intending the business of householders and of executing householders' commissions. Look, your reverences, we will speak praise to household-

¹ Cf. Bu-Pj 4, where it is an offence involving defeat unfoundedly to claim a condition of further-men (*uttarimanussa-dhamma*). See BD 1.151ff. for notes.

ers concerning this or that condition of further-men, saying: ‘Such a monk is possessed of the first musing, such a monk is possessed of the second musing, such a monk is possessed of the third musing, such a monk is possessed of the fourth musing, such a monk is a stream-attainer, such a monk is a once-returner, such a monk is a non-returner, such a monk is man perfected, such a monk is a three-fold wisdom man, such a monk is a sixfold super-knowledge man.’ Thus these (householders) will think to give to us; thus we, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, will spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food. It is better, your reverences, to speak praise to householders concerning this or that condition of further-men.”

Then these monks spoke praise to householders concerning this or that condition of further-men, saying, “Such a monk is possessed of the first musing ... such a monk is a sixfold super-knowledge man.” Then these (men) thought: “Surely we have gained, surely there is a profit for us that such monks have come to us for the rains. Surely such monks as these monks, virtuous and of good character, never came to us for the rains before.” Accordingly these did not on their own account eat meals—they gave not to parents, they gave not to wife and children, they gave not to slave or servant, they gave not to friend or colleague, they gave not to blood-relations, as they gave to the monks. Accordingly these did not on their own account take savoury solid foods or drinks—they gave not to parents, they gave not to wife and children, they gave not to slave or servant, they gave not to friend or colleague, they gave not to blood-relations, as they gave to the monks. Thus these monks became handsome, of rounded features, their complexions bright, their skins clear.

Now it was the custom for monks who had finished keeping the rains to go and see the lord. Then these monks who had finished keeping the rains, the three months having elapsed, packing away their bedding taking their bowls and robes, went up to Vesālī. In the course of time they came up to Vesālī, the Great Grove, the pavilion

of the Gabled Hall, and to the lord, and having approached the lord, they greeted him and sat down at a respectful distance. At that time the monks who had spent the rains in those regions had become lean, wretched, of a bad colour, having become very yellow, their veins standing out all over their bodies; but the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā had become handsome, of rounded features, their complexions bright, their skins clear. Now it was the custom for enlightened ones, for lords, to exchange friendly greetings with incoming monks. So the lord said to the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā:

“I hope, monks, that things went well with you, I hope that you had enough to support life, I hope that, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, you spent a comfortable rainy season and did not go short of alms-food?”

“Things did go well with us, lord, we had enough to support life, lord, and all together we, lord, being on friendly terms and harmonious, spent a comfortable rainy season and did not go short of alms-food.”

Tathāgatas knowing (sometimes) ask; knowing (sometimes) do not ask; they ask, knowing the right time (to ask), and they do not ask, knowing the right time (when not to ask). Tathāgatas ask about what belongs to the goal, not about what does not belong to the goal; the breaking of the bridge of the Tathāgatas is among what does not belong to the goal. Enlightened ones, lords, question monks concerning two matters, either: “Shall we teach *dhamma*?” or, “Shall we make known a rule of training for disciples?”

Then the lord spoke thus to the monks from the banks of the Vaggumudā:

“In what way did you, monks, all together, being on friendly terms and harmonious, spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of alms-food?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

“Indeed, monks, I wonder if that is a fact?”

“It is a fact,¹ lord,” they said.

¹ At Vin 3.89 (BD 1.154), the answer is, “It is not a fact,” or it is a falsehood (*abhūta*).

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, monks, for the sake of your stomachs, speak praise to householders concerning this or that condition of further-men? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should speak of a condition of further-men to one who is not ordained**—if it is a fact,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”

8.2.1

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Not ordained means: setting aside monk and nun, the rest are called not ordained.

Condition of further-men² means: musing, freedom, concentration, attainment, knowledge and insight, making the Way to become, realisation of the fruits, destruction of the corruptions, delight in solitude for the mind devoid of the hindrances.

Musing means: the first musing, the second musing, the third musing, the fourth musing.

Freedom means: void freedom, signless freedom, freedom in which there is no hankering.

Concentration means: void concentration, signless concentration, concentration in which there is no hankering.

Attainment means: void attainment, signless attainment, attainment in which there is no hankering.

14.26

Knowledge and insight³ means: the three knowledges.

Making the Way to become means: the four presences of mindfulness, the four right efforts, the four bases of psychic potencies, the five faculties, the five powers, the seven parts of enlightenment, the noble eightfold Way.

2.212

Realisation of the fruits means: realisation of the fruit of stream-attainment, realisation of the fruit of once-returning, realisation of the fruit of no-return, realisation of the fruit of perfection.

¹ If it is not a fact, then there is a *Pārājika* offence (Bu-Pj 4). ² From here to end of this *Pācittiya*, cf. Vin 3.92-100 (BD 1.161-171). ³ At Vin 3.93, simply *ñāṇa*, knowledge.

Destruction of the corruptions means: the destruction of passion, the destruction of hatred, the destruction of confusion.

For the mind devoid of the hindrances means: the mind devoid of the hindrance of passion, the mind devoid of the hindrance of hatred, the mind devoid of the hindrance of confusion.

Delight in solitude means: during the first musing there is delight in solitude, during the second musing ... during the third musing ... during the fourth musing there is delight in solitude.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I am attaining the first musing."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I attained the first musing." ... "I am possessed of the first musing ... I am master of the first musing ... The first musing is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: "I will attain the second ... third ... fourth musing. I am attaining the second ... third ... fourth musing. I attained the second ... third ... fourth musing. I am possessed of the ... fourth musing. I am master of the ... fourth musing. The ... fourth musing is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: "I will attain ... I am attaining ... I attained the void freedom, the signless freedom, the freedom in which there is no hankering, the void concentration, the signless concentration, the concentration in which there is no hankering, I am possessed of ... I am master of the concentration in which there is no hankering, the concentration in which there is no hankering is realised by me."

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: "I will attain ... I am attaining ... I attained the void attainment, the signless attainment, the attainment

in which there is no hankering, I am possessed of ... I am master of the attainment in which there is no hankering, the attainment in which there is no hankering is realised by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: “I will attain the three knowledges ... I am possessed of the three knowledges ...”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: “I will attain ... I am possessed of the four presences of mindfulness, the four right efforts, the four bases of psychic potencies ...”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained: “I will attain the five faculties, the five powers ... I am possessed of ... I am master of the five powers, the five powers are realised by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the seven parts of enlightenment ... I am possessed of the seven parts of enlightenment ...”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the noble eightfold Way ... I am possessed of the noble eightfold Way ...”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the fruit of stream-attainment, the fruit of once- returning, the fruit of no-return, perfection ... I am possessed of perfection ...”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “Passion is given up by me, hatred is given up by me, confusion is given up by me ... renounced ... sacrificed ... destroyed ... forsaken ... thrown aside ... rejected.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “My mind is devoid of the hindrance of passion ... of hatred ... my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for say-

ing to one who is not ordained: “In solitude I will attain the first musing ... the second musing ... the third ... the fourth musing ... in solitude I am possessed of the fourth musing ...”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing and the second musing ... the second musing is realised by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing and the third musing ... the first musing and the fourth musing are attained by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing and the void freedom and the signless freedom and the freedom in which there is no hankering and the void concentration and the signless concentration and the concentration in which there is no hankering ... is realised by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing and the void attainment and the signless attainment and the attainment in which there is no hankering ... is realised by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing and the three knowledges ... is realised by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing and the four presences of mindfulness and the four right efforts and the four bases of psychic potencies ... realised by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing and the five faculties and the five powers ... realised by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing and the seven parts of enlightenment, and the noble eightfold Way, and the

fruit of stream-attainment, and the fruit of once-returning, and the fruit of no-return, and perfection ... realised by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing ... I attained ... and passion is given up by me, and hatred is given up by me, and confusion is given up by me, and ... rejected.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing ... I am attaining ... realised by me ... and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of passion ... of the hindrance of hatred ... of the hindrance of confusion.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will enter upon the second musing and the third musing, and the second musing and the fourth musing ... and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the second musing and the first musing ... attained by me.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “My mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion and I will attain the first musing and the second musing and the third musing and the fourth musing ... realised by me ...”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “My mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of hatred ...”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain ... I am attaining ... I attained the first musing and the second musing and the third musing and the fourth musing and the void freedom and the signless freedom and the freedom in which there is no hankering and the void concentration and the signless concentration and the concentration in which there is no hankering and the void attainment and the signless attainment and the attainment in which there is no hankering and the three knowledges and the four presences of mindfulness and

the four right efforts and the four bases of psychic potencies and the five faculties and the five powers and the seven parts of enlightenment and the noble eightfold Way and the fruit of stream-attainment and the fruit of once-returning and the fruit of no-return and perfection and passion is given up by me ... and hatred is given up by me ... and confusion is given up by me, renounced, sacrificed, destroyed, forsaken, thrown aside, rejected, and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of passion and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of hatred and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion.”

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing,” and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, “I will attain the second musing”; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the first musing,” and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, “I will attain the third musing ... the fourth musing ... the void freedom ... and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion”; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “I will attain the second musing,” and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, “... and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion” ... for saying, for acknowledging ... “I will attain the first musing ...”; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, “My mind is devoid of the hindrance of hatred,” and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, “I will attain the first musing” ... for saying, for acknowledging ... “... My mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion”; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for say-

ing to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the first musing and the second musing and the third musing and the fourth musing ... and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of hatred," and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, "My mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion"; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Should speak of means: there is an offence of expiation for saying to one who is not ordained, "I will attain the second musing and the third musing ... and my mind is devoid of the hindrance of confusion," and for acknowledging it, if he is desirous of saying, "I will attain the first musing"; but if he does not acknowledge it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

8.2.5
There is an offence of wrong-doing for saying to one who is not ordained, "The monk who lives in this dwelling-place will attain ... is attaining ... attained the first musing, this monk is possessed of, master of the first musing, the first musing is realised by this monk."

2.218
There is an offence of wrong-doing for saying to one who is not ordained, "The monk who lives in this dwelling-place will attain ... is attaining ... attained the second musing, the third musing, the fourth musing, the void freedom ... perfection ... Passion is given up by this monk ... hatred is given up ... confusion is given up by this monk, renounced ... rejected. This monk's mind is devoid of the hindrance of passion ... of hatred ... is devoid of the hindrance of confusion."

14.30
There is an offence of wrong-doing for saying to one who is not ordained, "The monk who lives in this dwelling-place will attain ... is attaining ... attained the first musing in solitude ... the second musing ... the third musing ... the fourth musing in solitude ... This monk is possessed of the fourth musing in solitude, is master of ... The fourth musing is realised by this monk in solitude."

There is an offence of wrong-doing for saying to one who is not ordained, "The monk who uses your dwelling-place, who uses your robes, who uses your alms-food, who uses your lodgings, who uses your medicines for the sick ... by whom your dwelling-place was

used, by whom your robes were used, by whom your alms-food was used, by whom your lodgings were used, by whom your medicine for the sick were used ... to whom, thanks to you, he gave a dwelling-place, he gave robes, he gave alms-food, he gave lodgings, he gave medicines for the sick, that monk attained the fourth musing in solitude ... the fourth musing was realised by that monk in solitude.”

There is no offence if he speaks of what is a fact¹ to one who is ordained; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Eighth

¹ *bhūta*.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 9

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, came to be making a quarrel with the group of six monks. He, having fallen into the offence of intentional emission of semen,¹ begged the Order for probation on account of this offence. The Order granted him probation on account of this offence. At that time a certain guild at Sāvattthī had food for the Order. He, being under probation, sat down in the refectory at the end of a seat. The group of six monks said to these lay-followers:

“Your reverences, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, an esteemed dependent of yours, is eating the gift of faith with the very same hand as that which he used to emit semen. He, falling into the offence of intentional emission, begged the Order for probation on account of that offence. The Order granted him probation on account of that offence, so that being under probation, he is sitting at the end of a seat.”

Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks speak of a very bad offence² of a monk to one who is not ordained?”

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, spoke of a very bad offence of a monk to one who is not ordained?”

¹ Bu-Ss 1, Vin 3.112 = BD 1.196. Cf. also Bu-Pc 64. ² *duṭṭhullā āpatti*. Old Commentary shows that *duṭṭhulla* means here something more general than “lewd” (Vin 3.128, Vin 3.191-192; BD 1.215, BD 1.336-337). *Vinaya Texts* i.33 has “grave offence,” but I am keeping this as a technical term for *thullaccaya*. Cf. Kv 163.

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, speak of a monk’s very bad offence to one who is not ordained? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should speak of a monk’s very bad offence to one who is not ordained, except on the agreement of the monks,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Of a monk’s means: of another monk’s.

Very bad offence means: both the four involving defeat and the thirteen involving a formal meeting of the Order.²

Not ordained means: setting aside monk and nun, the rest are called not ordained.³

Should speak of means: should speak of to a woman or to a man or to one who leads the household life⁴ or to one who has gone forth.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks.

There is agreement of the monks limited to offences,⁵ not limited to families; there is agreement of the monks limited to families, not limited to offences; there is agreement of the monks limited to offences and limited to families; there is agreement of the monks neither limited to offences nor limited to families.

Limited to offences means: if he says: “he should be spoken to concerning just those offences,”⁶ offences come to be taken up.⁷

Limited to families means: if he says: “he should be spoken to among just those families,” families come to be taken up.

¹ Cf. above, BD 2.15, BD 2.157. ² = Vin 4.128. ³ Cf. above, BD 2.191, BD 2.211.

⁴ gahaṅṅha. ⁵ āpattipariyantā. Cf. Vin 2.58, āpattipariyantāṃ na jānāti, rattipariyantāṃ na jānāti; translated at Vinaya Texts ii.416 “he was not aware of the degree of the offences and was not aware of the duration of the times.” Cf. below, BD 2.371, bhesajjapariyantā and rattipariyantā. ⁶ ettakāhi āpattihi. ⁷ āpattiyo pariggahitāyo.

Limited to offences and limited to families means: if he says: “he should be spoken to concerning just those offences among just those families,” offences come to be taken up and families come to be taken up.

Neither limited to offences nor limited to families means: there come to be offences that are not taken up and there come to be families that are not taken up.

In “limited to offences,” if setting aside those offences which come to be offences that are not taken up, he speaks about other offences, there is an offence of expiation. In “limited to families,” if setting aside those families which come to be families that are not taken up, he speaks among other families, there is an offence of expiation. In “limited to offences and limited to families,” if setting aside those offences which come to be offences that are taken up, and if setting aside those families which come to be families that are taken up, he speaks about other offences among other families, there is an offence of expiation. In “neither limited to offences nor limited to families,” there is no offence.

If he thinks that it is a very bad offence when it is a very bad offence (and) tells one who is not ordained, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a very bad offence (and) tells one who is not ordained, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a very bad offence when it is a very bad offence (and) tells one who is not ordained, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation. If he tells of an offence that is not very bad, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he tells one

who is not ordained of a transgression¹ which is very bad or which is not very bad, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a very bad offence when it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a very bad offence when it is not a very bad offence there is an offence of wrong-doing.²

BD 2.22

There is no offence if he speaks of an example but not of an offence; if he speaks of an offence but not of an example³; if there is the agreement of the monks; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

Bu-Pc

The Ninth

¹ *ajjhācāra*. Examples are given at [Vin 3.121](#) (coming into physical contact with a woman), [Vin 3.128](#) (offending a woman by lewd speech); see [BD 1.202, n. 3](#). At *Vinaya Texts* i.184 *ajjhācāra* is taken to be transgression in conduct, consisting in offences against the minor rules of the Pātimokkha. [Vin 1.172](#) is cited in support of this, for here failures in good behaviour, *ācāravipatti*, are said to be grave offences, those of expiation, those of confession, those of wrong-doing and those of wrong speech. This is what Vin-a 754 must be referring to when it says that “beginning with five rules, a transgression is called very bad; the rest are not very bad.” ² This should surely read *anāpatti*. ³ According to Vin-a 754 if he names some transgression done by someone, there is no offence; likewise if he merely mentions an offence into which a monk has fallen, beginning with a *Pārājika* and going down to one of wrong speech, there is no offence. But if he names the type of offence and gives an example of it, such as saying, ‘This (monk) has fallen into an offence involving a formal meeting of the Order, for having emitted impurely,’ there is an offence for bringing forward (*ghaṭetvā*) the offence together with an example of it. The word translated as “example” is *vatthu*, matter, substance.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 10

10.1.1 ... at Āḷavī in the chief shrine at Āḷavī. Now at that time the monks of
2.223 Āḷavī, making repairs, dug the ground and had it dug. People looked
down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, dig the ground and have it dug? These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are harming life that is one-facultied.”¹

Monks heard these people who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these monks of Āḷavī dig the ground and have it dug?”

...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, dug the ground and had it dug?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

14.33 “How can you, foolish men, dig the ground and have it dug? For, foolish men, people having consciousness as living beings are in the ground. It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should dig the ground or have it dug, there is an offence of expiation.**”

10.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Ground means: there are two (kinds of) ground: natural ground

¹ Cf. Vin 3.156 = BD 1.266f.

and artificial ground.¹ **Natural ground** means: pure soil, pure clay, (with) few stones, (with) few pebbles, (with) few potsherds, (with) little gravel,² (with) little sand, almost all soil, almost all clay. Natural ground is also called not burnt.³ And whatever heap of soil or heap of clay is (left) damp⁴ for more than four months, this too is called natural ground. **Artificial ground** means: pure stone, pure pebbles, pure potsherds, pure gravel, pure sand, little soil, little clay, almost all stones, almost all pebbles, almost all potsherds, almost all gravel, almost all sand. Artificial ground is also called burnt. And whatever heap of soil or heap of clay is (left) damp for less than four months, this too is called artificial ground.

Should dig means: if he himself digs, there is an offence of expiation.

Should have (it) dug means: if he commands another, there is an offence of expiation. Commanding once, if he then digs many times, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is ground when it is ground (and) digs it or has it dug or breaks it or has it broken or burns it or has it burnt,⁵ there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is ground (and) digs it ... or has it burnt, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not ground when it is ground (and) digs it ... or has it burnt, there is no offence. If he thinks that it is ground when it is not ground, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not ground, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not ground when it is not ground, there is no offence.

¹ *jātā ca pathavī ajātā ca pathavī.* ² *marumbā*, or perhaps coarse sand. At Vin 2.121 monks are allowed to spread *marumbā*, in a damp or swampy cell. Cf. Vin 2.142, Vin 2.153; also Mil 197. ³ By the potter. ⁴ *ovaṭṭha*; Vin-a 756 *ovaṭṭa* with variant readings *ovuṭṭa*, *ovuṭṭha*, *ovaṭṭha*. ⁵ Even by making a fire for cooking a bowl, Vin-a 758.

2.225 There is no offence if he speaks, saying: “Find¹ this, give this, convey this, this is wanted, make this allowable”; if it was unintentional,² if (he was) not thinking, if he did not know, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.³

The Tenth

THIS IS ITS KEY

Lying, insulting speech, slander, lines, then two on lying down,
Except a learned man (be present), facts, very bad offence, digging.

The First Division

¹ *jāna*; Vin-a 758 reads *jānāhi*, and indicates that these four activities refer to holes dug for stakes, to heavy clay, clay for chaff (*thusamattikā*) and soil. ² =Below, BD 2.229, BD 2.262, and Vin 4.125, Vin 4.185, and cf. Vin 3.78 (BD 1.136). ³ Cf. below, end of Bu-Pc 11.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 11

... at Āḷavī in the chief shrine at Āḷavī. Now at that time the monks of Āḷavī, making repairs, were cutting down trees and having them cut down; and a certain monk of Āḷavī cut down a tree, and the *devatā* living in that tree said to this monk:

“Do not, honoured sir, desiring to make an abode for yourself, cut down my abode.”

This monk, taking no notice, cut it down, and in doing so, struck the arm of that *devatā*'s son. Then it occurred to that *devatā*:

“What now if I, just here, should deprive this monk of life?” Then it occurred to that *devatā*:

“But this would not be suiting in me, that I were, just here, to deprive this monk of life. What now if I were to tell this matter to the lord?”

Then this *devatā* approached the lord, and having approached she told this matter to the lord.

“Very good, *devatā*, it is good that you, *devatā*, did not deprive this monk of life. If today you, *devatā*, had deprived this monk of life, you, *devatā*, would also have produced much demerit. You go, *devatā*; in a certain place there is a solitary tree, go you into it.”

People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, cut down trees and have them cut down? These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are harming life that is one-facultied.”¹ Monks heard these people who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

¹ As in Bu-Pc 10.

“How can these monks of Āḷavī cut down trees and have them cut down?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, cut down trees and had them cut down?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, cut down trees and have them cut down? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“For destruction of vegetable growth¹ there is an offence of ex-
piation.”

Vegetable growth means: there are five kinds of propagation: (what is) propagated from roots, propagated from stems,² propagated from joints, propagated from cuttings,³ and fifthly (what is) propagated from seeds.⁴

Propagated from roots⁵ means: turmeric, ginger, orris root, white orris root, garlic,⁶ black hellebore, khus- khus,⁷ nut-grass,⁸ or

¹ *bhūtagāma*; translation taken from MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *To Become or Not to Become*, p.118. Vin-a 761 says *gāma ti rāsi*, and that standing green grass and trees is a synonym for *bhūtagāma*. *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.6 has “growing plants” for this word. This rule is referred to at Dh-p-a 3.302; Snp-a 3. At Mil 266 the destruction of *bhūtagāma* is said to be no sin in the eyes of the world, but a sin in the teaching of the Jina (an epithet for both Gotama and the Jain, Mahāvīra). Cf. MN i.180 = MN iii.34.

² *khandhabijja*. ³ *aggabijja*. *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.6: “propagated from buddings,” with note that “it may mean ‘graftings’ if the art of grafting was then known in the Ganges valley.” But the plants mentioned could not be propagated by buddings, which, moreover, does not seem to be a recognised botanical term. These plants are propagated by cuttings. ⁴ For this list, cf. DN i.5, DN iii.44, DN iii.47 (= *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.40, *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.42, “things grown from tubers, or shoots, or berries, or joints, or fifthly from seeds”), SN iii.54 (= KS iii.46, “root-seed, trunk-seed, seed from shoots, seed from joints, grain-seed, making five in all”); cf. DN-a 77, SN-a ii.272. ⁵ Cf. DN-a 81 to end of Bu-Pc 11.1.1 below. ⁶ *ativisā*, or dried ginger; an antidote to poison.

whatever others are born from a root, arise from a root; this means propagated from roots.

Propagated from stems means: the fig-tree,¹ the banyan-tree, (a kind of) fig-tree,² (another kind of) fig-tree,³ the Indian cedar wood,⁴ the wood-apple,⁵ or whatever others are born from a stem, arise from a stem; this means propagated from stems.

Propagated from joints means: sugar-cane, bamboo, reeds or whatever others are born from a knot, arise from a knot⁶; this means propagated from joints.

Propagated from cuttings means: basil,⁷ camel- grass,⁸ a kind

⁷ *usīra*, probably *Andropogon muricatum*. Cf. below, **BD 2.240**, where one of the four kinds of stools or settees (*koccha*) is made of *usīra*. At **Vin 2.130** one of the three kinds of fans allowed is made of *usīra*. In some parts of the East the roots are woven into sweet-smelling mats and baskets and are used in making perfume. ⁸ *bhaddamut-taka*, probably *Cyperus rotundus*. Has underground edible tubers. See **Vin 1.201**, where these roots (or tubers) are allowed medicinally for flavouring foods which otherwise would be too unpalatable, for ill monks to take. Decoction of these roots used today in Ceylon as medicine for fever and stomach complaints. ¹ This list is the same as that at **SN v.96**. ² *pilakkha*, probably *Ficus infectoria*. “Wave-leafed,” as at **KS v.80**, is not a sufficient differentiation and is not the botanical name of any of the vast family of figs. ³ *udumbara*, probably *Ficus glomerata*; of bunchy habit. ⁴ Or Toon tree, *kacchaka*. Cedar suggested at **KS v.80**. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives *Cedrela Toona*; *Path of Purity* ii.210 (= *Vism* 183), “black fig.” ⁵ *kaṭṭhana*. Variant readings are *kaṭṭhaka*, *kaṭṭhana*, *kaṭṭhana*. *Pali-English Dictionary* says that it is the tree *Thespesia populneoides*, as does **CHILDERS** under *kaṭṭhana*. **KS v.80** and *Path of Purity* ii.210, both reading *kaṭṭhaka*, render by “wood-apple.” The Dictionaries, placing “wood-apple” under *kaṭṭha*, *kaṭṭha*, call it *Feronia elephantum*. There is, however, no family connection between *Thespesia populneoides* and *Feronia elephantum*. The former has a hard, dry, inedible fruit; the latter an edible fruit with a hard woody shell filled with a soft pulp, also used for medicinal purposes. Neither is a fig-tree (as tentatively suggested at **KS v.80**), but *Feronia* is more like a fig, and would be meant if we were certain that the context was suggesting a tree with an edible fruit. ⁶ *paḍḍa*, joint, knot or section. Word hitherto translated as “joint” is *phaḷu*. ⁷ *ajjuka*. *Pali-English Dictionary* and *Critical Pali Dictionary* give *Ocimum gratissimum*. Probably the ordinary basil, *Ocimum basilicum*, is meant, as *O. gratissimum* is sometimes used as a synonym for this.

of andropogon,¹ or whatever others are born from a cutting, arise from a cutting; this means propagated from cuttings.

Propagated from seeds means: grain, pulses,² or whatever others are born from a seed, arise from a seed; this means propagated from seeds.

11.2.2

If he thinks that it is a seed when it is a seed (and) cuts it or has it cut or breaks it or has it broken or cooks it or has it cooked, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a seed (and) cuts it ... or has it cooked, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a seed when it is a seed (and) cuts it ... or has it cooked, there is no offence. If he thinks that it is a seed when it is not a seed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a seed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a seed when it is not a seed, there is no offence.

11.2.3

There is no offence if he speaks, saying: “Find this, give this, convey this, this is wanted, make this allowable”; if it was unintentional, if (he was) not thinking, if he did not know; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.³

The First

⁸ *phanijjaka*=*bhūtanaka*, Ja 6.536. CHILDERS calls it the plant *samīraṇa*, which, according to MONIER-WILLIAMS, is the plant *maruvaka*. (I cannot discover what is meant by this.) *Pali-English Dictionary* calls *bhūtanaka*, *Andropogon schoenanthus*. Camel-grass yields aromatic oil, mostly used for medicinal purposes. ¹ *hirivela*, occurring also at Ja 6.537. *Pali-English Dictionary* suggests as above. MONIER-WILLIAMS gives *hrivela*, a kind of perfume=*hrivera*, a kind of drug and perfume (= *bāla*, *bālaka*). Under *bāla* he gives “a kind of perfume or fragrant grass, *Andropogon schoenanthus*.” CHILDERS also gives *hiriveram*, a perfume, *Andropogon schoenanthus*. ² Cf. BD 1.83, n. 3. ³ Cf. above, end of Bu-Pc 10; also below, BD 2.262, and Vin 4.125. Vin-a 766 says that the clauses “Find this,” etc., refer to medicines made from roots, to roots and leaves, to trees or creepers, to flowers and fruits, and to trees or creepers or fruits respectively. Vin-a 767 refers to an *anujānāmi* at Vin 2.109, in which monks are allowed to eat fruit that has become allowable to recluses in five ways.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 12

... at Kosambī in Ghosita's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Channa, having indulged in bad habits,¹ being examined for an offence² in the midst of the Order, shelved the question(s) by (asking) others,³ saying, "Who has committed? What has he committed? On what ground has he committed? How has he committed? What do you say? Why do you say (it)?" Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Channa, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, shelve the question(s) by (asking) others, saying: 'Who has committed ... Why do you say (it)?' ... "It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order ... saying, '... Why do you say (it)?' ... It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ..." and having rebuked him and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Well then, monks, let the Order bring a charge of evasion⁴ against the monk, Channa. And thus, monks, should he be charged: the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying:

¹ As at **BD 1.309**. Cf. Channa at **Vin 2.292**, DN ii.154. ² At **Vin 2.88**, when monks charge a monk with failure in conduct, *ācāravipatti*, there is a legal question arising out of censure. ³ *aññen' aññaṃ paṭicarati*; cf. above, **BD 2.164**. ⁴ *aññavādakaṃ ropetu*. *Aññavādaka* is the person who prevaricates, who evades the issue by talking about something else, "who prefers to talk about something else, shuffling and evading the thing in question" (*Critical Pali Dictionary*). Verbal evasion only is meant, see Old Commentary.

‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk, Channa, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, shelved the question(s) by (asking) others. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should bring a charge of evasion against the monk, Channa. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk, Channa ... by (asking) others. The Order brings a charge of evasion against the monk, Channa. If the bringing of a charge of evasion against the monk, Channa, seems right to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it does not seem right, they should speak. A charge of evasion is brought by the Order against the monk, Channa, and it is right ... So do I understand.’”

Then the lord having rebuked the venerable Channa in many a figure for his difficulty in maintaining himself ... “... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“In evasion,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

^{12.2.1} Now at that time the venerable Channa, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, thinking, “Shelving the question(s) by (asking) others, I will fall into an offence,” (so) having become silent, he vexed² the Order. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Channa, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, having become silent, vex the Order?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Chaiina, being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, having become silent, vexed the Order?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man ... vex the Order? It is not, foolish man,

¹ aññavādake. ² tuñhibhūto sañgham viheseti. Vin-a 770 says that vihesaka, vexing, is a name for becoming silent.

for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” and having rebuked him and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, let the Order bring a charge of vexing¹ against the monk, Channa. And thus, monks ... (as above in **Bu-Pc 12.1.1**; *instead of evasion read vexing*; *instead of shelving the question(s) by (asking) others read having become silent*, he vexes the Order) ... should this rule of training be set forth:

“**In evasion, in vexing, there is an offence of expiation.**”²

Evasion means: being examined in the midst of the Order on an example³ or for an offence, not wishing to speak of it, not wishing to bring it forward,⁴ he shelves the questions by (asking) others, saying: ‘Who has committed? What has he committed? On what ground has he committed? How has he committed? What do you say? Why do you say (it)?’—this means evasion.

Vexing means: being examined in the midst of the Order on an example or for an offence, not wishing to speak of it, not wishing to bring it forward, having become silent, he vexes the Order—this means vexing.

If he is not being charged with evasion (but) is being examined in the midst of the Order on an example or for an offence, (and) not wishing to speak of it, not wishing to bring it forward, he shelves the question(s) by (asking) others, saying: ‘Who has committed? ... Why do you say (it)?’ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is not being charged with vexing (but) is being examined ... not wishing to speak of it, not wishing to bring it forward, having become silent, he vexes the Order, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is being charged with evasion (and) is being examined ... he shelves the question(s) by (asking) others, saying: ‘... Why do you say (it)?’, there is an offence of expiation. If he is being charged with vexing (and) is being examined

¹ vihesakam ropetu. ² aññavādake vihesake pācittiyam. Vin-a 770 says that in the two-fold matter there is a twofold pācittiya. ³ vatthusmiri; cf. vatthu + āpatti above, **BD 2.222**. ⁴ na ugghātetukāma.

... having become silent, he vexes the Order, there is an offence of expiation.

12.3.2
If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, in evasion, in vexing, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, in evasion, in vexing, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act¹ when it is a legally valid act, in evasion, in vexing, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence.²

12.3.3
2.234
There is no offence if, not knowing, he asks; if, being ill, he does not speak; if, thinking: 'Quarrel or dispute or strife or contention will come to be for the Order,' he does not speak; if, thinking: 'There will come to be schism in the Order or dissension in the Order,'³ he does not speak; if, thinking: 'He will carry out an (official) act'⁴ according to what is not the rule,⁵ or by an incomplete congregation,⁶ or against one who is not suitable for an (official) act,⁷ he does not speak; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Second

¹ *adhammakamma*, explained at Vin 1.317. ² Cf. BD 1.302, BD 1.307, BD 1.313, BD 1.327; below, BD 2.237. ³ Cf. Vin 4.128, Vin 4.153, Vin 4.217. *Saṅghabheda* and *saṅgharāji* discussed at Vin 2.303; referred to at Vb-a 428. ⁴ Six kinds of *kamma*, official acts, given at Vin 1.317. ⁵ *adhammena*. Cf. Vin 1.115, where it is allowed to protest against an (official) act that is being conducted according to what is not the rule. ⁶ *vaggena*, by a section only of the Order, not all the members being present. Cf. Vin 1.108, Vin 1.111; also below, BD 2.269, and Vin 4.126. ⁷ *na kammārahā*. Cf. Vin 4.126, Vin 4.152, Vin 4.153; Vin 5.221.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 13

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, assigned lodgings to the Order and distributed meals.¹ Now at that time monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka were newly ordained as well as of little merit; they obtained whatever inferior lodgings belonged to the Order and inferior meals.² These made monks look down upon³ the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, saying:

“Dabba, the Mallian, assigns lodgings through favouritism⁴ and distributes meals through favouritism.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka make monks look down upon the venerable Dabba, the Mallian?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, made monks look down upon Dabba, the Mallian?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them saying:

“How can you, foolish men, make monks look down upon Dabba, the Mallian? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“In making (someone) look down upon,⁵ there is an offence of expiation.”

¹ Cf. Vin 3.158 (=BD 1.272ff.) and Vin 4.154. ² Cf. Vin 3.160 = BD 1.275. ³ *ujjhāpentī*. Vin-a 770 says *avajānāpentī avaññāya olokāpentī lāmakato vā cintāpentī ti attho*; cf. above, BD 2.2, n. 3, on *ujjhāyanti*. ⁴ *chandāya* = *pakkhapātena*, Vin-a 771. ⁵ *ujjhāpanake*; in full probably meaning “in making a monk look down upon another monk,” see Old Commentary, below.

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

13:2.1
2:236
Now at that time monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka thought: “Making (someone) look down upon is forbidden by the lord, (but) this much shall the monks hear,” and in the neighbourhood of monks, they criticised¹ the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, saying:

“Dabba, the Mallian, assigns lodgings through favouritism and distributes meals through favouritism.”

Those who were modest monks ... (as in **Bu-Pc 13.2.1** instead of “make monks look down upon” read “criticise”) ... “... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**In making (someone) look down upon, in criticising,² there is an offence of expiation.**”

13:3.1
Making (someone) look down upon means: if he makes (someone) look down upon or if he criticises one who is ordained, desiring to bring blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame³ to one who is ordained (and) agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings or as distributor of meals or as apportioner of conje or as apportioner of fruit or as apportioner of solid foods or as disposer of trifles,⁴ there is an offence of expiation.

¹ *khīyanti*. *Khīyati* (Sanskrit *kṣiyate*) is explained in the Dictionaries to mean “to be exhausted, to waste away, to become dejected, to fall away from” (*Pali-English Dictionary*); “*geht zu Ende*” (GEIGER, *Pali Literature*, p.115); “to wane, to decrease, to be diminished, to waste away, perish” (MONIER-WILLIAMS). But Vin-a 296, Vin-a 771 gives *pakāsenti*, to show up, illustrate, explain, make known, give information about (*Pali-English Dictionary*). Cf. above, **BD 2.2, n. 4.** ² *khīyanake*—i.e., the action of a person. *Pali-English Dictionary* calls this “a falling-away offence (legal term denoting the falling away from a consent once given),” as in **Bu-Pc 79, Bu-Pc 81** (*khīyadhamma*); also see **Vin 2.94, Vin 2.100, AN iii.269, AN iv.374.** ³ *maṅku*, literally staggering, so shock, confusion, shame; see AN v.v. This trio also occurs below, **BD 2.280.** ⁴ Cf. **Vin 4.155.** At **Vin 2.176f.** the qualifications that a monk appointed “distributor,” etc., should possess, are given. The items that the last, *appamattakavisajjaka*, is to dispose of, are enumerated at Vin 2.177. Cf. also AN iii.275.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, in making (someone) look down upon, in criticising, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, in making (someone) look down upon, in criticising, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, in making (someone) look down upon, in criticising, there is an offence of expiation. If he makes (someone) look down upon or if he criticises one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes (someone) look down upon or if he criticises one who is ordained or one who is not ordained, desiring to bring blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame to one who is ordained (but) not agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings ... as disposer of trifles there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes (someone) look down upon or if he criticises one who is ordained or one who is not ordained, desiring to blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame to one who is not ordained, (but) agreed upon or not agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings ... or as disposer of trifles, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence.¹

There is no offence if he makes (someone) look down upon or if he criticises one acting by nature from desire, from hatred, from stupidity, from fear²; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.³

The Third

¹ Cf. **BD 1.302**, **BD 1.307**, **BD 1.313**, **BD 1.327**; above, **BD 2.233**, and **Vin 4.155**. ² These are the four *agatis*. Only a monk not endowed with them can be appointed a distributor of the various items mentioned here and in other parts of Vinaya. See **Vin 2.176f.**; also cf. the “silver-remover,” above, **BD 2.104**, the assigner of bowls, above, **BD 2.122**, and **Vin 3.183**, **Vin 3.185**; see **BD 1.323**, n. 7, for further references. ³ Cf. **Vin 4.155**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 14

14.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
2.238 at that time, monks preparing lodgings¹ in winter-time in the open
air, drying their bodies in the sun, when the time was announced,²
setting forth neither removed³ them nor had them removed, (but) set
forth without having asked (for permission).⁴ The lodgings became
damp.⁵ Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can monks, preparing lodgings in the open air, setting forth,
neither remove them nor have them removed, (but) set forth without
having asked (for permission, so that) the lodgings are (left) damp?”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks preparing lodgings in
the open air ... (left) damp? ... And thus, monks, this rule of training
should be set forth:

2.239 **“Whatever monk, spreading⁶ or having spread in the open air**

¹ A definition of *senāsana* given at Vb 251 is a catalogue of things to sit and lie on, various types of buildings, caves, etc. It does not include *seyyā*, obviously thought of as a *senāsana*, below, **BD 2.244**. Vb-a 365 merely says that if he sleeps and sits there, it is a “lodging.” ² Vin-a 770 says, “for the gruel meal.” ³ *uddharati*. Same word as *ubbhata* (+*kaṭhina*) of **Bu-NP 1-Bu-NP 3** ⁴ *anāpucchā*. Cf. *āpucchā* and *anā°* at **Vin 4.100**, **Vin 4.101**, **Vin 4.165**, **Vin 4.166**. Cf. also **Vin 2.211**, where monks set out without asking permission as to the lodgings. It is there said, and cf. Old Commentary, below, that a monk, or, failing him, a probationer, or, failing him, a monastery-attendant should be asked for permission; this is in order that such a person may take care of the lodgings during the monks' absence. ⁵ *ovaṭṭham hoti*. Vin-a 770 says that what remained became damp owing to the snow and rain. *Ovaṭṭha* occurs above, **BD 2.224**, in connection with heaps of clay and soil. ⁶ *santharivā*. Cf. above, **BD 2.72, n. 1**, but not used in that sense here.

a couch or a chair or a mattress or a stool¹ belonging to the Order, setting forth, should neither remove it nor have it removed, or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks, staying in the open air, were bringing back² lodgings early in the morning. Now the lord saw these monks bringing back lodgings early in the morning, and seeing them, in this connection, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, for the eight months (of the time) not appointed for keeping the rains³ to put aside lodgings in a hut⁴ or at the foot of a tree, wherever crows or vultures do not leave droppings.”⁵

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.⁶

¹ *koccha*. See Old Commentary, below. *Vinaya Texts* i.34, n., says, “it is apparently therefore of wicker work.” Called at *Vinaya Texts* iii.165 (= **Vin 2.149**) “a cane-bottomed chair.” Allowed at **Vin 2.149**. ² *atiharanti*, or removing from one place to another. ³ *avassika-saṃkete*. At **Vin 1.298** *vassika-saṃkete* is one of the five occasions when a monk may lay aside his outer cloak. *Saṃketa* at *BD.1* was rendered “rendezvous”—i.e., an appointment, an appointed time. See *Vinaya Texts* ii.234, note, on this word. At **Vin 1.107** it is an offence of wrong-doing to recite the Pātimokkha in cell after cell without making a rendezvous or appointment (*asaṃketena*), since incoming monks did not know where the *uposatha* was to be held. *Vin-a 772* says that the four months of the cold and the four months of the hot seasons are the eight months not thus appointed (*evam apaññatte*) as months of the rains. ⁴ *maṇḍape*. *Vin-a 772* says, “a *maṇḍapa* (shed or hut) of *sākhā* (branches), or a *maṇḍapa* of *padara* (boards, planks of wood; or this might be a *maṇḍapa* in a crevice). ⁵ N.B.—This is not a *sikkhāpada*, rule, but an *anujānāmi*, “allowance.” ⁶ Cf. above, **BD 2.161**.

Couch means:¹ there are four (kinds of) couch: a long one,² one with slats,³ one with curved legs,⁴ one with removable legs.⁵

Chair means: there are four (kinds of) chair: a long one, one with slats, one with curved legs, one with removable legs.⁶

Mattress means: there are five (kinds of) mattress: a mattress (made) of wool, a mattress (made) of cotton-cloth, a mattress (made) of bark, a mattress (made) of tina-grass, a mattress (made) of leaves.⁷

Stool means: made of bark or made of khus-khus⁸ or made of *muñja*-grass or made of reeds⁹; it is bound, having tucked them in.¹⁰

Spreading means: himself spreading.

Having spread¹¹ means: making another spread. If he makes one who is not ordained spread (it), it is an impediment¹² for him.¹³ If he makes one who is ordained spread it, there is an impediment for the one who spreads (it).¹⁴

¹ This definition of *mañca* occurs at Vin 4.168, Vin 4.169; Vb-a 365. These four kinds of couches and four kinds of chairs are allowed at Vin 2.149. ² *masāraka*. Vin-a 773 says, “it is made by boring a hole into the feet of the couch, and putting a knotted end through there.” ³ *bundikābaddha*. Vin-a 773 says, “it is made by holding the bedstead together, having burnt the feet of the couch with knotted ends.” ⁴ *kuḷīrapādaka*, or carved. Vin-a 773, “made with feet like the feet of horses, rams, etc. Whatever has curved feet (*vañkapādako*, literally curved as to the feet) is called *kuḷīrapādaka*” (literally a crab-footer). ⁵ *āhaccapādaka*. Vin-a 774 says that “it is made by piercing the leg (*añge*). Then having pierced the knotted end, putting a knot through there, and giving a pin (or peg, *āṇim*) above, the couch that is made should be called an *āhaccapādaka*.” This probably means that the pin can be removed at pleasure, when the couch would collapse. At Vin 4.46 it is defined as *añge vijjhivā ṭhito hoti*, standing, having pierced the leg—i.e., having put the pin through. *Āhacca-pādaka* means literally a “take-away footer”—i.e., one whose feet can be taken away. ⁶ = Vin 4.168, Vin 4.169, Vb-a 365. ⁷ Same definition given at Vb-a 365. These five kinds of *bhisi* are allowed at Vin 2.150. Cf. above, BD 2.47, n. 1, on *bhisi*. ⁸ *usīra*, one of the plants “propagated from roots,” cf. above, BD 2.228. ⁹ *babbaja*, or bulrushes. Shoes made of this and of *muñja*-grass were not to be worn, Vin 1.190. ¹⁰ *anto samveṭhetvā baddham hoti*. Vin-a 774 says that it is bound in the middle and spread out above and below. The middle, being made of the hides of lions and tigers, gives the *senāsana* the appearance of being made of gold. ¹¹ Causative. ¹² *palibodha*, or obstacle, obstruction. Cf. Vinaya Texts ii.157, n. 2. ¹³ Vin-a 774, for the one who causes it to be spread out. ¹⁴ *santhāraka*, at Vin 2.113, Vin 2.116, Vin 2.148, meaning a (*tiṇa*-grass) mat. Here it must refer to the person spreading out the things.

Setting forth, should neither remove it means: should not himself remove it.

Nor have it removed means: should not make another remove it.

Or should go away without asking (for permission) means: not asking a monk or a novice or a monastery attendant (for permission),¹ if he goes further than the outward stone-throw of a man of average height,² there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it belongs to the Order³ when it belongs to the Order, spreading it or having it spread in the open, setting forth should neither remove it nor have it removed, or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to the Order ... there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to the Order, spreading it or ... in the open air ... without having asked (for permission), there is an offence of expiation. If it is a carpet⁴ or a bed-cover⁵ or a ground-covering⁶ or a straw-mat⁷ or an animal's skin⁸ or a mat for the feet⁹ or a wooden chair,¹⁰ spreading it or having it spread in the open air, setting forth should neither remove it nor have it removed, or should go away without having asked

¹ Cf. Vin 2.211. ² Cf. BD 1.74 = Vin 3.46. ³ Cf. Bu-Pc 15, Bu-Pc 16. ⁴ *cimilikā*. At Vin 2.150 monks are allowed to use *cola*, cotton-cloth, as a *cimilikā*. Editor, *Vinaya Texts* iii.167, n. 2, says, *cilimika* may be a "rug ... It is probably the same word as, or connected with, *cimilikā*." See same note for Buddhaghosa's definition of this word. Here he says, Vin-a 775, when the earth is prepared with plaster it is made for preserving its texture, spreading it below, they spread out a *kaṭasāraka* (a mat for sitting on or lying on) above. ⁵ *uttaratharaṇa*, see above, BD 2.46, n. 3. ⁶ *bhum-mattharaṇa*, see above, BD 2.46, n. 4. ⁷ *taṭṭikā*. Vin-a 776 says, "made of palm-leaves or of bark." Cf. Ja 1.141, Vism 97. ⁸ *cammakhaṇḍa*. At Vin 2.122 this was allowed as a water vessel (*vāraka*). Above it means a skin used as a mat, as at Mil 366 and Vism 99 (translated *Path of Purity*, p. 115, "piece of leather"). ⁹ *pādapuñchanī*. At Vin 2.174 monks are allowed to use a bear-skin, a piece of drapery (*cakkali*), and a little piece of cloth as a *pādapuñchanī*. This, according to *Vinaya Texts* iii.218, is a mat to wipe the feet on, not to sit upon. Vin-a 776 says that it is made of rope and rags for wiping the feet on. ¹⁰ *Phalaka-piṭṭha*, a chair (made) of a board, plank or slips of wood. Also called at Vin-a 776 *dārumayapīṭṭha*, a chair made of wood.

(for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to an individual (but) to another individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if it belongs to the individual himself, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, having removed it, he goes away; if, having caused it to be removed, he goes away; if, having asked (for permission), he goes away; if, drying himself in the sun, he goes away¹; if it comes to be taken possession of by something²; if there are accidents³; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fourth

¹ *otāpento gacchati*. Vin-a 776 says there is no offence if, drying himself in the heat of the sun, he thinks, 'Coming back I will remove it.' ² *kenaci palibuddham hoti*. Vin-a 776 says that if a senior monk, turning (the owner) out (*uṭṭhāpetvā*), takes it, if a *yakkha* or a departed one, coming along, sits on it, or if some *ṛṣi*, coming along, takes it, or if lions and tigers stand on it, the lodging becomes taken possession of. ³ *āpadāsu*—i.e., Vin-a 777 says there is no offence if there are accidents (*antarāya*) to those leading the brahma-life for their life-time. Cf. Bu-Pc 15, Bu-Pc 16

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 15

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of seventeen monks were companions. Staying, they just stayed together, setting forth, they just set forth together. These, spreading¹ a sleeping-place in a certain dwelling belonging to the Order, setting forth, neither removed it nor had it removed, (but) set forth without having asked (for permission). The lodging became eaten by white ants. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of seventeen monks, spreading a sleeping-place in a dwelling belonging to the Order, setting forth, neither remove it nor have it removed, (but) set forth without having asked (for permission, so that) the lodging is eaten by white ants?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord ... He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of seventeen monks ... belonging to the Order, setting forth neither removed it ... eaten by white ants?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men ... eaten by white ants? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, spreading a sleeping-place or having it spread in a dwelling belonging to the Order, setting forth, should neither remove it nor have it removed, or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation.”

¹ *santharivā*, see Introduction, **BD 2.xxii**.

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.¹

Sleeping-place² means: a mattress,³ a carpet,⁴ a bed-cover, a ground-covering, a straw mat, an animal's skin,⁵ a piece of cloth for sitting on,⁶ a sheet,⁷ a grass-mat,⁸ a leaf mat.

Spreading means: himself spreading.⁹

Having spread means: making another spread.¹⁰

Setting forth, should neither remove it means: should not himself remove it.¹¹

Nor have it removed means: should not make another remove it.¹²

Or should go away without asking (for permission) means: not asking a monk or a novice or a monastery-attendant (for permission), if he goes further than the fence of a fenced-in monastery, there is an offence of expiation; if he goes further than the precincts¹³ of a monastery not fenced-in, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it belongs to the Order¹⁴ when it belongs to the Order, spreading a sleeping-place or having it spread, setting forth should neither remove it nor have it removed, or should go away without asking (for permission) there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to the Order ... without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to the Order, spreading a sleeping-place ... or should go away without asking (for permis-

¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.161](#), [BD 2.239](#). ² Another definition of *seyyā* given above, [BD 2.196](#).

³ Cf. above, [BD 2.240](#). ⁴ Cf. above, [BD 2.241](#), for this and the next four words. ⁵ Cf. above, [BD 2.241](#), for this and the next four words. ⁶ *nisidana*. Defined at [Vin 3.232](#), [Vin 4.123](#), [Vin 4.171](#).

⁷ *paccattharaṇa*. Buddhaghosa at [Vin-a 777](#) calls it *pāvāro kojavo*, a cloak (mantle?), a rug or cover with long hair. ⁸ *tiṇa-santhāra*. [Vin-a 777](#) says a mat of any grasses whatsoever; the same for a leaf-mat. ⁹ Cf. above, [BD 2.241](#).

¹⁰ Cf. above, [BD 2.241](#). ¹¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.241](#). ¹² Cf. above, [BD 2.241](#). ¹³ *upacāra*.

¹⁴ Cf. [Bu-Pc 14](#), [Bu-Pc 16](#).

sion), there is an offence of expiation. If, spreading a sleeping-place or having it spread in the precincts of a dwelling-place¹ or in an assembly-room² or in a hut³ or at the foot of a tree,⁴ setting forth should neither remove it ... or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If, spreading a couch or a chair or having it spread in a monastery or in the precincts of a monastery or in an assembly-room⁵ or in a hut⁶ or at the foot of a tree, setting forth should neither remove it ... or should go away without asking (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁷ If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to an individual (but) to another individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if it belongs to the individual himself, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, having removed it, he goes away; if, having caused it to be removed, he goes away; if, having asked (for permission), he goes away; if it comes to be taken possession of by something; if going with the expectation,⁸ standing there, he asks (for permission); if he becomes taken possession of by something⁹; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹⁰

The Fifth

¹ Vin-a 778 says that this means a cell, *pariveṇa*. ² *upaṭṭhānasālā*. Cf. above, BD 2.194, n. 4. Vin-a 778 calls this *pariveṇabhojanasālā*, a refectory and cells.

³ *maṇḍapa*. Cf. above, BD 2.239, n. 4. Vin-a 778 says *pariveṇa-maṇḍapo*. ⁴ Vin-a 778 says *pariveṇarukkhamūla*. ⁵ Vin-a 778 here merely says *bhojanasālā*, refectory.

⁶ Vin-a 778 here says that it is *maṇḍapa*, whether covered or not, for the assembly of many people. ⁷ Apparently not a *pācittiya* as there is not so much danger of the things being eaten by white ants if spread in these places, Vin-a 778. ⁸ *sāpekkho*.

⁹ Vin-a 780, by full rivers, robber chiefs, and is unable to return. ¹⁰ Cf. Bu-Pc 14.2.3.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 16

16.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
2.247 that time the group of six monks took possession of the best sleeping-places.¹ The monks who were elders turned them away. Then it occurred to the group of six monks:

“What now if we, by some stratagem, should spend the rainy season² in this very place?” Then the group of six monks, encroaching upon³ (the space intended for) monks who were elders, lay down in the sleeping-places, saying:

“He for whom it becomes too crowded may depart.” Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the group of six monks lie down in sleeping-places, encroaching upon (the space intended for) monks who are elders?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. ...

14.43 “Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, lay down in sleeping-places ... for monks who are elders?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, lie down in sleeping-places, encroaching upon (the space intended for) monks, who are elders? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus,

¹ *varaseyyāyo palibuddhanti* = Vin 2.166. For *palibuddha*, cf. above, BD 2.242, BD 2.245f.

² Cf above, BD 2.208. ³ *anupakhajja* = *anpavisitva* according to Old Commentary, and Vin-a 780. Word occurs again in Bu-Pc 43 and at Vin 2.213. Editor, *Vinaya Texts* iii.285, n. 3, says that sense intended in these three passages is the same, while it is different at Vin 2.88, there explained by Buddhaghosa as *antopavisati*. At Vin 1.47 the monk who shares the cell of his preceptor is not to sit down so as to encroach upon the elders (*na there bhikkhū anupakhajja nisīditabbari*).

monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should lie down in a sleeping-place in a dwelling belonging to the Order, knowing that he is encroaching upon (the space intended for) a monk who arrived first, saying, ‘He for whom it becomes too crowded may depart,’ doing it for just this object, not for another,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ...

A dwelling belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.²

He knows³ means: he knows, thinking, ‘He is an old man’⁴; he knows, thinking, ‘He is an ill man’; he knows, thinking, ‘It was given to the Order.’

Encroaching upon means: forcing a way into.⁵

Should lie down in a sleeping-place means: if entering or departing he spreads a sleeping-place or has one spread in the precincts of a couch or a chair, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he sits down on it or lies down on it, there is an offence of expiation.

Doing it for just this object, not for another means: there comes to be no other object whatever for which to lie down, encroaching, in a sleeping-place.

If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to the Order, (and) encroaching, lies down, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to the Order, (and) encroaching, lies down, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to the Order, (and) encroaching, lies down, there is an offence of expiation. If entering or departing, setting aside the precincts of a couch or chair, he spreads a sleeping-place or causes one to be spread, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he sits down on it or lies down on it, there is an

¹ Cf. below, **BD 2.352**, and **Vin 4.149**, **Vin 4.150**. ² Cf. **Vin 3.266**, and above, **BD 2.244**.

³ Cf. above, **BD 2.161**. ⁴ *vuddho*; therefore he should not be made to get up, **Vin-a 780**. ⁵ *anupavisitvā*, or entering into = **Vin 4.95**. Cf. **Vin-a 780**.

offence of wrong-doing. If he spreads a sleeping-place or causes one to be spread in the precincts of a dwelling-place or in an assembly-room or in a hut or at the foot of a tree or in the open air,¹ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he sits down on it or lies down on it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to an individual (but) to another individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if it belongs to the individual himself, there is no offence.²

16.2.3

There is no offence if an ill man enters, if one pressed by cold or by heat enters, if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Sixth

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.241**. ² Cf. **Bu-Pc 14**, **Bu-Pc 15**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 17

... at Sāvatti¹ in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time the group of seventeen monks were repairing a large dwelling-place in the neighbourhood,² thinking: "We will spend the rains here."

The group of six monks saw the group of seventeen monks as they were repairing the dwelling-place, and seeing them, they said:

"Your reverences, this group of seventeen monks are repairing a dwelling-place. Come, we will turn them away."

Some spoke thus: "Wait, your reverences, until they have repaired it; when it is repaired, we will turn them away."

Then the group of six monks said to the group of seventeen monks: "Go away,³ your reverences, the dwelling-place belongs to⁴ us."

"Your reverences, should not this have been explained before, and we would have repaired another?"

"Your reverences, does not the dwelling-place belong to the Order?"

"Yes, your reverences, the dwelling-place belongs to the Order."

"Go away, your reverences, the dwelling-place belongs to us."

"Your reverences, the dwelling-place is big⁵; you stay, and we too will stay."

"Go away, your reverences, the dwelling-place belongs to us," and angry, displeased, taking them by the throat they threw them out.

¹ This story also forms the introductory story to **Kd 16.11** = **Vin 2.166**. ² *paccantima*, adjoining, bordering, next to. ³ *uṭṭheta*, or get up. ⁴ *pāpuṇāti*. ⁵ *mahallaka*, said of a *vihāra* at **Vin 3.156** (= **BD 1.267**). A big building containing several rooms to accommodate a number of people (Ṭikā); implies a permanent building.

These being thrown out, wept. Monks said (to them):

“Why do you, your reverences, weep?”

“Your reverences, this group of six monks, angry, displeased threw us out of a dwelling-place belonging to the Order.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks, angry, displeased, throw out monks from a dwelling-place belonging to the Order?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that you, angry and displeased ... to the Order?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, angry ... belonging to the Order? Foolish men, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, angry, displeased, should throw out a monk or cause him to be thrown out from a dwelling-place belonging to the Order, there is an offence of expiation.”

17.2.1
14.45

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Monk¹ means: another monk.

Angry, displeased² means: dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.

A dwelling-place belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.³

Should throw out means: if, taking (him) in the room⁴ he throws him out on to the verandah,⁵ there is an offence of expiation. If, taking him on the verandah, he throws him outside,⁶ there is an offence of expiation. If, with one effort⁷ he makes him pass through many doors, there is an offence of expiation.

Should cause him to be thrown out means: if he commands another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. When once commanded,

¹ Accusative. ² Cf. **BD 1.281 = Vin 3.163.** ³ Cf. **Vin 3.266, Vin 4.41, Vin 4.43.**

⁴ *gabbhe*. ⁵ *pamukharā*, house-front. ⁶ I.e., out of the compound. ⁷ *payoga*, or action, thrust.

if he makes him pass through many doors, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it belongs to the Order¹ when it belongs to the Order, (and) angry, displeased, throws him out or causes him to be thrown out, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to the Order, (and) angry ... causes him to be thrown out, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to the Order, (and) angry ... to be thrown out, there is an offence of expiation. If he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he throws (a monk) out or causes (him) to be thrown out from the precincts of a dwelling-place or from an assembly-room or from a hut or from the foot of a tree or from the open air, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he throws out or causes one who is not ordained to be thrown out from a dwelling-place or from the precincts of a dwelling-place ... or from the open air, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is doubtful as to whether it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to an individual, (but) to another individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if it belongs to the individual himself, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he throws out or causes one who is not scrupulous to be thrown out, if he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out; if he throws out or causes to be thrown out one who is mad, if he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out; if he throws out or causes to be thrown out one who makes strife, one who makes quarrels, one who makes contention, one who makes

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 14–Bu-Pc 16.

brawls, one who makes disputes in the Order,¹ if he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out; if he throws out or causes to be thrown out a novice or one who shares a cell or one who is not proceeding fitly,² if he throws out or causes his requisites to be thrown out; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Seventh

¹ These same words said of the nun Caṇḍakālī at [Vin 4.230](#). See also [Vin 1.328](#); and [AN iii.252](#), where five dangers to be expected for such a monk are enumerated.

² *na sammāvattanta*.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 18

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time two monks (were) in a lofty cell with an upper part,¹ in a dwelling-place belonging to the Order; one lived below, one above. The monk above sat down suddenly on a couch with removable feet.² The foot of the couch, falling off,³ hit⁴ the lower monk on the head, (and) this monk uttered a cry of distress. Monks, running up, said to this monk:

“Why do you, your reverence, utter a cry of distress?”

Then that monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can a monk, in a lofty cell with an upper part, in a dwelling-place belonging to the Order, sit down suddenly on a couch with removable feet?”

Then these monks told this matter to the lord...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, in a lofty cell with an upper part, in a dwelling-place belonging to the Order, sat down suddenly on a couch with removable feet?” ...

¹ *upari-vehāsa-kuṭī*. Meaning is obscure. For *vehāsa* as “above ground,” see **BD 1.79**. *Vehāsa-kuṭī* seems to be a lofty cell, as Old Commentary, says it is one which will not knock the head of a man of medium height. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives “air-hut, airy room.” Probably means the cell was so high that there was room for an “upper berth” (see DICKSON, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1876, 128, n. 1), not a single-roomed cell. Vin-a 782 says *uparivehāsakuṭī* is a two or three storeyed cell without a roof (*acchannatala*). ² *āhaccapādaka*, see above, **BD 2.240**, in definition of “couch” and “chair.” *Āhaccapādaka mañca* allowed at **Vin 2.149**. ³ *nippaṭṭivā* = *nipatitvā*, *nikkhamitvā*, Vin-a 782. ⁴ *avatthāsi*. Cf. **BD 1.138**, **BD 1.140** = **Vin 3.79**, **Vin 3.81**.

“... It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk, in a lofty cell with an upper part, in a dwelling place belonging to the Order, should sit down¹ or lie down on a couch or chair with removable feet, there is an offence of expiation.**”

18.2.1

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Dwelling-place belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.²

Lofty cell means: it does not touch the head³ of a man of medium height.

Couch with removable feet means: having perforated⁴ the legs, it stands.

Chair with removable feet means: having perforated the legs, it stands.

Should sit down on means: if he sits down on it, there is an offence of expiation.

Should lie down on means: if he lies down on it, there is an offence of expiation.

18.2.2

If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to the Order, (and) sits down on or lies down on a couch or a chair with removable feet in a lofty cell with an upper part, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to the Order ... If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to the Order

2.256

¹ Note that *sahasā*, suddenly, hastily, is omitted in the Rule; it is put in at *Vinaya Texts* i.34. Cf. this for translation of *uparivehāsakuṭṭi*; also GÖGERLY'S version, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1862, p.443, and DICKSON'S, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1876, p.111. The latter also puts *sahasā* (“hurriedly”) into the Rule, and it would seem more logical to do so; for if no couch or chair with removable legs were to be sat or lain on in an upper storey, there was little point in allowing these objects there at all. ² Cf. above, [BD 2.161](#), [BD 2.239](#), [BD 2.244](#), [BD 2.248](#), [BD 2.251](#).

³ *asīsaghaṭṭā*. Vin-a 782, none of the lower beams or rafters touch (or knock) the head of a man of medium (middle or average, *majjhima*) measure. ⁴ cf. above, [BD 2.240](#), and Vin-a 774.

... with an upper part, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it belongs to the Order when it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it belongs to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it belongs to an individual when it belongs to an individual (but) to another individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if it belongs to the individual himself, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is in a cell that is not lofty¹; if he is in one that touches the head; if the one below comes to be not in use; if there comes to be an accumulation of boards²; if a pin is provided³; if standing on it he takes down from or hangs up on⁴; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Eighth

¹ *avehāsakuṭīya*. Vin-a 782, made among *sāl*-leaves on the ground, for it is not possible to hurt another person there. ² *padara-sañcitarū hoti*. Vin-a 783 (the cell) of which the upper-most floor (*tala*) is spread over thickly with sticks and planks. ³ *paṭāṇi dinnā hoti*. This means the pin or peg which must be inserted in a couch or chair whose feet are removable in order that the foot will not fall off when the chair is sat upon; Vin-a 783, and cf. Vin-a 774. ⁴ Vin-a 783, “standing on a couch or chair whose feet are removable, he says, ‘take down a robe or anything hung up on a peg (*nāgadanta*)’ or hangs up another, there is no offence for him.”

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 19

19.1.1 ... at Kosambī in Ghosita's monastery. Now at that time a chief minister, the venerable Channa's supporter, was having a dwelling-place
2.257 built for the venerable Channa.¹ Then the venerable Channa again
1 4.47 and again had the finished dwelling-place roofed, again and again had it plastered. The overloaded dwelling-place fell down. Then the venerable Channa, collecting grass and sticks, despoiled the cornfield of a certain brahmin. Then that brahmin looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the revered ones despoil our cornfields?” Monks heard this brahmin who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Channa again and again have a finished dwelling-place roofed, again and again have it plastered (so that) the overloaded dwelling-place falls down?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Channa, again and again had a finished dwelling-place roofed ... so that the overloaded dwelling-place fell down?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, again and again have a finished dwelling place roofed, again and again have it plastered, (so that) the overloaded dwelling-place falls down? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of

¹ Cf. **BD 1.266**, where a householder was building a dwelling-place for him.

training should be set forth:

“When a large dwelling-place is being built for a monk, an enclosure¹ of two or three roofings may be determined upon for placing the door-bolts, for making the window-holes² as far as the door-way,³ in establishing it where there are no crops.⁴ If, though established where there are no crops, he should determine upon (something) more than that, there is an offence of expiation.”⁵

Large means: it is so called if it is a dwelling-place having a benefactor.⁶

Dwelling-place means: it comes to be smeared inside or smeared outside or smeared inside and outside.

Is being made means: making or causing to be made.⁷

As far as the door-way⁸ means: a reach of the hand from all round the door-posts and lintel.⁹

For placing the door-bolts means: for placing the door-way.

For making the window-holes means: for making windows¹⁰:

¹ *paryāya*. Vin-a 784 says *pariyāyaṃ vuccati parikkhepo*. *Parikkhepo* is closing round, surrounding, enclosure. *Paryāya* can also mean method. ² *ālokasandhi*, small holes for light and air. ³ *dvārakosa*. *Dvāra* is “the aperture and not that by which the aperture could be closed.” This is called *kavāṭa*. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.160, n. 3. *Kosa* is a cavity or enclosure containing something. ⁴ *appaharita*, “little or no grass” (*Critical Pali Dictionary*), but Old Commentary points to “crops.” ⁵ My translation of this rule differs considerably from that given at *Vinaya Texts* i.35, where editor says, “This rule ... is somewhat obscure, owing to our want of information as to the mode in which such dwellings should be put up.” *Vinaya Texts* i.35 has “rectified” for *adhiṭṭhātabbāṃ*, which I have translated as “determined upon.” For the point of this rule is that when the *vihāra* is built and everything is *ṭhito*, fixed, established, a monk must not ask the *dāyaka*, benefactor, donor, to change the positions of doors and windows or make any additions or rectifications. If he does so, he incurs a *pācittiya* offence. ⁶ Cf. Vin 3.156 (= BD 1.267, BD 1.268). ⁷ Cf. Vin 3.226, Vin 3.232.

⁸ Vin-a 783 says that here *dvārakosa* means a space (*okāsa*) the measure of the door’s breadth from all round the door-posts and lintel; it quotes other authorities giving different measures. Apparently doors and windows must not be made nearer than this distance to the doorway. ⁹ *piṭṭhasaṃgāṭa*. Allowed at Vin 2.120, Vin 1.148. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.105, n. 2. ¹⁰ *vātapāna*. Three kinds allowed at Vin 2.148, but not the kinds given above. Vin-a 784 takes it as *vātapānakavāṭa*, shutters, which perhaps makes more sense here.

whitewash,¹ black colouring, the use of red chalk,² wreath-work,³ creeper-work, sword-fish design,⁴ cupboards.⁵

An enclosure of two or three roofings should be determined upon, in establishing it where there are no crops means: crops mean: grain and pulses.⁶ If it is established where there are crops (and) he determines upon (some alteration), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is roofing with a way, having determined upon two ways, commanding a third way, he may depart.⁷ If he is roofing with an enclosure, having determined upon two enclosures, commanding a third enclosure, he may depart.

If, though established where there are no crops, he should determine upon (something) more than that⁸ means: if he is roofing with tiles, for every tile there is an offence of expiation. If he is roofing with stones, for every stone there is an offence of expiation. If he is roofing with plaster, for every lump there is an offence of expiation. If he is roofing with grass, for every wisp there is an offence of expiation. If he is roofing with leaves, for every leaf there is an offence of expiation.⁹

If he thinks that it is more when it is more than two or three enclosures (and) determines upon,¹⁰ there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is more than two or three enclosures

¹ All these items are allowed, in other connections, at Vin 2.121, also at Vin 2.117 with two more not occurring above. Cf. Vin 2.172. “Whitewash” is *setavaṇṇa*, or plaster; “black colouring” is *kāḷavaṇṇa*, or blacking. ² *gerukaparikamma*, red colouring. These three colourings are allowed to be used in *vihāras* at Vin 2.150. ³ These four kinds of design are allowed in another connection at Vin 2.152. ⁴ *makaradantaka*. The meaning is not at all clear, but “a design in painting or carving” (*Pali-English Dictionary*). ⁵ *pañcapaṭṭhika*. For lack of better translation, I follow *Vinaya Texts* iii.97, q.v. n. 3. But the meaning is very doubtful. ⁶ See BD 1.83, n. 4. ⁷ Vin-a 785, having had it roofed in two ways, *magga*, but because it was badly done he may have it roofed again in a third way—doubtless he may choose three of the five ways mentioned immediately below. ⁸ Vin-a 785 says, “upon a fourth way or enclosure over and above the three ways and enclosures.” ⁹ These five kinds of roofing are allowed at Vin 2.154. It is meant here that once the building is finished he must not add one tile or stone and so forth. ¹⁰ Presumably more roofings or enclosures.

(and) determines upon, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is less when it is more than two or three enclosures (and) determines upon, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is more when it is less than two or three enclosures, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than two or three enclosures, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is less when it is less than two or three enclosures, there is no offence.

There is no offence if there are two or three enclosures; if there are less than two or three enclosures; if it is in a cave, if it is in a hut, if it is in a *tiṇa*-grass hut; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property¹; except it be as a house there is no offence in any other circumstances; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.²

The Ninth

¹ I was told in Ceylon that this means that a monk gives something—rice, paddy, fruit—to a family, which then uses it in preparing a meal for him. ² Cf. [Vin 3.155](#), and [BD 1.264](#), notes.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 20

20.1.1 ... at Āḷavī in the chief shrine at Āḷavī. Now at that time the monks of
2.261 Āḷavī, doing repairs, knowing that the water contained life, sprinkled
grass and clay and had them sprinkled. Those who were modest
monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the monks of Āḷavī, knowing that the water contained
life ... and have them sprinkled?” Then these monks told this matter
to the lord...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, knowing that the water
contained life ... and had them sprinkled?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

14.49 “How can you, foolish men, knowing that the water contained life
... and have them sprinkled? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those
who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training
should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk, knowing that the water contains life, should
sprinkle grass or clay or should have them sprinkled, there is an
offence of expiation.**”

20.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

He knows¹ means: either he knows by himself or others tell him.

Should sprinkle means: if he himself sprinkles, there is an offence of expiation.

Should have sprinkled means: if he commands another, there

¹ Cf. BD 2.161, BD 2.297.

is an offence of expiation. When once commanded, if he sprinkles many times, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it contains life when it contains life, (and) sprinkles grass or clay or has them sprinkled, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it contains life ... has them sprinkled, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it does not contain life when it contains life ... has them sprinkled, there is no offence.¹ If he thinks that it contains life when it does not contain life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it does not contain life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it does not contain life when it does not contain life, there is no offence.

There is no offence if it was unintentional, if he was not thinking, if he did not know²; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Tenth

THIS IS ITS KEY

Vegetable-growth, by another,
making (someone) look down upon,
these two on setting forth,
First, throwing out, removable (feet),
and on doors, containing life.

The Second Division: that on Vegetable-growth

¹ Oldenberg says, Vin 4.358, that in his manuscript called "C." this case is left out.

² Cf. above, [BD 2.225](#), [BD 2.229](#), and [Vin 4.125](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 21

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks who were elders, exhorting nuns, came to receive¹ requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicines for the sick.² Then it occurred to the group of six monks:

"Your reverences, at present monks who are elders, exhorting nuns, come to receive requisites ... for the sick. Come, your reverences, let us too exhort nuns."

Then the group of six monks, approaching nuns, spoke thus:

"Now, approach us, sisters, then we will exhort (you)."

Then those nuns approached the group of six monks, and having approached and greeted the group of six monks, they sat down at a respectful distance. Then the group of six monks, giving the nuns merely inferior talk on *dhamma*, spending the day in worldly talk,³ dismissed them, saying: "Go, sisters."

Then these nuns approached the lord, and having approached and greeted the lord, they stood at a respectful distance. As they were standing at a respectful distance, the lord spoke thus to these nuns:

"I hope, nuns, that the exhortation was effective?"⁴

"Lord, how could the exhortation be effective? The masters, the group of six monks, giving merely inferior talk ... dismissed us, saying, 'Go, sisters.'"

Then the lord gladdened, roused, pleased, delighted these nuns with talk on *dhamma*. Then these nuns, gladdened ... delighted by

¹ *lābhino honti*, literally came to be receivers of. ² = BD 2.279. ³ *tiracchānakathā*. Various species of this, talk of kings, robbers, and so on, given at Vin 4.164; DN i.7, DN i.179; MN i.513; SN v.419; AN v.128, etc. ⁴ *iddha*. Cf. Vin 4.313.

the lord with talk on *dhamma*, greeting the lord, departed, keeping their right sides towards him. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the group of six monks, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, giving nuns merely inferior talk ... ‘Go, sisters?’”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, giving nuns merely inferior talk on *dhamma* ... dismiss them, saying: ‘Go, sisters’? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, I allow (you) to agree upon¹ an exhorter of nuns. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon. First, a monk should be requested, and having been requested, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order agree upon the monk so and so as exhorter of nuns. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order agrees Upon the monk so and so as exhorter of nuns. If it pleases the venerable ones, let the monk so and so be agreed upon as exhorter of nuns ... they should speak. And a second time I tell this matter ... And a third time I tell this matter. Let the Order listen to me ... they should speak. The monk so and so is agreed upon by the Order as exhorter of nuns, and it is right ... Thus do I understand this.’”

Then the lord, having rebuked the group of six monks in many a figure for their weakness ... “... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, not agreed upon, should exhort nuns, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.14](#), [BD 2.81](#), [BD 2.157](#) for other “agreements,” *sammuti*.

Now at that time monks who were elders, (and who had been) agreed upon, exhorting nuns, came to receive, as before,¹ requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicines for the sick. Then it occurred to the group of six monks:

“Your reverences, at present, the monks who are elders, (and who have been) agreed upon, exhorting nuns, are receiving, as before, requisites ... for the sick. Come, your reverences, let us, going outside the boundary,² agreeing upon one another as exhorter of nuns, exhort the nuns.”

Then the group of six monks, going outside the boundary, agreeing upon one another as exhorter of nuns, approaching the nuns, said:

“Now we, sisters, are agreed upon, so approach us and we will exhort (you).”

Then these nuns ... (etc., as above [Bu-Pc 21.1.1](#)) ... having rebuked them, and given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to agree upon a monk endowed with eight qualities as exhorter of nuns: one who is virtuous,³ who lives restrained by the restraint of the Pātimokkha,⁴ who is possessed of good behaviour and lawful resort,⁵ who sees danger in the slightest faults,⁶ who undertaking, trains himself in the rules of training,⁷ who has become very learned, who knows the learning by heart,⁸ who is a store of learning.⁹ Those things which, lovely at the beginning, lovely at the middle, lovely at the ending, declare with the spirit, with the letter¹⁰ the Brahma-life completely fulfilled, wholly purified—such things¹¹ come to be much learned by him, learnt by heart,¹² repeated

¹ *tath' eva.* ² Of their particular *āvāsa*, doubtless with the idea of setting up as a *saṅgha* on their own and carrying out their own formal acts. ³ = [Vin 2.95](#) to “linguistic form” below; and = [AN ii.22](#) ...to “vision” below. ⁴ Cf. [DN i.63](#) = [AN ii.14](#) = [AN iv.140](#) = [MN i.33](#) = [It 118](#) = [Vism 1.15](#) = [Vb 244](#).

⁵ References as in n. 4 above. Translation of *ācāragocarasaṃpanna* as at *Path of Purity* 1.20. [Vin-a 788](#) says families possessed of faith are *gocara*, “lawful resort.” ⁶ Cf. [DN i.63](#) = [AN ii.14](#) = [AN iv.140](#) = [MN i.33](#) = [It 118](#) = [Vism 1.15](#) = [Vb 244](#). ⁷ Cf. [DN i.63](#) = [AN ii.14](#) = [AN iv.140](#) = [MN i.33](#) = [It 118](#) = [Vism 1.15](#) = [Vb 244](#). ⁸ *suta-dhara*, literally “a bearer of the heard,” all teaching being at that time oral. ⁹ *suta-sannicaya*.

¹⁰ See *Vinaya Texts* iii.50, n. 2. ¹¹ *dhammā*. ¹² *dhatā*. At [Vin 2.95](#), [Vin-a 788](#) *dhatā*.

out loud, carefully pondered over, well penetrated by vision¹; both the *Pātimokkhas* come to be properly handed down² to him in detail, well sectioned, well regulated, well investigated rule by rule,³ as to the linguistic form.⁴ He comes to be of charming speech, of charming delivery⁵; as a rule he becomes dear to nuns, liked (by them), he becomes competent to exhort nuns, he does not come to be one who, on going forth for the sake of the lord, on being clad in the yellow robes, has previously committed (some offence) against an important rule⁶; he comes to be one of twenty years' standing⁷ or of more than twenty years' standing. Monks, I allow you to agree upon a monk endowed with these eight qualities⁸ as exhorter of nuns.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Not agreed upon means: not agreed upon by an (official) act at which the motion is put three times and then followed by the decision.⁹

Nuns means: ordained by both Orders.¹⁰

Should exhort means: if he exhorts concerning the eight important rules, there is an offence of expiation. If he exhorts concerning

¹ *ditṭhiyā = paññāya*, Vin-a 788. ² *svāgatāni = suṭṭhu āgatāni*, Vin-a 790. See also AN iv.140, GS 4.95, translated: “properly handed down,” and *Vinaya Texts* iii.51, “completely handed down.” Passage also occurs *Vin 1.65*, where it is the fifth of the five necessary qualities in a monk who is to ordain a nun. At *Vin 1.68* a sixth quality is added. See also *Vin 2.249*. ³ *suttaso or suttato*. See *Vinaya Texts* i.xxix, *BD 1.x*, for *sutta* in such contexts meaning “rule,” or “clause,” rather than “discourse.” Translated as “rule” at *Vinaya Texts* iii.317. ⁴ *anubyañjanaso*. Vin-a 790 explains: *akkharapadapāripūriyā*, as to the completion of line and syllable. ⁵ Vin-a 790, *madhurassara*, sweet-toned, sweet-voiced. Cf. AN ii.97, AN iii.114. ⁶ *garudhamma*, esteemed or principal rule. *Vinaya Texts* iii.322 translates *garudhammā* as “chief rules,” GS 4.183 as “cardinal rules.” Given in detail below and also at *Vin 2.255*; AN iv.276. See also *Vinaya Texts* i.35, n. 2. These “important rules” were recited to Mahāpajāpati when Gotama told her that women might become nuns, and they were to count as her ordination. Vin-a 790 says that in his time as a householder, he (i.e., the monk agreed upon) had not committed unchastity with nuns, female novices or probationers. ⁷ Vin-a 791, since his *upasampadā* ordination. ⁸ The eight qualities are summarised at Vin-a 791. ⁹ *ñatticatuttha kamma*. Cf. below, *BD 2.275*. ¹⁰ Cf. above, *BD 2.32*.

another rule,¹ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he exhorts one who has been ordained by one (Order only), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

When that monk has been agreed upon, sweeping the cell, providing drinking water and water for washing, making ready a seat, taking a colleague,² they should sit down.³ The nuns going there, greeting that monk, should sit down at a respectful distance. They should be asked by that monk: 'Sisters, are you all come?'⁴ If they say: 'Master, we are all come,' he says: 'Sisters, are the eight important rules⁵ being kept up?' If they say: 'Master, they are being kept up,' he, saying: 'This, sisters, is the exhortation,' should deliver it. If they say: 'Master, they are not being kept up,'⁶ he should expound them⁷:

A nun who has been ordained (even) for a century⁸ must greet respectfully, rise up from her seat, salute with joined palms, do proper homage to a monk ordained but that day. This rule is to be honoured, respected, revered, venerated, never to be transgressed during her life.

A nun must not spend the rains in a residence where there is no monk.⁹ This rule is to be honoured ... her life.

Every half month a nun should desire¹⁰ two things from the Order

¹ *aññena dhammena*. ² *dutiya*. Vin-a 792 says this means that a *dutiya* should be wanted for setting him free from offence in teaching *dhamma*; cf. above, **BD 2.206**, where in teaching *dhamma* to women a learned man should also be present.

³ *nisīditabbam*. Vin-a 792, "they should all sit down at the place of arrival, not at the outskirts of or in the middle of the *vihāra*, not at the door of the *uposatha*-hall or of the refectory." ⁴ *samagga ttha bhaginiyo*. *Samagga* also means "in unity, harmonious," but Vin-a 792 explains by *sabbā āgaman' attha*, 'are you all come?'

⁵ *garudhamma*, see above, **BD 2.266**. ⁶ *Vattanti = āgacchanti*, Vin-a 792. ⁷ *osāretabbā*, but Vin-a 792 reads *osāretabbo*. ⁸ See HORNER, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p.120, where the eight *garudhammā*, their infringements and remodelling are set out in some detail. These eight principal rules occur again at **Vin 2.255**.

⁹ *abhikkhuke āvāse*. *GS 4.183*, "where there is no resident monk." Vin-a 792 says, "if the monks giving exhortation do not live within half a *yojana* of the nunnery (or nuns' quarters), this means a residence without monks (*ayaṃ abhikkhuko āvāso nāma*)." For then she could not go for the exhortation. This rule is the same as the 56th *Bhikkhunī Pācittiya*, **Vin 4.313**. ¹⁰ *paccāsimṣitabbā*, expect or ask for. Vin-a 794 gives *icchitabbā*, desire.

of monks: the asking (as to the date) of the Observance day,¹ and the coming for the exhortation.² This rule is to be honoured ... her life.

After the rains, a nun must keep the ceremony held at the end of the rains³ before both Orders, in respect of three matters: what was seen, what was heard, what was suspected. This rule is to be honoured ... her life.

A nun, offending against an important rule, must undergo the *mānatta* discipline⁴ for half a month⁵ before both Orders.⁶ This rule ... her life.

When, as a novice, she has trained in the six rules⁷ for two years, she should seek ordination from both Orders.⁸ This rule ... her life.

A monk is not to be reviled⁹ or abused in any way¹⁰ by a nun.¹¹ This rule ... her life.

From today, admonition¹² of monks by nuns is forbidden, admonition of nuns by monks is not forbidden. This rule is to be honoured, respected, revered, venerated, never to be transgressed during her life.

If, saying, 'Master, we are all come,' he speaks another rule, there

¹ I.e., whether it is to be held on the fourteenth or fifteenth day of the month, see *Vinaya Texts* iii.323, n. 2, and Vin-a 794. ² *ovādupasaṃkamana*. Nuns should ask for this. Cf. Vin 4.315 and Vin-a 795. The vicissitudes which led to a monk going to the nuns, instead of the nuns to a monk, are set out at Vin-a 794f., quoting Vin 2.263ff. This rule is the same as the 59th Bhikkhunī Pācittiya, Vin 4.315. The 58th Bhikkhunī Pācittiya is that it is an offence for a nun not to go for exhortation. ³ *pavāretabbarā*. At this ceremony, the *pavāraṇā*, monks and nuns were mutually invited to avow offences seen, heard, or suspected. GS 4.183 translates "Invitation Festival." See GS 4.183, n. 3. Failure of a nun to keep this rule is a *pācittiya* for her, Vin 4.314 (= Bi-Pc 57). Nuns' shortcomings with regard to the *pavāraṇā* are told at Vin 2.275, together with the means of carrying it out properly. Cf. Vin 1.159 ⁴ See BD 1.195-196. ⁵ *pakkhamānatta*. ⁶ Eventually only nuns were allowed to carry out a formal act (*kamma*) against nuns, Vin 2.260, though not here specifically the *mānatta*. ⁷ I.e., for novices. Referred to, Bi-Pc 63-Bi-Pc 67. ⁸ Cf. Vin 2.257, Vin 2.271. ⁹ *akkositabbo*. Cf. *akkosa*, "mode of address," at BD 2.171 above. ¹⁰ *kenaci pariyāyena*. ¹¹ = Bi-Pc 52. ¹² *vacanapatha*. Ed. *Vinaya Texts* iii.324 says, "the reference is, no doubt, to the various kinds of official admonitions given in detail in chapter 20 below" = Vin 2.276. Vin-a 800 says she should not exhort or instruct a monk; while Commentary on AN iv.277 says that *vacanapatha* is *ovādanusāsanadhammakathā*, talk on *dhamma* and instruction and exhortation.

is an offence of wrong-doing. If, saying, ‘Master, we are not all come,’¹ he speaks the eight important rules, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, not delivering² the exhortation, he speaks another rule, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act³ when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of expiation.

If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is not all come ... If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether the Order of nuns is not all come ... thinking that they are all come ... there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is not all come ... (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether it is not all come ... (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is all come ... (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether it is not all come ... (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of expiation.

If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act (and)

¹ *vagga*. See *Vinaya Texts* i.36, n. 2 (from **BD 2.35**), where it is said that “*vagga* is *vyagra*, the opposite of *samagga*.” ² *aniyyādetvā* is according to Vin-a 800 *avatvā*.

³ The (legal) act is here the formal act (*kamma*) appointing the exhorter, Vin-a 800.

exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is all come ... (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether it is not all come ... (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is all come ... (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether it is not all come ... (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is not all come ... (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether it is not all come ... (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come ... being in doubt ... thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come ... being in doubt ... thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is not all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is all come ... is in doubt ... thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is all come when the Order of nuns is all come ... there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) exhorts, thinking that it is not all come when the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing ... (and) exhorts, being in doubt as to whether the Order of nuns is all come, there is an offence of wrong-doing ... thinking that the Order of nuns is all

come when it is all come, there is no offence.

21.3.3
2.272
There is no offence (in) giving an exposition,¹ giving an interrogation²; if he expounds being called upon: ‘Expound, master³ if she asks a question⁴; if, having, asked a question, he speaks; if, talking for the good of another, nuns hear; if it is to a female probationer, if it is to a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.’⁵

The First

¹ Cf. Vin 1.75, Vin 2.219. Vin-a 808, “reciting the text of the eight important rules.”

² *paripucchā*. Cf. below, BD 2.275, BD 2.278, BD 2.395, and Vin 1.70, Vin 2.219. Vin-a 800, “speaking an explanation on the text of the important rules.” ³ Vin-a 800, the important rules. ⁴ Vin-a 801, “if a nun asks a question about the eight important rules or about the *khandhas*, whatever the monk says to that is no offence for him.”

⁵ Cf. BD 2.207, BD 2.275.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 22

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks who were elders exhorted the nuns in turn.¹ Now at that time it came to be the turn of the venerable Cūḷapanthaka² to exhort the nuns. The nuns said:

“Now today the exhortation will not be effective,³ for now master Cūḷapanthaka will speak the same stanza⁴ again and again.”

Then these nuns approached the venerable Cūḷapanthaka, and having approached and greeted the venerable Cūḷapanthaka, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Cūḷapanthaka spoke thus to these nuns:

“Sisters, are you all come?”⁵

“Master, we are all come.”

“Sisters, are the eight important rules being kept up?”⁶

“They are being kept up, master.”

“Sisters, this is the exhortation,” (and) delivering (it) he spoke this stanza again and again:

“For the sage, high-minded, zealous,
trained in paths of wisdom,⁷
For such, tranquil, ever mindful,⁸

¹ *pariyāyena*. ² At AN i.23 called chief among monks skilled in creating forms by mind-power and mental “evolution.” His verses are at Thag 557–Thag 566. See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* for details of his life. ³ *Iddha*, cf. above, BD 2.263.

⁴ *Udāna*. ⁵ Cf. above, BD 2.267. ⁶ Cf. above, BD 2.267. ⁷ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2980.) ⁸ *Sadā satīmato* = SN i.81.

sorrows come not to be.”¹

The nuns spoke thus: “Is it not as we said? The exhortation will not now become effective today, for now master Cūḷapanthaka will speak the same stanza again and again.”

The venerable Cūḷapanthaka heard this conversation of those nuns. Then the venerable Cūḷapanthaka, rising up above the ground,² paced up and down in the air, in the sky, then he stood, then he sat down, then he lay down in a sleeping-place, then he was obscured, then blazed forth, then he disappeared; he spoke this same stanza and another long utterance of the enlightened one. The nuns spoke thus:

“Indeed it is wonderful, good-sir, indeed it is marvellous, good sir, indeed never before has an exhortation come to be so effective as this one of master Cūḷapanthaka.”

Then the venerable Cūḷapanthaka, exhorting these nuns until the dark of the night, dismissed them, saying: “Go, sisters.” Then these nuns, staying outside the town because the town-gate was closed, entered the town in the morning.³ People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“These nuns are not leading the Brahma-life; having remained together with monks in the monastery, now they are entering the town.”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Cūḷapanthaka exhort nuns after sunset?”

...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Cūḷapanthaka, exhorted nuns after sunset?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, Cūḷapanthaka⁴ ... after sunset? Cūḷapanthaka, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks,

¹ = Ud 43 = Thag 68. ² *vehāsa*, cf. BD 1.79. ³ Cf. below, BD 2.401. ⁴ Note Gotama calls him by his name here, and not *moghapurisa*, “foolish man.”

this rule of training should be set forth:

“If a monk, even though agreed upon, should exhort nuns after sunset, there is an offence of expiation.”

Agreed upon means: agreed upon by an (official) act at which the motion is put three times and then followed by the decision.¹

Bu-Pc:

After sunset means: after the sun has gone down.

Nuns means: ordained by both Orders.

Should exhort means: if he exhorts concerning the eight important rules or concerning another rule, there is an offence of expiation.²

Bu-Pc:

If he thinks that (the sun) has set when it has set (and) exhorts, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it has set (and) exhorts, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it has not set when it has set (and) exhorts, there is an offence of expiation. If he exhorts one who has been ordained by one (Order only), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it has set when it has not set, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it has not set, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it has not set when it has not set, there is no offence.

Bu-Pc:

There is no offence (in) giving an exposition, giving an interrogation; if he expounds being called upon: ‘Expound, master if she asks a question; if, having asked a question, he speaks; if, talking for the good of another, nuns hear; if it is to a female probationer, if it is to a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.’³

The Second

¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.267](#). ² Cf. above, *ibid.* ³ Cf. above, [BD 2.207](#), [BD 2.272](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 23

23.1.1 ... among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery.¹ Now
2.276 at that time the group of six monks, approaching the nuns' quarters,
exhorted the group of six nuns. Nuns spoke thus to the group of six
14.56 nuns: "Come, ladies, we will go for exhortation."

"Well, ladies, we would go for the sake of exhortation, (but) the group of the six masters exhort us in this very place."²

Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of the six monks, approaching nuns' quarters, exhort nuns?"

Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks ... exhort nuns?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks ... exhorted nuns?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men ... exhort nuns? Foolish men, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monk, approaching nuns' quarters, should exhort nuns, there is an offence of expiation."³

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

23.2.1 ¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.94**. ² *Idh'eva*, literally "right here," as the Americans say. ³ Cf.
2.277 **Vin 2.259**, where the laity complain that the monks go to nuns' quarters to recite the Pātimokkha.

Now at that time Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid became ill. Monks who were elders approached Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid, and having approached they spoke thus to Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid:

“Gotami, we hope things are going well with you, we hope you are keeping going.”

“Masters, things are not going well with me, I am not keeping going. Please, masters, give *dhamma*.”

“Sister, it is not allowable, approaching nuns’ quarters, to give *dhamma* to a nun,” they said, and being scrupulous they did not give it. Then the lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid, and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. As he was sitting down, the lord spoke thus to Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid:

“Gotami, I hope things are going well with you, I hope you are keeping going.”

“Formerly, lord, monks who were elders, coming to me, gave *dhamma*: because of this comfort came to be for me.¹ But now they say it is forbidden by the lord, and being scrupulous they do not give it; because of this comfort does not come to be for me.”

Then the lord having ... delighted Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid with talk on *dhamma*, rising up from his seat, departed. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given *dhamma*-talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, approaching nuns’ quarters, to exhort a nun who is ill. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, approaching nuns’ quarters, should exhort the nuns except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. This is a right time in this case: if a nun comes to be ill; this, in this case, is a right time.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Nuns’ quarters means: where nuns stay even for one night.

Approaching means: going there.

¹ Cf. below, [BD 2.342](#), [BD 2.399](#).

Nuns means: ordained by both Orders.

Should exhort means: if he exhorts concerning the eight important rules, there is an offence of expiation.

Except at a right time means: setting aside a right time.

An ill nun means: if she is unable to go for exhortation or for communion.¹

23.3.2

If he thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained, (and) approaching the nuns' quarters, exhorts her—except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether she is ordained ... at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that she is not ordained when she is ordained ... at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he exhorts (her) concerning a different rule, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he exhorts one who is ordained by one (Order only), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not ordained when she is not ordained, there is no offence.

23.3.3

There is no offence if it is at a right time, (in) giving an exposition, giving an interrogation (as **Bu-Pc 22.2.3**) ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Third

¹ *saṁvāsa*. For definition of this, see Old Commentary's exegesis on *asaṁvāsa* in each *Pārājika* (BD.1).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 24

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks who were elders, exhorting nuns, came to receive requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicines for the sick.¹ The group of six monks spoke thus:

“The monks who are elders are not doing a service² in exhorting nuns; the monks who are elders are exhorting nuns for the sake of gain.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks speak thus: ‘The monks who are elders ... for the sake of gain?’” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, spoke thus: ‘The monks who are elders ... for the sake of gain?’”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, speak thus: ‘The monks who are elders ... for the sake of gain?’ It is not, foolish men, for pleasing, those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should speak thus: ‘The monks who are elders are exhorting nuns for the sake of gain,’ there is an offence of expiation.**”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

¹ = BD 2.263. ² *na bahukatā*. Vin-a 804 says *na katabahumānā na dhammabahumānam katvā*, “not revering, not doing reverence to *dhamma*,” apparently not rendering a service.

For the sake of gain means: for the sake of robes, for the sake of alms-food, for the sake of lodgings, for the sake of the requisite of medicines for the sick, for the sake of honour, for the sake of respect, for the sake of reverence, for the sake of homage, for the sake of veneration.

Should speak thus means: if desiring to bring blame,¹ desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame² to one who is ordained (and) agreed upon by the Order as exhorter of nuns, he speaks thus, saying: 'He is exhorting for the sake of robes ... for the sake of veneration,' there is an offence of expiation.

24.2.2
If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, (and) speaks thus, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, (and) speaks thus, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, (and) speaks thus, there is an offence of expiation. If, desiring to bring blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame to one who is ordained (but) not agreed upon by the Order as exhorter of nuns, he speaks thus, saying: 'He is exhorting for the sake of robes ... for the sake of veneration,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, desiring to bring blame ... to bring shame to one not ordained,³ agreed upon or not agreed upon by the Order as exhorter of nuns, he speaks thus, saying, 'He is exhorting ... for the sake of veneration,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence.

24.2.3
2.281
There is no offence if he usually speaks exhorting for the sake

¹ *avaṇṇam kattukāmo*. Cf. above, **BD 2.236**. ² *maṅkuṃ kattukāmo*. See above, **BD 2.178** and n. 5. ³ Such as a learned probationer, Vin-a 804.

of robes ... for the sake of veneration; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fourth

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 25

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a monk was walking for alms in Sāvattḥī along a certain road. And a nun was walking for alms along that road. Then that monk spoke thus to that nun: "Go, sister, in such and such a place alms-food is being given." And she spoke thus: "Go, master, in such and such a place alms-food is being given."

These had become friends through constantly seeing (one another). Now at that time robe-material was being distributed to the Order. Then that nun, going for exhortation, approached that monk, and having approached and greeted that monk, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, that monk spoke thus to that nun:

"Sister, this is my share of the robe-material, you may accept it."

"Yes, master, my robe is worn thin." Then that monk gave that nun the robe-material. Then that monk became one whose robe was worn thin. Monks spoke thus to this monk.

"Your reverence, make up your robe-material now." Then that monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can a monk give robe-material to a nun?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, gave robe-material to a nun?"

"It is true, lord."

"Is she a relation of yours, monk, or not a relation?"

"She is not a relation, lord," he said.

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for

a nun who is not a relation.¹ How can you, foolish man, give robe-material to a nun who is not a relation? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should give robe-material to a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Then scrupulous monks did not give robe-material in exchange to nuns.² The nuns ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the masters not give robe-material to us in exchange?”

Monks heard these nuns who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, I allow you to give in exchange to five (classes of people): to a monk, a nun, a female probationer, a male novice, a female novice. I allow you, monks, to give in exchange to these five (classes of people). And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should give robe-material to a nun who is not a relation, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation.**”³

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or the father's side back through seven generations.⁴

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Robe-material means: any one robe-material of the six (kinds of) robe-materials, (including) the least one fit for assignment.⁵

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.39, BD 2.44.** ² Cf. above, **BD 2.39**, where scrupulous monks did not accept robes in exchange. ³ Cf. Bu-NP 5, where it is an offence for a monk to receive a robe from a nun who is not related, except in exchange. ⁴ See above,

BD 2.31. ⁵ See above, **BD 2.7.**

Except in exchange means: setting aside (the fact that) he gives in exchange, there is an offence of expiation.

25.3.2

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation, (and) gives robe-material (to her), except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether she is a relation ... If he thinks that she is a relation when she is not a relation ... there is an offence of expiation. If he gives robe-material to one ordained by one (Order only), except in exchange, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence.

25.3.3

There is no offence if she is a relation; if there is an exchange; if there is a large thing for a small thing, or a small thing for a large thing; if a nun takes it on trust; if she takes it for the time being; if he gives another requisite, except robe-material; if she is a female probationer, a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

The Fifth

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.41**, and below, **BD 2.287**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 26

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Udāyin¹ became skilled² in making robes. A certain nun³ approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached she spoke thus to the venerable Udāyin:

“Honoured sir, it were good if the master sewed a robe for me.”

Then the venerable Udāyin, having sewed a robe for this nun, having made it well dyed, well worked, having raised⁴ up a bold design⁵ in the middle, having folded it up,⁶ laid it aside. Then that nun approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached she spoke thus to the venerable Udāyin:

“Where, honoured sir, is that robe?”

“Come, sister, having taken this robe as it was folded up, having laid it aside, when the Order of nuns comes for exhortation, then, having put on this robe, come at the back of the Order of nuns.”

Then that nun, having taken this robe as it was folded up, when

¹ Vin-a 804 calls him Lāḷudāyi. See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ² *paṭṭha*. Above, **BD 2.109**, same thing said of Upananda. Cf. also above, **BD 2.42**. ³ Vin-a 804 says she was his former wife. ⁴ *vuṭṭhāpetvā*, variant reading *samuṭṭhāpetvā*. ⁵ *paṭibhānacitta*. Vin-a 804 says *paṭibhānacittan ti attano paṭibhaṇena, katacittan*, so *kira cīvaraṃ rajitvā tassa majjhe nānavaṇṇehi vippakatamethunaṃ itthipurisarūpaṃ akāsi*, which seems to mean a design (or painting, *citta*) made by his own wit (or ingenuity, intelligence). They say that he, dyeing the robe-material, made in the middle, with various colours, the form of a woman and a man in interrupted intercourse (so *Pali-English Dictionary* for *vippakatamethuna*). Cf. **Vin 2.151**, where the group of six monks had “imaginative drawings (*paṭibhānacitta*) painted on their *vihāras*, figures of men and figures of women” (*Vinaya Texts* iii.172, q.v., n. 3). *Paṭibhānacitta* occurs again as being in a *cittāgāra*, picture-gallery, at **Vin 4.298**. ⁶ *samharitvā*. Cf. **Vin 1.46**; **Vin 2.117**, **Vin 2.150**.

the Order of nuns came for exhortation, then, having put on this robe, she came at the back of the Order of nuns. People ... spread it about, saying:

“How little these nuns fear blame, they are sly, they have no shame,¹ inasmuch as they raise up a bold design on a robe.”

Nuns spoke thus: “Whose work is this?”

“Master Udāyin’s,” she said.

“A thing like this should not adorn these who have little fear of blame, who are sly, who have no shame. Is it not master Udāyin’s?” they said.

Then the nuns told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Udāyin sew a robe for a nun?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, sewed a robe for a nun?”

“It is true, lord.”

“Is she a relation of yours, Udāyin, or not a relation?”

“She is not a relation, lord,” he said.

“Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is pleasing or what is unpleasing for a woman who is not a relation. How can you, foolish man, sew a robe for a nun who is not a relation? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should sew or should cause a robe to be sewn for a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation.”

26.2.1

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

2.287

Not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother’s side or on the father’s side back through seven generations.²

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.³

¹ = Vin 3.128 = BD 1.214. ² Cf. above, BD 2.31, BD 2.47. ³ Cf. above, BD 2.32, BD 2.40.

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes.¹

Should sew means: if he himself sews, in each insertion of the awl² there is an offence of expiation.

Should cause to be sewn means: if he commands another, there is an offence of expiation. When once commanded, if he sews much, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation, (and) sews or causes a robe to be sewn, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether she is not a relation ... If he thinks that she is a relation when she is not a relation ... there is an offence of expiation. If he sews or causes a robe to be sewn for one ordained by one (Order only), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is a relation there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence.

There is no offence if she is a relation; if he sews or causes another requisite to be sewn, except a robe; if she is a female probationer, a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.³

The Sixth

¹ Cf. below, [BD 2.407](#). Vin-a 804 and Vin-a 863 say this means that which he is able to put on, to dress in, using the verbs *nivāsetuṃ* and *pārupituṃ*, which refer to the inner robe and to the upper robe and outer cloak; see above, [BD 2.32, n. 2, n. 3](#). Vin-a 863 expressly says that the robe which is the least one fit for assignment is not meant (at [Vin 4.120](#)); presumably it is not meant here either. ² *ārāpathe*. ³ Cf. above, [BD 2.284](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 27

27.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
2.288 at that time the group of six monks, having arranged together with nuns, were going along the same high-road.¹ People ... spread it about, saying:

“Just as we tour with our wives, so do these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, tour together with nuns.”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks, having arranged together with nuns, go along the same high-road?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks ... the same high-road?”

“It is true, lord.” The enlightened one, the lord rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men ... same high-road? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of trailing should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, having arranged together with a nun, should go along the same high-road, even among villages,² there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

27.2.1 Now³ at that time several⁴ monks and nuns came to be going
14.63 along the high-road from Sāketa to Sāvattḥī. Then these nuns spoke
2.289

¹ Cf. Vin 4.131, Vin 4.133. ² *gāmantarām*. ³ Cf. below, BD 2.292. ⁴ *sambahulā*, usually in Vinaya “two or three,” a *gaṇa*.

thus to these monks:

“We will go along with the masters.”

“Sisters, it is not allowable, having arranged together with a nun, to go along the same high-road. Either you go first, or we will go (first).”

“Honoured sirs, the masters are the highest men,¹ so let the masters go first.”

Then as those nuns were going last thieves robbed them on the way and assaulted them. Then these nuns, having arrived at Sāvattthī, told this matter to the nuns. The nuns ... to the monks. The monks ... to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to go along the same high-road, having arranged together with a nun, if it is on a road agreed upon as dangerous, frightening,² (where) one must go with a weapon.³ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, having arranged together with a nun, should go along the same high-road, even among villages, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case this is the right time: if a road becomes agreed upon as dangerous, frightening, (where) one must go with a weapon. This is the right time in this case.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Together with means: together.

Having arranged⁴ means: if one arranges, saying, ‘We are going, sister, we are going, master, we are going, master, we are going, sister,

¹ *aggapurisa*, or foremost, chief among men. ² Cf. above, **BD 2.158**, for these two words; and cf. MN i.134. ³ *satthagamanīya*. I follow rendering of *Vinaya Texts* i.37: “when the road is so insecure and dangerous that travellers on it have to carry arms,” and not the “caravan-road” of *Pali-English Dictionary*. For Old Commentary’s definition would, in conjunction with this phrase, make nonsense if “caravan-road” were meant. *Sattha* may be, more specifically, “knife,” cf. **Bu-Pj 3** ⁴ Cf. below, **BD 2.293**, and **Vin 4.131**.

we are going either today or tomorrow¹ or the next day,² there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Even among villages means: in a village close enough for a cock (to walk),³ among every (such) village,⁴ there is an offence of expiation. For every half *yojana*⁵ in what is not a village, in a jungle,⁶ there is an offence of expiation.⁷

Except at the right time means: setting aside the right time.⁸

A road where one must go with a weapon means: it comes to be impossible to go without a weapon.

Dangerous⁹ means: if, on this road, a place where thieves are halting is seen, a place where they are eating is seen, a place where they are resting is seen, a place where they are sitting down is seen, a place where they are lying down is seen.

Frightening¹⁰ means: if on this road people injured by thieves are seen, (people) plundered are seen, (people) beaten down are seen.

Having gone to a frightening (place), having seen that it is not frightening, they should be dismissed, with the words, 'Go, sisters.'

If he thinks that it was arranged when it was arranged, (and) goes along the same high-road even among villages, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it was arranged ... If he thinks that it was not arranged when it was arranged ... there is an offence of expiation. If a monk arranges (and) a nun does not arrange, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was arranged when it was not arranged, there is an

¹ *hiyyo*, usually "yesterday." Cf. Hindustani *kāl*, meaning both "yesterday" and "tomorrow." ² *pare*, or it can mean "in the future." ³ *kukkuṭasampāte gāme*. Vin-a 806 says, "setting out from a village a cock goes on foot to another village." Cf. *kukkuṭasampātika* at AN i.159, and GS 1.142, and n. 2; DN iii.75, and *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.72 and n. 2. The whole phrase seems to mean it is an offence to walk to a village that is so close that a cock could walk to it. ⁴ *gāmantare gāmantare*.

⁵ See RHYS DAVIDS, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p.16. ⁶ See definition of "jungle" at BD 1.74, BD 1.85. ⁷ Cf. below, BD 2.294, and Vin 4.131. ⁸ To here from "together with" above, cf. below, BD 2.293, and Vin 4.131. ⁹ Cf. above, BD 2.158, and MN-a 2.109. ¹⁰ Cf. above, BD 2.158, and MN-a 2.109.

offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it was not arranged, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was not arranged when it was not arranged, there is no offence.

There is no offence if it is at the right time; if he goes not having arranged; if the nun arranges (and) the monk does not arrange; if they go without (making) a rendezvous¹; if there are dangers²; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.³

The Seventh

¹ *visaṃketena*. Vin-a 807, “if they say: we will go before the meal, and they go after the meal; if they say: we will come today, and they go on the morrow, thus as it is not at the time of the rendezvous (*kālavisaṃkete*) there is no offence.” Cf. *asaṃketena* above, BD 2.239, n. 3. ² Vin-a 807, “when there is dissension in the kingdom and the country people mount their carts and drive away”; a stock phrase, cf. AN i.178, AN iii.66, AN iii.104. ³ Cf. below, BD 2.294, and Vin 4.132, Vin 4.133.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 28

28.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
2.292 at that time the group of six monks, having arranged together with
(some) nuns, embarked in one boat. People ... spread it about, saying:

“Just as we amuse ourselves in a boat with our wives, so do these
recluses, sons of the Sakyans, having arranged together with nuns,
amuse themselves in a boat.”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who
were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks, having arranged together with
nuns, embark in one boat?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, having arranged together
with nuns, embarked in one boat?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men ... embark in one boat? It is not, foolish
men ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, having arranged together with a nun, should
embark in one boat, going either upstream or downstream, there is
an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by
the lord.

28.2.1 Now¹ at that time several monks and nuns were going along the
high-road from Sāketa to Sāvattthī. On the way there was a river to
be crossed. Then these nuns spoke thus to these monks:

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.288.**

“We will cross over together with the masters.”

“Sisters, it is not allowable, having arranged together with a nun, to embark in one boat. Either you cross over first, or we will cross over (first).”

“Honoured sirs, the masters are the highest men, so let the masters cross over first.”

Then as those nuns were crossing over last thieves robbed them and assaulted them. Then these nuns, having arrived at Sāvattthī, told this matter to the nuns. The nuns ... to the monks. The monks ... to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to embark in one boat, having arranged together with a nun, if it is for crossing over to the other bank. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, having arranged together with a nun, should embark in one boat, going either upstream or downstream, except for crossing over to the other bank, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Together with means: together.

Having arranged¹ means: if one arranges, saying, ‘We are embarking, sister, we are embarking, master, we are embarking, master, we are embarking, sister, we are embarking either today or tomorrow or the next day,’ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If the monk embarks when the nun has embarked, there is an offence of expiation. If the nun embarks when the monk has embarked, there is an offence of expiation. Or if both embark there is an offence of expiation.

Going upstream² means: upstream.³

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.290**. ² *uddhaṅgāminī*. Vin-a 808, “going against the stream of the river.” ³ *ujjavanikāya*. Instrumental feminine, used as adjective. Cf. **Vin 2.290**.

Going downstream¹ means: downstream.²

Except for crossing over to the other bank means: setting aside for crossing over to the other bank.

In a village close enough for a cock (to walk), among every (such) village, there is an offence of expiation. For every half *yojana* in what is not a village, in a jungle, there is an offence of expiation.³

28.3.2
14.66
If he thinks that it was arranged when it was arranged (and) embarks in the same boat, going either upstream or downstream, except for crossing over to the other bank, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it was arranged ... (see **Bu-Pc 27.3.2**) ... no offence.

28.3.3
There is no offence if it is for crossing over to the other bank⁴; if they embark not having arranged; if the nun arranges (and) the monk does not arrange; if they embark without (making) a rendezvous; if there are dangers; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.⁵

The Eighth

¹ *adhogāminī*. ² *ojavanikāya*. ³ Cf. above, **BD 2.290**, and **Vin 4.131**. ⁴ Vin-a 809 says, 'here it is not only the river, for there is no offence for one who goes from the port of a great ford to Tāmalitti or Suvaṇṇabhūmi.' Tāmalitti was a sea-port (the modern Tamluk), formerly on the estuary of the Ganges, and the port from where Asoka sent the branch of the Bodhi-tree to Ceylon.

Suvaṇṇabhūmi is the modern Cambodia (*Pali-English Dictionary*); or more probably Lower Burma (Pegu and Moulmein districts), according to B.C. LAW, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p.70, the Pagan and Moulmein districts, according to *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*; mentioned at Mnd 155, Sāsanavaṃsa 10, where it is said that it stands near the great sea. ⁵ Cf. above, **BD 2.291**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 29

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā¹ came to frequent a certain family as a regular diner. And monks who were elders came to be invited by that householder. Then the nun Thullanandā, dressing in the morning, taking her bowl and robe, approached that family, and having approached, she said to that householder:

“Householder, why is this abundant solid food and soft food prepared?”

“Lady, elders are invited by me.”

“But who are the elders for you, householder?”

“Master Sāriputta,² master Moggallāna the Great,³ master Kaccāna the Great,⁴ master Koṭṭhita the Great,⁵ master Kappina the Great,⁶ master Cunda the Great,⁷ master Anuruddha,⁸ master Re-

¹ Cf. **BD 1.110**; **Vin 4.211**, **Vin 4.332ff.**; **SN ii.219**, **SN ii.222**. ² Chief of the disciples of great wisdom, **AN i.23**. See **Thag 340**. For reference to all these, see *Psalms of the Bretheren*; **GS 1.16–GS 1.20**; and *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ³ Chief of the disciples of psychic potencies, **AN i.23**. See **Thag 382**. ⁴ Chief of the disciples who are expounders in full of brief sayings, **AN i.23**. See **Thag 238**. ⁵ Chief of the disciples who are masters of logical analysis, **AN i.24**. See **Thag 6**. ⁶ Chief of the disciples who are exhorters of monks, **AN i.25**. See **Thag 254**. ⁷ Not specially distinguished in **AN i**. See **Thag 118**. ⁸ Chief of the disciples who are of deva-sight, **AN i.23**. See **Thag 325**.

vata,¹ master Upāli,² master Ānanda,³ master Rāhula.⁴”

“But why did you, householder, invite fellows⁵ posing as⁶ great heroes⁷?”

“But who are the great heroes for you, sister?”

“Master Devadatta, master Kokālika, master Kaṭamorakatissaka, master the son of the lady Khaṇḍā, master Samuddadatta.”⁸

Now this chance talk⁹ of the nun Thullanandā was interrupted¹⁰ when these monks who were elders entered. She said:

“Householder, is it true that the great heroes are invited by you?”¹¹

“You, lady, called (them) now ‘fellows,’ now ‘great heroes,’” he said, and he turned her out of the house and put an end to regular dining. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can Devadatta eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun?”¹²

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Devadatta, ate alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

¹ Revata Khadiravaniya, “the acacia woodlander”; at AN i.24 is called “chief of the jungle-dwellers,” while Kaṅkhā-revata is there called chief of musers. Vin-a does not say which one is meant. See Thag 45, Thag 279, Thag 7. ² Chief of those versed in Vinaya, AN i.25. See Thag 168. Also BD.1, Index. ³ Chief of those of wide learning, of those who are mindful, of those of good behaviour, of those who are resolute, of personal attendants, AN i.24f. See Thag 349. ⁴ Chief of those desirous of training, AN i.24. See Thag 183, Gotama’s only son. ⁵ *cetaka*. Under *ceṭaka*, *Pali-English Dictionary*, referring to this passage, gives “servant, slave, (bad) fellow,” while for *cetaka* it gives “decoy-bird.” Commentary of no help. ⁶ *tiṭṭhamāna*. ⁷ *Mahā-nāga*, *nāga* also meaning snake or elephant. ⁸ The schismatics of Bu-Ss 10, Bu-Ss 11, see BD.1. ⁹ *antarākathā*. Cf. Ud 11. ¹⁰ *vippakatā*, interrupted, broken off, left unfinished, but Vin-a 808 reads *vippakathā* ‘ti kayiramānā hoti (variant reading honti). ¹¹ Vin-a 808, “looking round as the elders came in, she spoke thus, knowing that they had heard her.” ¹² *bhikkhunīparipācīta*; Vin-a 809, “procuring it, making it be taken by explaining its qualities.”

“Whatever monk should eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time a certain monk who had gone forth from Kaja-gaha arrived at a family of (his) relations. People, saying: “At last the revered sir¹ is come,” duly made ready a meal. A nun who frequented that family spoke thus to these people:

“Sirs, give a meal to the master.”

Then that monk, thinking: “It is forbidden by the lord to eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun,” being scrupulous, did not accept it; he was not able to walk for alms, he became famished.² Then that monk, having gone to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun, if there is a prior arrangement with the householder.³ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should eat alms-food knowing that it was procured through (the intervention of) a nun, unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

He knows means: either he knows by himself, or others tell him, or she herself tells him.⁴

A nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

¹ *bhaddanto*. ² *chinnabhatta*. ³ *pubbe gihisamārambhe*, a prior undertaking on the part of the householder. Vin-a 809 says *samārambha* is a synonym for *paṭiyādita*, given, arranged, prepared. ⁴ Cf. above, [BD 2.161](#), [BD 2.261](#); below, [BD 2.333](#).

Procures means: previously not desirous of giving, not desirous of treating him, if she says: “The master is a repeater, the master is very learned, the master is versed in the Suttantas, the master is an expert in Vinaya, the master is a speaker of *dhamma*, give to the master, treat the master”: this means procures.

Alms-food means: any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals.¹

Unless there is a prior arrangement with the house-holder means: setting aside the arrangement with the householder.

An arrangement with the householder means: they are relations or they are invited² or they are ordinarily prepared (for the monk).³

If he says: “I will eat,” and accepts (a meal), unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder, there is an offence of wrongdoing. For each mouthful there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is procured when it is procured (and) eats it, unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt⁴ as to whether it is procured (and) eats ... with the householder, there is an offence of wrongdoing. If he thinks that it is not procured when it is procured (and) eats ... with the householder, there is no offence. If he eats what is procured through (the intervention of) one ordained by one (Order only), unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder, there is an offence of wrongdoing. If he thinks that it is procured when it is not procured, there is an offence of wrongdoing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not procured, there is an offence of wrongdoing. If he thinks that it is not procured when it is not procured, there is no offence.

¹ Cf. below, **BD 2.305**. These five kinds of meals are enumerated below, **BD 2.330**.

² *pavārita*. ³ *pakaṭṭipatiyatta*. Vin-a 809, they (i.e., meals) are usually prepared (*paṭiyādita*) for that very monk, with the words, ‘we will give to the elder.’ ⁴ Oldenberg at Vin 4.359 says that in this and the next case the manuscript called “C.” has *āpatti pācittiyassa*, an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if there is a prior arrangement with the householder; if a female probationer procures it, if a female novice procures it; setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, there is no offence in (eating) any others¹; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Ninth

¹ I.e., in eating rice-gruel, cakes, and fruits prepared for a nun, Vin-a 809. Cf. below, [BD 2.305](#), [BD 2.314](#), [BD 2.320](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 30

30.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
2.300 at that time the former wife of the venerable Udāyin¹ had gone forth
among the nuns. She frequently came to the venerable Udāyin, and
the venerable Udāyin frequently went to this nun. Now at one time
the venerable Udāyin was sitting down in a private place together
with this nun, the one with the other.² Those who were modest monks
... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Udāyin sit down in a private place together with a nun, the one with the other?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, sat down in a private place together with a nun, the one with the other?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, sit down in a private place together with a nun, the one with the other? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should sit down in a private place together with a nun, the one with the other, there is an offence of expiation.”³

30.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

¹ Mentioned in Bu-Ss 2-Bu-Ss 5, to which Vin-a 809 refers, always in connection with women. In both *Aniyatas*, he is discovered sitting in private with a lay woman. Opening phrases of this *pācittiya* = Bu-NP 4. ² *eko ekāya*. ³ Cf. Bu-Pc 44, Bu-Pc 45.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Together with means: together.

The one with the other means: there is a monk and also a nun.

A private place means: private from the eye, private from the ear. Private from the eye means: if covering the eye, or raising the eyebrow, or raising the head, he is unable to see. Private from the ear means: it is impossible to hear ordinary talk¹ (from him and the woman).

Should sit down means: if a nun is sitting and a monk comes to be sitting or lying down close (to her), there is an offence of expiation; if a monk is sitting and a nun comes to be sitting or lying down close (to him), there is an offence of expiation. Or if both are sitting or if both are lying down, there is an offence of expiation.²

If he thinks that it is a private place when it is a private place (and) sits down, the one with the other, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a private place ... If he thinks that it is not a private place when it is a private place ... is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is a private place when it is not a private place, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a private place, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a private place when it is not a private place, there is no offence.

There is no offence if some learned friend comes to be (present); if he stands, does not sit; if he is not desirous of a private place; if he sits down thinking about something else³; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.⁴

The Tenth

THIS IS ITS KEY

Not agreed upon, the setting sun,

¹ Cf. **BD 1.332**, and below, **BD 2.358**, **BD 2.361**. ² Cf. below, **BD 2.358**, **BD 2.361**.

³ *aññāvihita*. ⁴ Cf. below, **BD 2.358**, and **Vin 4.269**.

quarters, gain, because of a gift, he sews,
A high-road, a boat, should eat, the
one with the other: these ten.

The Third Division: that on Exhortation

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 31

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time, not far from Sāvattḥī, alms-food came to be prepared in a public rest-house¹ by some guild. The group of six monks, dressing in the morning, taking their bowls and robes, entering Sāvattḥī for alms-food, (but) not obtaining alms-food, went to the public rest-house. People, saying: "At last the revered ones are come," duly waited upon them. Then the group of six monks also on the second day ... also on the third day, dressing in the morning ... going to the public rest-house, ate (a meal). Then it occurred to the group of six monks:

"What difference do we make?² Having gone to the monastery, then tomorrow³ it will be right to return just here."⁴ Staying on and on⁵ just there, they ate alms-food at the public rest-house. Followers of other sects went away. People ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, staying on and on, eat alms-food at the public rest-house? The alms-food at the public rest-house is not prepared merely⁶ for them, the alms-food at the public rest-house is prepared simply for everybody."

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks, staying on and on, eat alms-food at a public rest-house?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks ... rest-house?"

¹ *āvasathapiṇḍa*. See *Vinaya Texts* i.37, n. 3, for information and references. Cf. *āvasathāgāra*, above, **BD 2.198**. ² *kiṃ mayam karissāma*. ³ *hiyyo*. Vin-a 810 reads *bhīyyo pi ti sve pi*. ⁴ *idh'eva āgantabbaṃ bhavissati*. ⁵ *anuvāsivā anuvāsivā*. ⁶ *eva*.

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men ... rest-house? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“One meal at a public rest-house may be eaten. If he should eat more than that, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

^{31.2.1} Now at that time the venerable Sāriputta, going through the Kosalan country to Sāvattthī, approached a certain public rest-house. People saying: “At last the elder is come,” duly waited upon (him). Then when the venerable Sāriputta had eaten, a painful affliction arose, he was not able to leave that public rest-house. Then on the second day these people spoke thus to the venerable Sāriputta: “Eat, honoured sir.” Then the venerable Sāriputta, thinking: “It is not allowed by the lord, staying on and on, to eat alms-food at a public rest-house,” and being scrupulous, he did not accept; he became famished. Then the venerable Sāriputta, having gone to Sāvattthī, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord in this connection, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, staying on and on, to eat alms-food at a public rest-house. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**One meal in a public rest-house may be eaten by a monk who is not ill. If he should eat more than that, there is an offence of expiation.**”

^{31.3.1} **Not ill** means: he is able to leave that public rest-house. Ill means: he is not able to leave that public rest-house.

^{n 4.71}
^{2.305} **Meal in a public rest-house** means: any one meal of the five

(kinds of) meals¹; as much as is wanted² is prepared, not specially for him,³ in a hall or in a hut⁴ or at the foot of a tree or in the open air.

By a monk who is not ill means: (a meal) may be eaten once (only). If he accepts more than that, thinking: “I will eat,” there is an offence of wrong-doing; for each mouthful, there is an offence of expiation.⁵

If he thinks that he is not ill when he is not ill, (and) eats more than a meal at a public rest-house, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ill ... If he thinks that he is ill when he is not ill ... offence of expiation. If he thinks that he is not ill when he is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ill when he is ill, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is ill; if he eats once when he is not ill; if he eats going out or coming in; if the proprietors, having invited him, offer him food, if it is specially⁶ prepared (for him); if what is prepared is not as much as is wanted⁷; setting aside the five (kinds of) meals there is no offence in (eating) any others⁸; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The First

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.298**; below, **BD 2.330**. ² *yāvadattho*. Vin-a 810, “such a lot of food not being allotted.” ³ *anodissa*. Vin-a 810, “prepared for all.” ⁴ *maṇḍapa*.

⁵ Cf. above, **BD 2.298**. ⁶ *odissa*, thus disproving *Pali-English Dictionary*’s “only in negative”. ⁷ Vin-a 811, “and he takes very little.” ⁸ Cf. above, **BD 2.299**; below, **BD 2.314**, **BD 2.320**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 32

32.1.1
2.306 ... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time¹ Devadatta, gain and honour lost,² ate with his friends, having asked and asked³ among households. People ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, eat, having asked and asked among households? Who is not fond of well-cooked things? Who does not like sweet things?”⁴

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can Devadatta eat with his friends, having asked and asked among households?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Devadatta, ate with your friends, having asked and asked among households?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, eat with your friends, having asked and asked among households? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

2.307

¹ Cf. Vin 2.196. *Vinaya Texts* iii.250, n. 2, referring to this *pācittiya*, says that it is “a rule the previous existence of which is implied in the decision given here”—i.e., that (not more than) three monks shall eat a group meal at people's houses. Whoever does so shall be dealt with *yathādhamma*, according to the rule—this means Bu-Pc 32. ² *pahīnalābhasakkāra*. Even Ajātasattu turned against him, when Devadatta, attempting to murder the Buddha, had a fierce elephant let loose on the road by which Gotama was to travel. See Vin-a 811. Whole story told Vin 2.184ff.

³ *viññāpetvā viññāpetvā*. ⁴ =below, BD 2.341.

In a group-meal,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time people invited ill monks to a meal. The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, saying: “A group-meal is forbidden by the lord.” They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill to eat a group-meal. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness; this is a right time in this case.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time people, at the time of giving robes, having prepared a meal with the robes, invited monks, saying: “Having offered food, we will clothe (you) with robes.” The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, saying: “A group-meal is forbidden by the lord.” Little robe-material accrued (to them).² They told this matter to the

¹ *gaṇabhojane*, group- or party-meal. Two to four monks constitute a *gaṇa*, group. See Old Commentary, below, and Vin-a 812. *Vinaya Texts* i.38, *Vinaya Texts* ii.151, “in a body”—i.e., a meal taken in a body, a group, instead of singly. At **Vin 2.196** one of the three reasons why monks may not eat in a body is *kulānuddayā*, compassion for households. Unrestricted, obviously they might become too heavy a burden. But at **Vin 1.254** a group-meal is allowable after the making of the *kaṭhina* cloth. *Gaṇabhojana*, *paraṃparabhojana* (**Bu-Pc 33**) and (*an*)*atirittabhojana* (**Bu-Pc 35**) form the subject of a controverted point at Kv 552. At Vism 67 one of the advantages of being a *piṇḍapātika*, almsman, living more or less on scraps, is said to be that such a monk will not fall into the offences, contained in this section of the Vinaya, of eating a group-meal or an out-of-turn meal. ² *uppajjati*. Vin-a 811 says, “Not taking the meal they did not give robes, therefore little accrued.” Cf. below, **BD 2.318**, **BD 2.364**. Here *Vinaya Texts* i.38, n. 4, says this exception was “simply to guard against the stock of robes falling short.” Cf. *Vinaya Texts* ii.150, n. 1.

lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, at a time of giving robes, to eat a group-meal.¹
And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving robes; this is a right time in this case.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

^{32:4:1} Now at that time people, at the (time of) making robes,² invited monks to a meal. The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, saying: “A group-meal is forbidden by the lord.” They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, at a time of making robes, to eat a group-meal. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving robes, a time of making robes; this is a right time in this case.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

^{32:5:1}
^{1:4:73} Now at one time monks were going on a journey together with (some) men. Then these monks said to these men:

“Sirs, wait a moment, we will go for alms-food.” These said:

^{2:309} “Honoured sirs, eat just here.” The monks, being scrupulous, did not accept (food), saying: “A group-meal is forbidden by the lord.” They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, at a time of going on a journey, to eat a group-meal. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving

¹ Cf. [Vin 1.254](#). ² *cīvarakārake*. Here *samaya* is omitted; it is inserted in the “allowance” and in the “rule,” *cīvarakārasamaya*, below.

robes, a time of making robes, a time of going on a journey; this is a right time in this case.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks were going in a boat together with (some) men. Then these monks said to these men:

“Sirs, take us to the bank for a moment, we will go for alms-food.” These said:

“Honoured sirs, eat just here.” The monks, being scrupulous, did not accept (food), saying: “A group-meal is forbidden by the lord.” ...

“I allow you, monks, at a time of being embarked in a boat, to eat a group-meal. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving robes, a time of making robes, a time of going on a journey, a time of being embarked in a boat; this is a right time in this case.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time, monks having spent the rains in (various) districts,¹ came to Rājagaha to see the lord. People, having seen the monks from various parts of the country,² invited them to a meal. The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent.

“I allow you, monks, to eat a group-meal when there is a great scarcity.³ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness ... a time of

¹ *Disā*. ² *nānāveraḷḷake*, or various provinces, different kingdoms. Cf. AN iii.263.

³ *mahāsamaye*. See Old Commentary below, and Vin-a 813. Four Monks may not beg, but when a great scarcity comes, this rule is waived, otherwise it might be impossible for all to get a meal. *Samaya* also means both time and concourse; for the latter, cf. *Mahāsamayāsuttanta* of DN

embarking in a boat, when there is a great scarcity; this is a right time in this case.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at one time a blood-relation of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha had gone forth among the Naked Ascetics. Then that Naked Ascetic approached King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, and having approached, he spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

“I, sire, wish to make a meal for all heretics.”¹

“If, you, honoured sir, would first entertain the Order of monks with the enlightened one at their head, you might do this.”

Then that Naked Ascetic sent a messenger to the monks, saying:

“Let the monks consent to (take) a meal with me on the morrow.”

The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, saying: “A group-meal is forbidden by the lord.” Then that Naked Ascetic approached the lord, and having approached he exchanged friendly greetings with the lord, and having exchanged greetings of friendliness and courtesy, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance, that Naked Ascetic spoke thus to the lord:

“The revered Gotama is gone forth; I, too, am gone forth. One who has gone forth is worthy to accept the alms-food of one who has gone forth. Let the revered Gotama consent to (take) a meal with me on the morrow together with the Order of monks.”

The lord consented by becoming silent. Then that Naked Ascetic, having obtained the lord’s consent, departed. Then the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to eat a group-meal at a meal-time of recluses.² And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“In a group-meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case, a right time is a time of illness, a time of

¹ *sabbapāsaṅḍikabhadda*. ² *Samaṇabhaddasamaya*. *Samaṇa* is a member of a permanent body, either belonging to Gotama’s Order, *saddhammika*, or to another ascetic-body, *aññatitthiya*.

giving robes, a time of making robes, a time of going on a journey, a time of being embarked in a boat, when there is a great scarcity, a meal-time of recluses; this is a right time in this case.”

Group-meal means: when four monks eat, invited to any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals, this is called a group-meal.

Except at a right time means: setting a right time to one side.

Time of illness means: even when the feet become split¹; this means that at a time of illness (a group-meal) may be eaten.

Time of giving robes means: the last month of the rainy season when the *kaṭhina* cloth is not (formally) made, the five months when the *kaṭhina* cloth is (formally) made²; this means that at the time of giving robes (a group-meal) may be eaten.

Time of making robes means: when the robes are being made; this means that at the time of making robes (a group-meal) may be eaten.

Time of going on a journey means: if he thinks: “I will go for half a *yojana*,” (a group-meal) may be eaten, it may be eaten by him going out, it may be eaten by him coming in.³

Time of being embarked in a boat means: if he thinks: “I will embark in a boat,” (a group-meal) may be eaten, it may be eaten by him embarking, it may be eaten by him disembarking.

A great scarcity means: when two or three monks, walking for alms-food, keep themselves going, (but) when a fourth has come they do not keep themselves going; this means that when there is a great scarcity (a group-meal) may be eaten.

Meal-time of recluses means: whoever makes a meal, being one who has attained (to the stage of) a wanderer,⁴ this means that at the meal-time of recluses (a group-meal) may be eaten.

¹ *pādāpi phālītā honti*, so that a monk cannot go to a village for alms, Vin-a 812. Not an uncommon complaint among people who usually go barefoot. ² = below, BD 2.366. Cf. above, BD 2.5, BD 2.26, for *atthata kaṭhina*. ³ Cf. below, BD 2.405.

⁴ *paribbājakasamāpanna*. Vin-a 813 says this is a certain one among co-religionists and members of other sects. For definition of *paribbājaka*, see Vin 4.92, Vin 4.285.

If, except at the right time, he accepts (food), thinking, “I will eat,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation.

32:9.2 If he thinks that it is a group-meal when it is a group-meal, (and) eats, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a group-meal ... If he thinks that it is not a group-meal when it is a group-meal ... offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is a group-meal when it is not a group-meal, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a group-meal, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a group-meal when it is not a group-meal, there is no offence.

32:9.3 There is no offence if it is at a right time; if two or three eat together¹; if having walked one by one for alms, they eat having assembled together; if it is the regular supply of food; if it is food (allowed by) ticket²; if it is (food given) on a day of the waxing or waning of

¹ Vin-a 814 distinguishes five groups of four persons: (1) those not invited, where one of those invited does not come, but someone else arrives and receives food: no offence; (2) those going for alms, where one does not accept the invitation but receives his share as he is going to the village: no offence; (3) those not ordained, when monks are invited with a probationer: no offence; (4) those sending out their bowls, where one going away sends out his bowl: no offence; (5) those who are ill, where monks are invited with one who is ill: no offence for the ill one. ² *salākabhatta*. At

times when alms-food was short, food-tickets were issued (*salākāvutta*) by a monk in charge of the meals—a kind of steward. See, e.g., *BD 1.11*, *BD 1.26*, *BD 1.151*. This and the next three terms occur at *Vin 1.58*, *Vin 1.96*; *Vin 2.175*. At *Vin 1.58* = *Vin 1.96* these four kinds of meals, together with those derived from three other sources, are called “extra allowances,” while at *Vism 66* it is said that the almsman, *piṇḍapātika* (one who follows an ascetic practice), should not accept fourteen kinds of meals, including food given by ticket and the next three kinds, as above. At *Vin 2.175*, at a time when Rājagaha was short of alms-food, Gotama allows the monks to obtain food in each of these (seven) ways. This and the next (as *pakkhikabhatta*) occur also at *Ja 2.209f*.

the moon,¹ if it is (given) on an Observance day,² if it is (given) on the day after an Observance day³; setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, there is no offence in (eating) any other⁴; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Second

¹ *pakkhikaṃ*. Cf. *Vism* 66, translated at *Path of Purity* i.75, “on the day of the waxing or waning of the month”; this emphasises the lunar control of such givings rather better than does the “each fortnight” of *Vinaya Texts* i.173, or the “during a fortnight” of *Vinaya Texts* iii.220. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.220, n. 6, and *Pali-English Dictionary*. A fortnight, however, was one half of the lunar month: the light, moonlit half, or the dark, moonless half. *Pakkhikaṃ* means food given any day once a fortnight, while the next two expressions each refer to a particular day in the fortnight. ² *uposathikaṃ*, the last day of each fortnight—i.e., either the full moon day or the dark moon day. *Upasathika* is a fasting day for the lay people, but monks recite the Pātimokkha then, therefore it is a day to be observed or kept. Months are calculated from *uposathika*. As it is the last day of each fortnight, the day after it is the beginning of a month. ³ *pāṭipadikaṃ*. *Path of Purity* i.75 has “on the first day of the moonlit fortnight”—i.e., at the beginning of a month, full moon to new moon or new moon to full moon. ⁴ Cf. above, [BD 2.299](#), [BD 2.305](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 33

... at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the hall of the Gabled Roof. Now at that time in Vesālī a succession of meals of sumptuous foods came to be arranged.¹ Then it occurred to a certain poor workman: "This² will not be inferior, in that these people duly prepare a meal. What now if I were to prepare a meal?" Then that poor workman approached Kirapatika,³ and having approached, he said to Kirapatika:

"I, master,⁴ want to prepare a meal for the Order of monks with the enlightened one at the head. Give me a wage."

Now Kirapatika had faith and was virtuous. Then Kirapatika gave more than a wage⁵ to this poor workman. Then the poor workman went up to the lord, and having gone up, having greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the poor workman spoke thus to the lord:

"Lord, may the lord, together with the Order of monks, consent to a meal with me tomorrow."

"But, sir, do find out, the Order of monks is large."

"Lord, let the Order of monks be large. Many are the jujube fruits⁶ prepared by me, the things to be drunk⁷ will be perfect on account

¹ *Vesāliyaṃ paṇitānaṃ bhattānaṃ bhattapaṭipāṭi adhiṭṭhitā hoti. Cf. Vin 1.248, Kusinārāyam ... hoti, translated Vinaya Texts ii.138, "a succession had been fixed, in which the inhabitants of Kusināra should each in succession provide food for the Saṅgha."* ² Vin-a 816, this teaching or this gift to the Order. ³ A clansman (*kulaputta*) named Kira, evidently influential (*patika*), giving out work and paying wages monthly, by the season, by the year, Vin-a 817. Mentioned nowhere but here, I believe. ⁴ *ayyaputta*. ⁵ *abbhatireka vetana*. ⁶ *badara*. ⁷ *peyya*.

of the juice of the jujube fruits.”¹

The lord consented by becoming silent. Then that poor workman, having obtained the lord’s consent, having risen up from the seat, having greeted the lord, departed, keeping his right side towards him. Monks heard it said:

“The Order of monks, with the enlightened one at the head, is invited for tomorrow by a poor workman. The things to be drunk will be perfect on account of the juice of jujube fruits.” These ate, walking for alms that morning. People heard it said: “The Order of monks, with the enlightened one at the head, is invited by, the poor workman.” These conveyed much solid food and soft food for the poor workman. Then that poor workman, at the end of that night, having had sumptuous solid food and soft food prepared, had the time announced to the lord, saying: “Lord, it is time, the meal is ready.” Then the lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the poor workman’s dwelling, and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks. Then that poor workman served the monks in a refectory. The monks spoke thus:

“Sir, give a little, give a little, sir.” He said: “Do not you, honoured sirs, accept so very little saying, ‘This is a poor workman.’ Much solid food and soft food was prepared for me. Honoured sirs, accept as much as you please.”

“Sir, it is not for this reason that we accept so very little, but we ate, having walked for alms this morning; that is why we are accepting so very little.”

Then that poor workman looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the revered sirs, invited by me, eat elsewhere?² Yet am I

¹ *badaramissena*. Vin-a 817 explains by *badarasālavena*. According to *Pali-English Dictionary*, *badaramissa* is “mixture or addition of the juice of the jujube fruits,” while it says that *sālava* is “perhaps a kind of salad.” At *Atthasālinī* 320 *lapila*, cf. *lambila*, bitter or astringent, is defined as *badarasālava-kapiṭṭhasālavadi*, the s° of the jujube, the s° of the wood-apple is astringent. ² Cf. Vin 3.66, where monks accepted lodgings elsewhere, thus annoying their would-be host, who also refers to them as *bhaddantā*.

not competent¹ to give as much as they please?”

Monks heard this poor workman who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can these monks, invited somewhere, eat elsewhere?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the monks, invited somewhere, ate elsewhere?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men ... eat elsewhere? It is not, monks ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth: In an out-of-turn meal,² there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time a certain monk became ill. A monk, taking alms-food, went up to that monk, and having gone up he spoke thus to that monk: “Eat, your reverence.”

“Very well, your reverence, but there is for me the expectation of a meal.”

Alms-food was conveyed to that monk in the evening. That monk did not eat as much as expected. They told this matter to the lord.

¹ *na cāham paṭibalo*. OLDENBERG, Vin 4.359, says: “The ‘na’ appears not to be correct.” It is only correct if the sentence is interrogative, *na ca* = but not. ² *paraṃparabhōjane*. *Vinaya Texts* i.38, “there is *pācittiya* in taking food in turn,” with note (q.v.) to say, “that is, in picking and choosing with regard to food, or in regard to different invitations. The bhikkhus were to eat straight on whatever was given, and to accept invitations in the order in which they were received.” *Pali-English Dictionary* gives phrase as “taking food in succession,” successive feeding. GÖGERLY, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1862, p.445, gets the gist of the notion without literal accuracy: “If a priest eat his ordinary meal when under an invitation to dine, except on allowed occasions, it is *Pachittian*.” Also DICKSON, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1876, p.112: “A sin is committed when a priest takes food in any other order than that in which it is offered to him.” HUBER, *J. BU-AS.*, Nov-Dec, 1913, does not attempt a translation. *Path of Purity* 1.76 calls it “a meal subsequent to the acceptance of a previous one.” This kind of meal should not be accepted by the *piṇḍapātika*, almsman; see above, **BD 2.307, n. 1**.

Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, to eat an out-of-turn meal. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In an out-of-turn meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case, a right time is a time of illness; this is a right time in this case.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

At that time people, at the time of giving robes, having had a meal prepared together with the robes, invited monks, saying: “Having offered food, we will present (you) with robes.” The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, saying: “It is forbidden by the lord to eat an out-of-turn meal.” ... (See **Bu-Pc 32.3**, **Bu-Pc 32.4**) ... “... should be set forth:

“In an out-of-turn meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is a time of illness, a time of giving robes, a time of making robes; this is a right time in this case.”¹

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Then the lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, with the venerable Ānanda as his attendant,² came up to a certain household, and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then these people gave a meal to the lord and to the venerable Ānanda. The venerable Ānanda, being scrupulous, did not accept (it).

“Take it, Ānanda,” he said.

“Very well, lord, (but) there is for me the expectation of a meal.”

“Well now, Ānanda, having assigned it (to another), take (this food).”

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.308**; below, **BD 2.365**. ² Cf. **BD 1.20, n. 1**.

Then the, lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, having assigned (food to another), to eat an out-of-turn meal. And thus, monks, should it be assigned: ‘I will give the meal that I am expecting to so and so.’”¹

^{33:5-1} **An out-of-turn meal** means: invited to any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals, having set this to one side, if he eats any one other meal of the five (kinds of) meals, this means an out-of-turn meal.

Except at a right time means: setting aside a right time.

Time of illness means: sitting in one seat he is not able to eat as much as he pleases: this means that at a time of illness (an out-of-turn meal) may be eaten.

Time of giving robes means: ... **Time of making robes** means: ... (see **Bu-Pc 32**).

If, except at a right time, he accepts (food), saying: “I will eat ...” (see **Bu-Pc 32.9.1**) ... If he thinks that it is not an out-of-turn meal when it is not an out-of-turn meal there is no offence.

^{33:5-2} There is no offence if it is at a right time; if he eats, having assigned (a meal); if he eats two or three invitations together²; if he eats the invitations in succession³; if invited by a whole village he eats anywhere in that village; if invited by a whole guild he eats anywhere in that guild; if being invited, he speaks saying: “I will take alms-food”⁴; if it is the regular supply of food; if it is food (allowed by) ticket; if it is (food given) on a day of the waxing or waning of the moon; if it is (given) on an Observance day; if it is (given) on the day after an Observance day; setting aside the five (kinds of) meals,

¹ Either to one who is present, or if he sees no one, then he should assign it to one person among the five kinds of his co-religionists. Vin-a 817. ² Vin-a 817, two or three families invite him, and he puts the food into one bowl, eats it in one place.

³ *nimantanapaṭipāṭiya bhujjati*. This must mean in the order in which they are given. ⁴ Vin-a 819, “I do not require your meal.”

there is no offence in (eating) any other; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

The Third

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 32.9.3.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 34

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a woman lay-follower, the mother of Kāṇā,¹ had faith and was virtuous. Kāṇā² came to be given³ to a certain man in a village. Then Kāṇā went to her mother's house on some business or other. Then Kāṇā's husband sent a messenger to Kāṇā, saying: "Let Kāṇā come back, I desire Kāṇā's return." Then the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, saying: "It is awkward to go empty-handed,"⁴ cooked a cake.⁵ When the cake was cooked, a certain monk walking for alms came up to the dwelling of the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother. Then the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, gave the cake to that monk. He, having gone away, told another, and she gave him a cake. He, having gone away, told another, and she gave him a cake.⁶ As

¹ Kāṇāmata. The Babbu-Jātaka was told on account of Kāṇāmata. The Introduction to this Jātaka (Ja 1.477) differs somewhat from the above account, and also says that Kāṇāmata was a stream-attainer (as does Vin-a 819) and a disciple of the noble ones. Different version again at Dhp-a 2. 149ff. (on Dhp 82). Kāṇāmata and Kāṇā mentioned only in this Jātaka, *pācittiya* 34 and *Dhp-a*. ² She was so beautiful that when people saw her they became blind (*Kāṇā*) through passion, blinded (*andha*) with passion, so she was called *Kāṇā* because she caused blindness in others, Vin-a 819. ³ I.e., in marriage. ⁴ *kismim viya rittahatthaṃ gantuṃ*. Cf. Ja 1.477, *kathaṃ tuccha-hatthā va gamissasi*; and see above, **BD 2.43**, "it is awkward to go out with (only) one piece of cloth," *kismim viya ekasāṭakam gantuṃ*, with n. 4. Vin-a 819 explains by *kīdisaṃ viya, lajjanakam viya hoti*, it is like that, it is like causing shame. ⁵ *pūva*. *Vinaya Texts* i.39, "sweetmeats," which it was "the custom to send as presents from one house to another" (*Vinaya Texts* i.39, n. 1). ⁶ Possibly a fourth monk came and was given a cake, although the sentence is omitted. In the next paragraph four monks went to the caravan for alms, and in the Babbu-Jātaka four cats make the mouse give them food. Kāṇāmātā is said to have been the mouse, and the four monks the cats.

soon as a cake was ready it disappeared.¹ A second time did Kāṇā's husband send a messenger to Kāṇā, saying: "Let Kāṇā, come back, I desire Kāṇā's return." A second time did the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, saying: "It is awkward to go empty-handed" ... it disappeared. A third time did Kāṇā's husband send a messenger to Kāṇā, saying: "Let Kāṇā, come back, I desire Kāṇā's return. If Kāṇā does not come back, I will take² another wife." A third time did the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, saying: "It is awkward to go empty-handed" ... it disappeared. Then Kāṇā's husband procured another wife. Kāṇā heard: "It is said that another wife is taken by this man." She stood weeping. Then the lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, came up to the dwelling of that woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, approached the lord, and having approached and greeted the lord, she sat down at a respectful distance. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance, the lord spoke thus to the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother:

"Why does this Kāṇā weep?"

Then the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, having ... gladdened the woman lay-follower, Kāṇā's mother, with talk on *dhamma*, rising up from his seat, departed.

Now at that time a certain caravan was desirous of going from Rājagaha to the south.³ A certain monk, walking for alms-food, entered that caravan for alms-food. A certain lay-follower had barley-meal⁴ given to that monk. He, having gone away, told another, and he had barley-meal given to him. He, having gone away, told another, and he had barley-meal given to him. He, having gone away, told another,

¹ Vin-a 819: As she was a disciple of the noble ones, when she saw monks she was unable not to give, thus as soon as she gave everything disappeared. ² *āneti*, lead back. ³ *paṭi-y-āloka*. Same phrase occurs at [Vin 4.131](#); Vin-a 868 supports above rendering. ⁴ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2981.)

and he had barley-meal given to him. As soon as provisions for the journey were ready, they disappeared. Then that lay-follower said to these people:

“Masters, wait until tomorrow. As soon as provisions for the journey are ready, they are given to the masters. I will prepare provisions for the journey.”

Saying: “Master, we are unable to wait, the caravan is setting out,” they went away. Then as that lay-follower, having prepared provisions for the journey, was going along last, thieves robbed (him). People ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation, accept (provisions)? This (man) having given to them, going along last, was robbed by thieves.”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord in this connection, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Because of this, monks, I will make known a rule of training for monks, founded on ten reasons: for the excellence of the Order ... for following the rules of restraint.¹ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“If a monk, going up to a family, (who) asking, should invite² him (to take) cakes or barley-gruel,³ two or three bowlfuls may be accepted by a monk desiring them. Should he accept more than that, there is an offence of expiation. Having accepted two or three bowlfuls, having taken them back⁴ from there, they must be shared together with the monks. This is the proper course in this case.”

If a monk, going up to a family means: a family means: there

¹ Cf. BD 1.37, and above, BD 2.87. ² *abhihaṭṭhum pavāreyya*. See above, BD 2.51, n. 1.

³ *mantha*. Combined with *madhupiṇḍdika*, honey-ball, at Vin 1.4. See above, BD 2.322, n. 4.

⁴ I.e., to the monastery.

are four (kinds of) family: noble family, brahmin family, merchant family, low-class family.¹

Going up to means: going there.

A cake means: whatever is prepared as a present.²

Barley-gruel means: whatever is prepared as provisions for a journey.

Asking, should invite means: they say, ‘take just as much as you want.’

Desiring means: wanting.

Two or three³ bowlfuls may be accepted means: two or three⁴ bowlfuls may be accepted.

Should he accept more than that means: if he accepts more than that, there is an offence of expiation.

Having accepted two or three bowlfuls, while taking them back from there, seeing a monk, he should be told: ‘Two or three bowlfuls were accepted by me in such and such a place, so do not accept (anything) there.’ If, seeing (him), he does not tell (him), there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁵ If, although told, he accepts, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Having taken them back from there, they must be shared together with the monks means: returning, having taken them back,⁶ they must be shared.

This is the proper course in this case means: this is the appro-

¹ = Vin 3.184; Vin 4.177, Vin 4.272. ² *pahiṇaka*. Vin-a 819 explains by *paṇṇākara*, a donation, present, gift. ³ *dvitti ... dve tayo*. ⁴ *dvitti... dve tayo*. ⁵ There was a case in Colombo not long ago where monks visited for alms-food the hut of some very humble people, who that very day had managed to collect for themselves a rather less scanty meal than usual. The monks did not tell others that they had called here; and it happened that others followed them, so the people had to give away all the food they had. The matter was looked into by the Order and the monks’ attention drawn to this *Pācittiya*. ⁶ *paṭikkamaṇaṃ niharitvā*. Vin-a 820 says that if two or three bowlfuls are taken, putting one aside for himself, one or two respectively should be given to the Order. Cf. *paṭikkamaṇasālā* at Snp-a 53. Vin-a 820 says, *āsanasālāṃ gacchantena ca chaḍḍitasālā na gantabbam yattha hi bhikkhusaṅgho nisīdati tattha gantabbam*—that is, the monk must go there where the Order is sitting down, to a hall with seats.

priate course¹ in this case.

34.2.2 If he thinks that there are more when there are more than two or three bowlfuls, (and) accepts, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether there are more than ... If he thinks that there are less when there are more than two or three bowlfuls, (and) accepts, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that there are more when there are less than two or three bowlfuls, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether there are less than two or three bowlfuls, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that there are less when there are less than two or three bowlfuls, there is no offence.

34.2.3 There is no offence if he accepts two or three bowlfuls; if he accepts less than two or three bowlfuls; if they give what is prepared neither as a present nor as provisions for a journey; if they give the remainder of what is prepared either as a present or as provisions for a journey; if they give because the journey is given up²; if they belong to relations; if they are invited; if they are for the good of another; if it is by means of his own property; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fourth

¹ *anudhammatā*; cf. above, **BD 2.69**. ² *gamane paṭippassaddhe*. Vin-a 820 says, “seeing an accident on the road, or not wanting (to travel), they say, ‘We will not set forth, we will not go,’” thus the journey is *paṭippassaddhe*, *upacchinne*, broken off, interrupted.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 35

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time, a certain brahmin, having invited the monks, gave them a meal. The monks, having eaten,¹ being satisfied,² went to relations and families, and some ate, some went out taking the alms-bowl. Then that brahmin spoke thus to the neighbours³:

“Masters, the monks were satisfied⁴ by me; come and I will satisfy you.” These said:

“How will you, master, satisfy us? For those invited by you came to our houses, some ate, others went out taking the alms-bowl.”

Then that brahmin looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the revered sirs, having eaten in our house, eat elsewhere?⁵ Yet am I not competent to give as much as they please?”⁶ Monks heard that brahmin who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

¹ *bhuttāvin*. ² *pavāritā*. *Pavāreti* in conjunction with *bhuttāvin* seems in Vinaya to mean “to offer, to invite,” also “to satisfy,” as in *Pali-English Dictionary Vinaya Texts* i.39, [Vin 2.74](#), [Vin 2.76](#), [Vin 2.118](#) use “to offer” or “invite.” Vin-a 821 says that the brahmin told the monks to take as much as they wanted, but they asked for only a little. Lower down there is another verb, *santappati*, meaning to satisfy, just as *nimanteti* means “to invite.” Doubtless the notion of offering implied satisfying, and here “refusing” on the part of the monk. Vin-a 821 says, “the offer made, the refusal made,” which probably means, as *Vinaya Texts* i.39 suggests, that the monk, though he has finished his meal, is still invited to continue eating—but refuses to do so. Cf. *abhihaṭṭhūṃ pavāreyya* at [BD 2.51](#) above. At Mil 266 one of the offences into which an arahān may fall is said to be that of thinking food was not offered when it was offered. ³ *paṭivissake*. Cf. MN i.126. ⁴ *santappitā*. ⁵ Cf. [BD 1.110](#), and above, [BD 2.317](#). ⁶ Cf. above, [BD 2.317](#).

“How can these monks, having eaten, being satisfied, eat elsewhere?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks ... ate elsewhere?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“Monks, how can these foolish men, having eaten, being satisfied, eat elsewhere? Monks, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, having eaten, being satisfied, should eat or partake of solid food or soft food,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks brought back sumptuous alms-food for ill monks.² The ill monks did not eat as much as expected, (and) the monks threw these away.³ The lord heard a loud noise, a great noise, a noise (like) the cawing of crows,⁴ and hearing this he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying:

“What, Ānanda, is this loud noise, this great noise, this noise (like) the cawing of crows?” Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord.

“But, Ānanda, monks should eat what is left over by ill (monks).⁵”

“They would not eat it, lord.”

Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to eat what is left over⁶ both by one who is ill and by one who is not ill. And, monks, (what is left over) should be

¹ The two terms for eating, *khādeyya* and *bhūñjeyya*, correspond to the two classes of food, *khādaniya*, solid food, and *bhojaniya*, soft food. *Vinaya Texts* i.39, n. 5, gives some account of what these comprise, and see Old Commentary below. ² At [Vin 1.293](#) the monk who tends the sick, *Monks' gilānupaṭṭāko*, is the one who brings back food for him. ³ *chaḍḍenti*, or rejected them, *tāni*. ⁴ = [Vin 1.239](#). The last of these three noises is *kākoravasadda*. ⁵ *gilānātiritta*. ⁶ *atiritta*. Cf. Mil 266, where one of the offences into which an arahān may fall is said to be that of thinking food is left over when it is not left over.

made left over,¹ saying, ‘All this is enough.’² And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, having eaten, being satisfied, should eat or partake of solid food or soft food that is not left over,³ there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Having eaten means: any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals,⁴ and even (as little as) becomes eaten with a blade of grass.⁵

Being satisfied means: eating is to be seen,⁶ a meal is to be seen, standing within a reach of the hand,⁷ he asks⁸ (him), a refusal is to be seen.⁹

What is not left over¹⁰ means: it becomes made not allowable¹¹;

¹ *atirittam katabbam*. ² *alam etam sabbam*, spoken by the ill monk. If he is too ill to speak, he makes a sign. ³ *anatiritta*. Exceptions are made to this rule at Vin 1.213, Vin 1.214, Vin 1.215 in times of scarcity. But at Vin 1.238, the time of scarcity having passed, the exception does not stand, and the monk is to be dealt with according to rule—i.e., to this Bu-Pc 35. Referred to also at Vism 69. In the account of the Council of Vesālī (Kd 12) it is affirmed that *gāmantarakappa*—i.e. (as explained at Vin 2.300), going amidst villages, having eaten, being satisfied—it is not allowable to eat food that is left over because (Vin 2.306) it violates a *pācittiya* rule. It is also affirmed that *amathitakappa*—i.e. (as explained at Vin 2.301), having eaten, being satisfied—it is not allowable to drink milk that is left over, because it violates a *pācittiya* rule (Vin 2.307). ⁴ Those mentioned below, BD 2.330. ⁵ Cf. below, BD 2.100. ⁶ *asanam paññāyati*. Vinaya Texts i.39, n. 2, reads *āsanam*, and translates tentatively, “a seat for him is there.” Vin-a 821 says, “a meal left unfinished means ‘he is satisfied’ ... it is to be seen (*dissati*).” ⁷ *hatthapāse thito*. Vin-a 821, “if, taking enough of the meal offered, the donor comes to be in a place distant two and a half cubits (from him)”; cf. above, BD 2.200, n. 1. ⁸ *abhiharati*—i.e., the donor or benefactor, *dāyaka*, offers him food with a gesture. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 821, Vin-a 825 takes “standing within a reach of the hand” and “he asks (him)” as separate items, while at Vin-a 822 he says that in five ways is an offer or invitation, *pavāraṇā*, to be seen (or is apparent, visible), and then he enumerates the five occurring in this paragraph. ⁹ *paṭikkhepo paññāyati*. The monk refuses what was offered by a gesture or by voice. This is called “being satisfied” according to the fifth of the ways given at Vin-a 822. See preceding note, and also BD 2.326, n. 2. ¹⁰ *anatiritta*—i.e., if the following means have not been carried out. ¹¹ *akappiyakataṃ hoti*. *Kata* in this and the following phrases is comparable in meaning to the *atirittam katabbam* above.

it becomes made not formally accepted¹; it becomes made not delivered²; it becomes made not within a reach of the hand³; it becomes made by one who has not eaten⁴; it becomes made by one who has eaten, has been satisfied (and) has risen from his seat; it does not come to be said, ‘All this is enough’; it does not come to be left over by one who is ill: this means what is not left over.⁵

What is left over means: it becomes made allowable; it becomes made formally accepted; it becomes made being delivered; it becomes made within a reach of the hand; it becomes made by one who has eaten; it becomes made by one who has eaten, has been satisfied (and) has not risen from his seat; it comes to be said, ‘All this is enough’; it comes to be left over by one who is ill: this means what is left over.

Solid food means: setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, and food (that may be eaten) during a watch of the night,⁶ during seven days,⁷ during life,⁸ the rest means solid food.

Soft food means: the five (kinds of) meals: cooked rice,⁹ food

¹ *appaṭiggahitakatam hoti*—i.e., by the monk (Vin-a 829). ² *anuccāritakatam hoti*. Vin-a 829 says *kappiyam kārāpetum āgatenā bhikkhunā īsakaṃ pi anukkhittam vā anapanāmitam vā katam*. ³ Vin-a 829, to make it allowable is done by standing beyond the reach of the hand of one coming in. ⁴ *abhuttāvinā katam hoti*. Vin-a 829 says that whoever saying, ‘This is enough,’ makes it left over, it is made (allowable) by one who has not eaten (though) a sufficient meal was offered. ⁵ Vin-a 829 says, by the seven Vinaya acts that which is left over is not made allowable, rather than that not left over by an ill monk; but both should be called ‘not left over.’ ⁶ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2981.) ⁷ *sattāhakālika*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.144 states that “this also refers to certain medicines; see the 23rd Nissaggiya.” These medicines are the same as those referred to at **Kd 6.1.5=Kd 6.1.2 (Vin 1.199)**. ⁸ *yāvajīvika*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.144, n. 4, says, “what this refers to is unknown to us.” I think it may refer to the different kinds of roots and other things allowed as medicines, and which could be stored up for life, *yāvajīvam*, **Vin 1.201**. Vin-a 833, quoting this Vinaya passage (**Vin 1.201**), says that these roots are called in the text *yāvajīvikam*. They apparently did not deteriorate with keeping, and so could be kept during a life-time. ⁹ *odana*. Vin-a 822 says *odana* is *sāli* (rice), *vīhi* (paddy, rice), *yava* (corn, barley), *godhūma* (wheat), *kaṅgu* (millet), *varaka* (a bean), *kudrūsaka* (perhaps rye, see *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3. 70, n. 1)—i.e., the seven kinds of grain, *dhañña*. At **Vin 4.264** these seven appear in definition of *āmakadhañña*, grain in its raw, uncooked state. Cf. DN-a 78, **BD 1.83, n. 4**. Vin-a 822 defines all these grains.

made with flour,¹ barley-meal,² fish, meat. If he accepts, thinking, 'I will eat, I will partake of,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is not left over when it is not left over (and) eats or partakes of solid food or soft food, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not left over ... If he thinks that it is left over when it is not left over ... an offence of expiation. If he accepts for the sake of nutriment (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not left over when it is left over, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is left over, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is left over when it is left over, there is no offence.

There is no offence³ if, having caused it to be made left over, he eats; if, having caused it to be made left over, he accepts it, thinking: "I will eat"; if he goes away, conveying it for the sake of another; if he eats the remainder of an ill (monk's meal); if, when there is a reason,⁴ he makes use of (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fifth

¹ *kummāsa*. Vin-a 823 says that it is *yavehi katakummāso*, a junket made with barley; see *yava* in previous note. ² *sattu*, see above, BD 2.322, n. 4. ³ Cf. Bu-Pc 36 below, BD 2.334. ⁴ *sati paccaye*. Vin-a 831 says that if he is thirsty and makes use of the food to be eaten during the periods mentioned above, for the sake of slaking his thirst, or if he has a pain that could be eased, and uses these foods for that purpose, there is no offence.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 36

36.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
2.332 at that time two monks were travelling to Sāvattthī along a high-
road in the Kosalan districts. One monk indulged in bad habits; the
second monk said to this monk: "Your reverence, do not do that, it
is not allowable." He grumbled at him.¹ Then these monks arrived
at Sāvattthī. Now at that time food for the Order was (prepared) by a
certain guild² in Sāvattthī. The second monk, having eaten, came to
be satisfied. The monk who grumbled,³ having gone to his relations,
taking alms-food, approached that monk, and having approached
he said to that monk:

"Do eat, your reverence."

"No need, I am full, your reverence."

"Your reverence, the alms-food is delicious, do eat."

4.8.4 Then this monk, being pressed by that monk, ate that alms-food.
The monk who grumbled said to that monk:

Your reverence, you think that I should be advised (by you), when
you, having eaten, being satisfied, eat soft food that is not left over?"

"Your reverence, should it not be spoken about?"

"Your reverence, should it not be inquired into?"

Then that monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were
modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

2.333 "How can a monk, asking a monk who has eaten, who is satisfied,
invite him (to take) soft food that is not left over?"

¹ To here = **Vin 2.118**, but where the story proceeds to a tragic ending. ² Cf. above, **BD 2.160**. ³ *upanandha bhikkhu*, explained by *janita-upanāha*, produced a grudge, ill-will, Vin-a 831.

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, asking a monk ... soft food that is not left over?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, asking a monk who has eaten, who is satisfied, invite him (to take) soft food that is not left over? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk, asking¹ a monk who has eaten, who is satisfied, should invite him (to take) solid food or soft food that is not left over, saying: ‘Now, monk, eat or partake of,’² knowing,³ desiring to find fault with,⁴ in the eating there is an offence of expiation.**”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Monk means: another monk.

Having eaten means: ... (see **Bu-Pc 35.3**) ... this means *what is not left over*.

Solid food means: ... (see **Bu-Pc 35.3**) ... meat.

Asking, should invite⁵ means: he says, “Take just as much as you want.

He knows⁶ means: either he knows by himself, or others tell him, or he⁷ tells him.

Desiring to find fault with means: if he asks (him), saying: ‘I will reprove him for this, I will remind him, I will blame him, I will make him think back, I will shame⁸ him,’ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, at his bidding, he accepts, saying: ‘I will eat, I will partake of,’ there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. At the end of the meal there is an offence of expiation.

¹ Above, **BD 2.51, BD 2.323**. ² Above, **BD 2.327**. ³ I.e., knowing by means of one of the three ways of knowing (see Old Commentary) that that monk is satisfied.

⁴ *āsādanāpekkho*. Vin-a 831, desiring to arouse insult, rebuke, shame. ⁵ Above, **BD 2.51, BD 2.324**. ⁶ Above, **BD 2.161, BD 2.297**. ⁷ I.e., that monk. ⁸ *maṅkum karoti*, cf. above, **BD 2.178**.

If he thinks that he was satisfied when he was satisfied (and), asking him, invites him (to take) solid food or soft food that is not left over, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he was satisfied ... offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he was not satisfied when he was satisfied ... is no offence.¹ If he asks him (to take) for the sake of nourishment (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, at his bidding, he accepts, saying: 'I will eat, I will partake of,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he was satisfied when he was not satisfied, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he was not satisfied, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he was not satisfied when he was not satisfied, there is no offence.

There is no offence² if, having caused it to be made left over, he gives it; if, having caused it to be made left over, he gives it, saying, "Eat"; if he gives it, saying: "Go away, conveying it for the sake of another"; if he gives the remainder of an ill (monk's meal); if, when there is a reason, he gives (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, saying, "Make use of it"; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Sixth

¹ Variant reading *āpatti dukkaṭassa*, see Vin 4.360. ² Cf. Bu-Pc 35, above, BD 2.331.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 37

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time, in Rājagaha there came to be a festival on a mountain top.¹ The group of seventeen monks went to see the festival on the mountain-top. People, seeing the group of seventeen monks, having bathed, having anointed themselves, having offered (them) (food), gave solid food. The group of seventeen monks, taking the solid food, having gone to the monastery, said to the group of six monks:

“Take, your reverences, eat solid food.”

“Where did your reverences obtain solid food?” they said.

The group of seventeen monks told this matter to the group of six monks.

“Then do you, your reverences, eat a meal at the wrong time?”²

“Yes, your reverences.”

The group of six monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the group of seventeen monks eat a meal at the wrong

¹ *giraggasamajja*. See on *samajja* interesting n. 4 at *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.7, also *Vinaya Texts* iii.71. At **Vin 2.107-108** the group of six monks went to see such a festival, at which there was singing, dancing, music: made a *dukkata* offence. At **Vin 4.267**, when the group of six monks went, the offence incurred is a *pācittiya*. Word occurs again at **Vin 2.150**. In *Vinaya* the festival seems always to have been held on a mountain near Rājagaha. Cf. Ja 3.538, where it is mentioned as being held all over Jambudīpa. Vin-a 831 says that *samajja* (festival) is a high place on a mountain or a high festival on a mountain. Also that it was announced seven days beforehand, and held on level ground in the shadow of a mountain slope outside a city. See also *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. *Samajja* mentioned alone at Ja 1.394, Ja 3.541.

² *vikāle*. Cf. **Bu-Pc 85**.

time?” Then this group of six monks told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the group of seventeen monks eat a meal at the wrong time?” These monks told this matter to the lord.

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, ate a meal at the wrong time?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, eat a meal at the wrong time? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should eat or partake of solid food¹ or soft food at the wrong time,² there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

The wrong time means: after noon has passed until sunrise.³

Solid food means: ... **Soft food** means: ... meat. If he accepts it, thinking: “I will eat, I will partake of,” there is an offence of wrongdoing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation.

¹ Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 832ff. enumerates various kinds of solid food under the following categories: roots, tubers, roots of lotuses, top sprouts, leaves, flowers, stones of fruits, eatables made from flour (*piṭṭhakhā-daniya*, cf. Vin 1.248, Vin 1.249, where this was allowed to monks), resins. ² *vikāle*, see Old Commentary, just below. At Vin 1.200 the five medicines are allowed to be used at the right time and at the wrong time. Also at Vin 1.200 regulations are laid down for receiving, cooking, mixing fat at the right time and at the wrong time. At Mil 266 it is said that a meal at the wrong time is not a sin in the eyes of the world, but in the Jina’s teaching. The account of the Council of Vesālī (Vin 2.294ff.) affirms that the *dvaṅgula-kappa* (i.e., when the shadow has turned by two finger-breadths, Vin 2.300) is not allowable, because it violates the *vikalābhajana pācittiya*—i.e., eating at the wrong time.

See the vivid description attributed to Udāyin, at MN i.448f., of his feelings at the successive injunctions for monks to give up day and evening meals, and his ultimate conviction of the lord’s wisdom in stopping alms-giving in the dark of the night. Cf. also MN i.124, MN i.473; and MN i.437, where Bhaddāli confessed that he had not been able to keep to the regimen of one meal a day. ³ Cf. Vin 4.166.

If he thinks that it is the wrong time when it is the wrong time (and) eats or partakes of solid food or soft food, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is the wrong time ... If he thinks that it is the right time when it is the wrong time ... offence of expiation. If he accepts for the sake of nourishment (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is the wrong time when it is the right time, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is the right time, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is the right time when it is the right time, there is no offence.

There is no offence¹ if, when there is a reason, he makes use of (food) to be eaten during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Seventh

¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.331](#), [BD 2.334](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 38

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Belaṭṭhasīsa,¹ the preceptor of the venerable Ānanda, was staying in the jungle. He, having walked for alms-food, having conveyed boiled rice² to the monastery, having had it dried, laid it aside; when he came to need it for food, then moistening it with water, he ate it; after a long time he entered the village for alms-food. Monks spoke thus to the venerable Belaṭṭhasīsa: "How is it that you, your reverence, after a long time enter the village for alms-food?" Then the venerable Belaṭṭhasīsa told this matter to the monks. They said:

"But do you, your reverence, eat a meal that was stored³?"

"Yes, your reverences." Those who were modest monks ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Belaṭṭhasīsa, ate a meal that was stored?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, Belaṭṭhasīsa, eat a meal that was stored? It is not, Belaṭṭhasīsa, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monk should eat or partake of solid food or soft food

¹ Vin-a 838 says he was the prominent great *thera* of the thousand *jaṭilas*, or matted hair ascetics. His verses given at Thag 16. In Commentary, on this (see *Psalm of the Brethren*, p. 21) it is said that with these ascetics he was tamed by Gotama, and attained arahanship after the Utterance on Burning (Vin 1.35). He suffered from eczema, Vin 1.202, Vin 1.295. ² *sukkhakūra*; Vin-a 838 calls it *asūpabyañjana odana*, boiled rice without the curry and sauce. ³ *sannidhikāraka bhojana*.

that was stored,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Stored means: accepted today, it becomes eaten the next day.

Solid food means: ... **soft food** means: ... meat. If he accepts it, saying, “I will eat, I will partake of,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is stored when it is stored (and) eats or partakes of solid food or soft food, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is stored ... If he thinks that it is not stored when it is stored ... expiation. If he accepts for the sake of nutriment food (to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is stored when it is not stored, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not stored, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not stored when it is not stored, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, having stored² (food) for the time being,³ he eats it in that time; if, having stored (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, he eats it in a watch of the night⁴; if, having stored (food) to be eaten during seven days, he eats it in seven days; if, when there is a reason, he uses (food to be eaten) during life⁵; if he is mad; if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. rules against storing up medicines for more than seven days at [Vin 1.209](#), [Vin 3.251](#). It is said that an arahan cannot become one to use for sensual pleasure what is stored up, DN iii.235 = MN i.523 = AN iv.370. Cf. also *sannidhikāra* at DN i.6. In the Cūlavagga account of the Council of Vesālī, [Vin 2.294ff.](#), it is called not allowable to carry about salt in a horn, so as to put salt on to what is not salted ([Vin 2.300](#)), as by so doing the “*sannidhikāarakabhojana pācittiya*” would be infringed ([Vin 2.306](#)).

² *nidahitvā*, or hoarding. ³ *yāvakālika*. Vin-a 839, it may be eaten until noon. Cf. above, [BD 2.330, n. 1](#). ⁴ Vin-a 839, it may be eaten until the last watch of the night.

⁵ Cf. [Vin 1.251](#) on relations of right and wrong times for eating these foods.

The Eighth

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 39

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having asked for sumptuous foods¹ for themselves,² ate them. People ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, having asked for sumptuous foods for themselves, eat them? Who is not fond of well-cooked things? Who does not like sweet things?”³ Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks, having asked for ... eat them?”

...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, having asked for ... ate them?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, having asked for ... eat them? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever are sumptuous foods, that is to say, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses,⁴ fish, meat, milk, curds—whatever monk, having asked for sumptuous foods such as these for himself, should eat them, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

¹ *paṇītabhojanānī ti uttamabhōjanam*, Vin-a 840.

² *attano atthāya*.

³ = Vin 2.196 = Vin 4.71. ⁴ The five standard medicines.

Now at that time monks became ill. Monks, enquiring after the ill ones, spoke thus to the ill monks:

“We hope that your reverences are better, we hope that you are keeping going.”

“Formerly, your reverences, we, having asked for sumptuous foods for ourselves, ate them. Therefore there came to be comfort for us. But now it is forbidden by the lord, and being scrupulous, we do not ask, therefore there comes to be no comfort for us.”¹

They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion,² having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, having asked for sumptuous foods for himself, to eat them. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever are sumptuous foods, that is to say, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses, fish, meat, milk, curds—whatever monk who is not ill, having asked for sumptuous foods such as these for himself, should eat them, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever are sumptuous foods³: **ghee**⁴ is called ghee from cows or ghee from she-goats or ghee from buffaloes, ghee from those whose meat is allowable.⁵ **Fresh butter** means fresh butter from just these. **Oil** means sesamum oil, oil of mustard seeds, oil containing honey, oil of the castor-oil plant, oil from tallow. **Honey** means honey of bees. **Molasses** means what is produced from sugar-cane. **Fish** means it is called one that lives in water. **Meat** means the meat of those whose meat is allowable. **Milk** means milk of cows or milk of she-goats or milk of buffaloes, milk of those whose meat is allowable. **Curds** means curds from just these.

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.277**; below, **BD 2.399**, **BD 2.402**. ² *etasmim pakaraṇe*, “in this connection,” omitted here. ³ Vin-a 840 says that besides these (nine)—i.e., ghee and so on—sumptuous foods are also those prepared from the seven kinds of grain. Cf. *Vinaya Texts* ii.133, n. 3. ⁴ From here to “sugar-cane” = **Vin 3.251**. See above, **BD 2.131**. ⁵ Various kinds of meat which, if eaten, give rise to *dukkata* offences are given at **Vin 1.218f**.

Sumptuous foods such as these means: sumptuous foods like these.

Not ill means: for whom there comes to be comfort without sumptuous foods. **Ill** means: for whom there does not come to be comfort without sumptuous foods. **Not ill, asks for himself**, for every request,¹ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he accepts (alms) thinking, “I will eat on acquisition,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that he is not ill when he is not ill, (and) having asked for sumptuous foods for himself, eats them, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as-to whether he is not ill ... If he thinks that he is ill when he is not ill ... expiation. If he thinks that he is not ill when he is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ill when he is ill, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is ill; if having become ill, having asked, one who is not ill eats (the alms); if he eats the remainder of an ill (monk’s meal);² if they belong to relations; if they are invited; if it is for the good of another; if it is by means of his own property; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Ninth

¹ *payoge payoge*; each time he asks there is an offence. ² Cf. above, **BD 2.331**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 40

... at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the Hall of the Gabled Pillars. Now at that time a certain monk, wearing robes made entirely of rags, was staying in a cemetery. He did not want to accept gifts¹ from people. And himself taking (food) put down for the departed masters² in a cemetery and at the foot of a tree and on a threshold,³ he ate it. People ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this monk, himself taking (food) put down for our departed masters, eat it? This monk is strong,⁴ he is fat,⁵ for certain he eats meat (belonging to) people.”⁶

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can a monk convey to his mouth⁷ nutriment not given?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, conveyed to your mouth nutriment not given?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, convey to your mouth nutriment not given? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

¹ *diyyamāna*. ² *ayyavosāṭitakāni*. Vin-a 842 says *ayyā* are the ancestors who have done their time (here), and *vosāṭitakāni* are the solid and soft foods put down in cemeteries and so on for these by their relations. ³ *ummāre*; cf. Vin 4.100, Vin 4.160. ⁴ *thero* = *thiro ghanabaddho*, Vin-a 842. ⁵ *vadhara* = *thūla*, Vin-a 842, reading *vaṭhara*. ⁶ Meat is a “soft food,” cf above, BD 2.330, and *bhuñjati* is the verb technically associated with it. Here we get *manussamaṃsaṃ khādati*. At Vin 1.218 *manussamaṃsa* is combined with *paribhuñjati*, and certainly means human flesh. ⁷ *mukhadvādra*, the door of the face.

“Whatever monk should convey to his mouth nutriment not given, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks were scrupulous in regard to water for cleansing the teeth.¹ They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, yourselves having taken water for cleansing the teeth, to partake of it. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should convey to his mouth nutriment not given, except water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Not given means: it is called not accepted.²

Given means: if in giving by means of the body or by means of something attached to the body³ or by means of something that may be cast,⁴ standing within a reach of the hand, if he accepts by means of the body or by means of something attached to the body,⁵ this is called given.

Nutriment means: setting aside water for cleansing the teeth, whatever is fit to eat, this is called **nutriment**.

Except water for cleansing the teeth means: setting aside water for cleansing the teeth.

If he takes it, thinking: ‘I will eat, I will partake of,’ there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is not accepted when it is not accepted (and)

¹ *udakadantapona*, also a tooth-cleaner. *Vinaya Texts* i.40 takes this compound as “water and a tooth-cleaner.” ² Vin-a 843 points out that in Bu-Pj 2, ‘not given’ means not appropriated from others. ³ E.g., a spoon, Vin-a 843. ⁴ Cf. BD 1.208.

⁵ E.g., a bowl, Vin-a 843.

conveys to his mouth nutriment that is not given, except water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not accepted ... If he thinks that it is accepted when it is not accepted ... offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is not accepted when it is accepted, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is accepted, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is accepted when it is accepted, there is no offence.

There is no offence in regard to water for cleansing the teeth; if himself, having taken the four foul things,¹ he makes use of them when there is a reason (and if) there is no one to make them allowable²; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Tenth

THIS IS ITS KEY

A meal, a joint (meal), an out-of-turn (meal),³
a cake, and two on having eaten, being satisfied,
At the wrong time, storing, milk,
with water for cleansing the teeth—these ten.

The Fourth Division: that on Food

¹ *cattāri mahāvīkatāni*. These are given at [Vin 1.206](#) as remedies for a monk who was bitten by a snake. Further said that these things might be accepted *sati kappiyakārake* (if there is anyone there who, by offering a thing, makes that thing *kappiya*, allowable), but if there is no one there to offer and hence to make allowable, then a monk may take these things himself. ² Again, cf. [Vin 1.206](#), where it is said, *anujānāmi bhikkhave sati kappiyakārake paṭiggahāpetuṃ asati kappiyakārake sāmāṃ gahetvā paribhuñjitun ti*, I allow, monks, (these things) to be accepted if there is anyone there to make them allowable; if there is no one there to make them allowable, (I allow a monk) himself taking them, to make use of them. ³ *param* here.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 41

... at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the Hall of the Gabled Pillars. Now at that time there came to be abundant¹ solid food for the Order. Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Well, Ānanda, give the cakes² to those who eat scraps of food.”³

“Very well, lord,” and the venerable Ānanda, having answered the lord, having made those who eat scraps of food sit down one after the other,⁴ giving a cake to each, gave two cakes to a certain female wanderer, thinking that they were one. Neighbouring female wanderers spoke thus to this female wanderer:

“This recluse is your lover.”

“This recluse is not my lover; he gave two cakes, thinking that they were one.”

A second time ... A third time did the venerable Ānanda, giving a cake to each one, give two cakes, thinking that they were one, to this female wanderer. Neighbouring female wanderers spoke thus to this female wanderer: ...

“This recluse is not my lover; he gave two cakes, thinking that they were one.”

Saying, “The lover is not a lover,” they quarrelled.

Then a certain Naked Ascetic went to a distribution of food. A certain monk, mixing cooked rice with a quantity of ghee, gave a

¹ *ussanna*. At Vin 1.285 said of robes; at Bu-Pc 47 of medicines. ² *pūvaṃ*, or “sweetmeats,” see above, BD 2.321. ³ *vighāsādda*, not Sakyan monks who should not eat what is left over, see above, BD 2.328. Word occurs at Ja 1.348, Ja 2.96, Ja 3.191.

⁴ *paṭipāṭiyā*, successively, in order.

large alms-meal to that Naked Ascetic. Then the Naked Ascetic, taking that alms-meal, went away. A certain Naked Ascetic said to that Naked Ascetic:

“Where, your reverence, was an alms-meal obtained by you?”

“It was obtained, your reverence, at a distribution of food (made) by a shaven householder¹ of that recluse Gotama.”

Lay followers heard this talk of those Naked Ascetics. Then these lay followers approached the lord, and having approached, having greeted the lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, these lay followers spoke thus to the lord:

“Lord, these adherents of other sects desire blame for the enlightened one, they desire blame for *dhamma*, they desire blame for the Order. It were well, lord, that the masters did not give to the adherents of other sects with their (own) hand(s).”

Then the lord gladdened ... delighted these lay followers with *dhamma*-talk. Then these lay followers, having been gladdened ... delighted by the lord with *dhamma*-talk, rising from (their) seats, having greeted the lord, departed, keeping their right sides towards him. Then the lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“On account of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training for monks, founded on ten reasons: for the excellence of the Order, for the comfort of the Order ... for establishing what is *dhamma* indeed, for following the rules of restraint.² And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should give with his own hand solid food or soft food to a naked ascetic³ or to a wanderer or to a female wanderer, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

¹ *muṇḍagakapatika*, clearly a term of disparagement. It may be in apposition to “that recluse Gotama.” ² = Vin 3.21 (BD 1.37f.). ³ Here *acelaka*, previously *ājīvaka*. See BD 2, Introduction, p. xiii, n. 2.

Naked ascetic¹ means: whoever being naked has reached (the stage of) a wanderer.²

Wanderer means: setting aside monk and novice, whoever has reached (the stage of) a wanderer.³

Female wanderer means: setting aside nun and female probationer and female novice, whoever has reached (the stage of) a female wanderer.⁴

Solid food means: setting aside the five (kinds of) meals (and) water for cleansing the teeth, what remains is called solid food.

Soft food means: the five (kinds of) meals: cooked rice, food made with flour, barley-meal, fish, meat.⁵

Should give means: if he gives by means of the body or by means of something attached to the body or by means of something that may be cast, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that he is an adherent of another sect when he is an adherent of another sect, (and) gives with his (own) hand solid food or soft food, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is an adherent of another sect ... If he thinks that he is not an adherent of another sect when he is an adherent of another sect ... of expiation. If he gives water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is an adherent of another sect when he is not an adherent of another sect, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not an adherent of another sect, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not an adherent of another sect when he is not an adherent of another sect, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he gets someone to give,⁶ (but) does not

¹ Here *acelaka*, previously *ājīvaka*. See Introduction, **BD 2.xiii, n. 2.** ² *parib-*
bājakasamāpanna. This definition = **Vin 4.285.** ³ = **Vin 4.285.** ⁴ **Vin 4.285**
⁵ = **Vin 4.83.** ⁶ *dāpeti*—e.g., one who is not ordained—**Vin-a 855.**

(himself) give; if he gives depositing (it) near¹; if he gives ointment for external (use)²; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.³

The First

¹ I.e., not giving “with his own hand,” but putting food on the ground or in his bowl, and inviting the recipient to take from there. ² *bāhirālepaṁ*; offences are incurred by giving a member of another sect things to eat or drink, even water for washing the teeth. *Ālepa* occurs at [Vin 1.274](#). ³ = [Vin 4.303](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 42

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, spoke thus to a monk, who shared (his) brother's cell:

“Come, your reverence, we will enter the village for alms-food.” Without having had (alms-food) given to him, he dismissed him, saying: “Go away, your reverence. Neither talking nor sitting down with you comes to be a comfort for me; either talking or sitting down alone comes to be a comfort for me.”

Then that monk, when the meal-time was near, was not able to walk for alms, and returning he did not achieve participation in the meal; he became famished.¹ Then that monk, having gone to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, saying to a monk, ‘Come, your reverence, we will go into the village for alms-food,’ without having had (alms-food) given to him, dismiss him ...?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, saying to a monk, ‘Come ...’ dismiss him? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, saying to a monk, ‘Come, your reverence, we will go into a village or little town² for alms-food,’ either causing to be given or not causing to be given (alms-food) to him, should dismiss him, saying, ‘Go away, your reverence, neither talking nor sitting down with you comes to be a comfort for me; either

¹ Cf. Vin 4.70, Vin 4.175. ² *nigama*; cf. above, BD 2.63, n. 2.

talking or sitting down alone comes to be a comfort for me'—if doing it for just this object, not for another,¹ there is an offence of expiation."

42.2.1

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Monk means: another monk.

Come, your reverence, to a village or little town means: a village and a little town and a town, a village as well as little town.

Causing to be given (alms-food) to him means: causing conjei or solid food or soft food to be given.

Not causing to be given means: not causing anything to be given.

Should dismiss means: if desiring to laugh, desiring to sport together with a woman, if desiring to sit down in private, if desiring to indulge in bad habits, he speaks thus: 'Go away, your reverence, neither talking ... sitting down alone comes to be a comfort for me,' (and) dismisses² him, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Dismissing him from sight³ or from hearing is an offence of wrong-doing. When he is dismissed, there is an offence of expiation.

If doing it for just this object, not for another means: there comes to be no other object whatever (for which) to dismiss him.

42.2.2

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained, (and) dismisses him, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained ... If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained, (and) dismisses him, there is an offence of expiation. If he finds fault with another,⁴ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he dismisses one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he finds fault with another,⁵ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that

2.353

1.4.94

¹ = above, **BD 2.248; Vin 4.149, Vin 4.150.** ² *uyyojeti*. ³ *dassanūpacāraṃ* (literally the precincts of sight) *vijahantassa*; cf. below, **BD 2.376.** ⁴ *kalisāsanam āropeti*.

⁵ *kalisāsanam āropeti*.

he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if he dismisses him, saying: ‘Together we will not both keep going’²; if, seeing costly goods, he dismisses him, saying, ‘It will produce a state of greed’³; if, seeing a woman, he dismisses him, saying, ‘She will produce dissatisfaction’; if he dismisses him, saying, ‘Take back conje⁴ or solid food or soft food for one who is ill, or for one who is left behind,⁴ or for a guardian of the dwelling-place’; if, not desiring to indulge in bad habits, he dismisses him if it ought to be done; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Second

¹ Most probably error for “no offence.” ² *yāpeti*, or “We will not both go together.”

³ *lobhadhamma*. ⁴ *ohiyyaka*, as e.g. on guard at a *vihāra* (though this notion is covered by next word); cf. [Vin 3.208](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 43

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, going to a friend's house, sat down¹ in a sleeping-room² together with his wife. Then that man approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, having greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, that man spoke thus to his wife:

“Give alms-food to the master.”

Then that woman gave alms-food to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. Then that man spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

“You may go, honoured sir, inasmuch as alms-food has been given to the master.”

Then that woman, observing, “This man is obsessed,”³ spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

“Sit down, honoured sir, do not go away.”

A second time that man ... A third time that man spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

“You may go, honoured sir, inasmuch as alms-food has been given to the master.”

A third time did that woman say to the venerable Upananda, the

¹ *nisajjaṃ kappeti*. ² *sayaniḥhara*; a definition is given at Vin 4.160. Cf. Vin 1.140.

³ *pariyuṭṭhita*. Cf. Vin 4.229. Also DN ii.104; MN i.433; Vin 2.289 (where with *citta*). Vin-a 856 says *rāgapariyuṭṭhito methunādhippayo*, obsessed (or possessed) by passion, desiring intercourse.

son of the Sakyans:

“Sit down, honoured sir, do not go away.” Then that man, going out, made monks look down upon¹ (Upananda), saying:

“Honoured sirs, this master Upananda is sitting in the sleeping-room together with my wife; he, being dismissed by me, does not wish to go. We are very busy, there is much to be done.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, intruding upon² a family with food,³ sit down?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, intruding upon ... sat down?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: “How can you, foolish man, intruding ... sit down? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, intruding upon a family with food, should sit down, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Family with food 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.

Intruding means: forcing a way into.⁴

¹ *ujjhāpeti*. Cf. above, **BD 2.235**. ² *anupakhajja*. Cf. above, **BD 2.247**, and note. ³ *sabhojane kule*. *Vinaya Texts* i.41, “into a house where a meal is going on.” Editor, *Vinaya Texts* i.41, n. 3, remarks that the Vin-a, doubtless to justify the Old Commentary’s definition (see below) with its “suggested implication,” makes *sabhojanam* equal to *saha ubhoji janehi*(!); or, in the alternative, to *sabhogam*, since the wife is the *bhoga* (property) “of a man still given to passion, and the husband the *bhoga* of a wife ...; it is just possible we should translate, ‘a household still given to pleasure” (cf. **Kd 18.5.1**), or ‘fond of good food’ (Mil 76).” HUBER, J.Bu-As., Nov, “dans une maison ou on ‘mange.’” *Pali-English Dictionary* suggests very tentatively “sharing food (?).” *Sabhojana* at Snp 102 means “with food.” At **Vin 2.216** (= **Kd 18.5.2**), a monk who has entered a dwelling for food should cover up his bowl with his robe when he has received the alms, and turn away. ⁴ = above, **BD 2.248**.

Should sit down means: if he sits down in a large house, having left (the space of) a reach of the hand¹ from door-posts and lintel,² there is an offence of expiation; if he sits down in a small house, having gone beyond the beam,³ there is an offence of expiation.

43.2.2 If he thinks that it is a sleeping-room when it is a sleeping-room (and), intruding upon a family with food, sits down, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a sleeping-room ... If he thinks that it is not a sleeping-room when it is a sleeping-room ... an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is a sleeping-room when it is not a sleeping-room, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a sleeping-room, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a sleeping-room when it is not a sleeping-room, there is no offence.

43.2.3 There is no offence if he sits down in a large house, not having left (the space of) a reach of the hand from door-posts and lintel; if he sits down in a small house, not having gone beyond the beam; if there comes to be a second monk; if both have gone out⁴; if both are with-out passion; if it is not in a sleeping-room; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Third

¹ = Vin 4.269. ² *piṭṭhasaṅghāta*. Cf. above, BD 2.258, and Vin 2.120, and *Vinaya Texts* iii.105, n. 2. ³ *piṭṭhivaṁsa*. Vin-a 856 says that if such a sleeping-room is among four large rooms, then *piṭṭhivaṁsam atikkamitvā* means going beyond the middle (of the house), *iminā majjhātikkamaṁ dasseti*. The word *piṭṭhivaṁsa* occurs at Dh-p-a 1.52 (translated, *Buddhist Legends* 1.174, as “the central rafter of the hut”) and at MN-a 3.167. ⁴ = Vin 4.161.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 44

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having gone to the house of a friend, sat down in a private place on a secluded seat together with his wife. Then that man looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can master Upananda sit down in a private place on a secluded seat together with my wife?”

Monks heard that man who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sit down in a private place on a secluded seat together with a woman?”

...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, sat down ... with a woman?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, sit down ... with a woman? Foolish man, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should sit down in a private place on a secluded seat together with a woman, there is an offence of expiation.”¹

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

¹ Cf. the *aniyatas*, **BD 1.33off.**; also **Bu-Pc 30** (where monks are forbidden to sit down in private with a nun), and **Bu-Pc 45**.

Woman¹ means: a human woman, not a female *yakkha*, not a female departed one, not a female animal, even a girl born this very day, much more an older one.

Together with means: together.

A private place means: private from the eye, private from the ear. Private from the eye means: if covering the eye, or raising the eyebrow, or raising the head, he is unable to see. Private from the ear means: it is impossible to hear ordinary talk.²

A secluded seat means: it is secluded by a wall built of wattle and daub or by a door or by a screen or by a screen-wall or by a tree or by a pillar or by a sack or by anything whatever.

Should sit down means: if a woman is sitting and a monk comes to be sitting or lying down close (to her), there is an offence of expiation; if a monk is sitting and a woman comes to be sitting or lying down close (to him), there is an offence of expiation. Or if both are sitting or if both are lying down, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is a woman³ when it is a woman (and) sits down in a private place on a secluded seat, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a woman ... If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is a woman ... offence of expiation. If he sits down in a private place on a secluded seat with a female *yakkha* or with a female departed one or with a eunuch or with an animal in woman's form, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a woman when it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is not a woman, there is no offence.

There is no offence if some learned friend comes to be (present); if he stands, does not sit; if he is not desirous of a private place; if

¹ From here to end Bu-PC 44.2.2, cf. BD 1.332. ² Cf. above, BD 2.301. ³ Cf. above, BD 2.202, BD 2.206.

he sits down thinking about something else; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

The Fourth

¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.301](#), and [Vin 4.269](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 45

45.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
2,360 at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having gone to the house of a friend, sat down in a private place together with his wife, the one with the other. Then that man ... spread it about, saying:

“How can master Upananda sit down in a private place together with a woman, the one with the other?”

Monks heard this man who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saving:

“How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sit down in a private place together with a woman, the one with the other?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, sat down ... the one with the other?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, sit down ... the one with the other? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should sit down in a private place together with a woman, the one with the other, there is an offence of expiation.”¹

45.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

¹ Cf. the *aniyatas*, **BD 1.33Off.**, and **Bu-Pc 30, Bu-Pc 44**, above.

Woman means: a human woman, not a female *yakkha*, not a female departed one, not a female animal, one who is learned, competent to know good speech and bad speech, what is lewd and what is not lewd.¹

BD 2.3

Together with means: together.²

The one with, the other means: there is a monk and also a woman.³

Bu-Pc

A private place means: ... private from the eye ... ordinary talk.⁴

Should sit down means: ... (see **Bu-Pc 44.2.1**. *Instead of* in a private place on a secluded seat *read* in a private place, the one with the other) ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

Vin 4.9

The Fifth

¹ =BD 1.215f., BD 1.337. ² =BD 1.332, BD 1.337; and above, BD 2.301, BD 2.358.

³ =BD 1.332. ⁴ =BD 1.332, and above, BD 2.301, BD 2.358.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 46

46.1.1 ... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place.
2.362 Now at that time the family who supported the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, invited the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to a meal, and they invited other monks to the meal. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, used to visit¹ families before the meal. Then these monks said to these people:

“Sirs, give the meal.”

“Wait, honoured sirs, until master Upananda comes.” A second time these monks ... A third time these monks said to these people:

“Sirs, give the meal before the right time passes.”² A third time they said:

“Honoured sirs, we made the meal on account of master Upananda. Wait, honoured sirs, until master Upananda comes.”

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having visited families before the meal, returned during the day. The monks did not eat as much as expected. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, being invited, and being (provided) with a meal, call upon³ families before the meal?” ...

2.363 “Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, being invited, and being (provided) with a meal, called upon families before the meal?”

¹ *payirupāsati*, or wait upon. Cf. *Vin* 4.157, most likely meaning there “to pay homage to”; and for whole of this passage cf. *Vin* 1.213f. ² By *Bu-Pc* 37 monks were not allowed to eat at the wrong time—i.e., after mid-day. ³ *cārittaṃ āpajjati*.

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, being invited ... before the meal? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, being invited, and being (provided) with a meal, should call upon families before the meal, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time the family who supported the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sent solid food for the Order, saying:

“Pointing it out as for master Upananda, it should be given to the Order.” Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, had entered the village for alms-food. Then these people, having gone to the monastery, asked the monks: “Where, honoured sirs, is master Upananda?”

“Sirs, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, has entered the village for alms-food.”

“Honoured sirs, pointing out this solid food as for master Upananda, it should be given to the Order.”

They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, having accepted it, put it aside until Upananda comes back.”

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, thinking, “It is forbidden by the lord to call upon families before a meal,” having visited families after a meal, returned during the day.¹ The solid food was left over.² Those who were modest monks ... spread it about,

¹ I.e., for the later part of it, after the meal-time. To here from beginning of this par. cf. [Vin 1.213f.](#), but this passage continues differently, ending in an exception to [Bu-Pc 35](#).

saying:

“How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, call on families after a meal?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, called on families after a meal?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, call on families after a meal? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, being invited, and being (provided) with a meal, should call upon families before a meal or after a meal, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

^{46.3.1} Now at that time scrupulous monks,¹ at the time of giving robes, did not visit families; little robe-material accrued. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, at the time of giving robes, to visit families. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, being invited, and being (provided) with a meal, should call upon families before a meal or after a meal, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case this is the right time: the time of giving robes; this is the right time in this case.”² And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

^{46.4.1} Now at that time monks³ were making robes and they came to be in need of needles and thread and scissors. The monks, being

² *khādaniyaṃ ussādiyittha*. Cf. *ussādiyimsu* at [Vin 2.167](#), and *Vinaya Texts* iii.202, n. 4. ¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.307](#), [BD 2.318](#). ² At [Vin 1.254](#) one of the five things allowed to monks after the *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made is going to houses of people who have not invited them. ³ Cf. above, [BD 2.308](#), [BD 2.318](#).

scrupulous, did not visit families. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, at the time of making robes, to visit families. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, being invited and being (provided) with a meal, should call upon families before a meal or after a meal, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case this is the right time: the time of giving robes, the time of making robes; this is the right time in this case.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks became ill and came to be in need of medicines. The monks, being scrupulous, did not visit families...

“I allow you, monks, to visit families, having asked (for permission) if a monk be there.¹ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk, being invited and being (provided) with a meal, not having asked (for permission) if a monk is there, should call upon families before a meal or after a meal, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case a right time is the time of giving robes, the time of making robes²; this is the right time in this case.**”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Invited means: invited to any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals.³

¹ *santam bhikkhum, āpucchā*. Cf. Vin 4.165, where, in Bu-Pc 75, *āpucchā* and *anāpucchā* occur first without the phrase *santam bhikkhum* and then with it. *Vinaya Texts* i.42 has “without having previously spoken about it to a bhikkhu, if there is one there,” and *Vinaya Texts* i.53 has “without having informed a bhikkhu if one is present.” Cf. also *anāpucchā* in Bu-Pc 14, Vin 4.39, translated at *Vinaya Texts* i.34, “without saying anything to anybody.” ² Time of illness seems to be overlooked here. Cf. above, BD 2.308, BD 2.318. ³ Cf. above, BD 2.51, BD 2.324, BD 2.333. The five are given at BD 2.330.

With a meal means: that to which he is invited with a meal.

If a monk be there means: he is able to enter having asked (for permission).

If a monk be not there means: he is unable to enter having asked (for permission).

Before the meal means: invited to it, he is one who has not eaten it.

After the meal means: invited to it, even (as much as) becomes eaten with a blade of grass.¹

A family means: there are four (kinds of) families: a noble family, a brahmin family, a merchant family, a low-caste family.²

Should call on families means: there is an offence of wrong-doing for entering the precincts of the house of another. If he makes the first foot cross the threshold,³ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes the second foot cross, there is an offence of expiation.⁴

Except at a right time means: setting aside a right time.

Time of giving robes means: the last month of the rainy, season when the *kaṭhina* cloth is not (formally) made, the five months when the *kaṭhina* cloth is (formally) made.⁵

Time of making robes means: when the robes are being made.

If he thinks that he is invited when he is invited (and), except at the right time, calls on families before the meal or after the meal, not having asked (for permission) if a monk be there, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is invited ... If he thinks that he is not invited when he is invited ... offence of expiation. If he thinks that he is invited when he is not invited, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not invited, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not invited when he is not invited, there is no offence.

¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.328](#). ² Cf. [BD 1.325](#); [Vin 4.80](#), [Vin 4.272](#). ³ *ummāra*. At [Vin 4.160](#) *in-dakhila* is defined as the threshold (*ummādra*) of the sleeping-room, ⁴ = [Vin 4.160](#).

⁵ Cf. above, [BD 2.311](#); [Vin 4.286](#).

There is no offence, if at the right time, he enters having asked (for permission) if a monk be there; if he enters not having asked (for permission) if a monk be not there; if the way is through the house of another; if the way is through the precincts of a house; if he is going into a village¹; if he is going to the nuns' quarters; if he is going to a sleeping-place of adherents of other sects²; if he is going on his way back³; if he is going to a house for food⁴; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.⁵

The Sixth

¹ Vin-a 857 says that if his dwelling-place is inside a village and he is going to it. ² *titthiyaseyyā*. Commentary does not explain. ³ *paṭikkamanam gacchati*.

⁴ *bhattiyaghara*. Vin-a 857 says, "the house where he is invited or the house of the donors of ticket-food and so on." ⁵ Cf. Vin 4.166.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 47

47.1.1 ... among the Sakyans in Kapilavatthu at the Banyan monastery. Now
2:368 at that time Mahānāma the Sakyan¹ had abundant medicine. Then Mahānāma the Sakyan approached the lord, and having approached, having greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Mahānāma the Sakyan spoke thus to the lord:

“I want, lord, to invite the Order (to accept) medicine for four months.”

“Very good, Mahānāma; well then, you, Mahānāma, invite the Order (to accept) medicine for four months.”

The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to accept² an invitation (to accept) a requisite for four months.”

47.1.2 Then monks asked Mahānāma the Sakyan for a little medicine, (although) Mahānāma the Sakyan had abundant medicine as before.³ A second time did Mahānāma the Sakyan approach the lord ... spoke thus to the lord:

“I want, lord, to invite the Order (to accept) medicine for an additional four months.”

¹ Mahānāma Sakka, a cousin of Gotama, and belonging to a Sakyan family of Kapilavatthu. He had not entered the Order, or he would have been called Sakyaputtiya, literally son of the Sakyan(s), a distinction which should therefore be preserved in translations. Referred to at AN i.26 as an *upāsaka*, chief of those who give choice things. Cf. AN-a 1.393. ² *sāditum*, to consent to, to permit. ³ *tath'eva*.

“Very good, Mahānāma; well then, you, Mahānāma, invite the Order (to accept) medicine for an additional four months.”

The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to accept a renewed invitation.”¹

Then monks asked Mahānāma the Sakyan for just² a little medicine, (although) Mahānāma the Sakyan had abundant medicine as before. A third time did Mahānāma the Sakyan approach the lord ... spoke thus to the lord:

“I want, lord, to invite the Order (to accept) medicine for life.”³

“Very good, Mahānāma; well then, you, Mahānāma, invite the Order (to accept) medicine for life.”

The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to accept a permanent invitation.”⁴

Now at that time the group of six monks had become improperly dressed, improperly clothed, not decently attired.⁵ Mahānāma the Sakyan became a speaker⁶:

“Why are you, honoured sirs, improperly dressed, improperly clothed, not decently attired? On going forth, should not one become properly dressed, properly clothed, decently attired?”

The group of six monks grumbled at Mahānāma the Sakyan. Then

¹ *punapavāraṇā*, or a further, additional offer or invitation. Cf. AN-a 1.393, where, after a year, the teacher does not consent to Mahānāma’s giving for any further period. ² *yeva*. ³ One of the boons conferred on Visākhā was that she might give medicines for the sick for life, Vin 1.292ff. ⁴ *niccavāraṇā*. ⁵ *dunnivatthā duppārutā anākkappasampannā*. Cf. Vin 1.44, where monks went for alms like this, and Vin 2.212, where they went to the refectory like this, and spread out their outer cloaks (*saṅghāṭi*). See Vinaya Texts i.152, Vinaya Texts iii.285 for slightly different translations, and see above, BD 2.32, n. 3, n. 4, on *nivattha* and *pāruta*. Rules for going properly clad and with decent deportment into houses for alms are given at Vin 2.213, Vin 2.215, and Bu-Sk 31–Bu-Sk 55 = Vin 4.191ff. The word *ākkappasampanna* occurs at AN iii.78, “it is hard to find one gone forth when old who is *ākkappā*.”

⁶ *vattā hoti*. Cf. *vattar* at AN i.32, AN v.79; DN i.139.

it occurred to the group of six monks: “Now, in what way could we bring shame¹ to Mahānāma the Sakyan?” Then it occurred to the group of six monks: “The Order is invited by Mahānāma the Sakyan (to accept) medicine. Come, your reverences, let us ask Mahānāma the Sakyan for ghee.” Then the group of six monks approached Mahānāma the Sakyan, and having approached they spoke thus to Mahānāma the Sakyan:

“Sir, we want a *doṇa*² measure of ghee.”

“Honoured sirs, wait this day (only)³; people are going to the cattle-pen to get ghee; you may fetch it in the morning.”

A second time ... A third time did the group of six monks speak thus: ... “... in the morning.”

“Do you, sir, not give what you invited (us to accept) because you do not desire to give what you invited (us to accept)?”

Then Mahānāma the Sakyan looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these revered sirs, being told: ‘Wait this day (only), honoured sirs,’ not wait?”

Monks heard Mahānāma the Sakyan as he ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks being told by Mahānāma the Sakyan, ‘Wait this day (only), honoured sirs,’ not wait?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, being told ... did not wait?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, being told by Mahānāma the Sakyan ... not wait? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“When a monk is not ill, an invitation (to accept) a requisite⁴ for four months may be accepted, unless there be a renewed invitation, unless there be a permanent invitation. If one should accept for longer than that, there is an offence of expiation.”

¹ *maṅkuraṃ kareyyāma*. Cf. above, BD 2.178.

² See BD 1.104, n. 2.

³ Cf.

Vin 3.22of. = above, BD 2.64.

⁴ Or requisites.

When a monk is not ill, an invitation (to accept) a requisite for four months may be accepted means: an invitation (to accept) a requisite may be accepted by one who is ill.¹

And a **renewed invitation may be accepted** means: if he thinks, ‘When I become ill, then I will ask.’

And a **permanent invitation may be accepted** means: if he thinks, ‘When I become ill, then I will ask.’

If **one should accept for longer than that** means: there is an invitation limited to medicines, not limited to nights²; there is an invitation limited to nights, not limited to medicines; there is an invitation limited to medicines and limited to nights; there is an invitation neither limited to medicines nor limited to nights.

Limited to medicines means: if he says, “I invite (them to accept) just these medicines,” medicines come to be taken up.

Limited to nights means: if he says, “I invite (them to accept) on just these nights,” nights come to be taken up.

Limited to medicines and limited to nights means: if he says, “I invite (them to accept) just these medicines on just these nights,” medicines come to be taken up and nights come to be taken up.

Neither limited to medicines nor limited to nights means: there come to be medicines that are not taken up and there come to be nights that are not taken up.

In “limited to medicines,” if, setting aside those medicines which he came to be invited (to accept), he asks for other medicines, there is an offence of expiation. In “limited to nights,” if, setting aside those nights for which he came to be invited (to accept), he asks for other nights, there is an offence of expiation. In “limited to medicines and

¹ Vin-a 857 says, if at that time he is not ill, it (i.e., the invitation) should not be rejected; if he becomes ill, he says, ‘I will ask.’ ² *bhesajjapariyantā na rattipariyantā*. Cf. above, **BD 2.220**, *āpattipariyantā na kulapariyantā*. Cf. also **Vin 2.59**, *āpattipariyantā ca rattipariyantā ca*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.416 translates for the latter, “the duration of the times,” while *Pali-English Dictionary* gives “limitation of the probationary period.” Here the limitation to nights (the Indian way of saying “days”) seems to refer to the length of time or to particular nights for which the invitation would hold good.

limited to nights,” if setting aside those medicines which he came to be invited (to accept), if setting aside those nights for which he came to be invited (to accept), he asks for other medicines for other nights, there is an offence of expiation. In “neither limited to medicines nor limited to nights” there is no offence.

47.2.2 If he asks for medicine that is not to be used as medicine,¹ there is an offence of expiation. If he asks for one medicine that may be used as a different medicine,² there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is for longer than that when it is for longer than that (and) asks for medicine, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is for longer than that ... If he thinks that it is not for longer than that when it is for longer than that ... offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is for longer than that when it is not for longer than that, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not for longer than that, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not for longer than that when it is not for longer than that, there is no offence.

47.2.3 There is no offence if he asks for those medicines which he came to be invited (to accept); if he asks for those nights for which he came to be invited (to accept); if he asks, explaining, ‘Of those medicines which we were invited by you (to accept) we need this and that medicine’; if he asks, explaining, ‘Those nights for which we were invited by you have passed and we need medicine’; if they belong to relations; if they are invited; if it is for the sake of another; if it is by means of his own property; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Seventh

¹ Vin-a 858 says that if he can keep himself going on mixed food, it is not called “used as medicine.” ² Vin-a 858 says that if offered ghee he asks for oil, if offered an *āl̥haka* measure (he asks for) a *doṇa* measure.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 48

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time King Pasenadi of Kosala came to march out against an army.¹ The group of six monks went to see the army fighting.² Then King Pasenadi of Kosala saw the group of six monks coming from afar; on seeing them, sending for them, he spoke thus:

“Why do you, honoured sirs, come here?”

“Sire, we want to see³ your Majesty.”

“What, honoured sirs, is the good of seeing me since it is the battle you delight in?⁴ Should not the lord be seen?”

People ... spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, come to see an army fighting? For us it is not profitable and for us it is ill-gotten; such as we come with the army for the sake of livelihood, on account of child and wife.”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks go to see an army fighting?”

They told this matter to the lord...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, went to see an army fighting?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

¹ *senāya abbhuyyāto hoti*. Vin-a 858, *abbhuyyāto ti abhiyyāto, parasenam abhimukho gamissāmī ti nagarato niggato ti attho*,” the meaning is gone out from the town, thinking, ‘I will go forth towards the opposing army.’” *Abbhuyyāta* occurs at Vin 1.342; MN ii.124. ² *uyyutta*, striving. ³ *daṭṭhukāma*. Cf. Snp 685. ⁴ *yuddhābhinandinā*. Cf. Vin 1.73.

“How can you, foolish men, go to see an army fighting? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should go to see an army fighting, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time the uncle of a certain monk became ill in the army. He sent a messenger to that monk, saying: “I am indeed ill in the army, let the revered sir come. I want the revered sir to come.”

Then it occurred to that monk: “A rule of training laid down by the lord says: ‘There should be no going to see the army fighting,’ but my uncle is ill in the army. What line of conduct should be followed by me?” He told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to go to an army when there is sufficient reason for it.¹ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should go to see an army fighting, unless there is sufficient reason for it, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Army fighting means: having gone out from the village, it comes to be camped or marched forth.² **Army** means elephants, horses, chariots, infantry.³ An elephant (has) twelve men,⁴ a horse (has) three men,⁵ a chariot (has) four men,⁶ the infantry (has) four men, hands on arrows.⁷

¹ *tathārūpapaccayā*. Cf. below, **BD 2.399**. ² *payātā*. ³ Cf. Ja 4.494. These four divisions of an army are fairly frequently alluded to in the Jātakas; see Index, under “Army,” to Cambridge translation. ⁴ Vin-a 838, four are mounted, two look after each foot. ⁵ Vin-a 858, one is mounted, two look after the feet. ⁶ Vin-a 858, one is the charioteer, one the warrior, two look after the linch-pins. ⁷ *sarahatthā*, meaning presumably that each unit of infantry consists of archers.

If he goes to see, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where he sees, there is an offence of expiation. If, having dismissed from sight,¹ he sees again, there is an offence of expiation.

Unless there is sufficient reason for it means: setting aside a sufficient reason for it.

If he thinks that there is fighting when there is fighting, (and) goes to see, unless there is sufficient reason for it, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether there is fighting ... If he thinks that there is not fighting when there is fighting ... offence of expiation. If he goes to see one or other,² there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where he sees, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If having dismissed from sight, he sees again, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that there is fighting when there is not fighting,³ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether there is not fighting, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that there is not fighting when there is not fighting, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, standing in the monastery, he sees; if it comes to a place where a monk is resting or to a place where he is sitting down or to a place where he is lying down⁴; if he, going along the opposite road, sees it; if there is a sufficient reason for it; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Eighth

¹ *dassanūpacāraṃ vijahitvā*. Cf. above, **BD 2.352**. Vin-a 858 says, “if at a distance or down in a hollow he does not see, thinking, ‘Standing here, it is impossible to see,’ going to another place, there is a *pācittiya* in every act of seeing.” ² *ekamekaṃ*. Vin-a 858, one or another of the four divisions of the army, elephants and so on.

³ Vin-a 858 says that one man mounted on an elephant and a man at one foot of an elephant means “not fighting”; also a king going to a pleasure or to a river is “not fighting.” ⁴ Cf. above, **BD 2.158**, **BD 2.290**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 49

4.106 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
49.1.1 that time the group of six monks, having gone to the army as there
2.377 was business, stayed with the army more than three nights. People
... spread it about, saying:

“How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, stay with the army?
For us it is not profitable and for us it is ill-gotten; such as we stop¹
with the army for the sake of livelihood, on account of child and
wife.”

Monks heard these people ... spread it about. Those who were
modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks stay with the army for more
than three nights?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, stayed with the army for
more than three nights?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, stay with the army for more than
three nights? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not
(yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set
forth:

**“If there is for a monk some reason for going to an army, that
monk may stay with the army for two or three nights. Should he
stay longer than that, there is an offence of expiation.”**

¹ *paṭivasāma*, balancing the monks' staying in the army; also against “come,” *āgacchāma* of previous *pācittiya*, and which balances the monks' going to see the army.

If there is for a monk some reason for going to an army means: if there is a reason, if there is business.

That monk may stay with the army for two or three nights means: he may stay two (or) three nights.

Should he stay longer than that means: if he stays with the army until sunset on the fourth day, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is more when it more than three nights, (and) stays with the army, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is more than three nights ... If he thinks that it is less when it is more than three nights ... offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is more when it is less than three nights, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than three nights, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is less when it is less than three nights, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he stays for two (or) three nights; if he stays for less than two (or) three nights; if having stayed for two nights, having departed on the third night before dawn, he stays again¹; if he stays (because he is) ill; if he stays because there is something to be done for one who is ill or if the army becomes invested by the opposing army²; if he comes to be taken possession of by something³; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Ninth

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.197**. ² *senā vā paṭisenāya ruddhā hoti*. Vin-a 859 says, “inasmuch as its approach (or road, *sañcāra*) is cut off, so it becomes invested.” Cf. *nagaraṃ rundhati* at Ja 1.409; Ja 3.159; Ja 4.230. ³ If he is invested by an enemy or by a chief, Vin-a 859.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 50

50.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
2.379 at that time the group of six monks, staying with the army for two
(or) three nights, went to a sham-fight and to the troops in array and
to the massing of the army and to see a review.¹ Then a certain monk
of the group of six, having gone to a sham-fight, became pierced by
an arrow. People made fun of that monk, saying:

“Honoured sir, we hope it was a good battle. How many targets
were obtained by you?”²

That monk, being made fun of by these people, became ashamed.
People ... spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, come to see a sham-
fight? For us it is not profitable, and for us it is ill-gotten; such as we
come to a sham-fight for the sake of livelihood, on account of child
and wife.”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who
were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks go to see a sham-fight?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, went to see a sham-fight?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

2.380
¹ *uyyodidka balagga senābyūha anīkadassana*. All occur at DN i.6; the first at AN v.47. Vin-a 859 explained the second term as “they know which is chief for strength,” and also says (= DN-a 85), it is the place for counting the strength (or forces)—i.e., roll-calls as at *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.9. As to *vyūha*, Ja 2.406 mentions three types: *paduma*-(lotus), *cakka*-(wheel), *sakaṭa*-(waggon). ² *kati te lakkhāni laddhāni*. “Target” is *lakkha*, which also means a mark, or a high numeral, cf. *lak* (also spelt *lac*, *lack*, in modern times always implying rupees).

“How can you, foolish men, go to see a sham-fight? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“If a monk, staying with the army for two nights (or) three nights, should go to a sham-fight or to the troops in array or to the massing of the army or to see a review, then is an offence of expiation.”

If a monk, staying with the army for two nights, three nights means: staying for two (or) three nights.

Sham-fight means: where a conflict¹ is seen.

Troops in array means: so many elephants, so many horses, so many chariots, so many infantry.

Massing of the army means: let elephants be on this side, let horses be on this side, let chariots be on this side, let foot-soldiers² be on this side.

A review means: a review of elephants, a review of horses, a review of chariots, a review of infantry. The least elephant review (has) three elephants, the least horse review (has) three horses, the least chariot review (has) three chariots, the least infantry review (has) four men as infantry, hands on arrows.

If he goes to see, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where he sees, there is an offence of expiation. If, having dismissed from sight, he sees again, there is an offence of expiation. If he goes to see one or other, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where he sees, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having dismissed from sight, he sees again, there is an offence of wrong-doing.³

There is no offence if, standing in the monastery, he sees; if a conflict is seen, having come to a place where a monk is resting or to a place where he is sitting down or to a place where he is lying down; if he, going along the opposite road, sees (it); if, going as there

¹ *sampahāra*. ² *pattikā* here. ³ Cf. above, **BD 2.376**.

is something to be done, he sees (it); if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Tenth

THIS IS ITS KEY

Cakes, talking, three on Upananda,
and also (the family who) supported (him),
Mahānāma, Pasenadi,
the army, pierced, these ten.

The Fifth Division: that on the Naked Ascetic

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 51

... touring for alms in the Cetiya country,¹ set out for Bhaddavatikā.² Cowherds, goatherds, yeomen farmers, travellers saw the lord coming from afar, and seeing him they spoke thus to the lord: “Do not, lord, let the lord go to Ambatittha³; lord, in Ambatittha a serpent⁴ lives in a matted-haired ascetic’s hermitage; he has psychic potency, he is a terribly venomous snake; do not let him hurt the lord.”⁵ When they had spoken thus, the lord became silent. And a second time ... And a third time cowherds, goatherds, yeomen farmers, travellers spoke thus to the lord:

“Do not, lord, let the lord go to Ambatittha; ... do not let him hurt the lord.” And a third time the lord became silent. Then the lord, touring for alms, in the course of time arrived at Bhaddavatikā. The lord stayed there at Bhaddavatika. Then the venerable Sāgata⁶ approached the hermitage of the matted-hair ascetic of Ambatittha, and having approached, having entered the fire-room,⁷ having made ready the grass mat,⁸ he sat down cross-legged, the back erect, having caused mindfulness to be present in front of him. Then that

¹ *Cetiyesu*. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* 1.911 says that “the people of Ceti seem to have had two distinct settlements,” and thinks that the one referred to here is probably the later colony, lying to the east of the earlier one. ² A market-town near Kosambī. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* 2.351. ³ A village. ⁴ *nāga*.

⁵ For this passage cf. [Vin 1.24f](#). and [Ja 1.360](#). The *Surāpāna-jātaka* is founded on this story. ⁶ No verses in the *Theragāthā* are ascribed to him. But at [AN i.25](#) he is called chief of those good at the heat-condition. See [AN-a 1.324ff](#). At [Vin 1.179](#) he is called the lord’s attendant at that time, and performed some feats of psychic potency.

⁷ Cf. [MN i.501](#). *Agyāgāra* called at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.353 “fire-hut,” at [GS 5.162](#) (= [AN v.234](#)) “fire-house.” *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* article on “Ambatittha” speaks of a “fire-place.” ⁸ *tiṇasanthāraka*.

serpent, seeing that the venerable Sāgata had entered, bad at heart,¹ blew forth smoke. And the venerable Sāgata blew forth smoke. Then that serpent, not conquering anger, blazed up, and the venerable Sāgata, having attained to the condition of heat,² blazed up. Then the venerable Sāgata, having mastered by heat that serpent's heat, approached Bhaddavatika. Then the lord, having stayed at Bhaddavatikā for as long as he found suitable, departed on an alms-tour to Kosambī. Lay-followers of Kosambī heard:

“They say that master Sāgata came into conflict with the serpent of Ambatittha.”

Then the lord, touring for alms, in the course of time arrived at Kosambī.

Then the lay-followers of Kosambī, having met the lord, approached the venerable Sāgata; having approached, having greeted the venerable Sāgata, they stood at a respectful distance. As they were standing at a respectful distance, the lay-followers of Kosambī spoke thus to the venerable Sāgata:

“Honoured sir, what is hard for the masters to obtain, and liked (by them)? What may we give?”

When they had spoken thus, the group of six monks spoke thus to the lay-followers of Kosambī:

“There is, your reverences, a spirituous liquor called white spirits³; it is hard for the monks to obtain, and liked (by them). Give that.”

Then the lay-followers of Kosambī having given the spirituous liquor, white spirits, in house after house, seeing that the venerable Sāgata had entered for alms-food, spoke thus to the venerable Sāgata:

“Honoured sir, let master Sāgata drink the spirituous liquor, white spirits; honoured sir, let master Sāgata drink the spirituous liquor, white spirits.”

¹ *dummano*. ² *tejodhātu*; cf. **BD 1.273**, where Dabba attained this same condition.

³ *kāpotikā nāma pasannā*. Called in the *Surāpānājātaka*, Ja 1.360, *kāpotikā surā*, *pasannā kāpotikā* and *kāpotikā pāsanna*, translated in Cambridge edition, *Jātaka* vol.i, p. 207, as “white spirits, clear white spirit.” Vin-a 859 says *kāpotikā* is a shining red colour like pigeons' feet; and *pasannā* is a synonym for *surāmaṇḍa*, the finest fermented liquor.

Then the venerable Sagata, having drunk the spirituous liquor, white spirits, in house after house, as he was departing from the town fell down at the town-gate. Then the lord, departing from the town with a great company of monks, saw the venerable Sāgata fallen down at the town-gate; seeing him, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, take up Sāgata.”

“Yes, lord,” and these monks having answered the lord, having led the venerable Sāgata to the monastery, made him lie down with his head towards the lord. Then the venerable Sāgata, having turned round, went to sleep¹ with his feet towards the lord. Then the lord addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, formerly was not Sāgata respectful, deferential towards the Tathāgata?”

“Yes, lord.”

“But monks, is Sāgata respectful, deferential towards the Tathāgata now?”

“No, lord.”

“Monks, did not Sāgata come into conflict with the serpent of Ambatittha?”

“Yes, lord.”

“But, monks, is Sāgata able to come into conflict with the serpent of Ambatittha now?”

“No, lord.”

“But, monks, could he become unconscious, having drunk that which may be drunk?”

“No, lord.”

“Monks, it is not fitting for Sāgata, it is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How, monks, can Sāgata drink strong drink?² It is not, monks,

¹ *seyyaṃ kappesi*, or “lay down in a sleeping-place.” ² *majja*. At Vin 1.205 *majja* was allowed to be put into oil in cases of illness. The six monks put in too much and became drunk. They were to be dealt with according to the rule (i.e., this *pācittiya*). And the amount of *majja* allowed for the oil was such that neither its colour, smell nor taste was perceptible. At DN iii.62, DN iii.63 it is said that *majja* should not be drunk—one of the five *sīlas*. Cf. also Snp 398–Snp 400.

for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“In drinking fermented liquor¹ and spirits² there is an offence of expiation.”

Fermented liquor means: if it is fermented liquor from flour, fermented liquor from cakes, fermented liquor from cooked rice, if it is worked-up yeast,³ if it is mixed with ingredients.⁴

Spirits means: if it is an extract from flowers,⁵ an extract from fruits, an extract from honey,⁶ an extract from sugar,⁷ if it is mixed with ingredients.⁸

Should drink means: if he drinks even (as much as) with a blade of grass, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is strong drink when it is strong drink, (and) drinks it, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is strong drink ... If he thinks that it is not strong drink when it is strong drink, (and) drinks it, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is strong drink when it is not strong drink, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not strong drink, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not strong drink when it is not strong drink, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he drinks that which is not strong drink though it comes to be the colour of strong drink, the smell of strong

¹ *surā*. ² *meraya*. At the Council of Vesālī, **Vin 2.294**, it was affirmed that it was not allowable to drink *jalogi*, unfermented toddy; to do so would be to infringe the “*surāmerayapāne pācittiya*” (**Vin 2.307**). MN i.238 states that the *acelaka*, naked ascetic, leaders do not drink *surā* or *meraya*. ³ *kiṇṇapakkhitta*. ⁴ *sambhārasaṃyuttā*. At DN-a 944, Vv-a 73, Kp-a 26, Vb-a 381 these are given as the fivefold *surā*. ⁵ *pupphāsava*. Referred to at Ja 4.117 as a *meraya*. ⁶ *madhvāsava*. Pali-English Dictionary says, “wine from the flower of *Bassia latifolia*.” ⁷ *guḷāsava*. ⁸ = DN-a 944 = Vv-a 73 = Kp-a 26. At Vb-a 381 these are called five *āsavā* or extracts.

drink, the taste of strong drink; if it is in a concoction of broth, in a concoction of meat, in a concoction of oil, in molasses and emblic myrobalam¹; if he drinks a distilled liquor² that is not strong drink; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The First

¹ *āmalaka*, *Phyllanthus erablica* (*Pali-English Dictionary*). One of the fruits allowed as medicine, [Vin 1.201](#). Mentioned again as a medicine at [Vin 1.278](#). ² *ariṭṭha*, “a kind of liquor” (*Critical Pali Dictionary*).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 52

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks made one of the group of seventeen monks laugh by tickling him with the fingers. This monk, faint and unable to get his breath, died.¹ Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks make a monk laugh by tickling him with the fingers?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks ... with the fingers?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men ... with the fingers? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"In tickling with the fingers there is an offence of expiation."

Tickling with the fingers means: if one who is ordained desiring to make laugh one who is ordained, rubs² the body with the body,

¹ = Vin 3.84 (BD 1.146f.). Though occurring in the *pārājika* section, this offence is there said to be one not involving defeat; but as is sometimes the case, it is not said what kind of offence it is. This suggests that Vin 3.84 was formulated earlier than Bu-Pc 52. See BD 1 Introduction, p. xxxvi, for suggestion why the offence of causing death by this treatment is not a *pārājika*; also for some translations of *aṅgulipatodaka*. *Sor-sor-thar-pa*, p. 63, translated S.C. VIDYABHUSANA, 1915, p. 30, gives, "pokes a person with the finger"; *Le Prātimokṣa-sūtra des Sarvāstivādins*, translated HUBER, J. Bu-As., Nov, Bu-Pc 63 "chatouille quelqu'un avec le doigt." Buddhaghosa, Vin-a 860, defines as *aṅgulihi upakacchādighaṭṭanam vuccati*, "It is called striking (or touching, *ghattana*) the arm-pits (loins, legs, *upakacchd*), and so on, with the fingers." ² *āmasati*, see BD 1.203, n. 6.

there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained, (and) makes him laugh by tickling with the fingers, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained ... If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained ... an offence of expiation. If he rubs something attached to the body¹ with the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he rubs the body with something attached to the body ... wrong-doing. If he rubs something attached to the body with something attached to the body ... wrong-doing. If he rubs the body with something that may be cast,² there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he rubs something attached to the body with something that may be cast ... wrong-doing. If he rubs something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he rubs the body of one who is not ordained³ with the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he rubs something attached to the body with the body ... the body with something attached to the body ... something attached to the body with something attached to the body ... the body with something that may be cast ... something attached to the body with something that may be cast ... something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁴

There is no offence if, not desiring laughter, he rubs (him) if there is something to be done⁵; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Second

¹ *kāyapaṭibaddha*. Cf. **BD 1.204ff. = Vin 3.120ff.** ² *nissaggiya*. Cf. **BD 1.204ff. = Vin 3.120ff.** ³ *anupassampannaṃ kāyena kāyaṃ āmasati*. Vin-a 860 says that he may touch a nun for amusement, instead of one not ordained. ⁴ This surely is an error for *anāpatti*, no offence. ⁵ *sati karaṇīye* = above, **BD 2.381**. Cf. *sati paccaye* at **Vin 4.83, Vin 4.85ff.**

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 53

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of seventeen monks were sporting in the water of the river Aciravatī. Now at that time King Pasenadi, the Kosalan, came to be on the upper storey of the palace¹ together with Queen Mallikā. King Pasenadi, the Kosalan, saw the group of seventeen monks sporting in the water of the river Aciravatī; seeing them he spoke thus to Queen Mallikā:

“Mallikā, these who are sporting in the water are men perfected.”²

“Undoubtedly, sire, a rule of training has not been laid down by the lord, or these monks are not conversant³ (with it).”

Then it occurred to King Pasenadi, the Kosalan:

“Is there not some device by which I would not speak to the lord but (yet) the lord would know that these monks sported in the water?”

Then King Pasenadi, the Kosalan, having had the group of seventeen monks summoned, gave them a large sugar-ball,⁴ saying:

“Honoured sirs, give this sugar-ball to the lord.”

The group of seventeen monks, taking that sugar-ball, approached the lord, and having approached they spoke thus to the lord:

“Lord, King Pasenadi, the Kosalan, gives this sugar-ball to the lord.”

“But, monks, where did the King see you?”

“Sporting in the water of the river Aciravatī, lord.”

¹ *uparipāsādavaragalo hoti*; cf. *Vin* 4.158, and on *pāsāda*, cf. above, *BD* 2.16, n. 5.

² *arahanto*. ³ *a-ppakata-ññū*. *Critical Pali Dictionary* gives, “not knowing what is appointed ... ignorant of the main point.” Cf. *Vin* 4.143. ⁴ *guḷapiṇḍa*.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, sport in the water? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**In playing¹ in the water, there is an offence of expiation.**”

Playing in the water means: if desiring, laughter he immerses (the part) above the ankle in the water, or draws it out or swims,² there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is playing when it is playing in the water, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is playing in the water ... If he thinks that it is not playing when it is playing in the water, there is an offence of expiation. If he sports in the water with (the part) below the ankle, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he sports with a boat,³ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he strikes the water with the hand or with the foot or with a stick⁴ or with a sherd, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he sports with water in a bowl,⁵ or with sour rice-gruel or with milk or with butter-milk or with dye-stuff or with urine or with mud, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is playing when it is not playing in the water, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not playing in the water, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not playing when it is not playing in the water, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, not desiring laughter, plunging into the water if there is something to be done, he immerses or draws out or swims; if, going to the other side,⁶ he immerses or draws out or

¹ *hāsadhamma*, or, a thing of laughter. Vin-a 861 *udakakīḷikā vuccati*. ² *palavati*, Vin-a 861 *tarati*, crosses, using either his hands or feet. See DhP 334, Thag 399.

³ *nāvāya*; hauling it up on a bank or propelling it with rudder and oars, Vin-a 861.

⁴ Cf. AN i.124=Pp 30, Pp 36. ⁵ *bhājanagata*, cf. BD 1.77, BD 1.85, and notes. ⁶ *pāraṃ*.

swims; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Third

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 54

... at Kosambī in Ghosita's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Channa indulged in bad habits.¹ The monks said:

“Reverend Channa, do not do that, it is not allowable.” He did the same (things) out of disrespect.² Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Channa do a disrespectful thing?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Channa, did a disrespectful thing?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, do a disrespectful thing? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**In disrespect there is an offence of expiation.**”³

Disrespect means: there are two (kinds of) disrespect: disrespect for a man and disrespect for *dhamma*. **Disrespect for a man** means: if being spoken to by one who is ordained concerning what is laid down, thinking, ‘This one is suspended⁴ or disparaged⁵ or blameworthy,⁶ his bidding will not come to be done,’ he does a disrespect-

¹ Cf. **BD 1.309; Vin 4.35, Vin 4.141.** ² *anādariyaṃ paṭicca karoti yeva.* Cf. **Vin 4.185, Vin 4.349.** At **Vin 2.220** the group of six monks behaved disrespectfully (*anādariyaṃ paṭicca*) to the *theras*. At Pp 20=Ds 1325=Vb 359 *anādariyaṃ* is one of the terms used to define *dovacassatā*, contumacy. Cf. AN v.146, where the word occurs with *dovacassatā* and *pāpamittatā*. ³ At **Vin 1.176** there are three cases of *anādariyaṃ pācittiyaṃ* connected with ill monks and the Pavāraṇā ceremony. ⁴ *ukkhittaka.* Cf. **Vin 1.97, Vin 1.121; Vin 2.61, Vin 2.173, Vin 2.213; Vin 4.137.** ⁵ *vambliita.* ⁶ *garahita.* Cf. Dhp 30, Snp 313.

ful thing, there is an offence of expiation. **Disrespect for dhamma** means: if being spoken to by one who is ordained concerning what is laid down, (saying), ‘How may this be lost or destroyed or disappear? or, he does not wish to learn this,’¹ he does a disrespectful thing, there is an offence of expiation.

54.2.2

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained (and) does a disrespectful thing, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained ... If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained ... offence of expiation. If being spoken to by one who is ordained concerning what is not laid down,² thinking, ‘This does not conduce to expunging (evil)³ nor to punctiliousness nor to graciousness nor to decreasing (the obstructions) nor to putting forth energy,⁴ he does a disrespectful thing, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If being spoken to by one who is not ordained concerning what is laid down or concerning what is not laid down, thinking, ‘This does not conduce to expunging (evil) ... nor to putting forth energy,’ he does a disrespectful thing, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁵

4.114

54.2.3

2.395

There is no offence if he speaks, saying: ‘Thus the version⁶ of our teachers is an interrogation’⁷; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ I.e., according to Vin-a 861, “what is laid down.” ² Vin-a 861, what has not been handed down in the Suttas or Abhidhamma. ³ *sallekhā*. ⁴ See **BD 1.37** (and notes), **BD 1.296**. ⁵ Doubtless should read *anāpatti*, no offence. ⁶ *uggaha*. See Vism 96, Vism 99, translated, PTS edition, ‘Version’ and ‘text.’ Vin-a 861 says, ‘in this matter the version of the teacher as to respect should not be adopted, but the version of the teacher that has come down as custom should be adopted.’ ⁷ *paripucchā*. Perhaps ‘questionable.’ Cf. above, **BD 2.271**, **BD 2.275**, **BD 2.278**.

The Fourth

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 55

55.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
2.396 that time the group of six monks frightened¹ the group of seventeen monks. These, being frightened, cried out. Monks spoke thus:

“Why do you, your reverences, cry out?”

“Your reverences, this group of six monks frightened us.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the group of six monks frighten a monk?” ... (see Bu-
Pc 52.1) ... “... should be set forth:

55.2.1 “Whatever monk should frighten a monk, there is an offence
of expiation.”

Whatever means: is monk to be understood in this case.

Monk means: another monk.

Should frighten means: if one who is ordained, desirous of frightening one who is ordained, arranges a form or a sound or a smell or a taste or a touch,² whether he is afraid or whether he is not afraid, there is an offence of expiation. If he points out the wilds of thieves, or the wilds of beasts of prey, or the wilds of goblins,³ whether he is afraid or whether he is not afraid, there is an offence of expiation.

55.2.2

¹ *bhīmsāpentī*. ² Cf. BD 1.133f. (= Vin 3.77f.). Vin-a 862 says, “offering a form and so on is to be explained according to the meaning in *manussaviggaha*,” human form—i.e., in Commentary, on Bu-Pj 3. ³ *pisācakantāra*. At Ja 1.99 five kinds of *kantāra* are given, the first two as above and three others; each is defined. Four kinds at Cnd 630.

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained (and) frightens (him), there is an offence of expiation.

If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained ... If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained (and) frightens (him), there is an offence of expiation. If he is desirous of frightening one who is not ordained (and) arranges a form ... a touch, whether he is afraid or whether he is not afraid, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he points out the wilds of thieves ... or whether he is not afraid, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if, not desirous of frightening, he arranges a form or a sound or a smell or a taste or a touch, or points out the wilds of thieves or the wilds of beasts of prey or the wilds of goblins; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fifth

¹ Doubtless should read, as in Bu-Pc 54, *anāpatti*, no offence.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 56

... was staying in the Bhagga country at Crocodile Hill¹ in Bhesakala grove² in the deer-park. Now at that time monks, kindling in the winter time a fire of large hollow logs, warmed themselves.³ And in that hollow a dark poisonous snake⁴ was scorched by the fire; issuing forth, he pursued the monks. The monks ran about here and there.⁵ Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these monks, kindling a fire, warm themselves?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, kindling a fire, warmed yourselves?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men, kindling a fire, warm themselves? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, desirous of warming himself, should kindle or should cause a fire to be kindled, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by

¹ *Sumsumāragiri*. Vin-a 862 says it is the name of a town. It was probably the capital. Here were formulated two other Vinaya rules: Vin 2.127, Vin 4.198; cf. Vin 5.145. *Anumāna Sutta*, MN i.95, *Māratajjaniya Sutta*, MN i.332, *Bodhirājakumāra Sutta*, MN ii.91, uttered here. ² Called after the *yakkhini* who presided there, SN-a ii.249.

³ *visibbesum*, from *visibbeti* = *visīveti*, to thaw, to warm oneself; another *visibbeti* means to sew. Cf. *visibbesum* at Vin 1.31–32, where the *Jaṭilas* “warmed themselves” at vessels of burning fire after emerging from the cold river. Cf. *visīvetvā* at Mil 47; and *visīvetum* twice, at Ja 2.68 with variant readings, one being *visibbitum*. ⁴ *kaṇhasappa*. Cf. Vin 3.20. ⁵ *taham taham*. Cf. Ja 1.384.

the lord.

Now at that time monks became ill. Monks, inquiring after the ill ones, spoke thus to the ill monks: “We hope that your reverences are better, we hope that you are keeping going.”

“Formerly, your reverences, we, kindling a fire, used to warm ourselves; thus there came to be comfort for us. But now it is forbidden by the lord, (and) being scrupulous, we do not warm ourselves; thus there comes to be no comfort for us.”¹

They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, kindling or causing a fire to be kindled, to warm yourselves. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, not being ill, desirous of warming himself, should kindle or should cause a fire to be kindled, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks, being scrupulous, did not light a lamp in the fire-room² or in the bath-room.³ They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to kindle or to cause a fire to be kindled when there is a sufficient reason for it.⁴ And thus ... should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk, not being ill, desirous of warming himself, should kindle or should cause a fire to be kindled, unless there is sufficient reason for it, there is an offence of expiation.**”

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Not being ill means: he for whom there comes to be comfort without a fire.

¹ Cf. above, BD 2.277, BD 2.342, below, BD 2.402. ² *jotika*, according to Vin-a 862, a fire for the purpose of sweating: *pattapacanasedakammādisu jotikaraṇe*. ³ See *Vinaya Texts* i.157, n. 2; *Vinaya Texts* iii.103. ⁴ Cf. above, BD 2.375.

Ill means: he for whom there does not come to be comfort without a fire.

Desirous of warming himself means: wishing to heat himself.¹

A fire² means: what is called a fire.³

Should kindle means: if he himself kindles, there is an offence of expiation.

Should cause to be kindled means: if he commands another, there is an offence of expiation. When once commanded, if he kindles much, there is an offence of expiation.

Unless there is a sufficient reason for it means: setting aside a sufficient reason for it.⁴

If he thinks that he is not ill when he is not ill, (and) desirous of warming himself, kindles or causes a fire to be kindled, unless there is a sufficient reason for it, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ill ... If he thinks that he is ill when he is not ill ... offence of expiation. If he picks up a fallen fire-brand,⁵ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ill when he is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ill when he is ill, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is ill; if he warms himself at one made by another; if he warms himself over raked-out embers⁶; if at a lamp, in a fire-room, in a bath-room; if there is a sufficient reason for it; if there are dangers⁷; if he is mad; if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Sixth

¹ *tappitukāma*. ² *joti*. ³ *aggi*. ⁴ Vin-a 862 says, “setting aside lamps and so on, there is no offence in kindling (a fire) when there is another suitable reason for it.” ⁵ *paṭilātaṃ ukkhipati*. Vin-a 862 says *ḍayhamānaṃ alāṭaṃ patitaṃ* (variant reading *patati taṃ*) *ukkhipati*, if he picks up a glowing fire-brand that has fallen. ⁶ *vitacchitaṅgāra*. ⁷ Vin-a 862—i.e., from nasty beasts of prey and beings other than human.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 57

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time monks used to bathe in the Tapodā.¹ Now at that time King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, thinking: "I will bathe (my) head," having gone to the Tapodā, waited for (them) at a respectful distance, thinking: "(I will wait) as long as the masters bathe." The monks bathed until the dark of the night. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, bathing (his) head at the wrong time, staying outside the town because the town gate was closed, when it was early morning² approached the lord, anointed,³ perfumed⁴; having approached, having greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the lord spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

"Why do you, sire, come in the early morning, anointed, perfumed?"

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha told this matter to the lord. Then the lord roused ... delighted King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha with *dhamma*-talk. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having been roused ... delighted by the lord with *dhamma*-talk, rising from his seat, greeting the lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying:

¹ A lake, and also a river; literally the hot waters. The lake was cool, but the river flowing from it was hot; see Vin 3.108 (BD 1.188), quoted at DN-a 1.35, Ud-a 110. ² Cf. above, BD 2.274. ³ *asambhinnena*. Pali-English Dictionary says that this at the above passage is the "name of a kind of ointment." ⁴ *vilepanena*.

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks, though having seen the king, not knowing moderation, bathed?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men, though having seen the king, not knowing moderation, bathe? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks, being scrupulous, did not bathe in the hot weather, in the fever weather; they lay down¹ with limbs covered with sweat; robes and lodgings got soiled. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, in the hot weather, in the fever weather, to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. This is a right time in this case: thinking, ‘a month and a half of the summer remains,’ (and) ‘the first month of the rains’ — these are the two and a half months when there is hot weather, when there is fever weather. In this case this is a right time.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks became ill. Monks, inquiring after the ill ones, spoke thus to the ill monks: “We hope that your reverences are better, we hope that you are keeping going.”

Formerly, your reverences, we used to bathe (at intervals of) less

¹ *sayanti*, or, went to sleep.

than half a month; thus there came to be comfort for us. But now it is forbidden by the lord, (and) being scrupulous, we do not bathe; thus there comes to be no comfort for us.”¹

BD 2.4

They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. This is a right time in this case ... when there is fever weather, at a time of illness. In this case this is a right time.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks making repairs, being scrupulous, did not bathe; they lay down with limbs covered with sweat; robes and lodgings got soiled. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

Bu-Pc 5

“I allow you, monks, at a time of work,² to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation ...”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks, having gone on a journey, being scrupulous, did not bathe; they lay down with limbs covered with sweat ... They told this matter to the lord. He said:

Bu-Pc 5

“I allow you, monks, at a time of going on a journey, to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a

¹ Cf. above, [BD 2.277](#), [BD 2.342](#), [BD 2.399](#). ² Or, of building, *kammasamaya*; see the Old Commentary's definition below.

2.404 month, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. This is a right time in this case: ...”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

57.6.1 Now at that time several monks, making robes in the open air, became assailed¹ by a dusty wind, and the god was raining little by little.² The monks, being scrupulous, did not-bathe; they lay down with damp limbs; robes and lodgings got soiled. They told this matter 4.119 to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, at a time of wind and rain,³ to bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should bathe (at intervals of) less than half a month, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. In this case this is a right time: thinking, ‘a month and a half of the summer remains,’ (and) ‘the first month of the rains’—these are the two and a half months when there is hot weather, when there is fever weather; at a time of illness, at a time of work, at a time of going on a journey, at a time of wind and rain. This is a right time in this case.**”

57.7.1 **Whatever** means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

Less than half a month⁴ means: less than half a month.⁵

Should bathe means: if he bathes with chunam or with clay,⁶ in each action there is an offence of wrong-doing; when the bathing is completed there is an offence of expiation.

2.405 **Except at a right time** means: setting a right time to one side.

Hot weather means: a month and a half of the summer remains.

¹ *okiṇṇā*. ² *devo ca thokaṃ thokaṃ phusāyati*. Cf. SN i.184, Ud 5, *devo ekaṃ ekaṃ phusāyati*. ³ *vātavutṭhi*. Cf. AN iii.378; Snp-a 34. ⁴ *oren’ addhamāsaṃ*.

⁵ *ūnakaddhamāsaṃ*. ⁶ Cf. Vin 1.202, where monks with affections of the skin are allowed to use *cunṇa*, chunam, while those who are in health are permitted *mattikā*, clay. Cf. also Vin 1.47=Vin 1.52, and see notes at Vinaya Texts i.157; Vin 2.120, Vin 2.220, Vin 2.224.

Fever weather means: the first month of the rains. Thinking, 'these are the two and a half months when there is hot weather, when there is fever weather,' there may be bathing.

Time of illness means: if there comes to be no comfort for one without bathing; thinking, 'it is a time of illness,' there may be bathing.

Time of work means: even a cell comes to be cleaned; thinking, 'it is a time of work,' there may be bathing.

Time of going on a journey means: saying, 'we will go half a *yojana*,' there may be bathing; there may be bathing when going, there may be bathing when gone.¹

Time of wind and rain means: if monks become assailed by a dusty wind, if two or three drops of rain come to be fallen on the body, thinking, 'it is a time of wind and rain,' there may be bathing.

If he thinks that it is less when it is less than half a month, (and) bathes, except at a right time, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than half a month ... If he thinks that it is more when it is less than half a month ... offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is less when it is more than half a month, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is more than half a month, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is more when it is more than half a month, there is no offence.

There is no offence if it is at a right time; if he bathes at (intervals of) the half-month; if he bathes (at intervals of) more than half a month; if he bathes going to the further bank²; if he is in nothing but bordering districts³; if there are accidents⁴; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Seventh

¹ Cf. above, **BD 2.312**. ² *pāraṃ gacchanto nhāyati*. Cf. above, **BD 2.392**. ³ *sabba-paccantimesu janapadesu*. Buddhaghosa gives no explanation. ⁴ Such as being pursued by bees, Vin-a 863.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 58

58.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
2.406 at that time many monks and wanderers were going along the high-
road from Sāketa to Sāvattḥī. On the way, thieves, having issued
forth, robbed them. At Sāvattḥī hirelings of the king,¹ having issued
forth, having seized these thieves with the goods, sent a messenger
to the monks, saying:

“Let the revered sirs come; let each, recognising his own robe,
take it.”²

The monks did not recognise them. They³ looked down upon,
criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the revered sirs not recognise their own robes?”⁴

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these
monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion,
in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, hav-
ing given reasoned talk on what is befitting, on what is suitable,
addressed the monks, saying:

“On account of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training for
monks based on ten grounds: for the excellence of the Order, for the
comfort of the Order ... for establishing what is verily *dhamma*, for
following discipline.⁵ And thus, monks, this rule of training should
be set forth:

“When a monk obtains a new robe, any one mode of disfigure-

¹ *rājabhaṭa*, persons ill royal service. At Vin 1.74 it is a *dukkāṭa* to confer the *pabbajā* on these. Cf. Vin 1.88. ² *sakaṃ sakaṃ cīvaraṃ saṃjānitvā gaṇhantu*.

³ I.e., the hirelings. ⁴ *attano attano cīvaraṃ na saṃjānissanti*. ⁵ = Vin 3.21 (BD 1.37f.) = BD 3.232 (above, BD 2.87) = AN i.98, AN i.100 (GS 1.84, GS 1.85) = AN v.70 (GS 5.50).

ment¹ of the three modes of disfigurement must be taken²: either dark green or mud(-colour) or black.³” If a monk should make use of a new robe without taking⁴ any one mode of disfigurement of the three modes of disfigurement, there is an offence of expiation.⁵”

New means: it is called so if not made allowable.⁶

Robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes.⁷

Any one mode of disfigurement of the three modes of disfigurement must be taken means: even (as little as) with a blade of grass must be taken.

Dark green⁸ means: there are two (kinds of) dark green: the

¹ *dubbaṅṅakaraṇaṃ*. Vin-a 863 says *dubbaṅṅakaraṇaṃ ādātābbaṃ ti etaṃ kappabinduṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ*. Pali-English Dictionary calls *kappabindu* a “small black dot or smudge imprinted on a new robe to make it lawful” (*kappa*). HUBER, J. BU-AS., 1913, has (*pācittiya* 59): “si un bhikṣu reçoit un vêtement neuf, il doit employer une des trois manières pour en détruire la belle couleur.” At Vin 1.255 the *kaṭhina*-cloth is called “made (*atthata*) if it is made allowable (*kappakata*).” SN v.217, *dubbaṅṅakaraṇī jare* = KS v.192, “age that makes the colour fade.” ² *ādātābbaṃ*, from *ādiyati*, to take up, take to oneself. Cf. Vin-a 684, *ādātābbaṃ ti gahetābbaṃ*. Vinaya Texts i.45, “he must choose.” Cf. Vin 1.50, *na ekacco pacchāsamaṇo ādātābbo* = Vinaya Texts i.163, “let him not take anyone else with him as his companion.” ³ Vinaya Texts i.45, “either (making part of it) dark blue, or (marking part of it with) mud, or (making part of it) black.” ⁴ *anādā*. ⁵ The robe must be disfigured so as to be identifiable by the monk to whom it belongs. Cf. Bu-NP 15, where portions of an old rug have to be added to a new rug “so as to disfigure it,” although not for purposes of identification. ⁶ *akatakappa*. The robe is made allowable by having a smudge made upon it, Vin-a 863. At Vin 1.215 fruit that is *akatakappa* is allowed to be eaten, even when there is no one there to make it allowable (*kappiyakāraka*, cf. Vin 1.211) for the monks by offering it to them. Cf. *akappakata* occurring below at Bu-Pc 58.2.3. ⁷ Cf. above, BD 2.40, BD 2.48. Here Vin-a 863 says, whatever he is able to put on, to dress in (using *nivāsetuṃ* and *pārupituṃ*, the verbs referring to the inner robe, and to the upper robe and outer cloak, cf. BD 2.32, n. 2, n. 3); the “least robe fit for assignment” is not meant. Cf. above, BD 2.287. ⁸ *nila*, often translated as blue, dark blue. But Old Commentary lends support for green here. See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, 1924, p. 49, n.

dark green of bronze,¹ the dark green of foliage.²

Mud(-colour)³ means: it is called water.⁴

Black⁵ means: anything that is of black.⁶

If a monk ... without taking any one mode of disfigurement of the three modes of disfigurement means: if a monk makes use of a new robe without having taken⁷ any one mode of disfigurement of the three modes of disfigurement, even (as little as) with a blade of grass, there is an offence of expiation.

If he makes use of it, thinking that he has not taken⁸ when he has not taken, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he has not taken ... If he makes use of it, thinking that he has taken when he has not taken, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that he has not taken when he has taken, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he has taken, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he has taken when he has taken, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, having taken, he makes use of it; if what is allowable becomes destroyed⁹; if what made the appearance allow-

¹ *kaṁsanīla*; *kaṁsa* is bronze, or sometimes metal. Vin-a 863 explains by *cam-makāranīla*, the *nīla* of a leather-worker, and says that according to Mahāpaccariya it is called *ayomala* (variant reading *ayomaya*) and *lohamala*, an iron-(or metal-) stain, a copper-(brass-or bronze-) stain. ² *palāsanīla*, explained at Vin-a 863. *yo koci nīlavaṇṇo paṇṇaraso*, whatever is a heap of leaves is *nīla* colour. At Vv-a 197, Pv-a 158, *harita*, usually translated as “green,” is explained by *nīla*. ³ *kaddama*.

⁴ *odaka*. At Vin 2.262 monks and nuns sprinkled one another with *kaddamodaka*, muddy water (*kaddama-udaka*). ⁵ *kāḷāsama*. Both *kāḷa* and *sāma* can mean black, dark. At MN i.246 the words mean, according to *Pali-English Dictionary*, black, brown, respectively; so translated at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.176. But *Pali-English Dictionary* also says (article for *kāḷa*) that “*kāḷa-sāma* at Vin 4.120 is to be taken as dark-grey,” while under article for *sāma* it says, “Vin 4.120 (*kāḷāsāma* dark blue [?]).” Some words for colours may, in the Canon, have denoted more than one colour, or nothing very definite and fixed; or we may not yet know exactly to what colour some of the words for colours refer. ⁶ *kāḷāsāmaka*, or blackish, darkish.

⁷ *anādiyivā*. ⁸ *anādinna*, presumably referring to a “disfigurement.” ⁹ *kappo naṭṭho hoti*, perhaps if the smudge (*bindu*) disappears in some way.

able becomes worn away¹; if what was not made allowable² becomes sewn together³ with what was made allowable⁴; if there is a patch⁵; if there is a braiding⁶; if there is a binding⁷; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

BD 2.4

The Eighth

¹ *kappakatokāsojiṇṇo hoti.* ² *akappakataṃ.* Again cf. Vin-a 863 and above, **BD 2.407.**
³ *samsibbitaṃ hoti.* Cf. Vism 1, Mil 102, Mil 148. ⁴ *kappakatenā,* as *Critical Pali Dictionary* says, by *kappabindu.* **Vin 4.286,** *samañacīvaraṃ nāma kappakataṃ vuccati,* a recluse's robe is called what is made allowable. At **Vin 1.254,** **Vin 1.255,** the expressions occur, *na akappakatenā atthataṃ hoti kaṭṭhinaṃ; kappakatenā atthataṃ hoti kaṭṭhinaṃ,* translated at *Vinaya Texts* ii.155, *Vinaya Texts* ii.156, “when the ceremony has (has not) fallen through,” **BD 2.155, n. 2,** saying, “*akappakatenā ti anādinna-kappa-bindhunā* (Buddhaghosa), which we do not understand. Perhaps we should read *bindunā.*” See Vin-a 1111 for this definition, and where reading is *bindunā.* The sense is that the *kaṭṭhina*-cloth is not properly made if it is not made allowable—i.e., through not taking a disfiguring smudge by which the owner can identify it. ⁵ *aggaḷa.* Vin-a 863, “putting these *aggaḷa,* and so on, on to a robe after it is made allowable is not a device for making it allowable (*kappakaraṇakicca.*)” *Aggaḷa,* patch, strip of cloth, was used for strengthening robes. See **Vin 1.290,** where a monk's inner robe was torn and he inserted a “strip of cloth” and was commended by the lord. Buddhaghosa says (see Vin-a 1128), *aggaḷam acchādeyyan* (text, *acchupeyyaṃ*) *ti chinnaṭṭhāne pilotika-khaṇḍaṃ laggāpeyyaṃ* (variant reading *ṭhapeyyaṃ*): “(what now) if I should stick bits of cloth (or rags) into the torn places?” Vin-a 1129 gives, *suttalūkhaṃ kātun ti sutten' eva aggaḷam kātun ti attho,* “to darn roughly with thread means to darn a patch with thread.” ⁶ *anuvāta.* *Vinaya Texts* ii.154, n. 1, *anuvāta-karaṇa-mattenā ti piṭṭhi-anuvāta-āropana-mattena,* from which it appears that the *anuvāta* was put along the back of the robe. *Anuvāta* used in explained of *kusi* at **Vin 1.287,** see *Vinaya Texts* ii.208, n. 5. Vin-a 684 uses the word in explaining the rule for disfiguring a rug. *Critical Pali Dictionary* calls *anuvāta* “probably a collar or facing (on a monk's cowl).” ⁷ *paribhaṇḍa.* *Vinaya Texts* ii.154, n. 2, *paribhaṇḍa-karaṇa-mattenā ti kucchi-anuvāta-āropana-mattena,* put inside. Buddhaghosa on **Vin 1.297** again explains *anuvāta* and *paribhaṇḍa* “by the words themselves,” see *Vinaya Texts* ii.231, n. 2. The two words occur again at **Vin 1.254** as things to be used in making a *kaṭṭhina*-cloth robe, and at **Vin 2.116** as things to be put on to the edge (*anto*) of the *kaṭṭhina* when it is worn thin; at **Vin 2.177** they are among the “trifles” for which a disposer is to be appointed. On *paribhaṇḍa* as some kind of flooring, see **Vin 2.113,** **Vin 2.172;** *Vinaya Texts* iii.85, n. 3; **Vin 3.213,** n. 6.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 59

59.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
2.411 that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, himself
having assigned a robe¹ to a monk who shared his brother's cell,²
made use of it, (the robe) not having been taken away.³ Then that
monk told this matter to the monks, saying:

“Your reverences, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans,
himself having assigned a robe to me, makes use of it, (the robe) not
having been taken away.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, himself
having assigned a robe to a monk, make use of it, (the robe) not
having been taken away?”

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, yourself having assigned
... not having been taken away?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, yourself having assigned ... not having
been taken away? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are
not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be
set forth:

**“Whatever monk, himself having assigned a robe to a monk or
to a nun or to a female probationer or to a male novice or to a
female novice, should make use of it, (the robe) not having been
taken away, there is an offence of expiation.”⁴**

¹ At Vin 1.297 monks were allowed to allot robes, but not to assign them. ² Cf. above, BD 2.139. ³ *apaccuddhāraka*. Cf. above, BD 2.22, n. 3. ⁴ Cf. Bu-Pc 81.

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

To a monk means: to another monk.

A nun means: one ordained by both Orders.¹

A female probationer means: one training in the six rules² for two years.

A male novice means: one conforming to the ten rules of training.³

A female novice means: one conforming to the ten rules of training.⁴

Himself⁵ means: himself⁶ having assigned.

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes, (including) the least one fit for assignment.⁷

Assignment means: there are two (kinds of) assignment, assignment in the presence and assignment in the absence. Assignment in the presence means that he says, 'I assign this robe to you or to so and so.' Assignment in the absence means that he says, 'I will give-this robe to you for the sake of assigning (it).'⁸ He should say, 'Who is your friend or intimate acquaintance?' 'So and so, and so and so,' he says. He should say, 'I will give to them; make use of what is due to them or give it away or do as you like (with it).'

(The robe) not having been taken away means: either if it is not given to him, or if not putting his trust in him, he makes use of it, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that (the robe) is not taken away when it is not taken away, (and) makes use of it, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether (the robe) is not taken away ... If he thinks that (the robe) is taken away when it is not taken away, (and) makes use

¹ = above, [BD 2.32](#), [BD 2.40](#). ² *chasu dhammesu sikkhitasikkhā*. Cf. [Vin 4.343](#). These rules are the five *śīlas* and one against eating at the wrong time. For this last cf. [Bu-Pc 37](#). ³ *dasasikkhāpadika*. ⁴ *dasasikkhāpadikā*. Cf. [Vin 4.343](#). ⁵ *sāmaṃ ... sayam*. ⁶ *sāmaṃ ... sayam*. ⁷ Cf. above, [BD 2.40](#), [BD 2.48](#), [BD 2.140](#). ⁸ Or, as at *Vinaya Texts* i.45, n. 3, 'I give this robe to you for you to appoint (to someone else).'

of it, there is an offence of expiation. If he allots¹ it or gives it away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that (the robe) is not taken away when it is taken away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether (the robe) is taken away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that (the robe) is taken away when it is taken away, there is no offence.

59.2.3

There is no offence either if he gives it, or if putting his trust in him, he makes use of it; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Ninth

¹ *adhitt̐heti*, see above, **BD 2.7, n. 1.**

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 60

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of seventeen monks did not store their requisites. The group of six monks hid a bowl and a robe belonging to the group of seventeen monks. The group of seventeen monks spoke thus to the group of six monks:

“Your reverences, give back the bowl and the robe to us.”

The group of six monks laughed; these cried out. Monks spoke thus:

“Why do you, your reverences, cry out?”

“Your reverences, this group of six monks are hiding a bowl and a robe belonging to us.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the group of six monks hide a bowl and a robe belonging to monks?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, are hiding a bowl and a robe belonging to monks?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, hide a bowl and a robe belonging to monks? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should hide or should cause to hide a monk's bowl or robe or (piece of cloth) to sit upon¹ or needle-case or girdle, even in fun, there is an offence of expiation.”

¹ *nisīdana*. Cf. Vin 1.295 and above, BD 2.34, BD 2.87, BD 2.414

Whatever means: ... is monk to be understood in this case.

A monk's means: another monk's.

Bowl means: there are two (kinds of) bowls, an iron bowl and a clay bowl.¹

Robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes, (including) the least one fit for assignment.²

(Piece of cloth) to sit upon means: it is so called if it has a border.³

Needle-case⁴ means: it is with a needle or it is without a needle.

Girdle means: there are two (kinds of) girdles, those made of strips of cloth⁵ and those ...⁶

Should hide means: if he himself hides, there is an offence of expiation.

Or should come to hide means: if he commands another, there is an offence of expiation. When once commanded, if he hides much, there is an offence of expiation.

Even in fun means: desiring amusement.

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained, (and) hides or causes (someone) to hide a bowl ... or a girdle, even in fun, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained ... If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained ... offence of expiation. If he hides or causes (someone) to hide another requisite, even in fun, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he hides or causes (someone) to hide the bowl or robe or another requisite of one who is not ordained, even in fun, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁷ If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained, there is

¹ = above, **BD 2.115** (where see n. 2), and **Vin 4.243**. Cf. also the three bowls mentioned at **Vin 3.169** = **BD 1.292**, *lohapatta*, *sāṭakapatta*, *sumbhakapatta*. ² Cf. above, **BD 2.40**, **BD 2.48**. ³ *sadasa*. Cf. above, **BD 2.87**, and **Vin 4.171**. ⁴ Cf. **Vin 1.301ff.**, and **Bu-Pc 86**. ⁵ *paṭṭika*. I follow translation at *Vinaya Texts* iii.143. ⁶ *sūkarantaka*. *Vinaya Texts* iii.143, n. 5, "we do not venture to translate the term." See Buddhaghosa's explanation at **Vin 2.319**. Both these kinds of girdles are allowed at **Vin 2.136**. ⁷ Indicating that members of other sects were not to be inconvenienced.

an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if he is not desiring fun; if he puts in order what is badly arranged²; if he puts it in order, thinking, 'I will give it back, having given *dhamma*-talk'; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Tenth

THIS IS ITS KEY

Fermented liquor, the finger, and water,³
and disrespect, frightening,
Fire, bathing, disfigurement,
himself (the robe) not having been taken away,
and about hiding.

The Sixth Division: that on drinking fermented liquor

¹ Another of these errors, noted before—should surely read *anāpatti*, no offence.

² *dunnikkhitta*, wrongly put down or set down. ³ *toya*.

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

This volume of the *Book of the Discipline* concludes the translation of the Suttavibhaṅga of the Vinaya and covers vol.4 of Oldenberg's edition of the *Vinayaṭīkāraṁ*, p. 124 to the end. It thus includes the last thirty-two *Pācittiyas* for monks, **Bu-Pc 61–Bu-Pc 92**, the four *Pāṭidesaniyas* or offences which ought to be confessed, the seventy-five *Sekhiyas* or rules for training or of etiquette, and the seven *Adhikaraṇasamathā dhammā* or ways for settling legal questions. This ends the Mahāvibhaṅga portion of the Suttavibhaṅga, that portion devoted to the Pātimokkha rules of restraint and training for monks. The nuns' portion, the Bhikkhunivibhaṅga, follows immediately, the rules being classified on the same lines as those for monks: *Pārājika*, *Saṅghādisesa*, *Nissaggiya*, *Pācittiya*, *Pāṭidesaniya*, *Sekhiya*, *Adhikaraṇasamathā dhammā*. There is, however, no *Aniyata*, or undetermined class of offence, for nuns.

THE MONKS' PĀCITTIYA GROUP (BU-PC.61–BU-PC.92)

Sāvattī is given as the locus or provenance of twenty-eight of these thirty-two rules, Rājagaha of two, Kosambī and Kapilavattu of one each. It is not uninstrucive to look at these four rules in which the lord is recorded to have been elsewhere than in Sāvattī. **Bu-Pc 65**, whose locus is given as Rājagaha, recounts the choice of young Upālī's parents of a monk's career for him, apparently mainly on the grounds that recluses are pleasant in their conduct and live in

a certain amount of ease. The episode occurs again in the *Mahāvagga* (Vin 1.77), but there, because at the end it is stated that he who ordains a person who is under twenty years of age “must be dealt with according to the rule,” the existence of this *Pācittiya* is evidently presupposed.

Both accounts assert that Upāli and his young friends were in Rājagaha and also show the lord to have been here too.¹ Thus there would appear to be some tradition associating the boy Upāli with this place.

Bu-Pc 81 has as its central figure Dabba the Mallian. In **Bu-Ss 8** he is appointed distributor of lodgings and meals to the Order. In **Bu-Pc 13** he is accused of showing favouritism in the discharge of his duties. These three contexts all lay the scene in Rājagaha, as does **Bu-Ss 9**, where this same monk is falsely charged with seducing Mettiyā. Although he was not born at Rājagaha, there is a consistent propensity to regard this as the scene of many of his activities.

Similarly, Channa is a monk traditionally connected with Kosambī. In **Bu-Ss 12**, **Bu-Pc 54**, and again in **Bu-Pc 71**, we hear of him indulging in bad habits, always when the lord is said to be at Kosambī. Also while he was here, Channa is reputed to have cut down a tree at a shrine (**Bu-Ss 12**) and to have damaged a brahmin’s barley field when building a dwelling-place given him by his supporter (**Bu-Pc 19**).

The introductory story of **Bu-Pc 86** is developed on exactly the same lines as the first story in **Bu-NP 22**, the only differences being that (1) the *Nissaggiya* story ends in the formulation of a *dukkāṭa* offence, and the *Pācittiya* in the formulation of a *sikkhāpada*, a rule; and (2) the people who offer to supply the monks’ needs are potters in the *Nissaggiya* and ivory-workers in the *Pācittiya*. In both these stories the lord is said to have been residing at Kapilavatthu, his birth-place. I have already put forward various reasons to support my view that **Bu-NP 22** represents some specially ancient fragment of the *Pātimokkha*.² Now the form in which **Bu-Pc 86** exists would appear

¹ All the incidents in **Vin 1.35–Vin 1.80** are imputed to a time when the lord was making a long stay in Rājagaha. ² **BD 2, Introduction, p. xivff.**

to support this probability. It looks like a mere copy of **Bu-NP 22**, and in narrating its story may be said to utilise material already at hand. For it cannot well be earlier than the *Nissaggiya*, since the articles in respect of which the offence was committed were needle-cases, whereas in the *Nissaggiya* they were bowls, requisites doubtless allowed to monks before they felt the lack of needle-cases. These latter were not essential in the daily round, merely an adjunct to it, a means of preserving the needles, themselves one of the eight necessities, and through them other necessities: robes, belts, shoulder-straps and so on. In taking over an older setting, older because the articles with which it deals were earlier accretions to the monks' property, the story of **Bu-Pc 50** imitates the one it copies so closely as to create the impression that it was borrowing this older setting because there existed no special story which could be used to introduce the formulation of its own rule.

Some of the twenty-eight rules whose provenance is given as *Sāvattihī*, for example **Bu-Pc 63**, **Bu-Pc 69**, **Bu-Pc 73**, **Bu-Pc 79**, **Bu-Pc 80**, by dealing with the internal polity of a *saṅgha*, are portraying an organisation no longer in its infancy. For they presuppose a time when the *saṅgha* had been in existence long enough to have developed a working constitution of a certain complexity. They speak of such technical institutes as "formal acts" and their carrying out (**Bu-Pc 63**, **Bu-Pc 79**, **Bu-Pc 80**), of the giving of *chanda*, or an absentee member's consent by proxy to a fellow monk to attend a business meeting of the Order on his behalf (**Bu-Pc 79**, **Bu-Pc 80**), and of "legal questions" together with a ban on reopening these once they had been settled "according to rule" (**Bu-Pc 63**). Thus, as **Bu-Pc 63** shows, the attempt to safeguard the validity and finality of legal questions that had already been settled implies work still going forward in regard to legal questions, although perhaps the procedure which was gradually adopted was brought to its conclusion in this *Pācittiya*. Two *Pācittiyas*, **Bu-Pc 79** and **Bu-Pc 81** (locus: *Rājagaha*), also seek to prevent a monk from making criticisms, *khīyadhammaṃ āpajjati*, after he has taken part in some constitutional proceedings. He must

abide by the decisions that were taken then and in his presence, just as by **Bu-Pc 63** he must abide by whatever verdict had been given on a legal question.

Other *Pācittiyas* in this volume also show signs of being relatively late. **Bu-Pc 70** refers to the material of **Bu-Pc 5**, and **Bu-Pc 77** to that of **Bu-Pc 65**, hence both must be later than the *Pācittiyas* to which they refer. **Bu-Pc 73** speaks of “a rule being handed down in a clause, contained in a clause,” *dharmo suddhāgato suddhāpariyāpanno*, and due to be recited at every half-monthly recitation of the *Pātimokkha* rules, as though the rule referred to were to this extent fixed and stable. The *sikkhāpada* of this *Pācittiya* has a late ring about it, the language and thought depicting a time that had progressed some way beyond the archaic.

In my Introduction to *Book of the Discipline* vol.2 I took up the question¹ raised by Oldenberg and Rhys Davids of the comparative age of those *Pācittiyas* noticed by them as “formulated with the utmost brevity.” After an examination of these *Pācittiyas* I came to the tentative conclusion that they may mark some relatively *late* stage in the growth of the disciplinary code. I remarked that **Bu-Pc 72** and **Bu-Pc 73** “conform to” this brief type. Now the internal evidence of these two *Pācittiyas* suggests references to times when constitutionally the *saṅgha* was fairly well developed. Therefore such evidence may be regarded as contributing to the validity of the hypothesis that the *Pācittiyas* which are briefly stated, as well as those which conform to this type, belong to a comparatively late date.

But yet I think it unsafe to attempt any correlation of rules which seem to be late with Gotama’s protracted residence at Sāvattthī towards the end of his life. For other rules which bear the stamp of earlier formulation are said to have been set forth when the lord was here, while still others which might appear to emanate from later days were promulgated when he is said to have been elsewhere.

This same feature, the great preponderance of sayings and discourses said to have been delivered at Sāvattthī by the lord, is to be

¹ **BD 2, Introduction, p. xxxiv.**

found in the Saṃyutta.¹ In this Collection, the phrase *Sāvattḥī nidānam* sometimes occurs as well as a “condensed opening formula”;² and it is this that has led to the suggestion of *nidāna* here referring “to the source of the deposited and transmitted record ... and not to the original scene of the original utterance.”³ Although the word *nidāna* does not occur in such a connection in the Vinaya, future historians will have to bear in mind the possibility of names of places, *Sāvattḥī* as well as the others, referring to the centres where “repeaters” met when the canon was being established, instead of to the scene where the discourse was reputed to have been given or the rule laid down. Against this, however, we have to set the small villages, the hill-tops and mountain-sides spoken of throughout the Suttas as the places where the lord or his disciples were staying, but which were too small or remote ever to have reached eminence as centres of learning, repeating or codifying.

We may now consider various peculiarities manifest in some of the *Pācittiya*s already referred to as well as in others. **Bu-Pc 72**, for example, contains at least three further points which require some analysis. In the first place, in speaking of “mastering discipline under *Upāli*,” discipline, *Vinaya*, is incidentally shown to have acquired complexity and magnitude sufficient to attract expert study. Thus to understand it properly, in detail and in its various aspects and ramifications, the help of some competent person, such as *Upāli*, the great expert on discipline, was needed. According to the *Vinaya* tradition, this monk played a leading part at the first Council. There are also records showing him to have been with Gotama since relatively early days of his ministry.⁴ This will mean, in the first place, that *Upāli* will have had good opportunity to study the rules as they came into being and grew into a body; but that, in the second, had this body not attained an appreciable size, it could not have formed a worthy subject for any disciple’s study and mastery. Therefore the desire of the monks in **Bu-Pc 72** to learn discipline under *Upāli* (because

¹ ks 3, Introduction, p. xff., ks 4, Introduction, p. xivf. ² ks 3, Introduction, p. xi.

³ ks 4, Introduction, p. xv. ⁴ See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 216f.

the lord, as they are recorded to say, in praising discipline praises Upāli again and again), may be ascribed to some indefinite time subsequent to the establishment of this monk's reputation as the most eminent exponent of this branch of study

Again, **Bu-Pc 72** in referring to “the lesser and minor rules of training,” *khuddānukkhudakāni sikkhāpadāni*, does so in a way suggestive of some attempt at classification already made for these.¹ This was a matter, as **Vin 2.287** asserts, on which those elders who attended the first Council were themselves at variance. The Old Commentary on **Bu-Pc 72** is silent on the subject. It is very possible, as B.C. LAW points out,² and in fact it is almost certain, that the rules themselves had existed in a classified form since the earliest times. It would therefore be fallacious to find in any mention of “the lesser and minor rules of discipline” a pointer to some particular epoch of early Buddhist monastic history. At the same time, such a reference cannot belong to a time *before* there were sufficient rules and sufficient types of rules to merit classification.

Besides the term *khuddānukkhudakāni sikkhāpadāni*, **Bu-Pc 72** also contains the term *abhidhamma*. So, too, does Nuns' **Bi-Pc 95**. The meaning of this term is debatable, since the term must have gone through several fluctuations before coming to stand as the title of the third Piṭaka. Thus the particular meaning ascribed to it in any one context must depend largely on the sense, linguistic style and terminology of that whole context, which should therefore be considered on its own merits. I think that, not counting parallel passages, the word *abhidhamma* does not appear more than ten times in the first two Piṭakas, three of these being in the Vinaya.³ I will here confine myself to the two occasions when the word occurs in Vin 4. These are at **Vin 4.144** and **Vin 4.344**.

Now Oldenberg⁴ and Max Müller,⁵ by basing their arguments

¹ See below, **BD 3.41, n. 1**. ² *History of Pali Literature*, i.19. ³ **Vin 1.64 = Vin 1.68, Vin 4.144, Vin 1.344**. References in the admittedly later Parivāra—e.g., **Vin 5.2, Vin 5.86**—are not counted among the “ten times” that *abhidhamma* appears.

⁴ Vin.1, Introduction, p. xff. ⁵ *Dhammapada* (Sacred Books of the East X), 1st edition 1881, 2nd edition 1898, 1924, Introduction, p. xfff.

on the Vinaya accounts, have established that the Abhidhamma as a Piṭaka was not known by the time of the first Council. Thus the term *abhidhamma* when found in the Vinayapiṭaka and the Suttapiṭaka should not be taken to refer to the third Piṭaka, at least not to it in its finished closed form, unless the term can be regarded on such occasions as a later interpolation. Rather it should be taken as referring to some material or method in existence prior to the compilation of this Piṭaka, and out of which it was gradually elaborated and eventually formed.

The importance of the term cannot be appreciated unless the meaning be understood. This will to a large extent depend upon the meaning or meanings attributed to the great word *dhamma*. Since an investigation of this has been undertaken by others,¹ let us see *dhamma* as “doctrine,” as what had been and as what was being taught to disciples both by the lord and by his fellow workers, as religious views, precepts, sayings, which before being codified into an external body of doctrine were as yet appealing direct to the conscience, *dhamma*, in man, and to the deity, *ātman* and *dhamma*, which in the sixth century B.C. in India was held to be immanent in him.

Abhi- prefixed to a noun has in general an intensive meaning of higher, super, additional; and it can also mean “concerning,” “pertaining to.” Thus for the compound *abhidhamma*, we get some such phrase as “the higher doctrine,” “further, extra doctrine” or “what pertains to the doctrine”. It is possible that the cleavage between these two is not very great.

At both [Vin 4.144](#) and [Vin 4.344](#), *abhidhamma* is associated with Vinaya and also with *suttanta*, the words which gave the titles to the first and second Piṭakas. But in the former passage these three terms are also associated with *gāthā*, metric verses, songs, poems. This quartet is as unique in Pali canonical literature as is the perfect, unadulterated triad of *vinaya suttanta abhidhamma* at [Vin 4.344](#). Yet the very presence of the word *gāthā*, is enough to preclude the term

¹ MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, in several recent books, and W. GEIGER, *Pali Dhamma*, 1920.

abhidhamma from standing for the literary exegesis of that name, for no reference to the third Piṭaka as such would have combined a reference to part of the material, verses, which one of the Piṭakas finally came to include. Moreover, with verses being made since very early days, there is no reason to suppose the reference to the word *gāthā* in Monks' Bu-Pc 72 to stand for any completed collection or collections of verses, as Oldenberg suggests.¹

As already mentioned, Monks' Bu-Pc 72 purports to refer to the time when Upāli was alive. But since he could not long have survived the first Council, in the Vinaya accounts of which there is no mention of the *Abhidhamma*, this as a Piṭaka could not well have been compiled and completed, until after his death. There is thus no justification for seeing here in *abhidhamma* the title of the third Piṭaka, in spite of its proximity to words which were used as the titles of the two earlier Piṭakas.

Although we can say fairly confidently what *abhidhamma* does not mean here, it is by no means so easy to assess what it does mean. A monk may say to another, "Master *suttantas* or verses (*gāthā*) or *abhidhamma* and afterwards you will master discipline." To make this the chief aim is only suitable in a disciplinary compilation. It may be objected that, since for the purpose of mastering Vinaya, mastery of the *suttantas* is put forward as an alternative to mastery of *abhidhamma*, there might be some redundancy; for the *suttantas* are the repositories of *dhamma*. But if *abhidhamma* be taken to intensify the meaning of *dhamma*, or to refer to some method of teaching or learning it—by catechism, by analysis of terms, or by an almost lexicographical arrangement of synonyms—this difficulty would to a large extent fall away. Any one of these would imply something "extra" to *dhamma*, not in the sense of the addition of any fresh material, so much as of the contrivance of a new and systematised method of presenting some of the obscurer and more fundamental terms and concepts which it comprises.

If this be conceded, there would result for the monk who wants

¹ Vin.1, Introduction, p. xii, n. 2.

to master Vinaya a choice of two approaches to *dhamma*, which considering its immense importance to Gotama and his early followers is not out of proportion. Either, since the Vinaya itself contains no broad principles of ethics, he would study *dhamma* as handed down in the Suttas or as spoken in his hearing, in order to convince himself of the moral ground and the ideal which inspire the discipline and command adherence to its mass of particular rules. Or he would take the more austere way of approaching Vinaya through *abhidhamma*, an intellectual exercise perhaps, devoid of all extraneous matter, in which the meaning of *dhamma* terms and concepts is to be grasped through their grouping, through their classified relations of identity and dependence and so on, instead of through the more picturesque, personal and oratory methods, often made intelligible by homely parable and simile, which is the Suttanta way of presenting *dhamma*.

As in the mastery of *dhamma*, so in the mastery of *gāthā*, the disciple anxious to master Vinaya would find in them an inspiration to urge him, as the song-makers themselves had found elsewhere their own inspiration, to lead, to fulfil and to exult in *brahmacariya*, the godly life or faring. The *gāthā*, provide as it were a human approach, often a record of human experience, their value as spurs to mastering Vinaya lying in their appeal to the more emotional type of disciple, to the one who wants some personal example to emulate; whereas the mastery of *abhidhamma* would provide a field to attract the more intellectual type, while mastery of *suttantas* would stir the normally virtuous man of average mental equipment to act unremittingly in thought, word and deed from the dictates of an awakened conscience.

The *abhidhamma* passage in Nuns' **Bi-Pc 95** is stated by Oldenberg to be "the only passage in the Vinaya which really presupposes the existence of an Abhidhamma Piṭaka,"¹ and in which "we can unhesitatingly assume" these "words" to be an interpolation. Which exact "words" he means is not quite clear, since he only italicises *abhidhamma*. But probably he means no more than *abhidhamma vā* (or). A

¹ Vin.1, Introduction, p. xii, n. 2.

nun, according to this *Pācittiya*, having obtained a monk's permission to ask him about *suttanta*, commits an offence of expiation if she asks him instead about Vinaya or *abhidhamma*; and it is the same with the two variations on this theme.

Although I think that Oldenberg is very likely indeed to be right, and there is no internal evidence to suggest that he is wrong, or indeed to suggest anything helpful at all, I cannot feel myself so entirely convinced as he appears to be that the Abhidhamma Piṭaka was in existence by the time of the formulation of this passage. The main reason why I think he may be right is that this triad, appearing once only in the canon, supplies the names of what at some time came to be constituted as the three Piṭakas. Where, as in other contexts, *abhidhamma* is associated with only one but not with both of the words Vinaya and *suttanta*, then it is far less likely to have this reference.

On the other hand, although it is true that in the Nuns' *Pācittiya* group, **Bi-Pc 95** is the last but one of the rules there formulated, we should not be too much swayed by this consideration. For the position of a rule in the class in which it is placed affords no sure guide to its comparative date. For example, in the Monks' *Pācittiya* group, some of the rules towards the end have a much earlier aspect than some of those which precede them and which presume certain constitutional developments such as are capable of having arisen only when the Order had reached some degree of long-standing. In a word, since the rules cannot with certitude be said to survive in the order in which they were formulated, they can thus yield no reliable evidence for the historical sequence of their promulgation.

Another interesting *Pācittiya* among the thirty-two for monks contained in this volume is **Bu-Pc 68**. The chief person concerned is the "monk called Ariṭṭha." He is not referred to as "the venerable Ariṭṭha," *āyasmā Ariṭṭho*, in accordance with the usual narrative practice of the Vinaya. This indicates an atmosphere of disapproval surrounding him; and indeed he is a monk said to have held "pernicious views." The whole Ariṭṭha episode occurs again at **Vin 2.25–Vin 2.26**, with the difference that here at the end, instead of a rule being set

forth, the Order is enjoined to carry out an act of suspension against Ariṭṭha. The episode is also given at MN i.130–132. There is a comparable incident at SN iii.109, where to Yamaka, sometimes referred to as “monk,” sometimes as “the venerable,” is attributed a different set of “pernicious views,” and where monks, unable to dissuade him from these themselves, asked Sāriputta to go to him “out of compassion for him.”

Other *Pācittiya*s which contain material found in the Suttas are **Bu-Pc 83**, where the passage on the ten dangers of entering a king’s harem has its parallel at AN v.81ff.; and **Bu-Pc 85**, whose stock enumeration of the various kinds of “low,”¹ “worldly,”² “childish”³ or intellectually inferior talk, *tiracchānakathā*, occurs at several places in the Suttas.

In the Ariṭṭha *Pācittiya* there is a noteworthy absence of the stereotyped phrase that “the modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about,” and that having thus complained they told the lord. Here “several monks” tried, so it is recorded, to dissuade Ariṭṭha from his pernicious views by repeating to him the ten similes of the sense-pleasures. It was only when they failed in their object that they told the lord. In accordance with his usual practice, as given in the Vinaya, the lord then asked the offender, here Ariṭṭha, if what the monks said was true. But Ariṭṭha, instead of giving a meek affirmative answer, defended his views, or rather reiterated them, so that the lord is reputed to have upbraided him in exactly the same terms as those used by the “several monks.” It is true that some passages in this *Pācittiya*, such as that including the similes of the sense-pleasures, portray a literary skill and a knowledge of other Piṭakan contexts as only a relatively late “editing” could achieve. Yet the unusual development of the story, its omission of stereotyped phrases, may possibly indicate its derivation from some early source, in which was retained a tradition of an actual sequence of events strong enough to prevent the narrative, on the three occasions when

¹ *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.13; *Further Dialogues* i.362 (“low and beastly”). ² *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.245; *Vinaya Texts* ii.20. ³ *Dialogues of the Buddha* iii.33; KS v.355.

it appears, from falling into the standardised and monotonously recurring *Vibhaṅga* mould.

The *sikkhāpada* of this *Pācittiya*, **Bu-Pc 68**, is not so much in accord with *Pācittiya* formulation as with wording found in the type of *Saṅghādisesa sikkhāpada*, where the offender is to be admonished by his fellows up to the third time so as to give up his course. A Nuns' *Pācittiya*, **Bi-Pc 36**, also incorporates into its *sikkhāpada* the kind of material more usually associated with *Saṅghādisesa* formulation. Such anomalies probably do not arise through pure chance or pure carelessness, for in fact the early “editors” left little to chance, and were not nearly so careless as is sometimes thought. So that we have to attempt to account for the existence of these peculiarities in other ways. And it may be that the offences to which they refer and which now stand in the *Pācittiya* groups, were at one time counted as *Saṅghādisesa* offences¹; or that these offences only arose after the *Saṅghādisesa* group had been closed, and it was thus not possible to include them in it; or that, because the *sikkhāpadas* decree that the admonition was to be made by “monks” and “nuns” respectively, tacitly meaning a *saṅgha*—i.e., five or more monks or nuns—and do not give the alternatives of its being made by a “group” or by “one person,” these *Pācittiyas* automatically assume a *Saṅghādisesa* complexion.

Bu-Pc 76 recalls **Bu-Ss 8**, although in another way. For where in the latter there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order for defaming a monk with an unfounded charge of having committed an offence involving defeat, in **Bu-Pc 76** it is an offence of expiation to defame a monk with an unfounded charge of having committed an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

We have also seen that in its story **Bu-Pc 86** closely follows **Bu-NP 22**. Likewise **Bu-Pc 82** recalls **Bu-NP 30**. In the former the offence is to appropriate for another person, *puggala*, benefits given to the Order, while in the latter it is to appropriate for oneself any such benefits. A great point in monastic life was communal ownership. The

¹ See **BD 1.xxxiff**.

community should not be deprived for any individual, whoever he might be, of anything to which it had a rightful claim. But naturally, in the *Pācittiya*, the offending monk cannot as part of his penalty forfeit the article wrongfully appropriated by him, for presumably he had handed it over to another monk. I think it just as much this practical consideration as the fact that, of two evils, it is less bad to appropriate for another than for oneself, which was instrumental in determining the classification and hence the seriousness of these two comparable offences. To my mind the work of the early “editors” was so careful and rationally based that latter-day strictures such as S. Dutt’s, that “there is no reason why rule 82 of *Pācittiya* should be placed under that category while rule 30 of the *Nissaggiyas* (comes) under another category,”¹ must often with a fuller understanding of Vinaya outlook fall to the ground.

The last of the Monks’ *Pācittiyas*, **Bu-Pc 92**, is noticeable for containing the word *sugata*, often translated “well-farer.” As an epithet it is usually assigned to Gotama, but occasionally also to his disciples.² Its appearance in the *Vibhaṅgas* is very rare.³ This *Pācittiya* also suggests the growth of a legend already springing up round the Founder, for in it it seems as though his robe, called *sugata-cīvara*, was of a special size, rather larger than that permitted to the disciples.

The use of *sugata* in such a compound is all the more remarkable, for the context itself rules out the meaning of “standard” or “accepted,” which is what *sugata* appears to mean in the compounds *sugataṅgula* (**Vin 1.297**, **Vin 4.168**), standard finger-breadth, and *sugatavidatthi*, standard span, a word which occurs at **Vin 3.149** and also in the rule of **Bu-Pc 92** itself, in explanation of the correct measurement of a *sugatacīvara*. The Founder, who reckoned himself a man amongst men, had at one time, as other records show, been content with robe-material picked piecemeal from the rag-heap. Moreover, it is recorded that “he exchanged robes with Mahā-Kassapa. Of the two sets of robes brought by Pukkusa, one was given to Ānanda, and one was reserved for the Buddha himself; and no one can read the

¹ *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 97.

² AN i.217ff.; SN iv.252f.

³ **Vin 3.1**, **Vin 3.9**

account in the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta without feeling that both are supposed to be of the same size.”¹ It is also recorded that the brahmin Piṅgiyānin, having been presented with five hundred robes by the Licchavis, handed these on to the lord.²

Although the narrative part of this *Pācittiya* appears to refer to the lifetime of the Founder, it is not easy to believe in view of these records that before his death, by which time moreover, as the *Mahāparinibbāna-suttanta* shows, he was lonely and deserted, his disciples would have signified their admiration of him by ascribing to him a physical superiority. And for the purpose of this *Pācittiya* there was no need to do this. For had the Vinaya compilers wished to say that a robe in excess of a proper measure was not to be worn by monks, they could have found other means to do so more in line with their usual ways of expressing themselves.

On the other hand, if it were not giving utterance to some growing legend in which physical size was looked upon as a fitting accompaniment to mental strength, **Bu-Pc 92** may possibly be looking back to the theory of the thirty-two marks of the Great Man,³ which as Rhys Davids says is pre-Buddhist.⁴ But in this, the noble proportions by which the Great Man was marked were deemed to be perfect rather than specially large. This *Pācittiya* therefore remains something of a mystery and something of a misfit, while showing some unmistakable signs of late “editing.”

The last seven *Pācittiyas* form a group in which the penalty of expiation is combined with some other form of penalty. As in the class of offences of expiation involving forfeiture, *Nissaggiyaṃ Pācittiyaṃ*, we have here “offences of expiation involving cutting down,” *chedanakāṃ pācittiyaṃ* (**Bu-Pc 87**, **Bu-Pc 89–Bu-Pc 92**, and also Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 22**); “involving breaking up,” *bhedanakāṃ pācittiyaṃ* (**Bu-Pc 86**); “involving tearing off,” *uddālanakāṃ pācittiyaṃ* (**Bu-Pc 88**).

These *Pācittiyas* are concerned with prescribing the right measurements, and to a lesser degree the right materials, for some of the articles allowable to monks and used by them. They therefore do

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i.54, n. 3. ² AN iii.239. ³ DN ii.16; MN i.136, MN i.137. ⁴ *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.110, n. 2.

not belong to the earliest days of the Order's history, but to a time subsequent to the "allowance" of those articles for whose proper measurement and so on they prescribe. I cannot agree with S. DUTT that "rules Bu-Pc 86–Bu-Pc 92 (except one) hang together,"¹ in view of the fact that rules Bu-Pc 86–Bu-Pc 92 form a special class entailing an extra penalty, and into which rules Bu-Pc 83 and Bu-Pc 24 no more fit than does rule Bu-Pc 85, the one to which he takes exception.

It may be noted that the Old Commentary does not define *sū-cighara* in Bu-Pc 86, although it does so in Bu-Pc 60. This omission cannot be definitely ascribed to any feeling that the word did not need to be explained again. For the Old Commentary on several occasions defines the same words—for example, "robe," "householder," "he knows," "nun," in exactly the same terms; or, guided by circumstances, it defines the same words—for example, "sleeping-place" and, again, "householder," in different terms. Its omissions must be due either to carelessness or to some studied purpose or presupposition to which we have not as yet the clue. In *Book of the Discipline* vol. 2, I have drawn attention to some of these commentarial omissions.² In this volume the Old Commentary fails to define *udāka*, water, in Bu-Pc 62; *nihata*, settled, in Bu-Pc 63; *puggala*, person, individual, in Bu-Pc 65; *ekaddhānamagga*, the same high-road, in Bu-Pc 66, Bu-Pc 67; *chandam datvā*, having given leave of absence, in Bu-Pc 79; and *chandam datvā* and also *vattamānāya*, being engaged in, in Bu-Pc 80. Neither does the Old Commentary attempt any explanation of words contained in some *sikkhāpadas* but said to have been spoken by the offending monks, as for example in Bu-Pc 68, Bu-Pc 70, Bu-Pc 72, Bu-Pc 73, Bu-Pc 77, Bu-Pc 78. But the reason for this is understandable: these sentences are clear enough for all ordinary purposes, nor are they attributed to the lord. They therefore do not merit the meticulous care and attention usually bestowed on words said to have been used by him in formulating the rules, and which the Old Commentary generally aims at rendering as lucid as possible by synonyms or by some more reasoned form of interpretation.

¹ *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 97.

² BD 2, Introduction, p. xxvf.

BD 3.x

Because these thirty-two *Pācittiyas* deal with the corporate as well as with the individual behaviour of monks, it is not surprising to find in them no more than three records of lay people's complaints of monks' behaviour; while on the other hand "modest monks" are recorded to have complained as many as twenty-four times, monks who were elders once (Bu-Pc 92) and "several monks" twice (Bu-Pc 68, Bu-Pc 70). Yet on many occasions, as the narratives show, this large conventual source of criticism might, if taken by itself, give a somewhat misleading notion of the amount of association between the monks and lay people which these same *Pācittiyas* portray. That such association was easy and unrestricted needs no labouring at this stage in Pali studies. Examples of it may be found in Bu-Pc 66, Bu-Pc 67, Bu-Pc 83–Bu-Pc 86, Bu-Pc 88.

In addition, twice Gotama is reputed to formulate a rule as the result of some piece of direct evidence observed by him and not because someone had grumbled. Thus, in Bu-Pc 87, it is recorded how the lord, having come to Upananda's abode, himself takes exception to this disciple's body which evidently was too high. Again, the lord is recorded, in Bu-Pc 65, to hear the noise made by boys who had been ordained before they were twenty years old, and himself to raise objections to ordaining a person, *puggala*, into the Order before he was of an age to stand the physical hardships of monastic life.

It is a little curious that this is put as high as twenty, but it was doubtless to allow an entrant to develop sufficient stamina to render improbable his return to the "low life of a layman," for any such withdrawal from the Order was a blur on its reputation. In other connections, notably in the *Jātaka*, the "age of discretion" is said to be reached when a boy becomes sixteen. Nuns' Bi-Pc 74 makes it an offence for a nun to ordain a girl, a maiden, *kumāribhūta*, which the Old Commentary explains by *sāmaṇerī*, a novice, who was less than twenty. This therefore seems a kind of recognised age at which or over which to receive the *upasampadā* ordination. For *pabbajjā*, going forth into the Order, although not into full membership, clearly is not meant. Monks' Bu-Pc 65 uses the word *upasampādeti*, and Nuns' Bi-

BD 3.x

Pc 61–Bu–Pc 83 *vuṭṭhāpeti*, which the Old Commentary consistently explains by *upasampādeti* as though these two words mean the same thing.

In Monks' **Bu–Pc 65** the boy Upāli and his young friends are recorded to have obtained the consent of their parents to “go forth.” It was necessary for a boy, *putta*, to obtain this sanction¹ for a measure which the Vinaya states must not be accorded a youth, *dāraka*, if he were less than fifteen years of age.² The mistake of the monks, in **Bu–Pc 65**, seems to have been to let these youths go forth and simultaneously to confer the *upasampadā* on them, *pabbājesuṃ upasampādesuṃ*, while they were still under twenty years old. It was the latter step which was here made to entail an offence of expiation, not for the ordinand but for the ordaining monks; elsewhere it is stated that a monk incurs an offence of wrong-doing if he allows a youth under fifteen to go forth.³ It would therefore seem as if the six boys of whom the *Theragāthā* and its Commentary speak as each one having gone forth, with his parent's consent, at the age of seven,⁴ must antedate the Vinaya ruling, unless some other hypothesis to explain this discrepancy be found. It is tenable to suppose that in the early days of the Order a person might be admitted to its ranks by being ordained at the same time as he was allowed to go forth. The splitting of this early double process into two parts—allowing to go forth and ordination, as well as the minimum age clauses governing the legality of carrying out either process—was doubtless a later introduction into the growing monastic machinery.

In the *sikkhāpadas* of Monks' **Bu–Pc 65** and Nuns' **Bi–Pc 71–Bi–Pc 73**, the two words *puggala* and *kumāribhūtā*, respectively used to designate the kind of person not to be ordained if he or she were not yet twenty, are striking enough to arrest attention. *Puggala* is most unfortunately not noticed by the Old Commentary on Monks' **Bu–Pc 65**. But I suspect it here to have a monastic intention, as it has when it occurs as the third member of the triad *saṅgha*, *gaṇa*, *puggala*, Order, group, individual (monk). Another form of this triad

¹ **Vin 1.83.** ² **Vin 1.79.** ³ **Vin 1.79.** ⁴ *Psalms of the Bretheren* 37f., 60f., 73, 220, 231f., 233f.

is *saṅgha*, *sambahulā bhikkhū*, *eka bhikkhu*, where *eka bhikkhu* balances *puggala* and *sambahulā bhikkhū* balances *gaṇa*. The feminine equivalent of this triad supplies additional evidence for the merging of *puggala* and *bhikkhu*. For those parts of the legislative apparatus affecting nuns provide no exact counterpart to *puggala*, since the one word, *ekabhikkhunī*, one nun, does duty in the nuns' triad for the two words, *puggala* and *eka bhikkhu*, of the monks' triads. Moreover, *Nissaggiya* regulations for forfeiture make it clear that the use of these two words, *puggala* and *eka bhikkhu*, is derived more from some convention than from any desire to discriminate between the meaning, status or functions of the subject denoted by either.

Although the term *puggala* thus to some extent acquired the technical sense of “monk” in monastic terminology, it continued to be in vogue among the laity and also to be widely used by monks in talking of them. In addition lay life had the words *purisa*, man, male, and *kumāra*, boy. Monks also made use of these words, but perhaps more for the purpose of addressing or referring to men and boys (or girls, *kumāriyo*), still “in the world”¹ than for addressing or referring to members of the Order. *Purisa* and *kumāraka* are defined respectively at [Vin 4.334](#) as having attained and as not having attained to twenty years of age. But at [Vin 4.269](#), [Vin 4.316](#) *purisa* is defined as “a human man (or male person *manussapurisa*), not a *yakkha*, not a *peta*, not an animal.”

If a *purisa* or *kumāra* went forth he was no longer distinguished by these appellations, which savoured of the world; he became known as a *bhikkhu*, a monk, and as such might be further differentiated, for example as an elder, a teacher, a preceptor, a pupil, a novice, or a *puggala*. Regarded as *puggala* in its technical sense of individual (monk), a monk called *puggala* for any special purpose or reason would have certain rights and duties in the monastic structure, even before he received the *upasampadā*, ordination. After this had been conferred on him, and he had entered on to the different rights and

¹ Cf. [AN i.136f.](#), where Hatthaka of Ālavī is addressed by the lord as *kumāra*; and [AN iii.37](#) where the lord addresses girls newly joining their husbands' families as *kumāriyo*.

duties of a full member of the Order, he yet remained liable to be designated as either *bhikkhu* or *puggala*.

With the absence from the monks' terminology of the word *kumāra* as a description applicable to a monk while under twenty,¹ and therefore before he was ripe for full ordination, it is odd to find *kumāribhūtā*, a feminine form, of *kumāra*, applied to maidens under twenty, but who, because they are represented as having the *upasampadā* conferred on them, must already have gone forth and so be in some way members of the Order: probably, novices, *sāmaṇerī*, as the Old Commentary states, or probationers.

That the admissibility of using *puggala*, monkish man, instead of *bhikkhu*, monk, was not unknown to the Aṅguttara compilers, is apparent from AN iii.269, where their fellows in the godly life, *sabrahmacārī*, might engage in criticism, a Vinaya expression,² if they "lived in communion," also a Vinaya expression, with such men *puggalehi*, as are cemetery-like. Here the word *puggala*, from its association with *sabrahmācarī*, is at once marked as having a monastic reference. Similarly at AN iii.270 the dangers of becoming devoted to one person, *puggala*, show that person to be conceived of as a monk. And at AN i.33 the word *puggala* turns out to be used of Makkhali Gosāla, the leader of a rival sect, but still a recluse who has renounced the world, not a householder.

Conversely both the Devadūta Sutta and Vagga³ show Yama, the lord of death, addressing *ekacco*, "a certain one," as *purisa* in a context which clearly indicates *ekacco* to be not a monk but a person in the world. Again, AN iii.171-172, in speaking of a "good man," a donor, meaning a man "in the world," calls him *sap-purisa*; and examples could be multiplied.

Now to suggest that the Vinaya and sometimes other parts of the canon use *puggala* to designate a man who is a monk, is not to say that the term, as applying to male persons in general, vanished from either the monastic or the lay vocabularies. The Aṅguttara alone provides plenty of evidence to the contrary, with its mantra

¹ Cf. definition of *kumāra* at Vin 4.334. ² See Vin 4.152, Vin 4.154, Vin 4.331.

³ MN 130 and AN i.138.

occurring thirteen times: “There are in the world three sorts of) men,” and thirty-six times “four (sorts of) men,”¹ *puggala*. Nor can it be said that the use of *purisa* as referring either to man as *homo* or as “man in he world” (as against in the houseless state), entailed to complete lapse from the monks’ vocabulary as a arm applying to monks. At the same time it may be marked that when so used there is a tendency for it to appear in a compound with another word affixed to it.

For example, *mahā-purisa* occurs as an honorific title ascribed to Gotama, the great recluse; and a monk endowed with certain factors² or engaged on certain high mental work³ is called *uttama-purisa*, the highest man. At **Vin 4.63**, **Vin 4.65** nuns are recorded to address monks obliquely as *agga-purisa*, the chief, topmost men. Yet although people, human kind, are often denoted by the term *manussa*, it is not unreasonable to see *purisa* in these two Vinaya passages as equivalent to *homosapiens*, man and woman. For the nuns, I think, were not saying that the monks were the chief of all males, but only of the present company; and that consisted of monks and nuns.

There is also the interesting compound *purisa-puggala*, “male person,”⁴ which in various Vinaya passages seems to be useful when reference is intended at one and the same time to men of the world and men of the cloister. In Nuns’ *Pārājika* **Bi-Pj 5**, **Bi-Pj 8** and **Bi-Ss 5**, *purisapuggala* is defined in the same way as *purisa* in their **Bi-Pc 11**, **Bi-Pc 12** and **Bi-Pc 60**. The first word in this definition is *manussa-purisa*, a human male. This will embrace monks and non-monks. For however much nuns may be shown on these six occasions to have behaved unsuitably with men in the world, called *purisapuggala* and *purisa*, the legislation on such behaviour was extended to cover the conduct of nuns towards monks in similar circumstances. I think it highly probable that in Nuns’ **Bi-Pj 5**, **Bi-Pj 8** and **Bi-Ss 5**, the monkish *puggala* was added to the worldly *purisa*, and that in **Bi-Pc 11**, **Bi-Pc 12**,

¹ See GS ii, Introduction, p. xi. ² AN v.16; SN iii.61. ³ SN ii.278. ⁴ So translated, GS iii.156, and see also GS iii.274 n. See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, “Vanished Sakyan Window,” *Wayfarer’s Words*, ii.622, for further references.

and Bi-Pc 60 the worldly *purisa* was defined as *manussapurisa*, human male, so as to leave the nuns no grounds for arguing that these rules did not apply to their behaviour equally with monks as with men leading the household life. Thus the word *purisapuggala* was used to place beyond all doubt the need for nuns to refrain from acting undesirably either with men in the world or with monks and recluses. But when this word was not used, the same sense was achieved by the Old Commentary's definition of *purisa* as *manussa-purisa*. For both this and *purisapuggala* express the male of the human species under the double aspect of householder and monk.

The same line of argument could doubtless be applied to the eight *purisapuggala* mentioned at AN iii.212. Here the Order is not called the Order of monks, *bhikkusaṅgha*, but the Order of disciples, *sāvakaṅgha*, which at once enlarges the scope of *saṅgha* to include lay as well as monastic disciples. For by the eight *purisapuggala* are meant those on the four ways and those who have attained the fruits of the ways, achievements, as many records testify, not confined to monks alone, but won too by lay disciples. Very likely the force of *purisapuggala* is here to include potentially both male lay disciples and monks; but to exclude women, both female lay disciples and nuns, not necessarily through a desire to depreciate them, for many are recorded to have gained the ways and the fruits, but merely because the sight of the "white-frocked householder," Anāthapiṇḍika, inspired the lord to address Sāriputta with his mind focussed on men.

My conclusion, however tentative it may be, is that for Vinaya interpretation, the question of whether man became "lessened in worth as man, as *homo*, by the word *puggala*, male, being used for *purisa*, the older form"¹ is beside the point, for with Vinaya we are in the region of technicalities. Whatever the intrinsic meaning of these two words, whatever their age, their worth, both were needed in the monastic scheme and idiom, the one, *puggala*, acquiring a special and technical meaning equivalent to "monk"; and the other, *purisa*, being

¹ GS ii, Introduction, p. xi; Cf. GS iii.247, n.

used both as a term of honour among monks and also as carrying particular reference to men who were not monks.

THE SEKHIYAS

The rules for training, *sekhiyā dhammā*, numbering seventy-five, are the same for monks and nuns. Several interesting points arise. In the first place, the provenance for all except **Bu-Sk 51**, **Bu-Sk 55**, **Bu-Sk 56** is given as Sāvattthī. Secondly, the principal actors in the stories leading up to each “training to be observed” are invariably said to be the group of six monks, and then in the Nuns’ *Sekhiyas*, the group of six nuns. Thirdly, an offence of wrong-doing is incurred by any monk or nun who, out of disrespect, *yo(yā)anādariyaṃ paṭicca*, flies in the face of the training promulgated. These two items: “out of disrespect” and offence of wrong-doing, are common to all the trainings to be observed. Fourthly, the trainings fall into three groups:

1. **Bu-Sk 1–Bu-Sk 56** are concerned with such etiquette and decent, polite behaviour as is to be shown by a monk or nun when visiting houses for almsfood;
2. **Bu-Sk 57–Bu-Sk 72** are concerned with a regard to be accorded *dhamma*, for they rule that it should not be taught to people who, because of this circumstance or that, would be shutting the door to both a respectful giving and a respectful hearing of *dhamma*,
3. **Bu-Sk 73–Bu-Sk 75** are concerned with unsuitable ways of obeying the calls of nature and of spitting.

These matters would no doubt have lost some of their first importance once Buddhism became triumphantly established, although their force as a guide to good manners has been in no way diminished by the passage of time. But when in its infancy early Buddhism was groping its way, seeking to attract adherents in a very critical world which had a big choice of teachings and opinions before it, when it was in fact competing with other sects, it was necessary for

it to do all in its power to make itself acceptable and to arrange its external features in such a way as not to jeopardise any chances of a fair hearing for its message.

According to the early Buddhist way of thinking, no attempt should be made to kindle faith in this message unless people showed they were ready to listen in humility to what would be taught. A very interesting example occurs in the *Saṃyutta*.¹ A monk, Udayin,² is shown refusing to speak *dhamma* to a brahmin lady so long as she sat down on a high seat,³ put on her sandals,⁴ and muffled up (veiled) her head.⁵ We here get a monk scrupulously keeping three of the “rules for training.” He is shown as willing to speak *dhamma* to a woman, but not until she learns of the respect due to it, and which her pupil eventually tells her about. And when at last he is portrayed as teaching *dhamma* to this woman, even then, in compliance with **Bu-Pc 7**, he does not use more than six sentences⁶: arahants point out pleasure-pain when there is eye, when there is tongue, when there is mind, but do not point it out when there is not eye, tongue or mind. No doubt Udayin regarded the brahmin lady’s pupil as the “learned man” whose presence was required by the rule of **Bu-Pc 7** when a monk was teaching *dhamma* to a woman.⁷

A striking parallel to the *Sekhiya* rules for training in manners is to be found in Clement of Alexandria’s *Paedagogus (Instructor)*.⁸ Clement was apparently beset by the same kind of preoccupations and faced by the same kind of bad manners as were those who drew up the *Sekhiyas*. His own code of polite, civilised behaviour which he vigorously hoped his fellow Christians would adopt has been put in a nutshell by T.R. GLOVER,⁹ whom I cannot do better than quote. He says: “Clement of Alexandria has much to say to Christians about the minutiae of manners; they must not scratch themselves or spit in public; they should not guffaw, nor twitch, nor crack their fingers, nor fidget; they must not eat or drink in uncouth styles. Very trifling?”

¹ SN iv.121ff. ² There were three of this name, see KS iv.77, n. 2. ³ Bu-Sk 69.

⁴ Bu-Sk 61, Bu-Sk 62. ⁵ Bu-Sk 67. ⁶ SN iv.123. ⁷ BD 2.206. ⁸ Translated in *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. iv; CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, vol. i., Edinburgh, 1871. ⁹ *The Disciple*, Cambridge, 1941, p. 33.

No, not at all trifling; for these little things annoy the people to whom you have to appeal, to whom Christ has sent you with a message which it is important for them to hear." Thus India in the sixth and fifth centuries before Christ, and Egypt in the second century after, had the acumen to perceive the value of decorum and good manners in facilitating the growth of friendly interest, even faith, in the new religious ventures experienced by each of these two richly endowed countries.

NUNS' PĀTIMOKKHA RULES

The whole of the Bhikkhunivibhaṅga, the framework together with the statement of the Pātimokkha rules for nuns, falls within this volume. The rules themselves, the *sikkhāpada*, although in isolation from their framework, have been translated by B.C. LAW in two of his works.¹ The list of rules which he gives, telescoping here and there those which have the same tendency, is as useful as a swift guide to the discipline for nuns as is Rhys Davids's and Oldenberg's corresponding treatment of the discipline for monks.² Waldschmidt has made a comparison of the Pali text of the nuns' rules with the Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan texts obtaining among various of the schools.³ This study naturally necessitated a translation of each rule (into German), although a complete translation of the whole of the nuns' *Vibhaṅga*, that is of the introductory stories, the Old Commentarial material as well as of the rules themselves, would have been beside the point for his purpose. Such a translation occurs, I believe, for the first time in the present volume of the *Book of the Discipline*.

Both in regard to its grouping and its arrangement of the material surrounding each rule, the Nuns' *Vibhaṅga* is planned on exactly the same lines as the Monks'. There is thus a *Pārājika* group, a *Śaṅghādis-*

¹ *Women in Buddhist Literature*, p. 80ff., and *History of Pali Literature*, i.72ff., which corrects the omission of a "not" in the former, in item (10). ² *Sacred Books of the East XIII*. ³ E. WALDSCHMIDT, *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins*, *Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte*, Heft iii, Leipzig, 1926.

esa, a *Nissaggiya Pācittiya*, a *Pācittiya*, a *Pāṭidesaniya*, a *Sekhiya* and an *Adhikaraṇasamathā dhammā* group. The contents of these last two appear to be exact copies, substituting “nun” for “monk,” of the corresponding groups for monks. The nuns have no *Aniyatas* or undetermined offences.

The Pali *Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga*, as it has come down to us, is somewhat misleading in appearance. For the four *Pārājikas*, the ten *Saṅghādisesas*, the twelve *Nissaggiyas*, the ninety-six *Pācittiyas* and the eight *Pāṭidesaniyas* there set forth for nuns do not represent, except in the last case, the total number of rules which, according to the *Vibhaṅga*'s reckoning, fall into these various classes. They represent only those which have to be observed *solely* by nuns, and which are therefore not included in the discipline laid down for monks. The introductory sentence and the concluding paragraph attached to each class of rules in the *Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga* refer respectively to eight *Pārājika*, seventeen *Saṅghādisesa*, thirty *Nissaggiya*, a hundred and sixty-six *Pācittiya* and eight *Pāṭidesaniya* rules for nuns, and state that all of these come up for recitation. In effect, therefore, the nuns have not fewer but as many as eighty-four more rules to keep than have the monks. Traditionally those which do not appear in the Nuns' *Vibhaṅga* are held to be comprised in the Monks' *Vibhaṅga*; and they are also held to be as binding on nuns as they are on monks in spite of their being recorded in the Monks' *Vibhaṅga* only.

We may therefore regard the Nuns' *Vibhaṅga* in its present form as an abridged version of some more complete *Vibhaṅga* for nuns. This hypothesis is to some extent strengthened by a surviving fragment of a few lines belonging to the Tibetan *Bhikṣunī Prātimokṣa*. This fragment has been published by FINOT.¹ It contains only the end of one article and the beginning of another, but these can be easily identified as *Saṅghādisesas* for nuns corresponding to Monks' **Bu-Ss 8** and **Bu-Ss 9**. The survival of this fragment tempts us to presume as not impossible a time when a Nuns' *Pātimokkha* existed in full, and when it was not cut down, as it now is in the Pali *Vibhaṅga*, to include

¹ *Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins*, Appendix, Journal Asiatique, 1913, p. 548.

no more than those rules held to be incumbent only on nuns, and to exclude those others which, while being preserved only in the *Vibhaṅga* for monks, which naturally shows that monks should observe them, are also traditionally held to form part of the authorised discipline for nuns.

The rules which the Nuns' *Vibhaṅga* assumes to exist and to be binding on nuns, but which are not now to be found in that *Vibhaṅga*, have been identified by Buddhaghosa with various rules in the Monks' *Vibhaṅga*. And, in various parts of his *Vinaya Commentary*,¹ he has named such rules as he holds to be observable by both sides of the Order. With the exception of Finot's fragment, this great commentator is our sole authority for those rules for nuns which are supposed to be included in the Monks' *Vibhaṅga*, and which, although they are not incorporated in the existing form of the Pali *Bhikkhunivibhaṅga*, are traditionally held to be operative not only for monks but for nuns as well.

If we accept Buddhaghosa's opinions, the nuns' eight *Pārājikas* appear to consist of those four laid down in the Nuns' *Pārājika* class in addition to those four laid down in the Monks' *Pārājika* class. While therefore the nuns have four *Pārājika* rules peculiar to themselves, and hence four in excess of the number laid down for monks, there are on the other hand no *Pārājikas* peculiar to monks, since their complete set of four is also regarded as binding on nuns.

This is farther borne out by the occurrence of the word *pi* (too, also), in the *sikkhāpada* not only of the last three but also of the first of the Nuns' *Pārājikas*: *ayam pi pārājikā hoti*, "she too becomes one who is defeated," which means, according to the Old Commentary, that "she is so called in reference to the former (or preceding)." The presence of the word *pi* in the text of the "rule" of Nuns' **Bi-Pj 5** is significant. The Reference which it implies is to all foregoing *Pārājikas*. Among the total of eight *Pārājikas*, *pi* is absent only from Monks' **Bu-Pj 1**, where the corresponding phrase merely runs *pārājiko hoti*. Thus each of

¹ Vin-a 906, Vin-a 915, Vin-a 947, Vin-a 948. Failure to appreciate this important point invalidates most of Miss D.N. BHAGVAT's argument in her *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence*, p. 164ff.

the remaining seven rules is held to concur, through its use of *pi*, in connecting itself with whatever may be the number, one to seven, of *Pārājika* rules which has preceded it. Had *pi* been absent from Nuns' *Bi-Pj 5*, then where it occurs in their *Bi-Pj 6–Bi-Pj 8*, it would no doubt normally have been taken to refer to their *Bi-Pj 5* only, as the beginning of a series. But its occurrence in *Bi-Pj 5* itself pushes this beginning further back still: to the Monks' *Pārājika* class.

The Nuns' *Pārājika* rules further exhibit a curious and unparalleled feature, in that each rule is, in the "rule" itself, named after the woman who does the action giving rise to the particular offence which the rules severally aim at checking. This name is not commented upon by the Old Commentary because, as Buddhaghosa says (Vin-a 901), "It is only the name of the one who is defeated." She may be one who touched (a man) above his knees (*Bi-Pj 5*); one who conceals a fault (*Bi-Pj 6*); one who imitates a monk who has been suspended (by the Order) (*Bi-Pj 7*); or one who does eight things (*Bi-Pj 8*), that is, indulges in the eight kinds of dealings with men enumerated in the "rule" of *Bi-Pj 8*. These are the offences against which the Nuns' *Pārājikas* legislate.

It should be noticed that, just as part of the Old Commentary's definition of a monk who is defeated is that he is not a son of the Sakyans, *asakyaputtiya*, so part of its definition of a nun who is defeated is that she is not a daughter of the Sakyans, *asakyadhītā*. This latter appellation occurs again in Nuns' *Bi-Ss 10*, but in the positive, *sakyadhītā*.

In their *Saṅghādisesa* class the nuns are said to have seventeen rules of this type, although only ten are there set forth. The monks have thirteen. According to Buddhaghosa, six out of these thirteen rules are applicable to monks only, the remaining seven being observable by nuns as well. He indicates these latter to be Monks' *Bu-Ss 5*, *Bu-Ss 8*, *Bu-Ss 9*, all of which become offences at once (*paṭhamāpattika*), and Monks' *Bu-Ss 10–Bu-Ss 13*, which constitute the whole of the subdivision where offences become so on the third admonition of a monk or nun by other monks or nuns respectively (*yāvataṭṭhika*).

The wording of the Monks' *Saṅghādisesa* "rules" offers an interesting contrast to that of the Nuns' *Saṅghādisesa* "rules." For each of the monks' rules names the penalty incurred in the briefest possible way, simply by using the one word *saṅghādiseso*, "there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order." This holds good of the two groups into which the *Saṅghādisesa* offences are divided: those where the offences are so at once, and those where they are so on the third (and unsuccessful) admonition. The monks' rules do not explicitly mention these two groups by name, but their existence is recognised by the internal evidence of the "rules" themselves, especially in the case of the second group, that comprising Monks' **Bu-Ss 10–Bu-Ss 13**; and also by the paragraph which, in concluding the Monks' *Saṅghādisesa* Section, places nine of these offences under group (1) and four under group (2). In the Nuns' *Saṅghādisesa* "rules" the nature of the offence is stated more explicitly and therefore at greater length than in the monks'. In fact, not one word, but a sentence is used: *ayam pi bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ (yāvataṭṭhāyikaṃ) dhammaṃ āpannā nisāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ*, that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence at once (on the third admonition), entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away.

Now this sentence contains several interesting points. In the first place, the *pi*, although occurring unfailingly in **Bi-Ss 2–Bi-Ss 13**, does not occur in the "rule" of **Bi-Ss 1**, so that this cannot be held to pay any reference to preceding, that is, on the analogy of the *Pārājikas*, to the Monks' *Saṅghādisesas*, or in particular to those seven of them which Buddhaghosa asseverates to be operative for both sides of the Order: Monks' **Bu-Ss 5, Bu-Ss 8–Bu-Ss 13**. The absence of *pi* from this context raises the question whether, when the *Saṅghādisesa* standing first in the nuns' class was drawn up, those others now found only in the monks' class, but said to be observable also by nuns, were in actual fact *not* already framed, and hence incapable of forming a point of reference for Nuns' **Bi-Ss 1**.

We have no conclusive evidence one way or the other on which to base an answer to this question. All that can be said is that there

is nothing inherent in Nuns' **Bi-Ss 1** to lead us to assign its formulation to a date, posterior to the formulation of those seven which are posited by Buddhaghosa as common to both sides of the Order. In fact, had it not been that Monks' **Bu-Ss 12** were included in this list,¹ there would have been certain grounds for regarding Nuns' **Bi-Ss 1** as belonging to a date earlier than any of these others, with the possible exception of one of them, and therefore as a matter of history unable to refer to them. For Monks' **Bu-Ss 8** and **Bu-Ss 9** speak of a "legal question," **Bu-Ss 10** and **Bu-Ss 11** of a schism, both of which, in order to come into being, needed a certain amount of time to elapse after the inception of the Order. **Bu-Ss 13**, without our looking further than the length at which its "rule" is stated, suggests comparative lateness in formulation. **Bu-Ss 5**, that against being a go-between, is alone of these rules non-committal as to its possible date.

We thus get one rule (**Bu-Ss 5**) from which nothing can be gleaned as to its comparative age, one which suggests comparative earliness (**Bu-Ss 12**), and five which suggest comparative lateness (**Bu-Ss 8–Bu-Ss 11**, **Bu-Ss 13**). Yet this evidence, which is in any case no more than tentative, is in addition neither sufficiently sound nor consistent to warrant our definitely ascribing to these *Saṅghādisesa*s a date later in time than that of Nuns' **Bi-Ss 1**, that penalising a nun for speaking in envy of householders or recluses. Thus the absence of *pi* here must remain something of a mystery, unless we care to subscribe to the hypothesis which I have just advanced.

In the second place, each rule of the *Saṅghādisesa*s set forth in the nuns' class states precisely the type to which belongs the *Saṅghādisesa* offence into which the nun has fallen, whether it is that where an offence becomes one at once or after the third admonition. It is not uninteresting to note in passing, although it is not important, that the word for offence, *āpatti*, is comprised in the name of the first type of *Saṅghādisesa* offence, called *paṭhamāpattika*, but not in the second, called *yāvataṭṭhika*, where therefore it has to be understood.

¹ See **BD 1, Introduction, p. xv** for this *Saṅghādisesa*, possibly representing some specially ancient fragment of the *Pātimokkha*.

In the third place, the *Saṅghādisesa* offence, because it is grammatically constructed as that into which a nun has fallen, takes the accusative case, as against the nominative in the Monks' class. Moreover it is associated with the word *nissāraṇīya*, also in the accusative. The phrase *nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ*, meaning "(an offence) entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away," should be compared with the similar construction: *Nissaggiyaṃ Pācittiyaṃ*, "(an offence) of expiation involving forfeiture." In the Monks' *Saṅghādisesa*s there is no mention of *nissāraṇīyaṃ*. Waldschmidt translates the last sentence of the Nuns' *Saṅghādisesa* rules as¹: "*diese Nonne wird schuldig des 3-Vergehens muss auf(ge)geben (werden) (nissāraṇīyam) saṅghāvaśeṣa.*" This does not say what it is that "must be caused to be sent away." But Buddhaghosa (Vin-a 908) states that it is the nun who must be caused to be sent away from the Order (ablative) and not the offence. Oldenberg's suggestion that the correct reading at Old Commentary on *Bi-Ss 12* (where the offence is attributed to nuns, plural) is *nissāriyanti*, is therefore doubtless right, and the Mahīśāsaka version, quoted by WALDSCHMIDT²: "*diese Nonne 3 Ermahnungs-Vergehen, saṅghāvaśeṣa, muss remütig bekannt werden,*" wrong.

The phrase "involving being sent away" does not at all imply that the offending nun is to be sent away from the Order for good, nor did the Order let go of its erring members so lightly. It would seem to mean that she would be sent away for the time being probably because admonition, although it had been tried, had failed, and that during this time she would cease to be regarded as a full member of the Order. As the Old Commentary explains: "The Order imposes the *mānatta* discipline for her offence, it sends her back to the beginning (of her probationary course as nun, not as probationer) and (then) it rehabilitates her." This definition of *Saṅghādisesa* is identical with that of this same word in the Monks' *Saṅghādisesa* section. Lapse in full membership is of a temporary nature and lasting only

¹ E. WALDSCHMIDT, *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣunī-pratimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins*, p. 91.

² *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣunī-pratimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins*, p. 91.

a fortnight¹ while the offender is undergoing the *mānatta* discipline before, in the case of a nun, both Orders, as part of her penalty for having committed an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. *Nissāraṇīya*, involving being sent away, adds nothing new to the penalty. It is not something extra to the *Saṅghādisesa* penalty incurred by a nun, and hence marks no difference in the penalty imposed on monks and nuns for having committed such an offence. Only the word, as found in each “rule” of the Nuns’ *Saṅghādisesas*, is extra.

Wrong and right kinds of *nissāraṇā*, “the causing to be sent away,” are expounded at **Vin 1.321**, with an implied opposition to *osāraṇā*, “the causing to be restored,” at **Vin 1.322**. Vin-a 1147 concerns itself with two kinds of *nissāraṇā*, the one appearing to be by an act of banishment, and the other by an act imposing certain disabilities.

In the *Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga*, there are twice stated to be thirty *Nissaggiya* rules for nuns (the same number as for monks) although only twelve are there recorded. For these twelve are peculiar to nuns and are not regarded as operating for monks. From Buddhaghosa we learn that eighteen *Nissaggiya* rules pertained to both Orders; therefore there are also twelve peculiar to the monks. Buddhaghosa arrives at the eighteen common to both sides of the Order by a process of exclusion. They are as follows: bhikkhu **Bu-NP 1–Bu-NP 3, Bu-NP 6–Bu-NP 10, Bu-NP 18–Bu-NP 20, Bu-NP 22, Bu-NP 23, Bu-NP 25–Bu-NP 30**. At the same time he explains the composition of the *Vaggas* (divisions of the rules usually into groups of ten each) in the *Nissaggiya* Section for nuns. These, comprising the twelve rules peculiar to nuns and the eighteen to be observed by nuns as well as by monks, although these latter are stated only in the Monks’ *Vibhaṅga*, work out as follows:

- Bhikkhunī *Nissaggiya*, Vagga 1 = **Bu-NP 1, Bu-NP 2, Bu-NP 3, Bu-NP 6, Bu-NP 7, Bu-NP 8, Bu-NP 9, Bu-NP 10** (8) + **Bi-NP 2, Bi-NP 3** (2).

¹ **Vin 4.242**; see below, **BD 3.3.212**.

- Bhikkhunī Nissaggiya, Vagga 2 = Bu-NP 18, Bu-NP 19, Bu-NP 20 (3) + Bi-NP 4, Bi-NP 5, Bi-NP 6, Bi-NP 7, Bi-NP 8, Bi-NP 9, Bi-NP 10 (7).
- Bhikkhunī Nissaggiya, Vagga 3 = Bu-NP 22, Bu-NP 23, Bu-NP 25, Bu-NP 26, Bu-NP 27, Bu-NP 28, Bu-NP 30 (7) + Bi-NP 1, Bi-NP 11, Bi-NP 12 (3).

Of the hundred and sixty-six *Pācittiya*s which tradition computes for the nuns, ninety-six are set forth in their section. These ninety-six with the ninety-two set forth for monks together amount to a hundred and eighty-eight. Buddhaghosa works out that twenty-two *Pācittiya* rules, which he enumerates, are incumbent on monks only. The remaining seventy therefore, which are applicable to members of both Orders, bring the nuns' given total of ninety-six up to their actual total of a hundred and sixty-six.

In the nuns' *Pāṭidesaniya* section, eight rules are stated, and since eight is given as the total number, not one is here suppressed. Thus monks and nuns share no *Pāṭidesaniya* rules, the nuns having these eight and the monks their four.

A comparison of the monks' rules and those for nuns will show these together to contain:

1. Rules which owing to their subject matter could apply to one side of the Order only and not to both, as for example Monks' Bu-Ss 1; and also Bu-Ss 6, Bu-Ss 7 and Bu-NP 29 which, doubtless because nuns were not supposed to dwell alone or go about singly (Bi-Ss 3), could not be taken to apply to them. For this same reason their Bi-Ss 3 would have no point as a rule incumbent on monks;
2. Monks' rules which could apply to nuns but which do not, for example Bu-NP 11–Bu-NP 15, Bu-NP 16, Bu-NP 24;
3. Nuns' rules which could apply to monks but which do not, for example Bi-Ss 10–Bi-Ss 13, and all of their *Nissaggiya*s.

Moreover, the position is even more intricate than it might ap-

pear. For example, Nuns' **Bi-NP 1** has an affinity with Monks' **Bu-NP 21** (not held in common); **Bi-NP 3** is similar to Monks' **Bu-NP 25** (held in common); and **Bi-NP 6** and **Bi-NP 8** resemble Monks' **Bu-NP 30** (held in common). Further, Nuns' **Bi-Ss 11** may be compared with Monks' **Bu-Pc 63** and **Bu.Pc.79**, for although they are not exactly similar, all three concur in their mention of some dissatisfaction evinced by a monk or nun after the settlement of a legal question or after the carrying out of a formal act by the Order. Again, there is a very marked correspondence between Nuns' **Bi-Ss 12** and Monks' **Bu-Pc 64**, with both of which Nuns' **Bi-Pj 6** may also be compared. Why the monks should incur a lesser penalty than the nuns for a similar kind of offence is a problem not yet solved, but it is an occurrence of some frequency, of which an instance is noticed by Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 902.

The reduction of the rules to the three categories mentioned above seems to me to strengthen the view that rules were not promulgated in advance of the commission of offences, but as a result, their formulation thus in the main depending upon conduct which had actually taken place. This hypothesis would account for the inclusion of identical rules entailing identical penalties in the Pātimokkha of both Orders; for the resemblance, but without actual identity, of rules found in one Pātimokkha to those found in the other; for the not negligible degree of overlapping where similar or comparable offences entail dissimilar penalties in the case of each Order; and for the non-appearance in one Pātimokkha or the other of rules which, from the point of view of their subject matter, might suitably have found a place in it. To ascribe the inclusion or exclusion of such rules to pure chance is no explanation. Had the rules been drafted in advance of the commission of offences, it would have been a comparatively simple matter for the early "editors" to have kept apart all of those, and not merely a selection of them, which could have only a one-sided application, and to have set forth all the remainder as observable by members of both branches, of the Order. But because the drafting of rule and penalty follows a less simple, and

less obvious course, we may justifiably consider the composition of the *Pātimokkhas* to have been determined by the compelling hand of historical event and happening.

The critics, whose complaints of the nuns' behaviour is shown to result in the formulation of rules for nuns, are for the most part the "modest nuns." Seventy-four times they are recorded to be vexed and annoyed. "People" are recorded to have made criticisms thirty-two times. To these must be added the complaints of a man, of a Licchavi, of the keeper of a field, of prostitutes, of parents and husband, of a family, once each; of a brahmin and of a guild, twice each; of nuns, three times; and of monks, four times. Only once, in **Bi-Pc 21**, are no criticisms recorded, the nuns concerned telling other nuns, these the monks, and these the lord.

The locus of the introductory stories to all the rules in the *Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga* is, with seven exceptions only, given as Sāvattthī. Four stories, **Bi-Pc 10**, **Bi-Pc 39**, **Bi-Pc 40**, **Bi-Pc 81**, are set in Rājagaha, two, **Bi-Pc 5** and **Bi-Pc 58**, in Kapilavatthu, and one, **Bi-Pc 52**, in Vesālī. Without attempting to draw any inference as to why such a huge majority are attached to Sāvattthī, it may not be uninteresting to look at those stories and their rules which are said to emanate from other places.

Bi-Pc 10, which opens in the same way as Monks' **Bu-Pc 37**, had to be set in Rājagaha because of its need to refer to a festival which used to be held on a mountain top nearby. This was made the occasion in the Monks' *Pācittiya* for the prohibition of eating at the wrong time; while in the Nuns' *Pācittiya* it gave rise to the ban on their seeing (*dassana*, also able to mean "perceiving, noticing") dancing, singing and music.¹

Bi-Pc 39 and **Bi-Pc 40** are concerned with nuns' conduct during and after the rains. Similar events, connected with monks, are recorded in the *Mahāvagga*² when again the lord is said to have been

¹ Possibly in Ancient India, as in old Malabar, singing and music took on the character of miming and acting. If so, "seeing" would be as apt a term as "hearing."

² **Vin 1.79**, **Vin 1.137**, **Vin 1.138**.

in Rājagaha. This town therefore, besides its other claims to fame, may be regarded as a source of rules for the rains.

In **Bi-Pc 81**, Thullanandā, although herself not particularly connected with Rājagaha, is shown in association with the schismatic monks headed by Devadatta. Now these, in Monks' **Bu-Ss 10**, **Bu-Pc 11** and **Bu-Pc 29** for example, are the leading personages in narratives which purport to refer to times when the lord was staying in Rājagaha, and thus themselves seem to have frequented this place. Because this *Pācittiya* needed to make use of them, a good reason is forthcoming to account for its locus being given as Rājagaha.

Nuns' **Bi-Pc 58** appears to be complementary to Monks' **Bu-Pc 23**, the one rebuking nuns for not going to monks for exhortation, and the other rebuking monks for going to a nunnery to exhort nuns. Since Monks' **Bu-Pc 23** is for some reason set in Kapilavatthu, although the other exhortation rules belong to Sāvattihī, it is consistent to set the complementary rule for nuns also in Kapilavatthu. It may in fact have been the source of these two rules, for the legislation on exhortation went through several vicissitudes before being finally settled.

The motive ascribing **Bi-Pc 5** to a time when the lord was likewise said to be staying at his birthplace, although less obvious, is more interesting. For here we may be up against a rule the need of which began to be felt at a comparatively early date. Mahāpajāpati, one of the very few nuns shown to have direct access to the lord, is present, as recorded, and in converse with him. Yet, since she was his aunt, she could not have been much with him towards the end of his life when he came to reside more and more at Sāvattihī. Moreover, this *Pācittiya* is very unusual in leading up to a rule through an "allowance." Perhaps in early days it may have been guidance enough to prescribe allowances, but later a number of causes led to their abuse and hence to the need for a stricter type of regulation, framed in rules and penalties. At all events allowances not seldom appear in contexts which may reasonably be considered to show the influence of some older tradition. I think, too, Indians loving personal cleanli-

ness as they do, the question of the nuns washing themselves—the subject of this *Pācittiya*—would have required legislation reasonably soon after the inception of the female Order.

The rather elaborate introduction in **Bi-Pc 52**, whose locus is given as Vesālī, has no counterpart anywhere in the canon, nor is there any tradition specially connecting the group of six nuns with this place. In regard to the two monks mentioned, Kappitaka and Upāli, it is true that the *Petavatthu* associates Kappitaka with Vesālī, or more exactly with Kapinaccanā, a locality probably nearby, even perhaps the cemetery where according to **Bi-Pc 52** this monk was staying. But with no other canonical reference to Kappitaka, it seems very likely that the *Petavatthu* and its Commentary¹ placed him in Vesālī on the authority of this Vinaya story; and that this placed him here because it veritably was the place where the enraged nuns tried to murder him. He is rather a shadowy monk who fades from the picture, attention being diverted instead to Upāli, whom the nuns are recorded to have abused. Neither the *Pācittiya* nor its Commentary elucidates the identity of this Upāli, but the *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* takes him to be the Vinaya expert. The offence for which the rule legislates is abuse of a monk by a nun. Had the rule been concerned with attempted murder, it would have appeared in the *Pārājika* section, and Kappitaka might then have been more to the fore as the peg on which to hang the rule.

The group of six nuns, more frequently heard of when the lord is not recorded to have been in Vesālī, are often present on occasions when he is said to have been in Sāvattihī.² Thus there is no particular reason to expect Vesālī to be the scene when the activities of these nuns are being recounted, any more than there is when the *thera* Upāli's name is mentioned. His journeyings must have been as extensive as any of the great disciples'.

The group of six nuns formed a useful body to which to fasten misdemeanours. The *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* is of the opinion that the group of six monks was so named because of its six leaders,

¹ Pv 49; Pv-a 230. ² **Vin 2.262, Vin 2.266, Vin 2.269, Vin 2.271, Vin 2.276**; Nuns' **Bi-NP 1, Bi-Pc 2, Bi-Pc 22.**

and that these had nuns also in their following: those referred to as the group of six. Certainly in **Bi-Pc 58** (cf. Monks' **Bu-Pc 23**) the two groups are depicted in connection with one another.

Whether these nuns numbered six, or were the followers of six leaders, or were so called because six was not reckoned among the “lucky” numbers, there are some cases where offences clearly could not have been perpetrated by nuns acting singly but only in concert; for example, when they went to see play-acting (**Bi-Pc 10**), when they went to see a picture gallery (**Bi-Pc 41**), when they travelled in a vehicle (**Bi-Pc 85**), and when they bathed naked at a public ford (**Bi-Pc 2**, **Bi-Pc 21**). For nuns were not allowed to go about alone (**Bi-Ss 3**); therefore such offences had to be attributed to a group acting together. But other offences for which they are made responsible could have been committed as easily within the monastery precincts as in the world outside, and as easily by one nun as by several. In such conventual seclusion as existed, a nun would not have needed associates in order to spin yarn (**Bi-Pc 43**); to learn worldly knowledge (**Bi-Pc 49**), although if she wanted to teach it (**Bi-Pc 50**) she would require other nuns as pupils; to wear women's ornaments (**Bi-Pc 87**); to use perfume and paint (**Bi-Pc 88**); to bathe with scented ground sesamum (**Bi-Pc 89**); or to make a hoard of bowls (**Bi-NP 1**).

The group of six monks is also recorded to have made, a hoard of bowls (Monks' **Bu-NP 21**), so that a certain balance is visible here, although the resulting rule is differently stated in the ease of the two Orders.

I think it as valid to contend that one group did in fact copy the other in this acquisitive behaviour, or even unwittingly behaved in the same way, as it is to hold that the story leading up to the framing of the nuns' rule was copied, by the recensionists, from that of the monks'. For I think that had the group of six nuns been merely fictitious as a group, the “editors” would not have ascribed to them both various offences which could have been as easily attached to “a certain nun” without prejudicing the resulting rule, as well as various offences which had to be shown capable of perpetration only by

a number of nuns acting together. That this course was not adopted appears to me to go to attest the historical reality of a group of nuns, for some reason numbered as six, and their position as the veritable authors of the offences imputed to them.

Ordination.—Two whole divisions, one consisting of ten and the other of thirteen *Pācittiyas*, **Bi-Pc 61–Bi-Pc 70**, **Bi-Pc 71–Bi-Pc 83**, are devoted to the topic of ordination. No other subject in the *Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga* receives a comparable degree of attention. Hence ordination appears to be of outstanding interest and importance. The ceremony itself is not discussed. Of the twenty-four disqualifications precluding the admission of a woman into full membership of the Order, as laid down at **Vin 2.271**, only two, her age and training, are considered in the *Pācittiyas*. Together with these two points, the *Pācittiyas* on ordination are, among other matters, concerned with legislating for or against the admission of women in special circumstances: expectant and nursing mothers, married girls, maidens and probationers; with laying down the kind of treatment to be accorded newly ordained women; with insisting on the necessity to obtain the Order’s “agreement” to train and the “agreement” to receive ordination, and also the “agreement” to confer it; with emphasising the necessity to keep one’s promise to ordain; and with regulating the number of times that each nun might ordain annually, and also the number of candidates whom she might ordain. The whole treatment is very thorough.

The word used throughout these *Pācittiyas* for “to ordain” is *vuṭṭhāpeti*, meaning literally “to raise up,” but always explained by the relevant parts of the Old Commentary as *upasampādeti*, to confer the *upasampadā* ordination. The first step in joining the Order, *pabbajjā*, going forth (from home into homelessness), is not discussed, its occurrence being assumed already to have taken place.

But a complication as to the meaning of *vuṭṭhāpeti* arises through the use of this word in the rule of Nuns’ **Bi-Ss 2**. This, an *ad hoc* rule, makes it an offence for a nun to *vuṭṭhāpeti* a female thief who merits death if she has not obtained permission to do so, on the worldly side,

from either a rajah, a guild or a company (*seṇi*); or on the religious side, from either an Order or a group, *unless* the woman seeking admission to the Order is one who is “allowable.” The Old Commentary explains that there are two ways in which a woman is “allowable”: either because she has gone forth among other sects or because she has gone forth among other nuns. These latter presumably mean those already attached to Gotama’s Order, but belonging to some residence or boundary other than that to which the woman may be subsequently seeking admission.

Although the Old Commentary on **Bi-Ss 2** fails to explain *vuṭṭhāpeti*,¹ in the “rule” of this *Saṅghādisesa* it would appear to mean neither *upasampādeti* nor *pabbajati*, to go forth. This latter word and its causative form, *pabbājeti*, to let go forth, although used throughout the introduction to this rule, are dropped by the rule itself. In their place it employs the term *vuṭṭhāpeti*, a word which, however, does not occur in the introductory story. There are other occasions when the word used in a rule is more precise, more restricted or more inclusive in its scope than that used in the introduction to the rule. This too is a case where the word of the rule is more precise for its purposes, more technically correct than the word of the story.

For here *vuṭṭhāpeti* is meant to be synonymous neither with *upasampādeti* nor with *pabbājeti*. For whatever *vuṭṭhāpeti* may mean in the *Pācittiyas*, and the phrase *upasampadaṃ yāci*, she asked for the *upasampadā* ordination (to be conferred on her), occurring in **Bi-Pc 77** and **Bi-Pc 78**, strongly supports the Old Commentary’s regular and undeviating *Pācittiya* interpretation of it by *upasampādeti*, the internal evidence of **Bi-Ss 2** suggests nothing to imply that *vuṭṭhāpeti* stands there for receiving or conferring the *upasampadā* ordination. The woman thief, who eventually asked Thullanandā to let her go forth, had just run away from her husband and hoped to find sanctuary from his wrath among the nuns. But she had not reached a stage in the monastic career when she might be ordained as a full member. She is represented as asking for no more than to be allowed

¹ Cf. **BD 2, Introduction, p. xxv**, for some other examples of the *Old Commentary*’s omissions, and above, **BD 3. xx**.

to go forth; and it was only in the very early stages of the monastic venture that those who wanted to adopt the religious life asked, and it was always the lord himself whom they are shown as asking, to go forth and to be ordained at one and the same time.

Moreover, in **Bi-Ss 2** it seems as if *vuṭṭhāpeti* cannot mean the same as *pabbājeti*, to let go forth. It is used in connection with a woman thief in circumstances where, if an entrant were going forth for the first time, *pabbājeti* would be expected. A trace of the other meaning of *vuṭṭhāpeti* may therefore linger here, “to raise up” to a higher level of morality and spirituality, to admit a woman to conditions where she might come to see the error of her former ways.

But the usage of *vuṭṭhāpeti* here is also likely to depend I think on the exception which the rule makes legal: that of “receiving” (*vuṭṭhāpeti*) and without having to get permission to do so from either the world or the cloister, a woman-thief who had already gone forth. It is I think because of this, because the woman whom the exception has in mind is envisaged as one already gone forth, some person or some Order having already allowed her to do so, *pabbājeti*, that were this word, *pabbājeti*, used in the rule a technical difficulty would arise. For a word having a technical sense would then be used not precisely in that sense. No one could go forth twice, unless in the meantime he had returned to the household life¹; but the point of the exception to the rule is that such an action has not taken place. Hence in order to show that a nun was not allowing a woman-thief to go forth, as it were for the first time, a word which did not technically imply this had to be chosen. Thus the *vuṭṭhāpeti* of the rule is used in place of the *pabbājeti* of the introductory story.

We must further conclude that there is a difference in the technical significance of *vuṭṭhāpeti* as used in **Bi-Ss 2** and as used in the *Pācittiyas*. In the former it has, because providing for the possibility that someone has already “gone forth,” of necessity to bear some

¹ See **Vin 2.279**; if a woman has left the Order she is not a nun, and if she has joined other sects, and then comes back again and asks for the *upasampadā* to be conferred on her, she may not receive it. Cf. **Vin 1.69**, where a similar ruling is made in regard to men who were formerly members of other sects.

meaning that is different from this admittedly technical term. To “receive” or to “accept” into an Order is perhaps the nearest rendering for which there is any justification, especially if we take it to cover receiving or accepting a woman of doubtful character, with a view to her spiritual regeneration. This interpretation might be compared with the meaning the verb *ullumpati* apparently bears at **Vin 1.57–Vin 1.95**. Here it is said that a man asking the monks for ordination should say, “may the Order, out of compassion for me, raise me up,” *ullumpatu*. The Commentary, Vin-a 984, explains this as, “having made me arise from, what is bad may they (i.e., the Order) establish me in what is good; or, having raised me from the status of a novice may they establish me in the status of a monk.”

In the *Pācittiyas*, on the other hand, *vuṭṭhāpeti* appears to be closely connected with the business of ordaining, on the part of the nuns, a woman who had served her term as a probationer in an Order into full membership of that same Order. A fairly frequent definition of “nun” in Vin 4 is “one ordained by both Orders.” First, a woman had to be “ordained” by the nuns; then she had to pass a similar examination before the monks so as to complete her full ordination. Therefore two words were needed to distinguish these two parts of a woman’s ordination ceremony. The nuns raised her up, *vuṭṭhāpeti*; the monks ordained her fully, *upasampādeti*, finishing what the nuns had begun. But the actual process of ordination was the same for the candidate, and the same questions were put to her, whether she was being examined by a body of nuns or by a body of monks.

Besides the word *vuṭṭhāpeti*, which is a key-word in **Bi-Pc 61–Bi-Pc 83**, several other terms of interest come to the fore in the course of these regulations for ordination, a few of which may now be considered.

In the first place, there is the word *sikkhāmanā*. This, as meaning probationer, refers only to members of the female sex. It is a technical term for a female entrant of a certain standing and with certain duties to fulfil, and has no masculine counterpart. In this it differs from “novice.” For *sāmaṇera* and *sāmaṇerī* both figure in their

respective sides of the Order.

Technically a *sāmaṇera* is different in status from a *bhikkhu*, and a *sāmaṇerī* from both a *sikkhāmanā* and a *bhikkhuni*. For these sometimes appear together as the five classes of people among whom it is legitimate to effect certain transactions,¹ for example giving or accepting robes in exchange (Monks' **Bu-NP 5**, **Bu-Pc 25**). Further, the five are differently defined.² That is to say, the definition of “nun” balances and resembles that of “monk”; the definition of “female novice” balances and resembles that of “male novice,”³ “probationer” alone having no opposite number. Again, “male wanderer” is defined by excluding monk and male novice; “female wanderer” by excluding nun, probationer and female novice.⁴ There is too the women’s testimony, in **Bi-Pc 64**, that having been ordained, they are not probationers but nuns, and therefore are not to be ordered about by other nuns.

I should say that these five classes of persons represent a fundamental classification of the monastic personnel, and as such will be to some extent inclusive of other and differently divided classes, which may then be regarded as so many subdivisions: a monk (or nun) who is a junior, *nava*, one of middle standing, an elder; a teacher, pupil, preceptor one who shares a cell, and so forth.

In the second place, two other words of interest which occur in the ordination groups of rules are *gihigatā*, married girl, and *kumāribhūtā*, maiden. *Gihigatā*, meaning literally “one going (or gone) to a householder.” and thus meaning a married girl or woman, or one who has intercourse with a man, is defined in the Old Commentary on **Bi-Pc 65** as *purisantaragatā*, “one gone (or going) among men.” *Kumāribhūtā*, “being a girl,” must I think, as standing in antithesis to *gihigatā*, mean an unmarried woman, a maiden, or virgin. *Kumāribhūtā* is rather confusingly defined by the Old Commentary as *sāmaṇerī*, a woman novice. For although, as I have said, in the Vinaya

¹ See, e.g., **Vin 1.139**, **Vin 1.140**, **Vin 1.145**. ² See **Vin 4.122**, **Vin 4.343**, and definitions of “monk” and “nun” in the Old Commentary—e.g., on the *Pārājikas*, and of “nun” constantly in **Vin 3** and **Vin 4** as “one ordained by both Orders.” ³ **Vin 4.122**.

⁴ **Vin 4.92**, **Vin 4.285**; cf. **Vin 4.224**.

“female novice” is differently defined from “probationer,” yet in **Bi-Pc 72** and **Bi-Pc 73** it is clear that the “maiden” is thought of in terms more appropriate to a probationer than to a novice.

Bi-Pc 65 makes it an offence for a nun to ordain “a *gihagatā* under twelve.” But *the* question is, what exactly does this phrase mean? Does it mean a married girl less than twelve years old, or a girl who has been married for less than twelve years? WALDSCHMIDT adopts the latter view,¹ apparently taking his stand on a phrase given by Bendall: *strī dvādaśavarsagr̥hayuktā*. If a girl were married at eight, which is still customary in parts of India, betrothal having taken place earlier, but if she were under twenty when she sought ordination, then she would not have been married for as many as twelve years, and this would seem to be her age as considered from the point of view of the legislation laid down in **Bi-Pc 65–Bi-Pc 67**.

Certainly a passage in **Bi-Pc 65**, which describes the hardships young people were not able to endure, is used also in Monks’ **Bi-Pc 65** to show why persons under twenty, not under twelve, should not be ordained. Again when the age for ordaining “maidens” is being considered (**Bi-Pc 71**), twenty years is given as the minimum. I bring forward this internal evidence in support of Waldschmidt’s view, which I think merits serious consideration. Against it may be set Buddhaghosa’s remarks at Vin-a 941 that, having given the “agreement as to ordination” to a married girl of ten, the *upasampadā* may be conferred when she has completed twelve years of age. This shows that Buddhaghosa at least was puzzled by the word *gihigatā*.

A main point concerning the ordination of a probationer, a married girl and a maiden is the illegality of conferring the *upasampadā* on her unless she has trained, under a nun, for two years in six rules: the first five *śīlas* and abstention from eating at the wrong time.

Three *Pācittiyas* govern the ordination of a married girl and three that of a maiden: neither must be ordained (1) if she has not attained the minimum age prescribed (2) even if she is old enough but has not trained for two years in the six rules; and (3) even if she is old enough

¹ *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins*, p.138.

and has done the required training, but has not been agreed upon by the Order (as a suitable person to be ordained). The second and third clauses of each of these two groups have parallels in [Bi-Pc 63](#), [Bi-Pc 64](#) which, although omitting any reference to age, prohibit the ordination of a probationer, first, if she has not trained for two years in the six rules, and secondly if, even although she has trained, she is not agreed upon by the Order. Beyond the clause in [Bi-Pc 80](#) prohibiting ordination if she has not the consent of her parents or husband, only these two rules, as against the three each for the married woman and the maiden, concern themselves with a probationer's eligibility for ordination.

A reason for omitting to lay down a maximum age at which a probationer would be entitled to receive the *upasampadā*, is that this might be conferred on her, as on a married woman, however old she might be, there being no limit at the top end of the scale. But at the lower end, neither a maiden nor, or so it would appear, a married girl might be ordained while still under twenty. Now a probationer must be either married or not married. A widow, not being specially catered for in the ordination regulations, was perhaps regarded as ranking as a married woman for legislation purposes. And any woman, whether married or single, when she entered on the training (which is of course different from entering the Order) became technically a probationer. The deduction may therefore be made that a probationer must not be ordained if she were less than twenty, this assumption being tacitly conveyed by the legislation on the minimum age at which married and unmarried girls might receive the ordination. It is the same as the minimum age at which a boy might be ordained. And at [Vin 2.271](#) it is said that she on whom the *upasampadā* is being conferred, without however specifying more fully what is to be understood by "she," must be asked if she has completed twenty years of age.

In all cases, whether a woman was specifically called a probationer, married woman or maiden, before she began the two years' training in the six rules she had to obtain the Order's consent to enter

upon this training (Bi-Pc 63, Bi-Pc 66, Bi-Pc 72), which was carried out under the guidance of some nun. This consent is called the “agreement as to training,” *sikkhāsammuti*. At the end of her training when the probationer, married woman or maiden wanted to be ordained, she had to obtain from the Order a further agreement sanctioning this step, called the “agreement as to ordination,” *vuṭṭhānasammuti*. If a woman was ordained before she had fully trained, there was an offence for the nun who ordained her. To guard against such a contingency, that part of the Order to which the ordaining nun belonged was made responsible for weighing the candidate’s claims; it was the Order, and not a group or one nun, whom the candidate must ask for the agreement as to ordination. But if this were refused, and she were not agreed upon by the Order, *saṅghena asammata*, even though she were of the right age and had trained properly, and a nun were to ordain her, that nun incurred an offence of expiation.

Another interesting word is *ūnadvādasavassā*, appearing to mean “one who is under twelve.” She may not ordain (Bi-Pc 74). But I do not think that “being under twelve” refers to her actual age, any more than I think that the same condition refers to the married girl’s actual age. Since the minimum age for ordination has been laid down for married girls and for maidens, and since these together form a comprehensive class embracing every kind of probationer, for had widows been separately considered they would have been separately legislated for, to specify as twelve the minimum actual age at which a woman or girl, though described as neither probationer, married nor unmarried, might ordain, would betray such a gross inconsistency with those rules which speak of ordination age as being twenty as to reduce the legislation on these matters to an absurdity.

And I think that it was neither absurd nor careless enough to throw us back on the old argument of its composition being patchwork because it seems to entail contradictory statements, an easy line to take when we are baffled, but unfair to the work of the early compilers. This I am convinced was more often subtle, delicate and reasonable than we sometimes give it credit for. Here, for example,

before we condemn their work as invalid because of its seeming inconsistencies, it is necessary, in order to comprehend the gist and implications of **Bi-Pc 74**, to study it both in conjunction with those *Pācittiya*s which legislate for the age at which a candidate might be ordained, and which appear to concur in their view of this being twenty, and also in conjunction with the next *Pācittiya*, **Bi-Pc 75**.

Two words used here (**Bi-Pc 75**) provide a useful clue to support the conjecture that *ūnadvādasavassā* does not mean a girl under twelve years of age, but a nun who has not been ordained for as many as twelve years. These two words are *bhikkhunī* and *vuṭṭhāpanasammuti*. The first is used in connection with *paripuṇṇadvādasavassā*, and clearly means a nun who has completed twelve years (as an ordained nun). This apposition of *bhikkhunī* and *paripuṇṇadvādasavassā* is very revealing, the more so since we do not find probationer, married girl or maiden described by the term *bhikkhunī*.

The second clue word is *vuṭṭhāpanasammuti*. This is an agreement which a nun who has, technically speaking, completed twelve years has to ask for from the Order if she wishes to carry out a monastic function for which, in regard to her standing in the Order, she is eligible. She does not have to ask, as do the probationer, married girl and maiden, for the *vuṭṭhānasammuti*, the agreement as to ordination, that is to be ordained. She has to ask instead for the *vuṭṭhāpanasammuti*, the “agreement to ordain.” For *vuṭṭhāpana*, causative, with *sammuti*, means the agreement to cause ordination in others, to confer ordination on them, to ordain them before an Order of nuns. This *Pācittiya* shows this to be a privilege of a nun, but one which it is not legally valid to exercise if the nun who wishes to ordain has not herself completed twelve years as an ordained nun. It is interesting to find at **Vin 1.59** a ruling which makes it an offence of wrong-doing for a monk to ordain if he is of less than ten years’ standing, which means the lapse of less than ten years since his own ordination, combined with an “allowance” for a monk to ordain if he is of ten years’ standing or more. This difference of two years, ten since ordination for a monk, twelve for a nun, not only indicates the detailed care

lavished upon the ordination regulations. It also suggests the greater length of time that nuns were, at the time of the compilation of the Vinaya, supposed to need in order to qualify themselves for the office of ordaining other nuns.

The next *Pācittiya*, **Bi-Pc 76**, suggests that the agreement to ordain must be asked for by a nun each time she wishes to ordain a probationer. Caṇḍakālī is recorded to ask for this agreement, but to be refused it. She is called, as in her case is usual, “the nun Caṇḍakālī,” although in **Bi-Pc 79** she is, exceptionally, referred to as a probationer. One can only suppose this latter *Pācittiya* to refer to a time previous to that referred to by **Bi-Pc 76** and the other passages where Caṇḍakālī is called a “nun.”

In addition, there is no clause connected with the *ūnadvādasavassā* corresponding to that for the probationer, married girl and maiden, stressing the need for her to have trained for two years in the six rules. This indicates that this, for the “one under twelve years,” will have been a thing of the past, carried out by her before her own ordination, and for which she will have had to obtain from the Order first the agreement to train and then the agreement to be ordained, *vuṭṭhānasammuti*.

It would thus appear that on the two occasions when the word *ūnadvādasavassā* is used in the *Bhikkhunivibhaṅga*, it does not refer to the woman’s actual age, but to the number of years she had followed a certain calling: either that of a married woman or that of an ordained nun. To prohibit a nun, on pain of a penalty, to ordain others unless she herself had attained to twelve years’ standing as a nun, is to give time to test her integrity, her sense of responsibility and her value to the Order. To prohibit the ordination of a married girl unless she had completed twelve years of married life is to preserve and not to destroy domestic life; it calls to mind the four stages in a brahmin’s career and the due regard paid there to his stage as a householder.

While a woman was still a probationer it would not appear compulsory for her to sever her ties with the world. Caṇḍakālī is recorded

to have kept company with men and boys while she was a probationer. The disapprobation which was felt for her, although she herself was not censured, was transferred to the nun who ordained her, and it was made an offence for a nun to ordain a probationer who had behaved in this fashion (**Bi-Pc 79**). Nuns it would therefore seem had no power sufficient to shut off intending nuns from the world; and neither should they in respect of these disregard it entirely.

In spite of Pasenadi's dictum¹ that once a woman had (so much as) gone forth, there was nothing (for those in the world) to do in regard to her, there was nevertheless the offence of ordaining a probationer if she had not the consent of her parents or husband. Since probationers could be ordained however old, so long as they were over twenty, this clause would appear to have young probationers in mind, and may perhaps be regarded as pointing to the practice of child-marriage.² In any case it provides one more instance of the care taken by the Order not lightly to ordain anyone still having duties to the world, which is also shown by the questions put to women, and to men too, at the time of their ordination in respect of their freedom from debt and their employment in a king's service.³

Besides the two divisions comprising the twenty-three rules for ordination, there are other occasions where the nuns' rules in treating of a similar kind of subject-matter are for the most part placed in proximity to one another.

There are, for example, the seven *Nissaggiyas*, **Bi-NP 4–Bi-NP 10**, formulated to deter nuns from getting in exchange something which they fancied more than the commodity specified and earmarked by the donors as gifts now for an Order, now for a group, or now for one nun. Two rules, **Bi-Pc 39** and **Bi-Pc 40**, legislate for almstouring during and after the rains; while two more concerned with the rains, **Bi-Pc 56**, **Bi-Pc 57**, cut into a small group of rules (**Bi-Pc 56–Bi-Pc 59**) where, for the official carrying out of various transactions, such as the exhortation and the *Pavāraṇā*, nuns are shown to be dependent

¹ **Vin 4.226**. Cf. **Vin 1.75**, where this same view (in regard to men who have gone forth) is put into Bimbisāra's mouth. ² See my *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p. 27ff. ³ **Vin 2.271**.

on monks. These four rules are the same as four of the eight *garudhammā*,¹ the chief, cardinal or important rules for nuns, so that the infringement of any of these four *garudhammā* is here shown to entail a penalty of expiation. A fifth “important rule” is repeated at **Bi-Pc 52**, which makes it an offence of expiation for a nun to abuse or revile a monk.

In assessing the significance of this rule, it must be remembered that monks incurred offences if they insulted or slandered other monks (Monks’ **Bu-Pc 2**, **Bu-Pc 3**), while for nuns there was a rule against cursing themselves or others, “others” being defined by the Old Commentary as “ordained” (**Bi-Pc 19**), and also a rule against abusing a group (**Bi-Pc 53**). Thus two rules against “abusing” stand together (**Bi-Pc 52**, **Bi-Pc 53**). Monks had also to be restrained from striking one another or using a threatening gesture (Monks’ **Bu-Pc 74**, **Bu-Pc 75**). Clearly violence of speech or gesture was not exclusively a feminine trait.

If **Bi-Pc 52** is connected on the one hand with **Bi-Pc 53** through the word “abuse,” it is connected no less on the other with **Bi-Pc 51** through the word “monk.” This rule recounts nuns’ difficulties in entering a monastery not knowing whether monks were in it or gone out, their object apparently being to sweep the monastery and to put ready for the monks’ use water for washing and drinking. The offence here was in entering a monastery without having obtained permission to do so. It was not in rendering these services to monks, which apparently, unlike washing a monk’s robe for him (Monks’ **Bu-NP 4**) or standing close to him with drinking water and a fan while he was eating (Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 6**), remained permissible. It is noticeable in **Bi-Pc 6** that the rule is not formulated on the lines of the complaints made by the modest nuns—that a nun struck a monk with a fan, but on the lines of the situation postulated—that she was standing near him with a fan and drinking water while he was eating. This was made into the offence.

Bi-Pc 94 and **Bi-Pc 95** make a kind of pair. The former prohibits a

¹ Given at **Vin 2.255**, **Vin 4.52** (see **BD 2.268**).

nun from sitting down in front of a monk without having asked for permission, the latter from asking him a question without having asked for permission. “Question” is taken by the Old Commentary to mean a question on the Suttantas, Vinaya or Abhidhamma. The difficulty arising from this last term has been discussed above.¹

Other rules for nuns which may be classified together are the four against standing and talking with a man (Bi-Pc 11–Bi-Pc 14); the three against impolite behaviour when visiting at lay-people’s houses (Bi-Pc 15–Bi-Pc 17); the one against bathing naked followed by the one prescribing the right measurement for bathing-cloths (Bi-Pc 21, Bi-Pc 22); the eight dealing with various points connected with robes (Bi-Pc 23–Bi-Pc 30); the two about sharing a couch and a cover-and-cloak with another nun (Bi-Pc 31, Bi-Pc 32); the three covering ordinary decent behaviour towards other nuns (Bi-Pc 33–Bi-Pc 35); the two against walking for alms in a dangerous district without a weapon (Bi-Pc 37, Bi-Pc 38); the four against indulging in various practices which were not censurable in laywomen: amusing oneself by visiting picture galleries, reposing in comfort, spinning yarn, doing domestic tasks² (Bi-Pc 41–Bi-Pc 44); the two restraining greed over food (Bi-Pc 54, Bi-Pc 55); and another group of ten rules also against doing things, chiefly for comfort and adornment, like women in the world (Bi-Pc 84–Bi-Pc 93).

In view of these groupings, it would seem as if little support from the Bhikkhunivibhaṅga itself were forthcoming for Miss Bhagvat’s statement that this treatise is patchwork, “a work done in a hurry, and signs of carelessness are obvious.”³ To take only one point: the grouping of offences of a related character is as thorough, if not more so, than is the case in the Monks’ *Vibhaṅga*. I have attempted to show how thorough it is, although it is true that sometimes offences “which would naturally come together are found scattered in quite different parts of the same class.”⁴ This, however, is comparatively rare. A

¹ BD 3.xf. ² There are other occasions where nuns are rebuked for behaving like women still leading a household life. ³ *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence*, p.164.

⁴ *Vinaya Texts* i.Introduction xiv (referring to Monks’ *Vibhaṅga*).

fairly good example is supplied by the last *Pācittiya*, **Bi-Pc 96**, which is a rule against a nun's going to a village without wearing a bodice, *samkacchika*, and which more naturally belongs to the group of rules on robes than to the isolated position which it occupies. Many of the rules which appear in isolation do so however because there are no others to which they are related in character.

The eight *Pāṭidesaniyas* form a complete group of related offences, being word for word the same as one another, except for the particular commodity which each names: ghee, oil, honey, molasses, fish, meat, milk, curds. If a nun who was not ill asked for any of these and ate them, there resulted an offence to be confessed by her. The offence did not lie in having these things or in eating them, but in asking for them so as to eat them. The same notion is apparent in Nuns' **Bi-Pc 7**. "Asking for" would probably mean obtaining the articles of diet without waiting for them to be offered, and it was a greedy thing to do. There is no *Pāṭidesaniya* offence for Thullanandā in **Bi-NP 4** where the lay follower, as recorded, offers her something and she chooses ghee; or for this same nun in **Bi-NP 5** when she decides to have oil for the *kaḥāpaṇa* which a lay follower says he will deposit in a shop for her to get what she likes with it. For on neither of these occasions is she recorded to "ask for" anything, but merely to choose something in response to an offer freely made.

I.B. HORNER

Manchester, 1942.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 61

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at one time the venerable Udāyin¹ was an archer,² and crows were unpleasant to him. He, having shot crows, having cut off their heads, put them in a row on a stake. Monks spoke thus:

“By whom, your reverence, were these crows deprived of life?”

“By me, your reverences; crows are unpleasant to me.” Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Udāyin intentionally deprive a living thing of life?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, intentionally deprived a living thing of life?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, intentionally deprive a living thing of life? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should intentionally deprive a living thing of life, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Intentionally means: a transgression committed knowingly, consciously, deliberately.³

¹ Perhaps the same Udāyin as is mentioned at [Vin 3.110](#), [Vin 3.119](#), [Vin 3.127](#), [Vin 3.130](#), [Vin 3.135](#), [Vin 3.187](#), [Vin 3.190](#) (see [BD.1](#)), and [Vin 4.20](#), [Vin 4.61](#), [Vin 4.68](#) (see [BD.2](#)).

² *issāsa*. Cf. [MN iii.1 \(issattha\)](#); [AN iv.423](#). [Vin-a 864](#) says when he was a householder he taught archers. ³ = [Vin 3.73](#). See [BD 1.126](#) and n. 3.

Living thing means: it is called a living thing that is an animal.¹

Should deprive of life means: if he cuts off the faculty of life, destroys it, harms its duration,² there is an offence of expiation.

4.125
61.2.2
If he thinks that it is a living thing when it is a living thing, (and) deprives it of life, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a living thing, (and) deprives it of life, there is an offence of wrong-doing.³ If he thinks that it is not a living thing when it is a living thing, there is no offence. If he thinks that it is a living thing when it is not a living thing, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a living thing, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a living thing when it is not a living thing, there is no offence.

61.2.3
There is no offence if it is unintentional; if (he is) not thinking; if he does not know; if he is not meaning death⁴; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The First

¹ Depriving human beings of life is dealt with in Bu-Pj 3. ² = Vin 3.73 (BD 1.126).

³ Variant reading *āpatti pācittiyassa*. See Vin 4.361. ⁴ Cf. Vin 3.78 (BD 1.136);
BD 2.225, BD 2.229, BD 2.262.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 62

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks knowingly made use of¹ water that contained living things. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks knowingly make use of water that contains living things?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, knowingly made use of water that contained living things?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, knowingly make use of water that contains living things? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should knowingly make use of water that contains living things, there is an offence of expiation.**”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

He knows means: he knows by himself or others tell him.²

That contains living things means: if, knowing (this), he makes use of it knowing that “they will die from (this) use,” there is an offence of expiation.

¹ *paribhuñjati*. *Vinaya Texts* i.46 renders by “drink.” Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 865 mentions this, and also other uses of water, for washing (bowls e.g.), for bathing, and for sprinkling. Cf. Bu-Pc 20. See rules for filtering drinking water at Vin 2.118, and Introductory story to 31st Jātaka. ² Cf. Vin 4.49, Vin 4.67.

If he thinks that it contains living things when it contains living things (and) makes use of it, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it contains living things (and) makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹ If he thinks that it does not contain living things when it contains living things (and) makes use of it, there is no offence. If he thinks that it contains living things when it does not contain living things, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it does not contain living things, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it does not contain living things when it does not contain living things, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he makes use of it not knowing that it contains living things, knowing that it does not contain living things, knowing that they will not die from this use; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Second

¹ Variant reading *āpatti pācittiyassa*, offence of expiation. See Vin 4.361.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 63

at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks knowingly opened up¹ for a further (formal) act² a legal question³ settled⁴ according to rule, saying:

“The (formal) act is not carried out,⁵ the (formal) act is badly carried out, the (formal) act should be carried out again, it is not settled, it is badly settled, it should be settled again.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks knowingly open up ... ‘... it should be settled again?’” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, knowingly opened up ... ‘... it should be settled again?’”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, knowingly open up ... ‘... it should be settled again?’” It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should knowingly open up for a further (formal) act a legal question (that was) settled according to rule, there is an offence of expiation.”

¹ *ukkoṭeti*. Cf. Vin 2.94, which refers to this Pācittiya; also Vin 4.151. ² *punakam-māya*, or action, proceedings, adjustment. Cf. same expression at Vin 2.303. For “formal acts” and wrong and right ways of carrying them out, see Vin 1.315ff. ³ *adhikaraṇa*. Cf. Vin 3.164 = BD 1.282 and n. 5. See Vin 3.168 = BD 1.290, and S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, 153ff. ⁴ *nihata*. ⁵ *akata*.

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

He knows means: either he knows by himself, or others tell him, or (someone) tells him.¹

According to rule means: carried out according to rule, according to discipline, according to the teacher's instruction,² this means according to rule.

Legal question means: there are four (kinds of) legal questions: legal questions arising out of disputes legal questions arising out of censure, legal questions arising out of transgressions, legal questions arising out of obligations.³

Should open up for a further (formal) act means: if he opens it up, thinking: 'The (formal) act was not carried out, the (formal) act was badly carried out, the (formal) act should be carried out again, it was not settled, it was badly settled, it should be settled again,' there is an offence of expiation.

63.2.2

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, (and) opens it up, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act, (and) opens it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, there is no offence.⁴ If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence.⁵

63.2.3

There is no offence if he opens it up knowingly, thinking: 'The (formal) act was carried out according to what is not the rule, or by

¹ Cf. Vin 3.265; Vin 4.49, Vin 4.67. ² Cf. Vin 2.95; Vin 4.152; also DN ii.124ff.
³ = Vin 2.88 = Vin 3.164 (= BD 1.282) = Vin 4.238. ⁴ Variant reading *āpatti pācitiyassa* (offence of expiation), Vin 4.361. ⁵ = Vin 4.37, Vin 4.152. Cf. also Vin 3.174 (= BD 1.302) = BD 1.177 = BD 1.179 = BD 1.186, at all of which the last clause ends *āpatti dukkaṭassa*.

an incomplete congregation, or against one who is not suitable for a (formal) act'¹; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Third

¹ Cf. Vin 4.37, Vin 4.126, Vin 4.152, Vin 4.153; Vin 5.221.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 64

4.127

64.1.1

BD 3:7

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having fallen into the offence of intentional emission of semen,¹ said to his brother, the monk who shared his cell:

“I, your reverence, have fallen into the offence of intentional emission of semen; do not tell anyone else.”

Now at that time a certain monk, having fallen into the offence of intentional emission of semen, asked the Order for probation² on account of this offence. The Order granted him probation on account of this offence. He, being under probation, having seen that monk, spoke thus:

“I, your reverence, having fallen into the offence of intentional emission of semen, asked the Order for probation on account of this offence. The Order granted me probation on account of this offence of his,³ so I am under probation. I, your reverence,³ am experiencing a feeling, let the venerable one conceal me, saying: ‘He is experiencing a feeling.’⁴”

“But, your reverence, does another who falls into this offence also act likewise?”

“Yes, your reverence.”

“Your reverence, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having fallen into the offence of intentional emission of semen, said

¹ Formal Meeting, 1. See Vin 3.112 = BD 1.196. Cf. also Bu-Pc 9. ² *parivāsa*. See BD 1.196, n. 3 for Vinaya references to “probation,” and S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.168. ³ *tassa me saṅgho tassā āpattiyā ...* ⁴ *vediyāmaṃ ahaṃ āvuso vediyatī ti maṃ āyasmā dhāretu.*

to me: ‘Do not tell anyone.’”

“But are you, then, your reverence, not concealing¹ (him)?”

“Yes, your reverence.”

Then that monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this monk knowingly conceal a monk’s very bad offence?”²

...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, knowingly concealed a monk’s very bad offence?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, knowingly conceal a monk’s very bad offence? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should knowingly conceal a monk’s very bad offence, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

A monk’s means: another monk’s.

He knows means: either he knows by himself or others tell him or (someone) tells him.³

Very bad offence means: both the four involving defeat and the thirteen entailing a formal meeting of the Order.⁴

Should conceal means: if he thinks, ‘Knowing this they will reprove him, they will remind him, they will jeer at him, they will scoff at him, they will shame him,⁵ I will not tell,’ in the mere fact that responsibility is thrown off,⁶ there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is a very bad offence when it is a very bad offence (and) conceals it, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a very bad offence (and) conceals it,

¹ *paṭicchādeti*. Cf. **Bi-Pj 6**, *vajjapaṭicchādikā*. ² *duṭṭhullā āpatti*. Cf. **BD 2.219**. ³ Cf. **Vin 3.266**; **Vin 4.49**, **Vin 4.67**, and above, **BD 3.3**, **BD 3.5**. ⁴ = **Vin 4.31**. ⁵ *khumseti vambheti manikum karoti*; cf. **Vin 4.7**. ⁶ *dhuraṃ nikkhittamatte*. Cf. *dhuraṃ nikkhipati* at **Vin 3.50** = **BD 1.82**.

there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a very bad offence when it is a very bad offence (and) conceals it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he conceals an offence that is not a very bad one, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he conceals a transgression¹ that is very bad or that is not very bad of one who is not ordained,² there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a very bad offence when it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a very bad offence when it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing.³

54.2.3

There is no offence if he does not tell, thinking: “There will come to be quarrel or dispute or strife or contention for the Order”; if he does not tell, thinking: “There will come to be a schism in the Order or dissension in the Order”⁴; if he does not tell, thinking: “This one, harsh, rough, will be an obstacle to life or to the Brahma-life”⁵; if he does not tell, not seeing other suitable monks; if he does not tell (though) not desiring to hide⁶ (him); if he does not tell, thinking: “It will be evident from his own action”; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.⁷

The Fourth

¹ *ajjhācāra*. Cf. Vin 3.121 = BD 1.202, where see n. 3. Also cf. Vin 4.32. ² Vin-a 866 says that the very bad ones are the above, while the not very bad ones are in the remaining five classes of offence. ³ *anāpatti*, variant reading at Vin 4.361. But cf. Vin 4.32 (BD 2.222), which also see for the whole passage. ⁴ = Vin 4.37, Vin 4.153, Vin 4.217. *Saṅghabheda* and *saṅgharāji* discussed at Vin 2.203, Vin 2.204, referred to at Vb-a 428. See S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 193ff. ⁵ These are the last two of the ten dangers mentioned at Vin 1.112–Vin 1.113, Vin 1.169. ⁶ *na chādetukāma*—i.e., the offence. ⁷ With this paragraph, cf. Vin 4.217, where, in their Bu-Pj 2, similar exceptions are made for the nuns.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 65

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time in Rājagaha¹ a group of seventeen boys were friends; of these the youth Upāli² was the chief. Then it occurred to Upāli's parents: "By what means could Upāli, after our demise, live at ease and not be in want?" Then it occurred to Upāli's parents: "If Upāli should learn writing,³ so would Upāli, after our demise, live at ease and not be in want." Then it occurred to Upāli's parents: "But if Upāli learns writing, his fingers will become painful. If Upāli should learn calculation,⁴ so would Upāli, after our demise, live at ease and not be in want." Then it occurred to Upāli's parents: "But if Upāli learns calculation, his breast will become painful."⁵ If Upāli should learn money-changing,⁶ so would Upāli, after our demise, live at ease and not be in want." Then it occurred to Upāli's parents: "But if Upāli learns money-changing, his eyes will become painful. Now there are these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, pleasant in habit,⁷ pleasant in

¹ From here to **BD 3.12** below, "pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased" = **Vin 1.77-78**, which in the phrase *yathādhammo kāretabbo* refers to this Bu-Pc.rule. ² *Vinaya Texts* i.201, n. 1, "different from the famous Upāli who belonged to the chief disciples of Buddha; the latter came not from Rājagaha, but from the Sakya country." ³ *lekhaṃ sikkheyya*. *Vin-a* 867 says: 'his fingers will become painful with writing (*likhantassa*) syllables (*akkharāni*).' On writing, in *Vinaya*, see *Vinaya Texts* i.xxxiiff.; **BD 1.131, n. 1**. ⁴ *gaṇanā*. Cf. **Vin 4.7** (= **BD 2.176**). ⁵ *Vin-a* 867: there must be much thought for learning calculation. ⁶ *rūpaṃ sikkheyya*. *Vin-a* 867 says: 'for learning *rūpasutta*, *kaḥāpaṇas* must be looked at turning them over and over.' Therefore *rūpa* here seemed connected with the usual medium of exchange; I follow *Vinaya Texts* i.201 in adopting this translation in preference to 'drawing' or 'painting,' or other possible meanings given in *Pali-English Dictionary* under article *rūpa*. ⁷ *sukhasilā*.

conduct; having eaten good meals they lie down on beds sheltered from the wind.¹ Now if Upāli should go forth among the recluses, the sons of the Sakyans, so would Upāli, after our demise, live at ease and not be in want.”

The boy Upāli heard this conversation of (his) parents. Then the boy Upāli approached those boys, and having approached he spoke thus to those boys: “Come, masters,² we will go forth among the recluses, sons of the Sakyans.”

“If you, master, will go forth, we likewise will also go forth.”

Then these boys, having each approached (his) parents, spoke thus:

“Consent that I may go forth from home into homelessness.”

Then the parents of those boys consented, thinking: “All these boys desire the same thing, they are bent on what is good.” These, having approached monks, asked for the going forth. The monks let them go forth, they conferred the *upasampadā* ordination on them. Getting up in the night towards dawn, these cried out:

“Give conje, give rice,³ give solid food.”

The monks spoke thus: “Wait, your reverences, until it turns light.”⁴ Should there be conje, you shall drink it; should there be rice, you shall partake of it; should there be solid food, you shall eat it. But should there not be conje or rice or solid food, having walked for alms, you shall eat.”

But those monks, being spoken to thus by the monks, cried out just the same⁵: “Give conje, give rice, give solid food,” and they soiled the bedding and made it wet.⁶

The lord, getting up in the night towards the dawn, heard the noise of the boys, and hearing (it) he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying:

“Why ever, Ānanda, is there this noise of boys?”

Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of

¹ =e.g., Vin 1.57, Vin 1.72. ² ayyo. ³ bhatta. Cf. Vin 4.259–260 (BD 2.149). ⁴ ratti vibhāyati, said of the night brightening into day or dawn. Cf. DN ii.148. ⁵ yeva.

⁶ Cf. Vin 3.227.

monks convened, questioned the monks, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks knowingly conferred the *upasampadā* ordination on an individual¹ under twenty years of age?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “Monks, how can these foolish men knowingly confer the *upasampadā*, ordination on an individual under twenty years of age? Monks, an individual under twenty years of age is not able to endure cold, heat, hunger, thirst, contact with gadflies, mosquitoes, wind and sun, creeping things, abusive hurtful language; he is not the kind (of person) who endures bodily feelings which, arising, are painful, acute, sharp, shooting, disagreeable, miserable, deadly.² But, monks, an individual of twenty years of age is able to endure cold, heat ... miserable, deadly. Monks, this is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...³ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should knowingly confer the *upasampadā* ordination on an individual under twenty years of age, both that individual is not ordained and these monks are blameworthy; this is for him⁴ an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

He knows means: either he knows by himself or others tell him or (someone) tells (him).⁵

Under twenty years of age means: not attained to twenty years of age.⁶

If he thinks, “I will confer the *upasampadā* ordination,” (and)

¹ *puggala*, individual; unfortunately not defined in Old Commentary. Probably wrong to render “a man” here, for there is the word *purisa*, defined at Vin 4.334 as “attained to twenty years of age.” See Introduction xxii. ff.

² = Vin 4.321 = MN i.10 = AN ii.117 = AN ii.143 = AN iii.163 = AN v.132. Last clause only at Vin 1.302, Vin 1.303; AN iii.143. ³ To here from beginning = Vin 1.77-78. ⁴ *idam tasmim*—i.e., probably the preceptor. See Old Commentary below, end of 2, 1. ⁵ Cf. BD 2.161. ⁶ Cf. below, BD 3.381.

looks about for a group¹ or for a teacher² or for a bowl³ or for a robe, or if he determines a boundary,⁴ there is an offence of wrong-doing. As a result of the motion⁵ there is an offence of wrong-doing; as a result of two proclamations⁶ there are offences of wrong-doing. At the end of the proclamations,⁷ there is an offence of expiation for the preceptor,⁸ an offence of wrong-doing for the group and for the teacher.

If he thinks that he is under twenty years of age when he is under twenty years of age, (and) confers the *upasampadā* ordination (on him), there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is under twenty years of age, and confers the *upasampadā* ordination (on him), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he has completed twenty years of age when he is under twenty years of age, (and) confers the *upasampadā* ordination (on him), there is no offence.⁹ If he thinks that he is under twenty years of age when he has completed twenty years of age, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he has completed twenty years of age there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he has

¹ *gaṇa*, two to four monks, as opposed to both *saṅgha*, five or more monks, and *puggala*, one individual (monk). Cf. **BD 3.184**, **BD 3.361f.** below with this passage.

² *ācariya*. Allowed at **Vin 1.60**, where relationship of *ācariya* to *antevāsika*, pupil, is set forth.

³ Symbols of entry into the Order. A person had to be in possession of a bowl and robe before receiving the *upasampadā* ordination; cf. **Vin 1.90**.

⁴ A new boundary, according to *Vin-a* 867. See **Vin 1.106**, where the right way to determine a boundary is given.

⁵ *ñatti*. See S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.178, for view that *upasampadā* is the third stage in evolution of ordination. At **Vin 1.56** it is allowed to confer the *upasampada* by a *ñatticatuttha kamma*, a formal act at which the motion is put and then followed by three proclamations.

⁶ *kammavācā*. ⁷ Cf. **Vin 3.174**, **Vin 3.176**, **Vin 3.179** (= **BD 1.302**, **BD 1.307**, **BD 1.312**).

⁸ *upajjhāya*. See *Vinaya Texts* i.178, n. 2 for discussion of distinction between this and *ācariya*, teacher. The editors, referring to **Vin 1.56**, **Vin 1.57** and above passage, say that *upajjhāya* “was considered as the more important of the two,” and had a more prominent part in the *upasampadā* service. See also S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.181. ⁹ *Vin-a* 867, one who has completed twenty years from (the time of) taking on re-instatement (*paṭisandhi*), that is from the time of conception.

completed twenty years of age when he has completed twenty years of age, there is no offence.¹

There is no offence if he confers the *upasampadā* ordination on one under twenty years of age thinking that he has completed twenty years of age²; if he confers the *upasampadā* ordination on one who has completed twenty years of age thinking that they are completed; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.³

The Fifth

¹ Cf. below, **BD 3.370**. ² This exception to the rule is given also in preceding paragraph. ³ Cf. below, **BD 3.370**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 66

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain caravan was desirous of going from Rājagaha to the south.¹ A certain monk spoke thus to these people: "I will go together with the venerable ones."²

"But we, honoured sir, shall evade the tax."³

"Do you understand (how to do so), sirs?" Then the overseers⁴ heard: "A caravan will evade the tax." They infested the way.⁵ Then these overseers, having seized and ransacked that caravan, spoke thus to that monk:

"How is it that you, honoured sir, knowingly go together with a caravan (set on) theft⁶?" (and) having detained him they set him free.⁷ Then that monk, having arrived at Sāvattḥī, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can a monk, having arranged together with a caravan (set on) theft, knowingly go along the same highroad?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, ... knowingly went along the same high road?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

¹ = Vin 4.79 (BD 2.322). Vin-a 868 says *paṭiyālokan ti suriyālokassa paṭimukhaṃ pacchimidisaṇa attho*: it means facing the light of the sun, the western quarter. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, on the contrary; calls it "a place near Rājagaha." ² *āyasmaṇtehi*. Rare for a monk to address lay people in this way. ³ *suñikāṃ pariharati*. Cf. Vin 3.52 (= BD 1.87) where this is a *dukkāṭa* offence for a monk. ⁴ *kammikā*, which at Vin-a 868 is explained as *suñikaṭṭhāne kammikā*, overseers, superintendents at the customs place. ⁵ Cf. Atthasālinī 366. ⁶ *theyyasattha*. ⁷ *palibuddhitvā muñciṃsu*.

“How can you, foolish man, having arranged together with a caravan (set on) theft, knowingly go along the same high road? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk, having arranged together with a caravan (set on) theft, should knowingly go along the same high road, even among villages, there is an offence of expiation.**”¹

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

He knows means: either he knows by himself, or others tell him, or (someone) tells him.²

Caravan (set on) theft means: they are thieves who have done the deed or who have not done the deed³; or they go for the robbing of kings or they evade the tax.

Together with means: together.⁴

Having arranged means: if one arranges, saying, “We are going, reverend sir, we are going, honoured sir, we are going, honoured sir, we are going, reverend sir, we are going either today or tomorrow or the next day,” there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Even among villages means: in a village close enough for a cock (to walk), among every (such) village, there is an offence of expiation. For every half yojana in what is not a village, in the jungle, there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that a caravan is (set on) theft when the caravan is (set on) theft, and having arranged, goes along the same high road, even among villages, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether a caravan is (set on) theft ... offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a caravan is not (set on) theft when the caravan is

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 27; BD 2.289. ² Cf. above, BD 3.5, BD 3.8. ³ *corā katakammā vā honti akatakammā vā*—i.e., thieves who have or who have not committed a theft. Cf. MN i.448; AN iii.102; Vism 180; Ja 3.34 (*māṇava* = *cora*, MN-a 3.164; AN-a 3.271). ⁴ *sad-dhin ti ekato*. Cf. Vin 3.121, Vin 3.188, Vin 3.192 (= BD 1.202, BD 1.332, BD 1.337). From here to end of Bu-Pc 66.2.1 cf. Vin 4.63 (BD 2.290).

(set on) theft ... no offence. If monks arrange (and) the people do not arrange, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the caravan is (set on) theft when the caravan is not (set on) theft, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether the caravan is not (set on) theft, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the caravan is not (set on) theft when the caravan is not (set on) theft, there is no offence.

66.2.3

There is no offence if they go not having arranged; if the people arrange (and) monks do not arrange; if they go without (making) a rendezvous; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

The Sixth

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 27, Bu-Pc 28 (BD 2.291, BD 2.294), and below, BD 3.20.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 67

... at Sāvathī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain monk, going to Sāvathī through the Kosalan districts, passed by a certain village-gate. A certain woman, having quarrelled with her husband, having departed from the village, having seen that monk, spoke thus: "Where, honoured sir, will the master go?"

"I, sister, will go to Sāvathī."

"I will go together with the master."

"If you wish to,¹ sister," he said.

Then that woman's husband, having departed from the village, asked people: "Have the masters seen such and such a woman?"²

"She, master, is going along with one who has gone forth." Then that man, having followed after, having seized that monk, having thrashed him, set him free. Then that monk, incensed,³ sat down at the foot of a certain tree. Then that woman spoke thus to that man:

"Master, that monk did not make me come out⁴; but it is I myself who am going along together with this monk. This monk is innocent⁵; go along, apologise to him." Then that man apologised to that monk. Then that monk, having arrived at Sāvathī, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can a monk, having arranged together with a woman, go

¹ *eyyāsi*. ² *evarūpaṃ itthim*. Cf. **Vin 1.76**, *evarūpaṃ dārakaṃ*. ³ *padhūpento*; *padhūpāti* usually meaning 'to blow forth smoke or flames,' and *padhūpita*, 'reeking, smoked out.' Cf. *padhūpāsi*, **Vin 4.109**. *Vin-a 869* says: *pajjhāyanto attānaṃ yeva paribhāsanto nisīdi*, downcast, he sat down reviling just himself. ⁴ *nippātesī = nikkhāmesī*, *Vin-a 869*. ⁵ *akāraka*, one who has done nothing, therefore no wrong, thus innocent, blameless.

along the same high road?" ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, having arranged together with a woman, went along the same high road?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, having arranged together with a woman, go along the same high road? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, having arranged together with a woman, should go along the same high road, even among villages, there is an offence of expiation.”¹

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Woman means: a human woman, not a female *yakkha*, not a female departed one, not a female animal; she is intelligent, competent to know good speech, bad speech, what is lewd, what is not lewd.²

Together with means: together.³

Having arranged means: if one arranges, saying, ‘We are going, sister, we are going, master, we are going, master, we are going, sister, we are going either today or ... (see [Bu-Pc 27.3.1](#); [Bu-Pc 66.2.1](#)).

If he thinks that it is a woman when it is a woman, (and) having arranged, goes along the same high road, even among villages, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a woman ... If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is a woman ... offence of expiation. If the monk arranges (and) the woman does not arrange, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having arranged, he goes along the same high road together with a female *yakkha* or a female departed one or with a eunuch or with an animal in the form of a human woman,⁴ even among villages, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a woman when it is not a woman, there

¹ Cf. [Bu-Pc 27](#), [Bu-Pc 28](#), [Bu-Pc 66](#). ² Cf. [Vin 3.128](#), [Vin 3.192](#)=[BD 1.215](#), [BD 1.337](#).

³ Cf. [Vin 3.121](#), [Vin 3.188](#), [Vin 3.192](#). ⁴ Cf. [Vin 3.76](#)=[BD 1.132](#), and see there n. 2; cf. [Vin 4.22-23](#).

is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a woman when it is not a woman there is no offence.

There is no offence if he goes not having arranged; if the woman arranges (and) the monk does not arrange; if he goes without (making) a rendezvous; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

The Seventh

¹ Cf. Vin 4.64, Vin 4.66, and above, BD 3.17.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 68

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time¹ a pernicious view had arisen to² a monk named Ariṭṭha³ who had formerly been a vulture-trainer,⁴ like this:

“In so far as I understand *dhamma* taught by the lord, it is that in following those things called stumbling-blocks⁵ by the lord, there is no stumbling-block at all.”⁶

Several⁷ monks heard: “A pernicious view has arisen to the monk named Ariṭṭha, who was formerly a vulture-trainer, like this: ‘In so far as I understand ... there is no stumbling-block at all.’”

Then these monks approached the monk Ariṭṭha, who had formerly been a vulture-trainer, and having approached they spoke thus to the monk Ariṭṭha, who had formerly been a vulture-trainer:

“Is it true, as is said, reverend Ariṭṭha, that a pernicious view has

¹ Ariṭṭha episode occurs at **Vin 2.25–Vin 2.26**; MN i.130–MN i.132. At the former, instead of a rule being set forth, the Order is enjoined to carry out an *ukkhepaniyakamma* (act of suspension) against Ariṭṭha. ² *pāpakaṃ diṭṭhigataṃ upannaṃ hoti*. Cf. other pernicious views at MN i.256, MN i.326; AN v.194. ³ Mentioned in **Bu-Pc 69**; at **Vin 4.218** where Thullanandā imitated him; and at SN v.314. Note that he is not referred to as *āyasmā*, but as *bhikkhu*. An *upāsaka* Ariṭṭha occurs at AN iv.351.

⁴ *gaddhabādhipubba*. Vin-a 869 says it is meant that “he was born in a family *gijjhaghātaka*.” Discussion of the term and occupation given at *Vinaya Texts* ii.377, n. 1. Chalmers, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.90ff. has “vulture-catcher.” *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* refers to Ariṭṭha as *ga° bādhaputta*. ⁵ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2981.) ⁶ *nālaṃ antarāyāya*; *Vinaya Texts* ii.378 adding “(to prevent his acquiring spiritual gifts),” and *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.90 “to him who indulges in them.” These same views condemned in **Bu-Pc 70**, and the novice Kaṇḍaka expelled. Cf. the ten other *antarāyas* at **Vin 1.112 = Vin 1.169**.

⁷ *sambahulā*.

arisen to you, like this: ‘In so far as I understand ... no stumbling-block at all?’”

“Undoubtedly,¹ your reverences, as I understand *dhamma* taught by the lord, it is that in following those things called stumbling-blocks by the lord, there is no stumbling-block at all.”

“Do not speak thus, reverend Ariṭṭha; do not misrepresent² the lord, misrepresentation of the lord is not at all seemly, and the lord certainly would not speak thus. Reverend Ariṭṭha, in many a figure are things that are stumbling-blocks called stumbling-blocks by the lord, and in following these, there is a veritable³ stumbling-block. Sense-pleasures⁴ are declared by the lord to be (things) affording little satisfaction,⁵ of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more danger. Sense-pleasures are declared by the lord (to be) like a skeleton,⁶ of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more danger. Sense-pleasures are declared by the lord (to be) like a lump of meat,⁷ of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more danger. Sense-pleasure are declared by the lord (to be) like a fire-brand of dry-grass,⁸ ... Sense-pleasures are declared by the lord (to be) like a pit of glowing embers,⁹ ... Sense-pleasures are declared by the lord (to be) like a dream, ... Sense-pleasures are declared by the lord (to be) like something borrowed,¹⁰ ... Sense-pleasures are declared by the lord (to be) like the fruits of a tree, ... Sense-pleasures are declared by the

¹ *evaṃ* byā *kho* = *evaṃ* viya *kho*, Vin-a 870. *Vinaya Texts* ii. 378, n. 2: “Byā is only known to us as an intensive particle occurring in passages like the present one.”

² *abbhācikkhati*, to accuse, slander, calumniate. Phrase occurs also at MN i.256; MN iii.207; AN iii.291. ³ *alam*. I follow translation at *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.91. ⁴ This simile paragraph = AN iii.97. The ten similes also mentioned at Ja 5.210; Thig.487–Thig.491. See “expanded” rendering at *Psalms of the Sisters*, p.171. First seven explained in full at MN i.364ff. ⁵ Dh 186; Snp 71 (?). Cf. Ja 4.118. ⁶ *aṭṭhikānkala*;

AN iii.97 reading *aṭṭhisāṅkhala*, with v.ll. Cf. SN ii.185 = It 17. See Morris, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1885, p.75. MN-a 3.42, if a rib, a bone of the spine, or the skull is without flesh it is called *kaṅkala*. ⁷ See *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1907, p.122. Cf. MN i.145. Vin-a 870 = MN-a 2.103 explains by *bahusādhāraṇaṭṭhena*, “shared in by many,” for which cf. Mil 280. Referred to at Vism 341. ⁸ *tiṇukkā*. Cf. SN ii.152. ⁹ Cf. SN iv.188; AN iv.224, AN v.175; Snp 396; Ja 1.231, Ja 1.232; DN iii.283. ¹⁰ Commentaries say for the time being.

lord (to be) like a slaughterhouse,¹ ... Sense-pleasures are declared by the lord (to be) like an impaling-stake,² ... Sense-pleasures are declared by the lord (to be) like a snake's head,³ of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more danger.”

Yet the monk Arittha, who had formerly been a vulture-trainer, being spoken to thus by these monks, expressed that pernicious view as before, obstinately holding to it, adhering to it:

“Undoubtedly, your reverences, as I understand *dhamma* taught by the lord, it is that in following those things called stumbling-blocks by the lord, there is no stumbling-block at all.”

And since those monks were unable to dissuade the monk Ariṭṭha, who had formerly been a vulture-trainer, from that pernicious view, then those monks approached the lord, and having approached they told this matter to the lord.⁴ Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monk Arittha, who had formerly been a vulture-trainer, saying :

“Is it true, as is said, that to you, Ariṭṭha, a pernicious view arose like this: ‘In so far as I understand *dhamma* ... no stumbling-block at all?’”

“Undoubtedly, lord, as I understand *dhamma* ... no stumbling-block at all.”

“To whom then⁵ do you, foolish man, understand that *dhamma* was taught thus by me? Are not, foolish man, things that are stumbling-blocks called stumbling-blocks by me in many a figure, and in following these is there not a veritable stumbling-block? Sense-pleasures are declared by me (to be things) affording little pleasure, of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more danger ... Sense-pleasures are declared by me (to be) like a snake's head, of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more danger. And yet you, foolish man, not

¹ *asisūnā*. Cf. MN i.144. ² *sattisūla*, sword-stake. See SN i.128 = Thig.58 = Thig.141; Vism 341. ³ *sappasira*. Cf. Snp 768. ⁴ Here MN i.131 puts in a little extra matter, to the effect that the lord sends a monk to fetch Ariṭṭha to him, while it omits the convening of the Order. ⁵ *kassa nu kho*. MN-a 2.104 “to (or for) a noble, or a brahmin, or a merchant, or a low-caste person, or a householder, or one gone forth, or a deva, or a man?”

only misrepresent me because of your own wrong grasp,¹ but you also injure yourself² and give rise to much demerit which for a long time will be for you, foolish man, of woe and sorrow.³ It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...⁴ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should speak thus⁵: ‘In so far as I understand *dhamma* taught by the lord, it is that in following those things called stumbling-blocks by the lord, there is no stumbling-block at all’; that monk should be spoken to by the monks thus: ‘Do not, venerable one, speak thus, do not misrepresent the lord, misrepresentation of the lord is not at all seemly, and the lord certainly would not speak thus; in many a figure, your reverence, are things that are stumbling-blocks called stumbling-blocks by the lord, and in following these there is a veritable stumbling-block.’ And if that monk,⁶ when he has been spoken to thus by the monks, should persist as before, that monk should be admonished by the monks up to the third time for giving up that (course). If, being admonished up to the third time, he should give it up, that is good. But if he should not give it up, there is an offence of expiation.”⁷

BD 3.23

Bu-Pc 6

Vin 4.1

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Should speak thus means: ‘In so far as I understand *dhamma* taught by the lord ... no stumbling-block at all.’

That monk means: the monk who speaks thus.

By the monks means: by other monks, who see, who hear⁸; he should be told by these: “Do not, venerable one, speak thus ... a veritable stumbling-block.” And a second time he should be told ... And a third time he should be told ... If he gives it up, that is good. If he

¹ Cf. DN ii.124f. ² *Attānañ ca khaṇasi*. ³ To here = MN i.130–MN i.132 except for passages noted above, BD 3.23 n. ⁴ To here = Vin 2.25–26. ⁵ Cf. Bu-Pc 70.1. ⁶ Cf. Vin 3.173, Vin 3.175 = BD 1.300, BD 1.305. ⁷ This is more like *Saṅghādisesa* material.

Cf. J.Bu-As. 1914, p. 514, for the version of the *Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins*. ⁸ From here to end, 2, 3, cf. Vin 3.173–174, Vin 3.176, Vin 3.177–178 (BD.1.361–362, (BD 1.306, (BD 1.312)).

does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having heard, they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That monk, having been pulled to the midst of the Order, should be told: "Do not, venerable one, speak thus ... a veritable stumbling-block." And a second time he should be told ... And a third time he should be told. ... If he gives it up, that is good; if he does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

That monk should be admonished. And thus, monks, should he be admonished: the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. A pernicious view has arisen to the monk so and so, like this: "In so far as I understand ... no stumbling-block at all." He does not give up that view. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order admonish the monk so and so that he may give up this view. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me: A pernicious view has arisen to the monk so and so ... He does not give up this view. The Order admonishes the monk so and so that he may give up this view. If the admonishing of the monk so and so that he may give up this view is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, then you should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me ... then you should speak. The monk so and so has been admonished by the Order for giving up this view. If it is pleasing to the Order, let them be silent ... thus do I understand this.'

As a result of the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing; as a result of two proclamations there are offences of wrong-doing; at the end of the proclamations there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) does not give it up, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) does not give it up, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is a

legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence.¹

There is no offence if he is not admonished; if he gives it up; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Eighth

¹ Parallel passages at [Vin 3.174](#), [Vin 3.177](#), [Vin 3.179](#), [Vin 3.186](#) read for the last case, *āpatti dukkaṭassa*.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 69

4:137 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
69.1.1 that time the group of six monks knowingly used to eat together with
3:27 and be in communion with¹ and lie down in a sleeping place with
Ariṭṭha, the monk who talked thus,² who had not acted according to
the rule,³ who had got given up that view. Those who were modest
monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the group of six monks knowingly eat together with
and be in communion with and lie down in a sleeping place with
Ariṭṭha ... who has not given up that view?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, knowingly eat together with
and are in communion with and lie down in a sleeping place with
Ariṭṭha ... who has not given up that view?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, knowingly eat together with and be in
communion with and lie down in a sleeping place with Ariṭṭha ... who
has not given up that view? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those
who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training
should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should knowingly eat together with or be in
communion with or lie down in a sleeping place with a monk**

1 *saṃvāsati*. See Old Commentary's explanation below. *Saṃvāsa* at end of each
Pārājika rule translated in BD.1 by “communion.” 2 *tathāvādin*—i.e., as in Bu-
Pc 68. Cf. *tathāvādin* at Snp 430; It 122. 3 *akaṭānuddhamma*—i.e., he had not given
up his wrong views after the admonition suggested in the *sikkhāpada* of Bu-Pc 68.
Critical Pali Dictionary misses the point in translating as “who had not been dealt
with according to the rule.”

who talks thus, who has not acted according to the rule, who has not given up that view, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

He knows means: either he knows by himself or others tell him or (someone) tells him.¹

Talks thus means: talks so,² saying: ‘In so far as I understand *dhamma* taught by the lord, it is that in following those things called stumbling-blocks by the lord there is no stumbling-block at all.’³

Has not acted according to the rule means: he is suspended, not restored.⁴

Together with (to monk) who has not given up that⁵ view means: together with (a monk) who has not given up this⁶ view.

Or should eat with means: there are two (kinds of) eating, eating food and eating *dhamma*. Eating food⁷ means, if he gives or accepts food, there is an offence of expiation. Eating *dhamma* means, he recites or causes to recite. If he recites or causes a line to be recited, for every line there is an offence of expiation; if he recites or causes a syllable to be recited, for every syllable there is an offence of expiation.⁸

Or should be in communion with means: if he performs the Observance day (ceremony) or the Invitation ceremony or a (formal) act of the Order⁹ together with one who is suspended, there is an offence of expiation.

Or should lie down in a sleeping place with means: if one who is suspended is lying down and a monk lies down in a sleeping place under the same roof,¹⁰ there is an offence of expiation. If a monk is lying down and one who is suspended lies down, there is an offence of

¹ Cf. Vin 3.265; Vin 4.49, Vin 4.67, and above, BD 3.5, BD 3.8, BD 3.16. ² *evaṃvādin*.

³ As in Bu-Pc 68. ⁴ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2982.) ⁵ *taṃ*.

⁶ *etaṃ*. ⁷ *āmisasambhoga*. ⁸ Cf. Vin 4.15, Vin 4.22. ⁹ Cf. Vin 3.164 and BD 1.283 for these three ceremonies. ¹⁰ *ekacchanne*. *Channa* is a cover, meaning here a roof rather than a coverlet. Cf. Vin 4.17, Vin 4.19, in definition of *seyyā*, sleeping-place.

expiation. Or, if both are lying down, there is an offence of expiation. If, getting up, they lie down again and again, there is an offence of expiation.¹

59.2.2
3.30
If he thinks that one is suspended when he is suspended, (and) eats together with or is in communion with or lies down in a sleeping place with (him), there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether one is suspended ... offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not suspended when he is suspended ... no offence. If he thinks that one is suspended when he is not suspended, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether one is not suspended, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not suspended when he is not suspended, there is no offence.

69.2.3
There is no offence if he knows, “He is not suspended”; if he knows, “He was suspended, he is restored”; if he knows, “He has given up that view”; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Ninth

¹ Cf. Vin 4.17, Vin 4.19, and below, BD 3.34.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 70

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a pernicious view had arisen to the novice¹ Kaṇḍaka,² like this: "In so far as I understand *dhamma* taught by the lord, it is that in following those things called stumbling-blocks by the lord, there is no stumbling-block at all."³

Several monks heard: "A pernicious view has arisen to the novice Kaṇḍaka ..." (See **Bu-Pc 68.1**. *Instead of the monk Ariṭṭha, who was formerly a vulture-trainer, read the novice Kaṇḍaka; instead of Ariṭṭha, Kaṇḍaka; in his reply to the monks read honoured sir instead of your reverence.*) ...

"... It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... and it causes wavering in some."

Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Because of this, monks, let the Order expel⁴ the novice Kaṇḍaka. And thus, monks, should he be expelled: 'From today forth, reverend Kaṇḍaka, the lord can neither be referred to as your teacher, nor can that be yours of which other novices have the chance,⁵ namely the lying down to sleep for two or three nights with monks.⁶ Get away⁷

¹ *samañuddesa*, explained in Old Commentary as *sāmañera*. *Samañuddesa* = one marked as a recluse; cf. DN i.151 (Sīha); MN ii.244 (Cunda); MN iii.128 (Aciravata); AN ii.78 (*ārāmikasam*^o); AN iii.109, AN iii.343; Divyāvadāna 160. ² Another (?) Kaṇḍaka was one of Upananda's two novices, Vin 1.79; seduced a nun, Vin 1.85. Vin-a 874 calls him and Ariṭṭha and the Vajjiputtakas of Vesālī, enemies of the Buddha's teaching. ³ See **Bu-Pc 68**. ⁴ *nāsetu*. Cf. above, **BD 3.28, n. 4**. ⁵ *labhanti*. ⁶ See **Bu-Pc 5**. ⁷ *carā ti gaccha*, Vin-a 871.

with you, ¹ depart.’”²

Then the Order expelled the novice Kaṇḍaka. Now at that time the group of six monks knowingly encouraged³ and supported⁴ and ate with and lay down in a sleeping-place with the novice Kaṇḍaka, thus expelled. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the group of six monks knowingly encourage and support and eat with and lie down in a sleeping-place with the novice Kaṇḍaka, thus expelled?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, knowingly encourage and support and eat with and lie down in a sleeping-place with the novice Kaṇḍaka, thus expelled?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, knowingly encourage ... thus expelled? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“If even a novice should speak thus⁵: ‘In so far as I understand *dhamma* taught by the lord, it is that in following those things called stumbling-blocks by the lord, there is no stumbling-block at all,’ that novice should be spoken to thus by the monks: ‘Do not speak thus, reverend novice; do not misrepresent the lord, misrepresentation of the lord is not at all seemly, and the lord certainly would not speak thus. Reverend novice, in many a figure

¹ *pire*. *Vinaya Texts* i.49, n. 3, says: “In text read *cara pi re*, that is *cara api re*, instead of *cara pare*.” *Pali-English Dictionary* says that *pi* and *re* both act “as parts of exclamation. The Commentary explains by ‘*pire* (vocative?) = *para amāma*’ is an artificial construction.” *Critical Pali Dictionary*, quoting this passage, calls *pi re* an “expression of contempt; cf. *je*.” ² *vinassā ti nassa*, *Vin-a* 871, which adds “go away where we do not see you.” ³ *upalāpeti*, to cajole, flatter. ⁴ *upaṭṭhāpeti*. *Vinaya Texts* i. 49, n. 5 says that “no doubt *upaṭṭhāpeti* is used in the sense of showing such personal attentions to another, as the *upaṭṭhākā* did to the Buddha; and such services would very, rightly come under this rule.” Cf. *upaṭṭhāpetabbā* and *upaṭṭhāpeyya* at [Vin 1.79](#); not necessary to take it here in sense of ordaining as at *Vinaya Texts* i.205. It has rather sense of supporting, waiting on, ministering to. See Old Commentary, below.

⁵ Cf. [Bu-Pc 68.1](#).

are things that are stumbling-blocks called stumbling-blocks by the lord, and in following these, there is a veritable stumbling-block.’ And if that novice, when he has been spoken to thus by the monks, should persist as before, that novice should be spoken to thus by the monks: ‘From today forth, reverend novice, the lord can neither be referred to as your teacher, nor can that be yours of which other novices get the chance, namely, the lying down to sleep for two or three nights with monks. Get away with you, depart.’ Whatever monk should knowingly encourage or should support or should eat with or should lie down in a sleeping-place with a novice thus expelled, there is an offence of expiation.”

Novice¹ means: he is called a novice.²

Should speak thus means: he says: ‘In so far as I understand *dhamma* taught by the lord ... no stumbling-block at all.’³

That novice means: the novice who speaks thus.

By the monks means: by other monks, who see, who hear. He should be told by these: ‘Do not, reverend novice, speak thus ... no stumbling-block at all.’ And a second time he should be told ... And a third time he should be told ... If he gives it up, that is good. If he does not give it up,⁴ that monk should be spoken to thus by the monies: ‘From today forth reverend novice ... depart.’

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

He knows means: either he knows by himself, or others tell him, or (someone) tells him.⁵

Thus expelled means: so expelled.

Novice⁶ means: he is called a novice.⁷

Should encourage means: if he encourages⁸ him, saying: ‘I will give him a bowl or a robe or a recitation or an interrogation,’ there is an offence of expiation.

¹ *samañuddesa*. ² *sāmañera*. ³ Cf. above, **BD 3.24**. ⁴ Cf. above, **BD 3.25**. ⁵ Cf. above, **BD 3.5**. ⁶ *samañuddesa*. ⁷ *sāmañera*. ⁸ *Vinaya Texts* i.49, n. 4: “flatters him (talks him-over, *tassa upalāpeti*) ...” I do not think, however, that *tassa* goes with *upalāpeti*, but with *dassāmi*: *tassa pattam vā cīvaram vā ... dassāmi ti upalāpeti*; in 2,2 *upalāpeti* is not preceded by *tassa*.

Or should support means: if he agrees¹ to chunam or clay or a tooth-cleaner or water for the face² for him, there is an offence of expiation.

Or should eat with means: there are two kinds of eating: eating food and eating *dhamma* ... for every syllable there is an offence of expiation.³

Or should lie down in a sleeping-place with means: if a novice who is expelled is lying down and a monk lies down under one roof, there is an offence of expiation. If a monk is lying down and the novice who is expelled lies down, there is an offence of expiation. Or if both lie down, there is an offence of expiation. If, getting up, they lie down again and again, there is an offence of expiation,⁴

If he thinks that he is expelled when he is expelled, and encourages or supports (him) or eats with or lies down in a sleeping-place with him, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is expelled ... an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not expelled when he is expelled ... no offence. If he thinks that he is expelled when he is not expelled, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not expelled, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not expelled when he is not expelled, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he knows, “He is not expelled”; if he knows, “He has given up that view”; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Tenth

THIS IS ITS KEY

Intentional slaughter, with living things (in it), opening up, concealment of what is very bad,

¹ *sādiyati*. *Vinaya Texts* i. 49, p. 5: “by providing him with chunam ...” ² On these articles see [Vin 1.46](#) (= [Vin 2.223](#)), [Vin 2.51](#), [Vin 2.52](#), [Vin 2.61](#); and on tooth-cleaners, [dantakaṭṭha](#), [Vin 2.137](#). ³ = above, [BD 3.29](#). ⁴ Cf. above, [BD 3.29](#), and [BD 2.196](#), [BD 2.202](#).

Under twenty, and a caravan, an arrangement, about Ariṭṭha,
Suspended, and Kaṇḍaka: just these ten rules of training.

*The seventh Division: on what contains life.*¹

Vin 4.1.

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i.49, n. 6 points out that “this title is taken from the second, not, as in all other cases, from the first rule in the section.” But in the ninth Division, the *Ratanavagga*, again the second rule gives its title to the Division.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 71

... at Kosambī in Ghosita's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Channa indulged in bad habits.¹ Monks spoke thus: "Reverend Channa, do not do that, it is not allowable." He spoke thus:

"Your reverences, I will not train myself in this rule of training until I have inquired about it of another monk, experienced, expert in discipline."²

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Channa, being spoken to by monks regarding a rule,³ speak thus: 'Your reverences, I will not train myself ... expert in discipline?'"

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Channa, being spoken to by monks regarding a rule, spoke thus: 'Your reverences, I will not train myself ... expert in discipline?'"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, being spoken to by monks regarding a rule, speak thus: 'Your reverences, I will not train myself ... expert in discipline'? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not

¹ = Vin 3.177 = Vin 4.113. At Vin 2.9ff. = Vin 3.179ff. the act of banishment was to be carried out against monks who indulged in the long list of bad habits specified there. In view of this penalty it must be presumed that such bad habits were "not allowable." ² *vinayadhara*. At AN i.25 Upāli is said to be chief of those monks who are *vinayadhara*, proficient, skilled in discipline, who know it by heart; see BD 1.60, n. 4. To be a *vinayadhara* is one of the ten qualities which make a monk altogether charming and complete in every attribute, AN v.10ff., while the qualities for making one a *vinayadhara* are given at AN iv.14off. ³ *sahadhammikam*; cf. BD 1.310, where translation should have been as above.

(yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, being spoken to by monks regarding a rule, should speak thus: ‘Your reverences, I will not train myself in this rule of training until I have inquired about it from another monk, experienced, expert in discipline,’ there is an offence of expiation. Monks,¹ it should be learnt,² it should be inquired into, it should be investigated³ by a monk who is training.⁴ This is the proper course here.”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

By monks means: by other monks.

Regarding a rule means: whatever is a rule of training laid down by the lord, this is called regarding a rule.⁵

Being spoken to ... should speak⁶ thus⁷: ‘Your reverences, I will not train myself until I have inquired⁸ ... expert in discipline’ means: if he says, “I am inquiring about it of a wise, experienced, clever, learned speaker on the rules,”⁹ there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained (and) speaks thus, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he

¹ *bhikkhave*. Cf. *Nissaggiya pācittiya* 10, where this form of address also occurs in the *sikkhāpada*, rule. ² *aññātabbāṃ*, or should come to be known. Cf. *aññātāVindriya*. See my *Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected*, p.162ff. ³ *paripañhitabbāṃ*. See Old Commentary’s definition below. Vin-a 871 substitutes *upaparikkhitabbāṃ*. *Vinaya Texts* i.50 has “settle in his own mind.” Cf. AN v.16 for inquire+investigate. ⁴ This is the present participle medium, as also at DN ii.241. More frequently occurring as a feminine noun, *sikkhāmanā*, meaning a probationer, a woman undergoing a two years’ training; see below, Vin 4.319f., Vin 4.332ff. ⁵ = Vin 3.178 (BD 1.311). ⁶ Text and Siamese edition, *vadeti*; Sinhalese edition, *vadeyya*. ⁷ Sinhalese edition adds *ti*, “means”. ⁸ Omitted by Oldenberg and Siamese edition, but present in Sinhalese edition ⁹ *dhammakathika*. Here *dhamma* most probably in its Vinaya meaning of a “rule” or rules. There would be no point if, wanting to find out about the *vinaya*, the discipline, he were to ask someone who was an expert in *dhamma* in its Suttanta meaning of doctrine.

is ordained ... If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained (and) speaks thus, there is an offence of expiation. If, being spoken to about what is not laid down, he speaks thus, “This does not conduce to expunging (evil), nor to punctiliousness, nor to graciousness, nor to decreasing (the obstructions), nor to putting forth energy,”¹ (and) says: “Your reverences, I will not train myself in this rule of training until I have inquired about it of another monk, experienced, expert in discipline, one who is a wise, experienced, clever, learned speaker on the rules,”² there is an offence of wrong-doing. If being spoken to by one who is not ordained about what is laid down or about what is not laid down, he speaks thus: “This does not conduce to expunging (evil) ... nor to putting forth energy,” (and) says, “Your reverences, I will not train myself in this rule of training until I have inquired about it of another monk, experienced, expert in discipline, one who is a wise, experienced, clever, learned speaker on the rules,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.³

Is training means: is desiring to train.

It should be learnt means: it should be known.⁴

It should be inquired into means: he says, “This, honoured sir, what is the meaning⁵ of this?”⁶

It should be investigated means: it should be thought about, it

¹ Standing dhamma-talk. See **BD 1.37, n. 6** for references. ² Following the Sinhalese and Siamese editions, I omit Oldenberg’s text’s *ti* after *byattim vinayadharam*, “experienced, proficient in discipline.” The verb *paripucchāmi*, inquire, occurs once only in this sentence, at the end, thus governing the whole of it. As we have seen above in **Bu-Pc 71.2.1** the second clause, “a wise, experienced ...” is given as the definition of the first, “experienced, proficient in discipline,” and hence should not be treated as a separate sentence spoken by the offending monk. ³ No variant reading given. Probably should read *anāpatti*, no offence, although the next seven *Pācittiyas* in parallel passages read *anupasampanne anupasampannasāññī, āpatti dukkaṭṭassa*, as above. ⁴ *jānitabbaṃ*. ⁵ *attha*, or “use.” ⁶ Text inserts *vā*, or, after *imassa*, of this, but Sinhalese and Siamese editions omit.

should be examined.¹

This is the proper course here means: this is the appropriate course here.

There is no offence if he says, “I will know (about it and) I will train”; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The First

¹ *tulayitabbārī*, literally “should be weighed.”

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 72

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the lord in many a figure talked a talk on discipline¹ to the monks, he spoke in praise of discipline, he spoke in praise of accomplishment in discipline, he spoke in praise of the venerable Upāli,² referring (to him) again and again.³ Monks said: "The lord in many a figure talked a talk on discipline ... he spoke in praise of the venerable Upāli, referring (to him) again and again. Come, your reverences, let us master discipline under the venerable Upāli," and they, many monks, elders and newly ordained and those of middle standing, mastered discipline under the venerable Upāli. Then it occurred to the group of six monks:

"At present, your reverences, many monks, elders and ... are mastering discipline under the venerable Upāli. If these become properly versed⁴ in discipline they will win us to (them), they will win us round⁵ how they like, when they like, for as long as they like.⁶ Come, your reverences, let us disparage⁷ discipline."

Then the group of six monks, having approached the monks, spoke thus: "On account of what are these lesser and minor rules

¹ Vin-a 871 on what is connected with the allowable and the not allowable, with offences and what are not offences, with restraint and rejection. ² Cf. BD 1.60, n. 4, BD 1.112. ³ ādissa ādissa. Vin-a 875, *punappunam vavattḥapetvā visum visum katvā*.

⁴ *pakataññuno*. ⁵ *ālaḍḍhisanti parikaḍḍhissanti*. *Kaḍḍhali* is more literally to drag, to pull, to draw than to 'win'; but *pari*, round, over, used with any of these verbs, owing to the more prevalent associations of "to pull round," to drag round, cannot well be used. ⁶ *yenicchakam yadicchakam yāvadicchakam*. Cf. AN iii.28; Vism 154; Pp 11, Pp 12. ⁷ *vivaṇṇeti*, to dispraise, discredit, disparage.

of training¹ recited? They only² tend to remorse, to vexation,³ to perplexity.”⁴

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks disparage discipline’ ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, disparaged discipline?”
“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, disparage discipline? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should speak thus when the Pātimokkha is being recited⁵: ‘On account of what are these lesser and minor rules of training recited? They only tend to remorse, to vexation, to perplexity,’ in disparaging a rule of training, there is an offence of expiation.**”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

When the Pātimokkha is being recited means: when reciting it or when causing (another) to recite it or when studying it.⁶

Should speak thus means: he says: ‘On account of what are these lesser and minor rules of training recited? ... to perplexity.’ If he disparages discipline to one who is ordained, saying: ‘For those who master this there comes to be remorse, there comes to be vexation, there comes to be perplexity; for those who do not master this there does not come to be remorse, there does not come to be vexation, there does not come to be perplexity; this boon⁷ is not recited, this

¹ *khuddānukhuddaka sikkhāpada*. Vin 2.287 gives the views of various elders as to what these comprise. See DN ii.154 (and *Dialogues of the Buddha* 2.171, n. 2); Mil 142ff.; AN i.231f.; B.C. LAW, *History of Pali Literature*, i.19ff.; PRZYLUŚKI, *Le Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 52, p. 154, p. 217. ² *yāvad eva*. Cf. NEUMANN, *Reden*, p. 16 “nur”; *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.6, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.7 “only.” ³ *vihesā*. Cf. *vihesaka* at Vin 4.36 (BD 2.231f.), and *vihesikā* at Vin 4.239 (below, BD 3.207). At the former passage it means to keep silence when being examined for an offence; at the latter to protest against a formal act. ⁴ *vilekhā*. ⁵ *uddissamāne*. Vin-a 876, by a teacher to a pupil. ⁶ Cf. Vin 4.15, *sajjhāyam karonto*. ⁷ *vara*.

boon is not learnt, this boon is not mastered, this boon is not borne in mind,¹ or let discipline disappear or let these monks become not properly versed,² there is an offence of expiation.

72.2.2

If he thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained, (and) disparages discipline, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether he is ordained ... If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained ... offence of expiation. If he disparages another rule,³ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he disparages discipline or another rule to one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

4.144

72.2.3

There is no offence if, not desiring to disparage, he speaks, saying: “Look here, do you master *suttantas* or verses or what is extra to *dhamma*⁴ and afterwards you will master discipline;” if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Second

¹ *adhārita*, not held. ² *apakataññuno*; also occurs at [Vin 4.112](#). ³ *dhamma*, or here perhaps “matter,” since *dhamma* is in opposition to *Vinaya*, the whole of the discipline. Moreover, since there is *Pācittiya* in disparaging the lesser and minor rules, it would seem as if disparaging any more important rule would incur a heavier penalty than *dukkaṭa*. ⁴ *abhidhammaṃ*. Cf. [Vin 4.344](#), [Vin 5.86](#), where *abhidhamma* occurs with *suttanta* and *Vinaya*. See [BD 3, Introduction, p. xff](#). Other Sutta references to *abhidhamma* are at [Vin 1.64](#), [Vin 1.68](#); [MN i.472](#), [MN ii.239](#), [MN ii.240](#); [DN iii.267](#); [AN v.24](#), [AN v.27](#), [AN v.90](#), [AN v.201](#), [AN v.339](#); and see [MN-a 3.185](#), [MN-a 4.29](#); [DN-a 18](#), [DN-a 1047](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 73

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, thinking: "Let them understand¹ that having indulged in bad habits, we are fallen through ignorance,"² while the Pātimokkha was being recited, spoke thus: "Only now³ do we understand that this rule⁴ is, as is said, handed down in a clause,⁵ contained in a clause, (and) comes up for recitation every half-month."

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks speak thus while the Pātimokkha is being recited ... '... every half-month'?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that you spoke thus while the Pātimokkha was being recited ... '... every half-month'?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, speak thus while the Pātimokkha is being recited: '... every half-month'? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this

¹ *jānantu*, may these people understand, think that we have done this without knowledge. ² *aññāṇakena āpannā*, attained by the ignorant, by the man who does not know the rule. ³ *idān'eva kho*. *Vinaya Texts* i.50, "Now for the first time"; E. HUBER, *J.BU-AS*. Nov-Dec, 1913, Bu-Pc.83, "C'est maintenant seulement que je me rends compte." ⁴ *dhamma*. ⁵ *suttāgata*; cf. *āgatāgama* at, e.g. **BD 3.71** below. *Vinaya Texts* i.50, *Vinaya Texts* ii.434 (= **Vin 2.68**, where this whole speech also occurs) translate *suttāgato suttapariyāpanno* as "is handed down in the suttas, is contained in the suttas." But cf. *Vinaya Texts* i.xxviii.f. and **BD 1.X** for *Vinaya* use of *sutta* as rule, clause or article. No rule of discipline was formally handed down in the Suttas—which in any case ought perhaps more properly to be called Suttantas.

rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, while the Pātimokkha is being recited every half-month, should speak thus: ‘Only now do I understand that this rule is, as is said, handed down in a clause, contained in a clause, (and) comes up for recitation every half-month’; if other monks should know concerning this monk that this monk has sat down two or three times before,¹ not to say oftener,² while the Pātimokkha was being recited, there is not only no freedom³ for that monk on account of (his) ignorance, but he ought to be dealt with according to the rule for the offence into which he has fallen there, and further confusion should be put on⁴ him, saying: ‘Your reverence, this is bad for you, this is badly gotten by you, that you, while the Pātimokkha is being recited, do not attend applying yourself properly.’⁵ This for him on whom the confusion is put⁶ is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Every half-month means: every Observance day.⁷

When the Pātimokkha is being recited means: when reciting it.⁸

Should speak thus means: if he, thinking, “Let them understand that, having indulged in bad habits, I am fallen through ignorance,” speaks thus, while the Pātimokkha is being recited, “Only now do I understand ... every half-month,” there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If ... this means: the monk whom they desire to confuse.

¹ Seats had to be arranged in the *uposatha*-hall, Vin 1.118; cf. Vin 1.125; and the rules stating that the Pātimokkha must not be recited in a seated assembly, *nisinnaparīsā*, Vin 1.135. ² *ko pana vādo bhiyyo*. I follow translation at *Vinaya Texts* i.50. HUBER, J. BU-As. Nov, “*et pas davantage*.” ³ *mutti*, from the offence, Vin-a 877. ⁴ *moho āropetabbo*. It has to be established that he committed the offence in confusion, in ignorance. ⁵ *nā sādhuḥkaṃ aṭṭhikatvā manasikarosi*. *Vinaya Texts* i.51, “You fail to take it to your heart, and attend to it with care.” ⁶ *idaṃ tasmim mohanake pācittiyā ti*. The act of confusing, of establishing the fact that a monk had spoken or acted in ignorance, is *mohanaka*. It also means cheating, deceiving, pretending. ⁷ *anvaddhamāsan ti anuposathikaṃ* = Vin 4.315. ⁸ Cf. above, BD 3.41.

Monks should know (concerning this monk) that he has sat down ... and further confusion should be put on him. And thus, monks, should it be put on him: the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk so and so, while the Pātimokkha was being recited, did not attend applying himself properly. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should put confusion on the monk so and so. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk ... did not attend applying himself properly. The Order is putting confusion on the monk so and so. If the putting of confusion on¹ the monk so and so is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, you should speak. Confusion is put on the monk so and so by the Order, and it is right ... So do I understand this.’

If he confuses when confusion is not put on him,² there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he confuses when confusion is put on him,³ there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act⁴ when it is a legally valid act (and) confuses him, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) confuses him, there is an offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act (and) confuses him, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act (and) confuses him, there is an offence of wrong-

¹ *mohassa āropanā*. ² This I think can only mean that if he is convicted of being confused not by the Order but by an individual, there is a *dukkha* for that individual. But if he is convicted of being confused by the Order and then some individual tries to confuse him, there is *pācittiya* for that individual. ³ This I think can only mean that if he is convicted of being confused not by the Order but by an individual, there is a *dukkha* for that individual. But if he is convicted of being confused by the Order and then some individual tries to confuse him, there is *pācittiya* for that individual.

⁴ Vin-a 877 “amongst these, the (formal) act of ‘putting confusion on (a monk)’ is meant.”

doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

73.2.3

There is no offence if he is not heard in detail; if he is heard in detail (but) less than two or three times; if he does not desire to confuse; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Third

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 74

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, angry, displeased, gave the group of seventeen monks¹ a blow; these cried out. Monks spoke thus: "Why do you, your reverences, cry out?"

"Your reverences, this group of six monks, angry, displeased, gave us a blow." Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks, angry, displeased, give monks a blow?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, angry, displeased, gave monks a blow?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, angry, displeased, give monks a blow? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monk, angry, displeased, should give a monk a blow, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

A monk means: another monk.

Angry, displeased means: dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.²

Should give a blow means: if he gives a blow with the body or

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 52, Bu-Pc 55, Bu-Pc 60, Bu-Pc 75. ² = Vin 3.255 = Vin 4.236, Vin 4.238. Cf. Vin 3.163 where these five words are used to explain *duṭṭho doso*, "malignant, malicious"; see BD 1.281 and cf. DN iii.238; MN i.101.

with something attached to the body or with something that may be cast,¹ and even with a lotus-leaf,² there is an offence of expiation.³

If he thinks that one is ordained when he is ordained, (and) angry, displeased, gives a blow, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether one is ordained ... If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is ordained, (and) angry, displeased ... offence of expiation. If angry, displeased, he gives a blow to one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether one is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁴

There is no offence if, being in some difficulty, he gives a blow desiring freedom⁵; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fourth

¹ Cf. Vin 3.74 = BD 1.129. Cf. BD 1.207, BD 1.218, where commentarial explanations of *kāyapaṭibaddha*, “something attached to the body,” are cited. ² *uppalapatta*. Cf. next *Pācittiya* and Bi-Pc 3, Bi-Pc 4. ³ Referred to at Dh-p-a 3.48. ⁴ Surely should read *anāpatti*, no offence. ⁵ *kenaci viheṭhiyamāno mokkhādhippāyo*. Vin-a 877 says if it is on account of a man or an animal, it is no offence to strike a blow with the body, with something attached to it, or with something that may be cast.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 75

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, angry, displeased, raised the palm of the hand¹ against the group of seventeen monks.² These, frightened of a blow,³ cried out. Monks spoke thus: "Why do you, your reverences, cry out?"

"Your reverences, this group of six monks, angry, displeased, raised the palm of the hand against us." Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks, angry, displeased, raise the palm of the hand against the group of seventeen monks?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, angry, displeased, raised the palm of the hand against the group of seventeen monks?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, angry, displeased, raise the palm of the hand against the group of seventeen monks? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

¹ *talasattikaṃ uggiranti*. *Vinaya Texts* i.51 has "shall make use of any threatening gesture," a rendering governed by the Old Commentary's explanation, q.v. ² Cf. *Bu-Pc 52*, *Bu-Pc 55*, *Bu-Pc 60*, *Bu-Pc 74*. ³ Text reads *pahārasamucitā*. Variant readings: *te pahāraṃ pamuccitā*; *te pahārasaṃmucitā*; *te pahārasamuccitā*. *Pali-English Dictionary* says of *samucita* "(*saṃ+ucita*, pp. of *uc* to be pleased), suitable, *Vin 4.147* (must mean something else here, perhaps 'hurt' or 'frightened')." *Vin-a 878* says that these monks were familiar with blows, having received them before, and that they were frightened. The variant readings suggest that the monks were suitable objects for a blow, but that they escaped a blow which was threatened, not given.

“Whatever monk, angry, displeased, should raise the palm of the hand against a monk, there is an offence of expiation.”¹

75.2.1

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Against a monk means: against another monk.

Angry, displeased means: ... stubborn.²

Should raise the palm of the hand means: if he lifts up³ the body or something attached to the body, and even at most a lotus-leaf,⁴ there is an offence of expiation.

75.2.2

If he thinks that one is ordained when he is ordained, (and) angry, displeased, raises the palm of the hand ... (see **Bu-Pc 74.2**) ... There is no offence if, being in some difficulty, he raises the palm of the hand desiring freedom; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fifth

¹ Referred to at Dhp-a 3.50. ² =above, **BD 3.47**. ³ *uccāreti*. ⁴ Cf. above, **BD 3.48**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 76

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks defamed a monk with an unfounded charge of an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can the group of six monks defame ... formal meeting of the Order?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, defamed a monk with an unfounded charge of an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order?" "It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men, defame ... formal meeting of the Order? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monk should defame a monk with an unfounded charge of an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, there is an offence of expiation."¹

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Monk² means: another monk.

Unfounded means: unseen, unheard, unsuspected.³

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: any one of the thirteen (offences entailing this penalty).

¹ Cf. Vin 3.163, Vin 3.167-168 = BD 1.281, where there is a *saṅghādisesa* offence in unfoundedly charging a monk with an offence involving defeat; and cf. BD 1.289. This *Pācittiya* and Bu-Ss 8 are referred to at Vin 1.173. ² Accusative. ³ = Vin 3.163 (= BD 1.282).

Should defame means: if he reprimands him or causes (another) to reprimand him, there is an offence of expiation.

76.2.2 If he thinks that one is ordained when he is ordained, and defames (him) with an unfounded charge of an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether one is ordained... If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is ordained ... offence of expiation. If he defames (him) in respect of a falling away from right habits or a falling away from right views,¹ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he defames one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether one is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.²

76.2.3 There is no offence if, thinking what is true, he reprimands him or causes (another) to reprimand him; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.³

The Sixth

¹ *ācāravipattiya vā diṭṭhivipattiya vā*. At [Vin 1.171-172](#) these two, preceded by *sīlavipatti*, are translated at *Vinaya Texts* 1.343: “moral transgression, transgression against the rules of conduct, heresy.” This passage states the kind of offence covered by each of these three groups. These three *vipattiyo* referred to at Ne 126.

² Doubtless should read *anāpatti*. ³ = [Vin 3.170](#) = [BD 1.295](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 77

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks intentionally aroused¹ remorse in the group of seventeen monks,² saying:

“Your reverences, a rule of training laid down by the lord says that a person under twenty years of age is not to be ordained³; and you, (though) under twenty years of age, are ordained. Then perhaps you are not really ordained.” These cried out. Monks spoke thus: “Why do you, your reverences, cry out?”

“Your reverences, this group of six monks intentionally aroused remorse in us.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks intentionally arouse remorse in monks?”

... “Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, intentionally aroused remorse in monks?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “How can you, foolish men, intentionally arouse remorse in monks? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should intentionally arouse remorse in a monk, thinking, “There will be no comfort for him even for a moment,” if having done it for just this object, not for another,⁴ there is an offence of expiation.”

¹ upadahantī ti uppādentī, Vin-a 878. Cf. vipptaṭisāraṃ upadahati at DN ii.135. ² Cf. Bu-Pc 52, Bu-Pc 55, Bu-Pc 60, Bu-Pc 74, Bu-Pc 75 for these two groups. ³ Cf. Bu-Pc 65. ⁴ = BD 2.248, BD 2.352; below, BD 3.55.

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

In a monk means: in another monk.

Intentionally means: a transgression committed knowingly, consciously, deliberately.¹

Should arouse remorse means: if he arouses remorse saying: 'Surely you, (though) under twenty years of age,² are ordained, surely you eat at the wrong time,³ surely you drink strong drink,⁴ surely you sit in a private place together with a woman,⁵ there is an offence of expiation.⁶

Having done it for just this object, not for another means: there comes to be no other object whatever (for which) to arouse remorse.⁷

If he thinks that one is ordained when he is ordained, (and) intentionally arouses remorse, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether one is ordained... If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is ordained ... offence of expiation. If he intentionally arouses remorse in one who is not ordained,⁸ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether one is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if, not desiring to arouse remorse, he speaks, saying: 'Surely you, (though) under twenty years of age, are ordained ... surely you sit in a private place together with a woman; come now, find out (about it), do not let there come to be remorse for you afterwards;' if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ = Vin 3.73, Vin 3.112 (= BD 1.126, BD 1.196) = Vin 4.124 = Vin 4.290. ² Bu-Pc 65. ³ Bu-Pc 37. ⁴ Bu-Pc 51. ⁵ Bu-Ay 1, Bu-Ay 2; Bu-Pc 44. ⁶ Vin-a 878, "for each sentence."
⁷ Cf. BD 2.248, BD 2.352; below, BD 3.56. ⁸ Vin-a 878 calls such a one a *sāmañera*.

The Seventh

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 78

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks quarrelled together with well behaved monks.¹ The well behaved monks spoke thus: "Your reverences, this group of six monks are shameless; it is not possible to quarrel together with them."

The group of six monks spoke thus: "Why do you, your reverences, bring us into disgrace² by speaking (of us) as shameless?"

"But how could you, your reverences, hear?"

"We stood overhearing³ the venerable ones." Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks stand overhearing monks when they are quarrelling, disputing, engaged in contention?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, stood ... engaged in contention?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How could you, foolish men, stand ... engaged in contention? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monk should stand overhearing monks when they are quarrelling, disputing, engaged in contention, saying, 'I will hear what they say,' if having done it for just this object, not for another,⁴ there is an offence of expiation."

¹ Cf. Vin 4.4. ² *pāpeti*. Cf. Vin 4.5. ³ *upassutiṃ*. Cf. SN ii.75, SN iv.91. ⁴ = Vin 4.43, Vin 4.93; above, BD 3.53.

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

When monks means: when other monks.

Are quarrelling, disputing, engaged in contention means: (when they are engaged) with legal questions.¹

Should stand overhearing means: if hearing these, he goes away, thinking: 'I will reprove (him), I will remind (him), I will reprimand (him), I will make (him) remorseful,² I will make him ashamed,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. If standing where he hears, there is an offence of expiation. If, going behind, he goes quickly, thinking: 'I will hear,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. If standing where he hears, there is an offence of expiation. If, going in front, he stays behind,³ thinking, 'I will hear,' there is an offence of wrong-doing. If standing where he hears, there is an offence of expiation. Having come to a place where a monk is resting or to a place where he is sitting down or to a place where he is lying down,⁴ taking counsel⁵ he should cough, he should let him know. Should he not cough or should he not let him know, there is an offence of expiation.

Having done it for just this object, not for another means: there comes to be no other object whatever (for which) to stand overhearing.

If he thinks that one is ordained when he is ordained, (and) stands overhearing, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether one is ordained ... If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is ordained ... offence of expiation. If he stands overhearing one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether one is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

¹ *adhikaraṇajātānaṃ*. On "legal question" see **BD 1.282**, **BD 1.290**, **BD 1.300**, and above, **Bu-Pc 63**. ² *paṭissāressāmi*. ³ *ohiyyati*; cf. *ohiyyaka* at **Vin 4.94**. ⁴ Cf. **Vin 3.263**.

⁵ Or, "advising him," in sense of letting him know, informing him. *Mantentan ti aññena saddhiṃ aññasmiṃ mantayamāne. Mantente ti vā pāṭho ayaṃ ev' āttho*, **Vin-a 879**.

There is no offence if having heard these he goes away, thinking: ‘I will desist,¹ I will refrain, I will be calm,² I will set myself free’³; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Eighth

¹ *oramissāmi*. Cf. Vin 3.54 = BD 1.90. See Journal of the Pali Text Society 1887, p.154.

² *vūpasamissāmi*. Vin-a 879, ‘I will not make a quarrel.’ ³ *parimocessāmi*; “telling of my innocence I will free myself,” Vin-a 879.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 79

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having indulged in bad habits, protested when a (formal) act¹ was being carried out² against each one. Now at that time the Order came to be convened on some business or other. The group of six monks, making robes, gave (their) consent³ to one. Then the Order, saying:

“Your reverences, this monk of the sixfold group is come alone; come, let us carry out a (formal) act against him,” carried out a (formal) act against him. Then that monk approached the group of six monks. The group of six monks spoke thus to that monk: “What did the Order do, your reverence?”

“The Order carried out a (formal) act against me, your reverences.”

“Your reverence, we did not give the consent for this, that it would carry out a (formal) act against you. If we had known that it would carry out a (formal) act against you, we should not have given the consent.”

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the group of six monks, having given (their) consent for legiti-

¹ *kamma*. Cf. Vin 1.49, Vin 1.143, Vin 1.316f., etc.; Vin 2.93, and Bu-Pc 63. ² Cf. Vin 1.115, where leave is given to protest if an act that is not legally valid is being performed; also Vin 2.93, and Vinaya Texts iii.46. ³ *chandaṃ adaṃsu*. Cf. below, BD 3.61. *Chanda* here, as in other parts of Vinaya, used in a technical sense. It is the declaration of consent of an absentee member; he sends his consent by proxy. The rules of *chanda* are given at Vin 1.121, Vin 1.122; every member of an *āvāsa* had to attend the performance of (official) acts either in person or by proxy. See also Vin 2.93; Vinaya Texts i.277, n. 1, and S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.126, p.146.

mate (formal) acts,¹ afterwards engage in criticism?”² ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, having given (your) consent for legitimate (formal) acts, afterwards engage in criticism?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, having given (your) consent ... afterwards engage in criticism? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, having given (his) consent for legitimate (formal) acts, should afterwards engage in criticism, there is an offence of expiation.”³

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Legitimate (formal) act means: a (formal) act for which leave ought to be asked,⁴ a (formal) act at which a motion is put,⁵ a (formal) act at which a motion is put and followed by one proclamation,⁶ a (formal) act at which a motion is put and is followed by three proclamations⁷; carried out according to rule, according to discipline,

¹ *dhammika kamma*. Explained in Old Commentary below. Cf. *dhammakamma* at e.g. Vin 3.174, Vin 3.177, Vin 3.179. ² *khīyadhammaṃ āpajjati*, literally attained the point of humiliation, devaluation. Cf. same expression at Bu-Pc 81, Bi-Pc 76; AN iii.269, AN iv.374. At Bu-Pc 13 it is an offence if a monk criticises, *khīyati*, and this offence is called *khīyanaka*, see Vin 4.38. In Bu-Pc 79 *khīyadhammaṃ āpajjati* may have a quite technical meaning of “falling into the rule against criticism”—*dhamma* in Vinaya often meaning a rule, *āpajjati* being the word used for falling into an offence, and *khīya* being devaluation, falling away from, deterioration, and hence criticism. But I think that it means “incline to criticism” or engage in it, for in Vinaya an offence does not usually arise from committing another offence: offences lead to penalties, not to other offences. ³ Referred to at Vin 2.94ff. ⁴ *apalokana-kamma*. See commentarial exegesis on Vin 2.89 at Vinaya Texts iii.37. ⁵ *ñāttikamma*. On this and the next two terms see Vinaya Texts i.169, n. 2. ⁶ = *ñāttidutiyakamma*. Cases where this is carried out not according to the rule given at Vin 1.317. ⁷ *ñātticatutthakamma*. See Vin 1.317. At Vin 2.89 these four acts comprise legal questions arising out of obligations, *kiccādhikaraṇa*. Cf. MN-a 4.43. See also Vin 2.90, Vin 2.91ff., Vin 5.116, Vin 5.167, Vin 5.220. Vin-a 879 refers to these as four *saṅghakammas*, (formal) acts of the Order.

according to the teacher's instruction,¹ this is called a legitimate (formal) act.

Having given (his) consent, if he criticises,² there is an offence of expiation.³

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act⁴ when it is a legally valid act (and), having given (his) consent, criticises, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act ... no offence. If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he criticises, knowing, "The (formal) act was carried out according to what is not the rule or by an incomplete assembly or against one not suitable for a (formal) act"⁵; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Ninth

¹ At Vin 4.126 these last three phrases occur as definition of *yathādhammāṃ*, according to the rule. See DN ii.124ff.; AN ii.168. ² *khīyali*. Cf. Vin 2.94, Vin 4.38.

³ Vin-a 879, "for each sentence." ⁴ *dhammakamma*. ⁵ Cf. Vin 4.37, Vin 4.126, and below, BD 3.63.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 80

80.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
D 3.61 at that time the Order came to be convened on some business or
other. The group of six monks, making robes, gave (their) consent
to one.¹ Then the Order, thinking, "We will carry out that (formal)
act for the sake of which we were convened," set aside the motion.
Then that monk, thinking, "Even thus do they carry out a (formal)
act against each one; against whom do you carry out the (formal)
act?" not having given the consent, rising up from his seat, departed.
Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

4.153 "How can this monk, when the Order is engaged in decisive talk,²
not having given the consent, rising up from his seat, depart?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, when the Order was engaged
in decisive talk, not having given the consent, rising up from your
seat, departed?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying: "How can
you, foolish man, when the Order is engaged in decisive talk, not
having given the consent, rising up from your seat, depart? It is not,
foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus,
monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

**"Whatever monk, when the Order is engaged in decisive talk,
not having given the consent, rising up from his seat, should de-
part, there is an offence of expiation."**

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 79. ² Vinicchayakathā. See Old Commentary below, and cf. Vism 16,
translated *Path of Purity*, i.20 "deciding discourse." Translated at *Vinaya Texts* i.52
"(formal) enquiry."

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

When the Order is engaged in decisive talk means: a matter is announced (but) not decided, or a motion is set aside, or a resolution is unfinished.¹

Not having given the consent, rising up from his seat, should depart means: if he goes away, thinking, “Why should it not carry out this (formal) act (although) it may be quashed,² (although) it may be incomplete?”³ there is an offence of wrong-doing. In leaving (the space of) a reach of the hand⁴ from the assembly, there is an offence of wrong-doing. When he has left, there is an offence of expiation.⁵

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act⁶ (and) not having given the consent, rising up from his seat, departs, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act ... no offence. If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he goes away, thinking: “There will come to be quarrel or dispute or strife or contention for the Order”; if he goes away, thinking: “There will come to be schism in the Order or dissension in the Order”; if he goes away, thinking: “He will carry out the (formal) act according to what is not rule, or by an incomplete congregation, or against one not suitable for a (formal) act”⁷; if, being

¹ *vippakala*. Cf. Vin 2.243=Vinaya Texts iii.310 “going on”; Vin 2.304=Vinaya Texts iii.405 “unfinished”; AN ii.196=GS 2.208 “broken off” and “interrupted.” ² *kuppa*. Cf. *kammena kuppenna* at Vin 2.71 and *kammena akuppenna* at Vin 2.68, Vin 2.71. ³ Cf. Vin 1.315ff. ⁴ Cf. Vin 3.200, Vin 4.47; Vin-a 783. ⁵ Cf. Vin 4.93. ⁶ Cf. Vin 3.174, Vin 3.177, Vin 3.179, Vin 3.186; Vin 4.126, Vin 4.152. ⁷ Cf. Vin 4.37, Vin 4.126, Vin 4.152.

ill, he goes away; if he goes away because there is something to be done for one who is ill; if he goes away to relieve himself;* if anxious not to find fault with the (formal) act,¹ he goes away, thinking: “I will come back again”; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Tenth

¹ *na kammanā kopetukāmo.*

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 81

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time the venerable Dabba the Mallian assigned lodgings to the Order and distributed meals.¹ And the venerable one's robe became worn thin. Now at that time one robe accrued to the Order. Then the Order gave this robe to the venerable Dabba the Mallian. The group of six monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "The monks are appropriating a benefit belonging to the Order² according to acquaintanceship."³

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks, having given away a robe by means of a complete Order,⁴ afterwards engage in criticism?"⁵ ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, having given away a robe ... afterwards engaged in criticism?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, having given away a robe ... afterwards engage in criticism? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

¹ Cf. Bu-Ss 8, Vin 3.158 (BD 1.271-272), and Bu-Pc 13, Vin 4.37 (BD 2.235). ² Cf. Vin 3.265. ³ *yathāsantataṃ*, Variant reading *-saṅhatam*, explained below in Old Commentary, as *yathāmittatā*... Cf. Bu-Pc 13 where Dabba is accused of acting out of favouritism. ⁴ *samaggena saṅghena*. All members of any particular Order—i.e. that part of the Order staying in a certain residence, *āvāsa*, or within a certain boundary, *sīmā*, had to be present for the proper carrying out of all official proceedings. See Old Commentary below. Cf. Bu-Pc 21, especially Vin 4.52. ⁵ Cf. Bu-Pc 79.

“Whatever monk, having given away a robe by means of a complete Order, should afterwards engage in criticism, saying: “The monks are appropriating a benefit belonging to the Order according to acquaintanceship,” there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Complete Order means: belonging to the same communion,¹ staying within the same boundary.²

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.³

According to acquaintanceship means: according to friendship,⁴ according to comradeship,⁵ according to intimacy,⁶ according as one has the same preceptor, according as one has the same teacher.⁷

Belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to (it).⁸

A benefit means: the requisites of robes, almsfood, lodgings, medicines for the sick, and even a lump of chunam and a toothpick and unwoven thread.⁹

Should afterwards engage in criticism means: if he criticises when a robe is given to one who is ordained (and) agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings or as distributor of meals or as apportioner of conje or as apportioner of fruit or as apportioner of solid food or as disposer of trifles,¹⁰ there is an offence of expiation.

If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act, (and) criticises when a robe is given, there is an offence of expiation.

¹ *samānasarivāsaka*. Cf. definition of *sarivāsa*, communion, in each Defeat, BD.1.

² *samānasimāyaṃ ṭhito*. These two expressions occur in same definition at BD 3.170, BD 3.193 below, and Vin 3.173, also at Vin 1.321. See note at *Vinaya Texts* ii.209, *Vinaya Texts* ii.271. That the two terms are not necessarily coincident is shown at Vin 1.340. See also S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 132. ³ = BD 2.7, BD 2.40, BD 2.48, BD 2.140. ⁴ *yathāmittatā*. ⁵ *yathāsandiṭṭhatā*. *Sandiṭṭha* is a friend, one seen together with (you). ⁶ *Yathāsambhattatā*. Cf. DN ii.98. ⁷ Cf. Vin 4.178.

⁸ = Vin 3.266. ⁹ = Vin 3.266. Cf. Vin 3.241, Vin 3.260. ¹⁰ Cf. Vin 4.38 (= BD 2.236) and note for references.

If he is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act ... offence of expiation. If he criticises when another requisite is given, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he criticises when a robe or another requisite is given to one ordained, (but) not agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings ... as disposer of trifles, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he criticises when a robe or another requisite is given to one who is not ordained, (whether) agreed upon or not agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings ... as disposer of trifles, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is no offence.¹

There is no offence if he criticises, saying: 'What is the use of giving to one acting by nature from desire, from hatred, from confusion, from fear? For having received it, he will ruin it, he will not look after² it properly if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.'³

*The Eleventh*⁴

¹ Cf. Vin 4.39. ² *upanessati; upaneti*, to bring up to, to conduce, to adduce; to present, give. ³ Cf. Vin 4.39 (BD 2.237), and see n. 2. ⁴ See notes end of Bu-Pc 80.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 82

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery.¹ Now at that time at Sāvattthī food with robe-material was prepared for the Order by a certain guild, saying: "Having offered food, we will present them with robe-material." Then the group of six monks approached that guild, and having approached, they said to that guild: "Sirs, give these robes to these monks."

"Honoured sirs, we will not give; almsfood with robes are made ready by us every year for the Order."

"Sirs, many are the Order's benefactors, many are the Order's devotees. These (monks) are here depending on you, looking to you, but if you will not give to them, then who is there who will give to them? Sirs, give these robes to these monks."

Then that guild, being pressed by the group of six monks, giving the group of six monks as much robe-material as was prepared, served the Order with a meal. Those monks who knew that robe-material with a meal² was prepared for the Order and did not know that it was given to the group of six monks, spoke thus:

"Sirs, dedicate robe-material to the Order."

"Honoured sirs, there is none; the masters, the group of six monks appropriated to the masters, the group of six monks, as much robe-material as was prepared."

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks knowingly appropriate to an individual an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order?" ...

¹ Cf. **Bu-NP 30**. There the offence, however, is procuring something for oneself. See **BD 2.16off.** for notes. ² *sacīvarabhatta*; at **Vin 3.265** *cīvarabhatta*.

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, knowingly appropriated to an individual an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, knowingly appropriate to an individual an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should knowingly appropriate to an individual an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

He knows means: either he knows by himself or others tell him or (someone) tells him.

Belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to it.

A benefit means: the requisites of robes, almsfood, lodgings, medicines for the sick, and even a lump of chunam and a toothpick and unwoven thread.

Apportioned means: if it has been expressly said: “We will give, we will make,” (and) he appropriates it to an individual, there is an offence of expiation.

If¹ he thinks that it is apportioned when it is apportioned (and) appropriates it to an individual, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is apportioned (and) appropriates it to an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not apportioned when it is apportioned (and) appropriates it to an individual, there is no offence. If he appropriates what is apportioned to the Order for another (part of the) Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what

¹ Just before this passage Bu-NP 30 has the usual directions as to forfeiture, omitted of necessity here.

is apportioned to a shrine for another shrine or for the Order or for an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what is apportioned to an individual for another individual or for an Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is apportioned when it is not apportioned, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not apportioned, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not apportioned when it is not apportioned, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he himself being asked, 'Where do we give?' says, 'Give wherever your gift could be used or could be mended or should be for a long time or when for you the mind is peaceful;' if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Twelfth

THIS IS ITS KEY

Regarding a rule, and disparagement, causing confusion, striking a blow,¹ The palm of the hand, and unfounded, intentionally, and overhearing, And preventing and consent,² and on Dabba, appropriating.

The Eighth Division: that on regarding a rule

¹ *pahāraṁ*. ² *paṭibāhanachandañ ca*. *Paṭibāhana* does not occur in **Bu-Pc 79** or **Bu-Pc 80**. But in **Bu-Pc 79** it may be inferred that the group of six monks would have prevented one of their number from going to the Order, had they known that it was going to carry out a formal act against him; and in **Bu-Pc 80** a monk prevented a formal act from being carried out by withholding his consent. It is necessary for the compound, *paṭibāhana-chanda*, to refer to *two* rules, in order to bring the headings in the "key" up to twelve, which is the number contained in this Division.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 83

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Then King Pasenadi of Kosala enjoined the keeper of the pleasure ground, saying: "Good sir,¹ go along, clear the pleasure ground, we will go to the pleasure ground."

"Very well, sire," and the keeper of the pleasure ground, having answered King Pasenadi of Kosala, clearing the pleasure ground, saw the lord sitting at the foot of a certain tree, and seeing him, he approached King Pasenadi of Kosala, and having approached he spoke thus to King Pasenadi of Kosala:

"Sire, the pleasure ground is cleared, but the lord is sitting there."

"Good sir, let him be, we will pay homage to the lord."² Then King Pasenadi of Kosala, having gone to the pleasure ground, approached the lord. Now at that time a certain lay follower was sitting down paying homage to the lord. King Pasenadi of Kosala saw that lay follower sitting down paying homage to the lord; seeing him he stood, afraid. Then it occurred to King Pasenadi of Kosala: "This man cannot be depraved,³ inasmuch as he is paying homage to the lord," (and) he approached the lord; having approached, having greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. Then that lay follower, out of respect for the lord, neither greeted nor stood up for King Pasenadi of Kosala. Then King Pasenadi of Kosala became displeased, saying:

¹ *bhaṇe*. Literally: 'I say,' being according to *Pali-English Dictionary* originally 1st singular, present medium of *bhaṇati*, used as an interjection of emphasis, usually from kings to subjects. Cf. [Vin 1.240](#), [Vin 1.241](#), Mil 21. Translated *Vinaya Texts* ii.122, *Vinaya Texts* ii.123 "good sir," and *Quest. King Milinda* i.34, "my good men." ² *payirupāsati*. Also meaning "to visit," to pay a call on; cf. MN ii.65; [Vin 4.98](#). ³ *nārahaṭ'āyaṃ puriso pāpo hotuṃ*.

“How can this man, when I come neither greet (me) nor stand up?”

Then the lord, knowing that King Pasenadi of Kosala was displeased, spoke thus to King Pasenadi of Kosala: “Sire, this lay follower is very learned, he is one to whom the tradition has been handed down,¹ he is devoid of passion in respect of sense-pleasures.”

Then it occurred to King Pasenadi of Kosala: “This lay follower cannot be inferior, for the lord speaks praise of him,” and he said to this lay follower: “You may say, lay follower, what will be of use.”²

“Very well, sire.”

Then the lord ... delighted King Pasenadi of Kosala with talk on *dhamma*. Then King Pasenadi of Kosala having been ... delighted by the lord with talk on *dhamma*, rising up from his seat, having greeted the lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Now at that time King Pasenadi of Kosala came to be on the upper storey of the palace.³ Then King Pasenadi of Kosala saw this lay follower going along the road, a sunshade in his hand; seeing him, having had him summoned, he spoke thus: “They say that you, lay follower, are very learned, one to whom the tradition has been handed down; it would be well, lay follower, that you should teach *dhamma* in our women’s apartments.”⁴

“Sire, what I know is owing to the masters,⁵ only the masters shall teach *dhamma* in the women’s apartments of the king.”

¹ *āgatāgama*. Cf. Vin 1.119 (translated *Vinaya Texts* i.272, “who has studied the *āgamas* (i.e., the collections of suttas)”; Vin 1.127; Vin 2.8 (translated *Vinaya Texts* ii.345 “a man to whom the Nikāyas had been handed down”); AN i.117 (GS 1.101 “versed in the Sayings”); AN ii.147 (translated GS 2.151–GS 2.152 “versed in the doctrines,” with note that the *āgama*, what one goes by, is canonical ‘scripture,’ and that in Ceylon the word is used today for the ‘Buddhist religion’); AN iii.179 (GS 3.134 “to whom the traditional lore has come down”); cf. *āgama* at Vin 2.249. See E.J. THOMAS, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p.157, p.266. That the Nikāyas came to be called (and in Sanskrit) *āgamas* (see WINTERNITZ, *History of Indian Literature* 2.234) seems indisputable; but in *Vinaya*, *āgama* may not have stood for the Nikāyas themselves, so much as for the material out of which they later came to be compiled. ² *yena attho*. Same expression at Vin 3.132 = BD 1.222, and Vin 3.210 = BD 2.43. ³ *uparipāsāḍavaragato hoti*; cf. Vin 4.112. ⁴ = Vin 1.72. Here the word is *itthāgāra*; at Vin 3.250 it is *antepura*. ⁵ *ayyānaṃ vāhasā*.

Then King Pasenadi of Kosala, thinking: “What the lay follower says is true,” approached the lord; having approached, having greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King Pasenadi of Kosala spoke thus to the lord:

“It were well, lord, if the lord were to enjoin one monk who should teach *dhamma* in our women’s apartments.”

Then the lord ... delighted King Pasenadi of Kosala with talk on *dhamma* ... he departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the lord addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “Well now, Ānanda, do teach *dhamma* in the King’s women’s apartments.”

“Very well, lord,” and the venerable Ānanda having answered the lord, having gone in from time to time, spoke *dhamma* in the King’s women’s apartments. Then the venerable Ānanda, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of King Pasenadi of Kosala. Now at that time King Pasenadi of Kosala was in bed with Queen Mallikā. Queen Mallikā saw the venerable Ānanda approaching from afar, and seeing him she got up hastily; her garments, burnished cloth of gold, slipped down. Then the venerable Ānanda, having turned back again from there, having gone to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Ānanda, not announced beforehand,¹ enter the King’s women’s apartments?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Ānanda, not announced beforehand, entered the King’s women’s apartments?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, Ānanda, not announced beforehand, enter the King’s women’s apartments? It is not, Ānanda, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” and having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

¹ *pubbe appaṭṭisaṁvidita*; cf. Vin 4.182; SN ii.54; AN iii.59.

“Monks, there are these ten dangers of entering a king’s women’s quarters.¹ What are the ten?

1. “Here, monks, the king is seated together with the chief consort; a monk enters there; either the chief consort, having seen the monk, smiles, or the monk, having seen the chief consort, smiles; then it occurs to the king: ‘Surely it is done by these, or they will do it.’² This, monks, is the first danger of entering a king’s women’s quarters.
2. “And again, monks, a king is very busy, with much to be done; having gone to a certain woman, he does not remember; she on account of this, conceives (a child); then it occurs to the king: ‘No one enters here except one who has gone forth; now can this be the deed of one who has gone forth?’ This, monks, is the second danger of entering a king’s women’s quarters.
3. “And again, monks, some jewel disappears in a king’s women’s quarters. Then it occurs to the king; ‘No one else enters here except one who has gone forth; now can this be the deed of one who has gone forth?’ This, monks, is the third danger ...
4. “And again, monks, the secret plans within a king’s women’s quarters by being divulged abroad are spoiled.³ Then it occurs to the king: ‘No one else enters here except one who has gone forth; now can this be the deed of one who has gone forth?’ This, monks, is the fourth danger ...
5. “And again, monks, in a king’s women’s apartments either a son asks for⁴ (his) father, or a father asks for (his) son; it occurs to these: ‘No one else enters here except one who has gone forth; now can this be the deed of one who has gone forth?’ This, monks, is the fifth danger ...

¹ Here the word is *antepura*. This passage = AN v.81ff. ² GS 5:57: “Surely these two are guilty or will be guilty.” ³ *antepure abhantarā gūyhamantā bahiddhā sambhedam gacchanti*. I follow WOODWARD at GS 5:58, p. 5. with his note. ⁴ *pattheti*. Vin-a 88o says *antaram passivā ghātetum icchati*, (looking) inside he wants to kill him, while AN-a on AN v.81 has *māretum icchati* (longs to kill). WOODWARD, GS 5:58, n. 3, suggests that this refers ‘to the uncertainty of parentage in a royal harem,’ the one gone forth being ‘suspected of causing the confusion.’

6. “And again, monks, a king establishes in a high place one having a lowly position; it occurs to those to whom this is unpleasing: ‘The king is associating with one who has gone forth; now can this be the deed of one who has gone forth?’ This, monks, is the sixth danger ...
7. “And again, monks, a king establishes in a lowly place one having a high position; it occurs to those ... This, monks, is the seventh danger ...
8. “And again, monks, the king sends out the army at the wrong time. It occurs to those ... This, monks, is the eighth danger ...
9. “And again, monks, a king, having sent out the army at the right time, makes it turn back from the highroad; it occurs to those ... This, monks, is the ninth danger ...
10. “And again, monks, when a king’s women’s quarters are crowded¹ with elephants, crowded with horses, crowded with chariots, there are forms, sounds, scents, tastes, tangible objects for causing delight, which are not suitable for one who has gone forth. This, monks, is the tenth danger of entering a king’s women’s quarters.

Monks, these are the ten dangers of entering a king’s women’s quarters.”

Thus the lord, in many a figure having rebuked the venerable Ānanda on his difficulty in maintaining himself ... “... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, not announced beforehand, should cross the threshold of an anointed king of noble class² from which the king

¹ *sammadda*. AN v.83 reads *sammada*, drowsiness. As WOODWARD points out, it should be *sammadda*, which occurs in the variant readings. Cf. *sammaddanta* at Vin 1.137. ² *rañño khattiyassa muddhāvasittassa*. Cf. *khattiyō muddāvasitto* at DN i.69 (translated *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.79, “a sovereign, duly crowned”); DN iii.60f., DN iii.69; AN i.106, AN ii.207ff. (*rājā vā hoti khattiyō muddhāvasitto brāhmaṇo vā mahāsālo*); AN iii.151 (GS 3.116 “a warrior rajah, anointed of head”); AN iii.299; MN i.82, MN i.231, MN i.343, MN ii.152, MN ii.183, MN iii.132, MN iii.172. Rulers, chieftains were of the *khattiya* class. *Rājas* are called *khattiyas* at Dhp 294.

has not departed, from which the queen has not withdrawn,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”

83.2.1

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Noble class means: of pure birth on both the mother's side and the father's side back through seven generations, not open to criticism,² unblemished in point of birth.³

Anointed means: he becomes anointed in accordance with the consecration of a noble.⁴

From which the king has not departed means: the king has not departed from the sleeping-room.⁵

From which the queen has not withdrawn means: the chief consort has not departed from the sleeping-room; or neither has departed.

Not announced beforehand means: without having announced oneself beforehand.⁶

3.76

Threshold⁷ means: it is called the threshold⁸ of the sleeping-room.

Sleeping-room⁹ means: there wherever the king's bed is made ready, even if it is only surrounded by a screen-wall.¹⁰

Should cross the threshold means: if he makes the first foot cross the threshold, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes the second foot cross, there is an offence of expiation.¹¹

33.2.2

If he thinks that he is not announced when he is not announced, (and) crosses the threshold, there is an offence of expiation. If he

¹ *anikkhantarājake aniggataratanake*. See *Critical Pali Dictionary* under these headings, and *Vinaya Texts* i.52, note.; *Vin-a* 881 says *ratanam vuccati mahesī*, the chief consort is called a jewel. ² *akkhitta*. ³ = *AN* iii.151; cf., e.g., *DN* i.113; *Sn* p.115; *AN* iii.223, *AN* iii.228 (often said of a brahmin). ⁴ *muddhāvasitto nāma khat-tiyābhisekena abhisitto hoti*. Cf. *AN* i.107, referring to a *khattiya*; *AN* ii.87, *MN-a* 3.12.

⁵ *sayanighara*. Cf. *BD* 2.354 = *Vin* 4.94. ⁶ *anāmantetvā*. Cf. *Ja* 6.475: *anāmantā pavisati pubbe appaṭivedito*. ⁷ *indakhīla*. Cf. *Vin* 3.46 = *BD* 1.74. ⁸ *ummāra*. Cf. *Vin* 4.100.

⁹ N.B.—Either this word should have appeared in the *Sikkhāpada*, or the commentator is here defining a word used in the definition of 'threshold.'

¹⁰ *sāṇipākāraparikkhitta*. ¹¹ = *Vin* 4.100.

is in doubt as to whether he is not announced ... If he thinks that he is announced when he is not announced ... offence of expiation. If he thinks that he is not announced when he is announced, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is announced, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is announced when he is announced, there is no offence.

Vin 4.1

Bu-Pc

There is no offence if he is announced; if he is not of noble class; if he is not anointed in accordance with the consecration of a noble; if the king has departed from the sleeping-room, if the chief consort has departed from the sleeping-room, or if both have departed;¹ if it is not in the sleeping-room; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The First

¹ = Vin 4.95.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 84

84.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
D 3.77 at that time a certain monk was bathing in the river Aciravatī. And a certain brahmin, having put down a purse of five hundred (pieces) on the dry ground, having forgotten it while bathing in the river Aciravatī, went away. Then that monk, thinking, "Do not let this purse of that brahmin be lost," took hold of it. Then that brahmin, having remembered, having run back quickly, spoke thus to that monk: "Good sir, did you not see my purse?" Saying, "Here (it is), brahmin," he gave it back (to him).

Then it occurred to that brahmin: "Now by what device can I not give¹ an ample reward² to this monk?" Saying, "Good sir, I did not have five hundred (pieces), I had a thousand (pieces)," having obstructed him, he set him free.³ Then that monk, having gone to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can this monk pick up treasure?"⁴ ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, picked up treasure?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, pick up treasure? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"Whatever monk should pick up or should cause (another) to pick

¹ Cf. Vin 4.112. ² *puṇṇapatta*, literally a full bowl; cf. Ja 3.535. ³ Cf. Vin 4.131.

⁴ *ratana*.

up treasure or what is considered as¹ treasure, there is an offence of expiation.”²

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time there came to be a festival in Sāvaththī. People, having adorned themselves with ornaments,³ went to the pleasure ground. Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, thinking: “Having adorned myself with ornaments, I will go to the pleasure ground,” having departed from the village, thinking: “Having gone to the pleasure ground, what shall I do? What now if I should pay homage⁴ to the lord?” having taken off the jewelry, having tied it up into a bundle with an upper robe,⁵ she gave it to a slave-woman, saying: “Come along, take this bundle.” Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, approached the lord; having approached, having greeted the lord, she sat down at a respectful distance. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance, the lord gladdened ... delighted Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, with talk on *dhamma*. Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, gladdened ... delighted by the lord with talk on *dhamma*, rising up from her seat, having greeted the lord, departed keeping her right side towards him. Then the slave-woman, having forgotten that bundle, went away. A monk, having seen it, told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Well then, monk, having picked it up, lay it aside.” Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow you, monks, having picked up or having caused (someone) to pick up treasure or what is considered as treasure that is within a monastery, to lay it aside, thinking, ‘It will be for him who will take it.’⁶ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

¹ *ratanasammata*. *Sammata* is the word used for “agreed upon” by the monks. ² The monk seems to have been hoodwinked by the brahmin into believing that he took some of the contents of the purse. He only took up the purse temporarily and with no intention of stealing it, and it is not said that he looked at the contents; none of these aspects is considered here. ³ Cf. Vin 4.18. ⁴ Cf. Vin 4.98, Vin 4.157. ⁵ Cf. Vin 3.208. ⁶ = Vin 3.239.

“Whatever monk should pick up or should cause (someone) to pick up treasure or what is considered as treasure, except within a monastery, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time in the Kāsi country there came to be a village in which there was business¹ for the householder, Anāthapiṇḍika, so that an inmate² came to be enjoined by the householder, saying: “If the revered sirs come, you should make a meal (for them).” Now at that time several monks, walking on alms-tour in the Kāsi country, came up to the village in which there was business for the householder, Anāthapiṇḍika. That man saw these monks coming from afar, and seeing them, he approached these monks; having approached, having greeted these monks, he spoke thus:

“Honoured sirs, let the masters consent to the householder’s meal for tomorrow.” The monks consented by becoming silent. Then that man, at the end of that night, having had sumptuous solid foods and soft foods prepared, having had the time announced, having taken off a finger-ring,³ having served these monies with the meal, said: “Having eaten, let the masters go away, and I will go back to business,” and having forgotten the finger-ring, he went away. The monks, having seen it, saying: “If we go away, this finger-ring will be lost,” sat still just there. Then that man, returning from business, having seen these monks, spoke thus :

“Honoured sirs, why are the masters sitting still just there?” Then these monks, having told this matter to that man, having arrived at Sāvattthī, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, having picked up or having caused (someone) to pick up treasure or what is considered as treasure, that is within

¹ *kammantagāma*. ² *antevāsin*. Vin-a 881 says *paricārako*, an attendant, servant.

³ Cf. Vin 2.106.

a monastery or within a house, to lay it aside, thinking, 'It will be for him who will take it.' And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should pick up or should cause (someone) to pick up treasure or what is considered as treasure, except within a monastery or within a house, there is an offence of expiation. But if a monk, having picked up or caused (someone) to pick up treasure or what is considered as treasure, that is within a monastery or within a house, it should be laid aside, thinking, 'It will be for him who will take it.' This is the proper course here.”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Treasure means: pearl, crystal, lapis lazuli, mother-of-pearl, quartz, coral, gold, silver, ruby, cat's-eye.¹

What is considered as treasure means: that which is of profit, of use² to people, this is called what is considered as treasure.

Except within a monastery or within a house means: setting aside within a monastery, within a house. Within a monastery means: inside a monastery when the monastery is fenced in; the precincts when it is not fenced in.³ Within a house means: inside the house when a house is fenced in; the precincts when it is not fenced in.

Should pick up means: if he himself picks it up, there is an offence of expiation.

Should cause (someone) to pick up means: if he makes another pick it up, there is an offence of expiation.

But if a monk, having picked up or having caused (someone) to pick up treasure ... it should be laid aside means: having made

¹ Same list occurs at [Vin 2.238](#). Cf. also list of jewels at [Mil 267](#), and for notes see *Buddhist Suttas*, Sacred Books of the East XI, 2nd edition, p. 249; also on *veḷuriya*, perhaps cat's-eye or beryl, see *Vinaya Texts* ii.82, n. 1. ² *upabhogaparibhoga*. ³ =below,

a mark¹ by a form² or by a sign,³ having laid it aside, it should be pointed out,⁴ saying: 'Let him come whose goods are lost.' If he comes there, it should be said to him, 'Sir, what are your goods like?' If he succeeds in obtaining⁵ them by the form or by the sign, they should be given (to him). If he does not succeed in obtaining them, it should be said (to him), 'Examine them, sir.' In setting out from that residence he may set out, having deposited them in the hand(s) of those who there are suitable monks. But if the monks are not suitable, he may set out,⁶ having deposited them in the hands of those who there are suitable householders.

This is the proper course here means: this is the appropriate course here.

There is no offence if, having picked up or having caused (someone) to pick up treasure or what is considered as treasure that is within a monastery or within a house, he lays it aside thinking: 'It will be for him who will take it'; if he takes on trust what is considered as a jewel; if he takes it for the time being; if he thinks it is rag-robbers; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Second

¹ *saññāṇaṃ katvā*, or perhaps "having made it recognisable"; cf. *cīvaraṃ samjānitvā*, at Vin 4.120. ² *rūpena*. Vin-a 882 says: "Having freed the goods, having computed them, thinking, 'There are so many *kaḥāpaṇas* or there is gold and silver,' he should examine them." Cf. *rūpaṃ sikkhati* at Vin 1.77, Vin 4.129, perhaps some form of money-changing. ³ *nimitta*. Vin-a 882, in explaining this, uses the word *lañchana*, stamp, impress, seal; the goods are stamped or sealed with clay or with lac. ⁴ I.e., to the owner if he comes, but if he (the monk) does not see the owner, he should do what is suitable; so Vin-a 882. ⁵ *sampādeti*. Word occurs at Vin 1.217, Vin 2.214. ⁶ The idea seems to be that he should set out in search of the owner, having left the goods with some reliable persons.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 85

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks having entered a village at the wrong time,¹ having sat down in a hall,² talked a variety of worldly talk,³ that is to say talk of kings, talk of thieves, talk of great ministers, talk of armies, talk of fears, talk of battles, talk of food, talk of drink, talk of clothes, talk of beds, talk of garlands, talk of scents, talk of relations, talk of vehicles, talk of villages, talk of little towns, talk of towns, talk of the country, talk of women,⁴ talk of strong drink,⁵ talk of streets,⁶ talk of wells, talk of those departed before,⁷ talk of

¹ *vikāle*, out of the (right) time—i.e., not in the hours when the alms-round was permissible. Cf. Bu-Pc 37. ² *sabhāya*. Cf. Vin 3.200. ³ *tiracchānakathā*, literally animal talk, that is worldly, low, childish talk, gossip. Cf. Vin 1.188; DN i.7, DN i.178, DN iii.36; MN i.513, MN ii.1, MN ii.23; SN v.419; AN v.128; and KS v.355; *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.33; GS 5.86. There is a tendency at DN-a 89 to couple *gehasitakathā*, talk of worldly life, with *tiracchānakathā*. ⁴ On insertion of *purisakathaṃ* after *itthikathaṃ* in some of the manuscripts, see *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.34, n. 1. ⁵ *surākathaṃ* here. Vin 1.188; DN i.8, D.1.179, DN iii.36; MN i.513, MN ii.1, MN ii.23 read *sūrakathaṃ*, talk of heroes, valiant men; DN-a 90 = MN-a 3.223 saying that Nandimitta, a warrior, was called a hero. Vin-a 882 says nothing. SN-a iii.295 explains that there are two readings, *sūrak°* and *sūrak°*; by the latter is meant concurring to pleasure by drinking strong drinks. ⁶ *visikhākathaṃ*. Buddhaghosa at DN-a 90 takes this as talk about streets, whether they are well or badly situated, whether they contain brave people (*sūrā*), poor people, and so forth. Certainly “gossip at (or from) street corners” (*Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.13, *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.34) could not be meant here. See KS v.355, n. 7. ⁷ *pubbapetakathaṃ*. *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.14, *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.34 read “ghost-stories”; *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.363 “kinsfolk departed” (following DN-a, MN-a and SN-a, “talk on those who were formerly relations”).

diversity,¹ speculation about the world,² speculation about the sea, talk on becoming and not becoming thus or thus.³ People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, having entered a village at the wrong time, having sat down in a hall, talk a variety of worldly talk, that is to say, talk of kings ... talk on becoming and not becoming thus or thus? It is like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks, having entered a village at the wrong time, ... talk a variety of worldly talk, that is to say ... talk of becoming and not becoming thus or thus?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, having entered a village at the wrong time ... talked a variety of worldly talk, that is to say ... talk of becoming and not becoming thus or thus?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, having entered a village at the wrong time, ... talk a variety of worldly talk, that is to say ... talk of becoming and not becoming thus or thus? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing

¹ *nānattakatham*. Translated at *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.14, *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.34; GS 5.87; KS v.356 “desultory talk”; *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.363, “and all the rest of it; *Vinaya Texts* ii.20 “various tales.” See *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.14, n. 2. (SN-a iii.295 calls it *niratthakakathā*, useless, profitless talk, but also seems to think that it is talk on opposites: first, last; freed, something remaining. ² *lokakkhāyikam samuddakkāyikam*. See *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.14, n. 3. The Commentaries refer to the *lokāyatas* (a school of theorists; see *Vinaya Texts* iii.151, n. 2). *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.363 has “chatter about world and ocean”; GS 5.87 “fables about (the origin of) land and sea”; KS v.356. “fabulous talk about (the origin of) land and sea”; *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.34 “speculative talk on the world and the sea.” Word occurs at Mil 316, translated *Questions of King Milinda*, ii.187, “the physicists.”

³ *itibhavābhavakatham* iti vā. DN-a 91 says that *bhava* is growth (*vuddhi*), *abhava* loss or waste (*hāni*). SN-a iii.295 and MN-a 3.223 make a sixfold division: *bhava* is eternal, *sassata*; *abhava* is annihilation or breaking up, *uccheda*; *bhava* is growth, *abhava* is loss; *bhava* is happiness arising from sense-pleasures, *abhava* is exhaustion of self. *Itibhavābhavatā* occurs at Vin 2.184; Snp 6.

those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should enter a village at the wrong time, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time several monks,¹ going to Sāvattthī through the Kosalan country, arrived at a certain village in the evening. People, having seen these monks, spoke thus: “Enter, honoured sirs.” Then these monks, thinking, “It is forbidden by the lord to enter a village at the wrong time,” being scrupulous, did not enter. Thieves robbed these monks. Then these monks, having arrived in Sāvattthī, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, having asked (for permission),² to enter a village at the wrong time. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, not having asked (for permission), should enter a village at the wrong time, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time a certain monk, going to Sāvattthī through the Kosalan country, arrived at a certain village in the evening. People, having seen that monk, spoke thus: “Enter, honoured sir.” Then that monk, thinking, “It is forbidden by the lord to enter a village at the wrong time, not having asked (for permission),” being scrupulous, did not enter. Thieves robbed that monk. Then that monk, having arrived in Sāvattthī, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection,

¹ *sambuhulā bhikkhū*. ² *āpucchā*. Cf. *āpucchā* and *anā°* at [Vin 4.39](#), [Vin 4.40](#), [Vin 4.100](#), [Vin 4.101](#).

having given reasoned talk, addressed, the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, having asked (for permission) if a monk be there, to enter a village at the wrong time. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk, not having asked (for permission) if a monk be there, should enter a village at the wrong time, there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time a certain monk came to be bitten by a snake. A certain monk, thinking: “I will bring fire,” went to a village. Then that monk, thinking, “It is forbidden by the lord, not having asked (for permission) if a monk be there, to enter a village at the wrong time,” being scrupulous, did not enter. They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, if there is some kind of urgent thing to be done,¹ not having asked (for permission) if a monk be there, to enter a village at the wrong time. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk, not having asked (for permission) if a monk be there, should enter a village at the wrong time, unless there is some kind of urgent thing to be done, there is an offence of expiation.**”

Whatever means: monk is to be understood in this case.

If a monk be there means: he becomes able to enter having asked (for permission).²

If a monk be not there means: he does not become able to enter having asked (for permission).³

The wrong time means: after noon has passed until sunrise.⁴

¹ *tathārupe accāyike karaṇīye*. Cf. Vin 3.260 = BD 2.151, note on *acceka-cīvara*. ² Cf. Vin 4.100. ³ Cf. Vin 4.100. ⁴ Cf. Vin 4.86.

Should enter a village means: if he passes beyond the enclosure of a village that is fenced in, there is an offence of expiation; if he enters¹ the precincts of a village that is not fenced in, there is an offence of expiation.²

Unless there is some kind of urgent thing to be done means: setting to one side some kind of urgent thing to be done.

If he thinks that it is the wrong time when it is the wrong time (and) not having asked (for permission) if a monk be there, enters a village unless there is some kind of urgent thing to be done, there is an offence of expiation. If he is in doubt as to whether it is the wrong time ... If he thinks that it is the right time when it is the wrong time ... offence of expiation. If he thinks that it is the wrong time when it is the right time, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is the right time, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is the right time when it is the right time, there is no offence.

There is no offence if there is some kind of urgent thing to be done; if a monk be there he enters having asked (for permission); if no monk being there he enters not having asked (for permission); if he is going into a village³; if he is going to the nuns' quarters; if he is going to the sleeping-place of adherents of other sects; if he is going on his way back; if the way is through a village; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.⁴

The Third

¹ *okkamantassa.* ² Cf. *Vin 4.307.* ³ *antarāgāmaṃ.* *Vin 4.101* reads *antaragāmaṃ*; *Vin-a 857, Vin-a 883, antarārāmaṃ*, into a monastery. ⁴ Cf. *Vin 4.101 = BD 2.367.*

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 86

86.1.1
3.87
4.167

... among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery. Now at that time monks were invited by a certain ivory-worker, saying: “If the masters want a needle case,¹ I (can supply them) with a needle-case.”² Then the monks asked for many needle-cases; they asked for large needle-cases for those who had small needle-cases, they asked for small needle-cases for those who had large needle-cases. Then that ivory-worker, making many needle-cases for the monks, was not able to make other goods for sale, and he did not keep himself going and his wife and children suffered. People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation,³ ask for many needle-cases? This (man), making many needle-cases for these (monks), is not able to make other goods for sale ... and his wife and children suffer.” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can these monks, not knowing moderation, ask for many needle-cases? ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks, not knowing moderation, asked for many needle-cases?” “It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, monks, not knowing moderation, ask for many needle-cases? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set

¹ *sūcighara*. Cf. **Vin 4.123**, where this is one of the articles that monks are forbidden to hide, even in fun. ² For the rest of this paragraph, cf. **Bu-NP 22**, and where a potter, also of Kapilavatthu, used this expression in inviting monks to let him supply them with bowls. ³ Omitted above, probably owing to some scribe's error.

forth:

“Whatever monk should have a needle-case made that is made of bone or made of ivory or made of horn, there is an offence of expiation involving breaking up.”¹

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Bone means: whatever is bone.

Ivory means: it is called elephant-ivory.²

Horn means: whatever is horn.

Should have made means: if he makes it or causes it to be made, in the action there is an offence of wrong-doing: having broken it up on acquisition, an offence of expiation is to be confessed.

If what was incompletely executed by himself he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation. If he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by himself, there is an offence of expiation. If what was incompletely executed by others he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation. If he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by others, there is an offence of expiation. If he makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having acquired what was made for another, he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.³

There is no offence if it is a block,⁴ fire-wood,⁵ a buckle,⁶ a box

¹ *bhedanakam pācittiyam*. Cf. *nissaggiyam pācittiyam*. The remainder of the Pācittiyas involve some other form of punishment, *chedanaka* and *uddālanaka*, in addition to confession or expiation, *pācittiya*. ² *hatthidanta*, or elephant's tuBu-Sk. ³ Cf. Vin 3.225. ⁴ *gaṇṭhikā*. Allowed at Vin 2.136 to prevent a robe from being blown up by the wind. Word occurs again at Vin 1.46, Vin 2.215; Ja 1.150. ⁵ *araṇika*. Vin-a 883, *araṇike ti araṇidhanuke*. *Critical Pali Dictionary* calls *araṇika* “a part of the fire-tool,” and refers to *araṇi*, “either of the two pieces of wood for making a fire.” *Araṇidhanuka* it calls a “bow for keeping the twirling-stick going.” ⁶ *vidha*. Vin-a 883 reads *vīṭhe*. *Pali-English Dictionary* suggests “a little box” tentatively. Commentary does not help. Allowed at Vin 2.136; translated at *Vinaya Texts* iii.143 “buckle.” with note that “the word occurs also, and apparently in the same sense, in the Old Commentary on the 86th Pācittiya.”

for ointment,¹ a stick to put the ointment on with,² the handle of an adze,³ a towel⁴; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fourth

¹ *añjanī*. Allowed at [Vin 1.203](#), but to be made of prescribed materials, and again at [Vin 2.135](#). Word occurs at MN ii.65; Thag 773. MN-a 3.303 reads *anjañī ti añjananālikā*, a tube (or box) for ointment; cf. Thig-a 267. ² *añjanisālāka*. Allowed at [Vin 1.203](#), to be made of prescribed materials, and again at [Vin 2.135](#). ³ *vāsijaṭa*. Also at AN iv.127; SN iii.154. ⁴ *udakapuñchanī*. Allowed at [Vin 2.122](#).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 87

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, was lying down on a high couch. Then the lord, as he was touring the lodgings together with several monks, came up to the dwelling-place of the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. The venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, saw the lord coming from afar, and seeing him, he spoke thus to the lord: "Lord, let the lord come, let him lie down on my bed."

Then the lord, having turned back from there, addressed the monks, saying: "Monks, the foolish man should be spoken to about his abode."

Then the lord, having in many a figure rebuked the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, for his difficulty in maintaining himself ... "... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"When a new couch or chair is being made for a monk,¹ the legs should be made eight finger-breadths² (high) according to the accepted finger-breadth,³ except for the knotted ends below.⁴ In exceeding this (measure), there is an offence of expiation involving cutting down."⁵

¹ Cf. Bu-NP 13; Vin 3.226. ² *aṅgula*. ³ *sugataṅgula*, *sugata* here meaning "standard," recognised, accepted, right. Cf. *sugata-vidatthi*, a span of the accepted measure, at Vin 3.149 (=BD 1.253f.); but also cf. *sugata-cīvara* at Vin 4.173 below.

⁴ *heṭṭhimāya aṭaniyā*. Vinaya Texts i.53 translates "exclusive of the lowermost piece of the bed-frame." But at Vin-a 773f., on Bu-Pc 14, the word *aṭani* occurs in description of the various kinds of couches and chairs, and seems to mean "knotted end." Cf. Vinaya Texts iii.164.

⁵ *chedanakam pācittiyam*.

New means: it is so called with reference to the making.¹

Couch² means: there are four (kinds of) couch: a long one, one with slats, one with curved legs, one with removable legs.

Chair³ means: there are four (kinds of) chair: a long one, one with slats, one with curved legs, one with removable legs.

Is being made means: making or causing to be made.⁴

The legs should be made eight finger-breadths (high) ... except for the knotted ends below means: setting aside the knotted ends below. If he makes it or causes it to be made exceeding this (measure), in the business there is an offence of wrong-doing; having cut it down on acquisition, an offence of expiation is to be confessed.

If what was incompletely executed by himself he has finished by himself ... (see **Bu-Pc 86.2.1**) ... If he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by others, there is an offence of expiation.⁵ If he makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having acquired what was made for another, he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if he makes it to the (proper) measure; if he makes it less than the (proper) measure; if, having acquired what was made for another, (but) exceeding the (proper) measure, having cut it down, he makes use of it⁶; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fifth

¹ = **Vin 3.226** (**BD 2.77**); **Vin 4.279**.

² = **Vin 4.40** (**BD 2.240**, and see notes).

³ = **Vin 4.40** (**BD 2.240**, and see notes).

⁴ = **Vin 3.226** (**BD 2.77**); **Vin 4.279**. ⁵ Cf.

Bu-NP 11-15. ⁶ = below, **BD 3.96**.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 88

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks had a couch and a chair made covered with¹ cotton.² People, having seen (this) as they were touring the dwelling-places, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a couch and a chair made covered with cotton, like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks have a couch and a chair made covered with cotton?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, had ... covered with cotton?”
“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, have a couch and a chair made covered with cotton? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should have a couch or a chair made covered with cotton, there is an offence of expiation involving tearing off.”³

¹ *onaddha*, or stuffed with, as at *Vinaya Texts* i.54. At *Vin 2.150 onaddhamañca* and *onaddhapīṭha* allowed. *Vinaya Texts* iii.168 translates “chairs and bedsteads covered (and upholstered with, cushions to fit them).” See also *Vin 2.270*; *Dhp* 146. ² *tūla*.

³ *uddālanaka*, tearing off or out.

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Couch¹ means: there are four (kinds of) couch ...

Chair² means: there are four (kinds of) chair ... one with removable legs.

Cotton means: there are three (kinds of) cotton: cotton from trees, cotton from creepers, cotton from grass.³

Should have made means: if he makes (it) or causes it to be made, in the business there is an offence of wrong-doing; having torn it off on acquisition, an offence of expiation is to be confessed.

If what was incompletely executed by himself he has finished by himself ... If he makes others finish what was incompletely finished by others, there is an offence of expiation. If he makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having acquired what was made for another, he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁴

There is no offence if it is for a binding, for a girdle, for a shoulder-strap, for a bag for carrying the bowl in, for a water-strainer⁵; if he is making a squatting-mat⁶; if, having acquired what was made for another, having torn it off, he makes use of it; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Sixth

¹ Cf. Vin 4.40, Vin 4.168. ² Cf. Vin 4.40, Vin 4.168. ³ These three kinds of cotton are allowed at Vin 2.150 for making *bimbohana*, squatting-mats. The last, *potakitūla* (at Vin 2.150 *poṭaki*-) is not “*tūlam* from a young fowl,” as at *Vinaya Texts* i.54, n. 1. *Poṭaki* is “in *tūla* a kind of cotton, ‘grass-tuft,’ thistledown (?),” so *Pali-English Dictionary* Cf. *Vinaya Texts* iii.167, “cotton produced from *Poṭaki*-grass.” ⁴ Cf. above, BD 3.88. ⁵ These five articles mentioned as not causing an offence at Vin 3.257; see BD 2.144. ⁶ The three kinds of cotton are allowed to be used in making a *bimbohana* (Vin 2.150).

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 89

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a piece of cloth to sit upon¹ was allowed to monks by the lord.² The group of six monks, thinking: "A piece of cloth to sit upon is allowed by the lord," used pieces of cloth to sit upon that were not of a (proper) measure³; they made (these) hang down in front of and at the back of a couch and a chair. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks use pieces of cloth to sit upon that are not of a (proper) measure?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, use pieces of cloth to sit upon that are not of a (proper) measure?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, use pieces of cloth to sit upon that are not of a (proper) measure? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"When a piece of cloth to sit upon is being made for a monk, it must be made to a (proper) measure. This is the (proper) measure here: in length two spans⁴ according to the accepted span,⁵ in breadth one and a half spans. In exceeding this (measure), there is an offence of expiation involving cutting down."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by

¹ *nisīdana*. See BD 2.87, n. 2. ² At Vin 1.295, referred to by Vin-a 884. Cf. Bu-NP 15. At Vin 1.297 *nisīdana* are allowed to be kept for oneself and not assigned to another.

³ *appamāṇa*. They were evidently too big, and the right measure is laid down in the resulting *sikkhāpada*. ⁴ *vidatthi*. ⁵ *sugata-vidatthi*. Cf. Bu-NP 15, and BD 1.253.

the lord.

Now at that time the venerable Udāyin became very fat.¹ He, having made ready a piece of cloth to sit upon before the lord, pulling it out² all round, sat down. Then the lord spoke thus to the venerable Udāyin:

“Why do you, Udāyin, pull out the piece of cloth to sit upon, just as if it were an old skin?”³

“It is because, lord, the piece of cloth to sit upon allowed by the lord is very small.”

Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, a border⁴ of a span for a piece of cloth to sit upon. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“When a piece of cloth to sit upon is being made for a monk, it must be made to a (proper) measure. This is the (proper) measure here: in length two spans according to the accepted span, in breadth one and a half spans, the border a span. In exceeding this (measure), there is an offence of expiation involving cutting down.”

A piece of cloth to sit upon means: it is so-called if it has a border.⁵

Is being made means: making or causing to be made.

It must be made to a (proper) measure. This is the (proper) measure here : in length ... the border a span means: if he makes

¹ *mahākāya*, literally a “great body.” ² *samañcamāno*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives “to bend together.” ³ *purāṇāsikoṭṭha*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives “sheath” for *asi-koṭṭha*, and would therefore presumably read this passage, “Why do you bend together this piece of cloth, like an old sheath?” I take the commentarial explanation by *cammakāra* to refer to leather-worker; Vin-a 884 says that “as the-leather-worker says, ‘I will make this hide wide,’ and pulls it out (*samañchati*, with variant reading *samañchaticchaviri*, a skin), tugs it out (*kaḍḍhati*) from here and there, so he (does) to that piece of cloth to sit upon.” The meaning is confused because *asi-camma* means “sword and shield” (Vin 2.192; AN iii.93), and *kaḍḍhati* with *khagga* means “to draw the sword,” as at Ja 1.273. ⁴ *dasā*, border or fringe. ⁵ = Vin 3.232, Vin 4.123. See BD 2.87, BD 2.415.

it or causes it to be made having exceeded this (measure), in the business there is an offence of wrong-doing; having cut it down on acquisition, an offence of expiation is to be confessed.¹

If what was incompletely executed by himself he has finished by himself² ... If he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by others, there is an offence of expiation. If he makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If having acquired what was made for another, he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if he makes it to the (proper) measure; if he makes it less than the (proper) measure; if having acquired what was made for another (but) exceeding the (proper) measure, having cut it down, he makes use of it;³ if he makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat⁴; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Seventh

¹ =above, [BD 3.91](#). ² See [Bu-Pc 86.2.1](#), [Bu-Pc 87.2.1](#), [Bu-Pc 88.2.1](#); [Bi-Pc 22](#).

³ =above, [BD 3.91](#). ⁴ Cf. [Vin 3.225](#), [Vin 3.227](#), [Vin 3.229](#), [Vin 3.233](#); [Vin 4.171](#), and [Vin 4.279](#), which = this paragraph.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 90

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time an itch-cloth¹ was allowed to the monks by the lord. The group of six monks, thinking: "An itch-cloth is allowed by the lord," used itch-cloths that were not of a (proper) measure; they went about trailing (these) along² in front as well as behind.³ Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks use itch-cloths that are not of a (proper) measure" ...

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, use itch-cloths that are not of a (proper) measure? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"When an itch-cloth is being made for a monk, it must be made to a (proper) measure. This is the (proper) measure here: in length four spans of the accepted span, in breadth two spans. In exceeding this (measure), there is an offence of expiation involving cutting down."

Itch-cloth means: it is for covering him who has itch⁴ or a small boil⁵ or a running sore⁶ or a thick scab disease⁷ from below the navel to above the knee.

¹ *kaṇḍupāticchādi*. Allowed at [Vin 1.296](#), referred to at [Vin-a 884](#). ² *ākaḍḍhantā*. Cf. *ākaḍḍhanā* at [Vin 3.121](#), *ākaḍḍhiyamānā* at [Vin 4.225](#), and *kaḍḍhati*, above, [BD 3.95](#), n. 2. ³ Cf. below, [BD 3.99](#), [BD 3.235](#). ⁴ *kaṇḍū ti kacchu*, [Vin-a 884](#). *Kacchu* is a skin disease, itch, scab. ⁵ *piḷakā ti lohilutaṇḍikā sukhumapiḷakā*, [Vin-a 884](#). ⁶ *assāva*. ⁷ *thullakacchu vā ābādho ti mahāpiḷakābadho vuccati*, [Vin-a 884](#); or a bad outbreak of large boils.

Is being made means: ... (see **Bu-Pc 89.3**) ...

*it should be made to a (proper) measure ... in breadth two spans (**Bu-Pc 89.3**) ...*

... if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Eighth

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 91

91.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.99 at that time a cloth for the rains¹ was allowed to monks by the lord.²
The group of six monks, thinking: "A cloth for the rains is allowed
by the lord," wore cloths for the rains that were not of a (proper)
measure; they went about trailing (these) along in front as well as
behind.³ Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:
(see Bu-Pc 90.1) ... "... should be set forth:

4.173 "When a cloth for the rains is being made for a monk, it must
be made to a (proper) measure. This is the (proper) measure here:
in length six spans of the accepted span, in breadth two and a half
spans.⁴ In exceeding this (measure), there is an offence of expia-
tion involving cutting down."

91.2.1 **Cloth for the rains** means: it is for the four months of the rainy
season.

Is being made means: ... *it must be made to a (proper) measure ...*
if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Ninth

¹ Cf. Bu-NP 24; BD 2.134, n. 1. ² Vin 1.294. ³ Cf. above, BD 3.97. ⁴ See Vinaya
Texts ii.225, note.

MONKS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 92

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Nanda,¹ the son of the lord's aunt, was beautiful, good to look upon, charming, four finger-breadths less (in height²) than the lord. He wore a robe the measure of a well-farer's robe.³ Monks who were elders saw the venerable Nanda coming from afar; seeing him, saying: "The lord is coming," they rose from their seats. These, recognising him when he had come, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Nanda wear a robe the measure of a well-farer's robe?" They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord questioned the venerable Nanda, saying:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Nanda, wore a robe the measure of a well-farer's robe?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

¹ Chief of the disciples who guard the doors of the faculties, AN i.25. At SN ii.281 he put on robes that had been dressed (or pressed) on both sides, anointed his eyes, and taking a bright bowl, went up to Gotama. According to the Commentary he did this so as to evoke some comment from his cousin—either approval or censure. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* ii.11, n. 6 suggests that perhaps above Vinaya story is another version of the Saṃyutta story. See also KS ii.191, n. 1. ² *caturaṅgulomaka*. Vin-a 885 says *catuḥi aṅgulehi ūnakappamāṇo*, less as to measure (height) than four finger-breadths. ³ *sugata-cīvara-ppamāṇa*. Here *sugata* cannot mean, as it does in *sugata-vidatthi*, prescribed, accepted or standard span, or there would have been no offence in wearing such a robe. See *Vinaya Texts* i.54, n. 3 for view that Gotama's robe was not specially large. But here Nanda is mistaken for Gotama, but perhaps only because he was nearly the same height. Buddhaghosa is silent. See BD 3, Introduction, p. xviii.

3.101 “How can you, Nanda, wear a robe the measure of a well-farer’s robe? It is not, Nanda, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**Whatever monk should have a robe made the measure of a well-farer’s robe, or more, there is an offence of expiation involving cutting down. This is the (proper) measure here of a well-farer’s robe for a well-farer: in length nine spans of the accepted span, in breadth six spans; this is the (proper) measure of a well-farer’s robe for a well-farer.**”

92.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Well-farer’s robe means: in length it is nine spans of the accepted span, in breadth six spans.

Should have made means: if he makes it or causes it to be made, in the business ... (see **Bu-Pc 89**) ... If, having acquired what was made for another, he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

92.2.2
4.174 There is no offence if he makes it less; if having acquired what was made for another, having cut it clown, he makes use of it; if he makes a canopy ... or a squatting-mat; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹

The Tenth rule of training: that on Nanda

The Ninth Division: that on treasure²

Concluded is the Minor (Class)³

THIS IS ITS KEY

And of a king, treasure, if he be there,
a needle, and a couch, on cotton,
And a piece of cloth to sit upon,
and the itch, for the rains, and on a well-farer.

3.102
¹ Cf. **BD 3.96** above. ² Like the seventh Division, the title here is taken not from the first but from the second rule in the Division. ³ *khuddakaṃ samattaṃ*, a minor or lesser class of rules; cf. *khuddakaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ* at end of Nuns’ *Pācittiya*s.

Venerable ones, recited are the ninety-two rules for offences of expiation. Concerning them, I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The venerable ones are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent, thus do I understand this.

MONKS' CONFESSION (PĀṬIDESANIYA) 1

d1.1.1
3.103
At that time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain nun, having walked for alms in Sāvattthī, having seen a certain monk at the time of going back, spoke thus: "Come, master, accept alms."

"Very well, sister," and he took everything. She, at the approach of (meal)-time, was not able to walk for alms;¹ she became famished.² Then that nun on the second day ... on the third day, having walked for alms in Sāvattthī, having seen that monk at the time of going back, spoke thus: "Come, master, accept alms ... she became famished. Then that nun on the fourth day went trembling along a carriage road. A householder who was a merchant, coming along in a chariot the opposite way, spoke thus to the nun:

"Get out of the way, lady." She, turning aside, fell down just there. The householder who was a merchant apologised to that nun, saying: "Forgive me, lady, that I was the cause of your fall."³

"I, householder, did not fall because of you, but I am simply very weak."

"But why, lady, are you very weak?" Then this nun told this matter to the householder who was a merchant. The householder who was a merchant, having taken this nun to his house, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

3.104
"How can these revered sirs accept food from the hand of a nun? Women obtain things with difficulty."⁴ Monks heard this house-

¹ She could not go for alms again. ² Cf. Vin 4.70, Vin 4.93. ³ *māyāsi pātītā*, literally, that you were brought to fall by me. ⁴ Cf. Vin 3.208.

holder who was a merchant who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this monk accept food from the hand of a nun?”

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, accepted food from the hand of a nun?”

“It is true, lord.”

“Was she a relation of yours, monk, or not a relation?”

“She was not a relation, lord.”

“Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for a woman who is not a relation. How can you, foolish man, accept food from the hand of a nun who is not a relation? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever monk should eat or partake of solid food or soft food, having accepted it with his own hand from the hand of a nun who is not a relation (and) who has entered among the houses,¹ it should be confessed² by that monk, saying: ‘I have fallen, your reverences, into a blameworthy matter,³ inappropriate, which ought to be confessed⁴; I confess it.’”

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

(Nun) who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother’s side or on the father’s side back through seven generations.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Among the houses means: a carriage road,⁵ a cul-de-sac,⁶ cross-roads,⁷ a house.

¹ *antaragharāṃ*. ² *paṭidesetabbarāṃ*. ³ *dhamma*, thing, state, often rule in Vinaya.; here probably offence. ⁴ *pāṭidesaniya*. Cf. AN ii.243 (*pāṭidesaniyaka dhamma*).

⁵ The first three of these occur again at Vin 4.270f. *Rathiyā*, carriage-road, there defined, and also at Vin-a 886, as *racchā*, a word which occurs at Vin 3.151. ⁶ *byūham*. Vin 4.271 says “they depart by that (way) by which they entered.” ⁷ *siṅghāṭakarāṃ*. Vin 4.271 defines by *caccaraṃ*, cross-road, while Vin-a 886 says “three corners or four corners, the place where roads meet.” *Caccara* occurs at Vin 3.151.

Solid food means: setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, and (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life,¹ the rest means solid food.²

Soft food means: the five (kinds of) meals: cooked rice, food made with flour, barley-meal, fish, meat.

If he says, “I will eat, I will partake of,” (and) accepts, there is an offence of wrong-doing; for every mouthful there is an offence which ought to be confessed.

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation, (and) having accepted with his own hand solid food or soft food from the hand of her who has entered among the houses, if he eats it or partakes of it, there is an offence which ought to be confessed. If he is in doubt as to whether she is not a relation ... If he thinks that she is a relation when she is not a relation ... offence which ought to be confessed. If he accepts³ for the sake of nutriment (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he accepts solid food or soft food from the hand of one ordained by one (Order only), thinking, “I will eat, I will partake of,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is a relation when, she is a relation, there is no offence.

There is no offence if she is a relation; if she⁴ makes (another) give but does not (herself) give; if having put it down nearby, she gives⁵; if it is within a monastery⁶; if it is in the nuns’ quarters⁷; if it

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 35, Bu-Pc 36. ² Cf. Vin 4.83 (BD 2.330). ³ Cf. Vin 4.83, Vin 4.84, Vin 4.86, Vin 4.87. ⁴ Vin-a 886, someone who is not a relation. ⁵ Vin-a 886, if having put it on the ground, she says, ‘I will give this to you, master.’ ⁶ antarārama, not ajjhārāma as at Vin 4.161. ⁷ Cf. Vin 4.101.

is at the sleeping-place of members of other sects¹; if it is on the way back²; if, having taken it back³ from the village, she gives; if, when there is a reason, she gives (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life⁴ and he makes use of it; if it is from a female probationer, a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

Vin 4.1

The First

¹ Cf. Vin 4.101. ² Cf. Vin 4.101. ³ Cf. Vin 4.81. ⁴ Cf. Vin 4.83, Vin 4.85, Vin 4.86, Vin 4.87.

MONKS' CONFESSION (PĀṬIDESANIYA) 2

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrel's feeding-place. Now at that time monks ate, invited by families. The group of six nuns came to be standing, giving directions for the group of six monks, saying: "Here give curry, give cooked rice here." The group of six monks ate as much as they pleased, other monks did not eat as much as expected. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks, when the nuns are giving directions, not restrain¹ (them)?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, when nuns were giving directions, did not restrain (them)?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "How can you, foolish men ... not restrain (them)? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"Now, monks eat, invited by families. If a nun comes to be standing as though giving directions,² saying: 'Here give curry, give cooked rice here,' that nun should be rebuked by those monks, saying: 'Stand aside,³ sister, while the monks eat.' But if it should not occur to a single monk to dismiss that nun, saying: 'Stand aside, sister, while the monks eat,' it should be confessed by those monks, saying: 'We have fallen, your reverences, into a blame-worthy matter, inappropriate, which ought to be confessed; we

¹ *nivāreti*, to hold back, warn. ² *vosāsamānarūpā*. ³ *apasakka*.

confess it.”

Now monks eat, invited by families means: a family means there are four (kinds of) family: noble family, brahmin family, merchant family, low-class family.¹

Eat, invited, means: they eat, invited to any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Giving directions² means: if according to friendship, according to comradeship, according to intimacy, according as one has the same preceptor, according as one has the same teacher,³ she says: ‘Here give curry, give cooked rice here,’ this means giving directions.

By those monks means: by the monks who are eating.

That nun means: the nun who is giving directions.

That nun should be dismissed by those monks, saying: ‘Stand aside, sister, while the monks eat.’ But if she is not dismissed by a single monk (and) he accepts (food), saying: ‘I will eat, I will partake of,’ there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence which ought to be confessed.

If he thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained (and) does not restrain her when she is giving directions, there is an offence which ought to be confessed. If he is in doubt as to whether she is ordained ... If he thinks that she is not ordained when she is ordained ... offence which ought to be confessed. If he does not restrain one ordained by one (Order only) who is giving directions, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not ordained when she is not ordained, there is no offence.

¹ = Vin 3.184, Vin 4.80, Vin 4.272. ² vosāsantī. ³ = Vin 4.154.

3.109 There is no offence if she makes (another) give her own meal, (but) does not (herself) give; if she gives a meal to others (but) does not make (them) give; if she makes (another) give what was not given; if she makes (another) give where it was not given; if she makes (another) give the same to everybody; if a female probationer gives directions; if a female novice gives directions; setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, there is no offence in (eating) any others¹; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Second

¹ = Vin 4.68, Vin 4.71, Vin 4.75, Vin 4.78.

MONKS' CONFESSION (PĀṬIDESANIYA) 3

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time there was in Sāvattḥī a certain family which on both sides came to be pleased,¹ it grew in faith, it decreased in wealth; whatever solid food or soft food accrued to that family before a meal, having given it all away to monks, sometimes they went without food.² People ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation, accept? These (people), having given to these (monks), sometimes go without food.” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, when a family is growing in faith, is decreasing in wealth, to give such a family an agreement as to learners³ by a (formal) act at which the motion is followed by one proclamation.⁴ And thus, monks, should it be given: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Such and such a family is growing in faith, is decreasing in wealth. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order give the agreement as to learners to such and such a family. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Such and such a

¹ *ubhotapasanna*—i.e., pleased with the Sakyan teaching, “converted” to it. Vin-a 887 says that the layman and the laywoman follower were both pleased, and both are said to have been stream-attainers. ² *anasitā acchanti*. ³ *sekhasammuti*. *Sekha* is one who is under training, as opposed to *asekha*, the adept. An agreement, made by monks for lay-people, is as remarkable as it is unusual. ⁴ *ñāttidutiya kamma*.

3.111 family ... in wealth. The Order gives the agreement as to learners to such and such a family. If the giving of the agreement as to learners to such and such a family is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. The agreement as to learners is given by the Order to such and such a family, and it is right ... So do I understand this.' And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever are those families that are agreed upon as learners, whatever monk having accepted among such families as are agreed upon as learners solid food or soft food with his own hand, should eat it or partake of it, it should be confessed by that monk, saying: ‘I have fallen, your reverences, into a blameworthy matter, inappropriate, which ought to be confessed; I confess it.’”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

3.2.1 Now at that time there came to be a festival at Sāvattthī. People, having invited monks, offered them food. The monks, being scrupulous, did not consent, thinking: “It is forbidden by the lord, having accepted among families that are agreed upon as learners solid food or soft food with one’s own hand, to eat it, to partake of it.” These looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “But how is it that because of our way of living, the masters do not accept from us?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, when invited, having accepted among families agreed upon as learners solid food or soft food with your own hand, to eat it, to partake of it. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

4.180 “Whatever are those families that are agreed upon as learners, whatever monk if he is not invited beforehand, having accepted among such families as are agreed upon as learners solid food or soft

food with his own hand, should eat it or partake of it, it should be confessed by that monk, saying: ‘I have fallen, your reverences, into a blameworthy matter, inappropriate, which ought to be confessed; I confess it.’”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time a certain monk came to frequent that family. Then that monk, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached that family, and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. At that time this monk came to be ill. Then these people spoke thus to this monk: “Eat, honoured sir.” Then that monk, thinking: “It is forbidden by the lord, not being invited, having accepted among families agreed upon as learners solid food or soft food with one’s own hand, to eat it, to partake of it,” and being scrupulous, he did not accept; he was not able to walk for alms, he became famished. Then that monk, having gone to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, having accepted among families agreed upon as learners solid food or soft food with his own hand, to eat it, to partake of it. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever are those families that are agreed upon as learners, whatever monk, if he is not invited beforehand (and) not ill, having accepted among such families as are agreed upon as learners solid food or soft food with his own hand, should eat it or partake of it, it should be confessed by that monk, saying: ‘Your reverences, I have fallen into a blameworthy matter, inappropriate, which ought to be confessed; I confess it.’”

Whatever are those families that are agreed upon as learners means: a family agreed upon as learners is called that family

which is growing in faith, decreasing in wealth; for such a family an agreement as to learners comes to be given by a (formal) act at which the motion is followed by one proclamation.

Whatever means: ... monk is to be understood in this case.

Among such families as are agreed, upon as learners means: among families like these agreed upon as learners.

Not invited means: not invited for today or tomorrow. If he invites him as he is entering the precincts of the house, this means not invited. Invited means: invited for today or tomorrow. If he invites him not as he is entering the precincts of the house, this means invited.

Not ill means: he is able to walk for alms. Ill means: he is not able to walk for alms.

Solid food means: setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, the rest means solid food.¹

Soft food means: the five kinds of meals: cooked rice, food made with flour, barley-meal, fish, meat.²

If he is not invited, not ill, (and) accepts, thinking: "I will eat, I will partake of," there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence which ought to be confessed.

If he thinks that they are agreed upon as learners when they are agreed upon as learners, (and) not invited, not ill, having accepted with his own hand solid food or soft food, eats it or partakes of it, there is an offence which ought to be confessed. If he is in doubt as to whether they are agreed upon as learners ... If he thinks that they are not agreed upon as learners when they are agreed upon as learners ... offence which ought to be confessed. If he accepts for the sake of nutriment (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing.³ For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁴ If he thinks that they are agreed upon as learners when they are not agreed upon

¹ Cf. Vin 4.83. ² Cf. Vin 4.83. ³ Cf. Vin 4.83, Vin 4.84. ⁴ Cf. Vin 4.83, Vin 4.84.

as learners, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether they are not agreed upon as learners, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that they are not agreed upon as learners when they are not agreed upon as learners, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is invited; if he is ill; if he eats the remainder (of a meal) of one who was invited, or one who is ill; if there come to be alms there prepared for others; if having taken it out from the house, they give¹; if he is a regular diner; if it is (food allowed) by ticket; if it is food (given on) a day of the waxing or waning of the moon, on an Observance day, on the day after an Observance day²; if, when there is a reason, he gives (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life,³ and he makes use of it;⁴ if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Third

¹ Vin-a 887 says “they give, taking to a refectory or dwelling-place.” ² Cf. Vin 4.75, Vin 4.78 and BD 2.313, BD 2.320. ³ Cf. Vin 4.83, Vin 4.84. ⁴ Cf. Vin 4.83, Vin 4.84.

MONKS' CONFESSION (PĀṬIDESANIYA) 4

... among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery. Now at that time the slaves of the Sakyans came to be out of hand.¹ Sakyans women wanted to make a meal in jungle lodgings. The slaves of the Sakyans heard that Sakyans women were desirous of making a meal in jungle lodgings. They infested² the way. Sakyans women, taking sumptuous solid food, soft food, went off to a jungle lodging. The slaves of the Sakyans, having issued forth, robbed the Sakyans women and violated them. The Sakyans, having issued forth, having seized these thieves together with the goods, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these revered sirs not announce that thieves are living in the monastery?” Monks heard the Sakyans who ... spread it about ... Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

On account of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training founded on ten reasons: for the excellence of the Order ... for following the rules of restraint.³ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever are those jungle lodgings that are held to be dangerous, frightening,⁴ whatever monk in such lodgings, not announced beforehand,⁵ having accepted solid food or soft food within a monastery with his own hand, should eat it or partake of it, it should be

¹ *avaruddhā*. Vin-a 887, paraphrases by *paṭiviruddhā*. ² *pariyuṭṭhiṃsu*. ³ Cf.

BD 1.37. ⁴ Cf. Bu-NP 29; Vin 3.263. ⁵ *pubbe appaṭisaṃvidita*. Editors of Vinaya Texts i.57 take this to mean “the danger incurred by people that enter that forest.”

Cf. Vin 4.159.

confessed by that monk, saying: ‘I have fallen, your reverences, into a blameworthy matter, inappropriate, which ought to be confessed; I confess it.’”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time a certain monk came to be ill in a jungle lodging. People, taking solid food or soft food set out for the jungle lodging. Then these people spoke thus to this monk: “Eat, honoured sir.” Then that monk, thinking: “It is forbidden by the lord, having accepted in a jungle lodging solid food or soft food with one’s own hand, to eat it, to partake of it,” being scrupulous, did not accept it; he was unable to enter¹ for almsfood, he became famished. Then this monk told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, an ill monk, having accepted in a jungle lodging solid food or soft food with his own hand, to eat it, to partake of it. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“Whatever are those jungle lodgings that are held to be dangerous, frightening, whatever monk in such lodgings, not announced beforehand, having accepted solid food or soft food within a monastery with his own hand, should eat it or partake of it if he is not ill, it should be confessed by that monk, saying: ‘I have fallen, your reverences, into a blameworthy matter, inappropriate, which ought to be confessed; I confess it.’”

Those jungle lodgings means: the last lodging called “jungle” is five hundred *dhanus* measures (away from the village).²

Dangerous means: if, in a monastery, in the precincts of a monastery, a place where thieves are halting is seen, a place where they are eating is seen,³ a place where they are resting is seen, a place where

¹ *pavisitum*; variant reading *caritum*, to walk. ² Vin 3.263 (see BD 2.157). ³ Omitted at Vin 3.263, but not at Vin 4.63.

they are sitting down is seen, a place where they are lying down is seen.¹

Frightening means: if, in a monastery, in the precincts of a monastery, people injured by thieves are seen, (people) plundered are seen, (people) beaten down are seen.²

Whatever means: monk is to be understood in this case.

In such lodgings as those means: in lodgings like those.

Not announced means: there is “announced” in five (ways but) this means not announced. Setting aside a monastery, the precincts of a monastery (as) announced, this is called not announced.

Announced means: whatever woman or man having come to a monastery, to the precincts of a monastery, declares: ‘Honoured sirs, they will convey solid food, soft food for so and so,’ if it becomes dangerous it should be pointed out that it is dangerous, if it becomes frightening it should be pointed out that it is frightening. If he speaks, saying: ‘Let him be, honoured sir, he will convey it,’ the thieves should be told: ‘People are serving here, go away.’

If it is announced in regard to conje³ that the ingredients³ may be conveyed for that, this is called announced. If it is announced in regard to a meal that the ingredients may be conveyed for that, this is called announced. If it is announced in regard to solid food that the ingredients may be conveyed for that, this is called announced. If it is announced in regard to a family, the person who of that family conveys solid food or soft food, this is called announced. If it is announced in regard to a village, the person who in that village conveys solid food or soft food, this is called announced. If it is announced in regard to a guild, the person who in that guild conveys solid food or soft food, this is called announced.

Solid food means: ... **soft food** means: ... meat.

Within a monastery means: when a monastery is fenced in, inside a monastery; the precincts when it is not fenced in.⁴

¹ Vin 3.263 (see BD 2.157) = Vin 4.63 (BD 2.290). ² Vin-a 887 says “setting aside a monastery that is a jungle lodging and its precincts, seeing a monk on the way issuing from the precincts or coming to a village, announced is done, but this comes to be not announced.” ³ Parivāra. ⁴ = Bu-Pc 84; Vin 4.163.

Not ill means: he is able to walk for almsfood.

Ill means: he is not able to walk for almsfood.

If it is not announced, if he is not ill (and) accepts it, thinking: “I will eat, I will partake of,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence which ought to be confessed.

If he thinks that it is not announced when it is not announced (and) having accepted solid food or soft food with his own hand within the monastery when he is not ill, eats it or partakes of it, there is an offence which ought to be confessed. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not announced ... If he thinks that it is announced when it is not announced ... ought to be confessed. If he accepts for the sake of nutriment (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not announced when it is announced, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is announced, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is announced when it is announced, there is no offence.

There is no offence if it is announced, if he is ill; if he eats the remainder of (a meal) if it was announced or of one who was ill; if having accepted it outside the monastery he makes use of it inside the monastery; if he makes use of a root or bark, or a leaf or a flower or a fruit growing there; if when there is a reason he makes use of (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life¹; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fourth

Venerable ones, recited are the four rules for offences which ought to be confessed. Concerning them, I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I

¹ Vin 4.83, Vin 4.85, Vin 4.86.

ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The venerable ones are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent; thus do I understand this.

Told are the offences which ought to be confessed.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 1

These rules for training,¹ venerable ones, come up for recitation.

At that time the enlightened one, the lord was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks dressed with the inner robe² hanging down in front and behind. People ... spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, dress with the inner robe hanging down in front and behind, just like householders who enjoy the pleasures of the senses?”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks dress with the inner robe hanging down in front and behind?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion in this connection, [having given reasoned talk³], having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the group of six monks, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, dressed with the inner robe hanging down in front and behind?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, dress with the inner robe hanging down in front and behind? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training

¹ *sekhiyā dhammā*; rules for good behaviour, etiquette; “the rules regarding matters connected with discipline,” *Vinaya Texts* i.59. ² *nivāsenti*. This verb refers to dressing in the inner robe. *Pārupati*, see next *Sekhiya*, to putting on the upper robe and outer cloak. ³ Square brackets in text.

should be set forth:

“I will dress with the inner robe all round (me),¹ is a training to be observed.”²

The inner robe should be dressed in (going) all round one for covering the circle of the navel, the circles of the knees.³ Whoever out of disrespect dresses with an inner robe hanging down in front or behind, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know,⁴ if he is ill, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 2

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks put on the upper robe⁵ hanging down in front and behind ... “ ...

“I will put on the upper robe all round me,' is a training to be observed.”

The upper robe should be put on all round one having made both edges level.⁶ Whoever out of disrespect puts on an upper robe hanging down in front or behind, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence⁷ ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 3 & 4

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of

¹ *parimaṇḍalaṃ nivāsessāmi*. Cf. Vin 1.46, Vin 2.213. Many of the *Sekhiyas* are repeated at Vin 2.213f. ² *sikkhā karaṇīyā*. ³ These are the three circles, *timaṇḍala*. ⁴ = Vin 4.125. ⁵ *pārupanti*, possibly here refers only to the upper robe, not to the outer cloak. ⁶ *ubho kaṇṇe samaṃ katvā*, so that neither end hangs higher or lower than the other. ⁷ As in Bu-Sk 1.

six monks, having uncovered their bodies, went amidst the houses¹ (*instead of went read, in Bu-Sk 4, sat down.*)

“Properly clad will I go (sit down) amidst the houses,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should go (sit down) amidst the houses properly clad. Whoever out of disrespect, having uncovered the body, goes (sits down) amidst the houses, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill (*in Bu-Sk 4 it is added here: if he has gone into residence for the rains, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.*)

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 5 & 6

... in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, making play with hand and foot, went amidst the houses (*instead of went read, in Bu-Sk 6, sat down*) ... “...

“Well-controlled will I go (sit down) amidst the houses,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should go (sit down) amidst the houses well-controlled. Whoever out of disrespect, making play with hand or foot, goes (sits down) amidst the houses, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 7 & 8

... in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks looking about here and there went (sat down) amidst the houses ... “...

¹ antaraghare. See *Vinaya Texts* i.59, n. 2; *Vin* 3.286, n. 2.

“With the eyes cast down will I go (sit down) amidst the houses, is a training to be observed.”

One should go (sit down) amidst the houses with the eyes cast down looking only a plough's (distance ahead).¹ Whoever out of disrespect, looking about here and there, goes (sits down) amidst the houses, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

4.187

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 9 & 10

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks lifting up (their robes²) went (sat down) amidst the houses

10.1.1
3.123

... “ ...

“Not lifting up (the robes) will I go (sit down) amidst the houses, is a training to be observed.”

One should not go (sit down) among the houses with (the robes) lifted up. Whoever out of disrespect having lifted up (the robe) on one side or on both, goes (sits down) amidst the houses, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill (in *Bu-Sk 10* it is added here: if he has gone into residence for the rains, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.)

The First Division: that on all round

¹ Cf. Snp 410, Snp 411; Mil 398; Vism 19. ² *ukkhittakāya*. Vin-a 891 says, *ekato vā ubhato vā ukkhittacīvaro hutvā ti attho*; the meaning is, a robe having become raised (lifted up, pulled up) at one or both (sides).

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 11 & 12

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, laughing a great laugh,¹ went (sat down) amidst the houses ... “...

“Not with loud laughter² will I go (sit down) amidst the houses, is a training to be observed.”

One should not go (sit down) amidst the houses with loud laughter. Whoever out of disrespect, laughing a great laugh, goes (sits down) amidst the houses, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if he only smiles when the matter is one for laughter, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 13 & 14

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, making a loud noise, a great noise, went (sat down) amidst the houses ... “...

“*(With) little noise³ will I go (sit down) amidst the houses, is a training to be observed.*”

One should go (sit down) amidst the houses with little noise.⁴ Whoever out of disrespect, making a loud noise, a great noise, goes (sits down) amidst the houses, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if

¹ mahāhasitaṃ hasantā. ² ujjhaggikāya. ³ appasaddo ... appasaddena. ⁴ appasaddo ... appasaddena.

he does not know, if he is ill, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 15 & 16

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, their bodies swaying, went (sat down) amidst the houses, bending their bodies ... “...
16.1.1
4.188

“Not swaying the body will I go (sit down) amidst the houses, is a training to be observed.”

One should not go (sit down) amidst the houses swaying the body. One should go (sit down) holding the body straight. Whoever out of disrespect, the body swaying, goes (sits down) amidst the houses bending the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill (in *Bu-Sk 16* it is added here: if he has gone into residence for the rains, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.)

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 17 & 18

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, their arms swaying, went (sat down) amidst the houses, bending their arms ... “...
18.1.1

“Not swaying the arms will I go (sit down) amidst the houses, is a training to be observed.”

One should not go (sit down) amidst the houses swaying the arms. One should go (sit down) holding the arms straight. Whoever out of disrespect, the arms swaying, goes (sits down) amidst the houses bending the arms, there is an offence of wrong-doing.
3.125

There is no offence ... (as in *Bu-Sk 15*, *Bu-Sk 16*) ... if he is the first

wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 19 & 20

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, their heads swaying, went (sat down) amidst the houses, bending their heads ... “...
Bu-Sk 17

“**Not swaying the head will I go (sit down) amidst the houses, is a training to be observed.** ... (see *Bu-Sk 17, Bu-Sk 18*) ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Second Division: that on loud laughter

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 21 & 22

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, their arms akimbo,¹ went (sat down) amidst the houses ... “...
Bu-Sk 18

“**Not with arms akimbo will I go (sit down) amidst the houses, is a training to be observed.**”
Vin 4.1

One should not go (sit down) amidst the houses with the arms akimbo. Whoever out of disrespect, having placed the arms akimbo on one side or on both, goes (sits down) amidst the houses, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence ... (as in *Bu-Sk 15, Bu-Sk 16*) ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *khambhakata*. Vin-a 891 says that this is placing the hand on the hip.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 23 & 24

24.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having dressed themselves, including their heads, in the upper robes,¹ went (sat down) amidst the houses ... “...

“**Not muffled up² will I go (sit down) amidst the houses, is a training to be observed.**”

3.126 One should not go (sit down) muffled up amidst the houses. Whoever out of disrespect goes (sits down) amidst the houses, having dressed himself, including his head, in the upper robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence ... (as in *Bu-Sk 15*, *Bu-Sk 16*) ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 25

5.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, crouching down on their heels,³ went amidst the houses ... “...

“**Not crouching down on the heels will I go amidst the houses, is a training to be observed.**”

One should not go amidst the houses crouching down on the heels. Whoever out of disrespect goes amidst the houses crouching

¹ *sasīsam pārupitvā*. ² *ogunṭhito*. Cf. *Bu-Sk 67* below; and *Vin 2.207*, where it is clearly a sign of disrespect for an incoming monk to enter a monastery with his head muffled up. ³ *ukkuṭṭika*, an ascetic practice; see *Vin 1.45*, *DN i.167*, *AN i.296*, *Dhp 141*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives a description of this “special manner of squatting”; see also *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.231, n. 4, and cf. *Vin-a 891* and *DN-a 357*.

down on the heels, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 26

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks sat down amidst the houses lolling ... “... Bu-Sk

“Not lolling will I sit down amidst the houses,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not sit down amidst the houses lolling. Whoever out of disrespect sits down amidst the houses lolling, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if he has gone into residence for the rains, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 27

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks accepted almsfood inattentively,¹ as though desirous of throwing it away ... “... Bu-Sk
Vin 4.1

“Attentively will I accept almsfood,’ is a training to be observed.” BD 3.12

One should accept almsfood attentively. Whoever out of disrespect accepts almsfood inattentively, as though desirous of throwing it away, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *asakkacca*, carelessly. *Vinaya Texts* iii.288 has for *sakkacca* “with the mind alert”; Vin-a 891, “having raised up mindfulness.”

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 28

28.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks accepted almsfood looking about here and there; they did not know that they¹ were piled up and overflowing² ... “...

“**Thinking of the bowl will I accept almsfood, ' is a training to be observed.**”

One should accept almsfood thinking of the bowl. Whoever out of disrespect accepts almsfood, looking about here and there, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 29

29.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, accepting almsfood, accepted also much curry ... “...

“**I will accept almsfood with equal curry,**”³ **is a training to be observed.**”

Curry means: there are two kinds of curry, bean curry, kidney-bean curry,⁴ that may be conveyed by hand. Almsfood with equal curry should be accepted. Whoever out of disrespect accepts also much curry, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if

he does not know, if he is ill, if it is of another flavour,¹ if it belongs to relations, if it is offered, if it is for another, if it is by means of his own property, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 30

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks accepted heaped-up² almsfood ... “...

“I will accept almsfood at an even level,³ is a training to be observed.”

One should accept almsfood at an even level. Whoever out of disrespect accepts heaped-up almsfood,⁴ there is an offence of wrongdoing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Third Division: that on arms akimbo

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 31

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks ate almsfood inattentively,⁴ as though desirous not to eat ... “...

¹ presumably the bowls. ² *ākirante pi atikkante pi*. Cf. Bu-Sk 32 below. ³ Cf. Vin 1.45. Curry to be in measure one fourth of the rice, so Vin-a 892. ⁴ Curries made of vetch and so on, Vin-a 892. ¹ *rasarase*. Vin-a 892 says that having set aside the two bean-curries, *rasarasa* means that those remaining have the flavour of fish, the flavour of meat, and so on. ² *thūpikata*. ³ *samatitthika*. See *Buddhist Suttas*, p.178, n. Sinhalese edition reads *samatitthika*; also Vin-a 892, which explains by *samapuṇṇa*, *samabharita*, filled evenly, heaped up evenly. ⁴ Cf. Bu-Sk 27 above. Bu-Sk 31-Bu-Sk 55 repeated at Vin 2.214.

“Attentively will I eat almsfood,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should eat almsfood attentively. Whoever out of disrespect eats almsfood inattentively, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first-wrong-doer.

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 32

... in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks ate almsfood looking about here and there¹; they did not know that they were piled up and overflowing ... “...

“Thinking of the bowl will I eat almsfood,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should eat almsfood thinking of the bowl. Whoever out of disrespect eats almsfood looking about here and there, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 33

... in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having chosen² here and there, ate almsfood ... “...

“On continuous alms-tour³ will I eat almsfood,’ is a training to be observed.”

¹ Cf. Bu-Sk 28 above. ² *omadditvā*. From the context this seems to mean that the monks omitted to call at some houses, picking and choosing between them. Dictionary meanings of *omaddati* are to rub, to crush, oppress. In a sense ‘oppressed’ might be meant here, for the laity if unable to give the gifts of faith would be oppressed, pressed down. See below, Bu-Sk 35, note. ³ *sapadānaṃ*. Vin-a 893 says “not having made a distinction (*odhiṃ akatvā*) here and there, successively.”

One should eat almsfood on continuous alms-tour. Whoever out of disrespect eats almsfood, having chosen, here and there, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if giving to others he is impatient,¹ if piling up (food) into another's vessel he is impatient, if there are dainties,² if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

Vin 4.1

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 34

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, eating almsfood, ate also much curry³ ... “...
BD 3.13

“I will eat almsfood with equal curry, is a training to be observed.”

Curry means: there are two (kinds of) curry: bean curry, kidney-bean curry, that may be conveyed by hand. Almsfood with equal curry should be eaten. Whoever out of disrespect eats also much curry, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if it is of another flavour, if it belongs to relations, if it is offered, if it is by means of his own properties, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 35

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of

Bu-Sk 45

¹ *omasati* = *ava* + $\sqrt{mr\dot{s}}$. A monk on continuous alms-tour may become impatient if the donors keep him waiting his turn for alms, if he waits too long he may miss the right time for eating. ² *uttaribhaṅge*, also at Bu-Sk 39, Bu-Sk 45 below. See BD 1.275 for further references. ³ Cf. Bu-Sk 29 above.

six monks having chosen¹ from the top,² ate almsfood ... “...

“Not having chosen from the top will I eat almsfood,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should eat almsfood not having chosen from the top. Whoever out of disrespect eats almsfood having chosen from the top, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill; if among an insignificant remainder he eats, having selected,³ having chosen from one side; if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 36

36.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks covered up the curry and the condiment with conjei, desiring something: more ...” ...

3-131 **“I will not cover up the curry and the condiment with conjei, desiring something more,’ is a training to be observed.”**

One should not cover up the curry or the condiment with conjei, desiring something more. Whoever out of disrespect covers up the curry or the condiment with conjei, desiring something more, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know; if the owners give, having covered it up; if he is not desiring something more; if there are accidents, if he is mad, if

he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 37

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having asked for curry and conjeý for themselves, ate it.¹ People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks, having asked for curry and conjeý for themselves, eat it? Who does not like well-cooked things? Who does not like sweet things?"² Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks, having asked for curry and conjeý for themselves, eat it?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, having asked for curry and conjeý for yourselves, ate it?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men ... eat it? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

'I will not eat curry or conjeý, having asked for it for myself,' is a training to be observed."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time monks came to be ill. Monks, asking after the ill ones, spoke thus to the ill monks: "We hope that your reverences are better, we hope that you are keeping going."

"Formerly we, your reverences, having asked for curry or conjeý for ourselves, ate it; thus there came to be comfort for us. But now it

¹ *omadditvā*. Something of the same sense as in Bu-Sk 33 above of picking and choosing, here among the food put into the bowl Vinaya Texts i.63 has "pressing down." ² *thūpa*, explained by Vin-a 893 as *matthaka vemajjha*, the top, the middle

³ *samkaḍḍhati*, to collect; cf. Bu-Sk 53. ¹ Cf. Vin 1.45. ² Cf. Vin 2.196.

is forbidden by the lord, and being scrupulous, we do not ask; thus there comes to be no comfort for us.”¹ They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, when a monk is ill, having asked for curry or conje^y for himself, to eat it. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“I will not eat curry or conje^y, having asked for it for myself, if not ill,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat curry or conje^y, having asked for it for oneself, unless one is ill. Whoever out of disrespect, having asked for curry or conje^y for oneself, if not ill, eats it, there is an offence of wrongdoing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if it belongs to relations, if it is offered, if it is by means of his own property, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 38

... in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks looked at others’ bowls captious-mindedly² ... “...
38.1.1

“Not captious-mindedly will I look at others’ bowls,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not look at others’ bowls captious-mindedly. Whoever out of disrespect looks at others’ bowls captious-mindedly, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he looks thinking, ‘I will give or I will make (another) give,’ if he is not captious-minded, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.
3.133

¹ Cf. Vin 4.56, Vin 4.88, Vin 4.115, Vin 4.118. ² *ujjhāna-saññi*. Cf. SN i.23; Thag 958; Dhp 253.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 39

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks made up large mouthfuls¹ ... “...

“I will not make up too large a mouthful, is a training to be observed.”

One should not make up too large a mouthful. Whoever out of disrespect makes up too large a mouthful, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if they are solid victuals,² all sorts of fruits,³ dainties,⁴ if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 40

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks made up long pieces (of food)⁵ ...” ...

“I will make up the pieces (of food) into a round, is a training to be observed.”

One should make up a piece (of food) into a round. Whoever out

¹ *kabaḷa*. In India food is made up into balls with the fingers and eaten with the fingers. To make a large ball, that is a large mouthful, is bad manners. Vin-a 893 says that a “peacock's egg is very (or too) large, a hen's egg very small, an in-between size” must be made up. Chickens' eggs in the East are smaller than English bantams' eggs ² *khajjaka*. Vin-a 893 “here all solid foods (made of) roots.” Cf. Ja 1.186, and Bu-Sk 40, Bu-Sk 44, Bu-Sk 45 below. ³ *phalāphala*. Cf. Ja 1.416, etc., and Bu-Sk 40, Bu-Sk 44, Bu-Sk 45 below. ⁴ Cf. Bu-Sk 33, Bu-Sk 40, Bu-Sk 45. ⁵ *ālopa*, morsel, bit of food, here a mouthful.

of disrespect makes up a long piece (of food), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if they are solid victuals, all sorts of fruits, dainties,¹ if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Fourth Division: that on attentively

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 41

41.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of
3:134 six monks opened the door of the face² when the mouthful³ was not
4:195 brought close ... “...

“I will not open the door of the face when the mouthful is not brought close, is a training to be observed.”

One should not open the door of the face when the mouthful is not brought close. Whoever out of disrespect opens the door of the face when the mouthful is not brought close, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 42

42.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of
six monks, while eating, put the whole hand into the mouth ... “...

“I will not put the whole hand into the mouth while eating, is a training to be observed.”

One should not put the whole hand into the mouth while eating.

¹ Cf. above, Bu-Sk 39. ² mukhadvāra. ³ kabaḷa, see above Bu-Sk 39.

Whoever out of disrespect puts the whole hand into the mouth while eating, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 43

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks talked with a mouthful in the mouth ... “... Bu-Sk

“I will not talk with a mouthful in the mouth,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not talk with a mouthful in the mouth. Whoever out of disrespect talks with a mouthful in the mouth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 44

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks ate tossing up balls (of food)¹ ... “... Bu-Sk
BD 3,13

“I will not eat tossing up balls (of food),’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat tossing up balls (of food). Whoever out of disrespect eats tossing up balls (of food), there is an offence of wrong-doing. Vin 4,1

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if they are solid victuals,² all sorts of fruits,³

¹ *piṇḍukkhepakam* = *piṇḍam ukkhipitvā ukkhipitvā*, tossing up the balls (the lumps of almsfood) again and again, Vin-a 893. ² Cf. Bu-Sk 39, Bu-Sk 40, Bu-Sk 45. ³ Cf. Bu-Sk 39, Bu-Sk 40, Bu-Sk 45, Bu-Sk 46.

if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 45

45.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks ate, breaking up the mouthfuls¹ ... “ ...

“I will not eat breaking up the mouthfuls,' is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat breaking up the mouthfuls. Whoever out of disrespect eats breaking up the mouthfuls, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if they are solid victuals,² all sorts of fruits,³ dainties,⁴ if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 46

46.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of
4.196 six monks ate stuffing the cheeks⁵ ... “ ...

3.136 **“I will not eat stuffing the cheeks,' is a training to be observed.”**

One should not eat stuffing the cheeks. Whoever out of disrespect eats, having stuffed the cheek on one side or on both, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if they are all sorts of fruits,⁶ if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *kabaḷāvacchedakaṃ*, dividing the mouthfuls (into small parts); probably with the fingers and not “nibbling at,” as at *Vinaya Texts* i.64. ² Cf. Bu-Sk 39, Bu-Sk 40, Bu-Sk 44. ³ Cf. Bu-Sk 39, Bu-Sk 40, Bu-Sk 44, Bu-Sk 46. ⁴ Cf. Bu-Sk 39, Bu-Sk 40.

⁵ Vin-a 893, “having made swellings as does a monkey.” ⁶ Cf. Bu-Sk 39, Bu-Sk 40, Bu-Sk 44, Bu-Sk 45.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 47

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks ate shaking the hands about.¹ ... “...

“I will not eat shaking the hands about,' is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat shaking the hands about. Whoever out of disrespect eats shaking the hands about, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if he shakes the hands about getting rid of the crumbs,² if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 48

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks ate scattering lumps of boiled rice ... “...

“I will not eat scattering lumps of boiled rice,' is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat scattering lumps of boiled rice. Whoever out of disrespect eats scattering lumps of boiled rice, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if, getting rid of the crumbs, a lump of boiled rice is got rid of, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *hatthaniddhunakam.* ² *kacavaram chaḍḍento.*

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 49

49.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of
3:37 six monks ate putting out their tongues ... “...

“**I will not eat putting out the tongue,**’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat putting out the tongue ... offence of wrongdoing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrongdoer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 50

50.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of
six monks ate smacking the lips¹ ... “...

“**I will not eat smacking the lips,**’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat smacking the lips ... if he is the first wrongdoer.

The Fifth Division: that on the mouthful

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 51

51.1.1 At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Kosambī
in Ghosita's monastery. Now at that time a milk drink² had been

¹ *capucapukāraka*. Vin-a 893, making the sound *capu-capu*. ² *payopāna*.

prepared for the Order by a certain brahmin. The monks drank the milk¹ making a hissing sound.² A certain monk who had formerly been an actor spoke thus: “It seems that this whole Order is cooled.”³ Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this monk make a joke about the Order?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, made a joke about the Order?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, make a joke about the Order? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” ... and having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a joke should not be made about the enlightened one or *dhamma* or the Order. Whoever should make (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Then the lord, having rebuked that monk in many a figure for his difficulty in maintaining himself ... “... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“I will not eat making a hissing sound,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat making a hissing sound ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 52

... in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks ate licking the fingers ...

“I will not eat licking the fingers,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat licking the fingers ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *khīraṃ pivanti.* ² *surusurukāraka.* Vin-a 893, making the sound *suru-suru.*

³ *sītikata.*

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 53

53.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks ate licking the bowl ... “... ”

“I will not eat licking the bowl,' is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat licking the bowl ...

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is ill, if from an insignificant remainder he eats having collected,¹ having licked at one side, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 54

54.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery ... (see *Bu-Sk 52*. Instead of licking the fingers read licking the lips) ...

“I will not eat licking the lips,' is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat licking the lips ...

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 55

55.1.1
3-139 Now at that time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying among the Bhaggā on Sumsumāra Hill in the Bhesakaḷā Grove in the deer-park. Now at that time the monks in the Kokanada palace² accepted

¹ Cf. *Bu-Sk 35*. ² See *Vin 2.127*, MN ii.91. Vin-a 894 says that it was lotus-shaped, *padumakasaṅṭhāna*; MN-a 3.321 that it was made resembling a hanging lotus, *paduma*. *Kokanada* is the red lotus, AN iii.239.

a drinking cup, their hands (soiled) with food. People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, accept a drinking cup, their hands (soiled) with food, like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can these monks accept a drinking cup, their hands (soiled) with food?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, accepted a drinking cup, your hands (soiled) with food?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, accept a drinking cup, your hands (soiled) with food? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“I will not accept a drinking cup, my hands (soiled) with food, is a training to be observed.”

One should not accept a drinking cup, the hands (soiled) with food. Whoever out of disrespect accepts a drinking cup, the hands (soiled) with food, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if he accepts it, thinking, ‘I will wash’ or ‘I will get (someone) to wash (my hand),’ if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 56

At that time the enlightened one, the lord was staying among the Bhaggā on Suṃsumāra Hill in the Bhesakaḷā Grove in the deer-park. Now at that time monks in the Kokanada palace threw out amidst the houses¹ rinsings of the bowls with lumps of boiled rice. People ...

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i.65, n. 2 says that *antaraghare* “here means the space, or small open square in the middle of the house.”

spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, throw out amidst the houses rinsings of the bowls with lumps of boiled rice, like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?”

Monks heard ... (as in *Bu-Sk 55*) ... “... should be set forth:

“I will not throw out amidst the houses rinsings of the bowl with lumps of boiled rice, is a training to be observed.”

One should not throw out amidst the houses rinsings of the bowl with lumps of boiled rice. Whoever out of disrespect throws out amidst the houses rinsings of the bowl with lumps of boiled rice, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if he throws them out having removed¹ or broken up² or covered up³ or taken out,⁴ if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 57

57.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks taught *dhamma* to (someone) with a sunshade in his hand. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks teach *dhamma* to (someone) with a sunshade in his hand?” ...

3.141 “Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, taught *dhamma* to (someone) with a sunshade in his hand?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “How can

¹ *uddharitvā*. Vin-a 894 says, “if having removed the lumps of boiled rice from the water, having made them into a heap in one place, he throws out the water.”

² *bhīditvā*. Vin-a 894 says, “if having broken up the lumps of boiled rice, having put them in the water, he throws it out.” ³ *paṭiggahetvā*. Vin-a 894, reading *paṭiggahe va*, says “if he throws out what he has accepted, covering it up with a receptacle.”

⁴ *nīharitvā*. Vin-a 894, “if he throws it out outside.”

you, foolish men, teach *dhamma* to (someone) with a sunshade in his hand? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

‘I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) with a sunshade in his hand,’ is a training to be observed.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord.

At that time monks were (too) scrupulous to teach *dhamma* to (someone) who was ill (and) had a sunshade in his hand. People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not teach *dhamma* to (someone) who is ill (and) has a sunshade in his hand?”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to teach *dhamma* to (someone) who is ill (and) has a sunshade in his hand. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“**I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) who is not ill (and) who has a sunshade in his hand,**’ is a training to be observed.”

Sunshade¹ means: there are three (kinds of) sunshade: white sunshade,² sunshade of matting, sunshade of leaves; fastened at the middle, fastened to the rim.³

Dhamma means: spoken by the enlightened one, spoken by disciples, spoken by seers, spoken by devatas, connected with the goal, connected with *dhamma*.⁴

Should teach means: if he teaches by line, for every line there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he teaches by syllable, for every syllable there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁵

Dhamma should not be taught to (someone) who has a sunshade

¹ = Vin 4.338. ² *setacchatta*, emblem of royalty. Cf. DN ii.15, DN ii.19; AN i.145.

³ *salākabaddha*; -*bandha* at Vin 4.338. See Vinaya Texts iii.133 note for these two ways of fastening the handle to the sunshade. ⁴ = Vin 4.15, Vin 4.22. ⁵ Cf. Vin 4.15, Vin 4.22.

in his hand (and) who is not ill. Whoever out of disrespect teaches *dhamma* to (someone) who has a sunshade in his hand (and) who is not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 58

58.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks taught *dhamma* to (someone) with a staff in his hand ...

“...
“I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) who is not ill (and) who has a staff in his hand,' is a training to be observed.”

Staff means: (the size of) four hands¹ of a man of average height. Bigger than that it is not a staff, smaller it is not a staff.²

Dhamma should not be taught to (someone) who has a staff in his hand (and) who is not ill. Whoever out of disrespect teaches *dhamma* to (someone) who has a staff in his hand (and) who is not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 59

59.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks taught *dhamma* to (someone) with a knife in his hand ...

“...
“I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) who has a knife in his

¹ On *hattha*, “hand”—i.e., hand and forearm—see **BD 2.li**. ² *adaṇḍa*; cf. *apatta* at **Vin 3.243**. The above use of *adaṇḍa* has not been noticed by the *Critical Pali Dictionary*

hand (and) who is not ill,' is a training to be observed."

Knife means: a weapon,¹ single-edged, double-edged.² *Dhamma* should not be taught to (someone) who has a knife in his hand (and) who is not ill ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 60

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks taught *dhamma* to (someone) with a weapon³ in his hand ... " ...

"I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) who has a weapon in his hand (and) who is not ill,' is a training to be observed."

Weapon means: a long-bow, a cross-bow.⁴ *Dhamma* should not be taught to (someone) who has a weapon in his hand (and) who is not ill ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Sixth Division: that on hissing

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 61

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks taught *dhamma* to (someone) wearing shoes ... " ...

"I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) wearing shoes (and) who is not ill,' is a training to be observed."

Dhamma should not be taught to (someone) wearing shoes (and) who is not ill. Whoever out of disrespect teaches *dhamma* to (someone) mounted on (shoes) or (with shoes) fastened on or (with shoes) unfastened⁵ (and) who is not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

¹ *paharaṇi*. Oldenberg queries, and suggests "*paharaṇi*". ² Cf. MN i.281.

³ *āvudha*. ⁴ Cf. MN i.429. ⁵ Only at the heels, according to Vin-a 895.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he if the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 62

62.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery ... (see *Bu-Sk 61*. Instead of wear-
3:144 ing shoes read wearing sandals¹) ...

“I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) wearing sandals (and) who is not ill, is a training to be observed.”

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 63

63.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of
six monks taught *dhamma* to (someone) in a vehicle ... “ ...

“I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) in a vehicle (and) who is not ill, is a training to be observed.”

Vehicle² means: a cart,³ a carriage,⁴ a waggon, a chariot, a palanquin,⁵ a sedan-chair⁶.

Dhamma should not be taught to (someone) in a vehicle (and) who is not ill. Whoever out of disrespect teaches *dhamma* to (some-

¹ *upāhana*. Regulations for monks wearing these given at *Vin 1.185ff.*; at *Vin 2.207f.* it is said that in-coming monks should take off their sandals on entering a monastery—as a sign of respect. ² = *Vin 4.339*; cf. *Vin 3.49* which omits the last two, and DN-a 82 which omits the last but one. ³ *vayha*, translated as “litter” at *BD 1.81*. But at *Vin 1.191*, *Vin 2.276* an (ill) monk and nun were respectively made uncomfortable by the jolting of a *yāna* (vehicle), and two other means of transport were allowed: a palanquin and a sedan-chair. These are not included in the Old Commentary's definition of *yāna* at *Vin 3.49*, although they are above and at *Vin 4.339*. It looks therefore as if the first four items under *yāna* were the original ones, and further, as if they were conveyances drawn by animals and liable to jolt. It thus seems best to correct “litter” to “cart.” ⁴ See AN iv.191 for various parts of a horse-drawn *ratha*. ⁵ Allowed to be used by (ill) monks at *Vin 1.192*, by (ill) nuns at *Vin 2.277*. ⁶ Allowed to be used by (ill) monks at *Vin 1.192*, by (ill) nuns at *Vin 2.277*.

one) in a vehicle (and) who is not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 64

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks taught *dhamma* to (someone) on a bed ... “...
Bu-Sk 6
Vin 4.2

“I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) on a bed and who is not ill, is a training to be observed.”

Dhamma should not be taught to (someone) on a bed (and) who is not ill. Whoever out of disrespect teaches *dhamma* to (someone) on a bed and even lying on the ground (and) who is not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.
BD 3.14

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 65

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks taught *dhamma* to (someone) who was sitting down, lolling¹ ... “...
Bu-Sk 6
Vin 4.2

“I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) who is sitting down, lolling (and) who is not ill, is a training to be observed.”

Dhamma should not be taught to (someone) sitting down, lolling, (and) who is not ill. Whoever out of disrespect teaches *dhamma* to (someone) who is sitting down, lolling on his hands or lolling on his robes (and) who is not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-

¹ Cf. Bu-Sk 26.

doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 66

66.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks taught *dhamma* to (someone) with a turban on his head ...

“...
“I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) with a turban on his head (and) who is not ill,' is a training to be observed.”

Turban on the head means: it is a turban when it does not let the ends of the hair be seen.

Dhamma should not be taught to (someone) with a turban on his head (and) who is not ill. Whoever out of disrespect teaches *dhamma* to (someone) with a turban on his head (and) who is not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if he shows the ends of the hair having caused them to be uncovered, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 67

67.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks taught *dhamma* to (someone) with his head muffled up¹

3.146 ... “...
“I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) with his head muffled up (and) who is not ill,' is a training to be observed.”

4.203 **Head muffled up** means: it is so called if he is dressed, including his head, in his upper robe.

Dhamma should not be taught to (someone) with his head muffled

¹ Cf. Bu-Sk 23.

up (and) who is not ill. Whoever out of disrespect should teach *dhamma* to (someone) with his head muffled up (and) who is not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if he shows the head having caused it to be uncovered, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 68

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having sat down on the ground, taught *dhamma* to (someone) sitting on a seat ... “... Bu-Sk

“**Having sat down on the ground, I will not teach *dhamma* to (someone) sitting on a seat (and) who is not ill, is a training to be observed.**”

Having sat down on the ground, *dhamma* should not be taught to (someone) sitting on a seat (and) who is not ill. Whoever out of disrespect, having sat down on the ground, teaches *dhamma* to (someone) sitting on a seat (and) who is not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 69

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, having sat down on a low seat, taught *dhamma* to (someone) sitting on a high seat.¹ Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks ... teach *dhamma* to (someone) sitting on a high seat?” ... Bu-Sk

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, ... taught *dhamma* to (some- BD 3,14

¹ Ja no.309 (=Ja 3.27.) is based on this story, and should be compared with it, especially for variant readings.

one) sitting on a high seat?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

How can you, foolish men, ... teach *dhamma* to (someone) sitting on a high seat? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Formerly, monks, in Benares, the wife of a certain low class man¹ came to be pregnant. Then, monks, this low class woman spoke thus to this low class man: ‘Sir,² I am pregnant; I want to eat a mango.’

‘There are no mangoes, it is not the mango season,’ he said.

Now at that time the king had a mango tree with a perpetual crop of fruit. Then, monks, that low class man approached that mango tree; having approached, having climbed up that mango tree, he remained hidden. Then, monks, the king together with the brahmin priest, approached that mango tree; having approached, having sat down on a high seat, he learnt a mantra. Then, monks, it occurred to that low class man:

‘How unrighteous³ is this king, inasmuch as he learns a mantra, having sat down on a high seat. This brahmin also is unrighteous, inasmuch as he, having sat down on a low seat, teaches a mantra to (someone) sitting on a high seat. I too am unrighteous, I who for the sake of a woman, steal the king’s mangoes. But all this is quite gone,⁴ (and) he fell down just there.

Neither knows the goal,⁵

¹ *chapaka*. Vin-a 896 explains by *caṇḍāla*, which is the word used in the Jātaka.

² *ayyaputta*. At Vin 3.17, the monk Sudinna’s former wife addresses him as *ayyaputta*. ³ *adhammika*. ⁴ *parigata*. Reading seems confused. *Vinaya Texts* iv.364 gives variant reading *camarikatan ti* (°*ṇatan ti B*); Vin-a 896, variant reading *carimakatan ti*; Ja 3.28 *carimavataṃ*, with variant readings *carivamataṃ*, *carimaṃ kataṃ*. “Done long ago”—i.e., *carimaṃ kataṃ*, makes sense for the Jātaka version.

⁵ *attha*. Vin-a 896 says, “These two people do not know the meaning (*attha*) of the text (*pāli*).”

neither sees *dhamma*,¹
Neither he who teaches the mantra,
nor he who learns according to what is not the rule.”²

“My food³ is pure conje
of rice flavoured with meat,⁴
I do not therefore fare on *dhamma*,⁵
dhamma praised by the noble.”

“Brahmin,⁶ shame on that gain of wealth,
(that) gain of fame;
That conduct (leads) to falling away⁷
or to walking by what is not the rule.⁸

“Go forth,⁹ great brahmin,
for other creatures boil,¹⁰
Do not you, following what is not the rule,
from that break like a pot.”¹¹

At that time,¹² monks,¹³ to teach¹⁴ a mantra, having sat down on a low seat, to (someone) sitting on a high seat, was not liked by me. So, however could it now be not not¹⁵ liked to teach¹⁶ *dhamma*, having sat down on a low seat, to (someone) sitting on a high seat? It is not,

¹ Vin-a 896 says, “they do not see the text”; Ja 3.29, “the two people do not see that the rule of old (*porāṇakadhamma*) is worthy of respect,” and adds the verse: “First the rule came to appear, afterwards what is not the rule arose, in the world.” Or *dhamma* may here be in its wider sense, to balance “goal,” and not in its more specialised Vinaya sense of “rule.” ² *adhammena*. The “rule” against which these two, had they been monks, would be transgressing, is the one laid down in this *Sekhiya*. ³ *bhutta*. According to Ja 3.29 and Vin-a 896 the brahmin says this verse. ⁴ For this line, cf. also Ja 3.144, Ja 4.371. ⁵ Or “the rule.” ⁶ This verse, also found at Ja 2.422, Ja 3.32, is here, according to Vin-a 896, spoken by the low-class man. ⁷ *Vinipāta*, often combined with *apāya* and *duggati*, sometimes plus *niraya*, as one of the ways of woeful rebirth—e.g., Vin 1.227; DN i.82, DN i.162; MN i.73, AN i.29, AN i.48. ⁸ *adhammacaraṇena*; or unrighteousness, what is not *dhamma*. ⁹ I.e., into homelessness. ¹⁰ *pacanti*, cook or boil, here in one of the hells. ¹¹ *asmā kumbhaṃ iva bhida*. ¹² According to Ja 3.30, the *bodhisattva* was the low-class man. ¹³ Cf. Vin 4.6. ¹⁴ *vāceti*. ¹⁵ *na amanāpa*; at Vin 4.6, *manāpa*, liked. ¹⁶ *deseti*.

monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“I will not teach *dhamma*, having sat down on a low seat, to (someone) sitting on a high seat (and) who is not ill,’ is a training to be observed.”

Dhamma should not be taught, having sat down on a low seat, to (someone) sitting on a high seat (and) who is not ill. Whoever out of disrespect, having sat down on a low seat, teaches *dhamma* to someone sitting on a high seat (and) who is not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 70

70.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, standing, taught *dhamma* to (someone) who was sitting down ... “...

“I will not teach *dhamma*, standing, to (someone) who is sitting down (and) who is not ill,’ is a training to be observed.”

4.205 Dhamma should not be taught, standing, to (someone) who is sitting down (and) who is not ill ... (see *Bu-Sk 70*) ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 71

71.1.1 ... in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, going behind, taught *dhamma* to (someone) going in front ... “...

“I will not teach *dhamma*, going behind, to (someone) going in front (and) who is, not ill,’ is a training to be observed.”

Dhamma should not be taught, going behind ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 72

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks, going at the side of a path,¹ taught *dhamma* to (someone) going along the path ... “...

“I will not teach *dhamma*, going at the side of a path, to (someone) going along the path (and) who is not ill,’ is a training to be observed.”

Dhamma should not be taught, going at the side of a path ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 73

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks eased themselves standing

“I will not ease myself standing if not ill,’ is a training to be observed.”

One must not ease oneself standing if not ill. Whoever out of disrespect eases himself standing if not ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, ... if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 74

... in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of

¹ *uppatha*.

six monks eased themselves and spat on green corn¹ ... “... ”

“I will not ease myself or spit, if not ill, on green corn,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not ease oneself or spit, if not ill, on green corn. Whoever out of disrespect eases himself or spits, if not ill, on green corn, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if done where there is no green corn² he spreads³ green corn over it, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

MONKS’ TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 75

... in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks eased themselves and spat in the water. People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, ease themselves and spit in the water, like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks ... in the water?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, ... in the water?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, ... in the water? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

‘I will not ease myself or spit in the water,’ is a training to be observed.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by

¹ *harita*, fresh—i.e., green wheat or cereals; vegetables, grass. ² *appaharita*, little or no green corn. Vin-a 897 reads *na harite*. Cf. Bu-Pc 19. ³ *ottharati*, to spread, to cover up. See also BD 1.137, n. 4, and next *Sekhiya*, where *ottharati* seems to mean to pour or to sprinkle.

the lord.

Now at that time ill monks were (too) scrupulous to ease themselves and spit in the water. They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, a monk if he is ill, to ease himself and spit in the water. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

“I will not ease myself or spit in the water, if not ill,’ is a training to be observed.”

If one is not ill he should not ease himself or spit in the water. Whoever out of disrespect, if not ill, ... offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill, if done on dry land and he pours¹ water over it, if there are accidents, if he is mad, unhinged, in pain, if he is the first wrong-doer.

The Seventh Division: that on shoes

Recited, venerable ones, are the rules of training. Concerning them, I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The venerable ones are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent; thus do I understand this.

Told are the Rules for Training

¹ *ottharati*. See previous note above.

MONKS' DECIDING OF LEGAL QUESTIONS (ADHIKARAṆASAMATHA)

3:153 These seven rules, venerable ones, for the deciding of legal questions¹ come up for recitation. For the deciding, for the settlement of legal questions arising from time to time:

1. A verdict in the presence of² may be given.
2. A verdict of innocence³ may be given.
3. A verdict of past insanity⁴ may be given.

¹ *adhikaraṇa*. This passage = Vin 4.351, and cf. DN iii.254, AN iv.144. The four kinds of *adhikaraṇa* are explained at Vin 2.88ff., and the ways of settling them at Vin 2.99ff. The four are stated merely, in definition of *adhikaraṇa*, at Vin 3.164 (=BD 1.282), Vin 4.126 (=above, BD 3.6), Vin 4.238 (=below, BD 3.206). See also Vin 3.168, Vin 3.173. At AN i.99 (=GS 1.85) a list of monastic duties is given, ending with these seven ways of settling legal questions. For a full exposition of their working and significance, see S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, 156ff. ² *sammukhāvinaya*. Vin 2.93 says there must be the presence of the Order, of *dhamma*, of discipline, and of the persons (disputing). Each of these is then defined. See also Vin 2.96, Vin 2.97; MN ii.247. ³ *sativinaya*. See Vin 1.325, Vin 2.99; MN ii.247. *Vinaya Texts* i.68, *Vinaya Texts* iii.58 translate by “consciously innocent.” Such persons have been “mindful” (*sati*) in their behaviour, they do not remember (*sarati*) having fallen into any offence, therefore they are innocent of the charges brought against them. See also GS i.85, n. 7. ⁴ *amūlḥavinaya*. See Vin 2.82, where this decision was made specially for the mad monk Gagga, and cf. Vin 1.123. Afterwards (Vin 2.100) it was formed into a “general rule for every similar case” (*Vinaya Texts* iii.18, n. 2). See also MN ii.248.

4. It may be carried out on (his) acknowledgement.¹
5. (There is) the decision of the majority.²
6. The decision for specific depravity.³
7. The covering up (as) with grass.⁴

Recited, venerable ones, are the seven rules for the deciding of legal questions. Concerning them, I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The venerable ones are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand this.

¹ *paṭiññāya kāretabbaṃ*. See Vin 1.325, where it is said that to carry out this form of settling legal questions without the accused monk's acknowledgement of his offence is not a legally valid act; and Vin 2.83, where various official acts, if carried out against a monk without his acknowledgement, are said to give rise to a *dukkaṭa* offence. See MN ii.248, for the way in which a monk should confess (*paṭideseti*) the offence into which he had fallen (*āpattim āpanno*). ² *yebhuyyasikā*, or "of a greater number." It is explained at considerable length at Vin 2.93ff., and in less detail at MN ii.247, that if monks dwelling in one *āvāsa* are unable to settle legal questions themselves, they may take them to the monks dwelling in another *āvāsa*. At Vin 2.84, however, this method is apparently not contemplated, for here it is said that if monks are unable to settle a legal question, they are allowed to agree upon an assigner of (voting) tickets, *salākagāhāpaka* (cf. *pattagāhāpaka* at Vin 3.246 = BD 2.122, n. 5. n. 1), and then to vote; but nothing is here said about consulting monks living in another *āvāsa*. At Vin 2.85 ten ways are given for an invalid, and ten for a valid taking of votes, while at Vin 2.98f., three methods of taking votes are described. ³ *tassapāpiyyasikā*, or the "obstinately wrong" (*Vinaya Texts* iii.28 q.v., n. 3). This method of settling a legal question is to be employed when a monk "having denied (an offence) acknowledged it, having acknowledged it denied it, shelved the question by asking others, told a conscious lie," Vin 2.85, and cf. Vin 4.1, where Hatthaka is said to have behaved in this way. The right way of carrying out this method of settling a legal question is given at Vin 2.85, Vin 2.86, and, rather differently, at MN ii.249. AN iv.347 states the proper practice in regard to a monk against whom these proceedings have been taken. ⁴ *tiṇavatthāraka*. The kinds of disputes to be settled by this method and the right procedure for carrying it out, are given at Vin 2.86f., and cf. MN ii.250.

MONKS' CONCLUSION

Recited, venerable ones, is the occasion, recited are the four rules for offences involving defeat, recited are the thirteen rules for offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, recited are the thirty rules for offences of expiation involving forfeiture, recited are the ninety-two rules for offences of expiation, recited are the four rules for offences which ought to be confessed, recited are the rules for training, recited are the seven rules for the deciding of legal questions. So much (of the sayings) of the lord, handed down in clauses,¹ contained in clauses, comes up for recitation every half month. All should train therein in harmony, on friendly terms, without contention.

Told is the Great Analysis

¹ *sutta*, here, as elsewhere in Vinaya, meaning a clause, article, rule. See **BD 1, Introduction, p. x**, and above, **BD 3.43, n. 5**.

Volume II

The Analysis of Nuns' Rules (*Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*)

Nuns' Defeat (<i>Pārājika</i>) 5	1059
Nuns' Defeat (<i>Pārājika</i>) 6	1067
Nuns' Defeat (<i>Pārājika</i>) 7	1071
Nuns' Defeat (<i>Pārājika</i>) 8	1075
Nuns' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 1	1079
Nuns' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 2	1083
Nuns' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 3	1087
Nuns' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 4	1092
Nuns' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 5	1096
Nuns' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 6	1099
Nuns' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 10	1102
Nuns' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 11	1106

Nuns' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 12	1108
Nuns' Formal Meeting (<i>Saṅghādisesa</i>) 13	1111
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 1	1114
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 2	1118
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 3	1121
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 4	1124
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 5	1127
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 6	1129
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 7	1132
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 8	1134
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 9	1136
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 10	1137
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 11	1139
Nuns' Forfeiture (<i>Nissaggiya</i>) 12	1142
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 1	1144
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 2	1147
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 3	1149
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 4	1151
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 5	1153

Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 6	1155
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 7	1157
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 8	1159
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 9	1161
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 10	1163
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 11	1165
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 12	1167
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 13	1168
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 14	1169
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 15	1172
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 16	1175
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 17	1177
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 18	1179
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 19	1181
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 20	1183
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 21	1185
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 22	1187
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 23	1189
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 24	1192

Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 25	1194
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 26	1196
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 27	1198
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 28	1200
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 29	1202
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 30	1204
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 31	1206
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 32	1208
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 33	1210
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 34	1212
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 35	1214
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 36	1217
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 37	1220
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 38	1222
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 39	1223
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 40	1225
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 41	1227
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 42	1229
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 43	1231

Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 44	1233
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 45	1234
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 46	1236
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 47	1237
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 48	1239
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 49	1241
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 50	1243
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 51	1244
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 52	1247
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 53	1250
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 54	1252
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 55	1254
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 56	1256
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 57	1258
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 58	1260
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 59	1262
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 60	1264
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 61	1266
Nuns' Expiation (Pācittiya) 62	1268

Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 63	1269
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 64	1272
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 65	1274
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 66	1276
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 67	1278
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 68	1280
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 69	1282
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 70	1284
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 71	1286
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 72	1287
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 73	1288
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 74	1290
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 75	1292
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 76	1294
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 77	1296
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 78	1298
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 79	1299
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 80	1301
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 81	1303

Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 82	1305
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 83	1306
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 84	1307
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 85	1309
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 86	1311
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 87	1313
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 88	1315
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 89	1316
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 90	1317
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 91–93	1319
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 94	1321
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 95	1323
Nuns' Expiation (<i>Pācittiya</i>) 96	1325
Nuns' Confession (<i>Pāṭidesaniya</i>) 1	1327
Nuns' Confession (<i>Pāṭidesaniya</i>) 2–8	1330
Nuns' Training (<i>Sekhiya</i>) 1–75	1332
Nuns' Deciding of Legal Questions	1335
Nuns' Conclusion	1336

NUNS' DEFEAT (PĀRĀJIKĀ) 5

¹ At that time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Then Sālha, ² Migāra's grandson, ³ became desirous of building a dwelling-house for the Order of nuns. Then Sālha, Migāra's grandson, having approached the nuns, spoke thus:

“Ladies, I want to build a dwelling-place for the Order of nuns; give me a nun who is an overseer of repairs.”⁴

At that time four sisters had gone forth among the nuns: Nandā, Nandavatī, Sundarīnandā, Thullanandā.⁵ Among these, the nun Sundarīnandā⁶ had gone forth when she was young; she was beautiful, good to look upon, charming, she was clever, experienced, wise, she was skilled, energetic, she was possessed of consideration for those kinds of things,⁷ she was able to build, able to make arrangements.⁸ Then the nuns, having chosen the nun Sundarīnandā, gave (her) as overseer of repairs to Sālha, Migāra's grandson.

Now at that time the nun Sundarīnandā constantly went to the dwelling of Sālha, Migāra's grandson, saying: “Give a knife, give a hatchet, give an axe, give a spade, give a chisel.”⁹ And Sālha, Migāra's grandson, constantly went to the nunnery to learn what was built

¹ Note by Sujato: *Pārājika* 1 in I.B. Horner's edition. ² Mentioned also at AN i.193f. ³ Vin-a 900 says that he was the “grandson of Migāra's mother”—i.e., of Visākha. ⁴ *navakammikā*, a superintendent. Cf. Vin 2.15 (masculine). Method of entrusting repairs to an overseer, and the qualities he should possess, are given at Vin 2.160. Cf. also Vin 2.172f. ⁵ Cf. Vin 4.259. ⁶ Cf. Vin 4.232, Vin 4.234. ⁷ *tatrupāyāya vimānsāya samannāgatā*. Cf. Vin 1.70. Vin-a 900 makes out that she was connected with the investigation or examination of the building or repairs that should be undertaken. ⁸ Cf. Vin 1.70. ⁹ Cf. Vin 3.144.

and what was not built. These,¹ through constantly seeing (one another), came to be in love. Then Sālha, Migāra's grandson, through not getting an opportunity to seduce the nun Sundarīnandā, for this purpose gave a meal for the Order of nuns. Then Sālha, Migāra's grandson, having appointed a seat in the refectory, thinking: "Some nuns are senior to the lady Sundarīnandā," appointed a seat to one side, and thinking: "Some are junior," appointed a seat to the other side.² He appointed a seat for the nun Sundarīnandā in a concealed place, in a corner, so that the nuns who were elders might conclude, "She is sitting with the junior nuns," and the junior nuns might conclude, "She is sitting with the nuns who are elders."

Then Sālha, Migāra's grandson, had the time announced to the Order of nuns, saying: "It is time, ladies, the meal is ready." The nun Sundarīnandā, having realised (what was happening), thinking: "Sālha, Migāra's grandson, is not benevolent (although) he gave a meal for the Order of nuns; he wants to seduce me. If I go, there will be trouble for me,"³ ordered her pupil, saying: "Go, bring back almsfood for me, and if anyone asks for me, let it be known that I am ill."

"Very well, lady," the nun answered the nun Sundarīnandā.

At that time Sālha, Migāra's grandson, came to be standing outside the porch of the door, asking for the nun Sundarīnandā, saying: "Where, lady, is the lady Sundarīnandā; where, lady, is the lady Sundarīnandā?"

When he had spoken thus, the pupil of the nun Sundarīnandā spoke thus to Sālha, Migāra's grandson: "She is ill, sir; I will take back her almsfood." Then Sālha, Migāra's grandson, thinking: "This meal which I gave for the sake of the nuns was on purpose for the lady Sundarīnandā," and having commanded the people, having said: "Offer the meal for the Order of nuns," he approached the nunnery.

At that time the nun Sundarīnandā came to be standing outside the porch of the monastery waiting for Sālha, Migāra's grandson.

¹ I.e., Sundarīnandā and Sālha. ² See rights of seniority in a refectory, given at Vin 2.274. ³ Cf. Vin 4.229 = below, BD 3.188; Vin 4.339 = below, BD 3.404.

Then the nun Sundarīnandā saw Sālha, Migāra’s grandson, coming from afar; seeing him, having entered the dwelling,¹ having put on her upper robe including over her head,² she lay down on a couch. Then Sālha, Migāra’s grandson, approached the nun Sundarīnandā; having approached, he spoke thus to the nun Sundarīnandā: “What is your discomfort, lady? Why are you lying down?”

“Surely it is this, sir: she who desires is not desired.”

“How can I, lady, not desire you? But I did not get an opportunity to seduce you,” and filled with desire he came into physical contact³ with the nun Sundarīnandā, also filled with desire.

Now at that time a nun, weakened by age, her feet affected,⁴ came to be sitting down not far from the nun Sundarīnandā. That nun saw Salha, Migara’s grandson, filled with desire, coming into physical contact with the nun Sundarīnandā, (also) filled with desire; seeing them, she looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can the lady Sundarīnandā, filled with desire, consent to physical contact with a male person⁵ who is filled with desire?” Then this nun told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns, contented, conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training, these looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can the lady Sundarīnandā, filled with desire ... with a male person who is filled with desire?” Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. These monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can the nun Sundarīnandā, filled with desire ... with a male person who is filled with desire?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Sundarīnandā, filled with desire ... with a male person filled with desire?”

“It is true, lord,” they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“It is not fitting, monks, in the nun Sundarīnandā, it is not suitable,

¹ *Upassaya*, doubtless meaning *bhikkhuni-upassaya*, nuns’ quarters. ² Cf. *Bu-Sk 23*, *Bu-Sk 67*. ³ Cf. *BD 1.201, n. 3*. ⁴ *caraṇagilānā*. ⁵ *purisapuggala*, see Introduction, p. 25ff.

it is not becoming, it is unworthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How, monks, can the nun Sundarīnandā, filled with desire, consent to physical contact with a male person who is filled with desire? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increasing (the number of) those who are pleased, but, monks, it is both for displeasing those who are not (yet) pleased and those who are pleased, and for causing wavering in some.”

Then the lord, having in many a figure rebuked the nun Sundarīnandā for her difficulty in supporting¹ herself, for her difficulty in maintaining herself, having spoken in dispraise of great desires, of discontent, of clinging (to the obstructions²), of sloth; having in many a figure spoken in praise of ease in supporting oneself, of ease in maintaining oneself, of desiring little, of contentment, of expunging (evil), of punctiliousness, of graciousness, of decreasing (the obstructions),³ of putting forth energy⁴; having given reasoned talk to the monks on what is fitting, on what is suitable,⁵ he addressed the monks, saying:

“On account of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training for nuns founded on ten reasons: for the excellence of the Order, for the comfort of the Order, for the restraint of evil-minded nuns, for the ease of well-behaved nuns, for the restraint of cankers belonging to the here and now, for the combating of cankers belonging to other worlds, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, for increasing (the number of) those who are pleased, for establishing what is verily *dhamma*, for following the rules of restraint.⁶ And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun, filled with desire, should consent to rubbing,⁷ or rubbing up against, or taking hold of or touching or pressing against a male person below the collar-bone, above the circle⁸ of the knees, if he is filled with desire, she also becomes one who is

¹ *dubbharatāya*, translated at GS 4.187, “luxury.” ² *saṅgamika* = *kilesasaṅgamika* at Vin-a 222; but at AN iv.280, as gregariousness, sociability, it is contrasted with aloofness. ³ *apacaya*, translated at GS 4.187 “dispersion” (of rebirth). ⁴ Cf. Vin 3.21, Vin 3.171, and Vin 4.142. See BD 1.37, notes. ⁵ Cf. Vin 4.120. ⁶ Cf. Vin 3.21.

⁷ On *āmasati* see BD 1.203, n. 6. ⁸ *maṅḍala*, see above, BD 3.121.

defeated, she is not in communion, she is one who touches above the circle of the knees.”¹

Vin 4.2

Whatever² means: she who is an elder or a junior or one of middle standing, this one, on account of relations, on account of birth, on account of name, on account of clan, on account of virtue, on account of the way of living, on account of the field of activity, is called whatever.

Bi-Pj 5.

Nun means: she is a nun because she is a beggar for alms, she is a nun because she submits to walking for alms, she is a nun because she is one who wears the patch-work robes, she is a nun by the designation (of others), a nun because of her acknowledgement, a nun (to whom it was) said, ‘Come, nun,’ a nun is one ordained by the three goings to a refuge, a nun is auspicious, a nun is the essential, a nun is a learner, a nun is an adept, a nun is ordained by both complete Orders by means of a (formal) act at which the motion is put and followed by three proclamations, irreversible and fit to stand.³ In this way is this nun one who is ordained by both complete Orders by means of a (formal) act at which the motion was put and followed by three proclamations, irreversible, fit to stand, and this is how nun is to be understood in this case.⁴

BD 3.16

Filled with desire⁵ means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.

Filled with desire⁶ means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.⁷

A male person means: a human man, not a *yakkha*, not a departed one, not an animal; he is learned, competent⁸ to come into physical contact.

¹ *ubbhajānumaṇḍalikā*. Not explained in the Old Commentary. Vin-a 901 says, “it is only the name of this one who is defeated, therefore it is not considered in the *Padabhājaniya*.” ² Cf. Vin 3.23 (=BD 1.42). ³ *akuppa thānāraha*; probably meaning that the formal act should not be re-opened for discussion. ⁴ Cf. Vin 3.24 (=BD 1.42).

⁵ Feminine. ⁶ Masculine. ⁷ =Vin 3.121, Vin 3.128 in definition of *otiṇṇa*, affected by desire. ⁸ Cf. definition of “woman” at Vin 3.128, MN iii.192.

Below the collar-bone means: below the collar-bone.¹

Above the circle of the knees means: above the circle of the knees.²

Rubbing means: merely rubbed.³

Rubbing up against means: moving from here and there.⁴

Taking hold of means: merely taken hold of.⁵

Touching means: merely contact.⁶

Or should consent to pressing against means: having taken hold of a limb she consents to pressing against.

She also means: she is so called in reference to the preceding.⁷

Becomes one who is defeated means: as a man with his head cut off cannot become one to live by attaching it to his body, so a nun, filled with desire, consenting to rubbing or to rubbing up against or to taking hold of or to touching or to pressing a man who is filled with desire below the collar-bone, above the circle of the knees, becomes one who is not a recluse, not a daughter of the Sakyans; therefore she is called, **she becomes one who is defeated**.⁸

Is not in communion means: communion is called one (formal) act, one recital, an equal training; this is called communion. If it is not together with her, she is therefore called **not in communion**.⁹

If both are filled with desire (and) she rubs the body¹⁰ below the collar-bone, above the circle of the knees with the body, there is an offence involving defeat. If she rubs something attached to the body with the body, there is a grave offence. If she rubs the body with something attached to the body, there is a grave offence. If she rubs something attached to the body with something attached to the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs the body with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs something attached to the body with something that may

¹ *adhakkhakan ti heṭṭhakkhakaṃ.* ² *ubbhajānumaṇḍalan ti uparijānumaṇḍalaṃ.*
³ = Vin 3.121. ⁴ = Vin 3.121. ⁵ = Vin 3.121. ⁶ = Vin 3.121. ⁷ Vin-a 901 says, in reference to the group of the four *Pārājika* (set forth in the Monks' *Vibhaṅga*, but to be observed by nuns also see Introduction BD 3.32). ⁸ Cf. Vin 1.96, Vin 3.28. ⁹ Cf. Vin 3.28. ¹⁰ Cf. Vin 3.123ff.

be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If she rubs the body above the collar-bone, below the circle of the knees with the body, there is a grave offence. If she rubs something attached to the body with the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs the body with something attached to the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs something attached to the body with something attached to the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs the body with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs something attached to the body with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

BD 3,16

If one is filled with desire, and she rubs the body below the collar-bone, above the circle of the knees with the body, there is a grave offence. If she rubs the body with something attached to the body ... If she rubs something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If she rubs the body above the collar-bone, below the circle of the knees with the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs something attached to the body with the body ... If she rubs something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If both are filled with desire, and she rubs the body of a *yakkha* or of a departed one or of a eunuch or of an animal in human form, below the collar-bone, above the circle of the knees with the body, there is a grave offence. If she rubs something attached to the body with the body ... If she rubs something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If she rubs the body above the collar-bone, below the circle of the knees, with the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs something attached to the body with the body ... If she rubs something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there

is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one is filled with desire, and she rubs the body below the collar-bone, above the circle of the knees with the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs something attached to the body with the body ... If she rubs something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If she rubs the body above the collar-bone, below the circle of the knees with the body, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she rubs something attached to the body with the body ... If she rubs something that may be cast with something that may be cast, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional; if she is not thinking; if she does not know; if she does not consent; if she is mad, if her mind is unhinged, if she is in pain, if she is the first wrong-doer.¹

Told is the First Offence involving Defeat in the Nuns' Analysis

¹ Cf. Vin 3.126.

NUNS' DEFEAT (PĀRĀJIKĀ) 6

¹ ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Sundarīnandā became pregnant by Saḷhā, Migāra's grandson. Until the embryo quickened she concealed it; when the embryo was matured, having left the Order, she gave birth. Nuns spoke thus to the nun Thullanandā: "Lady, Sundarīnandā not long after leaving the Order gave birth. We wonder if she was pregnant when she was a nun?"

"Yes, ladies."

"But how is it that you, lady, knowing that a nun had fallen into a matter involving defeat,² neither reproved her yourself, nor spoke to a group?"

"Whatever is blame for her, that is blame for me; whatever is disgrace for her, that is disgrace for me; whatever is dishonour for her, that is dishonour for me; whatever is loss for her, that is loss for me. How can I, ladies, speak to others of my own blame, my own disgrace, my own dishonour, my own loss?"

Those who were modest nuns looked down upon, criticised, and spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā, knowing that a nun had fallen into a matter involving defeat, neither reprove her herself, nor speak to a group?" Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, having given reasoned talk, questioned the monks, saying:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā, knowing

¹ Note by Sujato: *Pārājika 2* in I.B. Horner's edition. ² As by **Bi-Pj 5**, having physical contact with a man.

3.166 that a nun ... neither reproved her herself, nor spoke to a group?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā, knowing that a nun ... neither reprove her herself, nor speak to a group? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

4.217 "Whatever nun, knowing that a nun has fallen into a matter involving defeat, should neither herself reprove her, nor speak to a group, but when she may be remaining or deceased or expelled or withdrawn,¹ should afterwards speak thus: 'Ladies, before I knew this nun, she was a sister like this and like that,' and should neither herself reprove her nor should speak to a group, she also becomes one who is defeated, she is not in communion, she is one who conceals a fault."²

6.2.1 **Whatever** means: she who ...

Nun means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

She knows means: either she knows by herself or others tell her or she³ tells (her).

Has fallen into a matter involving defeat means: of the eight offences involving defeat⁴ (she) has fallen into a certain offence involving defeat.

Should neither herself⁵ reprove her means: should neither herself reprimand her.

Nor should speak to a group means: nor should speak to other nuns.

3.167 ¹ *avasaṭā*. See Old Commentary, below. *Critical Pali Dictionary* gives "having entered, having arrived"; *Pali-English Dictionary* "withdrawn, gone away, one who has left a community and, gone over to another sect." ² *vajjapaṭicchādikā*, not explained in the Old Commentary. Vin-a 903 says it is merely the name of this *Pārājika* offence. Cf. Monks' Bu-Pc 64. ³ I.e., the nun who has committed the *Pārājika* offence, Vin-a 903. Cf. Vin 3.265 = BD 2.161. ⁴ Vin-a 903 says, a certain one of the four in common with monks and of the four not in common with monks. The nuns had to observe the *Pārājika* of the Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha, as well as their own. ⁵ *attanā ... sayam*.

But when she may be remaining or deceased means: **Remaining** means she is called remaining in her own characteristic.¹ **Deceased** means she is called one who has passed away. **Expelled** means she herself comes to be leaving the Order or she is expelled by others. **Withdrawn** means she is called one who has gone over to the fold of a sect.²

Should afterwards speak thus: ‘Ladies, before I knew this nun, she was a sister like this and like that,’ and should neither herself reprove her means: should neither herself reprimand her; *nor speak to a group* means: nor should speak to other nuns.

She also means: she is so called in reference to the former.

Becomes one who is defeated means: as a withered leaf freed from the stalk cannot become green again,³ so a nun, knowing that a nun has fallen into a matter involving defeat (and) thinking, ‘I will neither myself reprove her, nor speak to a group,’ in throwing off the responsibility,⁴ becomes one who is not a recluse, not a daughter of the Sakyans; therefore she is called, **she becomes one who is defeated**.

Is not in communion means: communion ... is therefore called **not in communion**.

There is no offence if she does not speak, thinking ‘There will come to be quarrel or dispute or strife or contention for the Order’; if she does not speak, thinking ‘There will come to be a schism in the Order or dissension in the Order’⁵; if she does not speak, thinking ‘This one, harsh, rough, will bring⁶ danger to life or danger to the Brahma-life if she does not speak not seeing other suitable nuns; if she does not speak (though) not desiring to conceal; if she does not

¹ *ñhitā nāma salinṅe ñhitā vuccati.* ² *titthāyatanam saṅkantā.* Cf. Vin 1.60, Vin 1.69, referring to one who formerly a member of another sect, *titthiya*, has gone back to it; Vin 2.279, where it is laid down that nuns who have joined the *titthiyas*, coming back to the Order of nuns, are not to be ordained again. *Titthāyatana* occurs at MN i.483, AN i.173, Ds 381, Ds 1003 See *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, 2nd. edition p.93, n. 9, and LEDI SAYADAW, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1913, p.117. ³ Cf. Vin 1.96, Vin 3.47. ⁴ Cf. BD 1.82. ⁵ = Vin 4.37, Vin 4.128, Vin 4.153. ⁶ *karissati*, literally will do or make.

speaking, thinking: 'It will be evident from her own action'; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.¹

Told is the Second Offence involving Defeat in the Nuns' Analysis

¹ Cf. Vin 4.128 = above, BD 3.9.

NUNS' DEFEAT (PĀRĀJIKĀ) 7

¹... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā imitated the monk Ariṭṭha who had formerly been a vulture-trainer,² and who was suspended by a complete Order.³ Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the lady Thullanandā imitate the monk ... suspended by a complete Order?” ... “It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā imitate the monk ... suspended by a complete Order? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should imitate him—a monk suspended by a complete Order, one who is disrespectful towards, who does not make amends towards,⁴ one who is unfriendly towards⁵ the rule,⁶ the discipline, the teacher's instruction—that nun should be spoken to thus by the nuns: ‘Lady, this monk, suspended by a complete Order, is disrespectful towards, he does not make amends towards, he is unfriendly towards the rule, the discipline, the teacher's instruction. Do not imitate this monk, lady.’ And if this

¹ Note by Sujato: *Pārājika* 3 in I.B. Horner's edition. ² See Monks' *Bu-Pc* 68, *Bu-Pc* 69. ³ See Monks' *Bu-Pc* 69. ⁴ *apaṭikāra*. Cf. *Vin* 1.97, *appaṭikamma* and *paṭikaroti* used with *āpatti*, an offence. Also *AN* ii.241ff., *yathādhammaṃ paṭikarissati*, he (or she) will make amends according to the rule, for having fallen into a *pārājika*, *saṅghādisesa*, *pācittiya* or *pāṭidesaniya(ka)* offence (*dhamma*). *Paṭikaroti* is also “to confess.” ⁵ *akatasahāya*. *Critical Pali Dictionary's* “who has not taken an advocate” cannot be accepted here. ⁶ *dhamma*.

3.170 **nun, being spoken to thus by these nuns, should persist as before, that nun should be admonished by the nuns up to the third time for giving up this (course). If, being admonished up to the third time, she should give it up, that is good. But if she should not give it up, she also becomes one who is defeated, she is not in communion, she is an imitator of one who is suspended.”¹**

j7.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Complete Order means: belonging to the same communion, staying within the same boundary.²

Suspended means: suspended for not seeing or for not making amends for or for not giving up an offence.³

Towards the rule, the discipline means: towards whatever is the rule, whatever is the discipline.⁴

Towards the teacher's instruction means: towards the conqueror's instruction, the enlightened one's instruction.⁵

Disrespectful means: he does not heed an Order or a group or an individual or a (formal) act.

Does not make amends towards means: he is suspended, not restored.⁶

4.219 **Unfriendly towards** means: monks belonging to the same communion are called friends. He who is not together with these is therefore called unfriendly.

Should imitate him means: if he becomes one of such views, of such indulgence, of such pleasures, she too becomes one of those views, of that indulgence, of those pleasures.

That nun means: whatever nun is an imitator of one who is suspended.

3.171 **By the nuns⁷** means: by other nuns: these see, these hear; she should be told by these saying: ‘Lady, this monk, suspended by a

¹ As in Monks' Bu-Pc 68, this is more like Saṅghādisesa method and material than Pārājika. ² = above, BD 3.65, below, BD 3.193, and Vin 3.173. ³ = below, BD 3.193.

⁴ = below, BD 3.193. ⁵ = below, BD 3.193. ⁶ = above, BD 3.28, in definition of akaṭānudhamma, “has not acted according to the rule.” ⁷ Cf. Vin 3.178f., Vin 3.185.

complete Order, ... do not imitate this monk, lady.' And a second time she should be told ... And a third time she should be told ... If she gives it up, that is good; if she does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having heard, they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That nun, having been pulled into the midst of the Order, should be told: 'Lady, this monk, suspended by a complete Order, ... do not imitate this monk, lady.' And a second time ... And a third time she should be told ... If she gives it up, that is good; if she does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

That nun should be admonished. And thus, monks, should she be admonished: the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: 'Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This nun so and so imitated a monk suspended by a complete Order, one who is disrespectful towards, who does not make amends towards, who is unfriendly towards the rule, the discipline, the teacher's instruction. She does not give up this course. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order admonish the nun so and so in order that she may give up this course. This is the motion. Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This nun so and so ... She does not give up this course. The Order admonishes the nun so and so in order that she may give up this course. If the admonishing of the nun so and so in order that she may give up this course is pleasing to the ladies, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, then you should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... The nun so and so is admonished by the Order for giving up this course. It is pleasing to the Order ... So do I understand this.'

As a result of the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing; as a result of two proclamations there are grave offences; at the end of the proclamations, there is an offence involving defeat.

She also means: she is so called in reference to the former.

She becomes one who is defeated means: as a flat stone broken in half cannot be put together again,¹ so a nun, being admonished up to the third time, not giving it up, becomes one who is not a (true)

¹ Cf. Vin 1.97, Vin 3.74.

recluse, not a daughter of the Sakyans; therefore she is called **she becomes one who is defeated**.

Not in communion means: communion ... is therefore called **not in communion**.

j7.2.2
If she thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) does not give it up, there is an offence involving defeat. If she is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act (and) does not give it up, there is an offence involving defeat. If she thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) does not give it up, there is an offence involving defeat. If she thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

j7.2.3
There is no offence if she is not admonished; if she gives it up, if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.²

Told is the Third Offence involving Defeat

¹ Cf. Vin 3.174, Vin 3.177, Vin 3.179, Vin 3.186; Vin 4.136, where last clause of Bi-Pj 7.2.2 ends *anāpatti* instead of, as on these other occasions, *āpatti dukkaṭassa*. ² Cf. Vin 3.174, Vin 3.177, Vin 3.179, Vin 3.186; Vin 4.136, where last clause of Bi-Pj 7.2.2 ends *anāpatti* instead of, as on these other occasions, *āpatti dukkaṭassa*.

NUNS' DEFEAT (PĀRĀJIKĀ) 8

¹ ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns, filled with desire, for the sake of following what was verily not the rule,² consented to taking hold of the hand of a male person who was filled with desire, and they consented to taking hold of the edge of (his) outer robe, and they stood and they talked and they went to a rendezvous and they consented to a man's approaching (them) and they entered into a covered place and they disposed the body for such a purpose.³ Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the group of six nuns, filled with desire, for the sake of following what is verily not the rule, consent to ... and stand and talk and go to a rendezvous ... and enter ... and dispose ...?” “It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “Monks, how can the group of six nuns ... consent to ... dispose the body for such a purpose? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun, filled with desire, for the sake of following what is verily not the rule, should consent to taking hold of the hand of a male person who is filled with desire or should consent to taking hold of the edge of (his) outer cloak or should stand or should talk or should go to a rendezvous or should consent to a

¹ Note by Sujato: *Pārājika* 4 in I.B. Horner's edition. ² *asaddhamma*—i.e., **Bu-Pj** 1. Vin-a 904 calls *asaddhamma* “physical contact, not sexual intercourse.” Not explained in Old Commentary. ³ *kāyam pi tadatthāya upasamharanti*.

man's approaching (her) or should enter into a covered place or should dispose the body for such a purpose, she also becomes one who is defeated, she is not in communion, she is a doer of eight things."¹

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Filled with desire means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.²

Filled with desire means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.³

A male person means: a human man, not a *yakkha*, not a departed one, not an animal; he is learned, competent to come into physical contact.⁴

Should consent to taking hold of the hand means: hand means, going up from the tip of the nail as far as the elbow.⁵ If for the sake of following what is verily not the rule, she consents to taking hold below the collarbone, above the circles of the knees, there is a grave offence.

Or should consent to taking hold of the edge of (his) outer cloak means: if for the sake of following what is verily not the rule, she consents to take hold of what he is clothed in⁶ or of what he has put on,⁷ there is a grave offence.

Or should stand means: if for the sake of following what is verily not the rule, she stands within the reach of a man's hand, there is a grave offence.

Or should talk means: if for the sake of following what is verily not the rule, she talks standing within the reach of a man's hand, there is a grave offence.

Or should go to a rendezvous means: if for the sake of following what is verily not the rule, she, being told by a man, 'Come to such and such a place,' goes (there), for every step there is an offence

¹ *aṭṭhavattukā*, not explained in the Old Commentary, but it means the eight actions here referred to. ² = above, **BD 3.161**. ³ = above, **BD 3.161**. ⁴ = above, **BD 3.161**.

⁵ = **Vin 3.121 (BD 1.203)**. ⁶ *nivattha*, referring to his inner robe. ⁷ *pāruta*, referring to his upper robe and outer cloak.

of wrong-doing. In merely approaching the reach of a man's hand, there is a grave offence.

Or should consent to a man's approaching means: if for the sake of following what is verily not the rule, she consents to a man's approaching, there is an offence of wrong-doing. In merely approaching a reach of his hand, there is a grave offence.

Or should enter into a covered place means: if for the sake of following what is verily not the rule, in merely entering any concealed place whatever, there is a grave offence.

Or should dispose the body for such a purpose means: if for the sake of following what is verily not the rule, standing within the reach of a man's hand, she disposes the body, there is a grave offence.

She also means: she is so called in reference to the former.

She becomes one who is defeated means: as a palmyra tree cut off at the crown cannot become one for new growth,¹ so a nun, completing² the eight courses,³ becomes one who is not a (true) recluse, not a daughter of the Sakyans; therefore she is called she becomes one who is defeated.

Not in communion means: communion ... is therefore called **not in communion**.

There is no offence if it is not intentional; if she is not thinking; if she does not know; if she does not consent: if she is mad, her mind unhinged, afflicted with pain, if she is the first wrong-doer.

Told is the Fourth Offence involving Defeat

Recited, ladies, are the eight offences⁴ involving defeat; a nun having fallen into one or other of these does not receive communion together with the nuns; as before, so after, she becomes one who is

¹ = Vin 1.97, Vin 3.92. ² *paripūrentī*, accomplishing. ³ *vatthu*, mode or course—i.e., the eight above specified. ⁴ According to Vin-a 906, four laid down for monks which are also to be followed by nuns, and these (above) four for nuns only; thus eight *Pārājika* rules are recited for the ladies at the joint recital the *Pātimokkha*. See BD 3, Introduction, p. xxxii.

defeated, she is not in communion. Concerning them, I ask the ladies: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The ladies are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent; thus do I understand this.¹

Told is the Portion on Defeat

4.223

¹ Cf. Vin 3.109 = BD 1.190.

NUNS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA)

1

These seventeen¹ things, venerable ones, entailing formal meetings of the Order, come for exposition.

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain lay-follower, having given a store-room² to an Order of nuns, passed away. He had two sons, one of no faith, not believing,³ the other with faith, believing. Then he of no faith, not believing, spoke thus to him with faith, believing: "The store-room is ours, let us deal it out."⁴ When he had spoken thus, the one with faith, believing, spoke thus to him of no faith, not believing: "Do not, sir, speak thus; it was given to the Order of nuns by our father." And a second time he of no faith, not believing, spoke thus to him with faith, believing: "The storeroom is ours, let us deal it out." Then the one with faith, believing, spoke thus to him of no faith, not believing: "Do not, sir, speak thus; it was given to the Order of nuns by our father." And a third time he of no faith ... "... let us deal it out." Then the one with faith, believing, thinking, "If it became mine, I also would give it to an Order of nuns," spoke thus to the one of no faith, not believing: "Let us deal it out." Then that store-room being dealt

¹ Ten are given in this section; but seven are the same as those already given in the *Saṅghādisesas* for monks; see below, **BD 3.212, n. 1**, and **BD 3, Introduction, p. xxxiii**.

² *uddosita* = *bhaṇḍasālā* (Vin-a 906). *Uddosita* is sometimes a stable; cf. **Vin 3.200**, and *Vinaya Texts* iii.363, n. 2. At **Vin 2.278** *uddosita* is "allowed," a lay-follower again being recorded to give one to an Order of nuns. ³ *appasanna*, or not pleased (with the master's teaching). ⁴ *bhājāma*; Sinhalese edition reads *bhājema*.

3.178 out by these, fell to¹ him of no faith, not believing. Then the one of no faith, not believing, having approached the nuns, spoke thus: “You must depart, ladies, the store-room is ours.” When he had spoken thus, the nun Thullanandā spoke thus to that man:

“Do not, sir, speak thus; the store-room was given to the Order of nuns by your father.”

Saying: “Was it given² (or) not given?” they asked the chief ministers of justice. The chief ministers spoke thus:

4.224 “Who knows, ladies, if it was given to the Order of nuns?” When they had spoken thus, the nun Thullanandā spoke thus to these chief ministers:

“But, masters, was not the gift seen or heard of by you as it was being given, eye-witnesses having been arranged?” Then the chief ministers, saying: “What the lady says is true,” made over the store-room to the Order of nuns. Then that man, defeated, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

3.179 “These shaven-headed (women) are not (true) recluses, they are strumpets.³ How can they have the store-room taken away from us?” The nun Thullanandā told this matter to the chief ministers. The chief ministers had that man punished.⁴ Then that man, punished,⁵ having had a sleeping-place made for Naked Ascetics not far from the nunnery, instigated the Naked Ascetics, saying: “Talk down⁶ these nuns.” The nun Thullanandā told this matter to the chief ministers. The chief ministers had that man fettered. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these nuns have a store-room taken away (from him) and secondly have him punished and thirdly have him fettered? Now they will have him killed.”

Nuns heard these people as they ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: “How can the lady Thullanandā be one who speaks in envy?”⁷ Then these nuns told this

¹ *pāpuruṇāti*, to reach, attain, arrive at, to obtain to. ² Square brackets in text, but Sinhalese edition reads *dinno na dinno*. ³ Cf. below, **BD 3.257**, **BD 3.275**. The word translated as “strumpets” is *bandhakiniyo*; cf. Ja 5.425. ⁴ *daṇḍāpesum*, perhaps beaten with a stick. ⁵ *daṇḍika*. ⁶ *accāvadatha*. Vin-a 906 says *atikkamitvā vadatha, akkosatha*, having surpassed them, talk, swear at them. ⁷ *ussayavādikā*.

matter to the monks ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā is one who speaks in envy?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā be one who speaks in envy? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should be one who speaks in envy concerning a householder or a householder’s sons (or brothers¹) or a slave or a workman² and even concerning a wanderer who is a recluse,³ that nun has fallen into a matter that is an offence at once,⁴ entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away.”⁵

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

One who speaks in envy means: she is called a bringer of law-suits.⁶

Householder means: he who lives in a house.⁷

Householder’s sons (or brothers) means: whoever are sons and brothers.⁸

Slave means: born within, bought for money, taken in a raid.⁹

Workman¹⁰ means: a hireling, a worker.¹¹

Wanderer who is a recluse means: setting aside monk and nun and probationer and novice and female novice, he who is endowed with (the status of) wanderer.¹²

¹ See Old Commentary below. ² *kammakāra*, or servant. ³ *samaṇaparibbājaka*.

⁴ *paṭhamāpattikaṃ*, which in **Bi-Ss 1–Bi-Ss 6** is in opposition to *yāvataṭṭhāyaka*, that which is not an offence until a nun has been admonished up to the third time (see **Bu-Ss 7–Bu-Ss 10**). Cf. **Vin 3.186 (=BD 1.328)**. ⁵ *nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ*; cf. the similar construction, *nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ*, and see **BD 3, Introduction, p. xxxvi**.

⁶ *aṭṭakārikā*, a maker of law-suits, cases, causes. ⁷ Cf. **BD 2.47, BD 2.55, BD 2.148**.

⁸ *yo koci puttabhātaro*. ⁹ =MN-a 3.8. These three are explained at Vin-a 361; four “slaves” mentioned at Mnd 11; cf. DN-a 1.168, DN-a 1.300. The last two, *dhanakkīta* and *karamarānīta* (feminine) come into the description of the ten kinds of wife at **Vin 3.140**. ¹⁰ Cf. MN-a 3.8, DN-a 300. ¹¹ *āhataka*, “one who is beaten,” so *Pali-English Dictionary*. ¹² Cf. **Vin 4.92, Vin 4.285**.

If she thinks, “I will bring a law-suit,” or looks about for a companion or goes herself,¹ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she announces it to one (person), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she announces it to a second, there is a grave offence. At the end of the law-suit, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

An offence at once means: she falls through transgression of a course,² not after admonition.³

Involving being sent away means: she is caused to be sent away from the Order.⁴

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: the Order inflicts the *mānatta* discipline on account of her offence, it sends back to the beginning, it rehabilitates; it is not several (nuns), it is not one nun, therefore it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. A synonym for this class of offence is (formal) act, therefore again it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.⁵

There is no offence if she goes being dragged along by people; if she asks for protection; if she explains without reference (to a particular person); if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. Vin 3.47 (= BD 1.76). Above it means, according to Vin-a 907, if she looks about for a witness or friend; and if standing where there is a nunnery, or alms-road, she thinks, “I will bring a law-suit,” going from there to the magistrates, there is an offence of wrong-doing for every step that she takes. ² *saha vatthujjhācārā*.

³ Cf. below, BD 3.203. ⁴ *saṅghamhā nissāriyati*, explained by Vin-a 908 as *saṅghato nissāreti*. The -sār- causative, “she is made or caused to be sent away.” See BD 3, Introduction, p. xxxvi. ⁵ Cf. Vin 3.112 (BD 1.196).

NUNS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA)

2

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time in Vesālī, the wife of a certain Licchavi came to be an adulteress. Then that Licchavi spoke thus to that woman: "Please desist, else will we do you harm." But being spoken to thus, she paid no heed. Now at that time a group of Licchavis were assembled in Vesālī on some business. Then that Licchavi spoke thus to those Licchavis: "Let the masters allow me power over one woman."¹

"What is her name?"

"My wife commits adultery, I will kill her."

"Take your right,"² they said. Then that woman heard: "My husband wants to kill me," and taking precious belongings, having gone to Sāvattthī, having approached members of other sects, she asked for the going forth.³ The members of other sects did not wish to let her go forth.⁴ Having approached nuns, she asked for the going forth. Neither did the nuns wish to let her go forth. Having approached the nun Thullanandā, having shown (her) the belongings, she asked for the going forth. The nun Thullanandā, having taken the belongings, let her go forth. Then that Licchavi, searching for that woman, having gone to Sāvattthī, seeing her gone forth among the nuns, approached King Pasenadi of Kosala; having approached, he spoke thus to King Pasenadi of Kosala:

"Sire, my wife, taking precious belongings, has reached Sāvattthī; let the king⁵ allow me power over her."

¹ *ekaṃ me ayyo itthiṃ anujānātha.* ² *jānāhi.* ³ *pabbajjaraṃ yāci.* ⁴ *pabbājetuṃ.*

⁵ *devo*

“Well now, good sir, having examined¹ (her), explain.”

“Sire, she was seen gone forth among the nuns.”

3.183 “If, good sir, she has gone forth among the nuns, there is nothing to do against her.² Well preached by the lord is *dhamma*; let her lead the Brahma-life for the utter ending of ill.”³

Then that Licchavi, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these nuns let a woman thief go forth?”⁴

Nuns heard that Licchavi who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: “How can the lady Thullanandā let a woman thief go forth?” Then these nuns told this matter to the monks ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā let a thief go forth?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “Monks, how can the nun Thullanandā let a woman thief go forth? It is not monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

3.184 **“Whatever nun should knowingly receive⁵ a woman thief who is found to merit death,⁶ without having obtained permission⁷ from a king or an Order or a group⁸ or a guild⁹ or a company,¹⁰ unless she is allowable,¹¹ that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence at once, entailing a formal meeting of the Order**

¹ *vicinitvā*. ² *na sā labbhā kiñci kāṭum*, she is not a receiver of anything there is to do. ³ Cf. *Vin* 1.74-75. ⁴ The Licchavi appears to lose sight of his wife's original sin in his effort to recover the property. ⁵ *vuṭṭhāpeti*; cf. below, *BD* 3.361, and Introduction, p. xlvff. ⁶ *vajjhā*. ⁷ *anapaloketvā*, explained by *anāpucchā*, Old Commentary, below, and *anāpucchitvā* at *Vin*-a 910. ⁸ *Vin*-a 910 makes out that this means a group of wrestlers and so on. But, preceded by *saṅgha*, it might have the usual Vinaya meaning of a group (of two to four monks or nuns). On the other hand, it is followed by two words that have no religious significance, and which denote associations of people “in the world.” ⁹ *pūga* = *dhammapūga*, “a guild under dhamma” (?), *Vin*-a 910. Probably a guild governed by some rule or law. ¹⁰ *seṇi*, a corporation, company or guild of artisans or traders following the same business or dealing in the same articles. *Vin*-a 910 says here it is a *seṇi* of perfumers, of cloth merchants. Number given as eighteen at *Ja* 6.22. ¹¹ *kappā*.

involving being sent away.”

Bi-Ss 2

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood.

She knows means: either she knows by herself or others tell her or she tells her.

Woman thief¹ means: she who takes by means of theft (anything) having the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas* that has not been given—she is called a woman thief.

To merit death means: having done that for which she is condemned to death.

Found² means: she becomes known³ by other people, thinking, ‘This one merits death.’

Without having obtained permission means: not asking (for permission).⁴

King means: where a king governs,⁵ the king’s permission should be obtained.⁶

Order means: it is called an Order of nuns; the permission of the Order of nuns should be obtained.

Group means: where a group governs, the group’s permission should be obtained.

Company means: where a company governs, the company’s permission should be obtained.

Vin 4.2

Unless she is allowable means: having set aside one who is allowable. **Allowable** means: there are two who are allowable: either she who has gone forth among members of other sects, or she who has gone forth among other nuns.⁷

If she thinks, “I will receive one, unless she is allowable,” and looks about for a group or for a female teacher or for a bowl or for a robe or if she determines a boundary,⁸ there is an offence of wrong-

BD 3.18

¹ Here feminine = Vin 3.47 (masculine). ² *viditā*. ³ *ñātā*. ⁴ =below, BD 3.360.

⁵ *anusāsati*, to govern, rule, advise, give instruction. ⁶ *rājā apaloketabbo*, or “the king should be asked for permission. But in spite of this grammatical construction, I think the two words, *apaloketi* and *āpucchati*, should be differently rendered.

⁷ These may be ordained without asking for permission. ⁸ See Vin 1.106 for prescribed method of determining a boundary.

doing. As a result of the motion, there is an offence of wrong-doing. As a result of two proclamations, there are grave offences. At the end of the proclamations, there is an offence involving a formal meeting of the Order for the female preceptor, an offence of wrong-doing for the group and for the female teacher.¹

She also means: she is so called in reference to the former.

Offence at once means: ... therefore again it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

2.2.2

If she thinks that she is a thief when she is a thief (and) receives her, unless she is allowable, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If she is in doubt ... offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not a thief when she is a thief ... no offence. If she thinks that she is a thief when she is not a thief, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not a thief, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not a thief when she is not a thief, there is no offence.

2.2.3

There is no offence if she receives her, not knowing; if she receives one, she having obtained permission; if she receives one who is made allowable; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ With this passage, *cf.* above, [BD 3.13](#), and below, [BD 3.362](#).

NUNS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA)

3

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a nun who was a pupil of Bhaddā Kāpilānī,¹ having quarrelled with nuns, went to a family of (her) relations² in a village. Bhaddā Kāpilānī, not seeing that nun, asked the nuns, saying: "Where is so and so? She is not to be seen."

"Lady, she is not to be seen (because) she has quarrelled with nuns."

"My dears,³ a family of her relations are in such and such a village; having gone there, look for her."

The nuns, having gone there, having seen that nun, spoke thus: "Why did you, lady, come alone? We hope that you were not violated?"

"I was not violated, ladies," she said. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can a nun go among villages⁴ alone?"

...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun went among villages alone?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can a nun go among villages alone? It is not, monks,

¹ A pupil (or pupils) of hers mentioned also at [Vin 4.268ff](#). Bhaddā Kāpilānī mentioned with Thullanandā at [Vin 4.290](#), [Vin 4.292](#). Her verses are at [Thig.63–Thig.66](#). [Thig-a 68–69](#) says that, having gone forth under Mahāpajāpati, she soon won arahanship. Called foremost of the nuns able to remember previous lives, [AN i.25](#). N.B. that, although nuns address her as "lady," she otherwise lacks a descriptive title.

² [Vism 91](#) distinguishes between *nātikula* (as above), a family of relatives, and *upattḥākakula*, a family of supporters. ³ *amma*. ⁴ *gāmantaram*, defined at [Vin 4.63](#) = [Vin 4.133](#).

for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

3.187 Whatever nun should go among villages alone, that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence at once, entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away.”

And thus this rule of training for nuns came to be laid down by the lord.

3.187 At that time two nuns were going along the high-road from Sāketa to Sāvathī. On the way there was a river to be crossed.¹ Then these nuns, having approached a boatman, spoke thus:

“Please, sir, take us across.”

Saying, “I am not able, ladies, to take both across at once,” he made one cross alone with him²; one who was across seduced the one who was across, one who was not across seduced the one who was not across. These, having met afterwards, asked (one another): “I hope that you, lady, were not violated?”

“I was violated, lady. But were you violated, lady?”

“I was violated, lady.” Then these nuns, having arrived at Sāvathī, told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying :

“How can a nun go to the other side of a river alone?” Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun went to the other side of a river alone?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can a nun go to the other side of a river alone? It is

¹ Cf. Vin 4.65. ² *eko ekam uttāresi*. Cf. *eko ekāya* in the *Aniyatas*, Vin 3.187ff. meaning, the one (a monk) with the other (a woman); here meaning a man (*eko*) and a nun (*ekam*). They crossed alone together. In Monks' Bu-Pc 28 it is evidently thought safer to allow a nun to cross a river with a monk than to wait behind on the bank.

not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should go among villages alone, or should go to the other side of a river alone, that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence at once, entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away.”

And thus this rule of training for nuns came to be laid down by the lord.

At that time several nuns, going to Sāvattthī through the country of Kosala, arrived in the evening at a certain village. A certain nun there was beautiful, good to look upon, charming. A certain man came to be in love with that nun on account of her appearance. Then that man, appointing a sleeping-place for those nuns, appointed a sleeping-place at one side for this nun. Then this nun, having realised, “This man is obsessed¹; if I come at night there will be trouble for me,”² not asking the nuns (for permission), having gone to a certain family, lay down in the sleeping-place. Then that man, having come during the night, searching for that nun, knocked against the nuns. The nuns, not seeing this nun, spoke thus: “Doubtless this nun has gone out together with the man.”

Then this nun, at the end of that night, approached those nuns. The nuns spoke thus to that nun: “Why did you, lady, go out together with the man?”

Saying: “Ladies, I did not go out together with the man,” she told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: “How can a nun be away for a night alone ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun was away for a night alone? ... let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should go among villages alone, or should go to the other side of a river alone, or should be away for a night alone, that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence at once, entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away.”

¹ = Vin 4.94. ² = Vin 4.212.

And thus this rule of training for nuns came to be laid down by the lord.

At that time several nuns were going along the highroad to Sāvathī through the country of Kosala. A certain nun there, wanting to relieve herself, having stayed behind alone, went on afterwards. People, having seen that nun, seduced her. Then that nun approached those nuns. The nuns spoke thus to that nun: “Why did you, lady, stay behind alone? We hope that you were not violated?”

“I was violated, ladies.”

Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: “How can a nun stay behind a group alone?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun stayed behind a group alone?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “Monks, how can a nun stay behind a group alone? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not” (yet) pleased ... let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should go among villages alone, or should go to the other side of a river alone, or should be away for a night alone, or should stay behind a group alone, that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence at once, entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Should go among villages alone means: in making the first foot cross¹ the enclosure of a village that is fenced in, there is a grave offence. In making the second foot cross, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.² In making the first foot cross the precincts of a village that is not fenced in, there is a grave offence. In making the second foot cross, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

¹ *atikkāmentiyā*. *Atikkamati* is to go beyond, to pass over. ² Cf. *Vin 3.52*.

Or should go to the other side of a river alone means: having covered up the three circles,¹ it is called a river wherever, as a nun is crossing over, the inner robe is made wet. In making the first foot cross over,² there is a grave offence. In making the second foot cross, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

Or should be away for a night alone means: at sunrise, if leaving a hand's reach of a nun who is a companion, there is a grave offence. When she has left it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

Or should stay behind a group alone means: if she, in what is not a village, in what is jungle, is leaving the range³ of sight or the range of hearing of a nun who is a companion, there is a grave offence. When she has left it, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

She also means: she is so called in reference to the former.

Offence at once means: ... therefore again it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

There is no offence if the nun who is the companion has gone away or has left the Order or has passed away or has gone over to (another) side⁴; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.⁵

¹ I.e., the navel and the two knees. ² *uttarantiyā*. ³ *upacāra*, literally precincts; cf. [Vin 4.93](#). ⁴ Cf. [Vin 4.313](#) below, and [Vin 1.60](#), where these four words occur. Of the last, *pakkhasaṃkanta*, *Vinaya Texts* i.178, n. 1 says, "Buddhaghosa can scarcely be right in explaining it by *titthiyapakkhasaṃkanta*." The commentarial explanation on the above passage is *titthāyatānaṃ saṃkantā*, gone over to members of another sect (*Vin-a* 913), a phrase which also occurs at [Vin 4.217](#) (=above, [BD 3.167](#)). At the same time, I do not think that *pakkha* necessarily means "a (schismatic) faction," as translated at *Vinaya Texts* i.178, although it undoubtedly has this meaning at [Vin 3.173](#), [Vin 3.175](#). For it can also mean another side or part of the Order, one of its sub-divisions, and in such cases does not imply any hostility, schism or dissension. At [Vin 1.307f.](#), we hear of people giving water and robes to one and the same *pakkha* or to different *pakkha*. In the former case the *pakkha* is said to be the owner, in the latter the *saṅgha*. Had the *pakkha* been regarded as schismatic, it would hardly have been considered entitled to receive these gifts. ⁵ Cf. below, [BD 3.353](#).

NUNS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA)

4

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time¹ the nun Caṇḍakālī² was one who made strife, who made quarrels, who made contention, who made brawls, who made disputes in the Order.³ The nun Thullanandā protested when a (formal) act was being carried out against her.⁴ At that time the nun Thullanandā went to a village on some business. Then the Order of nuns, thinking: "The nun Thullanandā has gone away," suspended⁵ the nun Caṇḍakālī for not seeing an offence. The nun Thullanandā having concluded that business in the village, returned again to Sāvattḥī. When the nun Thullanandā was coming, the nun Caṇḍakālī neither made ready a seat, nor put out⁶ water for washing her feet, a foot-stool,⁷ a foot-stand,⁸ nor having gone out to meet her did she take her bowl and robe, nor did she offer her drinking-water. The nun Thullanandā spoke thus to the nun Caṇḍakālī:

"Why did you, lady, when I was coming, neither make ready a

¹ Cf. Nuns' Bi-Pc 53 below. ² An obstreperous nun, mentioned at Vin 4.276, Vin 4.277, Vin 4.293, Vin 4.309, Vin 4.331, Vin 4.333. ³ Cf. Vin 4.12, Vin 4.150, Vin 4.309. At AN iii.252 it is said that five disadvantages are to be expected for such a monk—also probably for such a nun. ⁴ Cf. above, BD 3.58. ⁵ *ukkipi*. On *ukkhitta*, past participle of *ukkipati*, see above, BD 3.28, n. 4. ⁶ *upanikkhipati*, to lay down near, to store. ⁷ *pādapīṭha*. Vin-a 913 says a stool (*ṭhapanaka*) to put the washed feet on. ⁸ *pādakathalika*. According to Vin-a 913, "a stool to put the unwashed feet on"—i.e., probably another kind of foot-stool. Buddhaghosa on Kd 12.1.1 says that *pādakathalika* alternatively means a towel to rub the feet with. This word and the two preceding occur also at Vin 1.9, Vin 1.312; Vin 2.22, Vin 2.31; see Vinaya Texts i.92, n., Vinaya Texts ii.373, n. 5.

seat for me nor put out water for washing the feet, a foot-stool, a foot-stand, nor having gone out to meet me, take my howl and robe, nor offer me drinking-water?”

“Surely it is this, lady, that I am without a mistress¹ in regard to this.”

“But why are you, lady, without a mistress?”

“Lady, these nuns, saying of me, ‘She is without a mistress, she is not esteemed, there is no one who can answer for² her,’ suspended me for not seeing an offence.”

The nun Thullanandā, saying, “These are ignorant, these are inexperienced, they do not (even) know a (formal) act or the defect of a (formal) act³ or the failure of a (formal) act⁴ or the success of a (formal) act⁵; but we know a (formal) act and the defect of a (formal) act and the failure of a (formal) act and the success of a (formal) act, and we may make them carry out a (formal) act that was not carried out or we may find fault with⁶ a (formal) act that was carried out,” and having very quickly convened an Order of nuns, she restored⁷ the nun Caṇḍakalī. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the lady Thullanandā, without having obtained permission from the Order which carried out the proceedings⁸ in accordance with the rule, the discipline, the teacher’s instruction,⁹ not having learnt the desire¹⁰ of a group, restore a nun suspended by a complete Order?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā, without having obtained permission ... restored a nun suspended by a complete Order?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

¹ *anāthā*, or helpless, deserted, without a protector. ² *pativattar*. Word occurs also at SN i.222. ³ *kammadosa*. ⁴ *kammavipatti*. ⁵ *kammasampatti*. ⁶ *kopeyyāma*. Cf. above, BD 3.63, *kopetukāma*. ⁷ *osāreti*. Cf. Vin 4.137 = above, BD 3.28, q.v. and note. ⁸ *kāraṣaṅgha*. ⁹ Cf. Vin 4.126, Vin 4.152, Vin 4.218. ¹⁰ *chanda*, desire or partiality, as in the four *agatis*; consent of an absentee, as in Monks’ Bu-Pc 79, Bu-Pc 80.

“How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā, without having obtained permission ... restore a nun suspended by a complete Order? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased. And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun, without having obtained permission from the Order which carried out the proceedings in accordance with the rule, the discipline, the teacher’s instruction, not having learnt the group’s desire, should restore a nun suspended by a complete Order, that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence at once, entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away.”

54.2.1

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

4.232

Complete Order means: belonging to the same communion, staying within the same boundary.¹

Suspended means: suspended for not seeing or for not making amends for or for not giving up an offence.²

In accordance with the rule, the discipline means: according to whatever is the rule, according to whatever is the discipline.³

(In accordance with) the teacher’s instruction means: in accordance with the conqueror’s instruction, the enlightened one’s instruction.⁴

Without having obtained permission from the Order which carried out the proceedings means: not having asked (the permission) of the Order which carried out the (formal) act.

Not having learnt⁵ the desire means: not having known the desire of a group.

If she thinks, “I will restore (her),” (and) looks about for a group or determines a boundary, there is an offence of wrong-doing. As a result of the motion, there is an offence of wrong-doing. As a result of two proclamations, there are grave offences. At the end of the

3.194

¹ Cf. above, **BD 3.65**, **BD 3.170**, and **Vin 3.173**. ² Cf. above, **BD 3.170**. ³ Cf. above, **BD 3.170**. ⁴ Cf. above, **BD 3.170**. ⁵ *anaññāya ... ajānitvā*.

proclamations, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

She also means: she is so called in reference to the former.

Offence at once means: ... therefore again it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If she thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) restores her, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If she is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... If she thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) restores her, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If she thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if, having obtained permission from, the Order which carried out the (formal) act, she restores (her); if she restores (her) having known that it is the desire of the group; if she restores one who is behaving so as to get rid of the fault¹; if she restores (her), there being no Order which carried out the (formal) act; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *vatte vattantiṃ osāreti*, one taking steps about, proceeding in regard to, what has been done.

NUNS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA)

5

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Sundarīnanda was beautiful, good to look upon, charming.¹ People, having seen the nun Sundarīnanda in the refectory, were filled with desire (and) gave the very best meals to the nun Sundarīnanda² who was filled with desire. The nun Sundarīnanda ate as much as she pleased; other nuns did not obtain as much as expected. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Sundarīnanda, filled with desire, having accepted with her own hand from the hand of a man who is filled with desire, solid food, soft food, eat it, partake of it?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Sundarīnanda, filled with desire ... ate it, partook of it?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can the nun Sundarīnanda, filled with desire, having accepted with her own hand ... solid food or soft food, eat it, partake of it? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... And thus, monks ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, filled with desire, having accepted with her own hand from the hand of a man who is filled with desire, solid food or soft food, should eat it or partake of it, that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence at once, entailing a formal

¹ Cf. Vin 4.211 (=above, BD 3.156), Vin 4.234 (=below, BD 3.198). ² To here from beginning = Bi-Ss 6.

meeting of the Order involving being sent away.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Filled with desire¹ means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.

Filled with desire² means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.

Man means: a human man, not a *yakkha*, not a departed one, not an animal³; he is learned, competent to be infatuated.

Solid food means: having set aside the five (kinds of) meals⁴ (and) water for cleansing the teeth,⁵ the rest is called solid food.

Soft food means: the five kinds (of) meals: conjei, barley-meal, food made with flour, fish, meat.⁶

If, thinking, “I will eat, I will partake of,” she accepts, there is a grave offence. For every mouthful there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

She also means: she is so called in reference to the former.

Offence at once means: ... therefore again it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If she accepts water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one is filled with desire (and) she accepts, thinking, “I will eat, I will partake of,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful, there is a grave offence. If she accepts water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If both are filled with desire (and) thinking, “I will eat, I will partake of,” she accepts from the hand of a *yakkha* or of a departed one or of a eunuch or of an animal in human form, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is a grave offence. If she accepts water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

¹ = above, **BD 3.161**. ² = above, **BD 3.161**. ³ = above, **BD 3.161**. ⁴ Cf. **Vin 4.83**. ⁵ See Monks' **Bu-Pc 40**. ⁶ = **Vin 4.83**.

3.197
4.234
5.2.3

If one is filled with desire (and) she accepts, thinking, “I will eat, I will partake of,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she accepts water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if neither comes to be filled with desire; if she accepts, knowing, “He is not filled with desire”; if he is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA)

6

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Sundarīnandā was beautiful, good to look upon, charming. People, having seen the nun Sundarīnandā in the refectory, were filled with desire (and) gave the very best meals to the nun Sundarīnandā.¹ The nun Sundarīnandā, being scrupulous, did not accept. The nun immediately following her² spoke thus to the nun Sundarīnandā: "Why do you, lady, not accept?"

"He is filled with desire, lady."

"But are you, lady, filled with desire?"

"I am not filled with desire."

"What can this man,³ whether he is filled with desire or not filled with desire, do to you, lady, since you are not filled with desire? Please, lady, eat or partake of the solid food or the soft food which this man is giving to you, you having accepted it with your own hand."

Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this nun speak thus: 'What can this man ... Please, lady, eat or partake of ... having accepted it with your own hand'?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun spoke thus: 'What can this man ... Please, lady, eat or partake of ... having accepted it with your own hand'?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

¹ = opening of *Bi-Ss 5*, above. ² I.e., in the procession for alms. ³ *purisapuggala*, as at *Vin 4.212*.

“How, monks, can a nun speak thus: ‘What can this man ... Please, lady, eat or partake of ... having accepted it with your own hand’? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“**Whatever nun should speak thus: ‘What can this man, whether he is filled with desire or not filled with desire, do to you, lady, since you are not filled with desire? Please, lady, eat or partake of the solid food or the soft food which this man is giving to you, you having accepted it with your own hand,’ that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence at once, entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away.**”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Should speak thus: ‘What can this man ... with your own hand’ (and) instigates¹ her, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, at her bidding she accepts, thinking, “I will eat, I will partake of,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful, there is a grave offence. At the end of the meal, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

She also means: she is so called in reference to the former.

Offence at once means: ... therefore again it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If she instigates her, saying: “Accept water for cleansing the teeth,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, at her bidding she accepts, thinking, “I will eat, I will partake of,” there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If one is filled with desire (and) she instigates her saying: “Eat or partake of solid food or soft food from the hand of a *yakkha* or of a departed one or of a eunuch or of an animal in human form,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, at her bidding she accepts, thinking: “I will eat, I will partake of,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful, there is an offence of wrong-doing. At the end of the

¹ *uyyojeti*.

meal, there is a grave offence. If she instigates her, saying: "Accept water for cleansing the teeth," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If at her bidding she accepts, thinking: "I will eat, I will partake of," there is an offence of wrong-doing,

There is no offence if she instigates her knowing that he is not filled with desire; if she instigates her, thinking: "Being angry, she does not accept"; if she instigates her, thinking: "She does not accept out of compassion for a family"; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA)

10

¹ ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Caṇḍakālī, having quarrelled with nuns,² angry, displeased, spoke thus: "I repudiate³ the enlightened one, I repudiate *dhamma*, I repudiate the Order, I repudiate the training. What indeed are these recluses who are recluses, daughters of the Sakyans? For there are other recluses, conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training; I will lead the Brahma-life among these." Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Caṇḍakālī, a nun, angry, displeased, speak thus: 'I repudiate ... I will lead the Brahma-life among these?'" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Caṇḍakālī, angry, displeased, spoke thus: 'I repudiate ... I will lead the Brahma-life among these?'"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Caṇḍakālī, angry, displeased, speak thus: 'I repudiate ... I will lead the Brahma-life among these'? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, angry, displeased, should speak thus: 'I repudiate the enlightened one ... I repudiate the training. What indeed are these recluses who are recluses, daughters of the Sak-

¹ Note by Sujato: *Saṅghādisesa* 7 in I.B. Horner's edition. ² See *Bi-Ss* 4, where she is again shown as quarrelsome. ³ *paccācikkhati*, intensive of *paccakkhāti*, on which see *BD* 1.40, n. 2.

yans? For there are other recluses, conscientious, scrupulous, 'desirous of training; I will lead the Brahma-life among these,' that nun should be spoken to thus by the nuns: 'Do not, lady, angry, displeased, speak thus: "I repudiate the enlightened one ... I will lead the Brahma-life among these." Be satisfied, lady, *dhamma* is well preached, lead the Brahma-life for the utter ending of ill.' And if that nun, being spoken to thus by the nuns, persists as before, that nun should be admonished by the nuns up to a third time¹ for giving up that (course). If, being admonished up to a third time, she should give it up, that is good. If she should not give it up, that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence on the third (admonition),² entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away."

BD 3.2

Bi-Ss 10

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Angry, displeased means: dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.³

Should speak thus means: 'I repudiate ... I will lead the Brahma-life among these.'

That nun means: whatever nun speaks thus.

By the nuns means: by other nuns who see, who hear; she should be told by these⁴: "Do not, lady, angry, displeased ... for the utter ending of ill." And a second time she should be told, and a third time she should be told. If she gives it up, that is good. If she does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having heard, they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing. And that nun, having been pulled into the midst of the Order, should be told: "Do not, lady, angry, displeased, speak thus: 'I repudiate the enlightened one, I repudiate, *dhamma*, I repudiate the Order, I repudiate the training ... I will lead the Brahma-life among these.' Be satisfied, lady, ... lead the Brahma-life for the utter ending of ill." And a second time she

¹ *yāvataṭṭiyāṃ*. ² *yāvataṭṭiyakāṃ*. Cf. BD 1.328, n. 2. ³ = Vin 3.255 (BD 2.140), Vin 4.146 (above, BD 3.47), Vin 4.238 (below, BD 3.206); cf. Vin 3.163 (BD 1.281). ⁴ Cf. Vin 3.178, Vin 3.185 (BD 1.312, BD 1.326).

should be told, and a third time she should be told. If she gives it up, that is good. If she does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That nun should be admonished. And thus, monks should she be admonished: the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: “Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This nun so and so, angry, displeased, spoke thus: ‘I repudiate ... I will lead the Brahma-life among these.’ She does not give up this course. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order admonish the nun so and so for giving up this course. This is the motion. Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This nun so and so ... She does not give up this course. The Order admonishes the nun so and so for the giving up of this course. If the admonition of the mm so and so for the giving up of this course is pleasing to the ladies, let them be silent. If it is not pleasing, then you should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... The nun so and so is admonished by the Order for the giving up of this course. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.”

As a result of the motion, there is an offence of wrong-doing; as a result of two proclamations, there are grave offences. At the end of the proclamations, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If she is committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the offence of wrong-doing according to the motion and the grave offences according to the two proclamations, subside.¹

She also means: she is so called in reference to the former.

Up to the third time means: she falls on the third admonition, not through transgression of a course.²

Involving being sent away means: she is caused to be sent away by the Order.

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: ... therefore again it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

If she thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid

¹ Cf. **BD 1.302, BD 1.307, BD 1.313, BD 1.327.** ² Cf. above, **BD 3.180.**

act (and) does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If she is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... If she thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) does not give it up, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. If she thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if she is not admonished, if she gives it up; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.²

Bi-5510

¹ Cf. BD 1.302, BD 1.307, BD 1.313, BD 1.327. ² Cf. BD 1.302, BD 1.307, BD 1.313, BD 1.327.

NUNS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA)

11

¹ ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Caṇḍakālī,² overthrown³ in some legal question, angry, displeased, spoke thus: "The nuns are following a wrong course through desire and the nuns are following a wrong course through hatred and the nuns are following a wrong course through stupidity and the nuns are following a wrong course through fear." Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady, the nun Caṇḍakālī ... displeased, speak thus: '... and the nuns are following a wrong course through fear'?" ...

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Caṇḍakālī, ... displeased, speak thus: '... and the nuns are following a wrong course through fear'? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... set forth this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, overthrown in some legal question, angry and displeased, should speak thus: 'The nuns are following a wrong course through desire ... the nuns are following a wrong course through fear,' that nun should be spoken to thus by the nuns: 'Do not, lady, overthrown in some legal question, angry, displeased, speak thus: "The nuns are following a wrong course through desire ... and the nuns are following a wrong course through fear."

¹ Note by Sujato: *Saṅghādisesa* 8 in I.B. Horner's edition. ² Cf. **Bi-Ss 4, Bi-Ss 10.**

³ *paccākatā*.

The lady herself¹ may go (wrong)² from desire, and she may go (wrong) from hatred and she may go (wrong) from stupidity and she may go (wrong) from fear.’ And if this nun, being spoken to thus by the nuns, persists as before, she should be admonished up to a third time for giving up that (course). If, being admonished up to a third time, she should give it up, that is good. If she should not give it up, that nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence on the third (admonition), entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away.”

BD 3.2

Bi-Ss 11

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

In some legal question means: legal question means, there are four (kinds of) legal questions: legal questions arising out of disputes legal questions arising out of censure, legal questions arising out of transgressions, legal questions arising out of obligations.³

Overthrown means: she is called defeated.⁴

Angry, displeased means: dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.⁵

Should speak thus means: saying, “The nuns are following a wrong course through desire ... and the nuns are following a wrong course through fear.”

That nun means: whatever nun speaks thus.

By the nuns means: by other nuns who see, who hear; she should be told by these: “Do not, lady, overthrown ... and she may go (wrong) from fear.” And a second time she should be told. And a third time she should be told ... (see **Bi-Ss 10.2.1–Bi-Ss 10.2.3**. *Instead of* Do not, lady, angry, etc., *read* Do not, lady, overthrown, etc.; *instead of* this nun so and so, angry, etc., *read* this nun so and so, overthrown, etc.) ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

Vin 4.2

¹ *kho*. ² *gaccheyya*. ³ = **Vin 3.164** (**BD 1.282**), **BD 4.126** (=above, **BD 3.6**). ⁴ *parājitā*.

⁵ See **BD 3.47** above, for references.

NUNS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA)

12

¹ ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns who were pupils of the nun Thullanandā lived in company,² they were of evil habits, of evil repute, of evil ways of living,³ vexing⁴ the Order of nuns, concealing one another's sins.⁵ Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns live in company ... concealing one another's sins?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns live in company ... concealing one another's sins?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns live in company ... concealing one another's sins? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

"In case nuns live in company, of evil habits, of evil repute, of evil ways of living, vexing the Order of nuns, concealing one an-

¹ Note by Sujato: *Saṅghādisesa* 9 in I.B. Horner's edition. ² *saṃsaṭṭhā viharati*. Cf. *Vin* 4.293, *saṃsaṭṭhā viharati gahapatināpi gahapatiputtēna pi*, with householders and householders' sons; *Vin* 4.333, *purisaṃsaṭṭhā kumārakaṃsaṭṭhā*, in the company of men and youths; *Vin* 2.4, *gihisaṃsaṭṭho*, in the company of, or in association with, householders. *Vin*-a 915 says *missībhūtā*, become mixed up with (the world), and that in regard to the body they were pounding and cooking for householders, perfuming and adorning themselves, using garlands and chains, and in regard to their speech they were acting as go-betweens, carrying messages and replies. *Saṃsaṭṭhā viharati* occurs at AN iii.109. ³ *pāpasiloka*. ⁴ *vihesikā*. Cf. *vihesā*, vexation, at *BD* 3.41 above; and *vihesaka*, vexing, at *Vin* 4.36 (= *BD* 2.231f.), where it means keeping silence. ⁵ *vajja*. Cf. *Vin* 3.171 (= *BD* 1.297).

other's sins, those nuns should be spoken to thus by the nuns: 'Sisters are living in company ... concealing one another's sins. Let the ladies desist¹; the Order praises this detachment in sisters.' But if these nuns, being spoken to thus by the nuns, should persist as before, these nuns should be admonished by the nuns up to the third time for giving up that (course). If, being admonished up to the third time they should give it up, that is good. If they should not give it up, these nuns also have fallen into a matter that is an offence on the third (admonition), entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away."

BD 3.2

Bi-Ss 11

Vin 4.2

BD 3.2

In case nuns means: they are called ordained.

Are living in company means: in company means that they are living in company unbecomingly in regard to body and speech.

Of evil habits means: they are possessed of depraved habits.

Of evil report means: they are notorious² because of (their)³ bad reputation.⁴

Of evil ways of living means: they lead life by means of an evil, wrong mode of livelihood.

Vexing the Order of nuns means: they protest when a (formal) act is being carried out against each other.

Concealing one another's sins means: they reciprocally conceal a sin.

Those nuns means: those nuns who live in company.

By the nuns means: by other nuns who see, who hear; they should be told by these: "Sisters are living in company ... detachment in sisters." And a second time they should be told. And a third time they should be told ... (see **Bi-Ss 10.2.1**. *Instead of* Do not, ladies, angry, etc., *read* Sisters are living in company, etc.; *instead of* that nun) ... does not give up that course *read* those nuns ... do not give up that course; *instead of* this nun so and so *read* these nuns so and so

¹ *viviccāti*, separate themselves, be alone. Cf. below, **BD 3.210**. ² *abbhuggatā*, literally spread abroad. ³ Vin-a 915 says "the bad reputation of these, *etāsāṃ*, means 'evil report.' ⁴ *pāpaka kittisadda*.

and so and so are living in company ... they do not give up that course ... the nuns so and so and so and so should be admonished ... are admonished for giving up that course ... If they are committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the offence of wrong-doing according to the motion and the grave offences according to the two proclamations, subside.

Two or three should be admonished together. More than that should not be admonished together.

These nuns also means: they are so called in reference to the former.

Up to the third time means: they fall on the third admonition, not through transgression of a course.

Involving being sent away means: they are caused to be sent away¹ from the Order,

Offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order means: ... therefore again it is called an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

12.2.2

If they think that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) do not give up ... (see **Bi-Ss 10.2.2**) ... If they think that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

12.2.3

There is no offence if they are not admonished; if they give it up; if they are mad, if they are the first wrong-doers.

¹ Oldenberg, Vin 4.366, says that the correct reading is *nissāriyanti*, as against text's *nissāriyati*.

NUNS' FORMAL MEETING (SAṄGHĀDISESA)

13

¹ ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā, admonished by the Order, spoke thus to the nuns: "Ladies, live you as though in company, do not you live otherwise. For there are in the Order other nuns of such habits, of such repute, of such ways of living, vexing the Order of nuns, concealing one another's sins²; the Order does not say anything to these. It is to you yourselves that the Order, out of disrespect, out of contempt, out of impatience,³ in gossiping, on poor evidence,⁴ says this: 'Sisters are living in company, of evil habits, of evil repute, of evil ways of living, vexing the Order of nuns, concealing one another's sins. Let the ladies desist; the Order praises this detachment in sisters.'" Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the lady Thullanandā, admonished by the Order, speak thus to nuns: 'Ladies, live you as though in company ... detachment in sisters' ..."

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā, admonished by the Order, spoke thus to nuns: 'Ladies, live you ... detachment in sisters'?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā, admonished by the Order,

¹ Note by Sujato: *Saṅghādisesa* 10 in I.B. Horner's edition. ² See *Bi-Ss* 12. ³ Five disadvantages of being "impatient" given at AN iii.254. ⁴ *dubbalyatā*. See Journal of the Pali Text Society 1886, p.129.

3.211 speak thus to nuns:’ Ladies, live you ... praises this detachment in sisters?’ It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should speak thus: ‘Ladies, live you as though in company, do not you live otherwise. For there are in the Order other nuns of such habits, of such repute, of such ways of living, vexing the Order of nuns, concealing one another’s sins; the Order does not say anything to these. It is to you yourselves that the Order, out of disrespect, out of contempt, out of impatience, in gossiping, on poor evidence, says this: “Sisters are living in company, of evil habits, of evil repute, of evil ways of living, vexing the Order of nuns, concealing one another’s sins. Let the ladies desist, the Order praises this detachment in sisters,”’ — that nun should be spoken to thus by the nuns: ‘Do not, lady, speak thus: “Sisters are living in company ... detachment in sisters.”’ And if that nun, being spoken to thus by the nuns, should persist as before, that nun should be admonished by the nuns up to a third time for giving up that (course). If, being admonished up to a third time, she should give it up, that is good. If she should not give it up, this nun also has fallen into a matter that is an offence on the third (admonition), entailing a formal meeting of the Order involving being sent away.”

13.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Should speak thus means: ‘Ladies, live you as though in company ... It is to you yourselves that the Order, out of disrespect means: out of disesteem.

Out of contempt¹ means: out of disdain.

Out of impatience means: out of ill-temper.²

In gossiping means: made into talk.³

On poor evidence means: not having partisans.⁴

4.242 ¹ *paribhavana ... pāribhavyatā.* ² *kopena.* ³ *vibhassikatā.* ⁴ Text reads *apakkhatā*; Sinhalese edition *apakkhatā = a + pakkha + tā*, being without a faction, a side, thus without partisans (as *Critical Pali Dictionary*).

Says this means: it says, ‘Sisters are living in company ... detachment in sisters.’

By the nuns means: by other nuns who see, who hear; she should be told by these: “Do not, lady, speak thus: ‘Ladies, live you as though in company ... detachment in sisters.’” And a second time she should be told. And a third time she should be told ... (see **Bi-Ss 10.2.1–Bi-Ss 10.2.3**). *Instead of* do not, lady, angry, etc. *read* do not, lady, speak thus, etc. *Read*: Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This nun so and so, admonished by the Order, speaks thus to the nuns: ‘Ladies, live you as though in company,’ etc.) ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

Recited, ladies, are the seventeen matters that are offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order—nine which are offences at once, eight¹ on the third (admonition). A nun having fallen into one or other of these shall spend a fortnight in *mānatta* discipline² before both Orders. If, when the nun has performed the *mānatta* discipline, the Order of nuns should number twenty, then that nun may be rehabilitated. But if the Order of nuns, numbering less than twenty even by one, should rehabilitate that nun, that nun is not rehabilitated, and those nuns are blameworthy; this is the proper course there. Concerning this, I ask the ladies: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The ladies are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent; thus do I understand this.

Told are the Seventeen

¹ Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 915 brings the ten *Saṅghādisesas* here set out up to seventeen by saying that, besides these six that are offences at once, there are also three that are included in the Mahāvibhaṅga (**Bu-Ss 5, Bu-Ss 8, Bu-Ss 9**); and besides these four that are offences at the third admonition, there are also four that are included in the Mahāvibhaṅga (**Bu-Ss 10, Bu-Ss 11, Bu-Ss 12, Bu-Ss 13**). The nuns have four more *Saṅghādisesas* than the monks. See also **BD 3, Introduction, p. xxxiii**.

² *pakkhamānatta*. Buddhaghosa says that he will explain this phrase in detail in a *Khandhaka*. *Pakkha* here almost certainly has the meaning of one-half of the lunar month.

NUNS' FORFEITURE (*NISSAGGIYA*) 1

P.1.1.1
3.213 These thirty rules, ladies, for offences of expiation involving forfeiture come up for recitation.

At that time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattihī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time¹ the group of six nuns made a hoard of many bowls. People, engaged in touring the dwelling-place and seeing (this hoard), looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns make a hoard of many bowls? Will these nuns do a trade in bowls or will they set up an earthenware shop?"

Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns make a hoard of bowls?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns made a hoard of bowls?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can the group of six nuns make a hoard of bowls? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should make a hoard of bowls, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

P.1.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Bowl² means: there are two (kinds of) bowls: an iron bowl, a clay

¹ Cf. Monks' Bu-NP 21 (BD 2.113f.) where, however, the offence is to keep an extra bowl; and also Monks' Bu-NP 1 (BD 2.1f.). ² = BD 2.115 (Vin 3.243) and cf. BD 2.415 (Vin 4.123).

bowl. There are three sizes for a bowl: a large bowl, a medium-sized bowl, a small bowl. A large bowl means that it takes half an *ālḥaka* measure of boiled rice, or¹ a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice or a suitable curry. A medium-sized bowl means that it, takes a *nālīka* measure of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry. A small bowl means that it takes a *patṭha* measure of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry. (A bowl) greater than that is not a bowl, (a bowl) smaller (than that) is not a bowl.

Should make a hoard means: what is not allotted, not assigned.²

It is to be forfeited means: it should be forfeited at sunrise. It should be forfeited to an Order or to a group or to one nun.³ And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: That nun, having approached an Order, having arranged her upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior nuns, having sat down on her haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus: ‘Ladies, this bowl is to be forfeited by me, a night having elapsed. I forfeit it to the Order.’ Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent nun; the bowl forfeited should be given back (with the words): ‘Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This bowl of the nun so and so which had to be forfeited is forfeited (by her) to the Order. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order give back this bowl to the nun so and so.’

That nun, having approached several⁴ nuns, having arranged her upper robe over one shoulder ... having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus: ‘Ladies, this bowl is to be forfeited by me, a night having elapsed. I forfeit it to the ladies.’ Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent nun; the bowl forfeited should be given back (with the words): ‘Let the ladies listen to me. This bowl of the nun so and so which had to be forfeited is forfeited (by her) to

¹ Omitted, probably rightly, at [Vin 3.243](#). It does not occur in the other cases either here or there. ² Cf. definition of “extra robe,” “extra bowl” at [BD 2.7](#), [BD 2.114](#).

³ *ekabhikkhunī* balancing *puggala*, individual, in the Monks’ *Nissaggiyas*. ⁴ *sambahulā*, meaning a *gaṇa*, group of two to four monks or nuns.

the ladies. If it seems right to the ladies, let the ladies give back this bowl to the nun so and so.'

That nun, having approached one nun, having arranged her upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on her haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus: 'Lady, this bowl is to be forfeited by me, a night having elapsed. I forfeit it to the lady.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by this nun; the bowl forfeited should be given back (with the words): 'I will give back this bowl to the lady.'

^{P1.2.2} If she thinks that a night has elapsed when it has elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If she is in doubt as to whether a night has elapsed ... If she thinks that a night has not elapsed when it has elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If she thinks that it is allotted when it is not allotted ... If she thinks that it is assigned when it is not assigned ... If she thinks that it is bestowed when it is not bestowed ... If she thinks that it is lost when it is not lost ... If she thinks that it is destroyed when it is not destroyed ... If she thinks that it is broken when it is not broken ... If she thinks that it is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, not having forfeited the bowl which had to be forfeited, she makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that a night has elapsed when it has not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether a night has not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that a night has not elapsed when it has not elapsed, there is no offence.

^{P1.2.3}
^{3.216} There is no offence if before sunrise it is allotted, assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, broken, if they tear it from her, if they take it on trust; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.¹

^{P13.1} ¹ Cf. **BD 2.116f.**, and **BD 2.10f.** (a robe).

Then the group of six nuns did not give back a bowl that was forfeited. They told this matter ... to the lord. He said: “Monks, a bowl that is forfeited is not to be given back. Whosoever should not give it back, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”¹

¹ Cf. **BD 2.116f.**, and **BD 2.10f.** (a robe).

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 2

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time several nuns, having spent the rains in a village-residence, went to Sāvattḥī keeping the customs,¹ dignified in deportment, badly dressed, wearing shabby robes. Lay-followers having seen these nuns, thinking, "These nuns are keeping the customs ... wearing shabby robes, these nuns will have been robbed," gave robe-material to the Order of nuns not at the right time.² The nun Thullanandā, saying, "Our *kaṭhina*-cloth is (formally) made,³ it was robe-material given at the right time," having allotted it, had it distributed.⁴ The lay-followers having seen those nuns, spoke thus: "Was not the robe-material received by the ladies?"

"We did not receive robe-material, sirs. The lady Thullanandā, saying, 'Our *kaṭhina*-cloth is (formally) made; it was robe-material given at the right time,' having allotted it, had it distributed."

The lay-followers ... spread it about, saying:

¹ *vattasampannā*. Groups of *vattāni* enumerated at Vb-a 297. Here probably these nuns had not yet their new robes, as it was not the custom to get these during the rains. The village perhaps could not supply enough material and so the nuns proposed to get it in Sāvattḥī. ² See BD 2.26, BD 2.311, BD 2.366. ³ *atthata*. See BD 2.5, n. 1, BD 2.26, n. 3. The *kaṭhina*-cloth had to be made up after the rains, Vin 1.254. Robe-material accruing not at the right time might be accepted by a monk, but then should be made up quickly, Vin 3.203 (BD 2.25f.). It looks as if Thullanandā and her nuns had had their *kaṭhina* robes made up before these other nuns arrived at Sāvattḥī, and that she took possession of the material given by the laity, and in having it distributed, ignored these incoming nuns. ⁴ This seems to imply that she did not distribute it herself. At Vin 1.285 monks are allowed to agree upon a monk possessed of five qualities as distributor of robe-material; the way in which it should be distributed is then set forth.

“How can the lady Thullanandā, thinking that robe-material (given) not at the right time was robe-material (given) at the right time, having allotted it, have it distributed?”

Nuns heard these lay-followers who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: “How can the lady Thullanandā thinking ... have it distributed?”

Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks ... to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... had it distributed?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... have it distributed? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun, thinking that robe-material (given) not at the right time is robe-material (given) at the right time, having allotted it should have it distributed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Robe-material (given) not at the right time¹ means: some that has accrued during the eleven months when the *kaṭhina* cloth is not (formally) made; some that has accrued during the seven months when the *kaṭhina* cloth is (formally) made; a gift (of material) offered² even at the right time; this means robe-material (given) not at the right time.

If thinking, “It is robe-material (given) at the right time,” having allotted it, she has it distributed, in the action there is an offence of wrong-doing; on acquisition it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited

¹ Cf. Monks’ Bu-NP 3, Vin 3.204 (BD 2.26, where see note), and cf. BD 2.311, BD 2.366, “time of giving robes.” ² *ādiṣṣa*. Vin-a 546 explains by *apadisitvā*, pointed out, indicated, designated; Vin-a 658 by *uddisitvā*, pointed out, proposed; while Vin-a 916 says, “she saying, ‘having obtained (*sampattā*), let them distribute,’ and then she says, ‘I will give this to a group and this to you.’”

to an Order or to a group or to one nun. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: “Ladies, I, thinking that this robe-material (given) not at the right time was robe-material (given) at the right time, having allotted it, caused it to be distributed; it is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.” ... “... let the Order give back ... they should give back ... I will give back (this robe-material) to the lady.”

2.2.2

If she thinks that it is robe-material (given) not at the right time when it is robe-material (given) not at the right, time, and saying, “It is robe-material (given) at the right time,” having allotted it she has it distributed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If she is in doubt as to whether it is robe-material (given) not at the right time ... there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is robe-material (given) at the right time when it is robe-material (given) not at the right time ... there is no offence. If she thinks that it is robe-material (given) not at the right time when it is robe-material (given) at the right time, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is robe-material (given) at the right time, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is robe-material (given) at the right time when it is robe-material (given) at the right time, there is no offence.

2.2.3

There is no offence if she thinks that it is robe-material (given) not at the right time when it is robe-material (given) not at the right time and has it distributed; if she thinks that it is robe-material (given) at the right time when it is robe-material (given) at the right time and has it distributed; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 3

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā, having exchanged¹ a robe with a certain nun, made use of it. Then that nun, having folded up that robe, laid it aside.² The nun Thullanandā spoke thus to that nun: "Lady, that robe which was exchanged by you with me, where is that robe?" Then that nun, having taken out that robe, showed it to the nun Thullanandā. The nun Thullanandā spoke thus to that nun: "Lady, take back³ your robe, give⁴ me this robe. That which is yours is yours, that which is mine is mine. Give this to me, take away your own," and she tore it away.⁵ Then that nun told this matter to the nuns ... to the monks. The monks ... to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... tore it away?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can the nun Thullanandā ... tear it away? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having exchanged a robe with a nun, should afterwards speak thus: 'Lady, take your robe, give this robe to me. That which is yours is yours, that which is mine is mine. Give this to me, take away your own,' (and) should tear it away or should

¹ Or bartered, *parivattetvā*. In Bhikkhu **Bu-NP 5** monks are allowed to accept robes in exchange from monks, nuns, probationers, male and female novices; while in Bhikkhu **Bu-Pc 25** they are allowed to give robes in exchange to these same five classes of people. ² Cf. **Vin 4.61 = BD 2.285**. ³ *handā*. Vin-a 917 says *gaṇha*, take. ⁴ *āharati* here has sense of to give, as at **Vin 3.206**. ⁵ Cf. **Vin 3.254 (= BD 2.139)**.

cause (another) to tear it away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”¹

3.2.1

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

With a nun means: with another nun.

Robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.²

Having exchanged means: something large for something small or something small for something large.

Should tear it away means³: if she tears it away herself, there is an offence of’ expiation involving forfeiture.

Should cause (another) to tear it away means: if she commands another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If having commanded once, she then tears many away, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited to an Order or to a group or to one nun. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘Ladies, having exchanged this robe with a nun, it was torn away by me; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order’ ... ‘the Order should give back ... let the ladies give back ... I will give back (this robe) to the lady.’

3.2.2

4.2.48

3.2.22

If she thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained, (and) having exchanged a robe, tears it away or causes (another) to tear it away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If she is in doubt as to whether she is ordained ... If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is ordained ... involving forfeiture. Having exchanged another requisite, if she tears it away or causes (another) to tear it away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Having exchanged a robe or another requisite with one who is not ordained, if she tears it away or causes (another) to tear it away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to

¹ Cf. Monks’ Bu-NP 25 where a monk having himself given a Bu robe to a monk must not then tear it away from him. ² = Vin 3.210, Vin 3.213, Vin 4.122, Vin 4.123.

³ From here to end cf. Monks’ Bu-NP 25.

whether she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if she gives it or takes it from her in a friendly manner; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 4

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā came to be ill. Then a certain lay-follower approached the nun Thullanandā, and having approached he spoke thus to the nun Thullanandā: "What, lady, is your discomfort? What may be brought (for you)?"

"Sir, I am in need of ghee."

Then that lay-follower, having for a *kaḥāpaṇa* brought ghee from the house of a certain shopkeeper, gave it to the nun Thullanandā. The nun Thullanandā said: "I am not in need of ghee, sir, I am in need of oil." Then that lay-follower approached that shopkeeper, and having approached he spoke thus to that shopkeeper:

"The lady says that she does not need ghee, master, she needs oil. You take¹ the ghee (and) give me the oil."

"If we, master, take back again goods that were bought, when will our goods be sold? Ghee was taken owing to the purchase of ghee; give for² the purchase of oil (and) you shall take oil"

Then that lay-follower ... spread it about, saying: "How can this lady Thullanandā, having had one thing asked for,³ then have another thing asked for?" Nuns heard this lay-follower who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about ... Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks ... to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thulla nandā, having had one thing asked for, had another thing asked for?"

¹ *handā*, as above, BD 3.220. ² *āhara* = *yācitvā*, Vin-a 917, but I think the above translation better shows that the shopkeeper was, as he states, unwilling to change goods once bought. ³ *viññāpetvā*.

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... have another thing asked for? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun, having had one thing asked for, should have another thing asked for, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

Nun means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Having had one thing asked for means: having had anything whatever asked for.

Should have another asked for means: excepting that (thing), if she has another asked for, in the request¹ there is an offence of wrong-doing. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to an Order or to a group or to one nun. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: “Ladies, having had this thing asked for, the other thing asked for is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.” ... “... the Order should give back ... let the ladies give back ... I will give back (this thing) to the lady.”

If she thinks that one thing is another thing and has the other thing asked for, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If she is in doubt as to whether one thing ... If she thinks that an identical thing² is another thing ... offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If she thinks that another thing is an identical thing (and) has the identical thing asked for, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is an identical thing (and) has an identical thing asked for, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is an identical thing when it is an identical thing, there is no offence.

¹ *payoge*, action, doing. ² *anañña*.

There is no offence if she has that thing asked for and also has another thing asked for¹; if having pointed out the advantage, she has it asked for; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ According to Vin-a 917 this means that the little she first asked for does not suffice, so she asks for it again. If ghee was first asked for a watch of the night (i.e., to be used as a medicine) it may be boiled; but if the doctor prescribed oil and she says she needs this too, thus (it is said) she asks for another thing. The simultaneous asking for things is hence not an offence; it puts a shopkeeper to no embarrassment, and saves a lay-person from going to and fro. This “asking for” a thing when an offer has been made is different from the “asking for” in Bu-Pc 7 and in the *Pāṭidesaniyas*. For there, nuns appear to be asking for food and medicine on their own initiative.

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 5

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā came to be ill. Then a certain lay-follower approached the nun Thullanandā; having approached, he spoke thus to the nun Thullanandā: "I hope, lady, that you are better, I hope that you are keeping going."

Bi-NP 9
BD 3.2

"Sir, I am not better, I am not keeping going."

"Lady, I will deposit a *kahāpaṇa* in the house of such and such a shopkeeper; you can have whatever you want brought from there."

The nun Thullanandā enjoined a certain probationer, saying: "Go, probationer, fetch oil for the *kahāpaṇa* from the house of such and such a shopkeeper."

Then that probationer, having for the *kahāpaṇa* fetched oil from the house of that shopkeeper, gave it to the nun Thullanandā. The nun Thullanandā said: "I do not need oil, probationer, I need ghee." Then that probationer approached that shopkeeper; having approached, she spoke thus to that shopkeeper:

Vin 4.2

"The lady says that she does not need oil, sir, she needs ghee. You take the oil (and) give me the ghee."

"If we, lady, take back again goods that were bought, when will our goods be sold? Oil was taken owing to the purchase of oil; give for the purchase of ghee (and) you shall take ghee."

Then that probationer stood crying. Nuns spoke thus to that probationer: "Why are you crying, probationer?" Then that probationer told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

3.227 “How can the lady Thullanandā, having got one thing in exchange,¹ get another thing in exchange?”

“Is it true, as is said, monks, ... (see Bi-NP 4.1. *Instead of* having had asked for, etc., *read* having got in exchange) ... rule of training:

“**Whatever nun, having got one thing in exchange, should get another thing in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.**”

5.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Having got one thing in exchange means: having got anything whatever in exchange ... (see Bi-NP 4.2). *Instead of* has asked for, having had asked for *read* gets in exchange, having got in exchange ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *cetāpetvā*.

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 6

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time lay-followers, having made a voluntary collection¹ for robe-material² for an Order of nuns, having laid aside what was necessary³ in a certain cloak-seller's⁴ house, having approached the nuns, spoke thus: "Ladies, in such and such a cloak-seller's house what is necessary for robe-material is laid aside. Having had that robe-material brought from there, distribute it."

The nuns, having got medicine in exchange for what was necessary, made use of it. The lay-followers, having found out ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns get something⁵ in exchange for what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing,⁶ belonging to an Order?" Nuns heard these lay-

¹ *chandakam saṃharitvā*. This is *Pali-English Dictionary's* suggestion. *Vin-a* 918 says, "saying, 'Let us do a dhamma-duty, give what you are able,' thus having produced desire and pleasure in others, it is a synonym for a requisite that is taken up" (*gahitaparikkhāra*). ² *cīvararathāya*, instrumental; it therefore looks as if they did not collect robe-material itself, but some medium of exchange with which the nuns could obtain the material. ³ *parikkhāra*, the usual technical term for the four, or eight, requisites allowed to a monk. But in view of the construction *cīvararathāya*, it is likely that *parikkhāra* here stands not for a "requisite" itself, but for the means, perhaps some deposit of a medium of exchange, for obtaining it. This hypothesis is strengthened by *Bu-NP* 8, where a voluntary collection for conje, *yāgu*, was to be made. Conje is not a specific "requisite" at all, at *Vin* 4.93 e.g., being mentioned separately and in addition to solid food and soft food. There is in English the vulgarism "the needful," which I think *parikkhāra* in this and the following *Nissaggiyas* most nearly means. ⁴ *pāvārika*. *Pali-English Dictionary* suggests above translation. *Pāvāra* as cloak or mantle occurs at *Vin* 1.281, *Ja* 5.409. ⁵ *aññaṃ*. ⁶ *aññadatthikena parikkhārena aññuddisikena*, literally for the good of another, for the advantage of another, *Cf. attuddesaṃ* at *Vin* 3.149.

4.251 followers who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

“How can these nuns get something in exchange ... belonging to an Order?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns got something in exchange ... belonging to an Order?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can nuns get something in exchange ... belonging to an Order? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should get something in exchange for that which was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing, (and) belonging to an Order, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

6.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

For what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing means: for what was given for another thing.

Belonging to an Order¹ means: it is for an Order, not for a group, not for one nun.

Should get something in exchange means: having set aside that for which it was given, if she gets another thing in exchange, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action; it is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to an Order or to a group or to one nun. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘Ladies, this thing got in exchange for that which was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing, (and) belonging to an Order, is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.’ ... “... the Order should give back, ... let the ladies give back ... I will give back (this thing) to the lady.”

6.2.2 ¹ Another definition occurs at [Vin 3.266](#) and [Vin 4.43](#).

If she thinks that it was appointed for another thing when it was appointed for another thing, and gets something else in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If she is in doubt ... If she thinks that it was not appointed for another thing ... there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Having acquired what was forfeited, it may be taken as, so to speak, a gift.¹ If she thinks that it was appointed for another thing when it was not appointed for another thing, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it was not appointed for another thing, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it was not appointed for another thing when it was not appointed for another thing, there is no offence.

There is no offence if she takes² a remainder; if she takes having obtained the owner's permission³; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *yathādāne upanetaḥ*. ² *upaneti*. ³ I.e., saying it was given for the sake of robe-material, but they have this and need oil, Vin-a 918.

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 7

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time¹ lay-followers, having made a voluntary collection for robe-material for the Order of nuns, having laid aside what was necessary in a certain cloak-seller's house, having approached the nuns, spoke thus: "Ladies, in such and such a cloak-seller's house what is necessary for robe-material is laid aside. Having had the robe-material brought from there, distribute it."

And the nuns, although having themselves asked for² what was necessary, yet having got medicine in exchange, made use of it. The lay-followers, having found out ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns get something in exchange for what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing, belonging to an Order, (and) that they themselves asked for³?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns got something in exchange ... that they themselves asked for?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns get something in exchange ... that they themselves asked for? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should get something in exchange for what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing, belonging to an Order, (and) that she herself asked for, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

¹ Cf. Bu-NP 6. ² *sayam yācitvā*. Cf. Vin 3.144 (BD 1.246). ³ *saṃyācikenā*.

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

For what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing ... Belonging to an Order ... That she herself asked for means: oneself having asked for.¹

Should get something in exchange means: ... (see **Bi-NP 2.1-3**.
After belonging to an Order *insert* that she herself asked for)
... if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. **Vin 3.149 (BD 1.254)**.

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 8

8.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.233 at that time nuns dwelling in cells¹ belonging to a certain guild were going short of conje. Then that guild, having made a voluntary collection for conje for the nuns, having laid aside what was necessary in a certain shop-keeper's house, having approached the nuns, spoke thus: "Ladies, in such and such a shopkeeper's house what is necessary for conje is laid aside. Having had husked rice brought from there, having had the conje boiled, make use of it."

The nuns, having got medicine in exchange for what was necessary, made use of it. Then that guild, having found out ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns get something in exchange for what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing, belonging to a company²?"

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns got something in exchange ... belonging to a company?"

"It is true, lord."

4.253 The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks,

¹ *pariveṇavāsikā*. They were not a complete Order, merely a number of nuns.

² *mahājanikena*. *Mahājana* usually means "people, a crowd, the populace." Here it does not mean the guild regarded as a company, but the nuns for whom the conje was collected. The word is explained in the Old Commentary, and at Vin-a 918 by *gaṇa*, the technical term for "group" (two to four monks or nuns). This rule is in contrast on the one hand to Bu-NP 6 and Bu-NP 7, which speak of *saṅghikena*, belonging to an Order; and on the other to Bu-NP 10, which speaks of belonging to an individual, *puggalikenā*. It is because of this frequent triad, *saṅgha*, *gaṇa*, *puggala* (= *ekā bhikkhuni*) that *mahājana* must here be taken as equivalent to *gaṇa*, group, in its technical and monastic meaning.

how can nuns get something in exchange ... belonging to a company?
It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this
rule of training:

BD 3,2

“Whatever nun should get something in exchange for what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing, belonging to a company, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

Bi-NP 8

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

For what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing means: for what was given for another thing.

Belonging to a company means: it is for a group, not for an Order, not for one nun.

Should get something in exchange means: ... (see **Bi-NP 6.2.1–Bi-NP 6.2.3**. *Instead of* belonging to an Order *read* belonging to a company) ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 9

9.1.1
3.235 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns dwelling in cells belonging to a certain guild ... (see Bi-NP 8.1) ... "... make use of it." And the nuns, although having themselves asked for what was necessary, yet having got medicine in exchange, made use of it. Then that guild, having found out ... (see Bi-NP 8.1. *After* belonging to a company *insert* (and) that they themselves asked for) ... "... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should get something in exchange for what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing, belonging to a company, (and) that she herself asked for, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

9.2.1
3.235 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

For what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing ... Belonging to a company ... That she herself asked for means: oneself having asked for.

Should get something in exchange means: ... (see Bi-NP 6.2.1-Bi-NP 6.2.2) *Instead of* belonging to an Order *read* belonging to a company, (and) that she herself asked for)

4.254 ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 10

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā was very learned, she was a repeater, she was wise, she was skilled in giving *dhamma*-talk. Many people visited the nun Thullanandā. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā's cell was falling to pieces.¹ People spoke thus to the nun Thullanandā: "Why is this cell of yours, lady, falling to pieces?"

"Sirs, there are neither benefactors, nor are there workmen."

Then these people, having made a voluntary collection for the nun Thullanandā's cell, gave what was necessary to the nun Thullanandā. And the nun Thullanandā, although having herself asked for what was necessary, yet having got medicine in exchange, made use of it. The people, having found out ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā get something in exchange for what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing, belonging to an individual, (and) that she herself asked for?"

...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... (and) that she herself asked for?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... (and) that she herself asked for? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should get something in exchange for what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for

¹ *udriyati*.

another thing, belonging to an individual, (and) that she herself asked for, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

10.2.1

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

For what was necessary (and) appointed for another thing, destined for another thing... Belonging to an individual means: it is for one nun, not for an Order, not for a group.

That she herself asked for means: oneself having asked for.

Should get something in exchange means: ... (as above, *Bi-NP 6.2.1*; *read constantly* belonging to an individual, (and) that she herself asked for.)

4.255

... if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 11

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā was very learned, she was a repeater, she was wise, she was skilled in giving *dhamma*-talk.¹ Then King Pasenadi of Kosala having, in the cold weather, put on a costly woollen garment, approached the nun Thullanandā; having approached, having greeted the nun Thullanandā, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the nun Thullanandā roused ... gladdened King Pasenadi of Kosala with *dhamma*-talk. Then King Pasenadi of Kosala, having been roused ... gladdened with *dhamma*-talk by the nun Thullanandā, spoke thus to the nun Thullanandā: "Do let me know, lady, what would be of use (to you)."²

"If, Sire, you are desirous of giving (something) to me, give me this woollen garment."

Then King Pasenadi of Kosala, having given the woollen garment to the nun Thullanandā, having risen from his seat, having greeted the nun Thullanandā, departed keeping his right side towards her. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"These nuns have great desires, they are not contented. How can they ask the king for a woollen garment?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā ask the king for a woollen garment?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā asked the king for a woollen garment?"

¹ As in Bu-NP 10, Bu-Pc 33. Cf. Pasenadi's interview with the nun Khemā at SN iv.374.

² Cf. BD 1.222 = BD 2.43 for same expression.

3.239 “It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ask the king for a woollen garment? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“If a nun is bargaining for¹ a heavy cloth,² she may bargain for one (worth) at most four “bronzes.”³ If she should bargain for one (worth) more than that, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

11.2.1 **A heavy cloth** means: whatever is a cloth for the cold weather.

Is bargaining for means: is asking for.

4.256 **She may bargain for one (worth) at most four bronzes** means: she may bargain for one worth sixteen *kahāpaṇas*.

3.240 **If she should bargain for one (worth) more than that** means: if she asks for one (worth) more than that, in the request there is an offence of wrong-doing. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to an Order or to a group or to one nun. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: ‘Ladies, this heavy cloth (worth) at most more than four “bronzes,” bargained for by me, is to be forfeited. I forfeit

¹ *cetāpentiyā*, explained in Old Commentary, as *viññāpentiyā*, asking for, as at Vin 3.246 (BD 2.121). *Cetāpeti* is usually “to get in exchange,” see BD 2.54f., BD 2.120, and above Bu-NP 7-Bu-NP 10. Here Thullanandā certainly gets the cloth in exchange for her teaching. But, since for us, “to get in exchange “usually means the changing hands of tangible objects, I have thought it best, in order to avoid this implication, to use “to bargain.” Moreover, *cetāpeti* is not really synonymous with *viññāpeti*, although it may be said to contain, as does “to bargain,” this meaning.

² *garupāvuraṇa*. ³ *kaṃsa*. As Rhys Davids states, *Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon*, p. 7, this “as a measure of value is only found in this passage.” Here, according to the Old Commentary, four “bronzes” are worth sixteen *kahāpaṇas*; and so, as Buddhaghosa says, Vin-a 919, “here a *kaṃsa* is (worth) four *kahāpaṇas*”; and cf. *Kankhāvitarāṇī* (Simon Hewavitarne Bequest), p. 172, and Moggallāna, *Abhidhānappadīpikā* 905. The value being so small, Rhys Davids is against the notion that the *kaṃsa* was a bronze or brass cup, plate or vessel. It may possibly have been a bronze weight such as those used until recently in Burma. There is no commentarial support for Childers’ view that *kaṃsa* is “a coin,” or for Böhtlingroth’s that it is an equivalent of *āḍhaka* (Pali, *āḷhaka*).

it to the Order' ... "... the Order should give back ... let them give back ... I will give back this (heavy cloth) to the lady."

If she thinks that it is (worth) more when it is (worth) more than four "bronzes" (and) bargains for it, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If she is in doubt as to whether it is (worth) more than four "bronzes" ... If she thinks that it is (worth) less when it is (worth) more than four "bronzes" (and) bargains for it, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If she thinks that it is (worth) more when it is (worth) less than four "bronzes," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is (worth) less than four "bronzes," there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is (worth) less when it is (worth) less than four "bronzes," there is no offence.

There is no offence if she bargains for one (worth) at most four "bronzes"; if she bargains for one (worth) at most less than four "bronzes"; if they belong to relations; if they are offered; if it is for another; if it is by means of her own property; if she bargains for something of small value while (the other person) desires to bargain for something costly¹; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. Vin 3.217 (BD 2.57) and where *cetāpeti* is in sense of "to get in exchange" rather than "to bargain."

NUNS' FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) 12

12.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3:241 at that time the nun Thullanandā was very learned ... (see **Bi-NP 11.1**.
Instead of in the cold weather *read* in the hot weather; *instead of*
woollen garment *read* linen garment) ... “... this rule of training:

“If a nun is bargaining for a light cloth,¹ she may bargain for one (worth) at most two and a half ‘bronzes.’ If she should bargain for one (worth) more than that, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

12.2.1 **Light cloth** means: whatever is a cloth for the hot weather.

Is bargaining for means: is asking for.

She may bargain for one (worth) at most two and a half “bronzes” means: she may bargain for one worth ten *kahāpaṇas*.

If she should bargain for one (worth) more than that means: ... (see **Bi-NP 11.2**. *Read* a light cloth (worth) at most more than two and a half “bronzes,” more than two and a half “bronzes,” less than two and a half “bronzes”) ... there is no offence.

12.2.2 There is no offence if she bargains for one (worth) at most two and a half “bronzes”; if she bargains for one (worth) at most less than two and a half “bronzes”; ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

12.3.1 ¹ *lahupāvuraṇa*.

Recited, ladies, are the thirty rules¹ for offences of expiation involving forfeiture. Concerning them, I ask the ladies: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The ladies are quite pure in this matter; therefore are they silent. Thus do I understand this.

Told are the thirty offences of expiation involving forfeiture

¹ Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 919 says that eighteen (*Nissaggiya Pācittiya*) rules of training are laid down for both sides, that is for monks and nuns alike. As these have appeared already in the Mahāvibhaṅga, only twelve additional ones need to be included in the Bhikkhunī-Pātimokkha to bring the total of *Nissaggiyas* for nuns up to thirty. See [BD 3, Introduction, p. xxxvii](#).

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 1

These hundred and sixty-six matters, ladies, that are offences of expiation come up for recitation.

At that time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the Order of nuns was offered garlic by a certain lay-follower,¹ saying: "If these ladies need garlic, I (can supply them) with garlic."² And the keeper of the field was instructed (with the words): "If the nuns come, give two or three bundles³ to each nun." Now at that time there was a festival in Sāvattthī; the garlic was used up as soon as it was brought in.⁴ The nuns, having approached that lay-follower, spoke thus: "Sir, we have need of garlic." He said: "There is none, ladies; the garlic is used up as soon as it is brought in; go to the field." The nun Thullanandā, having gone to the field, not knowing moderation, had much garlic taken away. The keeper of the field looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns, not knowing moderation, have much garlic taken away?" Nuns heard that keeper of the field who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the lady Thullanandā, not knowing moderation, have much garlic taken away?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā, not know-

¹ Ja no.136 (Ja 1.474) is based on this story. ² Cf. Vin 3.244 (BD 2.118). ³ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2983.) ⁴ See *Pali-English Dictionary* under *yathābhatam*. Ja 1.475 makes out that the nuns went to the lay-follower's house where the garlic had been brought from the field. This would explain his injunction to them to go to the field.

ing moderation, had much garlic taken away?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā, not knowing moderation, have much garlic taken away? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” and having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Formerly, monks, the nun Thullanandā was the wife of a certain brahmin and there were three daughters, Nandā, Nandavatī, Sundarīnandā.¹ Then, monks, that brahmin, having passed away, was born in the womb of a certain goose² and his feathers were made all of gold. He gave a feather one by one to these. Then, monks, the nun Thullanandā, saying: ‘This goose is giving us a feather one by one,’ having taken hold of that king of the geese, plucked him. His feathers, on growing again, turned out white. So at that time, monks, the nun Thullanandā lost the gold through too much greed; now she will lose the garlic.”

“One should be pleased with what is received,
for too much greed is bad.
By taking hold of the king of the geese,
one may lose the gold.”

Then the lord having in many a figure rebuked the nun Thullanandā for her difficulty in maintaining herself ...” ... And thus, monks, the nuns should set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should eat garlic, there is an offence of expiation.”³

¹ Cf. Vin 4.211 where these appear as the sisters of Thullanandā. ² *hamsa*, or swan; “mallard” at Jātaka translation 1.293. ³ Ja 1.476 points out that this prohibition, affecting all the nuns, is due to Thullanandā’s greed. At Vin 2.140 it is made a *dukkata* offence for monks to eat garlic; nor should Jain monks accept it (*Āyāraṅgasutta* 2 1, 8.13).

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Garlic means: it is called the Magadha (plant).¹

If she says, 'I will eat,' and accepts, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that it is garlic when it is garlic (and) eats, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether it is garlic ... If she thinks that it is not garlic when it is garlic (and) eats, there is an offence of expiation. If she thinks that it is garlic when it is not garlic (and) eats, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is not garlic (and) eats, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is not garlic when it is not garlic (and) eats, there is no offence.

There is no offence if it is an onion, if it is a beetroot,² if it is yellow myrobalan,³ if it is bow-garlic,⁴ if it is in a concoction of broth,⁵ in a concoction of meat, in a concoction of oil; if it is in a salad⁶; if it is in a tit-bit⁷; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Vin-a 920 says that *māgadhaka* means that here it is a synonym for "garlic," for it is the garlic grown in the kingdom of Magadha. ² *bhañjanaka*. This, as a vegetable, is not given in *Pali-English Dictionary*. "Beetroot" is guess-work, based on remark at Vin-a 920 that it is red in colour. This, however, may suggest radish. Vin-a 920 also says that it has two bulbs (*miñja*); in this Vin-a resembles other early commentaries, which it cites. ³ *haritaka*. According to *Pali-English Dictionary* this is *Terminalia citrina* or *chebula*. Vin-a 920 says that it is the colour of vegetables (or greens) and has three "bulbs," or, according to another early commentary, one. Atthasālinī 320 uses *haritaka* in definition of *kaśāva*, an astringent decoction made from plants. At **Vin 1.201** the fruit is allowed as a medicine. ⁴ *cāpalasuṇa*. Vin-a 920 says it has no bulb but only sprouts; cf. the bulbless onion, *Allium fistulosum*, grown for its leafy tops; and cf. another botanical name, *cāpa-paṭa* (Sanskrit), the tree *Buchanania lalifolia*. ⁵ This and the two following occur at **Vin 4.110**. They could contain the Magadha garlic. ⁶ *sāḷave*. Vin-a 920 says there is no offence if it is in a "hot" salad, or salad of jujube-fruits and so on, *badarasāḷavādīsu*, or if it is among astringent vegetables, *ambilasākādīsu*. Cf. **BD 2.316, n. 2**; Vin-a 817; Atthasālinī 320. ⁷ *uttari-bhaṅga*, or dainties; cf. **BD 1.275, n. 5**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 2

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns, haying let the hair of the body grow, bathed naked together with prostitutes at the same ford of the river Aciravatī.¹ The prostitutes ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns let the hair of the body grow, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these prostitutes who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns let the hair of the body grow?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns let the hair of the body grow?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them saying:

"How, monks, can the group of six nuns let the hair of the body grow? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should let the hair of the body grow, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Hair of the body means: under both armpits and on the private parts.

Should let grow means: if she lets one hair grow, there is an offence of expiation. If she lets many hairs grow, there is an offence of expiation.

¹ Cf. Vin 1.293; Vin 4.278.

There is no offence if it is because of illness, if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 3

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time two nuns, tormented by dissatisfaction, having entered an inner room, slapped with the palms of the hands. Nuns, having run up at the sound of this noise, spoke thus to these nuns: "Why do you, ladies, misbehave with a man?" Saying: "Ladies, we are not misbehaving with a man," they told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns slap with the palms of the hands?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns slapped with the palms of the hands?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns slap with the palms of the hands? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"In slapping with the palms of the hands, there is an offence of expiation."¹

Slapping with the palms of the hands means: if she, enjoying the contact, gives a blow to the private parts even with a lotus leaf,² there is an offence of expiation.

¹ On these "brief Pācittiyas" (cf. also the next), see **BD 2, Introduction, p. xxxiv**.

² Cf. the same expression at **Vin 4.146** in definition of "should give a blow," and at **Vin 4.147** in definition of "should raise the palm of the hand."

There is no offence if it is because of illness, if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 4

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain woman who had formerly been a king's concubine, had gone forth among the nuns. A certain nun, tormented by dissatisfaction, approached this nun, and having approached, she spoke thus to this nun: "The king, lady, constantly came to see you. How did you manage?"

"By means of an application of lac, lady."

"What is this application of lac, lady?"

Then this nun showed an application of lac to that nun. Then that nun, having taken the application of lac, having forgotten to wash it, put it to one side. The nuns, having seen it surrounded by flies, spoke thus: "Whose doing is this?" She spoke thus: "It is my doing." Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can a nun take an application of lac?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun took an application of lac?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can a nun take an application of lac? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"In an application of lac, there is an offence of expiation."

Application of lac means: it is made of lac, made of wood, made of flour, made of clay.

Should take¹ means: if she, enjoying the contact, makes even a

¹ Note that a word is here defined which does not come into the rule, and that this, as it stands, is one of the "brief Pācittiya's."

lotus-leaf enter the private parts, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if it is because of illness, if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 5

... among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery. Then Mahāpajāpati the Gotamid approached the lord; having approached, having greeted the lord, she stood to windward, saying: "Lord, the women smell nasty." Then the lord, saying: "Then let the nuns take an ablution with water," roused ... delighted Mahāpajāpati the Gotamid with *dhamma*-talk. Then Mahāpajāpati the Gotamid, having been roused ... delighted with *dhamma*-talk by the lord, having greeted the lord, departed keeping her right side towards him. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: "I allow, monks, an ablution with water for the nuns."

Bi-Pc 5
BD 3,2

Now at that time a certain nun, saying: "An ablution with water is allowed by the lord," taking a very deep ablution with water, got a sore on her private parts. Then this nun told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this nun take a very deep ablution with water?" ...

Bi-Pc 5

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun took a very deep ablution with water?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can a nun take a very deep ablution with water? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"If a nun is taking an ablution with water, she may take at

most (a measure of) two finger-joints. For whoever exceeds this, there is an offence of expiation.”

Ablution with water means: it is called washing the private parts.

Is taking means: is washing.

She may take at most (a measure of) two finger-joints means: she may take at most (a measure of) two joints of two fingers.

For whoever exceeds this means: if she, enjoying the contact, exceeds by even a hair's breadth, there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that it is more when it is more than (a measure of) two finger-joints (and) takes it,¹ there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether it is more than (a measure of) two finger-joints ... If she thinks that it is less when it is more than (a measure of) two finger-joints (and) takes it, there is an offence of expiation. If she thinks that it is more when it is less than (a measure of) two finger-joints, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is less than (a measure of) two finger-joints, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is less when it is less than (a measure of) two finger-joints, there is no offence.

There is no offence if she takes at most (a measure of) two finger-joints; if she takes less than at most (a measure of) two finger-joints; if it is because of illness; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ I.e., the ablution.

NUNS' EXPIATION (*PĀCITTIYA*) 6

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time Ārohanta, a chief minister,¹ had gone forth among the monks (and) his former wife had gone forth among the nuns. Now at that time that monk participated in a meal in the presence of that nun. Then that nun enticed² that monk, standing near him with drinking water and with a fan as he was eating.³ Then that monk upbraided that nun, saying: "Do not, sister, do this, it is not allowable."

"Formerly you did this and that to me, now you do not put up with this much," and having thrown down the drinking cup on his head, she struck him with the fan. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can this nun strike a monk?' ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun struck a monk?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can a nun strike a monk? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should stand with drinking water or with a fan close to a monk while he is eating, there is an offence of expiation."

¹ Mentioned, I think, nowhere but here. ² *accāvadati*; in sense of "to talk down," at [Vin 4.224](#). Here, according to *Vin-a* 922, she spoke to him as though they were still leading the household life, saying that she used to stand close to him thus while he ate. Note that nuns had access to the monks quarters. ³ *bhuñjati* is the verb used for partaking of soft foods, those which constitute the five kinds of meals (see [Vin 4.83](#)) referred to below. To stand close to a monk eating solid food is a *dukkata* offence (below).

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

To a monk means: to one who is ordained.

Is eating means: is eating any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals.¹

Drinking water means: whatever is drinkable.²

Fans means: whatever is a fan.³

Should stand close means: if she stands within a reach of the hand, there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained (and) stands close with drinking water or with a fan, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether he is ordained ... If she thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained ... there is an offence of expiation. If she stands close having left a reach of the hand, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she stands close while he is eating solid food, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she stands close to one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁴

There is no offence if she gives⁵; if she causes (another) to give; if she commands one who is not ordained⁶; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ See [Vin 4.83](#). ² For *pāniya*, drinking water, also has this meaning of a beverage. *Vin-a 922* says that it may be pure water, or buttermilk, curds, milk and so on.

³ *vidhūpana ... vījanī*, *Vin-a 922* saying, “even the corner of a robe.” *Vidhūpana* allowed to monks at [Vin 2.130](#). *Vv-a 147* calls it *caturassavījanī*, a four-cornered *vījanī*. Three kinds of *vījanī* allowed at [Vin 2.130](#), in addition to the “mosquito-fan,” *makasavījanī*. *Vinaya Texts iii.131f.* translates as both fan and fly-whisk. ⁴ Cf. previous clause but two. ⁵ I.e., the curry or water to the monk to drink, or the fan for him to fan himself with, *Vin-a 922*. ⁶ *Vin-a 922*, if she commands a novice to stand near a monk (and minister to him as he is eating), there is no offence.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 7

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns, having had raw grain asked for at harvest time, carried it towards the town. (Those) at the gateway, saying: "Ladies, give a portion," having obstructed (them) let (them) go. Then these nuns, having gone to a dwelling,¹ told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns have raw grain asked for?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nuns had raw grain asked for?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns have raw grain asked for? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having asked for raw grain or having had it asked for, or having roasted it or having caused it to be roasted, or having pounded it or having caused it to be pounded, or having cooked it or having caused it to be cooked, should eat it, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Raw grain means: rice, paddy, barley, wheat, millet, beans, rye.²

Having asked for means: oneself having asked for.

Having had asked for means: having caused another to ask for.

Having roasted means: oneself having roasted.

¹ Probably meaning a nunnery. ² See **BD 1.83, n. 4.**

Having caused to be roasted means: having caused another to roast.

Having pounded means: ... Having caused to be pounded means ...

Having cooked means: ... Having caused to be cooked means: having caused another to cook.

If she says, “I will eat it” (and) accepts it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if it is because of illness, if she has pulses¹ asked for; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *aparāṇṇa*, or vegetables, or prepared cereals; cf. below, **BD 3.259**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (*PĀCITTIYA*) 8

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain brahmin who earned (his keep) as a hireling of a king,¹ saying, "I will ask for wages as before," having washed his head, went along beside a nunnery to the royal court. A certain nun, having relieved herself in a receptacle, in throwing it away over a wall, let it fall² on that brahmin's head. Then that brahmin ... spread it about, saying: "These shaven-headed strumpets are not true recluses.³ How can they let a pot fall on my head? I will set fire to their dwelling," and having taken up a fire-brand, he entered the dwelling. A certain lay follower as he was going out from the dwelling saw that brahmin who, having taken up the fire-brand, was entering the dwelling. Seeing him, he spoke thus to that brahmin: "Why do you, good sir, having taken up a fire-brand, enter the dwelling?"

"Good sir, these shaven-headed strumpets let a pot fall on my head. I will set fire to their dwelling."

"Go away, good brahmin, this is auspicious; you will receive a thousand, and this is (your) wage." Then that brahmin, having washed his head, having gone to the royal court, received a thousand, and this was the wage. Then that lay follower, having entered the dwelling, having told this matter to the nuns, scolded them. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns throw out excrement over a wall?" ...

Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns threw out excrement over a wall?"

¹ *nibbiṭṭharājabhāṭa*. Cf. Snp 25. ² *āsumbhi*. Cf. above, BD 3.252. ³ Cf. above, BD 3.178, below, BD 3.275.

3.258 “It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can nuns ... over a wall? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

4.266 **“Whatever nun should throw out or should cause (another) to throw out excrement or urine or rubbish or remains of food over a wall or over a fence, there is an offence of expiation.”**

8.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Excrement means: it is called faeces.

Urine means: it is called water.

Rubbish means: it is called sweepings.

Remains of food means: odd bits or bones or impure water.¹

Wall means: there are three (kinds of) walls, a wall of bricks, a wall of stones, a wall of wood.

Fence means: there are three (kinds of) fences, a fence of bricks, a fence of stones, a fence of wood.

Over a wall means: beyond a wall.

Over a fence means: beyond a fence.

Should throw out means: if she herself throws out, there is an offence of expiation.

Should cause (another) to throw out means: if she commands another, there is an offence of expiation. When once commanded, if she throws out many times, there is an offence of expiation.

8.2.2 There is no offence if she throws out having looked over; if she throws out into what is not a track²; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ This list occurs at [Vin 2.115](#), monks there being forbidden to take these things out in their bowls, as though they were waste-tubs. ² *avalañje*—i.e., presumably meaning into a place where no one is likely to pass, *avalañja* meaning “impassable, out of use” (*Critical Pali Dictionary*), and *valañja*, meaning a “track” (*Pali-English Dictionary*). Commentary is of no help.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 9

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain brahmin's cornfield was beside a nunnery. The nuns threw out excrement and urine and rubbish and remains of food into the field. Then that brahmin ... spread it about, saying: "How can the nuns despoil our cornfield?"¹ Nuns heard that brahmin who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can nuns throw out excrement ... and the remains of food on to the crops?"² ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns threw out ... on to the crops?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns throw out ... on to the crops? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should throw out or should cause (another) to throw out excrement or urine or rubbish or the remains of food on to the crops, there is an offence of expiation."³

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Excrement means: (see **Bi-Pc 8.2.1**) ... or impure water.

Crops means: grain and pulses⁴ planted as food for the use of human beings.

¹ Cf. **Vin 4.47** (**BD 2.257**). ² *harita*. Cf. **Vin 4.48**. ³ Cf. **Bu-Sk 74**. ⁴ *aparaṇṇa*. Cf. **BD 3.256**, above. This definition of "crops" = **Vin 4.48**.

Should throw out means: if she herself throws out, there is an offence of expiation.

Should cause (another) to throw out means: ... (see [Bi-Pc 8.2.1](#))
... offence of expiation.

9.2.2
If she thinks that they are crops when they are crops (and) throws out or causes (another) to throw out, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether they are crops ... If she thinks that they are not crops when they are crops ... offence of expiation. If she thinks that they are crops when they are not crops, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether they are not crops, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that they are not crops when they are not crops, there is no offence.

9.2.3
There is no offence if she throws out having looked round; if she throws out on to the edges of a field; if she throws out having asked the owner (for permission) and having obtained the permission¹; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *āpucchitvā apalokelvā*. Cf. above, [BD 3.184](#).

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 10

... in Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time there was a festival on a mountain-top in Rājagaha.¹ The group of six nuns went to see the festival on the mountain-top. People ... spread it about saying: "How can nuns come to see dancing and singing and music, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the group of six nuns go to see ... music?" ...

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can the group of six nuns go to see ... music? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should go to see dancing or singing or music, there is an offence of expiation."²

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Dancing means: whatever is dancing.³

Singing means: whatever is singing.⁴

Music means: whatever is music.⁵

¹ Cf. Vin 4.85 (BD 2.335 and note.) ² Made into a *dukkata* for monks at Vin 2.108.

³ Vin-a 925 says that if dancers and so on dance, or drunkards, and even peacocks, parrots and monkeys, all this is dancing. ⁴ Vin-a 925 says what is connected with the utter waning of the noble ones, or the singing on festive occasions, or the singing of dhamma-repeaters if they are monks lacking in restraint, all this is singing. Cf. Vin 2.108. ⁵ This may be music got by playing on a thong or the string of a lute or the music of the pitcher-drum and even of the water-drum, Vin-a 925.

If she goes to see, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where she sees or hears, there is an offence of expiation. If having left the region of sight, she sees or hears again, there is an offence of expiation. If she goes to see one or the other, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where she sees or hears, there is an offence of expiation. If having left the region of sight, she sees or hears again, there is an offence of expiation.¹

10.2.2

There is no offence if, standing in a monastery, she sees or hears; if, having come to where nuns are resting or sitting down or lying down, they dance or sing or play music; if, going along a path, she sees or hears; if, having gone as there is something to be done,² she sees or hears; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

The First Division: that on garlic

¹ Cf. Vin 4.108 (BD 2.380). ² Vin-a 926 says that if she has gone for ticket-food, or because there is anything else to be done, there is no offence.

NUNS' EXPIATION (*PĀCITTIYA*) 11

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a man, a relative¹ of a nun who was a pupil of Bhaddā Kāpilānī,² set out from a village for Sāvattḥī on some business. Then that nun stood together with and further talked with that man, the one with the other, in the dark of the night when there was no light. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this nun stand together with and further talk with a man, the one with the other, in the dark of the night when there is no light?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun ... when there was no light?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can a nun ... when there was no light? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should stand together with or should talk with³ a man, the one with the other, in the dark of the night when there is no light, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

In the dark of the night means: after the sun has gone down.⁴

When there is no light means: when it is dark.⁵

¹ Fact that he was a relative did not mitigate the offence. ² Mentioned at [Vin 4.227](#), [Vin 4.269](#), [Vin 4.290](#), [Vin 4.292](#). ³ Vin-a 926 "about worldly life." ⁴ Same phrase used in definition of *atthamgate suriye*, "after sunset," at [Vin 4.55](#) ([BD 2.275](#)).

⁵ *anāloke*.

Man means: a human man, not a *yakkha*, not a departed one, not an animal; one who is learned, competent to stand, to talk.

Together with means: together.¹

The one with the other means: there is a man as well as a nun.²

Should stand together with means: if she stands within a reach of a man's hand, there is an offence of expiation.

Or should talk with means: if she talks, standing within a reach of a man's hand, there is an offence of expiation. If she stands or talks, having left (the space of) a reach of the hand,³ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she stands together with or talks with a *yakkha* or a departed one or a eunuch or an animal in human form, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

11.2.2

There is no offence if some learned friend comes to be (present); if she, not wishing for a private place, stands or talks thinking about something else⁴; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. Vin 4.68 (BD 2.301). ² Cf. Vin 4.68 (BD 2.301). ³ Cf. Vin 4.95. ⁴ Cf. Vin 4.69, Vin 4.97 (BD 2.301, BD 2.358f.) and BD 3.268, below.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 12

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a man, a relative of a nun who was a pupil of Bhaddā Kāpilānī,¹ set out from a village for Sāvattḥī on some business. Then that nun, thinking: "It is forbidden by the lord to stand together with (or) talk with a man, the one with the other, in the dark of the night when there is no light,"² stood together with and talked with that very man, the one with the other, in a secluded place. Those who were modest nuns ... (Bi-Pc 11.1. *Instead of in the dark of the night when there is no light read in a secluded place*) ... "... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should stand together with or should talk with a man, the one with the other, in a secluded place, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.,

A secluded place means: it is secluded by a wall built of wattle and daub or by a door or by a screen or by a screen wall or by a tree or by a pillar or by a sack or it is secluded by anything whatever.³

Man means: a human man ... (Bi-Pc 11.2) ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ See above, BD 3.263, for references. ² Nuns' Bi-Pc 11. ³ Cf. Vin 3.188, Vin 3.192 (BD 1.332, BD 1.337).

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 13

13.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.266 at that time a man, a relative of a nun who was a pupil of Bhaddā
Kāpilānī,¹ set out from a village for Sāvattḥī on some business. Then
that nun, thinking: "It is forbidden by the lord to stand together with
(or) talk with a man, the one with the other, in a secluded place,"²
stood together with and talked with that very man in an open place.
Those who were modest nuns ... (Bi-Pc 11.1. *Instead of* in the dark of
the night when there is no light *read* in an open place) ... "... this rule
of training:

**"Whatever nun should stand together with or should talk with
a man, the one with the other, in an open place, there is an offence
of expiation."**

13.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Open place means: what is not secluded by a wall built of wattle
and daub ... or by a sack or what is not secluded by anything whatever.

Man means: a human man ... (Bi-Pc 11.2) ... if she is the first
wrong-doer.

¹ See above, BD 3.263, for references. ² Nuns' Bi-Pc 12.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 14

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā, stood together with and talked with a man, the one with the other, on a carriage road and in a cul-de-sac and at cross-roads,¹ and she whispered in his ear² and she dismissed the nun who was her companion. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the lady Thullanandā stand together with ... at cross-roads, and whisper in his ear and dismiss the nun who is her companion?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā stood together with ... and dismissed the nun who is her companion?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā stand together with ... and dismiss the nun who is her companion? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should stand together with or should talk with a man, the one with the other, on a carriage road or in a cul-de-sac or at cross-roads³ or should whisper in his ear or should dismiss the nun who is her companion, there is an offence of expiation.”

¹ These three words occur above, **BD 3.105 (Vin 4.176)** in definition of “among the houses.” ² *nikaṇṇikaṃ jappeti*. ³ Curiously translated by B.C. LAW, *History of Pali Literature* 1.74, in (12) “in the public street or cross roads where there are crows.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Carriage road means: it is called a carriage road.¹

Cul-de-sac means: they depart by that (way) by which they entered.

Cross-roads means: it is called a place where four roads meet.²

Man means: a human man, not a *yakkha*, not a departed one, not an animal; one who is learned, competent to stand, to talk.³

Together with means: together.⁴

The one with the other means: there is a man as well as a nun.⁵

Should stand together with means: ... offence of expiation.⁶

Or should talk with means: ... offence of expiation.⁷

Or should whisper in his ear means: if she talks close into a man's ear,⁸ there is an offence of expiation.

Or should dismiss the nun who is her companion means: if, desiring to indulge in bad habits, she then⁹ dismisses the nun who is her companion, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹⁰ In leaving the region of sight or the region of hearing, there is an offence of wrong-doing. When she has left, there is an offence of expiation.¹¹ If she stands or talks, having left (the space of) a reach of the hand, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹² If she stands together with or talks with a *yakkha* or a departed one or a eunuch or an animal in human form, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if some learned friend comes to be (present); if, not wishing for a private place she stands or talks thinking about something else¹³; if, not wishing to indulge in bad habits, she dis-

¹ *rathiyā nāma racchā vuccati*. *Racchā* is a contracted form of *rathiyā*; it occurs at [Vin 2.194](#), [Vin 3.151](#); [Ja 1.346](#), [Ja 1.425](#), and in definition of *rathikā*, at [Vin-a 886](#).

² *siṅghāṭako nāma caccaraṃ vuccati*. Cf. explanation of *siṅghāṭaka* at [Vin-a 886](#), quoted above, [BD 3.105](#). The word *caccara* occurs at [Vin 3.151](#) ([BD 1.257](#)); [Mil 330](#); [Ja 1.425](#). ³ = above, [BD 3.264](#). ⁴ = above, [BD 3.264](#). ⁵ = above, [BD 3.264](#). ⁶ = above, [BD 3.264](#). ⁷ = above, [BD 3.264](#). ⁸ *upakaṇṇake*, or secretly; cf. [Vin 2.99](#), [Vin 4.20](#) ([BD 2.203](#)). ⁹ *pi*, which Oldenberg says, [Vin 4.367](#), "we ought to expunge." ¹⁰ Cf. [Vin 4.93](#) ([BD 2.352](#)) in definition of "should dismiss." ¹¹ Cf. [Vin 4.93](#) ([BD 2.352](#)) in definition of "should dismiss." ¹² Cf. above, [BD 3.264](#). ¹³ Cf. [Vin 4.69](#), [Vin 4.97](#) ([BD 2.301](#), [BD 2.358](#)), [BD 2.269](#) (above, [BD 3.264](#)).

misses the nun who is her companion if there is something to be done¹; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. Vin 4.94 (BD 2.353). Vin-a 927 says on the above passage, “if it is for conveying ticket-food or for putting in order something badly arranged in the dwelling-place.”

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 15

15.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
3.270 that time a certain nun frequented a certain family as a regular diner.
Then that nun, having dressed in the morning, taking her bowl and
robe, approached that family; having approached, having sat down
on a seat, she departed without asking the owner (for permission).
4.272 The family's slave-woman, while sweeping the house, placed that
seat inside a dish.¹ The people, not seeing that seat, spoke thus to
that nun: "Lady, where is that seat?"

"I, sirs, did not see that seat."

Saying, "Lady, give back that seat," having scolded her, they
stopped (her as) a regular diner. Then these people, searching² the
house, having seen that seat inside the dish, having apologised to
that nun, (re-) established her as a regular diner. Then that nun told
this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it
about, saying:

"How can this nun, having approached families before a meal,
having sat down on a seat, depart without asking the owner (for
permission)?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun ... the owner (for permis-
sion)?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

¹ This sounds odd, but we know little of the sizes of the dishes and vessels used. But if the *āsana*, the seat, defined below as "the place for sitting cross-legged," was only a rush- or padded-seat for sitting on on the floor, it could easily be mislaid in quite a moderate sized bowl. ² *sodheti* can also mean to clean.

“How, monks, can a nun ... depart without asking the owner (for permission)? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“**Whatever nun, having approached families before a meal, having sat down on a seat, should depart without asking the owner (for permission), there is an offence of expiation.**”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Before a meal means: from sunrise until midday.¹

Family means: there are four (kinds of) families: a noble family, a brahmin family, a merchant family, a low-caste family.²

Having approached means: having gone there.

A seat means: it is called a place for sitting cross-legged.³

Having sat down means: having sat down on this.

Should depart without asking the owner (for permission) means: whatever man in that family is learned, without asking him (for permission but) in letting herself pass a place that is sheltered from the rain,⁴ there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that she has not asked (for permission) when she has not asked (for permission) and departs, there is an offence of

¹ This is the reverse of the definition of “wrong time” (for eating) at [Vin 4.86](#) ([BD 2.336](#)). These two definitions together divide the day into two times for eating—the right and the wrong. ² = [Vin 3.184](#), [Vin 4.80](#), [Vin 4.177](#). ³ *pallaṅka* must at some time have come to mean the thing sat upon, early on perhaps a simple mat. At [Vin 1.192](#) *pallaṅka* is among various things which if used gives rise to a *dukkata* offence; while at [Vin 2.280](#) nuns incur a similar offence if they sit on one, a half-*pallaṅka* being “allowed” instead. This may mean, however, sitting half cross-legged—so as to give more room. At [Vin 2.169](#) a *pallaṅka* is allowed to be used by monks if the hair is destroyed (*bhinditvā*), while at [Vin 4.299](#) this same proviso (here *chinditvā*, cut out) turns the nuns’ offence of using a *pallaṅka* into no offence.” It is defined here as “made by bringing (horse-) hair for it,” but at DN-a 86 as “made having put figures of wild animals on the legs.” See *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.11, n. 5 for some interesting remarks. ⁴ *anovassaka*. Cf. *deso anovassako* at [Vin 2.211](#). Vin-a 927 says that in making the first foot cross (or pass), there is an offence of wrong-doing; in making the second foot cross, one of expiation.

expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she has not asked (for permission) ... If she thinks that she has asked (for permission) when she has not asked (for permission) ... there is an offence of expiation. If it is not for a place for sitting cross-legged, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she has not asked (for permission) when she has asked (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she has asked (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she has asked (for permission) when she has asked (for permission), there is no offence.

15:23
4:273
There is no offence if she goes away asking (for permission); if it is one that is not movable¹; if she is ill; if there are accidents²; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *asamhāṛime*; presumably meaning that she can go away of her own accord if she has not been given a *pallaṅka* or other movable seat. ² Vin-a 927 says that if they depart (*pakkamanti*, variant reading °*ati*) without asking (for permission) should a fire have broken out in the house or if there are thieves or similar misfortunes, there is no offence.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 16

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā, having approached families after a meal, sat down on¹ a seat without having asked the owner (for permission) and moreover lay down on it. People, being shy of the nun Thullanandā, neither sat down on that seat nor lay down on it. The people ... spread it about, saying: "How can the nun Thullanandā, having approached families after a meal, sit down on a seat without asking the owner (for permission) and moreover lie down on it?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā ... and moreover lie down on it?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... and moreover lay down on it?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... and moreover lie down on it? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having approached families after a meal, should sit down on or should lie down on a seat without asking the owner (for permission), there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

¹ *abhi-* ... *abhi-* may be intended to convey meaning of "loll" and "sprawl."

After a meal means: after midday has passed until the sun has set.

3.274

Family means: ...¹

Having approached means: having gone there.²

Without asking the owner (for permission) means: whatever man in that family is the owner, without asking him to give (permission).

A seat means:³

Should sit down on means: if she sits down on it, there is an offence of expiation.

Should lie down on means: if she lies down on it, there is an offence of expiation.

16.2.2

If she thinks that she has not asked (for permission) when she has not asked (for permission) and sits down on or lies down on (a seat), there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she has not asked (for permission) ... (see **Bi-Pc 15.2**) ... there is no offence.

4.274

16.2.3

There is no offence if she, asking (for permission), sits down on or lies down on a seat; if it is a permanently appointed (seat); if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ See **Bi-Pc 15.2.1**. ² See **Bi-Pc 15.2.1**. ³ See **Bi-Pc 15.2.1**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (*PĀCITTIYA*) 17

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time several nuns, going to Sāvattthī through the Kosalan districts, having arrived at a certain village in the evening, having approached a certain brahmin family, asked for accommodation.¹ Then that brahmin woman spoke thus to these nuns: "Wait, ladies, until the brahmin comes." The nuns, saying: "Until the brahmin comes!", having spread a sleeping-place, some sat down, others lay down. Then that brahmin having come during the night, spoke thus to that brahmin woman: "Who are these?"

"They are nuns, master."

Saying: "Throw out these shaven-headed strumpets,"² he threw them out from the house. Then these nuns, having arrived in Sāvattthī, told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns, having approached families at the wrong time, having spread a sleeping-place without asking the owner (for permission), sit down on it³ and lie down on it?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ... lay down on it?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns, having approached families ... lie down on it? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having approached families at the wrong time,

¹ *okāsaṃ yācimsu*. ² Cf. *BD 3.178*, *BD 3.257*, above. ³ Here and below *abhinisidati*, *abhinipajjati*; above merely *nisidati*, *nipajjati*. The stress of *abhi-* may mean, as in previous *Pācittiya*, to "loll" and "sprawl."

having spread or having caused a sleeping- place to be spread without asking the owner (for permission), should sit down on it or should lie down on it, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Wrong time means: from sunset until sunrise.¹

Family means: ... Having approached means: ... Without asking the owner (for permission) means: ... (see **Bi-Pc 16.2.2**) ...

Sleeping-place means: even a spreading of leaves.²

Having spread means: oneself having spread.

Having caused to be spread means: having caused another to spread.

Should sit down on means: Should lie down on means: ...

If she thinks that she has not asked (for permission) when she has not asked (for permission) and having spread or having caused a sleeping-place to be spread, she sits down on it or lies down on it, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she has not asked (for permission) ... If she thinks that she has asked (for permission) when she has not asked (for permission) ... offence of expiation. If she thinks that she has not asked (for permission) when she has asked (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she has asked (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she has asked (for permission) when she has asked (for permission), there is no offence.

There is no offence if asking (for permission), having spread or having caused a sleeping-place to be spread, she sits down on it or lies down on it; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. other definitions of “wrong time” at **BD 2.336** and above, **BD 3.86**. ² Other definitions of “sleeping-place” at **BD 2.196 = BD 2.201, BD 2.244**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 18

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun who was the pupil of Bhaddā Kāpilānī¹ attended on Bhaddā Kāpilānī respectfully. Bhaddā Kāpilānī spoke thus to the nuns: "Ladies, this nun attends on me respectfully, I will give her this robe." Then that nun, because of a misapprehension,² because of a misunderstanding,³ saying: "Ladies, they say that I do not attend respectfully upon the lady, they do not say that she will give me a robe," made (someone) look down upon another. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this nun because of a misapprehension, because of a misunderstanding, make (someone) look down upon another?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun ... made (someone) look down upon another?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can a nun, because of a misapprehension, because of a misunderstanding, make (someone) look down upon another? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, because of a misapprehension, because of a misunderstanding, should make (someone) look down upon another, there is an offence of expiation."

¹ See Bi-Ss 3, Bi-Pc 11–Bi-Pc 13. ² *duggahitena*. I think here it does not mean that the robe was taken wrongly, but what Bhaddā said. ³ *dūpadhāritena*.

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Because of a misapprehension means: because it was apprehended in a different manner.

Because of a misunderstanding means: because it was understood in a different manner.

Another means: one who is ordained. If she makes (someone) look down upon (her), there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained (and) makes (someone) look down upon (her), there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she is ordained ... If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is ordained ... offence of expiation. If she makes (someone) look down upon one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.²

¹ Surely should read *anāpatti*, no offence. ² This *Pācittiya* is unique in the nuns' group in having no more than these two regularly recurring instances where no offence is caused.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 19

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns, not seeing their own things, spoke thus to the nun Caṇḍakālī¹: "Has the lady not seen our things?" The nun Caṇḍakālī ... spread it about, saying:

"What, am I a thief then? What, am I just shameless? That these ladies, not seeing their own things, spoke thus to me: 'Has the lady not seen our things?' If indeed, ladies,² I take your things I am not a true recluse, I am falling away from the Brahma-life, I rise up in hell. But whoever speaks thus of me when it is not a fact, let her too be not a true recluse, let her fall away from the Brahma-life, let her rise up in hell."

Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the lady Caṇḍakālī curse herself as well as another with hell as well as with the Brahma-life?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Caṇḍakālī cursed herself ... with the Brahma-life?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Caṇḍakālī curse herself as well as another with hell as well as with the Brahma-life? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should curse herself or another with hell or with the Brahma-life, there is an offence of expiation."

¹ See Bi-Ss 4, Bi-Ss 10, Bi-Ss 11. ² *sacā h'ayye*. Oldenberg says, Vin 4.367, that this may be *sace aham ayye*, and refers us to Vin 1.88, *sacāca*, with variant reading and interpretation given by Buddhaghosa, appearing at Vin 1.372.

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Herself means: herself (individually).¹

Another means: one who is ordained.

If she curses with hell or with the Brahma-life, there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained (and) curses (her) with hell or with the Brahma-life, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she is ordained ... If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is ordained ... offence of expiation. If she curses (her) with animal birth or with the realm of the departed or with human misfortune, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she curses one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.²

There is no offence if she is aiming at (explaining) the goal, if she is aiming at (explaining) a rule, if she is aiming at (explaining) the teaching³; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *attānan ti paccattam* = below, BD 3.281. This explanation will have been necessary if in early Buddhist thought *attā* was prevalently held to stand for *Ātman*, transcendental self. But here it has no such reference, meaning simply a person, an individual, *pacca-* = *paṭi-* throwing back the emphasis away from *Ātman* on to an individual or particular self X, as contrasted with Y. *Paccattam* at AN i.156 is explained by *sāmaṃ* at AN-a 2.256. ² This is the Sinhalese and Siamese reading. Oldenberg's edition reads: "if she thinks that she is ordained ...," as in sentence but one before. Offence of wrong-doing "should probably read no offence." ³ Vin 3.130 (BD 1.218, and see n. 2) = Vin 4.11 (BD 2.185) = Vin 4.309 (below, BD 3.345).

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 20

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Caṇḍakalī, having quarrelled with the nuns, wept having struck¹ herself again and again. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Caṇḍakalī weep, having struck herself again and again?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Caṇḍakalī wept, having struck herself again and again?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Caṇḍakalī weep, having struck herself again and again? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should weep, having struck herself again and again, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Herself means: herself (individually).²

If she weeps, having struck herself again and again, there is an offence of expiation. If she strikes, (but) does not weep, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she weeps, (but) does not strike, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if, smitten by loss of relations or by loss of

¹ *vadhivā*, also meaning to punish. ² See above, **BD 3.280**.

possessions¹ or by loss of health,² she weeps (but) does not strike; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

The Second Division: that on the dark

4.278

¹ *bhoga*, usually translated in this sequence as “wealth,” must here refer either to the nun’s own few possessions or to her relatives’ wealth. ² Here three misfortunes or losses, *vyasana*, occur; five are given at AN iii.147, DN iii.235, where it is said that of these five, three (those mentioned above) do not cause beings to arise after death in painful states, while the other two do.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 21

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time several nuns bathed naked with prostitutes at the same ford of the river Aciravatī.¹ The prostitutes made fun of the nuns, saying: "Why in the world, ladies, is the Brahma-life led by you when you are young? Surely the pleasures of the senses should be enjoyed. When you are old, then you can lead the Brahma-life; thus will both extremes be experienced² by you." The nuns, being made fun of by these prostitutes, became ashamed.³ Then these nuns, having gone to a dwelling, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"Because of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training for nuns founded on ten reasons: for the excellence of the Order ... for following the discipline.⁴ And thus, monks, the nuns should set forth this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should bathe naked, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

¹ Cf. Vin 1.293 and above, BD 3.247. Other regulations as to the foods to be used by nuns when bathing given at Vin 2.280. ² *pariggahita*, literally taken up. ³ At Vin 1.293 this is the story said to have been told by Visākhā to the lord when she was asking him to confer the eight boons, and of which the giving of bathing cloths for the nuns was the last. ⁴ See BD 1.37f.; BD 2.87, BD 3.248, BD 2.323.

Should bathe naked means: if she bathes not clothed, not dressed,¹ there is an offence of expiation.

21.2.2

There is no offence if she is one whose robe is stolen² or if she is one whose robe is destroyed³; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *nivattha* and *pāruta*, the words used above, are also those that together cover the putting on of the three robes; see **BD 2.32, n. 2, n. 3**. ² These words are defined (for monks) at **BD 2.48**—i.e., in Monks' **Bu-NP 6** which, as is to be gathered from Vin-a 919, holds good for nuns as well as for monks. ³ See previous note.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 22

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time bathing cloths for the nuns were allowed by the lord.¹ The group of six nuns, saying: "Bathing cloths are allowed by the lord," wore bathing cloths that were not of a (proper) measure; they went about trailing (these) in front as well as behind.² Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the group of six nuns wear bathing cloths that are not of a (proper) measure?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns wear bathing cloths that are not of a (proper) measure?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the group of six nuns wear bathing cloths that are not of a (proper) measure? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"When a bathing cloth is being made for a nun, it must be made to a (proper) measure. This is the (proper) measure here: in length four spans according to the accepted span, in width two spans. For her who exceeds this (measure), there is an offence of expiation involving cutting down."³

Bathing cloth means: dressed in⁴ which, she bathes.

¹ At Vin 1.294. The giving of bathing cloths for the Order of nuns was the last of the eight boons which Visakha asked the lord to confer on her. The bathing cloth was the fifth robe to be pointed out to a nun at her ordination, Vin 2.272. ² Cf. above, BD 3.99. ³ Cf. Monks' Bu-Pc 87, Bu-Pc 89, Bu-Pc 90, Bu-Pc 91. ⁴ Here is another example of a garment to which *nivattha* refers; see BD 2.32, n. 2.

Is being made means: making or causing to be made.¹

It must be made to a (proper) measure. This is the (proper) measure here: in length four spans according to the accepted span, in width two spans means: if she makes it or causes it to be made exceeding this (measure), in the business there is an offence of wrong-doing; having cut it down on acquisition, an offence of expiation is to be confessed.

If what was incompletely executed by herself she has finished by herself, there is an offence of expiation. If she makes others finish what was incompletely executed by herself ... If what was incompletely executed by others she has finished by herself ... If she makes others finish what was incompletely executed by others, there is an offence of expiation. If she makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having acquired what was made for another, she makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.²

22.2.2

There is no offence if she makes it to the (proper) measure; if she makes it to less than the (proper) measure; if having acquired what was made for another (but) exceeding the (proper) measure, having cut it down, she makes use of it; if she makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.³

¹ = Vin 3.226, Vin 4.168, Vin 4.171.

² = Vin 3.225, Vin 4.167, Vin 4.169, Vin 4.170, Vin 4.171.

³ = Vin 4.171.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 23

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain nun's robe of costly robe-cloth was badly made, badly sewn. The nun Thullanandā spoke thus to that nun: "Lady, this robe-cloth of yours is lovely, but the robe is badly made, badly sewn."

"If I unsew it, lady, will you sew it?"

"Yes, lady, I will sew it."

Then that nun, having unsewn that robe, gave it to the nun Thullanandā. The nun Thullanandā, thinking: "I will sew it, I will sew it," neither sewed it nor made an effort¹ to get it sewn. Then that nun told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā, having had a nun's robe unsewn, neither sew it nor make an effort to get it sewn?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the Thullanandā, having had a nun's robe unsewn, neither sewed it nor made an effort to get it sewn?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... nor make an effort to get it sewn? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having unsewn or having made (another) unsew a nun's robe, if she is not afterwards prevented should neither sew it nor should make an effort to get it sewn, except on the fourth and fifth days, there is an offence of expiation."

¹ *ussukkaṃ karoti*, or "to find energy." Cf. below, **BD 3.309**, **BD 3.330**.

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

A nun's means: another nun's.

Robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes.

Having unsewn means: herself having unsewn.

Having made (another) unsew means: having made another unsew.

If she is not afterwards prevented means: if there is not an obstacle.¹

Should neither sew means: should not herself sew.

Nor should make an effort to get it sewn means: should not command another.²

Except on the fourth and fifth days means: having excluded the fourth and fifth days.

If she thinks, "I will neither sew it nor make an effort to get it sewn," in the mere throwing off of the responsibility, there is an offence of expiation.³

If she thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained, having unsewn or having made (another) unsew a robe, and if she is not afterwards prevented, neither sews it nor makes an effort to get it sewn, except on the fourth and fifth days, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she is ordained ... If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is ordained ... offence of expiation. If, having unsewn or having made (another) unsew another requisite ... except on the fourth and fifth days, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, having unsewn or made (another) unsew a robe or another requisite of one who is not ordained ... except on the fourth and fifth days, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that

¹ =below, BD 3.331. ² Cf. below, BD 3.310, BD 3.331. ³ Cf. below, BD 3.331.

she is not ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if there is an obstacle¹; if, having looked about, she does not get the chance²; if she, working,³ lets the fourth and fifth days pass; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

Bi-Pc 2
BD 3.21

¹ *antarāya*; ten are enumerated at [Vin 1.112](#), [Vin 1.169](#). ² On analogy of [Bi-Pc 34](#), [Bi-Pc 45](#) below and following the Sinhalese version, I have adopted a different punctuation from that occurring in Oldenberg's text of [Bi-Pc 23](#), hence altering the sense. Cf. also below, [BD 3.310](#), [BD 3.331](#). ³ Taking the Sinhalese and Siamese *karontī* as against Oldenberg's *karontāṃ*.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 24

24.1.1
3.290

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time¹ nuns, having entrusted robes² to the hands of (other) nuns, set out on a tour of the country with (only) the inner and the upper robes. Those robes, deposited for a long time, became soiled; nuns dried them in the sun. Nuns spoke thus to these nuns: "Ladies, whose are these robes that are soiled?" Then these nuns told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can nuns, having entrusted robes to the hands of (other) nuns, set out on a tour of the country with (only) the inner and the upper robes?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ... with (only) the inner and the upper robes?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns ... with (only) the inner and the upper robes? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should miss going about in an outer cloak for five days,³ there is an offence of expiation."

¹ Cf. Monks' Bu-NP 2 (BD 2.12). ² Merely called *cīvara* here. The *sikkhāpada* makes it clear that the *saṅghāti*, outer cloak, is meant; Vin-a 652 says that this is the case with the monks' *cīvara* mentioned in Bu-NP 2. At some time the nuns came to be allowed five robes, mentioned below. For these see BD 2, Introduction, p. xix. It is therefore quite possible to say here that the nuns went with "only" their inner and upper robes, if we think of these with the outer cloak as constituting the regular set of three robes, to which the other two were merely added as extras for the nuns.

³ *pañcāhikam*, what consists of five days

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Should miss going about in an outer cloak for five days means: if on the fifth day she neither dresses in nor puts on nor dries in the sun the five robes, (but) lets the fifth day pass, there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that five days are passed when they are passed, there is an offence of expiation.¹ If she is in doubt as to whether five days are passed, there is an offence of expiation. If she thinks that five days are not passed when they are passed, there is an offence of expiation. If she thinks that five days are passed when they are not passed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether five days are not passed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that five days are not passed when they are not passed, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, on the fifth day, she dresses in or puts on or dries the five robes in the sun; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Some material left out here. These clauses should state that the offence also depends on her not dressing in, putting on or drying the five robes. Vin-a 929 says that for each robe there is an offence, thus for the five (robes) there are five (offences).

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 25

25.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.292 at that time a certain nun having walked for alms, having spread out a damp robe,¹ entered a dwelling-place. A certain nun, having put on that robe, entered a village for almsfood. She, having come out,² asked the nuns: "Ladies, have you not seen my robe?" The nuns told this matter to that nun. Then that nun ... spread it about, saying:

"How can this nun, without asking (for permission) put on my robe?" Then this nun told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this nun put on a nun's robe without asking (for permission)?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun ... without asking (for permission)?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can a nun ... without asking (for permission)? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should wear a robe that should be handed back,³ there is an offence of expiation."

25.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

3.293 **A robe that should be handed back** means: if she dresses in or puts on any one robe of the five (kinds of) robes of one who is

¹ *allacīvara*. Cf. Ja 6.51. *Alla* can mean wet, moist, and also fresh, new. ² This must refer to the first nun, meaning when she (later) came out of the dwelling-place.

³ *cīvarasaṃkamanīyaṃ*, explained at Vin-a 930 as *paṭidātabbacīvara*, a robe that should be restored, given back (to the rightful owner).

ordained, either if it was not given to her or without asking (permission) for it, there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained (and) wears a robe that should be handed back, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she is ordained ... If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is ordained ... offence of expiation. If she wears a robe of one who is not ordained and that should be handed back, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if she gives it or, if asking (permission) for it, she dresses in it or puts it on; if she is one whose robe is stolen,² if she is one whose robe is destroyed³; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Should doubtless read, "there is no offence." ² Cf. above, **BD 3.284**. ³ Cf. above, **BD 3.284**

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 26

26.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3:294 at that time the family who supported the nun Thullanandā spoke
thus to the nun Thullanandā: "Lady, we will give robes for the Order
of nuns." The nun Thullanandā saying: "You are very busy, there is
much to be done," put an obstacle in the way.¹ Then that family's
house was burnt down. They ... spread it about, saying: "How could
the lady Thullanandā put an obstacle in the way of our gift of faith?
We are down and out; all round,² both as to property and as to merit."
Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were
modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the lady Thullanandā put an obstacle in the way of a
group's receiving robes?"³ ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā put an
obstacle in the way of a group's receiving robes?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā put an obstacle in the way
of a group's receiving robes? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who
are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

**"Whatever nun should put an obstacle in the way of a group's
receiving robes there is an offence of expiation."**

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

26.2.1
3:295 ¹ *antarāyam akāsi*, as we might, say, "made an objection." ² *paribāhirā*; the word
also occurs at SN i.126. **Vin 2.140.** ³ Note how the interest is shifted from the
laypeople to the nuns.

A group means: it is called an Order of nuns.¹

Robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.²

Should put an obstacle in the way means: if, saying: “How can this robe be given?” she puts an obstacle in the way, there is an offence of expiation. If she puts an obstacle in the way of another requisite, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she puts an obstacle in the way of a robe or of another requisite for several nuns³ or for one nun or for a woman who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if she hinders having pointed out an advantage⁴; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ =below, **BD 3.346**. In the Vinaya, *gaṇa* is almost always a group of from one to four monks or nuns, while *saṅgha* is an Order—i.e., five or more monks or nuns. It is curious to find *gaṇa* and *saṅgha* identified, as above, but the wording of the introductory story appears to be responsible. ² =**Vin 3.196, Vin 3.210, Vin 4.60, Vin 4.122, Vin 4.123**, etc. ³ *sambahula*. With Old Commentary’s identification,

above, of *saṅgha* and *gaṇa*, *gaṇa* a group, has moved from its normal second to the first place of that triad which is usually found as *saṅgha gaṇa ekabhikkhūnī* (Order, group, one nun). The second place has therefore to be filled by another word: *sambahula* is the obvious choice, for in Vinaya it is often virtually a synonym for *gaṇa*. “One nun” follows next in its usual order and form. Cf. below, **BD 3.347**.

⁴ Cf. below, **BD 3.301**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 27

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time robe-material had accrued to an Order of nuns not at a right time.¹ Then that Order of nuns collected together wishing to distribute that robe-material. Now at that time the nuns who were pupils of the nun Thullanandā had gone out. The nun Thullanandā spoke thus to those nuns²: "Ladies, nuns are gone out; the robe-material should not be distributed yet," (and) she held back the division of the robe-material. Nuns, saying: "The robe-material should not be distributed yet," parted company. When the nuns who were pupils returned, the nun Thullanandā had that robe-material distributed. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā hold back a legally valid division of robe-material?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, that the nun Thullanandā held back a legally valid division of robe-material?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā hold back a legally valid division of robe-material? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should hold back a legally valid division of robe

¹ See Nuns' Bu-NP 2, where also Thullanandā takes a hand in robe-distribution, and where robe- (material given) not at a right time is defined. Cf. also Monks' Bu-NP 3, where *akālacivara* may be accepted by a monk. It is to be gathered from Vin-a 919 that the Monks' Bu-NP 3 holds good for nuns as well as for monks. ² Presumably to those constituting the Order, for the pupils had not yet returned.

material, there is an offence of expiation.”¹

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Legally valid division of robe-material means: a complete Order of nuns, having collected together, distributes it.²

Should hold back means: if, saying: “How could one distribute this robe-material?”³ she holds it back, there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that it is legally valid when it is legally valid (and) holds (the division) back, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether it is legally valid ... offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is not legally valid when it is legally valid ... no offence. If she thinks that it is legally valid when it is not legally valid, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is not legally valid, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is not legally valid when it is not legally valid, there is no offence.

There is no offence if she holds it back having pointed out an advantage; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. below, **Bi-Pc 30**. ² “Pupils,” not being fully ordained, did not rank as nuns with administrative powers, although they were called *antevāsibhikkhuniyo*. Therefore their absence from a ceremony would not invalidate it, as would the absence of a fully ordained nun. “Complete” (*samagga*) interpreted at Vin-a 792 as meaning “all come”; see **BD 2.267**, and note 7. ³ Oldenberg Vin 4.368, proposes to read *idam cīvaraṃ bhājiyeyya* for text’s *imam cīvaraṃ bhājeyya*. Sinhalese edition has *idam cīvaraṃ bhājeyya*; Siamese edition same as text.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 28

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā gave¹ recluses' robe-material to players² and to dancers³ and to female tumblers⁴ and to female conjurers⁵ and to drummers,⁶ saying: "Do praise me in public."⁷ The players and the dancers and the tumblers and the conjurers and the drummers praised the nun Thullanandā in public, saying: "The lady Thullanandā is very learned, she is a repeater, she is wise, she is skilled in giving talk on *dhamma*."⁸ Give for the lady, make for the lady." Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the lady Thullanandā give recluses' robe-material to a householder?" ...

¹ Cf. below, **BD 3.332**. ² *naṭā*, explained at Vin-a 931 as "those who play (or dance, *nāṭenti*) a pantomime (or dance, *nāṭakaṃ*)." This last is probably dance-drama. There was no hard-and-fast line in ancient India between dancing, acting and miming; all were needed together, with drumming, for the full production. At SN iv.306f. players, *nāṭa*, are said by Gotama, as recorded, to arouse wrong states of mind in their audience, and to be reborn in the Hell of Laughter. ³ *nāṭaka*, explained at Vin-a 931 as those who dance (*naccanti*). Word occurs at Mil 331, translated as "play actor," and at Mil 191. ⁴ *laṅghikā*, "those who do tumbling on bamboos and thongs," Vin-a 931. *Laṅghakā* (plural) occurs at Mil 34, Mil 191, Mil 331; Ja 2.142. ⁵ *sokajjhāyikā*. Vin-a 931 reads *sokasāyikā*, with variant readings as text and *sokachāyī*, and explains as "illusion-makers." Cf. Ja 6.580, explained thus here too, and with the further meaning of those who allay and dispel grief. ⁶ *kumbhathūṇikā*, explained at Vin-a 931 as players with a small jar (*ghaṭaka*?). Word also occurs at Ja 5.506, Ja 6.580 (not explained) and DN i.6; see *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.8, n. 4. DN-a 84 says that *kumbhathūṇa* is the noise of a pot striking a four-cornered trough, which explanation *Dialogues of the Buddha* 1.8, n. 4 says is "obscure and probably corrupt." ⁷ *parisati*.

⁸ As in Nuns' **Bu-NP 10**, **Bu-NP 11**, **Bu-Pc 33**.

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā gave recluses’ robe-material to a householder?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā give recluses’ robe material to a householder? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“**Whatever nun should give recluses’ robe-material to a householder or to a wanderer or to a female wanderer, there is an offence of expiation.**”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Householder means: he who inhabits a house.¹

Wanderer means: excluding monk and novice, he who has reached (the stage of a) wanderer.²

Female wanderer means: excluding nun and probationer and female novice, she who has reached (the stage of a) female wanderer.³

Recluses’ robe-material means: it is called made allowable.⁴ If she gives, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if she gives to (her) parents; if she gives for the time being⁵; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ = Vin 3.212, Vin 3.219, Vin 3.259 (BD 2.47, BD 2.60, BD 2.148). ² = Vin 4.92 (BD 2.349)=below, BD 3.332, and cf. Vin 4.224. ³ = Vin 4.92 (BD 2.349)=below, BD 3.332, and cf. Vin 4.224. ⁴ *kappakata*. Cf. definition of “new (robe)” as *akalakappa* at Vin 4.120. See BD 2.407, n. 5, n. 6, and BD 2.409, n. 5. ⁵ Cf. BD 1.110, n. 7.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 29

29.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.300 at that time the family who supported the nun Thullanandā spoke thus to the nun Thullanandā: "If we, lady, are able, we will give robe-material for the Order of nuns." Now at that time nuns, having kept the rains-retreat, collected together wishing to distribute robe-material. The nun Thullanandā spoke thus to these nuns: "Wait, ladies, there is for the Order of nuns an expectation of robe-material." The nuns spoke thus to the nun Thullanandā: "Do go, lady, and find out about this robe-material." The nun Thullanandā approached that family; having approached she spoke thus to the people: "Sirs, do give robe-material for the Order of nuns." They said: "Lady, we are not able to give robe-material for the Order of nuns." The nun Thullanandā told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the lady Thullanandā, when an expectation of robe-material is not sure,¹ let the robe-season² pass?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... let the robe-season pass?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... let the robe-season pass? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, when an expectation of robe-material is not

¹ *dubbala*, not strong, weak; uncertain, not sure, low or poor. ² Cf. Vin 3.261 (BD 2.152f.).

sure, should let the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

When an expectation of robe-material is not sure means: if they say, “If we are able, we will give, we will make,” (but their) word becomes broken.

Robe-season means: the last month of the rainy season when the *kaṭhina* cloth is not (formally) made, the five months when it is (formally) made.¹

Should let the robe-season pass means: if she lets pass the last day of the rainy season when the *kaṭhina* cloth is not (formally) made, there is an offence of expiation. If she lets the day pass for removing the *kaṭhina* (privileges),² there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that the robe-material is not sure when it is not sure (and) lets the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether the robe-material is not sure ... offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that the robe-material is sure³ when it is not sure ... no offence. If she thinks that the robe-material is not sure when it is sure, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether the robe-material is sure, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that the robe-material is sure when it is sure, there is no offence.

There is no offence if she hinders having pointed out an advantage⁴; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ = definition of “time of giving robes” at Vin 4.74, Vin 4.100 (BD 2.311, BD 2.366), and cf. Vin 3.204. ² Cf. Vin 3.196 (BD 2.5 and notes). ³ *adubbala*. ⁴ = above, BD 3.295.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 30

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a dwelling-place had been erected by a certain lay-follower for the Order. He, at the festival for this dwelling-place, was desirous of giving robe-material at the wrong time for both the Orders. Now at that time the *kaṭhina* cloth for both the Orders was (formally) made. Then that lay-follower, having approached the Order,¹ asked for the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges).² They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to remove the *kaṭhina* (privileges). And thus, monks, should the *kaṭhina* (privileges) be removed: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order remove the *kaṭhina* (privileges). This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order removes the *kaṭhina* (privileges). If the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges) is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent. If it is not pleasing, they should speak. The *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed by the Order, and it is right ... So do I understand this.’”

Then that lay-follower, having approached the Order of nuns, asked for the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges). The nun Thullanandā, thinking, “There will be robe-material for us,” held back the

¹ I.e., the Order of monks, as one gathers from the context. ² See BD 2.5, n. 3, BD 2.6, n. 5. Here the removal must depend on the ground of the robes being settled, or on that of the general removal of the privileges by a whole Order.

removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges). Then that lay-follower ... spread it about, saying: “How can these nuns not give a removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges) for us?” Nuns heard that lay-follower who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: “How can the nun Thullanandā hold back a legally valid removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges)?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā held back a legally valid removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges)?”

“It is true, lord “... (see **Bi-Pc 27.1**) “... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should hold back a legally valid removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges), there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case. Bi-Pc 3

Legally valid removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges) means a complete Order of nuns, having collected together, remove them.¹

Should hold back means: if, saying: “How can this *kaṭhina* (privilege) be removed?” she holds it back, there is an offence of expiation.²

If she thinks that it is legally valid when it is legally valid (and) holds it back ... (see **Bi-Pc 27.2**) ... if she is the first wrong-doer. Bi-Pc 3

The Third Division: that on being naked

¹ Cf. **Bi-Pc 27.2.1**. ² Cf. **Bi-Pc 27.2.1**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 31

31.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.304 at that time two nuns shared¹ one couch.² People, engaged in touring the dwelling-place, having seen (them) ... spread it about, saying: "How can two nuns share one couch, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can two nuns share one couch?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that two nuns shared one couch?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

4.289 "How, monks, can two nuns share one couch? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever two nuns should share one couch, there is an offence of expiation."

31.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Nuns mean: they are called ordained.

Two should share one couch means: if one is lying down and the other lies down, there is an offence of expiation. Or if both are lying down, there is an offence of expiation. If having got up, they lie down again, there is an offence of expiation.

31.2.2 ¹ *tuvattenti*, explained at Vin-a 932 as to lie down on. ² At Vin 2.124 it is made a *dukkata* offence for monks to share one couch. At Vin 2.10 one of the bad habits indulged in by lax monks was the sharing of one couch with women of respectable families.

There is no offence if one is lying down and the other sits down, or if both are sitting down; if they are mad, if they are the first wrongdoers.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 32

32.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.305 at that time two nuns shared one covering-cloth.¹ People, engaged
in touring the dwelling-place ... (see Bi-Pc 31.1. *Instead of* one couch
read one covering-cloth) ... “... this rule of training:

“Whatever two nuns should share one covering-cloth, there is
an offence of expiation.”

32.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Nuns mean: they are called ordained.

Two should share one covering-cloth means: if having covered themselves with that,² they put that³ on, there is an offence of expiation.

32.2.2 If they think that it is one covering-cloth when it is one covering-cloth (and) share it, there is an offence of expiation. If they are in doubt as to whether it is one covering-cloth ... If they think they are different covering-cloths when it is one covering-cloth ... offence of

¹ *ekattharaṇapāvuraṇa*. Vin-a 932 says that this means one covering as well as a cloth. At Vin 2.10, among the bad habits indulged in by lax monks were that they shared one covering, *attharaṇa*, that they shared one cloth, *pāvuraṇā*, and that they shared one covering-cloth, *attharaṇapāvuraṇā* with women of respectable families. At Vin 2.124 the group of six monks shared these articles, thereby incurring an offence of wrong-doing. The fact that the two words *attharaṇa* and *pāvuraṇā* appear both separately and then together (see also below), to my mind shows that, when joined, they stand for *one* article: a cloth used as a covering, therefore a covering-cloth. There is also the reference to it as *taṃ* (acc.), “that”; see next note. ² *tañ ñeva ... tañ ñeva*. ³ *tañ ñeva ... tañ ñeva*.

expiation. If they think that they are different cloths when it is one covering, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If they think that it is one covering-cloth when they are different coverings, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If they think that it is one covering-cloth when they are different covering-cloths, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If they are in doubt as to whether they are different covering-cloths, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If they think that they are different covering-cloths when they are different covering-cloths, there is no offence.

BD 3,3

There is no offence if they lie down having pointed out an arrangement¹; if they are mad, if they are the first wrong-doers.

Bi-Pc 3

Vin 4,2

¹ *vavatthāna*. Vin-a 932 says that for those who lie down having placed the “yellow robes” in the middle or a walking-staff or even a belt, there is no offence.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 33

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā was very learned, she was a repeater, she was wise, she was skilled in giving *dhamma*-talk.¹ Bhaddā Kāpilānī² also was very learned ... she was skilled in giving *dhamma*-talk, she was esteemed as being eminent.³ People, thinking: "Bhaddā Kāpilānī is very learned ... she is skilled in giving *dhamma*-talk, she is esteemed as being eminent," having first visited⁴ Bhaddā Kāpilānī afterwards visited the nun Thullanandā. The nun Thullanandā, overcome by envy,⁵ thinking: "Those who are said to have few wants, to be content, detached, not living in company, these are intent on convincing,⁶ intent on hinting," walked up and down and stood still and sat down and lay down on a sleeping-place and recited and made (another) recite and studied⁷ in front of Bhaddā Kāpilānī. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā intentionally cause discomfort to the lady Bhaddā Kāpilānī?"

...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā intentionally caused discomfort to Bhaddā Kāpilānī?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā intentionally cause dis-

¹ As in Nuns' Bi-NP 10, Bi-NP 11, Bi-Pc 28. ² Cf. above, BD 3.186, n. 1.

³ *uḷārasambhāvitā*. ⁴ *payirupāsati* also means to honour. ⁵ *issāpakatā*, as at SN ii.260, Vin 3.107. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 932 takes it as *issāya pakatā*, envious by nature, with the variant reading *apakatā*, not having done away with envy.

⁶ *saññattibahulā*. ⁷ For these last two cf. BD 2.192 (Vin 4.15).

comfort to Bhaddā Kāpilānī? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should intentionally cause discomfort to a nun, there is an offence of expiation.”¹

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

To a nun means: to another nun.

Intentionally means: a transgression committed knowingly, consciously, deliberately.²

Should cause discomfort means: if thinking, “Because of this there will be discomfort for her,” she walks up and down or stands still or sits down or lies down on a sleeping-place or recites or makes (another) recite or studies in front of (her) without asking (for permission),³ there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained (and) intentionally causes discomfort, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she is ordained ... If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is ordained (and) intentionally causes discomfort, there is an offence of expiation. If she intentionally causes discomfort to one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁴

There is no offence if she, not desiring to cause discomfort (and) having asked (for permission), walks up and down ... or studies in front of (her); if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. Monks' Bu-Pc 77. ² = Vin 3.73; see BD 1.126, n. 3. ³ This appears to be a gloss, limiting the scope of the rule. ⁴ Should doubtless be “no offence.”

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 34

34.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.309 at that time the nun Thullanandā, when (the woman) who lived with her¹ was ailing, neither attended to her nor made an effort² to get her attended to. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā, when (the woman) who lives with her is ailing, neither attend to her nor make an effort to get her attended to?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... neither attended to her nor ... attended to?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā, when (the woman) who lives with her is ailing, neither attend to her nor make an effort to get her attended to? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should neither attend to an ailing (woman) who lives with her nor should make an effort to get her attended to, there is an offence of expiation."

34.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Ailing means: she is called ill.

¹ *sahajīvinī*. cf. below, **BD 3.375**, **BD 3.379**. Not necessarily a fully ordained nun, for the *sahajīvinī* might be a pupil or one not ordained (see **Bi-Pc 34.2.1** below), while **Bi-Pc 68** and **Bi-Pc 70** speak of Thullanandā ordaining her *sahajīvinī*, which means that they had shared a cell before the latter was ordained. ² Cf. above, **BD 3.287**, below, **BD 3.330**.

(Woman) who lives with her means: she is called one who shares her cell.¹

Should neither attend to her means: should not herself attend to her.²

Nor should make effort to get her attended to means: should not command another.³

If she thinks, “I will neither attend to her nor make an effort to get her attended to,” in throwing off the responsibility, there is an offence of expiation.⁴ If she attends neither to a pupil nor to one who is not ordained nor makes an effort to get her attended to, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if there is an obstacle⁵; if, having looked about, she does not get the chance; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *saddhivihārīnī*, co-resident. Also below, **BD 3.375**, **BD 3.379**. ² Cf. above, **BD 3.288**, below, **BD 3.331**. ³ Cf. above, **BD 3.288**, below, **BD 3.331**. ⁴ Cf. above, **BD 3.288**, below, **BD 3.331**. ⁵ Cf. above, **BD 3.289**, but where the text's punctuation is different, and below, **BD 3.331**. I prefer that obtaining in **Bi-Pc.34** and **Bi-Pc.45**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 35

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time Bhaddā Kāpilānī had spent the rains in Saketa. As she had some business to do, she sent a messenger to the nun Thullanandā, saying: "If the lady Thullanandā would give me quarters, I would come to Sāvattthī." The nun Thullanandā spoke thus: "Let her come, I will give it." Then Bhaddā Kāpilānī went from Saketa to Sāvattthī. The nun Thullanandā gave quarters to Bhaddā Kāpilānī. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā was very learned, she was a repeater ... (see Bi-Pc 33.1) ... she was skilled in giving *dhamma*-talk. The nun Thullanandā, thinking: "Those who are said to have few wants ... (see Bi-Pc 33.1) ... intent on hinting," angry, displeased threw Bhaddā Kāpilānī out of her quarters. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the lady Thullanandā, angry, displeased, having given quarters to the lady Bhaddā Kāpilānī, throw her out?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... threw her out?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... throw her out? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having given quarters to a nun, should, angry, displeased, throw her out or have her thrown out, there is an offence of expiation."¹

¹ Cf. Monks' Bu-Pc 17.

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

A nun¹ means: another nun.

Quarters means: it is called fastened by a door.²

Having given means: oneself having given.

Angry, displeased means: dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.³

Should throw out means: if, having taken (her) in a room, she throws her out on to the verandah, there is an offence of expiation. If, having taken her on the verandah, she throws her outside, there is an offence of expiation. If, with one effort, she makes her pass through many doors, there is an offence of expiation.⁴ **Should have her thrown out** means: if she commands another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. When once commanded, if she makes her pass through many doors, there is an offence of expiation.⁵

If she thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained (and) having given her quarters, angry, displeased, throws her out or has her thrown out, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she is ordained ... If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is ordained ... offence of expiation. If she throws out or has her requisites thrown out, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she throws out or has her thrown out from what is not fastened by a door ... If she throws out or has her requisites thrown out ... If she throws out or has one who is not ordained thrown out from what is or from what is not fastened by a door ... If she throws out or has her requisites thrown out ... If she thinks that she is ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁶

¹ Accusative. ² = definition of "dwelling" at BD 3.336, below. ³ Cf. BD 1.281, BD 2.140, BD 2.251; Vin 4.146, Vin 4.236. ⁴ Cf. BD 2.251f. ⁵ Cf. BD 2.251f. ⁶ Last clause should probably read "no offence." Cf. whole paragraph with BD 2.252.

There is no offence if she throws out or has one who is shameless thrown out, if she throws out or has her requisites thrown out; if she throws out or has one who is mad thrown out, if she throws out or has her requisites thrown out; if she throws out or has one who makes strife ... quarrels ... contention ... brawls ... who makes disputes in the Order thrown out, if she throws out or has her requisites thrown out; if she throws out or has a pupil or one who shares a cell or one who is not proceeding fitly thrown out, if she throws out or has her requisites thrown out; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.¹

¹ Cf. **BD 2.253**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 36

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Caṇḍakalī kept company¹ with a householder and with a householder's son.² Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Caṇḍakalī keep company ...?"...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Caṇḍakalī kept company ...?"

"It is true, lord."

"How, monks, can the nun Caṇḍakalī keep company with a householder and a householder's son? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should keep company with a householder or with a householder's son, that nun should be spoken to thus by the nuns: 'Do not, lady, keep company with a householder and with a householder's son. Let the lady desist, the Order praises such detachment in a sister.' But if that nun, being spoken to thus by the nuns, should persist as before, that nun should be admonished by the nuns up to the third time for giving up that (course). If she should give it up, while being admonished up to the third time, that is good. If she should not give it up, there is an offence of expiation.

¹ This Pācittiya should be compared with the Nuns' **Bi-Ss 12**. The Pācittiya, partaking as it does of *Saṅghādisesa* material and character, seems out of place here. The main difference is that in the Pācittiya, a nun lived in society with a householder, while in the *Saṅghādisesa*, nuns who were pupils lived in society and were of evil habits and so on. Cf. also **Bi-Pc 79**. ² *gahapatināpi gahapatiputtana pi*. Cf. DN i.62; MN i.179, MN i.344.

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Keeps company means: keeps company unbecomingly as to body and speech.

Householder means: he who inhabits a house. Householder's son means: he who is a son or brother.¹

That nun means: that nun who keeps company.

By the nuns means: by other nuns who see, who hear; she should be told by these: "Do not, lady, ... the Order praises such detachment in a sister." And a second time she should be told. And a third time she should be told. If she gives it up, that is good. But if she does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Having heard, if they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That nun, having been pulled to the midst of the Order, should be told: "Do not, lady, ... the Order praises such detachment in a sister." And a second time she should be told. And a third time she should be told. If she gives it up, that is good. But if she does not give it up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. That nun should be admonished. And thus, monks, should she be admonished: the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: "Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This nun so and so keeps company with a householder and with a householder's son. She does not give up this course. If it seems right to the Order let the Order admonish the nun so and so for giving up this course. This is the motion. Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This nun so and so ..." And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... The nun so and so is admonished by the Order for giving up this course. If it is pleasing ... So do I understand this.²

As a result of the motion, there is an offence of wrong-doing; as a result of two proclamations, there are offences of wrong-doing. At the end of the proclamations, there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) does not give it up, there is an offence of expiation. If she

¹ *yo koci puttabhātaro.* ² Cf. Nuns' **Bi-Ss 10**.

is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... If she thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act ... offence of expiation. If she thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if she is not admonished; if she gives it up; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.²

Bi-Pc 3

¹ Should no doubt read “no offence.” ² Cf. Nuns’ **Bi-Ss 10**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 37

37.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
3.317 that time nuns walked without a weapon¹ on almstour within (their own) region² (when this was) agreed upon as dangerous, frightening.³ Bad men assaulted them. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns ... dangerous, frightening?" ...
"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ... dangerous, frightening?"
"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns ... dangerous, frightening? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should walk without a weapon on alms-tour within (her own) region (when this is) agreed upon as dangerous, frightening, there is an offence of expiation."

37.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

3.318 **Within (her own) region** means: in a region of that country⁴ in which she lives.

Dangerous means: if on this road a place where thieves are halt-

¹ *asatthikā*. As in Monks' Bu-Pc 27, translators differ as to whether this means "without a weapon" or not (having joined) a caravan. See BD 2.289, n. 3. I here follow B.C. LAW, *History of Pali Literature* 1.75 (No.21), and not WALDSCHMIDT, *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuni-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins*, p. 127, "ohne sich einer Karawane angeschlossen zu haben." ² *antoraṭṭhe*. Not given in *Pali-English Dictionary* or *Critical Pali Dictionary*, but cf. *tiroraṭṭha* in next *Pācittiya*. ³ Cf. Monks' Bu-Pc 27, where the only legal occasion where a monk might go along the same highroad with a nun was if the road was dangerous and frightening. ⁴ *vijita*, or kingdom, territory, conquered land.

ing is seen, a place where they are eating is seen, a place where they are resting is seen, a place where they are sitting down is seen, a place where they are lying down is seen.¹

Frightening means: if on this road people injured by thieves are seen, (people) plundered are seen, (people) beaten down are seen.²

Without a weapon³ means: without a weapon.⁴

Should walk on almstour means: in a village close enough for a cock (to walk), among every (such) village, there is an offence of expiation. For every half *yojana* in what is not a village, in a jungle, there is an offence of expiation.⁵

There is no offence if she goes with a weapon; if she goes in a place of security⁶ that is not frightening; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

Bi-Pc 3

Vin 4.2

¹ = BD 2.158, BD 2.290. ² = BD 2.158, BD 2.290. ³ *asatthikā*, more literally “weaponless.” ⁴ *vinā satthena*. ⁵ Cf. BD 2.290 in definition of “even among villages”; BD 2.294; and above, BD 3.16. ⁶ *khema*; a word which at some time became important as being applied particularly to spiritual peace, *nibbana*.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 38

38.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
3.319 that time nuns walked without a weapon on almstour outside (their own) region¹ (when this was) agreed upon as dangerous, frightening. Bad men ... (see **Bi-Pc 37.1**. *Instead of within (her own) region read outside (her own) region*) ...” ... this rule of training:

“**Whatever nun should walk without a weapon outside (her own) region (when this is) agreed upon as dangerous, frightening, there is an offence of expiation.**”

38.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Outside (her own) region means: setting aside that country in which she lives, in another's region.

Dangerous means: ... (see **Bi-Pc 37.2**) ... if she is the first wrongdoer.

¹ *tīroratṭhe*.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 39

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. Now at that time nuns walked on alms-tour during the rains. People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns walk on almstour during the rains, trampling down the crops and grasses, injuring life that is one-facultied, bringing many small creatures to destruction?"¹ Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can these nuns ... during the rains ... bringing many small creatures to destruction?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ... during the rains ... bringing many small creatures to destruction?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns walk on almstour during the rains ... bringing many small creatures to destruction? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should walk on almstour during the rains, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

¹ These three phrases occur at [Vin 1.137](#), [Vin 1.138](#), where rains-retreat is allowed to the monks, for lay-people had complained that by walking for alms in all seasons they did harm to crops and small living things, and where it is made a *dukkata* for monks to set out on almstour before they have kept the earlier or later three months of the rains. For "life that is one-facultied," cf. [BD 2.223](#), [BD 2.226](#), and for "small creatures to destruction," cf. [BD 2.71](#).

During the rains means: not having spent the first three months or the last three months.¹

Should walk on almstour means: in a village close enough for a cock (to walk) ... (see **Bi-Pc 37.2.1**) ... in what is not a village, in the jungle, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if she goes away for seven days because there is something to be done; if she goes away because she is troubled about something; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ The rains were reckoned to occupy four months; three of these had to be spent in a rains-settlement, on which there were two times for entering, **Vin 1.137**. Cf. definition of “having spent the rains” below, **BD 3.322**, **BD 3.354**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 40

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. Now at that time nuns, as before,¹ spent the rains in Rājagaha, the cold weather there, the hot weather there. People ... spread it about, saying: "The (four) quarters are blocked,² confused with nuns; because of them the (four) quarters are not seen."³ Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"Because of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training founded on ten reasons: for the excellence of the Order⁴ ... And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having kept the rains, should not set out on almstour, even for (a distance of) five or six *yojanas*, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Having kept the rains means: having kept the first three months or the last three months.⁵

If she thinks "I will not set out on almstour, even for (the distance

¹ *tatth'eva*—i.e., as in Bi-Pc 39. ² *āhundarika*. See MORRIS, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1884, p. 73. ³ Cf. Vin 1.79 for a corresponding paragraph, and DN ii.99, AN iii.69 for the last phrase. The meaning clearly is that the nuns were too many for the place. It seems that the lay people were complaining on their own account and not on that of the nuns, as the dative (*bhikkhunīnam, imāsam*) might suggest.

⁴ As at BD 1.37, BD 2.87. ⁵ Cf. Vin 1.138, Vin 4.314.

of) five or six *yojanas*,” in throwing off the responsibility, there is an offence of expiation.

40.2.2
3.323

There is no offence if there is an obstacle; if, having looked about for a nun as a companion,¹ she does not get the chance; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.²

The Fourth Division: that on sharing

¹ It was an offence for a nun to go about singly. ² = **BD 3.357**, **BD 3.380**, below; and *cf.* **BD 3.289**, **BD 3.310**, **BD 3.331**, **BD 3.336**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (*PĀCITTIYA*) 41

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a bold design¹ was made in a picture gallery² in King Pase-nadi of Kosala's pleasure grove. Many people went to see the picture gallery. The group of six nuns also went to see the picture gallery. People ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns go to see the picture gallery, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns go to see a picture gallery?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns went to see a picture gallery?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can this group of six nuns go to see a picture gallery? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should go to see a king's pleasure house³ or a picture gallery or a park or a pleasure grove or a lotus pond,⁴ there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

¹ *paṭibhānacitta*. See **BD 2.285, n. 5.** ² *cittāgāra*. ³ *rājāgāra*. Cf. DN i.1, °ka, which DN-a 42 explains as: "there they made a rest house (*agāra*) adorned with various designs (*paṭibhānacitta*) for the king's amusement. It was called a *rājāgāra*. ⁴ At **Vin 2.123** a lay follower wanted to have a lotus pond built for the monks. The lord, as is said, allowed the lotus pond to the monks.

King's pleasure house means: wherever it is made for a king to amuse himself, to enjoy himself.

Picture gallery means: wherever it is made for people to amuse themselves, to enjoy themselves.

Park¹ means: wherever it is made for people to amuse themselves, to enjoy themselves.

Pleasure grove means: wherever it is made for people to amuse themselves, to enjoy themselves.²

Lotus pond means: wherever it is made for people to amuse themselves, to enjoy themselves.

If she goes to see, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where she sees, there is an offence of expiation. Having left the region of sight, if she sees again, there is an offence of expiation. If she goes to see one or the other, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Standing where she sees, there is an offence of expiation. Having left the region of sight, if she sees again, there is an offence of expiation.³

4.299

41.2.2

There is no offence if, standing in a monastery, she sees;⁴ if she sees as she is going out or coming in⁵; if she sees, having gone out as there is something to be done;⁶ if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *ārāma*, which I have usually translated as “monastery”; see **BD 2.2, n. 2.** ² *uyyāna* therefore here does not have the special meaning of “royal” pleasance, as is sometimes the case. ³ Cf. **Vin 4.108 (BD 2.380)**. As Vin-a 934 points out, the last two clauses there, corresponding to the last two above, incur an offence of wrong-doing. It is sometimes the case that monks incur a lesser penalty than the nuns for a comparable offence. ⁴ According to Vin-a 934 this means that if she sees them building a king's pleasure house and so on when she is inside a monastery. ⁵ Vin-a 934 explains that if she sees when on the road for her almstour, there is no offence. ⁶ Vin-a 934, in the king's presence.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 42

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns made use of a sofa¹ and of a divan.² People, engaged in touring the dwelling place, having seen (them) ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns make use of a sofa and of a divan, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns make use of a sofa and of a divan?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns made use of a ... divan?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns make use of a sofa and of a divan? It is not,

¹ *āsandī*. This is the first of the high seats, the large seats which the group of six monks used, thereby incurring a *dukkata* offence, [Vin 1.192](#). The same list occurs at [Vin 2.163](#), where monks are allowed to sit down on all but *āsandī*, *pallaṅka* (see next note) and *tūlika*, but to lie down on none; also at [AN 1.181](#), and [DN 1.7](#) as being among the seats which Gotama is said to refrain from using. At [Vin 2.142-143](#) *āsandī* and *pallaṅka*, with bowls and shoes, are the only wooden articles not allowed to monks.

See *Dialogues of the Buddha*, 1.11, n. 4, where Rhys Davids is of the opinion that height and not length is referred to. The fact that in this *Pācittiya* it is "no offence" to use an *āsandī* if the legs have been cut down, also points this way, as does the allowance given monks at [Vin 2.169-170](#) to use *āsandī* if the legs have been broken, *bhinditvā*. On the other hand, at [DN 1.55 = MN 1.515 = SN iii.207](#) an *āsandī* is used as a bier—i.e., as something long, [SN-a ii.339 = MN-a 3.227](#), calling it a couch for lying down on, with (MN-a) variant reading "for sitting down on." Old Commentary, below speaks of sitting down on and lying down on. CHALMERS Jātaka translation 1.10, translates as "couch" (in a cart); it is therefore not "clear from Ja 1.108" that *āsandī* is a "cushion" as stated at *Vinaya Texts* ii.27, n. 2. ² *pallaṅka*. See above, [BD 3.271, n. 3](#).

monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should make use of a sofa or of a divan, there is an offence of expiation.”¹

42.2.1

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Sofa means: it is called of exceeding measure.

Divan means: it is made having brought hair (stuffing).²

Should make use of means: if she sits down on it or lies down on it, there is an offence of expiation.

42.2.2

There is no offence if, having cut down the legs of the sofa, she makes use of it; if, having cut out the hair (stuffing) from the divan, she makes use of it³; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ A *dukkāṭa* for nuns to sit on a divan at Vin 2.280, a half-(*aḍḍha-*) *pallaṅka* being allowed instead. ² *vāla* at MN-a 2.45 is explained as *assavāla*, horse-hair. ³ Cf. Vin 2.169–70, where these articles are allowed to monks if the legs of the former are broken, *bhīnditvā*, and the horse-hair of the latter destroyed, *bhīnditvā*. Above the reading is in both cases *chīnditvā*, cut.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 43

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns spun yarn. People, engaged in touring the dwelling place, having seen (them) ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns spin yarn, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns spin yarn?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns spin yarn?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the group of six nuns spin yarn? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should spin yarn, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Yarn means: the six (kinds of) yarn: linen, cotton, silk, wool, coarse hempen cloth, canvas.¹

Should spin means: if she herself spins, in the action there is an offence of wrong-doing; for every running up² there is an offence of expiation.

¹ = Vin 3.256. The same as the six kinds of robe-material; see BD 2.143 for notes.

² *ujjavujjave*; a term used in spinning, found I think only here. Vin-a 935 seems to say "if whatever was rolled by hand (*hatthena*, Pali-English Dictionary giving the reading *patthena*, by measure) is twisted round on that spindle (? *takka*), there is one offence."

There is no offence if she spins spun yarn¹; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *kantitasutta*; *kantita* can also mean “cut off.” Vin-a 935 explains by saying, “if she spins having bound together loose yarn (*dasikasutta*), or if she unspins what was badly spun, there is no offence.”

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 44

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns did household work. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns do household work?"

...
"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns do household work?"
"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:
"How, monks, can nuns do household work? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:
"**Whatever nun should do household work, there is an offence of expiation.**"

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Household work means: if she cooks conjei or rice or solid food for a layman,¹ if she washes a cloak or a turban, there is an offence of expiation

There is no offence if it is a drink of conjei,² if it is for the Order; if it is for worship at a shrine; if in doing household work for herself she cooks conjei or rice or solid food, washes a cloak or a turban; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *agārika*. ² Vin-a 935 says that there is no offence in cooking a drink of conjei (*yāgupāna*, cf. Vin 1.84, Vin 1.339) or rice for the Order (given) for it by people.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 45

45.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.330 at that time a certain nun, having approached the nun Thullanandā,
spoke thus: "Do come, lady, and settle this legal question." The nun
Thullanandā, having answered, "Very good," neither settled it nor
made an effort to get it settled.¹ Then that nun told this matter to
the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:
"How can the lady Thullanandā, being spoken to by a nun, saying:
'Do come, lady, and settle this legal question,' and having answered,
'Very good,' neither settle it nor make an effort to get it settled?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... to get it
settled?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... nor make an effort to
get it settled? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet)
pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, being spoken to by a nun, saying: 'Do come,
lady, and settle this legal question,' and having answered: 'Very
good,' (yet) if she is not afterwards prevented, should neither set-
tle it nor should make an effort to get it settled, there is an offence
of expiation."

45.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

By a nun means: by another nun.

Legal question means: there are four (kinds of) legal questions:

¹ Cf. Bi-Pc 23, Bi-Pc 34, Bi-Pc 77.

legal questions arising out of disputes legal questions arising out of
censure, legal questions arising out of transgressions, legal questions
arising out of obligations.¹

Do come, lady, and settle this legal question means: Do come,
lady, and decide this legal question.

If she is not afterwards prevented means: if there is not an
obstacle.²

Should neither settle it means: should not herself settle it.³

Nor should make an effort to get it settled means: should not
command another.⁴

If she thinks, "I will neither settle it nor make an effort to get
it settled," in throwing off the responsibility, there is an offence of
expiation.⁵

If she thinks that she is ordained when she is ordained (and)
neither settles a legal question nor makes an effort to get it settled,
there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether
she is ordained ... If she thinks that she is not ordained when she is
ordained ... offence of expiation. If she neither settles a legal question
nor makes an effort to get it settled for one who is not ordained, there
is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is ordained when
she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in
doubt as to whether she is not ordained ... If she thinks that she is
not ordained when she is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-
doing.⁶

There is no offence if there is an obstacle; if having looked about,
she does not get the chance⁷; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she
is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ = Vin 3.164 (BD 1.282). ² = above, BD 3.288. ³ = above, BD 3.288, BD 3.310.

⁴ = above, BD 3.288, BD 3.310. ⁵ = above, BD 3.288, BD 3.310. ⁶ Last clause should
probably read "no offence." ⁷ = above, BD 3.289, BD 3.310, and below, BD 3.336,
BD 3.355.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 46

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā gave with her own hand solid food and soft food to players and dancers ... (see **Bi-Pc 28.1**) ... "... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should give with her own hand solid food or soft food to a householder or to a wanderer or to a female wanderer, there is an offence of expiation."¹

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Householder means: ... (see **Bi-Pc 28.2**) ... she who has reached (the stage of a) female wanderer.

Solid food means: excluding the five (kinds of) meals and water for cleansing the teeth, the rest is called solid food.²

Soft food means: the five (kinds of) meals: cooked rice, food made with flour, barley-meal, fish, meat.³

Should give means: if she gives by means of the body or by means of something attached to the body or by means of something that may be cast, there is an offence of expiation.⁴ If she gives water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if she gets (someone) to give (but) does not (herself) give; if she gives depositing it near; if she gives ointment for external (use); if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.⁵

¹ Cf. Monks' **Bu-Pc 41**. ² = **Vin 4.92 (BD 2.349)** and cf. **Vin 4.83 (BD 2.330)**.

³ = **Vin 4.83, Vin 4.92**. For notes, see **BD 2.330**. ⁴ = **Vin 4.92**. ⁵ = **Vin 4.92**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 47

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā, not having given up her household robe,¹ made use of it. Other menstruating nuns did not obtain it. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā, not having given up her household robe, make use of it?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... makes use of it?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... make use of it? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, not having given up her household robe, should make use of it, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Household robe means: it is given with the words: 'Let menstruating nuns make use of it.'

Not having given up, should make use of it means: if, having made use of it for two or three days, having washed it on the fourth day, she makes use of it, not having given it up to a nun or to a probationer or to a female novice, there is an offence of expiation.

¹ *āvsathacīvara*; allowed to nuns at [Vin 2.271](#).

3:334 If she thinks that it is not given up when it is not given up (and) makes use of it, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether it is not given up ... If she thinks that it is given up when it is not given up ... offence of expiation. If she thinks that it is not given up when it is given up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is given up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is given up when it is given up, there is no offence.

47:2-3 There is no offence if, having given it up, she makes use of it; if she makes use of it on a further occasion; if there are no other menstruating nuns; if she is one whose robe is stolen; if she is one whose robe is destroyed; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

4:304

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 48

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā, not having given up her dwelling,¹ set out on almstour. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā's dwelling caught fire. Nuns spoke thus: "Come along, ladies, we are bringing out the things." Some spoke thus: "Ladies, we will not bring them out; she will make us responsible for² everything that is destroyed." The nun Thullanandā, having come back again to that dwelling, asked the nuns, saying: "Ladies, did you bring out my things?"

"We, lady, did not bring them out."

The nun Thullanandā ... spread it about, saying:

"How can these nuns, when a dwelling is on fire, not bring out the things?" Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the lady Thullanandā, not having given up her dwelling, set out on almstour?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... set out on almstour?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā, not having given up her dwelling, set out on almstour? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, not having given up her dwelling, should set out on almstour, there is an offence of expiation."³

¹ āvasatha. ² amhe abhiyujjissati. ³ The offence is not in not saving property and helping one another, but in not making proper provision for the cure of property.

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Dwelling means: it is called fastened by a door.¹

Not having given up, should set out on almstour means: if, not having given up to a nun or to a probationer or to a female novice, in passing beyond the enclosure of a dwelling that is fenced in, there is an offence of expiation. In passing beyond the precincts of a dwelling that is not fenced in, there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that it is not given up when it is not given up (and) sets out, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether it is not given up ... If she thinks that it is given up when it is not given up ... offence of expiation. If, not having given up what is not fastened by a door, she sets out, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is not given up when it is given up ... If she is in doubt as to whether it is given up, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that it is given up when it is given up, there is no offence.

There is no offence if she sets out having given it up; if there is an obstacle; if having looked about she does not get the chance; if she is ill; if there are accidents²; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. definition of “quarters,” *upassaya*, at [BD 3.312](#), above. ² Cf. above, [BD 3.289](#), [BD 3.310](#), [BD 3.323](#), [BD 3.331](#).

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 49

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns learnt worldly knowledge.¹ People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns learn worldly knowledge, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns learn worldly knowledge?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns learn worldly knowledge?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them saying:

"How, monks, can this group of six nuns learn worldly knowledge? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should learn worldly knowledge, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Worldly knowledge means: whatever is secular,² not connected with the goal.

¹ *tiracchāna-vijjā*, literally "animal wisdom." B.C. LAW, *History of Pali Literature* 1. p.75 has "art for her livelihood," but Old Commentary, does not bear this out. At *Vin* 2.139 it is a *dukkata* for a monk to learn this. Cf. *tiracchānakathā* at *Monks' Bu-Pc* 85, "worldly talk"—i.e., talk on matters concerning life in the world. *Vinaya Texts* iii.152 renders by "the low arts"—those set out at *DN* i.9–*DN* i.12. ² *bāhirakaṃ*.

Should learn means: if she learns by line,¹ for every line there is an offence of expiation. If she learns by syllable, for every syllable there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if she learns writing²; if she learns what is memorised³; if she learns a spell⁴ for protection; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *padena*; see **BD 2.190**, **BD 2.191** and notes. ² *lekham pariyāpuṇāti*. See *Vinaya Texts* i. p. xxxiiff. and **BD 1.131, n.** ³ *dhāraṇā*, a memorising; cf. *Mil* 79, and *dhammadhāraṇā* at *MN* ii.175. ⁴ *parittā*. Cf. *DN* iii.206, where monks are enjoined to learn and master the *Āṭānāṭiya rakkhā* or ward rune. This is called *atthasamhitā*, connected with the goal; cf. foregoing definition of “worldly knowledge,” which therefore looks as if it does not include protective spells. See *Dialogues of the Buddha* 3.185ff. for discussion of position and use of the various named *parittās* in early Buddhism. The proximity of writing (late?) and protective spells (early?) points to a patchwork compilation of this *Pācittiya*.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 50

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns taught worldly knowledge.¹ People ... spread it about ... (Bi-Pc 44.1. *Instead of learn read teach.*) ... “... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should teach² worldly knowledge, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Worldly knowledge means: ...

Should teach³ means: if she teaches by line ... (Bi-Pc 44.2. *Instead of learns read teaches.*) ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

The Fifth Division: that on a picture gallery

¹ At Vin 2.139 it is made a *dukkāṭa* for a monk to do so. ² *vāceyya*—i.e., should cause (someone) to repeat or speak. ³ Cf. Vin 4.15 (BD 2.192).

NUNS' EXPIATION (*PĀCITTIYA*) 51

51.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3:340 at that time several monks, (each) wearing (only) one robe, were making robes in a village residence. Nuns, having entered the monastery without asking (for permission), approached those monks. The monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can nuns enter a monastery without asking (for permission)?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ... without asking (for permission)?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns enter a monastery without asking (for permission)? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should enter a monastery without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for nuns came to be laid down by the lord.

51.2.1 Then these monks went out from that residence. The nuns, saying,
4:307 "The masters have gone out," did not go back to the monastery. Then these monks came back again to that residence. The nuns, saying, "The masters have come back," having entered the monastery asking (for permission), approached these monks, having approached, having greeted these monks, they stood at a respectful distance. As they were standing at a respectful distance, these monks spoke thus

to these nuns: “Why do you, sisters, neither sweep the monastery nor provide drinking water and water for washing?”

“Masters, a rule of training came to be laid down by the lord that, without asking (for permission) a monastery should not be entered (by a nun), therefore we did not come.” They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“I allow, monks, (a nun) to enter a monastery asking (for permission) if a monk be there. And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should enter a monastery without asking (for permission) if a monk be there,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”

And thus this rule of training for nuns came to be laid down by the lord.

Then these monks, having gone out from that residence, came back again to that residence. The nuns, saying, “The masters have gone out,” entered the monastery without asking (for permission). These became remorseful and said: “A rule of training laid down by the lord for nuns says that a monastery should not be entered (by a nun) without asking (for permission) if a monk be there, and we, not asking (for permission) if a monk was there, entered the monastery. Is it now possible that we have fallen into an offence of expiation?” They told this matter to the lord. He said: “And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“**Whatever nun should knowingly enter a monastery with monks (in it) without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation.**”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

She knows means: either she knows of herself or others tell her or these tell (her).²

A monastery with monks (in it) means: even where monks stay at the foot of a tree.

¹ Cf. Vin 4.100 (BD 2.365 and see n. 1). ² Cf. Vin 3.265 (BD 2.161), etc.

Should enter a monastery without asking (for permission)

means: without asking a monk or a novice or a monastery attendant (for permission),¹ in passing beyond the enclosure of a monastery that is fenced in, there is an offence of expiation. In entering the precincts of a monastery that is not fenced in, there is an offence of expiation.²

If she thinks that there are monks (in it) when there are monks (in it) and enters a monastery without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether monks are (in it) ... offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that monks are not (in it) when monks are (in it) ... no offence. If she thinks that monks are (in it) when monks are not (in it), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether monks are not (in it), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that monks are not (in it) when monks are not (in it), there is no offence.

There is no offence if she enters asking (for permission) if a monk be there; if she enters not asking (for permission) if a monk be not there³; if she walks looking ahead⁴; if she goes where there are nuns gathered together; if (her) way is through a monastery; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. Vin 4.40 (BD 2.241), and see Vin 2.211. ² Cf. Vin 4.166. ³ Cf. Vin 4.101 (BD 2.367). ⁴ Vin-a 937 says that there is no offence if she enters looking at the heads of the nuns who are entering first.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 52

... at Vesālī in the Great Grove at the Hall of the Gabled Pillars. Now at that time the venerable Kappitaka,¹ the venerable Upāli's preceptor,² lived in a cemetery. Now at that time an older³ nun of the group of six nuns had passed away. The group of six nuns, taking out that nun, having cremated her not far from the venerable Kappitaka's dwelling place, having made a tomb, having gone (there), wept at that tomb. Then the venerable Kappitaka, troubled by that noise, having destroyed that tomb, scattered (the materials). The group of six nuns took counsel,⁴ saying: "Our lady's tomb is destroyed by this Kappitaka, come, let us kill him." A certain nun told this matter to the venerable Upāli. The venerable Upāli told this matter to the venerable Kappitaka. Then the venerable Kappitaka, having gone out from that dwelling place, lay in hiding. Then the group of six nuns approached the venerable Kappitaka's dwelling place, having approached, having had the venerable Kappitaka's dwelling place covered over⁵ with stones and clods of earth, they departed, saying, "Kappitaka is dead." Then the venerable Kappitaka at the end of that night having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Vesālī for almsfood. The group of six nuns saw the venerable Kappitaka walking for almsfood; seeing him, they spoke thus: "This Kappitaka is alive, how ever did he foil our plan?"⁶ The group of six nuns heard it said: "Our plan was foiled by master Upāli."

¹ Cf. Pv 49–Pv 50. Vin-a 937, Pv-a 230 say that he was an elder among the thousand matted hair ascetics. ² Cf. Pv-a 230. ³ *mahatarā*, perhaps a leading nun. ⁴ *man-tesum*. Pali-English Dictionary says "perhaps 'plotted'" here. ⁵ *ottharāpetvā*; see BD 1.137, n. 4. ⁶ *mantam samharati*.

These reviled¹ the venerable Upāli, saying: “How can this barber,² a shampooing low-birth (person),³ foil our plan?” Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six nuns revile master Upāli?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns reviled Upāli?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can the group of six nuns revile Upāli? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should revile or should abuse a monk,⁴ there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Monk means: one who is ordained.

Should revile means: if she reviles with the ten ways of reviling⁵ or with any one of these, there is an offence of expiation.

Or should abuse means: if she makes him afraid,⁶ there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that he is ordained when he is ordained (and) reviles or abuses him, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether he is ordained ... If she thinks that he is not ordained when he is ordained ... offence of expiation. If she reviles or abuses one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that he is ordained when he is not ordained ... If she is in doubt as to whether he is not ordained ... If she thinks that he is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

¹ *akkosiṃsu*; see **BD 2.269** and **BD 2.171, n. 3**. ² *kasāvaṭa*; see *Psalms of the Brethren*. 168, *Tha-ap 37ff.*, and *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* 410 for view that Upāli was born a barber in this Buddha age. ³ *kasāvaṭo malamajjano nihīnajacco*; cf. *Ja 3.452 hīnajacco malamajjano nahāpita (putto)*. ⁴ Cf. the seventh of the eight important rules, *garudhammā*, given at **Vin 4.52 (BD 2.269)**, **BD 2.255**, **AN iv.277**. ⁵ See **BD 2.171, n. 3**. ⁶ *bhayaṃ upadaṃseti*, causes fear to appear.

There is no offence if she is aiming at (explaining) the goal, if she is aiming at (explaining) a rule, if she is aiming at (explaining) the teaching¹; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ = Vin 3.130 (BD 1.218) = Vin 4.11 (BD 2.185) = Vin 4.277 (above, BD 3.280).

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 53

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time¹ the nun Caṇḍakālī was one who made strife, who made quarrels, who made contention, who made brawls, who made disputes in the Order ... (see **Bi-Ss 4**) ... The nun Thullanandā, saying: "These are ignorant, these are inexperienced, they do not even know a (formal) act or the defect of a (formal) act or the failure of a (formal) act or the success of a (formal) act," and being quick tempered,² she abused³ a group. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the lady Thullanandā, being quick tempered, abuse a group?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā, being quick tempered, abused a group?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... abuse a group? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, being quick tempered, should abuse a group, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Being quick tempered means: she is called angry.⁴

¹ See Nuns' **Bi-Ss 4** above. ² *caṇḍikatā*. ³ *paribhāsati*; cf. **Bi-Pc 52**. ⁴ *kodhanā*; cf. **Vin 4:334**; Pv-a 83 *caṇḍī ti kodhanā*, and see definition at MN-a 2.99.

Group means: it is called an Order of nuns.¹

Should abuse² means: if she abuses, saying: “These are ignorant, these are inexperienced, they do not even know a (formal) act ... or the success of a (formal) act,” there is an offence of expiation. If she abuses several nuns or one nun or one who is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if she is aiming at (explaining) the goal ... (see **Bi-Pc 52.2.3**) ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ =above, **BD 3.295**. ² Cf. above, **BD 3.344**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 54

54.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3:348 at that time a certain brahmin, having invited nuns, offered them
4:311 food¹ ...” ...

“Whatever nun, being invited or being satisfied,² should eat or partake of solid food or soft food, there is an offence of expiation.”

54.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Being invited means: being invited to any one meal of the five (kinds of) meals.

Being satisfied means: eating is to be seen, a meal is to be seen, standing within a reach of the hand, she asks (her), a refusal is to be seen.³

Solid food means: setting aside the five (kinds of) meals, conjei,⁴ food (that may be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, the rest means solid food.⁵

Soft food means: the five (kinds of) meals: ... meat.⁶

¹ = Monks' Bu-Pc 35, first story; see BD 2.326f. The rule was amended for the monks but not for the nuns. ² The words are here changed to *nimantitā vā pavāritā vā* from *bhuttavi pavarita* of the story. This latter pair (in the masculine) appears in the monks' *sikkhāpada* (Bu-Pc 35); therefore the Old Commentary there defines *bhuttāvī*, having eaten, while above it defines *nimantitā*, being invited; but the terms used in these two definitions are the same. ³ = Monks' Bu-Pc 35.3.1. See BD 2.328ff. for notes. ⁴ This is omitted from corresponding paragraph in Monks' Bu-Pc 35. For conjei, *yāgu*, as being neither a solid food nor a soft food, see BD 2, Introduction, p. xxxi and BD 3.352f. It was counted rather as a drink, see “no offence” clause below. ⁵ = Monks' Bu-Pc 35.3.1. See BD 2.328ff. for notes. ⁶ = Monks' Bu-Pc 35.3.1. See BD 2.328ff. for notes.

If she accepts, thinking: “I will eat, I will partake of,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful, there is an offence of expiation.¹ If she accepts for the sake of nutriment (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful, there is an offence of wrong-doing.²

BD 3,3

There is no offence if, being invited (but) not being satisfied, she drinks conje; if she eats having asked the owner (for permission); if when there is a reason she makes use of (food to be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life³; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

Bi-Pc 5

Vin 4,3

¹ = Monks' Bu-Pc 35.3.1. See BD 2.328ff. for notes.

² = Monks' Bu-Pc 35.3.2.

³ = Monks' Bu-Pc 35.3.3.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 55

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain nun, walking for alms along a certain road in Sāvattḥī, approached a certain family; having approached, she sat down on an appointed seat. Then these people, having offered food to this nun, spoke thus: "Lady, other nuns may also come." Then this nun, thinking: "How may these nuns not come?" having approached the nuns, spoke thus: "Ladies, in such and such a place there are fierce dogs, a wild bull, the place is a swamp, do not go there." But a certain nun, walking for alms along that road, approached that family; having approached, she sat down on an appointed seat. Then these people, having offered food to that nun, spoke thus: "Why do not the other nuns come, lady?" Then this nun told this matter to those people. The people ... spread it about, saying: "How can that nun be grudging as to families?"¹ ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun was grudging as to families?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can a nun be grudging as to families? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should be one who is grudging as to families, there is an offence of expiation."

¹ Five forms of meanness, stinginess or grudgingness, macchhariya, are given at AN iii.139, AN iii.258, AN iii.266, AN iii.273, AN iv.459; DN iii.234; Ds 1122 (see *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, § 1122, n.); Vism 683.

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Family means: ... low caste family.¹

Should be one who is grudging as to families means: if they say, “Why do the nuns not come?” (and) she speaks dispraise of a family in front of nuns, there is an offence of expiation. Or if she speaks dispraise of nuns in front of a family, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if, not being grudging as to families, she merely explains that there is a danger²; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ = Vin 3.184, Vin 4.80, Vin 4.100, Vin 4.272. ² According to Vin-a 938 she either explains to the nuns that the family are non-believers, or she explains to the family that the nuns are of weak morality and of depraved states of mind.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 56

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time several nuns, having spent the rains in a village residence, went to Sāvattthī. Nuns spoke thus to these nuns: "Where did the ladies spend the rains? We hope that the exhortation was effective?"¹

"There were no monks there, ladies; how could the exhortation be effective?" Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can these nuns spend the rains in a residence where there is no monk?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nuns ... where there was no monk?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nuns ... where there is no monk? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should spend the rains in a residence where there is no monk, there is an offence of expiation."²

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

A residence where there is no monk means: it is not possible

¹ *iddha*, as at Vin 4.50, Vin 4.54. ² This rule is the same as the second of the eight "important rules," see BD 2.268.

to go for exhortation¹ or for communion.² If she thinks, “I will spend the rains,” (and) prepares a lodging, provides drinking water and water for washing, sweeps a cell, there is an offence of wrong-doing. With sunrise, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if monks, having entered on the rains settlement, come to have gone away or left the Order or done their time or gone over to (another) side; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.³

¹ Rules for exhortation in the eight “important rules” occur at Monks’ **Bu-Pc 21–Bu-Pc 24**. ² *saṁvāsa*. (To go) for communion explained at Vin-a 938 to mean (to go) for asking the (date of the) Observance day, *uposatha*, and the Invitation ceremony, *pavāraṇā*. See **BD 2.268** and n. 6, n. 8; also Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 57**; but also see definition of *saṁvāsa* at end of each *Pārājika* rule, and below, **BD 3.356**. ³ =above, **BD 3.190**, where see n. 3.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 57

57.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
3:354 that time several nuns, having kept the rains in a village residence,
went to Sāvattthī. Nuns spoke thus to these nuns: "Where did the
4:314 ladies keep the rains? Was an Order of monks 'invited'¹?"

"Ladies, we did not 'invite' an Order of monks." Those who were
modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns, having
spent the rains, not 'invite' an Order of monks?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ... did not 'invite' an Order
of monks?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns ... not 'invite' an Order of monks? It is not,
monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of
training:

**"Whatever nun, having kept the rains, should not 'invite' both
Orders in respect of three matters: what was seen or heard or sus-
pected, there is an offence of expiation."**²

57.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Having kept the rains means: having kept the first three months
or the last three months.³

If she thinks, "I will not 'invite' both Orders in respect of three

¹ *pavārito*, a technical term. See **BD 2.268, n. 8**. Regulations for nuns to hold the *pavāraṇā* ceremony, using the word *pavāreti*, given at **Vin 2.275**. Cf. also **Vin 1.161**.

² Cf. the fourth "important rule," **BD 2.268**. ³ Cf. definition of "during the rains,"
above, **BD 3.321**.

matters: what was seen or heard or suspected,” in throwing off the responsibility, there is an offence of expiation.

BD 3.33

There is no offence if there is an obstacle; if, having looked about, she does not get the chance; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.¹

Bi-Pc 5

¹ Cf. above, [BD 3.289](#), [BD 3.310](#), [BD 3.331](#), [BD 3.336](#); and below, [BD 3.376](#).

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 58

58.1.1
3.356 ... among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery. Now at that time¹ the group of six monks, having approached a nunnery, exhorted the group of six nuns. Nuns spoke thus to the group of six nuns: "Come, ladies, we will go for exhortation."

"Well, ladies, we would go for the sake of exhortation, (but) the group of the six masters exhort us, having come to this place itself." Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns not go for exhortation?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns do not go for exhortation?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

4.315 "How, monks, can the group of six nuns not go for exhortation? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should not go for exhortation or for communion, there is an offence of expiation."²

58.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Exhortation means: the eight important rules.³

Communion means: one (formal) act, one recitation, an equal

¹ Cf. Monks' Bu-Pc 23, where the offence is for a monk to exhort a nun in a nunnery except at a right time. Clearly the trend is for nuns to go to monks. Other regulations for exhortation set out at Vin 2.263ff. ² Cf. Vin 2.263; a nun who does not go for exhortation is to be dealt with according to the rule. ³ Cf. Monks' Bu-Pc 21–Bu-Pc 24.

training.¹ If she thinks, “I will not go for exhortation or for communion,” in throwing off the responsibility, there is an offence of expiation.

BD 3.33

There is no offence if there is an obstacle; if, having looked about for a nun as a companion, she does not get the chance; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.²

Bi-Pc 5

¹ Cf. Old Commentary’s explanation of *asamvāsa* in each *Pārājika* (BD.1), and definition of “ill nun” at [BD 2.278](#). ² = above, [BD 3.323](#), below, [BD 3.380](#), and cf. [BD 3.289](#), [BD 3.310](#), [BD 3.331](#), [BD 3.336](#).

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 59

59.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.358 at that time nuns neither asked (the date of) the Observance day¹
nor did they ask for exhortation. Monks ... spread it about, saying:
“How can these nuns neither ask (the date of) the Observance day
nor ask for exhortation?” ...

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns neither ... nor ask for exhortation?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can nuns neither ... nor ask for exhortation? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“Every half month a nun should desire two things from the Order of monks: the asking as to (the date of) the Observance day and the approaching for exhortation.² For her who transgresses this, there is an offence of expiation.”

59.2.1 **Every half month** means: every Observance day.³

Observance day means: the two Observance days, that on the fourteenth day and that on the fifteenth day.⁴

Exhortation means: the eight important rules.

If she thinks, “I will neither ask (the date of) the Observance day

¹ See Vin 1.105, where the lord is shown as prompting Kappina, and as saying that if brahmins do not honour the *uposatha*, who will? ² The third of the eight “important rules,” Vin 4.52; see BD 2.268. ³ =above, BD 3.44. ⁴ Cf. Vin 1.104, Vin 1.132.

nor ask for exhortation,” in throwing off the responsibility, ... (see [Bi-Pc 58.2.1](#)–[Bi-Pc 58.2.2](#)) ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 60

60.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
3:359 that time a certain nun together with a man, the one with the other, made a boil burst that had formed on the lower part of her body. Then that man began to violate that nun. She cried out in distress. Nuns, having run up, spoke thus to that nun: "Why do you, lady, cry out in distress?" Then that nun told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this nun together with a man, the one with the other, make a boil burst that had formed on the lower part of her body?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun ... lower part of her body?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can a nun ... lower part of her body? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, without having obtained permission from an Order or from a group, should together with a man, the one with the other, make a boil or a scab¹ that has formed on the lower part of her body burst or break or let it be washed or smeared or bound up or unbound,² there is an offence of expiation."

50.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Lower part of the body means: below the navel to above the circle of the knees.

3:360 **Has formed** means: has formed there.

¹ *rūhita*, a diseased growth, literally meaning "healed." ² *mocāpeyya*, in opposition to previous word, *bhandāpeyya*.

Boil means: whatever is a boil.

Scab means: whatever is a sore.

Without having obtained permission means: not asking (for permission).¹

Order means: it is called an Order of nuns.²

Group means: they are called several nuns.

Man means: a human man, not a *yakkha*, not a departed one, not an animal³; one who is learned, competent to violate.

Together with means: together.⁴

The one with the other means: there is a man and also a nun.⁵

If she commands, saying: “Burst it,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. When it is burst, there is an offence of expiation. If she commands, saying: “Break it ... wash it ... smear it ... bind it up ... unbind it,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. When it is broken ... washed ... smeared ... bound up ... unbound, there is an offence of expiation.

Vin 4.3

There is no offence if, having obtained permission, she causes it to be burst or broken ... or unbound; if some learned man (is there) as companion; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

Bi-Pc 6

The Sixth Division: that on a monastery

¹ =above, BD 3.184; cf. BD 3.193. ² =above, BD 3.184; cf. BD 3.193.

Vin 4.271. ⁴ =BD 1.202, BD 1.332, BD 1.337; Vin 4.269, Vin 4.271.

³ =Vin 4.269,

⁵ =Vin 4.269,

Vin 4.271.

NUNS' EXPIATION (*PĀCITTIYA*) 61

61.1.1 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.361 at that time nuns ordained¹ a pregnant woman. She walked for alms. People spoke thus: "Give almsfood to the lady, the lady is heavy with child." The people ... spread it about, saying: "How can the nuns ordain a pregnant woman?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying, "How can these nuns ordain a pregnant woman?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ordained a pregnant woman?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns ordain a pregnant woman? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should ordain a pregnant woman, there is an offence of expiation."

61.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Pregnant woman means: she is called entered by beings.²

Should ordain means: should confer the upasampada ordination.³

If she thinks: "I will ordain (her)" and looks about for a group or for a woman teacher or for a bowl or for a robe or if she determines a boundary, there is an offence of wrong-doing. As a result of the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing. As a result of two proclamations, there are offences of wrong-doing. At the end of the

¹ *vuṭṭhāpentī*. ² *āpannasattā*. ³ *upasampādeyya*.

proclamations, there is an offence of expiation for the woman preceptor, and an offence of wrong-doing for the group and for the woman teacher.¹

If she thinks that she is pregnant when she is pregnant (and) ordains her, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt ... offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not pregnant when she is pregnant, (and) ordains her, there is no offence. If she thinks that she is pregnant when she is not pregnant, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not pregnant, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not pregnant when she is not pregnant, there is no offence.

There is no offence if she ordains a pregnant woman thinking that she is not pregnant²; if she ordains a woman who is not pregnant thinking that she is not pregnant; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. above, **BD 3.13**, **BD 3.185**, for this passage. ² This has been said in the paragraph above.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 62

62.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3:363 at that time nuns ordained a woman giving suck. She walked for
alms. People spoke thus: "Give almsfood to the lady, the lady has a
companion."¹ The people ... spread it about, saying: "How can the
nuns ... (Bi-Pc 61.1, instead of pregnant woman read woman giving
suck) ..." "... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should ordain a woman giving suck, there is
an offence of expiation."

62.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Woman giving suck means: she is a mother or a foster-mother.

Should ordain means: ... (Bi-Pc 61.2. Read, If she thinks that she
is a woman giving suck when she is a woman giving suck; if she
thinks that she is not a woman giving suck, etc.) ... if she is the first
wrong-doer.

¹ *sadutiyaikā*, with a companion; cf. *dutiyaikā bhikkhunī* at Vin 4.230, Vin 4.315; and *porāṇa-dutiyaikā*, former wife.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 63

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns ordained a probationer who had not trained for two years in the six rules.¹ These² were ignorant, inexperienced, they did not know what was allowable or what was not allowable.³ Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns ordain a probationer who has not trained for two years in the six rules?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ... in the six rules?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these nuns ordain ... in the six rules? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ..." and having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to give a probationer the agreement as to training⁴ for two years in the six rules. And thus, monks, should it be given: That probationer, having approached the Order, having arranged her upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the nuns,⁵ having sat down on her haunches, having saluted

¹ Cf. the sixth of the eight "important rules," Vin 4.52, Vin 2.255. The six rules are given below. See also I.B. HORNER, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, 138ff. ² This refers to the probationers; one nun was enough to ordain a probationer, an Order or group not being necessary. The meaning here, and in similar passages below, is that several nuns each ordained one probationer. ³ As in Nuns' Bi-Pc 66, Bi-Pc 72. ⁴ *sikkhāsammuti*, occurring also in Nuns' Bi-Pc 66, Bi-Pc 72. Cf. other "agreements" at Vin 3.199, Vin 3.228, Vin 3.263, Vin 4.31, Vin 4.330.

with joined palms, should speak thus: ‘Ladies, I, so and so, a probationer, under the lady so and so, request the Order for the agreement as to training for two years in the six rules.’ And a second time it should be requested ... And a third time it should be requested. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: ‘Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This (woman) so and so, a probationer, under the lady so and so, requests the Order for the agreement as to training for two years in the six rules. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order give the probationer so and so the agreement as to training for two years in the six rules. This is the motion: Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This (woman) so and so ... requests ... for two years in the six rules. If the giving to the probationer so and so of the agreement as to training for two years in the six rules is pleasing to the ladies, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. The agreement as to training for two years in the six rules is given to the probationer so and so, and it is right ... So do I understand this.’”

That probationer should be told: “Speak thus: ‘I undertake for two years not to transgress the resolution of abstinence from onslaught on creatures; I undertake ... abstinence from taking what is not given ... abstinence from unchastity ... abstinence from lying ... abstinence from occasions for sloth (arising from) fermented liquor and spirits¹ and strong drink²; I undertake for two years not to transgress the resolution of abstinence from eating at the wrong time³.’”

Then the lord, having rebuked these nuns in many a figure for their weakness in maintaining themselves ... “... And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should ordain a probationer who has not train-

⁵ The word “senior” (*vuḍḍha*) which occurs in corresponding passages—e.g., in Monks’ *Nissaggiyas*, is rightly omitted here, for a probationer, being junior as regards ordination to all other nuns, should honour them all. ¹ See V.S. AGRAWALA, *Maireya in Pāṇini*, D.R. Bhandarkar Volume, 1940, p.291. ² Cf. DN iii.62; AN i.211f.; SN ii.68 for these five *sīlas*. ³ Cf. AN i.212, and Monks’ **Bu-Pc 37**.

ed for two years in the six rules, there is an offence of expiation.”¹

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Two years means: two years.²

Has not trained means: either the training is not given or the training is given (but) is interrupted.³

Should ordain means: ... (Bi-Pc 61.2.1) ... and an offence of wrongdoing for the group and for the woman teacher.

If she thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act (and) ordains her, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether it is a legally valid act ... If she thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is a legally valid act... offence of expiation. If she thinks that it is a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether it is not a legally valid act ... If she thinks that it is not a legally valid act when it is not a legally valid act, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁴

There is no offence if she ordains a probationer who has trained for two years in the six rules; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ The *upasampadā* ordination had to be conferred on nuns by monks as well as by nuns; see Vin 2.255, Vin 4.52; cf. Vin 2.257. The ordination proceedings are set out at Vin 2.271ff. ² *vassāni ... saṁvaccharāni*. The former is also more specifically the rains, but the exegesis under “has not trained” suggests that the training had to go on uninterruptedly for two full years and not merely for two rainy seasons. ³ *kupitā*, disturbed. ⁴ Last clause should probably read “no offence.”

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 64

64.1.1
3:367 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns ordained a probationer who had trained for two years in the six rules (but) who was not agreed upon by the Order.¹ Nuns spoke thus: "Come, probationers,² find out about this, give this, convey this, make this allowable." These spoke thus: "Ladies, we are not probationers, we are nuns." Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns ordain a probationer who has trained for two years in the six rules (but) who is not agreed upon by the Order?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ordained ... not agreed upon by the Order?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns ordain ... not agreed upon by the Order? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... and having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to give the agreement as to ordination³ to a probationer who has trained for two years in the six rules. And thus, monks, should it be given: That probationer who has trained for two years in the six rules, having approached the Order ... (Bi-Pc 63.1) ... should speak thus: 'Ladies, I, so and so, a probationer who has trained

4:321

¹ See previous Bi-Pc 63 where in order to carry out the training as to have a legal right to be ordained, a probationer had to receive the agreement of the Order.

² Note use of plural here, and cf. previous and following Pācittiyas: also Bi-Pc 73.

³ *vuṭṭhānasammuti*. See above, BD 3:364, for other "agreements."

for two years in the six rules under the lady so and so, request the Order for the agreement as to ordination.’ And a second time ... (Bi-Pc 63.1 *instead of* probationer *read* probationer who has trained for two years in the six rules *instead of* agreement as to training for two years in the six rules *read* agreement as to ordination.) ... So do I understand this.’”

Then the lord, having rebuked the nuns in many a figure for their weakness in maintaining themselves ... “... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should ordain a probationer who has trained for two years in the six rules (but) who is not agreed upon by the Order,¹ there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Two years means: two years.²

Has trained means: has trained in the six rules.³

Not agreed upon means: the agreement as to ordination is not given by a (formal) act at which the motion is followed by one proclamation.⁴

Should ordain means: ... (Bi-Pc 61.2.1) ...

There is no offence if she ordains a probationer who has trained for two years in the six rules and who is agreed upon by the Order; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ The probationer has to get the agreement, but the nuns have to abide by it. ² As above, BD 3.366. ³ =below, BD 3.374, BD 3.383. ⁴ =below, BD 3.374, BD 3.383. On *ñattidutiya kammās* see Vin 1.319, and on *Saṅghakammās* (formal acts) generally, S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, 146ff.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 65

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns ordained a girl¹ married for less than twelve years.² These³ were not able to endure cold, heat, hunger, thirst, contact with gadflies, mosquitoes, wind and sun, creeping things, abusive hurtful language; they were not able to endure bodily feelings which arising are painful, acute, sharp, shooting, disagreeable, miserable, deadly.⁴ Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can nuns ordain a girl married for less than twelve years?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ordained ... married for less than twelve years?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns ordain a girl married for less than twelve years? Monks, a girl married for less than twelve years is not able to endure cold ... bodily feelings ... miserable, deadly. It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should ordain a girl married for less than twelve years, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Less than twelve years means: not attained to twelve years.⁵

¹ *gihigatā*, one gone to a layman (as his wife or co-wife). ² See **BD 3, Introduction, p. xlix**, and I.B. HORNER, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p. 27ff. ³ As in previous *Pācittiyas*, plural used here, meaning that an indefinite number of nuns had each ordained a "married girl," or child-wife. ⁴ Cf. Monks' **Bu-Pc 65.1**, that in which monks are forbidden to ordain a man under twenty. ⁵ Cf. above, **BD 3.13**.

Girl married means: one cohabiting with a man.¹

Should ordain means: ... (Bi-Pc 61.2.1) ... and an offence of wrong-doing for the group and for the woman teacher.

If she thinks that it is less than twelve years when it is less than twelve years (and) ordains her, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether it is less than twelve years ... offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that twelve years are completed when it is less than twelve years ... no offence. If she thinks that it is less than twelve years when twelve years are completed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether twelve years are completed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that twelve years are completed when twelve years are completed, there is no offence.²

There is no offence if she ordains one (married) for less than twelve years thinking that twelve years are completed; if she ordains one who has completed twelve years thinking that they are completed³; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *purisantaragatā*. This is the definition of *itthi*, woman, at MN-a 2.209; DN-a 78. Cf. Ja 1.290; MN i.77; AN i.295, AN ii.206. ² Cf. above, BD 3.13. ³ This occurs in the preceding paragraph.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 66

66.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3:371 at that time nuns ordained a girl married for full twelve years (but) who had not trained for two years in the six rules. These were ignorant, inexperienced, they did not know what was allowable or what was not allowable.¹ Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns ordain a girl married for full twelve years (but) who has not trained for two years in the six rules?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks ...?" ...

The enlightened one, the lord rebuked them, saying: "How, monks, can these nuns ordain ... in the six rules? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ..." and having rebuked them, having
4:323 given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to give a girl married for full twelve years the agreement as to training for two years in the six rules. And thus, monks, should it be given: That girl married for full twelve years, having approached the Order ... (Bi-Pc 63.1) ... should speak thus: 'Ladies, I, so and so, a girl married for full twelve years, and who am under the lady so and so, request the Order ... (Bi-Pc 63.1. *Instead of probationer read a girl married for full twelve years*) ... So do I understand this.' That girl married for full twelve years should be told: 'Speak thus: ... (Bi-Pc 63.1) ...' " ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should ordain a girl married for full twelve years (but) who has not trained for two years in the six rules, there is an offence of expiation."

¹ For the whole of this Pācittiya, cf. Bi-Pc 63.

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Full twelve years means: attained to twelve years.¹

Girl married means: one cohabiting with a man.²

Two years means: ...

There is no offence if she ordains a girl married for full twelve years and who has trained for two years in the six rules; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ =below, **BD 3.374**. ² As in **Bi-Pc 65**, **Bi-Pc 67**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 67

67.1.1
3.373 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns ordained a girl married for full twelve years and who had trained for two years in the six rules, but who was not agreed upon by the Order. Nuns spoke thus: "Come, probationers, ... (Bi-Pc 64.1) ..." ... "How can these nuns ordain a girl married for full twelve years and who has trained for two years in the six rules, but who is not agreed upon by the Order?" ... he addressed the monks, saying:

4.324 "I allow you, monks, to give the agreement as to ordination to a girl married for full twelve years and who has trained for two years in the six rules. And thus, monks, should it be given: That girl married for full twelve years and who has trained for two years in the six rules, having approached the Order ... (Bi-Pc 63.1) ... should speak thus: 'Ladies, I, so and so, a girl married for full twelve years and who has trained under the lady so and so for two years in the six rules, request the Order for the agreement as to ordination.' And a second time ... (Bi-Pc 63.1. *Instead of probationer read girl married for full twelve years and who has trained for two years in the six rules; instead of agreement as to training for two years in the six rules read agreement as to ordination*) ... 'So do I understand this.'"

Then the lord, having rebuked these nuns in many a figure for their weakness in maintaining themselves ... "... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should ordain a girl married for full twelve years and who has trained for two years in the six rules (but) who is not agreed upon by the Order, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Full twelve years means: attained to twelve years.¹

Girl married means: one cohabiting with a man.²

Two years means: two years.³

Has trained upon means: has trained in the six rules.⁴

Not agreed upon means: the agreement as to ordination is not given by a (formal) act at which the motion is followed by one proclamation.⁵

Should ordain means: ... (Bi-Pc 61.2.1) ...

There is no offence if she ordains a girl married for full twelve years who has trained for two years in the six rules and who is agreed upon by the Order; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ = above, BD 3.372. ² = above, BD 3.370, BD 3.372. ³ = above, BD 3.366, BD 3.368.

⁴ = above, BD 3.368, below, BD 3.383. ⁵ = above, BD 3.368, below, BD 3.383.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 68

68.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3:375 at that time the nun Thullanandā, having ordained the woman who
lived with her,¹ for two years neither helped her nor had her helped.
These² were ignorant, inexperienced, they did not know what was
allowable or what was not allowable. Those who were modest nuns
... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā, having
4:325 ordained the woman who lives with her, for two years neither help
her nor have her helped?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... nor had
her helped?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks,
how can the nun Thullanandā ... nor have her helped? It is not, monks,
for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

**"Whatever nun, having ordained the woman who lives with
her, for two years should neither help her nor have her helped,
there is an offence of expiation."**

58.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Woman who lives with her means: she is called the one who
shares her cell.³

Having ordained means: having conferred the *upasampada* or-
dination.

¹ Cf. above, BD 3.309, below, BD 3.379. ² This must mean that at least for more than
one year Thullanandā had ordained her *sahajivinīs*. ³ =above, BD 3.309.

Two years means: two years.¹

Should neither help her means: should not herself help her in regard to the exposition, the interrogation,² the exhortation, the instruction.³

Nor should have her helped means: should not command another.

If for two years she thinks: "I will neither help her nor have her helped," in throwing off the responsibility, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if there is an obstacle; if having looked about she does not get the chance; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.⁴

¹ =above, BD 3.366, BD 3.368, BD 3.374. ² Cf. BD 2.94, BD 2.271. ³ *anusāsanī*. Cf. Vin 1.50 for repetition of these four words. ⁴ Cf. above, BD 3.289, BD 3.310, BD 3.331, BD 3.336, BD 3.355.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 69

69.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
3.377 that time nuns for two years did not wait upon an ordained woman
instructor.¹ These² were ignorant, inexperienced, they did not know
what was allowable or what was not allowable. Those who were mod-
est nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns for two
years not wait upon an ordained woman instructor?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ... woman instructor

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

4.326 "How, monks, can nuns ... ordained woman instructor? It is not,
monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of
training:

"**Whatever nun for two years should not wait upon an ordained
woman instructor, there is an offence of expiation.**"

69.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Ordained means: the *upasampadā*, ordination conferred.

Woman instructor means: she is called a woman preceptor.³

3.378 ¹ *pavattinī*, or proposer—i.e., for a nun on whom the *upasampada* ordination is being conferred, as at [Vin 2.271](#). ² Doubtless here referring to the nuns. ³ *upajjhā*. The first sentence of n. 1 at *Vinaya Texts* iii.351 must therefore be corrected; also *upajjhā* occurs twice at [Vin 3.35](#). The word (*upajjhā*) at [Vin 3.100](#) is obviously a shortened plural form of the regular masculine *upajjhāya*, for see [Vin 3.101 = Bi-Pc 69.2.1](#) which contains two stories about two (different) *upajjhāya*. *Pali-English Dictionary* is probably right in giving both *upajjha*, short masculine, as at [Vin 1.94](#) and doubtless once at [Vin 3.35](#); and *upajjhā*, feminine, as in above explanation of *pavattinī* and in the "no offence" clause, and doubtless once at [Vin 3.35](#).

Two years means: two years.

Should not wait upon means: should not herself attend upon.¹

If she thinks: "I will not wait upon her for two years," in throwing off the responsibility, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if the woman preceptor is ignorant or shameless; if he is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

Bi-Pc 6

¹ According to Vin-a 941, with soap-powder, toothpick, water for rinsing the mouth, and with whatever was to be done. Cf. **Bi-Pc 88** below.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 70

70.1.1
3.379 ... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā, having ordained (the woman) who lived with her,¹ neither withdrew² her nor had her withdrawn; her husband seized her. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā, having ordained (the woman) who lives with her, neither withdraw her nor have her withdrawn? Her husband seized her. If this nun had departed her husband could not have seized her." ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... nor had her withdrawn (so that) her husband seized her?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... nor have her withdrawn (so that) her husband seized her? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having ordained (the woman) who lives with her, should neither withdraw her nor have her withdrawn even to (a distance of) five or six *yojanas*, there is an offence of expiation."

70.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

(Woman) who lives with her means: she is called the one who shares her cell.³

¹ Cf. above, BD 3.309, BD 3.375. ² *vūpakāsesi*, to withdraw, seclude, alienate—i.e., from the haunts of men. ³ Cf. above, BD 3.309, BD 3.375.

Having ordained means: having conferred the upasampadā ordination.¹

Should neither withdraw her² means: should not herself withdraw her.

Nor should have her withdrawn means: should not command another.

If she thinks: “I will neither withdraw her nor will I have her withdrawn even to (a distance of) five or six *yojanas*,” in throwing off the responsibility, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if there is an obstacle; if, having looked about for a nun as a companion, she does not get the chance; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.³

¹ Cf. above, [BD 3.361](#), [BD 3.375](#). ² Vin-a 941, “if having taken her, she should not go away.” ³ Cf. above, [BD 3.323](#), [BD 3.331](#), [BD 3.336](#), [BD 3.355](#), [BD 3.357](#).

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 71

71.1.1
3.381 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns ordained a maiden¹ who was under twenty years of age. These were unable to endure cold ... (Bi-Pc 65. *Instead of a girl married for less than full twelve years read a maiden who is under twenty years of age; instead of for full twelve years read twenty years of age.*) ... “... this rule of training:

“**Whatever nun should ordain a maiden under twenty years of age, there is an offence of expiation.**”

71.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Under twenty years of age means: not attained to twenty years of age.²

Maiden means: she is called a female novice.

Should ordain means: ... (Bi-Pc 65.2. *Read who is under twenty years of age, who has completed twenty years of age.*) ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *kumāribhūtā*, probably a virgin. See BD 3, Introduction, p. xlix. Vin-a 942 says that if the agreement as to training has been given to a married girl in her tenth year of marriage, she may be ordained in her twelfth; and likewise receiving the agreement up to her eighteenth year of marriage she may be ordained in her twentieth. From a woman's eighteenth year on, according to her marriage or age, one may say, “This is a married girl” and “This is a maiden.” But a maiden is not to be called a married girl. For the eighteenth year, see next *Pācittiya*. ² = Vin 4.130.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 72

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns ordained a maiden who had completed twenty years of age (but) who had not trained for two years in the six rules. These were ignorant, inexperienced ... (Bi-Pc 66.1. *Instead of a girl married for full twelve years read a maiden who has completed twenty years of age.*) ... he addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to give a maiden of eighteen years of age the agreement as to training for two years in the six rules. And thus, monks, should it be given: That maiden of eighteen years of age having approached the Order ...” (Bi-Pc 66.1. *Instead of a girl married for full twelve years read a maiden of eighteen years of age.*) ... “... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should ordain a maiden who has completed twenty years of age (but) who has not trained for two years in the six rules, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Has completed twenty years of age means: has attained to twenty years of age.

Maiden means: she is called a female novice.

Two years means: ... (Bi-Pc 63.2) ...

There is no offence if she ordains a maiden who has completed twenty years of age and who has trained for two years in the six rules; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

Bi-Pc 7

BD 3:38

Vin 4:3

Bi-Pc 7

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 73

73.1.1
3.383 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns ordained a maiden who had completed twenty years of age and who had trained for two years in the six rules (but) who was not agreed upon by the Order. Nuns spoke thus: "Come, probationers, find out about this, give this, convey this, this is needed, make this allowable." These spoke thus: "Ladies, we are not probationers, we are nuns." Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns ..." (Bi-Pc 67.1. *Instead of a girl married for full twelve years read a maiden who has completed twenty years of age.*) ... "... this rule of training:

4.329 "Whatever nun should ordain a maiden who has completed twenty years of age and who has trained for two years in the six rules (but) who is not agreed upon by the Order, there is an offence of expiation."

73.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Completed twenty years of age means: attained to twenty years of age.

Maiden means: she is called a female novice.¹

Two years means: two years.²

Has trained means: has trained in the six rules.³

Not agreed upon means: the agreement as to ordination is not

¹ = above, BD 3.381, BD 3.382. ² = above, BD 3.366, BD 3.368, BD 3.374, BD 3.375, BD 3.378. ³ = above, BD 3.368, BD 3.374.

given by a (formal) act at which the motion is followed by one proclamation.¹

Should ordain means: ... (Bi-Pc 63.2) ...

There is no offence if she ordains a maiden who has completed twenty years of age, who has trained for two years in the six rules and who is agreed upon by the Order; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ =above, BD 3.368, BD 3.374.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 74

74.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
3:384 that time nuns ordained while they were less than twelve years (of standing).¹ They were ignorant, inexperienced, they did not know what was allowable or what was not allowable; moreover, the women who shared their cells were ignorant, inexperienced, they did not know what was allowable or what was not allowable. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns ordain while they are less than twelve years (of standing)?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ... less than twelve years (of standing)?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns ... less than twelve years (of standing)? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should ordain while she is less than twelve years (of standing) there is an offence of expiation."

74.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Less than twelve years means: not attained to twelve years.

Should ordain means: ... (Bi-Pc 61.2.1) ... offence of wrong-doing for the group and for the woman teacher.

74.2.2 ¹ *ūnadvādasavassā*, probably to be taken as nominative plural agreeing with *bhikkhuniyo*, and meaning less than twelve years from their own ordination. See next two *Pācittiyas*, and **BD 3, Introduction, p. lii**.

There is no offence if she ordains when she has completed twelve years (of standing); if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 75

75.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.385 at that time nuns ordained when they had completed twelve years
(of standing but) were not agreed upon by the Order. They were
ignorant ... (Bi-Pc 74.1. *Instead of less than twelve years (of standing)
read when they have completed twelve years (of standing but) are
not agreed upon by the Order.*) ... "... It is not, monks, for pleasing
those who are not (yet) pleased ..." and having rebuked them, having
given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to give a nun who has completed twelve years
(of standing) the agreement to ordain.¹ And thus, monks, should it
be given: That nun who has completed twelve years (of standing),
having approached the Order, having arranged her upper robe over
one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior nuns, having
sat down on her haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should
speak thus to it: 'Ladies, I, so and so, a nun who has completed twelve
years (of standing), request the Order for the agreement to ordain.'
And a second time it should be requested ... And a third time it should
be requested. This nun should be tested² by the Order thinking: 'This
nun is experienced, she is conscientious.' If she is both ignorant³
and unconscientious it should not be given. If she is ignorant but
conscientious it should not be given. If she is experienced but un-
conscientious, it should not be given. If she is both experienced and

3.386
¹ *vuṭṭhāpana-sammuti*, to cause ordination (in another). ² *paricchitabbā*. Cf. *paricchitvā* in next *Pācittiya* Vin-a 942 explains *upaparikkhati*, to test, examine, investigate. Apparently the Order, in testing her, should do so with a view to her experience and conscientiousness. ³ *bālā*, apparently here as opposite of *byattā*, experienced.

conscientious, it should be given. And thus, monks, should it be given: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: ‘Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This nun so and so who has completed twelve years (of standing) requests the Order for the agreement to ordain. If it seems right to the Order ... (cf. **Bi-Pc 63.1**, etc.) ... So do I understand this.’”

Then the lord, having rebuked the nuns in many a figure for their weakness in maintaining themselves ... “... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun who has completed twelve years (of standing but) who is not agreed upon by the Order should ordain, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Completed twelve years means: attained to twelve years.

Not agreed upon means: the agreement to ordain is not given by a (formal) act at which the motion is followed by one proclamation.¹

Should ordain means: ... (**Bi-Pc 63.2**) ...

There is no offence if she ordains when she has completed twelve years (of standing) and is agreed upon by the Order; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. above, **BD 3.368**, **BD 3.374**, **BD 3.383**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 76

76.1.1
3.387 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Caṇḍakālī, having approached the Order of nuns, asked for the agreement to ordain. Then the Order of nuns, having tested¹ the nun Caṇḍakālī, saying: "You have ordained sufficiently, lady, for the time being,"² did not give her the agreement to ordain. The nun Caṇḍakālī answered, "Very good." Now at that time the Order of nuns gave the agreement to ordain to other nuns. The nun Caṇḍakālī ... spread it about, saying: "Am I then ignorant, am I then unconscientious,³ that the Order gives the agreement to ordain to other nuns, but does not give it to me?" Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

"How can the lady Caṇḍakālī, on being told, 'You have ordained sufficiently, lady, for the time being,' and having answered, 'Very good,' afterwards engage in criticism?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Caṇḍakālī ... afterwards engaged in criticism⁴?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can the nun Caṇḍakālī ... afterwards engage in criticism? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, on being told, 'You have ordained sufficiently,

3.388
¹ *paricchitvā*; cf. previous Pācittiya. ² *alam tāva te ayye vuṭṭhāpitenā*, or "please stop ordaining," or "there is no need for you to ordain at present." Cf. *alam te idhavāsenā* at Vin 3.184. ³ The two points on which nuns had to be tested according to the previous Pācittiya. ⁴ See above, BD 3.59, BD 3.64, and notes.

lady, for the time being,' and having answered, 'very good,' should afterwards engage in criticism, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

"You have ordained sufficiently, lady, for the time being" means: "You have conferred the *upasampadā*,¹ sufficiently, lady, for the time being."

If, having answered, "Very good," she afterwards engages in criticism, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if she criticises one acting by nature from desire, from hatred, from confusion, from fear²; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ At **Bi-Pc 79** below, Caṇḍakālī is called a probationer, and was ordained by Thullanandā. ² Cf. above, **BD 3.66**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 77

77.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3:389 at that time a certain probationer, having approached the nun Thullanandā, asked for the *upasampadā* ordination. The nun Thullanandā, having said to that probationer, "If you, lady, will give me a robe, then will I ordain you," neither ordained her nor made an effort to get her ordained.¹ Then that probationer told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā, having said ... neither ordain her nor make an effort to get her ordained?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ... nor made an effort to get her ordained?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ... nor make an effort to get her ordained? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having said to a probationer: 'If you, lady, will give me a robe, then will I ordain you,' (yet) if she is not afterwards prevented, should neither ordain her nor should make an effort to get her ordained, there is an offence of expiation."

77.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Probationer means: one who has trained for two years in the six rules.

¹ Cf. Bi-Pc 23, Bi-Pc 34, Bi-Pc 45.

‘If you, lady, will give me a robe, then will I ordain you’ means: then will I confer the *upasampadā* ordination on you.

BD 3.30

If she is not afterwards prevented means: if there is not an obstacle.

Should neither ordain her means: should not herself ordain her.

Nor should make an effort to get her ordained means : should not command another.

If she thinks, “I will neither ordain her nor make an effort to get her ordained,” in throwing off the responsibility, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if there is an obstacle; if, having looked about, she does not get the chance; if she is ill; if there are accidents¹; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer. .

Bi-Pc 7

Vin 4.3

¹ Cf. above, BD 3.289, BD 3.310, BD 3.331.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 78

78.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now
3.391 at that time a certain probationer, having approached the nun Thullanandā, asked for the *upasampadā*, ordination. The nun Thullanandā spoke thus to that probationer: "If you, lady, will wait upon me for two years, then will I ordain you," and having said (this) ... (see Bi-Pc 77.1) ... "... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having said to a probationer: 'If you, lady, will wait upon me for two years, then will I ordain you,' (yet) if she is not afterwards prevented, should neither ordain her nor should make an effort to get her ordained, there is an offence of expiation."

78.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Probationer means: one who has trained for two years in the six rules.

'If you, lady, will wait upon me for two years' means: if you will attend upon me for two years.¹

'Then will I ordain you,' means: then will I confer the *upasampada*, ordination on you.

If she is not afterwards prevented means: ... (see Bi-Pc 77.2) ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. above, BD 3.378.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 79

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā ordained the probationer Caṇḍakalī who kept company with men, who kept company with youths, who was violent,¹ a dwelling-place of grief.² Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying:

“How can the lady Thullanandā ordain ... grief?”

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ordained ... grief?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can the nun Thullanandā ordain ... grief? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should ordain a probationer who keeps company with men, who keeps company with youths, who is violent, a dwelling-place of grief, there is an offence of expiation.”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Man means: one attained to twenty years of age.

Youth means: one not attained to twenty years of age.

Keeps company means: keeps company unbecomingly as to body and speech.³

Violent⁴ means: she is called angry.

¹ caṇḍī. ² sokāvāsā. ³ Cf. above, BD 3.208, BD 3.315. ⁴ Cf. above, BD 3.346, where same definition of caṇḍikatā, “quick-tempered.”

Dwelling-place of grief means: she arouses sorrow in others, she enters upon grief.

Probationer means: one who has trained for two years in the six rules.

Should ordain means: ... (see **Bi-Pc 61.2**) ... and an offence of wrong-doing for the group and for the woman teacher.¹

There is no offence if she ordains her not knowing; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Cf. above, **BD 3.13**, **BD 3.185**, **BD 3.361**.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 80

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā ordained a probationer without the consent of the parents and husband. The parents and the husband ... spread it about, saying : "How can the lady Thullanandā ordain the probationer without our consent?" Nuns heard the parents and the husband who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying : "How can the lady Thullanandā ordain a probationer without the consent of the parents and husband?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ordained ... and husband?" "It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can the nun Thullanandā ordain a probationer ... and husband? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should ordain a probationer without the consent of the parents and husband, there is an offence of expiation."¹

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Parents means: they are called the progenitors.

Husband means: he to whom she is married.²

Without the consent means: not asking (for permission).

Probationer means: one who has trained for two years in the six rules.

¹ The twenty-second of the twenty-four questions to be put to a nun at her ordination was whether she had her parents' and husband's consent, *Vin 2.271*. ² *yena pariggahitā hoti*, by whom she is possessed or appropriated.

Should ordain means: ... (see **Bi-Pc 61.2**) ... and an offence of wrong-doing for the group and for the woman teacher.

30.2.2

There is no offence if she ordains her not knowing; if she ordains her, (she) having obtained permission; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 81

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. Now at that time the nun Thullanandā thinking: "I will ordain a probationer," having had monks who were elders convened, having seen sumptuous solid foods and soft foods, saying: "Masters, I will not ordain the probationer yet," having dismissed the monks who were elders, having had Devadatta, Kokālika, Kaṭamorakatissaka, the son of the lady Khaṇḍā and Samuddadatta¹ convened, she ordained the probationer. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can the lady Thullanandā ordain a probationer by showing² favouritism³ to (monks) placed on probation⁴?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the nun Thullanandā ordained a probationer by showing favouritism to (monks) placed on probation?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can the nun Thullanandā ... (monks) placed on probation? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should ordain a probationer by showing favouritism to (monks) placed on probation, there is an offence of expi-

¹ Schismatic monks; cf. Monks' Bu-Ss 10, Bu-Ss 11. At Vin 4.66 Thullanandā says that these five were *mahānaḡā* (great heroes) to her. ² Literally giving, *dāna*.

³ *chanda*; as at Vin 4.38 (BD 2.235). ⁴ *pārivāsikā bhikkhū*. Cf. Vin 1.136; and Vin 2.31ff., where in Kd 12, Kd 13 the rules for monks under probation are discussed at length. The "four months' probation" is described at Vin 1.69, three other types in Kd 13. Four still further kinds given at Vin-a 943f. See also S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.168.

ation.”

81.2.1
3:397
4:336

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

By showing favouritism to (monks) placed on probation
means: to a company that has risen.¹

Probationer means: ... (Bi-Pc 80.2) ... and an offence of wrongdoing for the group and for the woman teacher.

81.2.2

There is no offence if she ordains her if the company has not risen; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *vuṭṭhitāya parisāya*. Cf. Vin 1.136, where it is said that *uposatha* should not be held by (accepting) the declaration of purity of (a monk) placed on probation except if the company has not (yet) risen “Has risen” would here seem to apply to monks considered not fit to carry out the various formal acts in a seated assembly of monks.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 82

... At Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns ordained every year; there were not sufficient dwellings. People ... spread it about saying: "How can these nuns ordain every year? There are not sufficient dwellings." Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns ordain every year?" ...

"Is it true, as it is said, monks, that nuns ordain every year?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns ordain every year? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of raining:

"Whatever nun should ordain every year, there is an offence of expiation."¹

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Every year means: annually.²

Should ordain means: ... and an offence of wrong-doing for the group and for the woman teacher.

There is no offence if she ordains in the alternate (years); if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Quoted MN-a 3.156 ² *anuvassan ti anusamvaccharaṃ.*

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 83

83.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
3.399 that time nuns ordained two (probationers) in the one year.¹ As be-
4.337 fore,² there were not sufficient dwellings. As before³ people ... spread
it about, saying: "How can these nuns ordain two (probationers) in
one year? As before, there are not sufficient dwellings." Nuns heard
these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ...
spread it about, saying: ... (cf. Bi-Pc 82.1) "... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should ordain two (probationers) in one year, there is an offence of expiation."

83.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

One year means: one year.⁴

Should ordain two (probationers) means: should confer the *upasampadā* ordination on two (probationers).

If she thinks: "I will ordain two (probationers)," and looks about for a group or ... (Bi-Pc 61.2) ... there is an offence of wrong-doing for the group and for the woman teacher.

33.2.2 There is no offence if she ordains in alternate years⁵; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

*The Eighth Division: that on a maiden.*⁶

¹ Vin-a 945 says "she ordained two (probationers) in one year in alternate years."

² *tath'eva*—i.e., in Bi-Pc 82. ³ *tath'eva*—i.e., in Bi-Pc 82. ⁴ *ekavassan ti ekaṃ saṃvaccharaṃ*.

⁵ Nothing to show whether the notion of "two (probationers)" is dropped here or not. ⁶ N.B. thirteen *Pācittiyas* in this Division, and also in the next.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 84

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns used sunshades and sandals. People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns use sunshades and sandals, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns use sunshades and sandals?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks ... and sandals?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can ... and sandals? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should use a sunshade and sandals, there is an offence of expiation."

And thus this rule of training for nuns came to be laid down by the lord.

At that time a certain nun came to be ill; there was no comfort for her without a sunshade and sandals. They told this matter to the lord. He said: "Monks, I allow a sunshade and sandals to a nun who is ill. And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

"Whatever nun who is not ill should use a sunshade and sandals, there is an offence of expiation."¹

¹ Cf. Bu-Sk 57, Bu-Sk 62.

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Who is not ill means: for whom there is comfort without a sunshade and sandals.

Who is ill means: for whom there is not comfort without a sunshade and sandals.

Sunshade means: there are three (kinds of) sunshade: white sunshade, sunshade of rushes, sunshade of leaves, fastened at the middle, fastened to the rim.¹

Should use means: if she uses (them) even once, there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that she is not ill when she is not ill (and) uses a sunshade and sandals, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not ill ... If she thinks that she is ill when she is not ill ... offence of expiation. If she uses a sunshade (but) not sandals, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she uses sandals (but) not a sunshade, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is not ill when she is ill ... If she is in doubt as to whether she is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is ill when she is ill, there is no offence.

There is no offence if she is ill; if she uses (them) in a monastery, in monastery precincts²; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ = Vin 4.200. N.B. sandals, *upāhana*, not defined by Old Commentary. ² At Vin 2.13of. regulations for monks using sunshades are: (1) sunshades allowed; (2) whoever uses one, offence of wrong-doing; (3) allowed for an ill monk; (4) allowed to be used by a monk whether ill or not ill in a monastery or monastery precincts. At Vin 2.207 it is said that incoming monks on entering the monastery should put down their sunshades—as a sign of respect.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 85

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns went¹ in a vehicle.² People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns go in a vehicle, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns go in a vehicle?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns went in a vehicle?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can this group of six nuns go in a vehicle? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should go in a vehicle, there is an offence of expiation."³

And thus this rule of training for nuns came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time a certain nun came to be ill. She was not able to

¹ *yāyanti*. GEIGER, *Pali Literature und Sprache*, §138, gives "geht", which seems more suitable than "have themselves earned" (*Vinaya Texts* ii.25), for "go" covers both driving and being carried in the vehicles mentioned by the Old Commentary. ² *yāna*; see note at **BD 1.81**. ³ A *dukkāṭa* for monks at **Vin 1.191**; at **Vin 2.276** it is said that nuns going in a vehicle "should be dealt with according to the rule"—i.e., this *Pācittiya*. Cf. **Bu-Sk 63**.

3,403 go on foot. They told this matter to the lord. He said: "I allow, monks, a vehicle for a nun who is ill.¹ And thus, monks ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun who is not ill should go in a vehicle, there is an offence of expiation."

85,2.1

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Not ill means: she is able to go on foot.

Ill means: she is not able to go on foot.

Vehicle² means: a cart,³ a carriage, a waggon, a chariot, a palanquin,⁴ or a sedan chair.⁵

Should go means: if she goes even once, there is an offence of expiation.

85,2.2

If she thinks that she is not ill when she is not ill (and) goes in a vehicle, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not ill ... If she thinks that she is ill when she is not ill ... offence of expiation. If she thinks that she is not ill when she is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is ill when she is ill, there is no offence.

85,2.3

There is no offence if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ This recurs at [Vin 2.276](#). Corresponding permission for monks given at [Vin 1.191](#).

² = [Vin 4.201](#), and *cf.* [Vin 3.49](#). ³ See above, [BD 3.144, n. 3](#). ⁴ See above, [BD 3.144,](#)

[n. 5](#). ⁵ See above, [BD 3.144, n. 5](#)

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 86

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain nun frequented a certain woman's family. Then that woman spoke thus to that nun: "Please, lady, give this petticoat to such and such a woman." Then that nun, thinking: "If I go away taking it in my bowl, there will be trouble for me,"¹ went away having tied it on. When she was on the high road the strings broke and were scattered. People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns² wear a petticoat, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns ... heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this nun wear a petticoat?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that a nun wore a petticoat?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can a nun wear a petticoat? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should wear a petticoat, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Petticoat means: whatever goes about the hips.

Should wear means: if she wears it even once, there is an offence of expiation.

¹ =above, BD 3.157, BD 3.188. ² The people generalise from one instance.

There is no offence if it is on account of illness; if she wears a hip-string¹; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *kaṭisuttaka*, allowed to nuns at [Vin 2.271](#), but not to be worn all the time; a *dukkāṭa* for monks to wear them at [Vin 2.106](#), but where meaning may be an ornamental waist-band.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 87

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns wore women's ornaments. People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns wear women's ornaments, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns wear women's ornaments?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that ... women's ornaments?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can ... women's ornaments? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should wear women's ornaments, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Women's ornaments mean: they go on the head, round the neck, on the hands,¹ on the feet, round the hips.²

Should wear means: if she wears them even once, there is an offence of expiation.

¹ *hattha* also means "forearm," see definition of "hand" at [BD 1.203](#). ² Cf. [Vin 3.239](#) ([BD 2.107](#)) where these phrases occur in definition of *kata*, "shaped."

There is no offence if it is on account of illness¹; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ It is difficult to imagine what diseases could be cured or alleviated by wearing ornaments.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 88

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns bathed with perfume and paint.¹ People ... (see **Bi-Pc 87.1**; read bathed with perfume and paint, etc.) ... “... this rule of training:

“**Whatever nun should bathe with perfume and paint, there is an offence of expiation².**”

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Perfume means: whatever is a perfume.

Paint means: whatever is a paint.

Should bathe means: if she bathes, in the business there is an offence of wrong-doing; at the end of the bathing there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if it is on account of illness; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ DN ii.142, DN ii.161; Thag 960. ² At **Vin 2.280** it is a *dukkata* for nuns to bathe with *chunam* (soft soap-powder) or scented clay.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 89

89.1.1 ... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at
3.408 that time the group of six nuns bathed with scented ground sesamum. People ... (see **Bi-Pc 87.1**; *read*, bathed with scented ground sesamum, etc.) ... “... this rule of training:

“Whatever nun should bathe with scented ground sesamum, there is an offence of expiation.”

89.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Scented means: whatever is scented.

Ground sesamum means: it is called crushed sesamum seed.

Should bathe means: if she bathes, in the business there is an offence of wrong-doing; at the end of the bathing there is an offence of expiation.

89.2.2 There is no offence if it is on account of illness; if she bathes with common ground sesamum; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 90

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns caused (themselves) to be rubbed (with ointment)¹ and also caused (themselves) to be massaged² by a nun. People, engaged in touring the dwelling-place, having seen (them), ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns cause (themselves) to be rubbed (with ointment) and also cause (themselves) to be massaged by a nun, just like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns cause (themselves) to be rubbed ... by a nun?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns caused (themselves) to be rubbed ... by a nun?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns cause (themselves) to be rubbed (with ointment) and also cause themselves to be massaged by a nun? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should cause (herself) to be rubbed (with ointment) or should cause (herself) to be massaged by a nun, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

¹ *ummaddāpenti*. At Vin 2.266 it is an offence of wrong-doing for a nun if she *mukham ummaddeti*, rubs (ointment, etc.) into her face. ² *parimaddāpenti*.

By a nun means: by another nun.

Should cause (herself) to be rubbed (with ointment) means: if she makes (another) rub (her with ointment),¹ there is an offence of expiation.

Should cause (herself) to be massaged means: if she makes (another) rub² (her), there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ Vin-a 946 reads *ubbaṭṭāpeti*, to make anoint, to make shampoo. ² *sambāhāpeti*, to rub or shampoo.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 91–93

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns caused (themselves) to be rubbed (with ointment) and also caused (themselves) to be massaged by a probationer ... by a female novice ... by a woman householder. People, engaged in touring the dwelling-place, having seen (them), ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns cause (themselves) to be rubbed (with ointment) and also cause (themselves) to be massaged by a probationer ... by a female novice ... by a woman householder, just like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard ... (see **Bi-Pc 90.1**) ... "... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should cause (herself) to be rubbed (with ointment) or should cause (herself) to be massaged by a probationer ... by a female novice ... by a woman householder, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Probationer means: one who has trained for two years in the six rules.¹

Female novice means: one conforming to the ten rules of training.²

Woman householder means: she is called a housewife.³

Should cause (herself) to be rubbed (with ointment) means: if she makes (another) rub (her with ointment), there is an offence of expiation.

¹ = **Vin 4.122, Vin 4.332, Vin 4.333, Vin 4.334, Vin 4.335.** ² = **Vin 4.122.** ³ *agāriṇī*; cf. *gharaṇī* at **Vin 4.20.**

Should cause (herself) to be massaged means: if she makes (another) rub (her), there is an offence of expiation.

91.2.2

There is no offence if it is on account of illness; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 94

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns sat down on a seat in front of a monk¹ without asking (for permission). Monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns ... without asking (for permission)?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that nuns ... without asking (for permission)?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can nuns ... without asking (for permission)? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should sit down on a seat in front of a monk without asking (for permission), there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

In front of a monk means: in front of one who is ordained.

Without asking (for permission) means: not having obtained permission.

Should sit down on a seat means: if she sits down even on the ground, there is an offence of expiation.

If she thinks that she has not asked (for permission) when she has not asked (for permission and) sits down on a seat, there is an offence of expiation. If she is in doubt as to whether she has not asked

¹ Cf. the first of the eight "important rules," Vin 4.52.

4.344
3.414

(for permission) ... If she thinks that she has asked (for permission) when she has not asked (for permission) ... there is an offence of expiation. If she thinks that she has not asked (for permission) when she has asked (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she has asked (for permission), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she has asked (for permission) when she has asked (for permission), there is no offence.

94.2.3

There is no offence if, having asked (for permission), she sits down on a seat; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 95

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time nuns asked a question of a monk who had not given leave.¹ Monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns ask a question of a monk who has not given leave?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks ... (see Bi-Pc 94.1) ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should ask a question of a monk who has not given leave, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Not given leave means: without asking (for permission).²

Should ask a question means: if, having asked for leave³ in regard to Suttanta, she asks about Discipline or about Abhidhamma,⁴ there is an offence of expiation. If, having asked for leave in regard to Discipline, she asks about Suttanta or about Abhidhamma, there is an offence of expiation. If, having asked for leave in regard to Abhidhamma, she asks about Suttanta or about Discipline, there is an offence of expiation.

¹ *anokāsakatam*, accusative, agreeing with *bhikkhuṃ*, meaning "who has not made an occasion" for allowing himself to be questioned. Cf. Vin 1.114, Vin 1.170. It seems as if the nun had to give some kind of notice, and get the monk's permission to put her question. ² The monk could not give leave before the nun had asked permission for it. ³ *okāsam kārāpetvā*, having had an opportunity made. ⁴ Here probably meaning the literary digest of this name. This passage would therefore seem late, dating from some time after the compilation of the three Piṭakas. See BD 3, Introduction, p. xff.

3.416 If she thinks that she has not asked (for permission) when she has not asked (for permission and) asks a question ... (Bi-Pc 94.2.2) ... there is no offence.

95.2.3 There is no offence if she asks, having asked for leave; if having asked for leave in general, she asks concerning whatever she likes¹; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

¹ *yattha katthaci*, there wherever, presumably meaning that she asks a question on any part of the Suttantas, Vinaya or Abhidhamma, and without having specified beforehand which of these three she would be asking about.

NUNS' EXPIATION (PĀCITTIYA) 96

... at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain nun entered a village for almsfood without her vest.¹ While she was on the high road gusts of wind blew up her outer cloak. People shouted out: "Beautiful is the waist of the lady." That nun, being made fun of by the people, became ashamed. Then that nun, having gone to a dwelling,² told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this nun enter a village without her vest?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that this nun ... without her vest?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can a nun enter a village without her vest? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun should enter a village without her vest, there is an offence of expiation."

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Without a vest means: without a vest.³

Vest means: from below the collar-bone to above the navel, for the sake of covering this.

Should enter a village means: in going beyond the enclosure of a village that is fenced in, there is an offence of expiation. In entering

¹ *saṃkacchika*, the fourth of a nun's five robes to be pointed, out to her at her *upasam-padā* ordination, *Vin 2.272*. ² *upassaya*, very likely meaning *bhikkhuni-upassaya*, a nunnery. ³ *asaṃkacchikā ti vinā saṃkacchikāṃ*.

the precincts of a village that is not fenced in, there is an offence of expiation.

There is no offence if she is one whose robe is stolen¹; if she is one whose robe is lost; if she is ill; if she is not thinking; if she does not know²; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

*The Ninth Division: that on a sunshade*³

Recited, ladies, are the hundred and sixty-six rules for offences of expiation.⁴ Concerning them, I ask the ladies: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The ladies are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent; thus do I understand this.

*Told is the Minor (Class)*⁵

¹ Vin-a 947 says that her vest is to be called a “robe.” ² Cf. above, BD 3.121ff. ³ Note that there are thirteen *Pācittiyas* in this, as in the preceding Division. ⁴ Ninety-six are here recorded. The monks have ninety-two. The total for monks and nuns is therefore 188. Of the monks’ 92, 70 apply also to the nuns. Thus we get 96 + 70 = 166 for nuns, leaving 22 for the monks alone, as stated at Vin-a 946. See BD 3, Introduction, p. xxxviii. ⁵ Cf. above, BD 3.101.

NUNS' CONFESSION (PĀṬIDESANIYA) 1

At that time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns, having had ghee¹ asked for, partook of it. People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns, having had ghee asked for, partake of it? Who does not like well cooked things? Who does not like sweet things?"² Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns, having had ghee asked for, partake of it?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns, having had ghee asked for, partook of it?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the group of six nuns ...? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun, having had ghee asked for, should partake of it, it should be confessed by that nun, saying: 'I have fallen, ladies, into a blameworthy matter, un-becoming, which ought to be confessed; I confess it.'"

And thus this rule of training for nuns came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time nuns came to be ill.³ Nuns enquiring after the ill ones, spoke thus to the ill nuns: "We hope, ladies, that you are better,

¹ One of the five standard medicines. ² = Vin 2.196 = Vin 4.71, Vin 4.87. ³ Cf. Vin 4.88 (BD 2.341).

we hope that you are keeping going.”

“Formerly, ladies, we, having had ghee asked for, partook of it, thus there came to be comfort for us. But now it is forbidden by the lord and, being scrupulous, we do not have it asked for, thus there does not come to be comfort for us.” They told this matter to the lord. He said:

4:347 “I allow, monks, an ill nun, having had ghee asked for, to partake of it. And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

“**Whatever nun who is not ill, having had ghee asked for, should partake of it, it should be confessed by that nun, saying: ‘I have fallen, ladies, into a blameworthy matter, inappropriate, which ought to be confessed; I confess it.’**”

d1.2.1 **Whatever** means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Not ill means: for whom there comes to be comfort without ghee.

Ill means: for whom there does not come to be comfort without ghee.

Ghee means: ghee from cows or ghee from she-goats or ghee from buffaloes, ghee from those whose meat is allowable.¹

If she is not ill (and) has it asked for for herself, in the request there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she accepts, thinking: “I will partake of it on acquisition,” there is an offence of wrong-doing. For every mouthful there is an offence which ought to be confessed.²

d1.2.2
3:421 If she thinks that she is not ill when she is not ill (and) having had ghee asked for partakes of it, there is an offence which ought to be confessed. If she is in doubt as to whether she is not ill ... If she thinks that she is ill when she is not ill ... offence which ought to be confessed. If she thinks that she is not ill when she is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she is in doubt as to whether she is ill, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If she thinks that she is ill when she is ill, there is no offence.³

¹ Cf. Vin 3.251, Vin 4.88 (BD 2.131, BD 2.342). ² Cf. Vin 4.89. ³ Cf. Vin 4.89.

There is no offence if she is ill; if having been ill (and) having had it asked for she partakes of it when she is not ill, if she eats the remainder of an ill nun's meal; if it belongs to relations; if they are invited; if it is for another; if it is by means of her own property; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.¹

¹ Cf. Vin 4.89.

NUNS' CONFESSION (PĀṬIDESANIYA) 2-8

... at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns having had oil asked for, partook of it ... having had honey ... molasses ... fish ... meat ... milk ... curds asked for, partook of them.¹ People ... (Bi-Pd 1.1.1-Bi-Pd 1.1.2. *Instead of ghee read curds*) ... "... this rule of training:

"Whatever nun who is not ill, having had oil (... honey ... molasses... fish ... meat ... milk ... curds ...) asked for, should partake of it, it should be confessed by that nun, saying: 'I have fallen, ladies, into a blameworthy matter, inappropriate, which ought to be confessed; I confess it.'"

Whatever means: ... nun is to be understood in this case.

Not ill means: for whom there comes to be comfort without curds.

Ill means: for whom there does not come to be comfort without curds.

Oil means: sesamum oil, oil of mustard seeds, oil containing honey, oil of the castor-oil plant, oil from tallow. **Honey** means: honey of bees. **Molasses** means: what is produced from sugar-cane. **Fish** means: it is called one that lives in water. **Meat** means: the meat of those whose meat is allowable. **Milk** means: milk of cows or milk of she-goats or milk of buffaloes, milk 'of those whose meat is allowable. **Curds** means: curds from just these.²

¹ Referring to curds. ² = Vin 3.251, Vin 4.88.

If she is not ill and has them¹ asked for for herself ... (Bi-Pd 1.2. *Instead of ghee read curds.*) ... if she is the first wrong-doer.

Recited, ladies, are the eight rules for offences which ought to be confessed. Concerning them, I ask the ladies: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The ladies are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent; thus do I understand this.

Told are the offences which ought to be confessed.

Bi-Pd 2
BD 3.4

Vin 4.3

¹ Referring to curds.

NUNS' TRAINING (SEKHIYA) 1-75

75.1.1
3.424

These rules for training, ladies, come up for recitation.¹

At that time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns dressed with the inner robe hanging down in front and behind. People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns dress with the inner robe hanging down in front and behind, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns dress ... and behind?" ...

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns ... and behind?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can the group of six nuns ... and behind? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"I will dress with the inner robe all round (me),¹ is a training to be observed."

One should dress with the inner robe going all round one for covering the circle of the navel, the circle of the knees. Whoever out of disrespect dresses with the inner robe hanging down in front or behind, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

¹ Being the same as the Monks' *Sekhiyas*, only the first and the last are reprinted here, as in Oldenberg's edition.

There is no offence if it is unintentional; if she is not thinking; if she does not know; if she is ill; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer ...

... at Sāvathī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns eased themselves and spat in the water. People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns ease themselves and spit in the water, like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Nuns heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six nuns ... in the water?" Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord questioned the monks, saying:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six nuns ... in the water?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: "Monks, how can this group of six nuns ... in the water? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... this rule of training:

"I will not ease myself or spit in the water,' is a training to be observed."

And thus this rule of training for nuns came to be laid down by the lord.

Now at that time ill nuns were (too) scrupulous to ease themselves and spit in the water. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

"I allow, monks, a nun if she is ill to ease herself and spit in the water. And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training:

"I will not ease myself or spit in the water, if not ill,' is a training to be observed."

If she is not ill she should not ease herself or spit in the water. Whoever out of disrespect, if not ill ... offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional; if she is not thinking; if she does not know; if she is ill; if done on dry land she pours water over it; if there are accidents; if she is mad, if she is the first wrongdoer.

76.1.1

Recited, ladies, are the rules for training. Concerning them, I ask the ladies ... thus do I understand this.

4.351

Told are the Rules for Training

NUNS' DECIDING OF LEGAL QUESTIONS (ADHIKARAṆASAMATHA)

These seven rules,¹ ladies, for the deciding of legal questions come up for recitation. For the deciding, for the settlement of legal questions arising from time to time:

1. **A verdict in the presence of may be given.**
2. **A verdict of innocence may be given.**
3. **A verdict of past insanity may be given.**
4. **It may be carried out on (her) acknowledgement.**
5. **(There is) the decision of the majority.**
6. **The decision for specific depravity.**
7. **The covering up (as) with grass.**

Recited, ladies, are the seven rules for the deciding of legal questions. Concerning them I ask the ladies ... thus do I understand this.

¹ = Vin 4.207. See above, BD 3.153f. for notes.

BD 3.4

Bi-As 1

Bi-As 2

Bi-As 3

Bi-As 4

Bi-As 5

Bi-As 6

Bi-As 7

NUNS' CONCLUSION

Recited, ladies, is the occasion, recited are the eight rules for offences involving defeat, recited are the seventeen rules for offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, recited are the thirty rules for offences of expiation involving forfeiture, recited are the hundred and sixty-six rules for offences of expiation, recited are the eight rules for offences which ought to be confessed, recited are the rules for training, recited are the seven rules for the deciding of legal questions. So much (of the sayings) of the lord, handed down in clauses, contained in clauses, comes up for recitation every half month. All should train therein in harmony, on friendly terms, without contention.

Told is the Nuns' Analysis

***Told are both Analyses*¹**

¹ Here ends Oldenberg's Vol. IV.

Volume III

Khandhaka

Translator's Introduction	1357
1. Going forth (<i>Pabbajjā</i>)	1380
On Awakening	1380
At the Goatherds' Banyan tree	1382
On Mucalinda	1384
At the Rājāyatana tree	1385
On the invitation of Brahmā	1386
On the group of five	1390
On the going forth of Yasa	1403
With Māra	1409
On going forth and full ordination	1411
With Māra, the second	1412
The story of the excellent group	1413
On the miracles at Uruvelā	1415
On Bimbisāra's gathering	1430
On the going forth of Sāriputta and Moggallāna	1436
On the duties to the preceptor	1443
On the duties to the one who shares his cell	1454

On dismissal	1455
On the duties to the teacher	1462
On the duties to the student	1467
On not forgiving when dismissed	1467
The story of the ignorant and inexperienced	1467
On the nullifications of guidance	1468
On five cases when one may ordain	1469
On six cases when one may ordain	1472
On one who had formerly been a member of another sect	1473
The story of five diseases	1477
On King’s service	1479
The story of a thief garlanded with fingers	1481
The story of a thief broken out of jail	1482
The story of an thief with a “wanted” notice	1483
The story of a scourged man	1483
The story of a branded man	1484
The story of a debtor	1484
The story of a slave	1484
The story of a bald-headed metal-smith	1485
The story of the boy Upāli	1486
The story of malaria	1488
The story of Kaṇḍaka	1489
The story of when it was crowded	1490
On release from dependence	1491
The story of Rāhula	1493
On training rules	1495
The story of an act of punishment	1496
The story of making a prohibition without asking	1498
The story of luring away	1498
The story of Kaṇḍaka the novice	1498

The story of a eunuch	1499
The story of one in communion by theft	1500
The story of an animal	1501
The story of a matricide	1503
The story of a parricide	1504
The story of a killer of a perfected one	1504
The story of a raper of nuns	1505
The story of a hermaphrodite	1505
The story of without a preceptor, etc.	1505
The story of without a bowl, etc.	1507
The portion on thirty-two (cases) where one should not let go forth	1508
The story of guidance for the unconscientious	1510
The story of guidance for one on a journey, etc.	1510
Permission to proclaim by clan	1512
The story of two expecting ordination, etc.	1512
Permission for ordination twenty years from conception	1513
Ordination procedure	1514
Four requisites	1518
Four things not to be done	1518
The story of one suspended for not seeing an offence	1520
2. Observance (Uposatha)	1525
Permission to gather	1525
Permission to recite the Pātimokkha	1526
The story of Mahākappina	1532
Permission for a boundary	1533
On an observance hall	1535
On a maximum for observance	1536
Permission for a “not separated” boundary	1538
Abolishing a boundary	1540

A village boundary, etc.	1541
Incomplete observance, etc.	1542
Reciting the Pātimokkha in brief, etc.	1543
On questioning regarding Vinaya	1545
On answering regarding Vinaya	1546
On reproving	1547
Protesting an act that is not the rule, etc.	1548
Requesting the reciting of the Pātimokkha, etc.	1549
Allowance to learn the counting of the fortnights, etc.	1550
Allowance for preliminary duties	1553
The story of those travelling to distant parts, etc.	1554
On giving entire purity	1556
On giving consent	1559
On being grabbed by relatives	1560
Agreement for the mad	1561
The observance by an Order, etc.	1562
Procedure for making amends for offences	1565
Procedure for an offence without making obstacle	1566
Procedure for making amends for a shared offence	1567
Fifty cases of no offence	1570
Fifty cases of perceiving it is a group or not a group	1571
Fifty cases of doubt	1572
Fifty cases of acting badly	1573
Fifty cases of aiming at schism	1573
Abbreviated repetitions on entering a boundary	1574
Seeing characteristics, etc.	1575
Performing observance with those of a different communion, etc.	1577
Portion on should not go	1578
Portion on should go	1579

Seeing a blameworthy person	1580
3. Rains (Vassa)	1583
Allowance to enter the rains	1583
On tour in the rains, etc.	1584
Allowance for seven days business	1585
Allowance for five even when not sent for	1589
Allowance for seven when sent for	1594
Allowance only when sent for	1595
Portion on no offence for cutting short the rains when there is danger	1596
Portion on no offence for cutting short the rains when there is schism in the Saṅgha	1599
Entering the rains in a cow pen, etc.	1601
Places for not entering the rains	1602
Unlawful agreement	1603
Offence of wrong-doing in assent	1604
4. Invitation (Pavāraṇā)	1609
Dwelling not in comfort	1609
Division of the Invitation	1614
Allowance to give invitation	1615
On being grabbed by relatives	1616
Division of invitation by Saṅgha, etc.	1616
Procedure for making amends	1619
Procedure for no obstacle from offence	1619
Procedure for making amends for shared offence	1620
Fifty cases of no offence	1620
Fifty cases of perceiving it is a group or is not a group	1621
Fifty cases of doubt	1622
Fifty cases of acting badly	1622

Fifty cases of aiming at schism	1623
Abbreviated repetitions on entering a boundary	1623
Various days	1624
Visible characteristics	1624
Invitation with those of different communion, etc.	1624
Portion on should not go	1624
Portion on should go	1624
Seeing a blameworthy person	1624
Invitation with two statements, etc.	1625
Setting aside the invitation	1627
Basis for a grave offence, etc.	1633
The story of makers of strife	1635
Harmonious invitation	1637
5. Leather (Camma)	1641
The story of Soṇa Koḷivisa	1641
Rejection of double-lined sandals	1650
Rejection of all dark green, etc.	1651
Allowance for cast off sandals with many linings	1653
Rejection of sandals inside a monastery	1654
Rejection of wooden sandals	1656
Rejection of vehicles, etc.	1661
Rejection of high and broad seats	1662
Rejection of all leather	1664
Allowance for what is displayed by householders, etc.	1666
The story of Soṇa Kutikaṇṇa	1667
The five boons for Mahākaccana	1669
6. Medicine (Bhesajja)	1677
On five medicines	1677
On root medicine, etc.	1679

The story of Pilindavaccha	1685
Allowance for sugar, etc.	1694
On rejection of what is prepared indoors, etc.	1696
Picked up and received	1698
Allowance for what is received, etc.	1701
On rejection of surgery	1704
On rejection of human flesh	1705
On rejection of elephant flesh	1709
Allowance for conjei and honey-lumps	1711
The story of the minister young in faith	1713
The story of Belaṭṭhakaccāna	1716
The story of Pāṭaligāma	1720
The story of Sunidha and Vassakāra	1723
On the truths at Koṭigāma	1726
The story of Ambapālī	1727
The story of the Licchavīs	1728
The story of General Siha	1730
Allowance for a place for what is allowable	1738
The story of the householder Meṇḍaka	1742
Allowance for five dairy products, etc.	1747
The story of Keṇiya the matted-hair ascetic	1750
The story Roja the Malla	1754
The story of one gone forth when old	1758
On the four great references	1762

7. Kaṭhina

1765

Allowance for Kaṭhina	1765
Seven on bringing	1773
Seven on taking	1775
Six on bringing	1775
Six on taking	1776

Fifty on bringing	1776
Fifty on taking, etc.	1779
Fifty on taking what is imperfectly executed	1779
Twelve cases contrary to expectation	1780
Twelve cases in accordance with expectation	1782
Twelve on business	1785
Nine cases on without collecting	1787
Five on living in comfort	1789
On obstacles and not-obstacles	1791

8. Robes (Cīvara) 1796

The story of Jīvaka	1796
The story of the merchant's wife	1800
The story of King Bimbisāra	1803
The story of the merchant of Rājagaha	1804
The story of the merchant's son	1807
The story of King Pajjota	1808
On a pair of Siveyyaka cloths	1812
On exactly thirty purges	1812
On asking for a boon	1814
On permission for woollen garments, etc.	1816
On searching for rag-robres	1818
On an agreement for the receiver of cloth	1820
On an agreement for a storeroom, etc.	1821
On dying robes	1824
Allowance for cut-up cloth	1827
Allowance for three robes	1829
On extra robes	1831
The story of Visākhā	1833
Allowance for a sitting-cloth, etc.	1840
On the least robe to be assigned, etc.	1843

On when a robe becomes the Saṅgha's	1847
The story of Upananda the Sakyan	1849
On the story of one ill	1852
On inheritance	1855
On rejection of nakedness	1857
On rejection of garments of grass, etc.	1858
On rejection of all dark green	1859
On when there is no robe after the rains	1860
On a robe for a divided Saṅgha	1862
On rightly and wrongly allotted	1863
Eight channels for the accruing of robes	1865
9. The monks from Campā (Campeyya)	1868
The story of the monk Kassapagotta	1868
On an act not by rule in an incomplete assembly, etc.	1873
On an act without a motion, etc.	1875
Carrying out by a fourfold Order, etc.	1880
Carrying out by a Fourfold (Order)	1881
Carrying out by a Fivefold (Order)	1882
Carrying out by a Tenfold (Order)	1882
Carrying out by a Twentyfold (Order)	1882
On one on probation, etc.	1882
On two sent away, etc.	1884
On an act not by rule, etc.	1886
On the questions of Upāli	1890
On an act of censure	1895
On an act of guidance	1897
On an act of banishment	1897
On an act of reconciliation	1898
On an act of suspension for not seeing an offence	1898
On an act of suspension for not making amends	1899

On revoking an act of suspension for not relinquishing . . .	1899
On revoking an act of censure	1899
On revoking an act of guidance	1900
On revoking an act of banishment	1901
On revoking an act of reconciliation	1901
On revoking an act of suspension for not seeing an offence .	1901
On revoking an act of suspension for not making amends . .	1901
On revoking an act of suspension for not relinquishing . . .	1901
On disputing an act of censure	1902
On disputing an act of guidance	1903
On disputing an act of banishment	1903
On disputing an act of reconciliation	1903
On disputing an act of suspension for not seeing an offence .	1904
On disputing an act of suspension for not making amends .	1904
On disputing an act of suspension for not relinquishing . . .	1904
On revoking an act of censure	1904
On revoking an act of guidance	1905
On revoking an act of banishment	1905
On revoking an act of reconciliation	1905
On revoking an act of suspension for not seeing an offence .	1905
On revoking an act of suspension for not making amends . .	1905
On revoking an act of suspension for not relinquishing . . .	1906

10. The monks from Kosambī (Kosambaka) 1911

On the dispute among the monks from Kosambī	1911
The story of Dīghāvu	1918
On going to Bālakaloṇaka	1929
On going to Pācīnavamsadāya	1930
On going to Pārileyaka	1932
On eighteen cases	1935
Allowance to restore	1938

On harmony in the Saṅgha	1939
Questions of Upāli on harmony in the Saṅgha	1940
Translator's Introduction	1944
11. The followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka	1962
Act of censure	1962
Twelve on an act not by rule	1965
Twelve on an act by rule	1966
Six on desires	1967
Eighteen duties	1969
Eighteen cases that should not be settled	1970
Eighteen cases that should be revoked	1971
Act of guidance	1972
Twelve on an act not by rule	1974
Twelve on an act by rule	1974
Six on desiring	1974
Eighteen duties	1974
Eighteen cases that should not be revoked	1975
Eighteen cases that should be revoked	1975
Act of banishment	1977
Twelve on an act not by rule	1982
Twelve on an act by rule	1982
Fourteen on desiring	1982
Eighteen duties	1983
Eighteen cases that should not be revoked	1984
Eighteen cases that should be revoked	1985
Act of reconciliation	1986
Twelve on an act not by rule	1990
Twelve on an act by rule	1990
Four on desiring	1990

Eighteen duties	1991
Eighteen cases that should not be revoked	1994
Eighteen cases that should be revoked	1994
An act of suspension for not seeing an offence	1994
Twelve on an act not by rule	1996
Twelve on an act by rule	1996
Six on desiring	1996
Forty three duties	1996
Forty-three cases that should not be revoked	1998
Forty-three cases that should be revoked	2000
An act of suspension for not making amends	2000
Twelve on an act not by rule	2000
Twelve on an act by rule	2000
Six on desiring	2001
Forty-three duties	2001
Forty-three cases that should not be revoked	2001
Forty-three cases that should be revoked	2001
An act of suspension for not relinquishing a wrong view	2001
Twelve on an act not by rule	2004
Twelve on an act by rule	2004
Six on desiring	2004
Forty-three duties	2005
Forty-three cases that should not be revoked	2006
Forty-three cases that should be revoked	2006

12. Probation (*Parivāsa*) **2010**

Duties on one on probation	2010
Duties of one being sent back to the beginning	2016
Duties of one deserving <i>mānatta</i>	2017
Duties of one undergoing <i>mānatta</i>	2018
Duties of one deserving rehabilitation	2019

13. Accumulation (*Samuccaya*)

2022

Emission of semen	2022
Unconcealed <i>mānatta</i>	2022
Unconcealed rehabilitation	2023
Probation concealed for one night	2025
<i>Mānatta</i> concealed for one night	2025
Rehabilitation concealed for one night	2026
Probation concealed for five days	2026
Sending one on probation back to the beginning	2026
Sending one deserving <i>mānatta</i> to the beginning	2028
<i>Mānatta</i> for three offences	2029
Sending one undergoing <i>mānatta</i> to the beginning	2029
Sending one deserving rehabilitation back to the beginning	2030
Rehabilitation for one who has been sent back to the beginning	2030
Probation for one who has concealed for a fortnight	2031
Sending one on probation for a fortnight back to the beginning	2032
Concurrent probation	2032
Sending one deserving <i>mānatta</i> back to the beginning, etc.	2033
<i>Mānatta</i> for three offences	2033
Sending one undergoing <i>mānatta</i> back to the beginning	2034
Sending one deserving rehabilitation back to the beginning	2034
Rehabilitation for one who concealed for a fortnight	2035
Probation	2035
Concurrent probation with dependent duration	2035
All lengths concealed with dependent duration	2036

Probation for two months	2037
Procedure for one given probation for two months	2042
Purifying probation	2044
Forty cases	2047
Thirty-six cases	2050
One hundred on <i>mānatta</i>	2051
Four hundred on concurrent probation and beginning	2055
The portion with eighteen cases measured, etc.	2057
The portion with eleven cases on two monks	2057
Nine cases on impure beginning	2060
Second set of nine cases	2062
Third set of nine cases	2064
14. Settlements (<i>Samatha</i>)	2066
Verdict in the presence of	2066
Verdict by memory	2068
Verdict by former madness	2076
Acknowledgement	2079
Majority	2081
Bad character	2083
Covering over with grass	2085
Issues	2088
Settlement of issues	2097
15. Minor matters (<i>Khuddaka</i>)	2113
16. Lodgings (<i>Sayanāsana</i>)	2181
First recitation section	2181
Allowance for dwellings	2181
Allowance for couches and chairs	2186
Allowance for whitewash, etc.	2190
Rejection of a bold design	2191

Allowance for a balustrade	2191
Allowance for an assembly hall	2193
Allowance for a porch	2194
Allowance for a fenced monastery	2194
Second recitation section	2195
The story of Anāthapiṇḍika	2195
Giving building work	2202
Allowance for the first seat, etc.	2204
Persons not to be bowed to	2207
Rejection of reserved seating	2207
Allowance for what is displayed by householders	2208
Appreciation for the Jetavana monastery	2209
Reservation of a seat, etc.	2210
Agreement for an assigner of lodgings	2213
Third recitation section	2215
Things not to be disposed of	2218
Things not to be distributed	2220
On the gift of building work	2222
Rejection of using elsewhere, etc.	2226
Allowance for meals for the Order, etc.	2228
Agreement for an issuer of meals	2229
Agreement for an assigner of lodgings	2229
Agreement on one to dispose of trifles	2230
Agreement on an accepter of outer cloaks	2231
17. Schism in an Order (Saṅghabheda)	2235
First recitation section	2235
On the going forth of the six Sakyans	2235
The story of Devadatta	2242
On the five teachers	2244
Second recitation section	2247

Act of informing	2247
The story of Prince Ajātasattu	2250
Sending assassins	2252
Shedding blood	2254
Sending out Nālāgiri	2256
On the request for the five points	2258
Third recitation section	2263
On schism in the Order	2263
Questions of Upāli	2270
18. Duties (Vatta)	2276
On the duties of visitors	2276
On the duties of residents	2280
On the duties of travellers	2281
On the duties of expressing appreciation	2283
On duties in the refectory	2284
On duties for those going on almsround	2287
On duties for forest dwellers	2289
On duties regarding lodgings	2291
On duties in the sauna	2294
On duties in the toilet	2295
On duties to the preceptor	2297
On duties to one who shares his cell	2304
On duties to the teacher	2307
On duties to the student	2307
19. Suspending the Observance (Uposathaṭṭhāpana)	2314
Requesting the recitation of the Pātimokkha	2314
Eight wonderful things about the great ocean	2316
Eight wonderful things about this Dhamma and Vinaya	2318
Those deserving to hear the Pātimokkha	2321

Setting aside the Pātimokkha by rule and not by rule	2322
Setting aside the Pātimokkha by rule	2327
Factors for undertaking on one's own behalf	2329
Things to be reviewed by a reprover	2331
Things to be established by a reprover	2333
On connected with the reprover and the reprovved	2333
20. Nuns (<i>Bhikkhunī</i>)	2338
First recitation section	2338
The story of Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī	2338
Eight important rules	2341
Allowance for the ordination of nuns	2343
Second recitation section	2350
Third recitation section	2364
21. (Recitation with) Five Hundred (<i>Pañcasata</i>)	2383
Origin of the Council	2383
On the lesser and minor training rules	2389
On the higher penalty	2393
22. (Recitation with) Seven Hundred (<i>Sattasata</i>)	2398
First recitation section	2398
Second recitation section	2410

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

The present volume of the *Book of the Discipline* covers the whole of the Mahāvagga, the Great, or Greater Division of the Vinaya, and is thus a translation of the first volume of OLDENBERG'S *Vinaya Piṭakam*, published in 1879. The Mahāvagga was translated in full by RHYSDAVIDS and OLDENBERG, and comprises most of Volume I and the first part of Volume II of their *Vinaya Texts* (their Cūlavagga translation also begins in Volume II), published in the Sacred Books of the East, Volumes XIII and XVII, in 1881, 1882. These volumes, although they first appeared seventy years ago, are still indispensable for a study of early Buddhist monastic life.

This new translation of the *Book of the Discipline* is, however, justified I think, for various reasons. For example, recent events have focused attention on the Buddhist lands of South-East Asia where Buddhist monks still follow these ancient rules; Buddhism itself is stirring and seeking to know more of its own treasures, and it is attracting non-Buddhists to become acquainted with them likewise. The moment is therefore not unsuitable to re-translate one of the principal works of the Pali canon, the more especially as many Western students are now debarred from consulting the original English translation, *Vinaya Texts*, since unfortunately it is out of print. Moreover, the scholarship which has been lavished on the Pali canon during roughly the last century has inevitably resulted in an increased understanding of the technical and other terms so abundant in the Vinaya and which in many cases also occur in other parts of the Pali canon. Following this, there has resulted a surer knowledge of Pali Buddhism as a whole. Now that references, allusions,

remarks, not to mention words themselves, can be compared with other contexts, which had been either not edited in Roman letters or not translated by the time *Vinaya Texts* was published, they are able to take on a fresh and a fuller meaning. For the same reason various terms and phrases, hitherto difficult and perhaps baffling, have become easier to understand, and hence to translate.

I have therefore attempted translations of various words that Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, for one reason or another, kept in the Pali. I do not claim originality, however, for my renderings, for most, if not all of these terms have already been translated where they occur in other canonical texts and have appeared in their appropriate books in the Pali Text Society's Translation Series or in the Sacred Books of the Buddhists. Some of these words may be mentioned here. For example, as in the first three volumes of the *Book of the Discipline*, *saṅgha* is rendered as Order; *dukkāṭa* as wrong-doing (a type of offence) of constant occurrence in this volume; *sāmaṇera* as novice; *titthiyā* as other sects; *bhikkhu* and *bhikkhunī* as monk and nun; *chabbaggiyā bhikkhū* as the sixfold group of monks; *vassa* as the rains; *parivāsa* as probation; *upajjhāya* as preceptor; *saddhivihārika* as the one who shares his cell; *ācariya* as teacher (in a technical sense), and *antevāsin* as his pupil; and *pavāraṇā* as Invitation.

In this volume I have also translated a number of other words, likewise left untranslated by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, and which have not occurred in my three preceding volumes. For example, I have translated *pārisuddhi* as entire purity; *nissaya* as dependence; and *ñatti* as motion while *ñatticatuttha* is a motion followed by a resolution put three times. I have also given the names of the formal acts of the Order in English. All these are technical terms, and should be understood, for they naturally help to clarify some of the depths and complications of the Vinaya. In almost every case the notes which Rhys Davids and Oldenberg append to their untranslated words are of great value and merit careful consultation. I have made no attempt to translate *dhamma* and *nibbāna*. But I hope by translating such terms as I have mentioned above I have, while keeping to the

Pali intention, perhaps clothed them in a meaning and significance easier for the English reader to grasp than when he is confronted with the Pali forms.

This volume opens with the account, of the greatest importance to historians and devotees of Buddhism alike, of the days immediately preceding the formation of the Order itself, beginning with the seven days' contemplation under the Bo-tree where Gotama sat enjoying the bliss of deliverance just after he had attained that full awakening, illumination or enlightenment which marked his passage from Bodhisattahood to Buddhahood.

According to this Mahāvagga account, during each of “the three watches of the night” —presumably the last of the seven spent under the Bo-tree—he uttered a solemn utterance concerned with cause, and then with the routing of Māra (in the third watch). The Dhammapada Commentary (Dhp-a iii.127) says that in the first watch he dissipated the darkness (ignorance) veiling his former abodes, or lives, births; that in the second he purified his deva-vision; and that in the third, out of compassion for creatures, he paid right mindfulness to dependent origination both in forward and reverse order. Then, self-awakened to the fullest self-awakening, he uttered the solemn utterance common to hundreds of thousands of Buddhas, namely the two verses beginning *anekajātisaṃsāram* (Dhp 153; Thag 183; Ja i.76). The Introduction to the Vinaya Commentary (Vin-a i.17) and the Dīgha Commentary (DN-a i.16), agree that these verses are the first Buddhavaṇṇana; while the Udāna Commentary (Ud-a 208) and the Suttanipāṭa Commentary (Sn-p-a ii.392) also say that he uttered these verses after he had attained the three knowledges in the three watches of the night. The Khuddakapāṭha Commentary (Kp-a 12f.), elaborating further, or perhaps following some other tradition, says that while these two verses were the first of all words to be uttered by the Buddha (Buddha, because now, although very recently, “awakened”), they were only spoken mentally and not out loud. For what he first spoke out loud, so this Commentary continues, was the verse which in the Mahāvagga is attributed to the end of the

first watch of the night of awakening.

At the end of the third watch of this crucial night the Buddha went, according to the Mahāvagga, to the foot of the Ajapāla banyan and sat there for seven days; he then spent another seven days at the foot of the Mucalinda tree, and a still further seven at the foot of the Rājāyatana. While he was at the first of these three trees he was visited by a brahmin, representative of one of the sects which abounded in India at that time, and the Buddha stated his view on what it is to be a “Brahmin” (in the true sense). While he was at the second tree a naga-king arrived to offer him protection—indicative of the close and, on the whole, friendly relations which in the Buddhist tradition existed between serpents and human beings. Again Gotama made a short statement, this time on what it is that constitutes “highest bliss”, *parama sukha*. Although this statement lacks the terseness of that attributed to Gotama in the *Māgandiya Sutta* (MN 75): that “*nibbāna* is the highest bliss”, it nevertheless contains tenets that throughout the long history of Buddhism have remained at the heart of its teaching: that the absence of malice, the absence of feeling attracted to conditioned things, the transcending of sense-pleasures, and the averting (or control, *vinaya*) of pride in the thought “I am” — that these are the highest bliss.

In the “Talk on Brahmā’s Entreaty” during the time of the Buddha’s hesitation to teach *dhamma*, concepts emerge which, with more insistence or less, are found in most of the Pali canonical texts: the deepness and difficulty of *dhamma*, its peace, and the consequent need to teach it in a world so delighting and rejoicing in sensual pleasure that it was averse to letting itself be persuaded that *dhamma*, earnestly practised, led upstream, against the current, *paṭisotagāmin*, and by the death of craving opened the doors of deathlessness to *nibbāna*, the source of true and supreme bliss.

The first Khandhaka, Section or Chapter of the Mahāvagga, called the Great (*mahā*) Section,¹ also contains Gotama’s famous utterance to Upaka, the Naked Ascetic, of his victoriousness, perfection and

¹ Note by Sujato: In this SuttaCentral edition this is titled the Pabbajjākkhandhaka, the Chapter on Going Forth.

self-awakening, of his uniqueness, and of his having had no teacher (Kd 1.6.8). He is therefore different from other human beings. Then there comes, preceded by further stress on the finding of deathlessness, the First Discourse, delivered to the five earliest followers, and called elsewhere the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta, the Discourse on the Rolling of the Wheel of *Dhamma*, in which the Middle Course between the two extremes, the dead-ends of too great luxury and too great austerity, is called the *ariyan* Eightfold Way. This Way is graded into *sīla*, *samādhi* and *pañña*. (MN i.301) and centres on *dukkha*, unsatisfactoriness, ill or suffering, and the stopping of it, epitomised later by Gotama when he is recorded to say (MN i.140): “As formerly, so now, this is precisely what I teach: ill and the stopping of ill.” Aññāta Koṇḍañña was the first of the disciples to apprehend this central fact in causality, that “whatever is of the nature to arise, all that is of the nature to stop”. It was his vision of *dhamma*, as it was soon afterwards that of his four companions.

As this *dhamma*-vision arose in each one of them he asked for the “going forth” or admission, *pabbajjā*, and for the ordination, *upasampadā*, in the Lord’s presence. In response, Gotama uttered the words, “Come, monk, *ehi bhikkhu*, well taught is *dhamma*, fare the Brahmarfaring for the utter ending of ill.” This, the original formula, used by Gotama when the Order was beginning to form and while it was still in its infancy, covers simultaneous admission and ordination. Later, two separate procedures supervened, and as the Mahāvagga shows, admission into the Order had to be gained before ordination could be conferred.

After the Second Discourse, that on the impossibility of the five *khandhas* being self because they are impermanent and suffering, and also spoken to the five original followers, and after the ordination of Yasa, his four friends, and then his fifty friends, there were sixty-one arahants in the world (Kd 1.10.4). “Freed from all snares,” they were told by Gotama to go out on tour and preach *dhamma* for the good and the welfare of the multitude. As a result many people became anxious for admission and ordination, but, journeying

to Gotama so as to be admitted and ordained by him, they arrived exhausted. Accordingly he thereupon allowed monks themselves to admit and ordain in any district, in any quarter. They were not, however, instructed to use the words “Come, monk.” On the contrary, it is now the candidate who has three times to repeat another formula. This is called admission and ordination by the “three goings for refuge”. This marks the second stage in the ordination proceedings. In the usage to be followed by those who wished to be monastic followers, the three refuges became stabilised as *buddhaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi*, *dhammaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi*, *saṅghaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi*, each phrase to be repeated three times. Those who wished to be counted as lay-disciples (*upāsaka*, feminine *upāsikā*) asked for this status by repeating the slightly different formula of taking refuge not in *buddhaṃ*, *dhammaṃ* and *saṅghaṃ*, but in *bhagavantaṃ*, *dhammaṃ* and *bhikkhusaṅghaṃ*,¹ or in *bhavantaṃ Gotamaṃ*, *dhammaṃ* and *bhikkhusaṅghaṃ*.²

It is probable that this method of admitting and ordaining did not last very long. The reasons given for abolishing it are perhaps not very convincing, and we should have expected more details and tales of mishaps showing that it no longer sufficed and therefore needed revising. At all events, as the Mahāvagga stands, on an occasion when Sāriputta asked him how he should admit and ordain a certain Brahmin, Gotama did not answer that the Brahmin’s repetition of the three goings for refuge would constitute his ordination (Kd 1.28.3). Instead the third phase now arose: that of the Order ordaining a candidate, presented by his preceptor, by means of a formal act (*kamma*) consisting of a motion and a resolution proclaimed three times (*ñat-ticatuttha*). This means that it is now the Order alone which has the authority, the power and the legal right to ordain. In addition, the candidate for ordination now has to have a preceptor, agreed upon by the Order, who must present him to the Order—that is to the one dwelling within the boundary where he wants to take up his

¹ Besides the Mahāvagga references, see e.g. MN i.368, MN i.379, MN i.391, MN i.396.

² See also e.g. MN i.290, MN i.413, MN i.489, MN i.501.

residence—and who must have prepared him beforehand so that, without feeling ashamed or confused, he will be able to answer a number of routine questions that will be put to him in the midst of the Order. No doubt of gradual growth, these routine-questions form a kind of examination, and it is impressed on the candidate by his preceptor that now, above all times, is a time for truth-speaking.

These are, however, merely some of the features among the many leading to the finalised form of the ordination proceedings. These multiplied and became intricate to suit the dynamic and progressive phase in which they took shape. Gone is the old simplicity of “Come, monk”. Regulations have to increase to meet a complexity of emergent eventualities. The resources, *nissaya*, the minimum number of monks composing an Order competent to ordain, the number of years a monk must have been ordained before he is reckoned as suitable or competent to ordain others, living in dependence, *nissāya vatthum*, on a teacher, giving guidance, *nissayam dātum*, the qualities that a monk should be possessed of in order to ordain, and the ordination and probation of former members of other sects, and the age at which a person may be ordained, are all subjects brought under review. The inner life of the Order had to be safeguarded as much as had its relations to the world outside.

That the candidate for ordination had to undergo a prior period of preparation and instruction at the hands of a preceptor implies a passage of time elapsing between “going forth” or preliminary admission, and “ordination”, or final admission. It would seem that in order to meet difficulties, perhaps created by the drawing power of Gotama’s Order itself, what had once been one operation became split into two. This is the intention of **Kd 1.28** which, without mentioning admission, allows monks to ordain by a formal act consisting of the motion and the resolution put to the Order three times. Since the method of admission is not formulated here, although Sāriputta had asked how to admit and how to ordain, it becomes clear that these two proceedings, hitherto simultaneous, are now in the process of separating. **Kd 1.30** shows even more confusion. It cites an instance

where monks admit and ordain a brahmin who had asked for admission (only). Gotama reproved them for admitting anyone who went forth for the sake of the good meals the monks were reputed to enjoy—and then pointed out the four “resources” for one being ordained, saying that admission was for the sake, not of good food, but of each one of the resources.

It is, however, clear that two stages were becoming necessary before the full status of a monk could be acquired, and that in the earlier of these two stages, entered on to by *pabbajjā*, admission, the monk’s standing, rights and duties would be different from those in the latter stage, entered on to by *upasampadā*, ordination. Hence when *pabbajjā* was functionally separated from *upasampadā*, it received a new and specialised significance, coming to mean admission to noviciateship. One became a novice, *sāmaṇera*, by the conferment of *pabbajjā*, a newly ordained monk, *nava*, by the conferment of *upasampadā*. The former, like the latter, had its own machinery for its proper enactment (BD 1.50–BD.1.61). For example, a boy should not be allowed to “go forth” unless he had his parents’ consent, and unless he had reached the age of fifteen, except on the strange condition that he could scare crows (BD 1.51)—a test perhaps that his first infancy was past. Methods of dealing with refractory novices are laid down (BD 1.57–BD.1.60). As depraved monks could be expelled after they had been ordained, so depraved novices could be expelled before they were ordained. The going for refuge in the *buddha*, *dhamma* and *saṅgha* although abolished from the normal procedure of ordination, was retained as the formula novices are to repeat when being allowed to go forth (Kd 1.54.3). It is also the formula to be used by those former members of other sects, who later will be eligible for ordination, when they are asking to enter on a four months’ probationary period which they have to observe first (BD 1.38).

By enlarging the Order to include novices, who might be those who shared a cell (with a preceptor) or pupils (of a teacher), by not limiting it to Gotama himself and the first sixty monks, all of whom were arahants, by exhorting these original “adepts” to go forth and

teach *dhamma* and as a result of their returning with an unspecified number of people seeking for admission and ordination, the Order was rendered accessible to men whose powers of attaining the matchless deliverance (Kd 1.13.1) were not so great as those of the original disciples. These were monks who therefore stood in need of training. But in spite of many opportunities of submitting to it and profiting by it, they did not always turn out satisfactorily. Hence it may be presumed that the *bhikkhusaṅgha* of the third refuge for lay followers said less than was intended. The *saṅgha* of arahants, or at least of ariyans is meant, not that of average men. The *Saṅgha* of the Triple Gem is not the community of monks as such, not the community that includes the groups of six or seventeen monks, notorious for their bad habits and as makers of trouble, or the quarrelsome monks of Kosambī, or those depraved or ill-behaved individuals on account of all of whom rules were formulated, regulations devised, and offences discriminated from what were not classed as offences, and whose misdoings provide the *raison d'être* of discipline, of *vinaya*, of the outward standard of self-control so much needed not merely to distinguish the monks from members of other sects, although in some cases a certain amount of imitation was permitted, but also to gain the loyalty and support of the lay followers. For on these depended to a large extent the physical conditions which would make a monk free to devote himself to his training, the goal of which was the vision of *nibbāna*. The *Saṅgha* of the third refuge has in reality reference only to those steadfast disciples who, having entered the *sotāpanna* stage are on the supramundane parts of the Way, and so are themselves of supramundane stature and attainments—*lokuttara* because unaffected by all that is *lokiya*, of the world, compounded and conditioned. “They are united by the communion of understanding and ethical behaviour,” according to the Commentaries on the *Bhayabherava Sutta* (MN-a i.130ff.) and the *Khuddakapāṭha* (Kp-a 18), in both of which the meaning of “going for refuge” is discussed at length and at a high level not approached in the *Vinaya Commentary*.

The first twenty-four chapters of the First Section, the Mahākhan-

dhaka, of the Mahāvagga appear to give a chronological account of events from the night of Awakening under the Bo-tree on the banks of the river Nerañjarā to the admission and ordination of Sāriputta and Moggallāna, the pair of chief disciples, already gone forth from home into homelessness as wanderers. From this point on, a precise historical narration is not so apparent, for the Mahāvagga now begins to group together subject-matter that belongs together. Strict chronology is suspended, no doubt in the interests of classifying this subject-matter and reducing its complexity to some kind of manageable order, the better to be fixed in the memory. What need was there for the existing or for any subsequent Order to know the exact procession of events? It was of greater value to learn and master the rules and procedure governing both the recurrent occasions and the daily conduct of monastic life, and this could be more easily accomplished if the material for the various topics were grouped together instead of being scattered throughout the immense compilation known as the Vinaya-Piṭaka.

If, in the hands of the early editors the sequence of events became secondary to systematisation, this plan nonetheless well shows both the development and the stabilisation of the Order as a uniform institution, the growth of several monastic practices, of government within it for the sake of its own preservation and continuance which, in turn, depended on the essential qualities of scrupulousness and striving on the part of the individuals who became its members. These therefore were being continually brought to live in conformity with a standard of behaviour specially suitable to recluses, *samaṇa*, and worthy of those who had “left the world” with its evanescent pleasures and its troubles and had instead entered on a way of life where worldly joys and sorrows were gradually to be renounced so that the other-worldly and higher joy that transcended them could be apprehended.

For achieving this, the life of the Order regarded as a whole came to be, no doubt gradually, planned and arranged and adapted to circumstances, while, running parallel to such developments, the life

of its members became carefully regulated. Thus the first steps of all—admission and ordination into the Order—were experimented with until various types of applicants regarded as not eligible for entry could be excluded by rules, based either on experience or on forethought. This left the Order open only to the sort of person whom it was not unreasonable to suppose might be assimilated without bringing it into disgrace. Even so, there were backsliders, as already mentioned. Disgrace would have been courted if, for example, debtors and those in the royal service had been allowed to escape their obligations by becoming monks. Therefore they were debarred from entering the Order.

After its first Section on Admission and Ordination, the Mahāvagga proceeds to an account of the nature and establishment of the great fortnightly Observance of *uposatha*, whose principal feature is the recital of the Pātimokkha rules. This provides monks with an occasion to reveal any offence they may have committed. Their silence, on the other hand, is taken to mean that they have “entire purity”, *pārisuddhi*, in respect of adherence to the rules. As usual, all kinds of subsidiary matters had to be defined and regularised in order to achieve the smooth running of the main concerns. In the case of the *Uposatha* it was for example determined that only monks living within the same recognised boundary should gather together on an *Uposatha* day. Therefore methods of fixing boundaries had to be established. Moreover the *Uposatha* could not be held at some place chosen at random; a place of a maximum size for the current needs had to be agreed upon within each boundary so that all the monks living there should know where to go and arrive in time. If they had difficulty in crossing a river—one that ran through their boundary—to get there, it might be agreed by the Order that they need not come bringing all their three robes; but if they left them behind they must not lay them aside in an unsuitable place where they might get lost or burnt or eaten by rats (BD 2.12).

Right and wrong methods of reciting the Pātimokkha are given: whether or not it should be recited in full or in brief, which to some

extent depended on the absence or presence of ten sources of danger. It was, ideally, to be recited by an elder (*thera*), but if he was incompetent, then it was to be recited by some other experienced, competent monk; if there were none within the boundary, a newly ordained monk was to be sent to a neighbouring residence to learn it there, either in full or in brief, and then return (Kd 2.17.6).

If a monk, owing to illness, could not attend the recital of the Pāti-mokkha, he had to send his “entire purity”, *pārisuddhi*, by another. This monk conveyed it on behalf of the one who was ill and declared it (*dātum*) to the Order; but many occasions are posited when the entire purity comes to be not conveyed on account of a variety of things that might happen to the conveyer both while on his way from the invalid to the meeting-place and after his arrival there but before he had given the entire purity. This, and the conveyance and giving, or declaration of the consent (*chandam dātum*) on behalf of a monk who is ill for the carrying out of a formal act of the Order, serve to show how extremely important it was held to be—a point stressed over and over again—that an Order should be “complete” whenever its business was being discharged. This was not to fall into the hands of the few. Even those who, like Mahākappina, claimed to be “purified with the highest purity” (Kd 2.5.5), were not not to go. For an Order would not have been complete if even one monk were absent. It would seem that the only reasons for not going to the Observance in person were severe illness and madness. In the former case the Order could be regarded as complete although in fact not complete, provided that the entire purity and the consent were properly and safely conveyed and declared. In the latter, the Order must grant the mad monk, here typified by Gagga, the agreement for a madman. This agreement is to the effect that whether the mad monk remembers the Observance or not, comes for it or not, whether he remembers a formal act of the Order or not, comes for it or not, the Order either with him or without him can legitimately carry out both the Observance and the formal act.

Such are some of the items and problems which had to be settled

and solved before the recital of the Pātimokkha received its final form. I do not recapitulate all these here, for they may be read in the text. Those I have given may be regarded as typical of the care taken to forestall and circumvent deleterious contingencies that might arise and disrupt the monk's standing either in his own eyes or in those of his fellows or those of the world. The strength of the regulations governing monastic proceedings and individual conduct lies in the standard or criterion they give of how to act in a multitude of circumstances affecting a monk's life.

When the Mahāvagga comes to deal with the rainy season it pays almost equal attention to entering on the rains and then keeping them by residing in one monastery for either the first three or the second three of the four months of this period, as it does to the journeys monks may take away from their rains-residence. The prime motive underlying the establishment of rains-residences was protection or non-injury: the protection of crops—the economic main-spring of life—and the protection of the teeming small creatures that some Pācittiyas also seek to safeguard. One of the results of this anxiety not to harm vegetable or animal life, and which sometimes received an impetus from the criticisms the laity made, was the allowance given monks and nuns to enter on the rains, followed by an attempt to immobilise them during this season. But restrictions such as this latter were at variance with the immense vitality the Orders possessed, as is shown by the numerous occasions when it is deemed not only permissible but desirable for monks to leave the rains-residence on various kinds of monastic business or on compassionate missions. Even as life must go on, so the Order's business must go on. And the life of this smaller world within the larger one could not close down entirely for a third of each year¹; monks were too much involved with the world outside, they were dependent on it (BD 3.10-BD.3.11.4), and had commitments towards it, and their lives were too much interlocked with those of the laity to make this

¹ The rains lasted for four months. Each monk could choose whether he would observe the first three months or the second three months, but he was not expected to observe all four.

feasible. A compromise had therefore to be found between, on the one hand, staying in a residence for the whole of the three months of the rains, whereby the minimum of harm would be brought to the crops and the life of minute creatures, and, on the other, leaving the residence for business which might reasonably be regarded as urgent. This compromise was effected by limiting the time of absence to seven days; and the business calling for a monk's presence being carefully defined, if he could not transact it within this time, he should not undertake it at all.

The end of the rains was marked by two ceremonies. One of these was the Pavāraṇā, when monks invited one another to speak of offences they had seen, heard or suspected to have been committed during the rains. The recital of the Pātimokkha was to "remove" offences, by confessing them, during the nine dry months of the year; the Invitation was to remove any offences that monks had committed during the three wet months, and would help them to aim at grasping discipline (Kd 4.1.13).

The other ceremony held at the end of the rains was not disciplinary in nature or connected with the confession of offences. It was for the making up of the *kaṭhina* cloth, or cotton cloth that had accrued by way of gift to the monks, into robes to replace those that had become thin and shabby or spoiled by the rains (Kd 7). Thus the replenishment of robe-material comes under consideration, and had to be managed in an orderly and prescribed way.

Further, various officers were created for looking after robe-material: the acceptor, the guardian, the distributor; places suitable for store-rooms are prescribed: dyes and methods of dyeing laid down; the use of three robes only (one doubled however) allowed; while the kinds of medicine monks might take are discussed in considerable detail. The kinds of shoes and sandals they might wear, and the use they might make of animals' skins are treated with equal precision. Both of these categories no doubt spring from the desire not to take life, however infinitesimal. Wooden shoes, or clogs, are objected to because if monks wore them and stepped on insects they might

kill them (Kd 5.6.3), besides disturbing monks who were meditating. Further, sandals made of young palmyra palms and young bamboos came to be forbidden after people had complained to monks that, in cutting these down, they were destroying life that was one-facultied. Other complaints must also have tended to reduce the slaughter of animals. Rugs—or garments (Kd 8.28.2)—made of black antelope skin were forbidden to monks and also sheets made of the hide of the *Kadali* deer (Kd 5.10.4), and it became an offence of wrong-doing to recline upon the hides of lions, tigers and leopards (Kd 5.10.6) or of smaller animals. Cowhides were forbidden because scandalised monks found that one of their number had incited a depraved lay follower to kill a calf for his benefit, and they remembered that Gotama had condemned “onslaught on creatures”. But, at the end of Kd 5, an exception is made in favour of the border districts (Kd 5.13.13) where, because of the hardships and discomfort, the hides of sheep, goats and deer were allowed to be used as coverings.

The last two Sections of the *Mahāvagga* point to an Order that was indubitably growing and that, in order to meet this expansion, had to be carefully controlled. Kd 9 engages on a thorough discussion of what it is that constitutes valid as against invalid formal acts that an Order can carry out. In the first place an Order to carry out a legally valid formal act must be complete; those monks not able to be present because of illness must send their leave for absence, and those who are present must not protest against the proceedings. A “complete Order” also refers, as before, to the one residing within a determined boundary. The actions and business of every such Order must be transacted on a uniform pattern, and conform to one uniform standard, so that each Order transacts its business in the same way as every other, all following the same regulations. This must therefore be done, in the second place, *dhammena*, rightly, properly, by rule. To carry out a formal act *dhammena*, by rule, means that if it is to be carried out by a motion and one resolution, *ñattidutiya*, the motion must be put and the resolution proposed once only. But if it is to be carried out by a motion and a resolution put three times,

ñatticatuttha, then this must be done, in all cases the motion being put before the resolution is proclaimed. The formal act will then be irreversible, fit to stand, and protests against its validity of no avail. Immense pains are taken to distinguish a formal act carried out in a complete assembly and by rule from one carried out in an incomplete assembly and either by what has the appearance of rule or not by rule. The formal acts under the jurisdiction of an Order number sixteen. They comprise (Kd 9.4.1): invitation, rehabilitation, ordination, but only an Order consisting of twenty monks or more can carry out all of these. They also include verdicts of innocence, of past insanity, specific depravity, formal acts of suspension for not seeing an offence, for not making amends for it, for not giving up a wrong view; and of banishment, censure, placing under guidance, reconciliation, sending one who merits probation back to the beginning, and the imposing of *mānatta* (two features in the penalty for *Saṅghādisesa* offences). When circumstances justify, these formal acts may be revoked by the Order.

Finally, the tenth and last Section strikes a different note again by promulgating regulations and advice for allaying schisms. These might arise through genuine disagreement upon what constituted an offence and what did not, or upon the particular kind of offence incurred by a particular action; or when factions formed to support a monk or monks who had quarrelled with their fellows from other causes, among which must be included the positive wish to create a schism, a wish put into practice by, for example, suspending a monk for an offence he had not committed and that he therefore refused to see as an offence of his. On one such an occasion Gotama is reputed to have tried, unsuccessfully, to make the bickering monks compose their differences by telling them a Jātaka story illustrating the conquest of wrath by non-wrath (Kd 10.2). The Mahāvagga therefore contains *dhamma* or doctrine as well as discipline. Indeed the latter would be nugatory if it were not based on the former and promulgated in conjunction with it. How great is the contrast between the quarrelsome monks of Kosambī whose brawls and dissen-

sions caused Gotama to seek solitude like the great bull-elephant who was beset and annoyed by the rest of the herd (Kd 10.4.6), and the peaceable monks, Anuruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila who lived harmoniously together as milk and water blend, regarding one another with the eye of affection, full of amity in gesture, speech and thought surrendering their minds to each other and so, although having different bodies, having only one mind *nāna hi kho no kāyā ekañ ca pana maññe cittaṃ*, (Kd 10.4.3-Kd.10.4.4).

The Mahāvagga deals with a time when, at the beginning of Gotama's ministry, the number of monks—and nuns too—was fast increasing, and when they, travelling to more distant parts of India, bore the new doctrine with them and so started the influx of members that has gone on until today. If the geographical expansion of the Order can be gauged by the relaxations in the rules for the outlying districts or border countries, made necessary by the conditions prevailing there, harder than those of the Middle Country where otherwise the scene is laid—principally at Rājagaha, also at Sāvattthī, Vesālī, Kapilavatthu and other neighbouring places—its numerical expansion can equally well be gauged by the awareness of schisms arising to the danger and detriment of the Order, and which could only have occurred some time after its formation.

Although the beginning of the Mahāvagga gives not only an impression but an account of an Order expanding and taking shape immediately after its inception, the remainder appears to refer to a time when the Order already had a considerable amount of history behind it, and to a time therefore when many rules had been laid down and when, in spite of attempted schisms, a certain amount of stability had been achieved in the matter of the Order's government and legislation. This may to some extent be judged, for example, by the number of times, thirteen in all, that the phrase *yathādhammo kāretabbo*, should be dealt with according to the rule, occurs. The rule referred to will in each case be found complete with the penalty incurred for infringing it, in the Vibhaṅgas. That the use of this phrase assumes the prior existence of the rule is confirmed, in ad-

dition, by the fact that the material contained in the Mahāvagga is placed in the palm-leaf manuscripts after the Maha- (or Bhikkhu-) and Bhikkhuni-Vibhaṅgas. Although this sequence is not followed by Oldenberg in his edition of the *Vinaya Piṭakam*, it is that rightly adopted in the *Vinaya Texts*, for here the Vibhaṅga for monks, although drastically curtailed precedes the Mahāvagga—that for nuns being omitted entirely.

The question then arises why, in the middle of the Vinaya, an account is incorporated “of the very first events in the history of the Saṅgha” (*Vinaya Texts* i.72, note). Rhys Davids and Oldenberg think it “natural” to connect “the stories or legends concerning the ordination of bhikkhus” with these early events because, so they argue, “it was impossible to realise the idea of a Saṅgha without rules showing who was to be regarded as a duly admitted member of the fraternity, and who was not”. I agree that this provides a good reason for prefacing the record of the development of the first and most vital step in a monk’s life by a short history of how there came to be a life for monks at all. From their admission and ordination, all the rest follows. At the same time many stories are interspersed throughout the whole of the Vinaya, excepting the Parivāra. Not only are there several in the Mahāvagga itself, for example about Ambapālī and the Licchavis, about Jīvaka Komārabhacca, Visākhā, Meṇḍaka, Dīghāvu, and about Pilindavaccha, and about the boy Upālī (both told elsewhere in the Vinaya), and countless shorter ones, but every rule in the Vibhaṅgas is introduced by some story, long or short, as the case may be. This being so, it seems not only “natural” but logical to introduce the rules governing the initial and most important step in a monk’s life by an account of the first events which occurred after the supreme moment when Gotama attained full self-awakening. Since this was the initial and most important step in a Buddha’s career, to recount it was therefore the greatest of all stories a Buddhist “book” could tell.

The Mahāvagga possibly derives its name from that of its first Section, the Mahākhandhaka, the Great (or Greater) Section because

it deals with great (or greater) events. The plan of naming a Division after its first Section, or a Section after its first chapter, is of fairly common occurrence in the Piṭakas, and was perhaps adopted here. On the other hand, it might be conceded that the Mahāvagga, including as it does matter concerned with admission and ordination, with the *Uposatha*, Pātimokkha, Pavāraṇā and Kaṭhina ceremonies, the clarification of what are valid formal acts, and the ways of dealing with a schism, contains subjects exceeding in importance those contained in the Cūlavagga. It is again possible that the Cūlavagga was regarded as the “Less” or “Lesser” or the Small Division because of its two Sections on the Councils of Rājagaha and Vesālī. As the first of these purports to have been convened shortly after Gotama had died, and the second a century later, the Cūlavagga takes us to a time when he, as the living fount of authority, was no longer promulgating discipline, and when discipline was no longer growing.

Yet the mass of the rules attributed to him and held to have been laid down by him when he was alive, many large in their scope, others concerned with small details, but having their own significance nonetheless, together yield a formidable body of that discipline, *vinaya*, which with *dhamma*, was to be the teacher after Gotama had passed away. The text at DN ii.154 is I think sufficiently clear in its meaning, although it has been accused of gloss. It reads *yo vo Ānanda mayā dhammo ca vinayo ca desito paññatto so vo mam’ accayena satthā*. Gotama was speaking to Ānanda, a monk; he would not therefore have omitted to speak of *vinaya* which, together with *dhamma*, gives a surer basis for progress towards the final vision and ultimate bliss than *dhamma* alone can give. Had the sentence run: *yo vo mayā dhammo ca desito vinayo ca paññatto*, it might have been more apparent that the reference of the following *so* was to both *dhamma* and *vinaya*. *Dhamma* is taught, *desita*, showing the Way; *vinaya* is laid down, *paññatta*, for keeping one’s footsteps on the Way by strict adherence to it. Both are *satthu sāsanaṃ*, the Teacher’s instruction.

Discipline, as promulgated, is itself an authority. According to the early editors (**Vin 1.99**) the teaching will stand firm so long as

4.xviii

Vinaya is not lost even if the Suttanta (Piṭaka) and the Abhidhamma be forgotten. It is moreover capable of almost indefinite extension and application, and can regulate items of behaviour that, in spite of the multitude of rules, offences and “allowances” (*anujānāmi*) that were laid down by the Teacher, were not legislated for in particular in his lifetime. The monk must make up his mind about what has not been legislated for, measuring any course of action by the general standard of what he knows to be discipline. He must remember this and apply it to his problem. When Mahāpajāpati asked to be taught *dhamma* in brief (Vin 2.258) a general standard was given to her by which she might know of other things *eso dhammo eso vinayo etaṃ satthu sāsanaṃ* (this is *dhamma*, this is discipline, this is the Teacher’s instruction). Similarly in the Mahāvagga, when some monks were doubtful or had scruples about what had been allowed, *anuññata*, and what had not, they were told that anything not fitting in with what had been allowed, anything tallying with what had not been allowed, was not allowable, *na kappati*, not suitable; and the contrary.

In the Mahāvagga alone there are about 280 occasions when Gotama, by uttering the word *anujānāmi*, I allow, I permit, made something or some usage permissible to monks. The variety of cases covered is so large, ranging as it does from accepting a monastery to the preparation of a foot-salve, from using three robes to the insertion of a patch, from the novices training in ten rules to the use of a trough for dye, that anyone acquainted with these would stand a good chance of knowing how to act in circumstances not specifically either allowed or objected to by Gotama. Or they could extend an “allowance” to suit circumstances beyond those legislated for. Gotama himself, as recorded, once gave a flint in this direction when, after making ten “allowances” for curing a boil a monk was suffering from, finally said, “I allow, monks, a linen bandage, and every treatment for curing a sore” (Kd 6.14.4–Kd.6.14.5).

Besides the use of *anujānāmi*, the Buddha is often represented as saying to monks, “you may” or “you should not”, a prohibition apt to be followed by intimating that contravention results in an offence of

wrong-doing. This kind of offence, with *thullaccaya*, grave offences, mentioned infrequently in this volume, and three other types of offence, not mentioned here at all, are regarded as a “falling away from right habits” (Kd 4.16.12).

Whether Gotama himself was responsible for all these allowances and prohibitions we shall probably never know. In the story of the three monks who had spent the rains at Rājagaha and who journeyed to Pāṭaliputta to ask elders residing there to solve their problem there is a hint that power might be delegated (Kd 8.24.6). This story may, however, be included in the Mahāvagga for the simple reason that it was recording exceptional events. Or it may have been left in because in fact the practice of turning to others instead of to Gotama to interpret *dhamma*, a rule, was becoming more generally adopted than is evident in the rest of the Mahāvagga.

It is true that there is not much philosophy in the Vinaya. It is by nature as by name a book or basket of discipline. But as it is rather hollow to lay down rules for training and for outward behaviour without giving the underlying reasons why they should be observed, it is not possible to exclude philosophical concepts completely from a “book” principally concerned with discipline. I have already mentioned some of these philosophical concepts (above, BD 4.viii). The Mahāvagga, especially at its beginning, is not in fact devoid of some of the notions which are recognised features in Buddhist philosophy. In the first place, to mention but a few examples, the goal is spoken of and is named. It is *amata*, deathlessness, the undying. Its gates have been opened by Gotama, the Way-finder, so that those who hear *dhamma* may arrive at the object of their quest. The notion of gaining the goal by travelling on a Way between two opposites is common to many traditions and in Pali Buddhism finds expression in the First Utterance, but which is merely one example among several the Pali canon contains of the philosophical rightness of adopting the mean between two opposing extremes. The First Sermon also defines the four truths of ill, or the unsatisfactoriness and suffering which possesses every compounded thing. It is because these truths are

not understood or grasped that there is this long long faring-on (in *saṃsāra*) “both for me and for you” (Vin 1.230). Ill has to be eradicated by cutting off its root, ignorant craving, before recurrent birth, again-becoming, *punabbhava*, can be stopped, and deathlessness won.

Then, the young men are told, in a passage that with the passing of time has become controversial, that they should seek, *gaveseyyātha*, the self, *attānaṃ* (singular). Anyone acquainted with the importance of Atman, self, in the Upaniṣads might be inclined to think that this was the greatest of all philosophical concepts in Ancient India. Various passages in the Pali canon, including the Attavagga of the *Dhammapada*, should not be ignored in estimating the position of it as a philosophical concept in Early Buddhism. The Second Utterance, for example, lays the idea of self beside that of not-self when it says in its opening words: *rūpaṃ bhikkhave anattā, rūpaṃ ca h’idaṃ bhikkhave attā abhaviṣṣa*, “material shape (or body), monks, is not self, for if, monks, material shape had been self ...” and similarly of the four other *khandhas*: if they had been self they would not be as we know them: impermanent, suffering and liable to alteration. Everything that is compounded or constructed is not-self. What is constructed is to be escaped from (Ud p.80); and the self is to be sought (Vin 1.23), that self which therefore by inference is not made, is not compounded, and which is unaffected by *kamma*, the deeds or actions done in a series of individual lives while the being is bound to *saṃsāra*, *satto saṃsāraṃ āpādi* (SN i.38).

The message of the Third Utterance is that if one turns away from feelings of pleasure and pain derived from the impingement of the sixfold sensory data on their appropriate sense-organs, then one knows that one is freed and comprehends that birth (rebirth) is destroyed, the walk to the Highest is brought to a close, done is what was to be done, and there is now no more of being this or that (Vin 1.34-35). The content of this Disquisition on Burning is purely philosophical.

Nor will the various allusions to cause and dependent origination

be missed. The whole system was based on cause: if this comes to be that will come to be. Discipline therefore will lead to something not yet existing for the man who is earnestly training in it and cultivating it. The Buddha would not have spent so much time in laying down rules and precepts unless he had thought they would be effective in the quest for the goal.

At the top of each right hand page the chapter number and paragraph number of each Section are given.¹ The figures in heavy type in square brackets in the body of the text refer to the page numbers of Oldenberg's *Vinaya Piṭakam*, Volume I, and are placed so as to mark the end of each such page.

I gratefully acknowledge the care and attention given by the Burleigh Press to the production of this volume.

I.B. HORNER.

London, February, 1951.

¹ Note by Sujato: These remarks do not apply to the SuttaCentral edition.

1. GOING FORTH (PABBAJĀ)

Praise to the Lord, the Perfected One, the Fully Self-Awakened One

ON AWAKENING

At one time¹ the awakened one, the Lord, being recently fully awakened, was staying at Uruvelā on the bank of the river Nerañjarā at the foot of the Tree of Awakening.² Then the Lord sat cross-legged in one (posture)³ for seven days at the foot of the Tree of Awakening⁴ experiencing the bliss of freedom.⁵

Then the Lord during the first watch of the night paid attention to⁶ causal uprising in direct and reverse order: conditioned by ignorance⁷ are the habitual tendencies⁸; conditioned by the habitual tendencies is consciousness⁹; conditioned by consciousness is psycho-physicality¹⁰; conditioned by psycho-physicality are the six (sense-) spheres; conditioned by the six (sense-) spheres is aware-

¹ From here to the end of *Kd 1.2.3* cf. Ud p. 1. I largely follow translation at *Verses of Uplift*, which also see for notes. ² *bodhirukkha* is the Bo-tree, *ficus religiosa*. Vin-a 952 says “*bodhi* is knowledge of the four ways; the lord attained that awakening here, so the tree acquired the name of the tree of awakening.” Cf. MN-a iii.326 and MN-a i.54. ³ *eka-pallaṅkena*. ⁴ *bodhirukkhamūle*; cf. *bodhiyā mūle* at Ps.i.174 = Mnd 458; and *bodhimūle* at Snp-a 32, Snp-a 391. ⁵ *vimuttisukha*. ⁶ *manasākāsi*, worked with the mind. ⁷ The “causal chain” occurs, with explanations of its terms, at SN ii.1ff. See also MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 76ff. ⁸ *sankhāra*. ⁹ *viññāṇa*. See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 77, p. 150; *Indian Religion and Survival*, p. 66; *Original Gospel*, p. 63, p. 112, p. 114; *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii, 2nd edition, Preface, p. ix for the view that *viññāṇa* has a meaning of “man as surviving.” ¹⁰ *nāmarūpa*, name and shape.

ness¹; conditioned by awareness is feeling; conditioned by feeling² is craving; conditioned by craving is grasping; conditioned by grasping is becoming; conditioned by becoming is birth; conditioned by birth, old age and dying, grief, sorrow and lamentation, suffering, dejection and despair come into being.

Such is the arising of this entire mass of ill. But from the utter fading away and stopping of this very ignorance (comes) the stopping of habitual tendencies; from the stopping of habitual tendencies the stopping of consciousness; from the stopping of consciousness³ the stopping of psycho-physicality; from the stopping of psycho-physicality the stopping of the six (sense-) spheres; from the stopping of the six (sense-) spheres the stopping of awareness; from the stopping of awareness the stopping of feeling; from the stopping of feeling the stopping of craving; from the stopping of craving the stopping of grasping; from the stopping of grasping the stopping of becoming; from the stopping of becoming the stopping of birth; from the stopping of birth, old age and dying, grief, sorrow and lamentation, suffering, dejection and despair are stopped. Such is the stopping of this entire mass of ill.

Then the Lord, having understood this matter, at that time uttered this (solemn) utterance:

“Truly, when things⁴ grow plain
to the ardent meditating brahmin,
His doubts all vanish
in that he comprehends thing-with-cause.”

Then the Lord during the middle watch of the night paid attention to causal uprising in direct and reverse order: conditioned by

¹ *phassa*, perhaps contact. It is the known or realised impingement of a sense-datum on its appropriate sense-organ. ² From here to “dejection and despair come into being”, cf. DN i.45. ³ From here to the end of the paragraph cf. DN ii.35. ⁴ *dhammā*. According to Vin-a 954-5 the (thirty-seven) things helpful to awakening and the four *ariyan* true things. These last are not necessarily the four truths of ill, for see AN v.56 (the four stations of mindfulness) and *Minor Anthologies 1*, Introduction, p. 2ff. But see also *Points of Controversy*, p. 118, n. 1. This verse and the two following occur at Kv 186.

ignorance are the habitual tendencies; conditioned by the habitual tendencies is consciousness ... Such is the arising ... Such is the stopping of this entire mass of ill.

Then the Lord, having understood this matter, at that time uttered this (solemn) utterance:

“Truly, when things grow plain
to the ardent meditating brahmin,
His doubts all vanish
in that he discerns destruction of cause.”

Then the Lord during the last watch of the night paid attention to causal uprising in direct and reverse order: conditioned by ignorance are the habitual tendencies; conditioned by the habitual tendencies is consciousness ... Such is the arising ... Such is the stopping of this entire mass of ill.

Then the Lord, having understood this matter, at that time uttered this (solemn) utterance:

“Truly, when things grow plain
to the ardent meditating brahmin,
Routing the host of Māra does he stand
Like as the sun when lighting up the sky.”

*Told is the Talk on Awakening.*¹

AT THE GOATHERDS' BANYAN TREE

Then the Lord, having emerged from that contemplation at the end of seven days, approached the Goatherds' Banyan² from the foot of the Tree of Awakening; having approached, he sat cross-legged in one (posture) for seven days at the foot of the Goatherds' Banyan experiencing the bliss of freedom.

¹ This is probably an abbreviation for “Told is the Talk at the Tree of Awakening”: see titles of 2, 3 and 4. ² Although Ud-a 51 gives two more possible explanations for this name than Vin-a 957, both agree that goatherds used to come and sit in the shade of this tree.

Then a certain brahmin of the class uttering the sound *hum*¹ approached the Lord; having approached, he exchanged greetings with the Lord; having exchanged greetings of friendliness and courtesy, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance, that brahmin spoke thus to the Lord: “To what extent, good Gotama, does one become a brahmin? And again, what are the things which make a brahmin²?”

Then the Lord, having understood this matter, at that time uttered this (solemn) utterance:

“That brahmin who bars out evil things,
not uttering the sound *hum*³,
with no impurity, curbed-of-self,
Master of Vedas⁴, who lives the Brahma-faring—
this is the brahmin who may rightly speak the Brahma-
speech⁵
Who has no blemishes⁶ anywhere in the world⁷.”

Told is the Talk at the Goatherds’

¹ *huhuñkajātiko brāhmaṇo*. See Journal of the Pali Text Society, 1901, p.42, and *Verses of Uplift*, p. 3, n. Vin-a 957 calls him one who believes in omens that are seen, *diṭṭhamangalika*, and who walks about making: (the sound) *hum* from arrogance and in anger. ² *brāhmaṇa-karaṇā*. Ud 3 reads *-kārakā*. ³ *nihuhuñka*. He is to give up having confidence in his superstitious omens and formulæ, and to believe instead in the new teaching. “Brahmin” came to mean, in this, the best and highest kind of man. ⁴ *vedāntagū*, as at Snp 463. Vin-a 958 says there has been a going either to the end by means of the “lores” (*vedas*, those called the knowledge of the four ways, or to the end of the three Vedas. ⁵ *dhammena so brāhmaṇo brahmāvādāni vadeyya*. Vin-a 958=Ud-a 55 take this to mean he can rightly say “I am a brahmin”. MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 85, translates *brahmavāda* by “Brahma-faith”, with a note, p. 84, that *vāda* is equally to be rendered by *-cult* or *-teaching*. ⁶ *ussāda*, prominence, excrescence; conceit, arrogance. Vin-a 958=Ud-a 55 give five: passion, hatred, stupidity, pride, false view. Snp-a ii.521 gives seven, enumerated at Snp-a ii.425 as the five of Vin-a and Ud-a With the addition of the obstructions and wrong conduct. See my *Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected*, p.262 and p.265, n. 2. ⁷ This verse occurs at Ud p. 3, Ne 150. Last line = last line of Snp 783.

ON MUCALINDA

^d1.3.1 Then the Lord, at the end of seven days, having emerged from that contemplation, approached the Mucalinda (tree) from the foot of the Goatherds' Banyan; having approached, he sat cross-legged in one (posture) for seven days at the foot of the Mucalinda experiencing the bliss of freedom.

^d1.3.2 Now at that time¹ a great storm arose out of due season, for seven days there was rainy weather, cold winds and overcast skies. Then Mucalinda, the serpent king, having come forth from his own haunt, having encircled the Lord's body seven times with his coils, having spread a great hood over his head, stood saying: "Let no cold (annoy) the Lord, let no heat (annoy) the Lord, let not the touch of flies, mosquitoes, wind and heat or creeping things (annoy) the Lord."

^d1.3.3 Then Mucalinda, the serpent king, at the end of those² seven days, having known that the sky³ was clear and without a cloud, having unwound his coils from the Lord's body, having given up his own form and assumed a youth's form, stood in front of the Lord honouring the Lord with joined palms.

^d1.3.4 Then the Lord, having understood this matter, at that time uttered this (solemn) utterance:

"Happy his solitude who glad at heart
Hath *dhamma* learnt and doth the vision see!
Happy is that benignity towards
The world which on no creature worketh harm.

Happy the absence of all lust, th' ascent
Past and beyond the needs of sense-desires.
He who doth crush the great 'I am' conceit—
This, truly this, is happiness supreme."

Told is the Talk at the Mucalinda

¹ Kd 1.23.2-Kd 1.3.4=Ud 2.1, Mucalindavagga; verses quoted Kv 212, see *Points of Controversy*, 129, n. 3 for further references. ² *tassa*, omitted at Vin 1.3, but found at Ud 10. ³ *deva*.

AT THE RĀJĀYATANA TREE

Then the Lord, at the end of seven days, having emerged from that contemplation, approached the Rājāyatana¹ from the foot of the Mu-calinda; having approached, he sat cross-legged in one (posture) for seven days at the foot of the Rājāyatana experiencing the bliss of freedom.

Now at that time² the merchants Tapussa³ and Bhallika were going along the high-road from Ukkalā to that district.⁴ Then a *devatā* who was a blood-relation of the merchants Tapussa and Bhallika spoke thus to the merchants Tapussa and Bhallika: “My good fellows, this Lord, having just (become) wholly awakened, is staying at the foot of the Rājāyatana, go and serve that Lord with barley-gruel⁵ and honey-balls, and this will be a blessing and happiness for you for a long time.”

Then the merchants Tapussa and Bhallika, taking barley-gruel and honey-balls, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they stood at a respectful distance. As they were standing at a respectful distance, the merchants Tapussa and Bhallika spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, let the Lord receive our barley-gruel and honey-balls, that this may be a blessing and happiness for us for a long time.”

Then it occurred to the Lord: “Truth-finders⁶ do not receive with their hands. Now with what shall I receive the barley-gruel and honey-balls?” Then the four Great Kings, knowing with their minds the reasoning in the Lord’s mind, from the four quarters presented the Lord with four bowls made of rock crystal, saying: “Lord, let

¹ Name of a tree. Called by MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 80, “Kingstead tree.” See *Vinaya Texts*, i.81, note. ² Cf. Ja i.80f. ³ Chief of the disciples who first came for refuge, AN i.26; included in a list of eminent householders and *upāsakas* at AN iii.450–451. Bhalliy(k)a has a verse at Thag 7, while Thag-a 50 gives in outline the story of their ministering to the Lord. ⁴ According to Vin-a 959, the Middle District (or Country) where the Lord was staying. ⁵ *mantha*, defined at Vin 4.80, see BD 2.324. ⁶ *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.118, n. 4, claims that “the first use of the term Tathāgata in the Buddha’s life-history” occurs at MN i.168.

the Lord receive the barley-gruel and honey-balls herein.” The Lord received the barley-gruel and the honey-balls in a new¹ bowl made of rock crystal, and having received them he partook of them.

Then the merchants Tapussa and Bhallika, having found that the Lord had removed his hand from the bowl, having inclined their heads towards the Lord’s feet, spoke thus to the Lord: “We, Lord, are those going to the Lord for refuge and to *dhamma*; let the Lord accept us as lay-disciples gone for refuge for life from this day forth.” Thus these came to be the first lay-disciples in the world using the two-word formula.²

Told is the Talk at the Rājāyatana

ON THE INVITATION OF BRAHMĀ

Then the Lord, having emerged from that contemplation at the end of seven days, approached the Goatherds’ Banyan from the foot of the Rājāyatana; having approached, the Lord stayed there at the foot of the Goatherds’ Banyan.

Then as the Lord was meditating in seclusion a reasoning arose in his mind thus:³ “This *dhamma*, won to by me, is deep, difficult to see, difficult to understand, peaceful, excellent, beyond dialectic, subtle, intelligible to the learned.⁴ But this is a creation delighting in sensual pleasure,⁵ delighted by sensual pleasure, rejoicing in sensual pleasure. So that for a creation delighting in sensual pleasure, delighted by sensual pleasure, rejoicing in sensual pleasure, this were a matter difficult to see, that is to say causal uprising by way of cause. This too were a matter very difficult to see,⁶ that is to say the calming

¹ *paccaggha*. Vin-a 960 says this usually means very costly; but it can mean, as here, quite new and quite hot (*abbhūṇha*), produced at that very moment. ² *dvevācīkā*, i.e. *bhagavā* (and not, as at some time became usual, *buddha*) and *dhamma*, there being at that time no *saṅgha*. ³ For the Great Hesitation, cf. SN i.136, DN ii.36, MN i.167, and see KS i.171, *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.29f. and *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.118 for notes. See also MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 73ff.

⁴ Quoted at Bv-a 9. ⁵ *ālaya*, what is clung to, “habit.” But Vin-a 961 = MN-a ii.174 explain by the five strands of sense-pleasure. ⁶ *suddasa*, as at Dh 36.

of all the habitual tendencies, the renunciation of all attachment, the destruction of craving, dispassion, stopping, *nibbāna*. And so if I were to teach *dhamma* and others were not to understand me, this would be a weariness to me, this would be a vexation to me.”

And further, these verses not heard before in the past occurred spontaneously to the Lord:

“This that through many toils I’ve won—
Enough! Why should I make it known?
By folk with lust and hate consumed
This *dhamma* is not understood.”¹

Leading on against the stream²,
Subtle, deep, difficult to see, delicate,
Unseen ‘twill be by passion’s slaves
Cloaked in the murk of ignorance.”³

In such wise, as the Lord pondered, his mind inclined to little effort⁴ and not to teaching *dhamma*. Then it occurred to Brahmā Sahampati,⁵ knowing with his mind the reasoning in the Lord’s mind: “Alas,⁶ the world is lost,⁷ alas, the world is destroyed, inasmuch as the mind of the Truth-finder, the perfected one, the fully awakened one, inclines to little effort and not to teaching *dhamma*.”

Then as a strong man might stretch forth his bent arm or might bend back his outstretched arm, even so did Brahmā Sahampati, vanishing from the Brahma-world, become manifest before the Lord.⁸

¹ Cf. Snp 764. ² *paṭisotagāmin*, against the stream up to the source (*nibbāna*), not with the stream, for that leads to dangerous whirlpools and waves in a pool (here in an unfavourable sense) lower down. Vin-a 962 says that *paṭisota* is called *nibbāna*. A stream can be a River of Life or a River of Death, according as to whether one goes against the current, striving with hands and feet, or with the current. Cf. LAMOTTE, Vol. I, p. 59, n. 1. ³ This translation follows that at *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.30, with the important exception that *paṭisotagāmin* is not “against the stream of common thought.” Verse also found at MN i.168, DN ii.38, SN i.136; Mahāvastu iii.314, *Lalitavistara*, edited LEFMANN, p.397. ⁴ *apposukkatā*, indifference, “rest quiet” (*Further Dialogues of the Buddha*, i.118), “to be averse from exertion” (KS i.173), “to remain quiet” (Vinaya Texts, i.85). ⁵ A Great Brahmā. ⁶ *vata bho*. ⁷ Quoted Bv-a 10. ⁸ For this paragraph and the beginning of the next, see AN ii.21,

Then Brahmā Sahampati, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having stooped his right knee to the ground having saluted the Lord with joined palms, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, let the Lord teach *dhamma*, let the Well-farer teach *dhamma*; there are beings with little dust in their eyes who, not hearing *dhamma*, are decaying, (but if) they are learners of *dhamma*, they will grow.”¹

Thus spoke Brahmā Sahampati; having said this, he further spoke thus:²

“There has appeared in Magadha before thee
An unclean *dhamma* by impure minds devised.
Open this door of deathlessness, let³ them hear
Dhamma awakened to by the stainless one.

“As on a crag on crest of mountain standing
A man might watch the people far below,
E’en so do thou, O Wisdom fair, ascending,
O Seer of all, the terraced heights of truth,⁴
Look down, from grief released, upon the peoples
Sunken in grief, oppressed with birth and age.

“Arise, thou hero! Conqueror in the battle!
Thou freed from debt! Man of the caravan!
Walk the world over, let the Blessed One
Teach *dhamma*. They who learn will grow.”⁵

When he had spoken thus, the Lord spoke thus to Brahmā Sahampati: “Brahmā, it occurred to me: “This *dhamma* penetrated by

¹ Quoted Bv-a 10. See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii, 2nd edition, Preface, xii. Also her Note to *Gotama the Man* (added in 1938) where she says, “The only rational translation (of *aññātāro bhavissanti*) is that ‘they who come to know (i.e. the *dhamma* you should teach), will come to be, will become, that is will grow. Thus rendered the last clause balances the opposed clause, that men are in a decline.”

² As at MN i.168, SN i.137; quoted Bv-a 10. For references to parallel Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan Texts, see LAMOTTE, *Traité de la Grande Veriu de Sagesse*, vol.1, p. 57, n. 1.

³ To end of this verse = Snp 384. ⁴ *dhammamaya pāsāda*; cf. *paññāpāsāda* at DhP 28.

⁵ Second part of verses taken from MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 82. The Dīgha version omits the first four lines. Last four lines at SN i.234.

me is deep ... that would be a vexation to me.’ And further, Brahmā, these verses not heard before in the past occurred spontaneously to me: ‘This that through many toils I’ve won ... cloaked in the murk of ignorance.’ In such wise, Brahmā, as I pondered, my mind inclined to little effort and not to teaching *dhamma*.”

Then a second time did Brahmā Sahampati speak thus to the Lord: “Lord, let the Lord teach *dhamma* ... if they are learners of *dhamma*, they will grow.” Then a second time did the Lord speak thus to Brahmā Sahampati: “But, Brahmā, it occurred to me: ... my mind inclined to little effort and and not to teaching *dhamma*.”

Then a third time did Brahmā Sahampati speak thus to the Lord: “Lord, let the Lord teach *dhamma* ... if they are learners of *dhamma*, they will grow.” Then the Lord, having understood Brahmā’s entreaty and, out of compassion for beings, surveyed the world with the eye of an awakened one. As the Lord was surveying the world with the eye of an awakened one, he saw beings with little dust in their eyes, with much dust in their eyes, with acute faculties, with dull faculties, of good dispositions, of bad dispositions, docile, indocile, few seeing fear in sins and the worlds beyond.¹

Even as in² a pond of blue lotuses or in a pond of red lotuses or in a pond of white lotuses, a few blue or red or white lotuses are born in the water, grow in the water, do not rise above the water but thrive while altogether immersed; a few blue or red or white lotuses are born in the water, grow in the water and reach to the surface of the water; a few blue or red or white lotuses are born in the water, grow in the water, and stand up rising out of the water, undefiled by the water.

Even so, did the Lord, surveying the world with the eye of an awakened one, see beings with little dust in their eyes, with much dust in their eyes, with acute faculties, with dull faculties, of good dispositions, of bad dispositions, docile, indocile, few seeing fear in sins and the worlds beyond. Seeing Brahmā Sahampati, he addressed

¹ *paralokavajjabhayadassāvino*, Vin-a 963 saying that these are those who see by fear (*bhayato*) the world(s) beyond and sin. ² Cf. DN i.75, MN iii.93, SN i.138.

him with verses:

“Open for those who hear are the doors of deathlessness¹;
let them renounce their faith².”

Thinking of useless fatigue, I have not preached, Brahmā,
the
sublime and excellent *dhamma* to men³.”

Then Brahmā Sahampati, thinking: “The opportunity was made
by me for the Lord to teach *dhamma*,”⁴ greeting the Lord, keeping
his right side towards him, vanished then and there.⁵

Told is the Talk on Brahmā’s Entreaty

ON THE GROUP OF FIVE

Then it occurred to the Lord: “Now, to whom should I first teach
dhamma? Who will understand this *dhamma* quickly?” Then it oc-
curred to the Lord: “Indeed, this Āḷāra the Kālāma⁶ is learned, ex-
perienced, wise, and for a long time has had little dust in his eyes.
Suppose I were to teach *dhamma* first to Āḷāra the Kālāma? He will
understand this *dhamma* quickly.”

But then an invisible *devatā* announced to the Lord: “Lord, Āḷāra
the Kālāma passed away seven days ago.” And the knowledge arose to
the Lord that Āḷāra the Kālāma had passed away seven days ago. Then
it occurred to the Lord: “Āḷāra the Kālāma was of great intelligence.
If he had heard this *dhamma*, he would have understood it quickly.”

¹ Vin-a 963 calls this “the noble Way”, *ariyamagga*. The “quest” in folklore and in the great religious traditions alike is for immortality, the undying. Early Buddhism is in line with these traditions. ² *saddhā* must refer to their (own, Vin-a 963) present wrong beliefs. ³ Verse also at DN ii.39, MN i.169, SN i.138; and cf. Mahāvastu iii.319; Lalitavistara, p.400. See discussion on some of the expressions found in theverse by LAMOTTE, Vol. I, p.60, n.1. ⁴ From the beginning of the verses to here is quoted at Bv-a 18. ⁵ *tatth’eva* can mean “as before”; if it does so here, it would mean by the same method of vanishing from the Brahma-world as in Kd 1.5,5above.

⁶ The teacher to whom, according to the biographical record (also preserved in the *Ariyapariyesanā Sutta*, MN 26.), Gotama first went for instruction after he had gone forth (from home into homelessness).

Then it occurred to the Lord: “Now, to whom should I first teach *dhamma*? Who will understand this *dhamma* quickly?” Then it occurred to the Lord: “Indeed, this Uddaka, Rāma’s son,¹ is learned, experienced, wise, and for a long time has had little dust in his eyes. Suppose I were to teach *dhamma* first to Uddaka, Rāma’s son? He will understand this *dhamma* quickly.”

But then an invisible *devatā* announced to the Lord: “Lord, Uddaka, Rāma’s son, passed away last night.” And the knowledge arose to the Lord that Uddaka, Rāma’s son, had passed away last night. Then it occurred to the Lord: “Uddaka, Rāma’s son, was of great intelligence. If he had heard this *dhamma*, he would have understood it quickly.”

Then it occurred to the Lord: “Now, to whom should I first teach *dhamma*? Who will understand this *dhamma* quickly?” Then it occurred to the Lord: “That group of five monks² who waited on me when I was self-resolute in striving³ were very helpful. Suppose I were to teach *dhamma* first to the group of five monks?”

Then it occurred to the Lord: “But where is this group of five monks staying at present?⁴ Then the Lord with *deva*-vision, purified and surpassing that of men, saw the group of five monks staying near Benares at Isipatana in the deer-park. Then the Lord, having stayed at Uruvelā for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Benares.

Upaka, a Naked Ascetic,⁵ saw the Lord going along the highroad between Gayā and the (Tree of) Awakening; seeing him, he spoke thus to the Lord: “Your reverence, your sense-organs are quite pure,

¹ According to the same account, the teacher to whom Gotama went next when he had mastered Ālāra’s teaching. See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*. 57ff. for some remarks on both these teachers, and E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha*, p.184. Mil 236 says that Ālāra and Uddaka were Gotama’s fourth and fifth teachers; and Thig-a 2 that he went first to Bhaggava (not mentioned at Mil 236). ² Añña-Koṇḍañña, Bhaddiya, Vappa, Mahānāma, Assaji, as below **BD 6.31ff.** See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*; MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, 62f.; and “Unknown Co-founders of Buddhism”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1927. ³ *padhānapahitattarū.*

⁴ Quoted at Bv-a 18. ⁵ *ājivika*, “man of the livelihood”, *Buddhist India*, p.143. At Divyāvadāna 393 Upaka appears to be called Upaganena.

your complexion very bright, very clear. On account of whom have you, your reverence, gone forth, or who is your teacher, or whose *dhamma* do you profess?"

When this had been said, the Lord addressed Upaka, the Naked Ascetic, in verses:¹

“Victorious over all, omniscient am I,
Among all things undefiled,
Leaving all, through death of craving freed,
By knowing for myself, whom should I follow?²

“For me there is no teacher,
One like me does not exist,
In the world with its *devas*
No one equals me.³

“For I am perfected in the world,
The teacher supreme am I,⁴
I alone am all-awakened,⁵
Become cool am I, *nibbāna*-attained.

“To turn the *dhamma*-wheel
I go to Kasi’s city,
Beating the drum of deathlessness
In a world that’s blind become.”

“According to what you claim, your reverence, you ought to be⁶ victor of the unending⁷” (Upaka said).

“Like me, they are victors indeed,
Who have won to destruction of the cankers;

¹ Verses also at MN i.171; quoted at Kv 289; Thig-a 220. ² This verse = Dhp 353.
³ This verse is quoted at Mil 235. Cf. also Mahāvastu iii.326. ⁴ Cf. Snp 179. ⁵ Or, “I am unique, the all-awakened.” ⁶ *arah’asi*, also meaning “you deserve to be, are worthy or fit to be”. There is also the reading *arahā asi*, as at Kv 289, and see *Psalms of the Sisters*, 129f. ⁷ *anantajina*. Vin-a 964 merely says “You are set on becoming a victor of the unending.” *Ananta*, the unending, may refer to *dhamma*, also to *nibbāna*.

Vanquished by me are evil things,
Therefore am I, Upaka, a victor.”¹

When this had been said, Upaka, the Naked Ascetic, having said, “It may be (so),² your reverence,” having shaken his head,³ went off taking a different road.

Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course approached Benares, the deer-park of Isipatana, the group of five monks. The group of five monks saw the Lord coming in the distance; seeing him, they agreed among themselves, saying: “Your reverences, this recluse Gotama is coming, he lives in abundance, he is wavering in his striving, he has

¹ This verse and Upaka’s remarks are quoted at Kv 289. ² *hupeyya*. MN i.171, Snp-a 258, Thig-a 220 read *huveyya* (which is interchangeable with *hupeyya*). It is a dialectical form of *bhaveyya*. According to B.M. BARUA, *The Ājīvikas*, p. 50, it is an expression found in the “Ājīvika language” and “is not a recognised Pali word.” He translates “perhaps it may be so,” Oldenberg “it may be so,” Chalmers, preserving the *patois*, “mebbe” E.J. THOMAS, *The Life of Buddha*, p. 83, “would that it might be so”, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* (under Upaka) “it may be so”; while MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *To Become or not to Become*, p. 85, would prefer “may he become”, the “he” referring to the man, every man, to whom Gotama was prepared to teach his message. She suggests that he will have rehearsed this message to Upaka, and maintains that what has survived—“a glaringly imperfect misrepresentation”—makes omission and glossing all but certain. ³ I think that as the text stands, had Upaka been convinced or even interested he would not have departed by a different road (*ummagga*, also meaning the wrong road). It is perhaps odd that this episode, if it shows disagreement, is presumed to have occurred at the beginning of Gotama ministry. But it may be included to emphasize his determination to preach first of all to the “five” in accordance with his decision; or to show that Upaka spoke somewhat as a prophet—in the “key”, below, **BD 4.127**, he is called *Upako isi*, Upaka the seer. According to Thig-a 220f., when Upaka was an old man, tormented by his wife’s gibes, he sought Gotama and went forth into homelessness; he then soon attained the stage of non-returning and died. From this account it does not appear that he had had any great urge earlier to become one of Gotama’s disciples.

In the translation above I have put a slight bias on three words, each of which admits of more than one rendering, so as to mark consistently what seems to me to be Upaka’s apparent failure to be convinced: (1) *arahasi* = (a) you ought to be (slightly contemptuous), (b) you are worthy to be (respectful); (2) *huveyya*, discussed in preceding note; (3) *sisam okampetvā*, having shaken his head. *Okampeti* may mean, according to *Pali-English Dictionary*, both to wag and to shake. Indians shake their heads from side to side to show disagreement, but wag them up and down to show agreement.

reverted to a life of abundance.¹ He should neither be greeted, nor stood up for, nor should his bowl and robe be received; all the same a seat may be put out, he can sit down if he wants to.”

But as the Lord gradually approached this group of five monks, so this group of five monks, not adhering to their own agreement, having gone towards the Lord, one received his bowl and robe, one made ready a seat, one brought water for washing the feet, a foot-stool, a foot-stand.² The Lord sat down on the seat made ready, and the Lord, while he was sitting down, washed his feet.³ Further, they addressed the Lord by name and with the epithet of “your reverence.”⁴

When this had been said, the Lord spoke thus to the group of five monks: “Do not, monks, address a Truthfinder by name, and with the epithet ‘your reverence’. A Truthfinder, monks, is a perfected one, a fully awakened one. Give ear, monks, the deathless has been found; *I* instruct, *I* teach *dhamma*. Going along in accordance with what has been enjoined, having soon realised here and now by your own super-knowledge that supreme goal of the Brahma-faring⁵ for the sake of which young men of family rightly go forth from home into homelessness, you will abide in it.”

When this had been said, the group of five monks spoke thus to the Lord: “But you, reverend Gotama, did not come to a state of further-men,⁶ to the eminence of truly *ariyan* vision of knowledge, by this conduct, by this course, by this practice of austerities. So how can you now come to a state of further-men, to the eminence of the truly *ariyan* vision of knowledge, when you live in abundance, are wavering in striving, and have reverted to a life of abundance?”

When this had been said, the Lord spoke thus to the group of five monks: “A Truthfinder, monks, does not live in abundance, he does not waver in striving, he does not revert to a life of abundance. A Truthfinder, monks, is a perfected one, a fully awakened one. Give

¹ *bahulla*. As MRS. RHYS DAVIDS observes. *Manual of Buddhism*, 69, this means literally “muchness”, Vin-a 964 taking it to mean abundance of robes, etc. ² Cf. Vin 4.231, Vin 4.310; see BD 3.191. ³ As at MN ii.139. ⁴ *āvusovādena*. ⁵ At MN i.197, MN i.201, this goal is said to be unshakeable freedom of mind. ⁶ Cf. Bu-Pj 4 (and see BD 1, Introduction, p.xxiv).

ear, monks, the deathless has been found; I instruct, I teach *dhamma*. Going along in accordance with what has been enjoined, having soon realised here and now by your own super-knowledge that supreme goal of the Brahma-faring for the sake of which young men of family rightly go forth from home into homelessness, you will abide in it.”

And a second time did the group of five monks speak thus to the Lord ... And a second time did the Lord speak thus to the group of five monks ... And a third time did the group of five monks speak thus to the Lord: “But you, reverend Gotama, did not come to a state of further-men ... by this practice of austerities ... to a life of abundance?”

When this had been said, the Lord spoke thus to the group of five monks: “Do you allow, monks, that I have never spoken¹ to you like this before?”

“You have not, Lord.”

“A Truthfinder, monks, is a perfected one, a fully awakened one. Give ear ... you will abide in it.” And the Lord was able to convince the group of five monks.² Then the group of five monks listened to the Lord again, gave ear to him and aroused their minds for profound knowledge.³

Then⁴ the Lord addressed the group of five monks, saying: “These⁵ two (dead) ends,⁶ monks, should not be followed by one who has gone forth. Which two? That which is, among sense-pleasures, addiction

¹ *bhāsitaṃ*. MN i.172 reads *vabbhācitaṃ*. Vin-a 965 and MN-a ii.191 explain by *vākyabhedanā*. ² From here the Majjhima version diverges. ³ *aññācittaṃ upaṭṭhāpesum*; cf. DN i,230, DN i231. ⁴ Cf. SN v.420. ⁵ See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p.109, for a literal translation of the First Utterance, and a discussion of many of its terms; also E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha*, p.87. This Utterance given at SN iv.330, SN v.420, and the “middle course” part of it at MN i.15, to whose Commentary (MN-a i.104f.) Vin-a 965 refers. ⁶ *anta* is end, then contrast, extreme, opposite, side. See *Manual of Buddhism*, p.118, for discussion of the meaning. SN-a iii.297 explains by *koṭṭhāsā*, parts, divisions. MN-a i.104 says “the Way does not lead to, does not approach these sides, it is freed from these sides, therefore it is called the middle course.” The “mean” between two extremes also found at SN ii.17, SN ii.20, SN ii.61, SN iii.135.

to attractive sense-pleasures, low, of the villager,¹ of the average man,² unariyan, not connected with the goal³; and that which is addiction to self-torment, ill, unariyan, not connected with the goal. Now, monks, without adopting either of these two (dead) ends, there is a middle course, fully awakened to by the Truthfinder, making for vision,⁴ making for knowledge, which conduces to calming,⁵ to super-knowledge,⁶ to awakening,⁷ to *nibbāna*.

“And what, monks, is this middle course fully awakened to by the Truthfinder, making for vision, making for knowledge, which conduces to calming, to super-knowledge, to awakening, to *nibbāna*? It is this *ariyan* eightfold Way itself, that is to say: right view, right thought, right speech, right action, right mode of living, right endeavour, right mindfulness, right concentration.⁸ This, monks, is the middle course, fully awakened to by the Truthfinder, making for vision, making for knowledge, which conduces to calming, to super-knowledge to awakening, to *nibbāna*.”

“And this, monks, is the *ariyan* truth of ill: birth is ill, and old age is ill and disease is ill and dying is ill, association with what is not dear is ill, separation from what is dear is ill, not getting what one wants is ill—in short the five groups of grasping are ill.”

“And this, monks, is the *ariyan* truth of the uprising of ill:⁹ that which is craving connected with again-becoming, accompanied by

¹ *gammo*. Another debatable term. I follow SN-a iii.297 (cf. AN-a iii.360) whose explanation is *gāma-vāsinaṃ santako*, belonging to village dwellers; meaning I think more “common” than “pagan”, by both of which it has been rendered. “Boorish” would be better. ² *pothujjaniko*, ordinary, of the many-folk, the “blind” and fools. ³ *anattasamhita*, defined at MN-a iii.110 as *na vuḍḍhinissita*, not bent on growth.

⁴ According to MN-a i.104 vision of the knowledge of the truths. ⁵ Of passion, etc., MN-a 1.104, AN-a iii.360; of the corruptions, SN-a iii.297. ⁶ *abhiññā*, of the four truths, MN-a and SN-a ⁷ MN-a i.104 says that awakening is the Way, *sambodho ti maggo*. ⁸ A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, p. 69, uses “composure” for *samādhi*, and elsewhere “synthesis.” MN-a i.105 gives the interpretations which the Ancients, *poraṇa*, used to put upon the eight “fitnesses” of the Way: “the way of insight is right view, the way of thorough furthering, *abhiniropana*, is right thought, the way of equanimity is right concentration.” The gaps may be filled up from what follows at MN-a i.105. ⁹ This paragraph is debated at Kv 488–489.

delight and passion, finding delight in this and that, that is to say: craving for sense-pleasures, craving for becoming, craving for de-becoming.¹

“And this, monks, is the *ariyan* truth of the stopping of ill: the utter and passionless stopping of that very craving, its renunciation, surrender, release, the lack of pleasure in it.²

“And this, monks, is the *ariyan* truth of the course leading to the stopping of ill³: this *ariyan* eightfold Way itself, that is to say: right view ... right concentration.

On thinking, ‘This is the *ariyan* truth of ill’, among things not heard before by me, monks, vision arose, knowledge⁴ arose, wisdom⁵ arose, higher knowledge⁶ arose, light arose. On thinking, ‘Now that which is the *ariyan* truth of ill must be completely known’ ... ‘Now that which is the *ariyan* truth of ill is completely known’, among things not heard before by me, monks, vision arose, knowledge arose, wisdom arose, higher knowledge arose, light arose.

“On thinking, ‘This is the *ariyan* truth of the uprising of ill’ ... light arose. On thinking, ‘Now that which is this *ariyan* truth of the uprising of ill must be given up’⁷ ... ‘... is given up’ ... light arose.

“On thinking, ‘This is the *ariyan* truth of the stopping of ill’ ... light arose. On thinking, ‘Now that which is this *ariyan* truth of the stopping of ill must be realized’ ... ‘... is realised’ ... light arose.

“On thinking, ‘This is the *ariyan* truth of the course going to the stopping of ill’ ... light arose. On thinking, ‘Now that which is this

¹ *vi-bhava*, meanings ascribed: (1) wealth, property, prosperity; (2) non-becoming, ceasing (although there is the word *a-bhava*); (3) more becoming, more births. *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.214 “annihilation.” See also *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.340, note. I think it means, with *taṇhā*, craving or thirst, the longing for sensations to come and go, rise and fall. LAMOTTE, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse*, vol.1, p. 3, n. 4, translates these three cravings (*taṇhā*) as cravings for *plaisir*, *existence*, *impermanence*. ² *anālaya*. On *ālaya*, pleasure (clinging, abode, habit) see above, **BD 4.6**. *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.214 “ejection”, *Dialogues of the Buddha* iii.298 “aversion from.” *SN-a* iii.112 defines it in connection with *kāma*. ³ The “four truths of ill” are cited at *Kv* 290. ⁴ *ñāṇa*. ⁵ *paññā*. ⁶ *vijjā*. We have nothing in English corresponding to the number Pali words for “knowledge.” ⁷ I.e. the craving or thirst (*taṇhā*) which leads to the uprising of ill must be given up.

ariyan truth of the course leading to the stopping of ill must be made to become' ... '... is made to become' ... light arose.

“And so long, monks, the vision of knowledge of these four *ariyan* truths with the three sections and twelve modes¹ as they really are, was not well purified by me, so long was I, monks, not thoroughly awakened with the supreme full awakening as to the world with its *devas*, with its Māras, with its Brahmās, with its recluses and brahmins, its creatures with *devas* and men. This I knew.

“But when, monks, the vision of knowledge of these four *ariyan* truths, with the three sections and twelve modes as they really are, was well purified by me, then was I, monks, thoroughly awakened with the supreme full awakening as to the world ... with its recluses and brahmins, its creatures with *devas* and men. This I knew.

“Moreover, the vision of knowledge arose in me: ‘Freedom of mind is for me unshakeable, this the last birth, there is not now again-becoming.’²” Thus spoke the Lord; delighted, the group of five monks rejoiced in the Lord’s utterance. Moreover, while this discourse³ was being uttered, *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose to the venerable Koṇḍañña that “whatever is of the nature to uprise, all that is of the nature to stop.”

And when the Lord had rolled the *dhamma*-wheel, the earth *devas* made this sound heard⁴: “The supreme *dhamma*-wheel rolled thus by the Lord at Benares in the deer-park at Isipatana cannot be rolled back by a recluse or brahmin or deva or by Māra or by Brahmā or by anyone in the world.” Having heard the sound of the earth *devas*, the *devas* of the Four Great Kings⁵ made this sound heard ... the Thirty *devas* ... Yama’s *devas* ... the Happy *devas* ... the *devas* who delight in creation ... the *devas* who delight in the creation of others ... the *devas* of Brahmā’s retinue made this sound heard: “The supreme *dhamma*-wheel rolled thus by the Lord at Benares in the deer-park

¹ Each of the four truths is treated as (1) a truth which (2) must be in some way responded to, and which (3) has been in that way responded to. ² One of the formulae of arahanship. ³ *veyyākaraṇa*, called at DN-a 130 a *sutta* (discourse) without verses. ⁴ Cf. Vin 3.18-19 (BD 1.33). ⁵ I.e. the Regents of the four quarters. A longer list of *devas* is to be found at MN i.289.

at Isipatana cannot be rolled back by a recluse or brahmin or *deva* or by Māra or by Brahmā or by anyone in the world.”

In this wise in that moment, in that second, in that instant, the sound reached as far as the Brahma-world, and the ten thousand-fold world-system¹ trembled, quaked, shook violently and a radiance, splendid, measureless, surpassing the *devas'* own glory,² was manifest in the world. Then the Lord uttered this solemn utterance: “Indeed, Koṇḍañña has understood, indeed, Koṇḍañña has understood.” Thus it was that Aññata Koṇḍañña³ became the venerable Koṇḍañña’s name.⁴

Then the venerable Aññata Koṇḍañña, having seen *dhamma*,⁵ attained *dhamma*,⁶ known *dhamma*,⁷ plunged into *dhamma*, having crossed over doubt, having put away uncertainty, having attained without another’s help to full confidence in the teacher’s instruction,⁸ spoke thus to the Lord: “May I, Lord, receive the going forth⁹ in the Lord’s presence, may I receive ordination?¹⁰”

“Come, monk¹¹,” the Lord said, “well taught is *dhamma*. Fare the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill.” So this came to be this venerable one’s ordination.

Then the Lord exhorted, instructed those remaining monks with *dhamma*-talk. Then while they were being exhorted, instructed by the Lord with *dhamma*-talk, *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose

¹ Cf. AN i.227. ² *devānaṃ devānubhāvaṃ*, cf. DN ii.12, MN iii.120. ³ *aññāta* meaning “who has understood”. He is often called Añña Koṇḍañña. At AN i.23 he is called “foremost of the disciples of long standing.” Verses at Thag 673–688. For the view that Añña was his personal name, see MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Gotama the Man*, p. 102, GS i.16, n. 2, *Verses of Uplift* (Sacred Books of the Buddhists VIII), p. 93, n. 1. See too Ud-a 371, *Psalms of the Bretheren*, p. 284. ⁴ Saṃyutta account breaks off here.

⁵ Saṃyutta account breaks off here. ⁶ Quoted Bv-a 13, the last two in reverse order. ⁷ Saṃyutta account breaks off here. ⁸ Cf. DN i.no.148; AN iv.186; MN i.234, MN i.501. ⁹ *pabbajjā*. ¹⁰ *upasampadā*. ¹¹ The first time that this, thought to be the oldest formula for leave to become a disciple of Gotama’s, is used in the Vinaya. The Order was not as yet in existence, and the ordination regulations were neither appointed nor was ordination separated by a period of probation from the time of a disciple’s “going forth”, *pabbajjā*, from home, or the household life, into homelessness.

to the venerable Vappa¹ and to the venerable Bhaddiya,² that “whatever is of the nature to uprise, all that is of the nature to stop.”

These, having seen *dhamma*, attained *dhamma*, known *dhamma* ... having attained without another’s help to full confidence in the teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord: “May we, Lord, receive the going forth in the Lord’s presence, may we receive ordination?”

“Come, monks,” the Lord said, “well taught is *dhamma*, fare the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill.” So this came to be these venerable ones’ ordination.

Then the Lord, eating the food brought back by these,³ exhorted, instructed those remaining monks with *dhamma*-talk, saying: “Let the group of six⁴ live on whatever the three monks bring when they have walked for almsfood.”

Then while they were being exhorted, instructed by the Lord with *dhamma*-talk, *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose to the venerable Mahānāma⁵ and to the venerable Assaji,⁶ that “whatever is of the nature to uprise, all that is of the nature to stop.”

These, having seen *dhamma*, attained *dhamma* ... having attained without another’s help to full confidence in the teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord: “May we, Lord, receive the going forth in the Lord’s presence, may we receive ordination?”

“Come, monks,” the Lord said, “well taught is *dhamma*, fare the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill.” So this came to be these venerable ones’ ordination.

Then the Lord addressed the group of five monks, saying: “Body,

¹ Verses at Thag 61, see also Thag-a 150, Vin-a 965, MN-a ii.192, AN-a i.147, Ja i.82; MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 63. ² No verses ascribed to him. See Vin-a 965, MN-a ii.192, AN-a i.147, Ja i.82. Omitted from *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*

³ Koṇḍañña, Vappa and Bhaddiya. ⁴ I.e. Gotama and the group of five. ⁵ References as under n. 2 above. See also Dh-p-a ii.74. Included in *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ⁶ The disciple through whom Sāriputta and so Moggallāna became followers of Gotama, see Vin 1.39f. (below, BD 4.52); also MN i.227 (Cūlasaccaka Sutta), SN iii.124ff., MN-a ii.270, MN-a ii.271, and BD 4.52, n. 3 below.

monks, is not self.¹ Now were this body self, monks this body would not tend to sickness, and one might get the chance of saying in regard to body, 'Let body become thus for me, let body not become thus for me'. But inasmuch, monks, as body is not self, therefore body tends to sickness, and one does not get the chance of saying in regard to body, 'Let body become thus for me, let body not become thus for me'.

Feeling is not self ... and one does not get the chance of saying in regard to feeling, 'Let feeling become thus for me, let feeling not become thus for me'.

"Perception² is not self ... The habitual tendencies are not self ... one does not get the chance of saying in regard to the habitual tendencies, 'Let the habitual tendencies become thus for me, let the habitual tendencies not become thus for me'.

"Consciousness is not self ... Inasmuch, monks, as consciousness is not self, therefore consciousness tends to sickness, and one does not get the chance to say in regard to consciousness, 'Let consciousness become such for me, let consciousness not become thus for me.'

What do you think about this, monks? Is body permanent or impermanent?"

"Impermanent, Lord."

"But is that which is impermanent painful or pleasurable³?"

"Painful, Lord."

"But is it fit to consider that which is impermanent, painful, of a nature to change, as 'This is mine, this am I, this is my self'?"

"It is not Lord."

"Is feeling ... perception ... are the habitual tendencies ... is consciousness permanent or impermanent?"

¹ This famous Second Utterance given also at SN iii.66, where called "The Five", doubtless referring to the five disciples who heard it, and to the five topics, body ... consciousness (or mind) which it covered; cf. MN iii.19. Translated at KS iii.59, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha*, ii, 165f., MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p.150, E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha*, p.88. ² *saññā*. ³ *sukha*, happiness, mental and physical ease; used in opposition to *dukkha*.

“Impermanent, Lord.”

“But is that which is impermanent painful or pleasurable?”

“Painful, Lord.”

“But is it (it to consider that which is impermanent, painful of a nature to change, as “This is mine, this am I, this is my self”?)

“It is not so, Lord.”

“Wherefore, monks, whatever is body, past, future, present or internal or external, or gross or subtle, or low or excellent whether it is far or near—all body should, by means of right wisdom, be seen, as it really is, thus: This is not mine, this am I not, this is not my self.

“Whatever is feeling ... whatever is perception ... whatever are the habitual tendencies ... whatever is consciousness past, future, present, or internal or external, or gross or subtle, or low or excellent, whether far or near—all consciousness should, by means of right wisdom, be seen as it really is, thus: This is not mine, this am I not, this is not my self.

“Seeing in this way, monks, the instructed¹ disciple of the ariyans disregards² body and he disregards feeling and he disregards perception and he disregards the habitual tendencies and he disregards consciousness; disregarding he is dispassionate; through dispassion he is freed; in freedom the knowledge comes to be: ‘I am freed’³, and he knows: Destroyed is birth, lived is the Brahma-faring, done is what was to be done, there is no more of being such or such.”

Thus spoke the Lord; delighted, the group of five monks rejoiced in what the Lord had said. Moreover while this discourse was being uttered, the minds of the group of five monks were freed from the cankers without grasping. At that time there were six perfected ones in the world.

The First Portion for Recital

¹ *sutavant*, one who has heard, hence learnt (the oral teaching). ² *nibbindati*, turns away from, is disgusted by. He “disregards” because he refuses to know. ³ See [BD 1.10 and its n. 2, n. 3](#).

ON THE GOING FORTH OF YASA

At that time in Benares there was a young man of family, the son of a (great) merchant¹, delicately reared, called Yasa².

He had three mansions, one for the cold weather, one for the hot weather, one for the rains. Being ministered to by bands of female musicians³ for four months in the mansion for the rains, he did not come down from that mansion⁴. Then while Yasa, the young man of family, was possessed of and provided with the five kinds of sense-pleasures⁵, and was being ministered to, he fell asleep first and his suite fell asleep after him, and an oil lamp was burning all through the night.

Then Yasa, the young man of family, having awoken first saw his own suite sleeping, one with a lute in the hollow of her arm, one with a tabor at her neck, one with a drum in the hollow of her arm, one with dishevelled hair, one with saliva dripping from her mouth, muttering in their sleep, like a cemetery before his very eyes.⁶ Seeing this, its peril grew plain, and his mind was set on disregarding it.⁷ Then Yasa, the young man of family, uttered a solemn utterance: "What distress indeed, what affliction indeed."

Then Yasa, the young man of family, having put on his golden sandals, approached the door of the dwelling. Non-human beings opened the door, thinking: "Let there be no obstacle for the going forth from home into homelessness of Yasa, the young man of family." Then Yasa, the young man of family, approached the city-door. Non-human beings opened the door, thinking: "Let there be no obstacle for the going forth from home into homelessness of Yasa, the young man of family." Then Yasa, the young man of family, approached the

¹ See **BD 2, Introduction, p. xlvii** and **BD 42, n. 4**. ² Verses at Thag 117. ³ *nippurisehi turiyehi*; see note at *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.18; also *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.356. ⁴ Reading *heṭṭhā pāsādā*. DN ii.21, MN i.504 read *heṭṭhāpāsādāṃ*, "to the lower (parts of the) mansion." On *pāsāda*, see **BD 2.16, n. 5, n. 6**. ⁵ Cf. **Vin 3.72**, DN i.36, DN i.60, and DN-a 121. ⁶ *hatthapattāṃ susānaṃ maññe*, literally one would think one's hand had reached a cemetery. *Hatthappatta*, what one can put one's hand on, and so what is before one's eyes. ⁷ *nibbidāya cittaṃ saṅṭhāsi*.

deer-park at Isipatana.

At that time, the Lord having risen in the night towards dawn, was pacing up and down in the open air. The Lord saw Yasa, the young man of family, coming in the distance: seeing him, having come down from (the place) where he was pacing up and down, he sat down on an appointed seat. Then Yasa, the young man of family, when he was near, uttered this solemn utterance to the Lord: “What distress indeed, what affliction indeed.” Then the Lord spoke thus to Yasa, the young man of family: “This, Yasa, is not distress, this, Yasa, is not affliction. Come, sit down, Yasa, I will teach you *dhamma*.”

Then Yasa, the young man of family, thinking: “It is said that this is not distress, that this is not affliction”, exultant and uplifted, having taken off his golden sandals, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord talked a progressive talk¹ to Yasa, the young man of family, that is to say, talk on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven, he explained the peril, the vanity, the depravity of pleasures of the senses, the advantage in renouncing them.

When the Lord knew that the mind of Yasa, the young man of family, was ready, malleable, devoid of hindrances, uplifted, pleased², then he explained to him the teaching on *dhamma* which the awakened ones have themselves discovered: ill, uprising, stopping, the Way³. And just as a clean cloth without black specks will take a dye easily, even so (as he was sitting) on that very seat, *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose to Yasa, the young man of family, that whatever is of a nature to uprise, all that is of a nature to stop.”

Then the mother of Yasa, the young man of family, having mounted up to the mansion, not seeing Yasa, the young man of family, ap-

¹ This passage is frequently found in connection with “conversions”; cf. Vin 2.156, Vin 2.192, DN i.110, DN i.148, DN ii.41, MN i.379, AN iv.186, AN iv.209, Ud 49. ² In sense of with the teaching, prepared to follow it. ³ Note that *paṭipadā* (of the fourth truth), the course which leads to the ceasing of ill, is here represented by the one word *maggā*. This may not be a substitution for the “fourth truth”, but the original notion, left in.

proached the (great) merchant, the householder; having approached she spoke thus to the (great) merchant, the householder; “Householder, your son, Yasa, is not to be seen.” Then the (great) merchant, the householder, having dispatched messengers on horse-back to the four quarters, himself approached the deer-park at Isipatana. The (great) merchant, the householder, saw the prints of golden sandals, and seeing them he followed them along.

The Lord saw the (great) merchant, the householder, coming in the distance; seeing him, it occurred to the Lord: “Suppose I were to perform such a psychic wonder that the (great) merchant, the householder, sitting here, should not see Yasa the young man of family, sitting here?” Then the Lord performed such a psychic wonder.

Then the (great) merchant, the householder, approached the Lord; having approached he spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord has the Lord not seen Yasa, the young man of family?”

“Well, householder, sit down. Perhaps, sitting here, you may see Yasa, the young man of family, sitting here.”

Then the (great) merchant, the householder, thinking: “It is said that I, sitting here, will see Yasa, the young man of family, sitting here”, and exultant, uplifted, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance.

As the (great) merchant, the householder was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord talked a progressive talk ... attained without the help of another to full confidence in the teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord: “Excellent, Lord! Excellent, Lord! Just as one might set upright what has been upset, or might uncover what was concealed, or might show the way to one who is astray, or might bring an oil lamp into the darkness, thinking, ‘Those with eyes may see shapes’, even so is *dhamma* explained in many a figure by the Lord. I myself go to the Lord as refuge, to *dhamma*, and to the Order of monks. Let the Lord accept me as a lay-disciple gone for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts.” Thus he came to be the first lay-disciple in the world using the three-word formula.¹

Kd 1.7.8

BD 4.2

Kd 1.7.9

Kd 1.7.1

Vin 1.17

Then while the father of Yasa, the young man of family, was being taught *dhamma*, as he¹ was reviewing his stage (of knowledge) as it was seen, as it was known, his mind was freed from the cankers without grasping. Then it occurred to the Lord: “While the father of Yasa, the young man of family, was being taught *dhamma*, as he was reviewing his stage (of knowledge) as it was seen, as it was known, his mind was freed from the cankers without grasping. Now Yasa, the young man of family, cannot become one, having turned back to the low life, to enjoy pleasures of the senses as he did formerly when leading a household life. Suppose I were to annul that psychic wonder?” Then the Lord annulled that psychic wonder.

Then the (great) merchant, the householder, saw Yasa, the young man of family sitting down; seeing him, he spoke thus to Yasa, the young man of family: “Dear Yasa, your mother is full of lamentation and grief, give your mother life.”

Then Yasa, the young man of family, looked towards the Lord. Then the Lord spoke thus to the (great) merchant, the householder: “What do you think about this, house-holder, that *dhamma* was seen by Yasa with a learner’s knowledge, with a learner’s insight, even as by you? As he was reviewing his stage (of knowledge), as it was seen, as it was known, his mind was freed from the cankers without grasping. Now can Yasa, householder, having turned back to the low life, become one to enjoy pleasures of the senses, as he did formerly when leading a household life?”

“No, Lord.”

“*Dhamma* was seen by Yasa, the young man of family, householder, with a learner’s knowledge, with a learner’s insight, even as by you. As he was reviewing his stage (of knowledge), as it was seen, as it was known, his mind was freed from the cankers without grasping. Now Yasa, the young man of family, householder, cannot become

¹ *tevācika*, instead of the *dvevācika* of Kd 1.4.5, for here the *Bhikkhusaṅgha* is included in the refuge-formula. We must therefore assume that when the group of five monks became disciples of Gotama a *saṅgha* was formed. ¹ I.e. Yasa.

one, having turned back to the low life, to enjoy pleasures of the senses, as he did formerly when leading a household life.”

“Lord, it is a gain for Yasa, the young man of family, Lord, it is well gotten for Yasa, the young man of family, inasmuch as the mind of Yasa, the young man of family, is freed from the cankers without grasping. Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with me on the morrow with Yasa, the young man of family, as his attendant?” The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then the (great) merchant, the householder, knowing that the Lord had consented, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him.

Then Yasa, the young man of family, soon after the (great) merchant, the householder, had departed, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may I receive the going forth in the Lord’s presence, may I receive ordination?”

“Come, monk,” the Lord said, “well preached is *dhamma*. Lead the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill.” So this came to be that venerable one’s ordination. At that time there were seven perfected ones in the world.

Told is the Going Forth of Yasa

Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of the (great) merchant, the householder, with the venerable Yasa as attendant; having approached, he sat down on an appointed seat. Then the mother and the former wife of the venerable Yasa approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance.

The Lord talked a progressive talk to these, that is to say, talk on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven ... *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose to them that, “whatever is of a nature to uprise, all that is of a nature to stop.”

These, having seen *dhamma*, attained *dhamma* ... spoke thus to the Lord: “Excellent Lord! ... we ourselves, Lord, go to the Lord as refuge, to *dhamma* and to the Order of monks. Let the Lord accept

us as women lay-disciples, gone for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts.” Thus these were the first women lay-disciples in the world using the three-word formula.

Then the venerable Yasa’s mother and father and former wife, having with their own hand(s) served the Lord and the venerable Yasa and having offered them sumptuous foods, solid and soft, sat down when the Lord had finished his meal and had removed his hand from the bowl. Then the Lord, having gladdened, roused, rejoiced, delighted the venerable Yasa’s mother and father and former wife with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat departed.

Four householder friends of the venerable Yasa, young men of families of (great) merchants and lesser (great) merchants¹ in Benares, Vimāla, Subāhu, Puṇṇaji, Gavampati², heard: “They say that Yasa, the young man of family, having cut off his hair and beard, having put on yellow robes, has gone forth from home into homelessness.” Having heard this, it occurred to them: “Now this can be no ordinary *dhamma* and discipline, nor can this be an ordinary going forth, in that Yasa, the young man of family, having cut off his hair and beard, having put on the yellow robes, has gone forth from home into homelessness.”

These four people approached the venerable Yasa; having approached, having greeted the venerable Yasa, they stood at a respectful distance. Then the venerable Yasa, taking these four householder friends, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Yasa spoke thus to the Lord: “These four householder friends of mine, Lord, young men of families of (great) merchants and lesser (great) merchants in Benares, Vimāla, Subāhu, Puṇṇaji, Gavampati, may the Lord exhort, may he instruct these four.”

The Lord talked a progressive talk to these, that is to say, talk

¹ *setṭhānuseṭṭhi*. See Ja v.384 for *mahā-setṭhi*, *setṭhi* (but with variant reading *anuseṭṭhi*) and *anuseṭṭhi*; also *Vinaya Texts* i.102, n. 3. ² Verses attributed only to Gavampati, Thag 38, and he appears to be the only one mentioned elsewhere in the canon, e.g. DN ii.356, SN v.436.

on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven ... *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose to them that “whatever is of the nature to arise, all that is of the nature to stop.”

These, having seen *dhamma*, attained *dhamma* ... spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may we receive the going forth in the Lord’s presence, may we receive ordination?”

“Come, monks,” the Lord said, “well preached is *dhamma*, fare the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill.” So this came to be these venerable ones’ ordination. Then the Lord exhorted, instructed these monks with *dhamma* talk. While they were being exhorted, instructed by the Lord with *dhamma* talk, their minds were freed from the cankers without grasping. At that time there were eleven perfected ones in the world.

Told is the Going Forth of the four Householders

Fifty householder friends of the venerable Yasa, young men of the first families and of those next to the first¹ in the district heard: “They say that Yasa, the young man of family ... (as in [Kd 1.9.1-Kd.1.9.4](#) down to:) While they were being exhorted, instructed by the Lord with *dhamma* talk, their minds were freed from the cankers without grasping. At that time there were sixty-one perfected ones in the world.

WITH MĀRA

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying²: “I, monks, am freed from all snares, both those of *devas*³ and those of men. And you, monks, are freed from all snares, both those of *devas* and those of men. Walk, monks, on tour for the blessing of the manyfolk, for the happiness of the manyfolk out of compassion for the world, for the

¹ *pubbānupubbaka*. Explained by Vin-a 966 as the oldest and next to the oldest in regard to lineage. ² SN i.105-106. ³ *dibba*; neither “divine” (*Vinaya Texts* i.112) nor “celestial” (KS i.131) is exactly right for this difficult adjective which means *deva*-ish, pertaining to *devas*.

welfare, the blessing, the happiness of *devas* and men. Let not two (of you) go by one (way.)¹ Monks, teach *dhamma* which is lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the ending.² Explain with the spirit and the letter the Brahma-faring completely fulfilled, wholly pure. There are beings with little dust in their eyes, who, not hearing *dhamma*, are decaying, (but) if they are learners of *dhamma*, they will grow. And I, monks, will go along to Uruvelā, to the Camp township,³ in order to teach *dhamma*.”

Then Māra, the Evil One, approached the Lord; having approached, he addressed the Lord with verses:

“Bound art thou by all the snares,
Both those of *devas* and of men,
In great bondage art thou bound,
Recluse, thou’lt not be freed from me.”⁴

“Freed am I from all the snares,
Both those of *devas* and of men,
From great bondage am I freed,
Humbled art thou, O End-maker.”⁵

“The tale of mind-impressions is a snare
That weaves its tallies to and fro in air.
With these will I have wherewith to fetter thee,
Recluse, thou wilt not be freed from me.”⁶

¹ *ekena* can also mean together, but above is interpretation given at Vin-a 966, and cf. SN-a i.172. ² SN-a i.172 gives differing but related arrangements of subjects included under “beginning, middle and end”. ³ Senānigama here and at MN i.166; for the variant spelling used at e.g. SN i.106, Ja i.68, see *Vinaya Texts* i.113, n. 1, KS i.132, n. 5; *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*; E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha*, p. 230. There was a tradition that in old times it had been an army’s camping place, MN-a ii.173, SN-a i.172, the town where Senāni, Sujāta’s father lived. ⁴ These four lines with the next four also at SN i.106. ⁵ *Antaka*, explained at Vin-a 966 as an inferior, low being; a name of Māra. Cf. Thig.59, Thig.62, Thig.195; also DhP 48, where not used in this way. ⁶ These four lines and the next four occur also at SN i.111.

“Sights, sounds, scents, tastes,¹ and things to touch,
Bringing delights to mind of man-for such
All wish, all will, for me is past and gone,
Humbled art thou, O End-maker.”

Then Māra, the Evil One, thinking, “The Lord knows me, the well-farer knows me,” pained, afflicted, vanished then and there.

Told is the Talk on Māra

ON GOING FORTH AND FULL ORDINATION

At that time monks brought (to the Lord) from various quarters, from various districts those wishing for the going forth, those wishing for ordination, thinking: “The Lord will let these go forth, he will ordain them.” Thereby both the monks as well as those wishing for the going forth and those wishing for ordination were tired. Then a reasoning arose in the Lord’s mind as he was meditating in seclusion, thus: “At present monks are bringing (to me) from various quarters ... and those wishing for ordination are tired. Suppose I were to allow it to monks, saying: ‘You, monks, may now yourselves let go forth, may ordain in any² quarter, in any district?’”

Then the Lord, emerging from seclusion towards evening, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “While I was meditating in seclusion, monks, a reasoning arose in my mind, thus: ‘At present monks are bringing ... in any quarter, in any district’”

“I allow, monks, that you yourselves may now let go forth may ordain in any quarter, in any district. And thus, monks, should one let go forth, should one ordain: First, having made him have his hair and beard cut off, having made him put on yellow robes, having made him arrange an upper robe over one shoulder, having made him

¹ The Vinaya version puts scents before tastes in the usual way. SN i.111 reverses the order; see KS i.140, n. 3. Cf. **Kd 5.1.27**; Snp 387, Snp 759, Thag 455. Thag 895. AN iii.69.

² *tāsu tāsu*. *Tam tam* means whatever, each, this and that.

honour the monks' feet, having made him sit down on his haunches, having made him salute with joined palms, he should be told: 'Speak thus: "I go to the awakened one for refuge, I go to *dhamma* for refuge, I go to the Order for refuge. And a second time I go ... And a third time I go to ... the Order for refuge.'" I allow, monks, the going forth and the ordination by these three goings for refuge.¹"

Told is the Talk on Ordination by the three Goings for Refuge

WITH MĀRA, THE SECOND

Then the Lord, having kept the rains, addressed the monks, saying: "Monks, by proper attention, by proper right effort was supreme freedom attained by me, supreme freedom² realised. You, too, monks, by proper attention, by proper right effort may attain supreme freedom, may realise supreme freedom."

Then Māra, the Evil One, approached the Lord; having approached, he addressed the Lord with verses:

"Bound art thou by Māra's snares,
Both those of *devas* and of men,
In great bondage art thou bound.
Recluse, thou wilt not be freed from me."³

"Freed am I from Māra's snares,
Both those of *devas* and of men,
From great bondage am I freed,
Humbled art thou, O End-maker."

Then Māra, the Evil One, thinking, "The Lord knows me, the well-farer knows me," pained, afflicted, vanished then and there.

¹ Apparently this was the second stage in admitting disciples to the religious life, the first being by the formula spoken by the Lord, 'come, monk'. Responsibility is now being delegated to his followers themselves. Note that *bhagavantam* (the lord) has given way to *buddham* (the awakened one) in the first sentence of the formula.

² Cf. AN iii.218. ³ These four lines occur at SN i.105, but there the third line of each verse reads, "In (From) Māra's bondage ..."

THE STORY OF THE EXCELLENT GROUP

Then the Lord, having stayed at Benares for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Uruvelā. Then the Lord, turning off from the road, approached a certain woodland grove¹; having approached, having plunged into that woodland grove, he sat down at the root of a certain tree. At that time a group of as many as thirty friends of high standing,² with their wives, were amusing themselves in that same woodland grove. One had no wife, (so) a woman of low standing³ was brought along for him. Then while they were heedlessly amusing themselves that woman of low standing, taking (their) belongings, ran away.

Then these friends, doing their friend a service and seeking for that woman, roaming about that woodland grove, saw the Lord sitting at the root of a certain tree; seeing him, they approached the Lord, having approached, they spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, has the Lord not seen a woman?”

“But what have you, young men, to do with a woman?”

“We, Lord, a group of as many as thirty friends of high standing, with our wives, were amusing ourselves in this woodland grove; one had no wife, (so) a woman of low standing was brought along for him. Then, Lord, as we were heedlessly amusing ourselves, that woman of low standing, taking our belongings, ran away. Consequently, Lord,

¹ At Ja i.82 this is called Kappāsiya woodland grove. ² *tiṃsamattā bhaddavaggiyā saḥāyakā*. Vin-a 971 says “sons of rājas, of high repute (*bhaddaka*, honoured, of good quality), bound into a group (*vagga*, party) by their bodies and minds, were wandering about”; and Vin-a 1106 says “because they were brothers by one father of the King of Kosala, a synonym for these elders is the group who are of high standing”. For both here and at Dhp-a ii.32 they are identified with the thirty monks of Pāvā (see Vin 1.253, SN ii187). The *bhaddavaggiyā* = *kumāra* are referred to at Ja i.82 = Dhp-a i.87, Dhp-a i.97 as among the “converts” who, because converted first, should, so some monks thought, have been given precedence over the Great Pair; at Dhp-a i.100, as having heard the Tuṇḍilovāda (cf. Vin-a 1106 and Ja no.388). Mahavaṃsa xxx.79 mentions their conversion as a subject to be represented in the relic shrine of the Mahā Thūpa. ³ *vesī* can also mean a prostitute, but here probably used in opposition to *bhadda*, high standing.

we friends, doing our friend a service and seeking for that woman, are roaming about this woodland grove.”

“What do you think of this, young men? Which is better for you, that you should seek for a woman or that you should seek for the self¹?”

“Truly this were better for us, Lord, that we should seek for the self.”

“Well then, young men, you sit down, I will teach you *dhamma*.”

Saying, “Yes, Lord,” this group of friends of high standing, having greeted the Lord, sat down at a respectful distance.

The Lord talked a progressive talk to these, that is to say, talk on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven ... that “whatever is of the nature to uprise, all that is of the nature to stop.”²

These, having seen *dhamma*, attained *dhamma*, known *dhamma*, plunged into *dhamma*,³ ... spoke thus to the Lord: “May we, Lord, receive the going forth in the Lord’s presence, may we receive ordination?”

“Come, monks,” the Lord said, “well taught is *dhamma*, fare the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill.” So this came to be these venerable ones’ ordination.

Told is the Case of the Group of Friends of High Standing

The Second Portion for Repeating

¹ *attānaṃ gaveseyyātha*. Cf. DhP 146 *andhakāreṇa onaddhā padīpaṃ na gavessatha*, “that ye in the bonds of darkness should not hunt for a lamp”; and the compound *attadīpā* of DN ii.100 and Snp 501. ² As in Kd 1.7.5–1.7.6. ³ As in Kd 1.6.32.

ON THE MIRACLES AT URUVELĀ

Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Uruvelā. Now at that time three matted hair ascetics, Kassapa of Uruvelā,¹ Kassapa of the River,² Kassapa of Gayā,³ were living at Uruvelā. Of these, the matted hair ascetic Kassapa of Uruvelā was leader, guide, highest, chief, head of five hundred matted hair ascetics; the matted hair ascetic Kassapa of the River was leader ... head of three hundred matted hair ascetics; the matted hair ascetic Kassapa of Gayā was leader ... head of two hundred matted hair ascetics.

Then the Lord approached the hermitage⁴ of the matted hair ascetic Kassapa of Uruvelā; having approached, he spoke thus to the matted hair ascetic Kassapa of Uruvelā: “If it is not inconvenient to you, Kassapa, let me stay for one night in the fire-room.”

“It is not inconvenient to me, great recluse, (but) there is a fierce serpent king of psychic power there; he is a terribly venomous snake. Do not let him harm you.” And a second time the Lord spoke thus to the matted hair ascetic Kassapa of Uruvelā: “If it is not inconvenient to you ...” And a third time the Lord spoke thus to the matted hair ascetic Kassapa of Uruvelā: “If it is not inconvenient to you, Kassapa, let me stay for one night in the fire-room.”

“It is not inconvenient to me, great recluse, (but) there is a fierce serpent king of psychic power there; he is a terribly venomous snake. Do not let him harm you.”

“It is not likely that he can harm me. Please do you, Kassapa, allow (me the use of) the fire-room,”

¹ Verses at Thag 375–380. At AN i.25 he is called chief of those disciples who have large followings. Thag-a i.71 recounts that one of this Kassapa’s followers, Belaṭṭhasīsa, was tamed with him (see below, Kd 20.18, Kd 20.19) and afterwards became Ānanda’s preceptor. These three Kassapas were brothers. They had a sister whose son, Senaka, was converted by the Lord, see *Psalms of the Bretheren*, p.180. On the three brothers, see MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Manual of Buddhism*, p.206ff. ² I.e. of the river Nerañjarā. His verses at Thag 341. Thag-a on Uruvelākassapa says that Kassapa of the River was so called because he “went forth” at a bend in a great river; and that Kassapa of Gayā was so called because he went forth at Gayāsīsa. ³ Verses at Thag 345–349.

⁴ Cf. Vin 4.107 (BD 2.382) for many similarities with this passage.

1.15.3 “Stay, great recluse, as you wish it.”

Then the Lord, having entered the fire-room, having laid down a grass mat, sat down cross-legged, keeping his back erect, having caused mindfulness to be present in front of him. Then that serpent saw that the Lord had entered, and seeing this, pained, afflicted, he blew forth smoke. Then it occurred to the Lord: “What now if I, without destroying this serpent’s skin and hide and flesh and ligaments and bones and the marrow of the bones, were to master (his) heat by heat?”

1.15.4 Then the Lord, having worked a work of psychic power, blew forth smoke. Then that serpent, not conquering anger, blazed up. The Lord, having attained the condition of heat, also blazed up. When both were in flames, the fire-room became as though burning, ablaze, in flames. Then the matted hair ascetics, having surrounded the fire-room, spoke thus: “Beautiful indeed is the great recluse, (but) he will be harmed by the serpent.”¹

1.15.5 Then the Lord at the end of that night, without having destroyed that serpent’s skin and hide and flesh and ligaments and bones and the marrow of the bones, having mastered (his) heat by heat, having placed him in his bowl, showed him to the matted hair ascetic, Uruvelākassapa, saying: “This, Kassapa, is your serpent, his heat was mastered by heat.” Then it occurred to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelākassapa: “Truly the great recluse is of great psychic power, of great majesty, in that he can master by heat the heat of the fierce serpent king who has psychic power and is a terribly venomous snake; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.”

1.15.6 Near the Nerañjarā,² the Lord
spoke thus to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelākassapa:

¹ Text reads *nāge na viheṭṭhissati*, but should be corrected, as *Vinaya Texts* i.120, n. 3 indicates, by parallel passage at **Vin 2.195**: *nāgena viheṭṭhiyissati*, which I follow. Sinhalese edition reads *nāgena viheṭṭhiyati*, is harmed by the serpent, which also makes sense if the ascetics, seeing Gotama in flames, thought he was already brought to harm. ² For note on this repetition of the story (in this and the next paragraph) in a more popular style, see *Vinaya Texts* i.120, n. 4. Note by Sujato: the “popular style” is in fact verse and I have formatted it as such, without changing the text.

“If it is not inconvenient to you, Kassapa,
let me stay this day (only)¹ in the fire-hall.²”

“It is not inconvenient to me, great recluse,
(but) as I am anxious for your comfort I warn you
that there is a fierce serpent king there,
of psychic power, a terribly venomous snake.
Do not let him harm you.”

“It is not likely that he can harm me.
Please do you, Kassapa, allow (me the use of) the fire-
room.³”

“It is given”; having understood this,
the fearless one entered, fear overpassed.

Having seen that the holy man⁴ had entered,
the chief of snakes⁵, afflicted, blew forth smoke.
The chief of men, joyful, unperturbed,
blew forth smoke there too.

But the chief of snakes, not conquering anger,
blazed up like a fire.
The chief of men, highly proficient in the condition of
heat,
blazed up there too.

When both were in flames,
the matted hair ascetics, as they were looking at the fire-
room, said:

¹ *ajjunho*; see **BD 2.64, n. 1**. Vin-a 971 also explains by *ajja ekadivasam*. ² Text reads *aggisālamhi*; Sinhalese edition *aggisaraṇamhi*; variant reading at Vin 1.365 *aggisālāyam*. ³ *agyāgara*, as throughout, except for case just referred to. ⁴ *isi = ṛsi*, seer, sage. ⁵ Here, instead of being called *nāgarājā*, king of serpents, he is called *ahināga*; and here *nāga* is probably not to be taken as “serpent” but as balancing the *nāga* in *manussanāga*, “chief of men,” just below, and therefore as meaning chief, strongest, foremost (something awe-inspiring: cobra, elephant, saint). Cf. *mahānāga*, used of (chief) disciples, at MN i.32, MN i.151; and definition of *nāga* at MN i.145 as “synonym for that monk in whom the cankers are destroyed,” and cf. also MN-a i.153.

1.15.7 “Beautiful indeed is the great recluse,
(but) he will be harmed by the serpent.”¹

Then at the end of that night
the serpent’s flames became extinguished,
but the multicoloured flames of him of psychic power
remained,
and multicoloured flames, dark green,
then red, crimson, yellow and crystal-coloured
were on Angirasa’s² body.

Having put the chief of snakes into his bowl,
he showed him to the brahmin,³ saying:
“This, Kassapa, is your serpent,
his heat was mastered by heat.”

1.1.26 Then the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa, thoroughly believing
in this wonder of psychic power of the Lord, spoke thus to the
Lord: “Stay just here, great recluse, I (can offer you) a constant supply
of food.”⁴

The First Wonder

1.16.1 Then the Lord stayed in a certain woodland grove near the her-
mitage of the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa. Then the four
Great Kings, having illumined the entire woodland grove on a glo-
rious night with glorious colour, approached the Lord; having ap-
proached, having greeted the Lord, they stood at the four quarters
like huge fires.

1.16.2 Then the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa approached the
Lord at the end of that night, and having approached he spoke thus

¹ See above, **BD 4.34, n. 1.** ² Name applied to Gotama now and again in the Piṭakas; DN iii.196 (“name of the son of the Sakyans”), SN i.196 = Thag 1252, AN iii.239, Thag 536, Ja i.116. See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* and GS iii.175, n. 1. Vin-a 971 says *aṅgato raṁsiyo saṁsaranti*, flames streamed from his body (limb). ³ Note that the *jaṭila* is here referred to as a brahmin. ⁴ This invitation seems to cancel the Lord’s request to stay for “one day (only),” and to account for the fact that he stayed on in the woodland grove for several days.

to the Lord: “It is time, great recluse, the meal is ready. But now, who were these, great recluse, who, having illumined the entire woodland grove during the glorious night with glorious colour, approached you and having approached, having greeted you, stood at the four quarters like huge fires?”

“Kassapa, these were the four Great Kings who approached me in order to hear *dhamma*.”

Then it occurred to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelākassapa: “Truly the great recluse is of great psychic power, of great might, in that the four Great Kings also approach him in order to hear *dhamma*; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.”

Then the Lord, having eaten the meal (offered by) the matted hair ascetic Uruvelākassapa, stayed in that same woodland grove.

The Second Wonder

Then Sakka, lord of the *devas*, having illumined the entire woodland grove on a glorious night with glorious colour, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he stood at a respectful distance, like a huge fire, more glorious and more superb than the former splendours of colour.¹

Then the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa approached the Lord at the end of that night ... (as in² Kd 1.16.2) ... stayed in that same woodland grove.

The Third Wonder

Then Brahmā Sahampati ... (as in Kd 1.17) ... stayed in that same woodland grove.

The Fourth Wonder

Now at that time a great sacrifice (made by) the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa was going forward,³ and the entire (population

¹ I.e. the four Great Kings, so Vin-a 972. ² Reading “Sakka, lord of *devas*” instead of “the four Great Kings.” ³ *paccupaṭṭhito hoti*. It was a sacrifice performed by him.

of) Aṅga and Magadha, taking abundant solid food and soft food, wanted to go (to it)).¹ Then it occurred to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa: “At present my great sacrifice is going forward, and the entire (population of) Aṅga and Magadha, taking abundant solid food and soft food, will come. If the great recluse does a wonder of psychic power before the populace, the great recluse’s gains and honour will much increase, my gains and honour will decline. Now the great recluse shall certainly not come to-morrow.”

Then the Lord, knowing by mind the reasoning in the mind of the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa, having gone to Uttarakuru,² having fetched almsfood from there, having eaten it by the Anotatta lake,³ took his midday rest there. Then at the end of that night the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa approached the Lord; having approached, he spoke thus to the Lord: “It is time, great recluse, the meal is ready. But why did you not come yesterday, great recluse? We thought of you however, saying ‘How is it that the great recluse does not come?’ A portion of solid food and soft food was put aside for you.”

“Now did it not occur to you, Kassapa, ‘At present my great sacrifice is going forward ... Now the great recluse shall certainly not come to-morrow’?”

“So I, Kassapa, knowing by mind the reasoning in your mind, having gone to Uttarakuru, having fetched almsfood from there, having eaten it by the Anotatta lake, took my mid-day rest there.” Then it occurred to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa, “Truly the great recluse is of great psychic power, of great might, in that he also knows mind by mind; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.” Then the Lord, having eaten the meal (offered by) the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa, stayed in that same woodland grove.

¹ Cf. the people’s annual festivals mentioned at *Psalms of the Brethren* 181, at one of which the Lord converted Kassapa of Uruvelā’s nephew. ² Mentioned at **Vin 3.7** (**BD 1.14**). See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, especially for its being considered a mark of great psychic power to be able to go here—a somewhat mythical region.

³ One of the seven great lakes of the Himalayas. See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*.

The Fifth Wonder

Now at that time a rag-robe accrued to the Lord. Then it occurred to the Lord: “Now where can I wash the rag-robe?” Then Sakka, lord of the *devas*, knowing by mind the reasoning in the Lord’s mind, having dug a tank with his hand, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the Lord may wash the rag-robe here.” Then it occurred to the Lord: “Now on what can I knead the rag-robe?” Then Sakka, lord of the *devas*, knowing by mind the reasoning in the Lord’s mind, having put down a large stone near him, said: “Lord, the Lord may knead the rag-robe here.”

Then it occurred to the Lord: “Now holding on to what can I come up from (the water)?” Then a *devatā* inhabiting a *kakudha* (tree)¹, knowing by mind the reasoning in the Lord’s mind, bent down a bough, saying: “Lord, the Lord may come up from (the water) holding on here.” Then it occurred to the Lord: “Now on what can I stretch out² the rag-robe?” Then Sakka, lord of the *devas*, knowing by mind the reasoning in the Lord’s mind, having put down a large stone near him said: “Lord, the Lord may stretch out the rag-robe here”

Then the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa approached the Lord at the end of that night; having approached, he spoke thus to the Lord: “It is time, great recluse, the meal is ready. But how is it, great recluse, that this tank was not here before, and now this tank is here? Nor was this stone put down before. By whom was this stone put down? Nor was a bough of this *kakudha* (tree) bent down before, and now this bough is bent down.”

“Kassapa, a rag-robe accrued to me here, and this occurred to me, Kassapa, ‘Now where can I wash the rag-robe?’ Then, Kassapa, Sakka, lord of the *devas*, knowing by mind the reasoning in my mind, having dug a tank with his hand, spoke thus to me: ‘Lord, the Lord may wash

¹ Terminalia Arjuna according to *Pali-English Dictionary*. Cf. Ja vi.518–519, Dhpa iv.153, *Ajjuna* at Buddhavaṃsa viii.23 and Dhpa i.105 is the tree of the Buddha Anomadassin. Vin-a 972 calls it *ajjunarukkha*, which *Pali-English Dictionary* calls Pentaptera Arjuna. ² *vissajjeyyaṃ*, explained at Vin-a 972 as *sukkhāpanatthāya pasāretvā ṭhapeyyaṃ* (where) can I put it, stretching it out to dry?

the rag-robe here.’ So this tank was dug by the hand of a non-human being.¹ Then this occurred to me, Kassapa, ‘Now on what can I knead the rag-robe?’ ‘... So this stone was put² by a non-human being.

Then this occurred to me, Kassapa, ‘Now holding on to what can I come up out of (the water)?’ Then, Kassapa, a *devatā* ... said: ‘Lord, the Lord may come up from (the water) holding on here.’ So this *kakudha* (tree) was a hold for my hand.³ Then this occurred to me, Kassapa, ‘Now on what can I stretch out the rag-robe?’ Then⁴ Sakka, lord of the *devas* ... So this stone was put by a non-human being.”

Then it occurred to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa: “Truly the great recluse is of great psychic power, of great might, in that Sakka, lord of the *devas*, does him a service; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.” Then the Lord, having eaten the meal (offered by) the matted hair ascetic Uruvelākassapa, stayed in that same woodland grove.

Then the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa approached the Lord at the end of that night; having approached, he announced the time to the Lord, saying: “It is time, great recluse, the meal is ready.”

“You go on, Kassapa, I am coming along,” and having dismissed the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa, having plucked a fruit from a rose-apple tree, after which this Land of the Rose-apples⁵ is named, he sat down in the fire-room, having arrived first.

The matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa saw the Lord sitting in the fire-room; seeing him he spoke thus to the Lord: “By what way have you come, great recluse? I set out before you, but you are sitting in the fire-room, having arrived first.”

“Now I, Kassapa, having dismissed you, having plucked a fruit from a rose-apple tree, after which this Land of the Rose-apples is named, am sitting in the fire-room, having arrived first. Truly, Kassapa, this rose-apple fruit is full of colour, full of scent, full of flavor; if you like, do eat it.”

“No, great recluse, you alone are worthy of it, you alone eat it.”

¹ *amanussena*. Cf. Vin 3.85 (and BD 1.147, n. 2). ² *nikkhittā*, instead of, as previously, *upanikkhi*-. ³ *āhara-hattha*. ⁴ The name Kassapa is omitted here. ⁵ Jambudīpa, usually meaning India.

Then it occurred to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa: “Truly the great recluse is of great psychic power, of great might, in that having dismissed me first ... he sat down in the fire-room, having arrived first; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.” Then the Lord, having eaten the meal (offered by) the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa, stayed in that same woodland grove.

Then the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa approached the Lord at the end of that night; having approached he announced the time to the Lord, saying: “It is time, great recluse, the meal is ready.”

“You go on, Kassapa, I am coming along,” and having dismissed the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa, and having plucked a mango fruit not far from the rose-apple tree, after which this Land of the Rose-apples is named ... having plucked a fruit of emblic myrobalan¹ not far from the mango tree ... having plucked a fruit of yellow myrobalan² not far from the emblic myrobalan, having gone to the Thirty,³ having plucked a flower from the Coral Tree,⁴ he sat down in the fire-room, having arrived first. The matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa saw the Lord sitting in the fire-room, and seeing him he spoke thus to the Lord: “By what way have you come, great recluse? I set out before you, but you are sitting in the fire-room, having arrived first.”

“Now I, Kassapa, having dismissed you, having gone to the Thirty, having plucked a flower from the Coral Tree, am sitting in the fire-room, having arrived first. Truly, Kassapa, this flower of the Coral Tree is full of colour, full of scent; if you like, do take it.”

“No, great recluse, you alone are worthy of it, you alone take it.” Then it occurred to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa: “Truly

¹ *āmalakī* (here and at MN i.456; elsewhere *āmalaka*), *phyllanthus emblica*. The fruit allowed to monks as a medicine, Vin 1.201. Cf. Vin 1.278. ² *haritākī*. Fruit also allowed as a medicine at Vin 1.201. Cf. MN iii.127. ³ I.e. to the realm of the Thirty (or Thirty-three) Devas, *tāvatiṃsa*. ⁴ *pāricchattaka*, “shading all round,” *Erythrina Indica*. (mythical) tree growing in the Tavatimsa realm. At AN iv.117 the *devas*’ rejoicings at each stage in the development of shoot and bloom are set out. See GS iv.78ff. for notes. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, missing the above Vinaya reference, asserts that the flowers are never plucked. In that case this is a noteworthy exception.

the great recluse is of great psychic power, of great might, in that having dismissed me first, having gone to the Thirty, having plucked a flower from the Coral Tree, he is sitting in the fire-room, having arrived first; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.”

Now at that time these matted hair ascetics, wanting to tend the (sacred) fires, were unable to chop sticks. Then it occurred to these matted hair ascetics: “Doubtless it is (owing to) the psychic might of the great recluse that we are unable to chop sticks.” Then the Lord spoke thus to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa: “Kassapa, let sticks be chopped.”

“Let them be chopped, great recluse.” Five hundred sticks were chopped simultaneously.¹ Then it occurred to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa: “Truly the great recluse is of great psychic power, of great might, in that also sticks are chopped; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.”

Now at that time these matted hair ascetics, wanting to tend the (sacred) fires, were unable to kindle the fires. Then it occurred to these matted hair ascetics: “Doubtless ... unable to kindle the fires.” Then the Lord spoke thus to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa: “Kassapa, let the fires be kindled.”

“Let them be kindled, great recluse.” Five hundred fires were kindled simultaneously ... “... in that also the fires are kindled; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.”

Now at that time these matted hair ascetics, having tended the fires, were unable to extinguish the fires.² ... The five hundred fires were extinguished simultaneously ... “... in that also the fires are extinguished; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.”

¹ *sakid eva*, just once, once only. There was doubtless one stick “for each of the five hundred *jaṭilas* over whom Kassapa was chief” (*Vinaya Texts* i.129). ² It is clear therefore that the fires were not kept burning perpetually.

Now at that time on the cold winter nights between the eights¹ in a time of snowfall these matted hair ascetics were plunging into the river Nerañjarā, then emerging and repeatedly plunging in and out.² Then the Lord created as many as five hundred fire-vessels³ just where these matted hair ascetics, having come up from (the river), warmed themselves.⁴ Then it occurred to these matted hair ascetics: “Doubtless it is (owing to) the psychic might of the great recluse that these fire-vessels are created.” Then it occurred to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa: “Truly the great recluse is of great psychic power, of great might, in that he can create these fire-vessels; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.”

Now at that time a great rain fell out of the proper season, and a great flood resulted.⁵ The Lord was staying in a place which became inundated by water. Then it occurred to the Lord: “Now suppose that I, having made the water recede all round, should pace up and down in the middle on dust-covered ground?” Then the Lord, having made the water recede all round, paced up and down in the middle on dust-covered ground. Then the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa,

¹ *antaraṭṭhakāsu*, the *aṭṭhakā* days which, according to Vin-a 1128, are “the eight (days) between Māgha and Phagguṇa” (names of lunar mansions). Cf. MN-a ii.48 (on MN i.79) “four at the end of the month of Māgha, four at the beginning of the month of Phagguṇa, thus between the two there are eight nights.” Cf. AN-a ii.225 (on AN i.136), “the time extends for eight days in the interval between Māgha and Phagguṇa. For there are four days at the end of Māgha and four at the beginning of Phagguṇa, this is called ‘occurring between the eights’” (*antaraṭṭhako*) See Vin 1.288, Ud 1.9, Ud-a 74. Translated at *Sacred Books of the Buddhists* viii, p. 7 as “between the eighths”; at GS i.119, *Further Dialogues of the Buddha* i.55 as “in the dark half of the month(s)”; at *Vinaya Texts* i.130, *Vinaya Texts* ii.211 as “between the Aṣṭakā festivals.” *Critical Pali Dictionary* gives “occurring between the eights.” The translation “eighths” is justified by the meaning of *aṣṭakā* (feminine) as the “eighth day after full moon” (Monier Williams). But “eights” seem preferred by the Commentaries. See notes at *Sacred Books of the Buddhists* viii.p. 7, GS i.119, *Vinaya Texts* i.130. ² Cf. Ud 6 for parallel passage. It would appear that *jaṭilas* practised purification by fire and water; cf. ceremonial bathing at Gayā mentioned by Kassapa of Gayā, Thag 345. ³ *mandāmukhi*. Vin-a 972 calls these *aggibhājāni*. ⁴ Same word, *visibbeti*, as used in Bu-Pc 56; see BD 2.398, n. 3. ⁵ *sañjāyi*, literally was born, was produced.

thinking: "I hope that the great recluse has not been carried away¹ by the water," went together with a boat and many matted hair ascetics to that place where the Lord was staying. The matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa saw the Lord who, having made the water recede all round, was pacing up and down in the middle on dust-covered ground, and seeing him he spoke thus to the Lord: "Is it indeed you who are here, great recluse?"

"It is I,² Kassapa," and the Lord having risen up above the ground, placed himself in the boat. Then it occurred to the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa: "Truly the great recluse is of great psychic power, of great might, in that also the water does not carry him away; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am."

Then it occurred to the Lord: "Now, for a long time it will occur to this foolish man, 'Truly the great recluse is of great psychic power, of great might; but yet he is not a perfected one as I am.' Now, suppose I should deeply stir³ this matted hair ascetic?" Then the Lord spoke thus to the matted hair ascetic Kassapa of Uruvelā: "Neither are you, Kassapa, a perfected one nor have you entered on the way to perfection, and that course is not for you by which you either could be a perfected one or could have entered on the way to perfection." Then the matted hair ascetic Kassapa of Uruvelā, having inclined his head to the Lord's feet, spoke thus to the Lord: "Lord, may I receive the going forth in the Lord's presence, may I receive ordination?"

"It is you, Kassapa, who are leader, guide, highest, chief, head of five hundred matted hair ascetics; do consult these so that they can do what they think (right)." Then the matted hair ascetic Kassapa of Uruvelā approached these matted hair ascetics; having approached, he spoke thus to these matted hair ascetics: "I want, good sirs,⁴ to fare the Brahma-faring under the great recluse; let the revered sirs⁵ do what they think (right)."

¹ Cf. same expression at Vin 3.213 (BD 2.48). ² Emphatic: *ayam ah'asmi*. ³ *saṁve-jeyyaṁ*. Cf. this word, as used above, with other examples of it given by A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Saṁvega*, 'Aesthetic Shock', Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Vol. 7, No. 3, Feb., 1943. ⁴ *bho*. ⁵ *bhavanto*.

“For a long time we, good sir,¹ have been much pleased² by the great recluse; if, revered sir,³ you will fare the Brahma-faring under the great recluse, all of us will fare the Brahma-faring under the great recluse.”

Then these matted hair ascetics, having let their hair, their braids, their bundles on the carrying-poles,⁴ their implements for fire worship be carried away⁵ all mixed up in the water, approached the Lord; having approached, having inclined their heads to the Lord’s feet, they spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may we receive the going forth in the Lord’s presence, may we receive ordination?”

“Come, monks,” the Lord said, “well taught is *dhamma* fare the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill.” So this came to be these venerable ones’ ordination.

The matted hair ascetic Kassapa of the River saw the hair the braids, the bundles on the carrying-poles, the implements for fire-worship being carried away all mixed up in the water; seeing this, it occurred to him: “I hope my brother is not in danger,” and he dispatched matted hair ascetics saying: “Go and find out about my brother,” and he himself with his three hundred matted hair ascetics approached the venerable Kassapa of Uruvela; having approached he spoke thus to the venerable Kassapa of Uruvela: “Is this better, Kassapa?”

“Yes, friend, this is better.”

Then these matted hair ascetics ...⁶ So this came to be these venerable ones’ ordination.

The matted hair ascetic Kassapa of Gayā saw the hair, the braids, the bundles on the carrying-poles, the implements for fire worship

¹ *bho*. ² In the sense of believing in his teaching. ³ *bhavaṃ*. ⁴ *khārikāja*, which Vin-a 972 explains as *khāri-bhāra*. *Khāri* is a three bushel measure, *kāja* (= *vividha*, *vivadha*) is the shoulder-pole on which some ascetics and wanderers carried their property, their *khāri*. DN-a 269 calls *khāri* the requisites of an ascetic: kindling wood, water pot, needle and so on. Cf. *khāri-vividha* at Ud 65=SN 1.78, and DN 1.101.

⁵ *pavāhetvā*. *Pavāheti* is to cause to be carried away, and hence to cleanse, to wash away (evil). Perhaps a dual reference is intended here. Cf. Thag 346 (Kassapa of Gayā’s verses). ⁶ Repeating Kd 1.20.19 for the followers of Kassapa of the River.

being carried away all mixed up in the water; seeing this, it occurred to him: "I hope my brothers are not in danger," and he dispatched matted hair ascetics, saying: "Go and find out about my brothers," and he himself with his two hundred matted hair ascetics approached the venerable Kassapa of Uruvela; having approached, he spoke thus to the venerable Kassapa of Uruvelā: "Is this better, Kassapa?"

"Yes, friend, this is better."

Then these matted hair ascetics, having let their hair, their braids, their bundles on the carrying-poles, their implements for fire worship be carried away all mixed up in the water, approached the Lord; having approached, having inclined their heads to the Lord's feet, they spoke thus to the Lord: "Lord, may we receive the going forth in the Lord's presence, may we receive ordination?"

"Come, monks," the Lord said, "well taught is *dhamma*, fare the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill." So this came to be these venerable ones' ordination.

Through the Lord's psychic resolution, five hundred fire-sticks could not be chopped, (and) were chopped; fires could not be kindled (and) were kindled; could not be extinguished (and) were extinguished; five hundred fire-vessels were created. In this way there came to be three thousand five hundred marvels.

Then the Lord, having stayed at Uruvelā for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Gayā Head together with a large Order of monks, with all those same thousand monks who had formerly been matted hair ascetics. Then the Lord stayed near Gayā at Gayā Head together with the thousand monks.

And there the Lord addressed the monks, saying: "Monks, everything is burning.¹ And what, monks, is everything that is burning? The eye, monks, is burning, material shapes are burning, consciousness through the eye² is burning, impingement on the eye³ is burning, in other words the feeling which arises from impingement on the

¹ Quoted at Kv 209. ² *cakkhuvīññaṇa*, i.e. cognising by the eye, vision or seeing. See *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, 2nd edition, p.161, n. 5; *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.340, *Dialogues of the Buddha* iii.230; and cf. MN i.111f. ³ *cakkhusamphassa*, or impression on, or contact with, the eye.

eye, be it pleasant or painful or neither painful nor pleasant, that too is burning. With what is it burning? I say it is burning with the fire of passion,¹ with the fire of hatred, with the fire of stupidity; it is burning because of birth, ageing, dying, because of grief, sorrow, suffering, lamentation and despair.

“The ear is burning, sounds are burning ... the nose is burning, odours are burning ... the tongue is burning, tastes are burning ... the body is burning, tangible objects are burning ...the mind is burning, mental states are burning, consciousness through the mind² is burning, impingement on the mind is burning, in other words the feeling which raises through impingement on the mind, be it pleasant or painful or neither painful nor pleasant, that too is burning. With what is it burning? I say it is burning with the fire of passion, with the fire of hatred, with the fire of stupidity; it is burning because of birth, ageing, dying, because of grief, sorrow, suffering, lamentation and despair.

“Seeing this, monks, the instructed disciple of the ariyans disregards the eye and he disregards material shapes and he disregards consciousness through the eye and he disregards impingement on the eye, in other words the feeling which arises from impingement on the eye, be it pleasant or painful or neither painful nor pleasant, that too he disregards. And he disregards the ear and he disregards sounds, and he disregards the nose and he disregards odours, and he disregards the tongue and he disregards tastes, and he disregards the body and he disregards tangible objects, and he disregards the mind and he disregards mental states and he disregards consciousness through the mind and he disregards impingement on the mind, in other words the feeling that arises from impingement on the mind, be it pleasant or painful or neither painful nor pleasant, that too he disregards; disregarding, he is dispassionate; through dispassion he is freed; in freedom the knowledge comes to be, ‘I am freed’, and he comprehends: Destroyed is birth, lived is the Brahma-faring, done is what was to be done, there is no more of being such or such.”³

¹ Quoted at Snp-a 32. ² *manovīññāṇa*, i.e. cognising by the mind, ‘apprehending’.

³ As above, **BD 4.21**.

And while this discourse was being uttered, the minds of these thousand monks were freed from the cankers without grasping.

Told is the Disquisition¹ on Burning

Told is the Third Portion for Repeating: the Wonder(s) at Uruvelā

ON BIMBISĀRA'S GATHERING

Then the Lord, having stayed at Gayā Head for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Rājagaha together with the large Order of monks, with all those same thousand monks who had formerly been matted hair ascetics. Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Rājagaha. The Lord stayed there at Rājagaha in the Palm Grove pleasure ground² in the Supatiṭṭha shrine.³

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha heard: "Verily, the recluse Gotama, the son of the Sakyans, who has gone forth from the Sakyan clan, has reached Rājagaha and is staying at Rājagaha in the Palm Grove pleasure ground in the Supatiṭṭha shrine. A lovely reputation has gone forth concerning the Lord Gotama, thus: He is indeed Lord, perfected one, fully awakened one, endowed with knowledge and conduct, well-farer, knower of the worlds, unrivalled charioteer of men to be tamed, teacher of *devas* and mankind, awakened one, Lord. Having realised them by his own super-knowledge, he makes known this world with its *devas*, with its Māras, with its Brahmas, creatures with *devas* and men, with recluses and brahmins. He teaches *dhamma*, lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the ending. He explains with the spirit and the letter the Brahma-faring completely fulfilled and wholly pure. Good indeed it were to see perfected ones like this."

¹ *pariyāya*. ² *Laṭṭhivanuyyāna*, literally the pleasance, pleasure ground or park of the grove of sprouts (or canes or sticks). Vin-a 972 explains by *tāluyyāna*, the palmyra, or talipot-palm pleasance. Cf. Ja i.68, Ja i.84; and *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ³ Vin-a 972 calls this a round tree. See E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha*, p. 230.

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, surrounded by twelve myriad¹ brahmins and householders² of Magadha, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. Then some of these twelve myriad brahmins and householders of Magadha having greeted the Lord, sat down at a respectful distance; some exchanged greetings with the Lord, and having exchanged greetings of friendliness and courtesy, they sat down at a respectful distance; some having saluted the Lord with joined palms, sat down at a respectful distance; some having shouted out their name and clan before the Lord, sat down at a respectful distance; some having become silent, sat down at a respectful distance.

Then it occurred to those twelve myriad brahmins and householders of Magadha: “Now,³ does the great recluse fare the Brahma-faring under Kassapa of Uruvelā, or does Kassapa of Uruvelā fare the Brahma-faring under the great recluse?” Then the Lord, knowing with his mind the reasoning in the minds of those twelve myriad brahmins and householders of Magadha, addressed Kassapa of Uruvelā with the verses:

“What hast thou seen, O dweller in Uruvelā,
That thou, known as emaciate⁴, hast abandoned the (sacred) fire?

I ask thee about this matter, Kassapa:
Hast thou abandoned thy fire-implements?”

“The sacrifices speak of forms and sounds,
Also of tastes⁵, pleasures and women.
Knowing that ‘This is dross’ among affections—
Therefore I delighted not in sacrifice, in offering.”

¹ *nahuti*. Cf. Snp 677. Exact meaning unknown, but some high number. Vin-a 972 says “here one *nahuta* is ten thousand.” ² *brāhmaṇagahapatika*, not “brahmin householders” as at BURLINGAME, *Buddhist Legends* i.197, but as at *Vinaya Texts* i.137 (where see note) and above. For see definition of “householder” at Vin 3.222, “setting aside king ... and Brahmin, he who remains is called ‘householder’.” ³ Cf. Ja vi.220; To end of second verse quoted at Bv-a 20. ⁴ *kisako vadāno*; see note *Vinaya Texts* i.138, n. 1. ⁵ *rūpe ca sadde ca atho rase*; cf. Snp 974.

“But if your mind delights not there, Kassapa,” the Lord said,

“Among forms, sounds and also tastes,
Then in the world of *devas* and men what does your mind
delight in?
Kassapa, tell me that.”

“When I had seen the path, peaceful, without substrate,¹
Stainless², not attached to sensations’ becoming,
Not becoming otherwise³, where one is not led by others⁴—

In consequence, I delighted not in sacrifice, in offering.”

1.22.6 Then the venerable Kassapa of Uruvelā, rising from his seat, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having inclined his head towards the Lord’s feet, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the Lord is my teacher, I am a disciple⁵; Lord, the Lord is my teacher, I am a disciple.” Then it occurred to those twelve myriad Brahmins and householders of Magadha: “Kassapa of Uruvelā fares the Brahmarfaring under the great recluse.”

1.22.7 Then the Lord, knowing by mind the reasoning in the minds of these twelve myriad Brahmins and householders of Magadha, talked a progressive talk ... stopping, the Way.⁶

1.22.8 And as a clean cloth without black specks will easily take a dye, even so as the twelve myriad Brahmins and householders of Magadha with Bimbisāra at their head were (sitting) in those very seats, *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose to them, that “Whatever

¹ *anupadhika*, i.e. without substrate for or attachment to rebirth. ² *akiñcanaṃ kāmabhava asattaṃ*, also at Snp 176, Snp 1059, Snp 1091. *Akiñcana* can also mean “having nothing”, “calling nothing one’s own”, see *Vinaya Texts* i.139, n. 1. Vin-a 973 says of it that it means without the stain of passion. ³ *anaññathābhāvīṃ*, i.e. there is no becoming (for the path) as to birth, decrepitude, dying (according to Vin-a 973). Cf. SN iii.225, SN iv.23, SN iv.66. ⁴ *anaññaneyyaṃ*. Vin-a 973 says that one should oneself, by making the Way become, come to the path and should not be brought to it by anyone else. Cf. Snp 55, Snp 213, Snp 364. ⁵ Ja vi.220, Bv-a 20. ⁶ As above, Kd 1.7.5-1.7.6.

is of the nature to uprise, all that is of the nature to stop,” and one myriad declared themselves to be lay-followers.

Then King Bimbisāra of Magadha, having seen *dhamma*, attained *dhamma*, known *dhamma*, plunged into *dhamma*, having crossed over doubt, put away uncertainty, having attained without another’s help to full confidence in the teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord: “Formerly, Lord, when I was a young man I had five ambitions.¹ These are now realised² by me.

1. “Formerly, Lord, when I was a young man it occurred to me: ‘Might I be anointed into kingship.’ This was my first ambition, Lord. It has now been realised by me.
2. “And ‘Might the perfected one, the fully awakened one come into my realm.’ This, Lord, was my second ambition. It has now been realised by me.
3. “And ‘That I might pay homage to this Lord.’ This, Lord, was my third ambition. It has now been realised by me.
4. “And ‘May that Lord teach me *dhamma*.’ This, Lord, was my fourth ambition. It has now been realised by me.
5. “And ‘Might I understand that Lord’s *dhamma*.’ This, Lord, was my fifth ambition. It has now been realised by me.

“Formerly, Lord, when I was a young man I had these five ambitions. They are now realised by me.

“Excellent, Lord! Excellent, Lord! Even, Lord, as one might set upright what has been upset³ ... even so is *dhamma* explained in many a figure by the Lord. So I, Lord, go to the Lord⁴ as refuge and to *dhamma* and to the Order of monks. Lord, may the Lord accept me as a lay-disciple gone for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts. And, Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with me to-morrow together with the Order of monks.” The Lord consented by becoming silent.

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having understood the Lord’s consent, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord,

¹ *assāsaka*. ² *samiddha*, well effected. ³ As above, **Kd1.7.10**. ⁴ *bhagavantam*.

departed keeping his right side towards him. Then King Seniya Bim-bisāra of Magadha, having had sumptuous food, solid and soft, prepared, at the end of that night had the time announced to the Lord, saying: “Lord, it is time, the meal is ready.” Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Rājagaha together with the large Order of monks, with all those same thousand monks who had formerly been matted-hair ascetics.

Now at that time Sakka, lord of the *devas*, having assumed the form of a Brahmin youth, walked in front of the Order of monks with the Lord at its head, singing these verses:

“The tamed with the tamed,
with the former matted-hair ascetics,
the well freed¹ with the well freed,
The Lord, beautifully coloured like a golden ornament,²
entered Rājagaha.

“The freed³ with the freed,
with the former matted-hair ascetics,
the well freed with the well freed,
The Lord, beautifully coloured like a golden ornament,
entered Rājagaha.

“The crossed over with the crossed over,
with the former matted-hair ascetics,
the well freed with the well freed,
The Lord, beautifully coloured like a golden ornament,
entered Rājagaha.

“He of the ten states,⁴
of the ten powers,⁵
versed in the ten things,⁶

¹ *vippamutta*. ² *singīnikkhasuvaṇṇa*. Cf. SN ii.234. Gold is the colour for immortality. ³ *mutta*. ⁴ *dasavāsa*. Ten *ariya-vāsā* given at DN iii.269, AN v.29. ⁵ *dasabala* became an epithet of this and the previous Buddhas. ⁶ According to Vin-a 973 the ten paths of action.

and furnished with the ten,¹
He, the Lord, surrounded by ten hundred,
entered Rājagaha.^{2”}

People having seen Sakka, lord of the *devas*, spoke thus: “Indeed this brahmin youth is lovely, indeed this brahmin youth is good to look upon, indeed this brahmin youth is charming. Whose, now, is this brahmin youth?” When they had spoken thus, Sakka, lord of the *devas*, addressed these people with a verse:

“He who is steadfast, tamed in every way,
awakened, peerless among men,
Perfected, well-farer,
I am his attendant in the world.”³

Then the Lord approached the dwelling of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha; having approached he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, with his own hand having offered, having satisfied the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head with sumptuous food, solid and soft, when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from the bowl, sat down at a respectful distance.

As he was sitting down at a respectful distance it occurred to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: “Now, where could the Lord stay that would be neither too far from a village nor too near, suitable for coming and going, accessible for people whenever they want⁴, not crowded by day, having little noise at night, little sound, without folk’s breath, haunts of privacy, suitable for seclusion?”⁵

Then it occurred to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: “Now, this Bamboo Grove of ours, a pleasure park,⁶ is neither too far from

¹ According to Vin-a 973 the ten factors of an adept, *asekhehi aṅgehi upeto*. Cf. the adept’s ten qualities, *dhammā*, at AN v.222, and his ten powers, *balāni*, at Ps.ii.173: both consist of the eight “fitnesses” of the eightfold Way with the addition of right knowledge and right freedom. ² Quoted at Ja i.84. ³ Ja i.84. ⁴ *atthikānaṃ-atthikānaṃ*, explained at Vin-a 974 as going up to the awakened one and hearing *dhamma*. ⁵ This is stock, Vin 2.158, DN iii.38, MN ii.118, MN iii.13, AN iv.88, Vb 224.

⁶ *uyyāna*; see definition at Vin 4.298. (BD 3.325).

a village ... suitable for seclusion. Suppose I were to give the Bamboo Grove, a pleasure park, to the Order of the monks with the awakened one at its head?"

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having taken a ceremonial vessel made of gold, dedicated it to the Lord, saying: "May I, Lord, give this Bamboo Grove, a pleasure park, to the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head?" The Lord accepted the park.¹ Then the Lord, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha with talk on *dhamma*, having risen from his seat, departed. Then the Lord, on this occasion having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: "Monks, I allow a park."²

ON THE GOING FORTH OF SĀRIPUTTA AND MOGGALLĀNA

At that time the wanderer Sañjaya³ was residing in Rājagaha together with a great company of wanderers, with two hundred and fifty wanderers. Now at that time Sāriputta and Moggallāna fared the Brahma-faring under the wanderer Sañjaya, and an agreement came to be formed by these: "Whoever attains the deathless first, let him announce it."

Then the venerable Assaji,⁴ having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Rājagaha for almsfood. He was pleasing whether he was approaching or departing, whether he was looking in front or looking behind, whether he was drawing in or stretching out (his arm), his eyes were cast down, he was possessed of pleasant

¹ *uyyāna*; see definition at [Vin 4.298](#). ([BD 3.325](#)). ² *Ārāma*, a park, and then a monastery. ³ *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, ii.p.1000 identifies him with Sañjaya-Belaṭṭhiputta, one of the six famous heretical teachers of Gotama's days, and whose doctrines are given at [DN i.58](#). See also MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Sakya*, p.123. ⁴ This Assaji was one of "the group of five" friends to whom Gotama addressed his first and second Utterances. See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Sakya*, p.122ff. for the view that the "subject of causation ... is due directly to Assaji," and her *Gotama the Man*, p.76f., p.108, p.242, *Manual of Buddhism*, p.215.

behaviour.¹ The wanderer Sāriputta saw the venerable Assaji walking for almsfood in Rājagaha—pleasing whether he was approaching ... possessed of pleasant behaviour—and seeing him, it occurred to him: “This is one of those monks who are indeed perfected ones in the world or who have entered on the way to perfection. What now if I, having approached this monk, should ask him: ‘On account of whom are you, your reverence, gone forth, or who is your teacher, or whose *dhamma* do you profess’?²”

Then it occurred to the wanderer Sāriputta: “But it is not the right time to question this monk, he has gone in among the houses, he is walking for almsfood. What now if I should follow close after this monk who has learnt a way for those who need it³?” Then the venerable Assaji, having walked for almsfood in Rājagaha, taking his almsbowl, returned. Then the wanderer Sāriputta approached the venerable Assaji; having approached, he exchanged greetings with the venerable Assaji; having exchanged courteous and friendly greetings, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance, the wanderer Sāriputta spoke thus to the venerable Assaji: “Your reverence, your faculties are quite pure, your complexion very bright, very clear. On account of whom, your reverence, have you gone forth, or who is your teacher, or whose *dhamma* do you profess⁴?”

“There is, friend, a great recluse, a son of the Sakyans, gone forth from a Sakyan family. I have gone forth on account of this Lord and this Lord is my teacher and I profess this Lord’s *dhamma*.”

“But what is the doctrine of your reverence’s teacher, what does he point out?”

¹ Stock. Cf. e.g. MN iii.35, MN iii.90, DN i.79, AN ii.104, AN ii.106, AN ii.210, Vin 3.180.

² Cf. above Kd 1.6.7. ³ *atthikehi upaṇṇātaṃ maggaṃ*. Vin-a 975 says this means either a way that is known and practiced; or, there will be deathlessness for us who need it; and thus *upaṇṇāta* means *nibbāna*, and so the meaning here is: tracking (or wayfaring after, *magganto*), seeking this. ⁴ As at Kd 1.6.7.

“Now, I, friend, am new,¹ not long gone forth, fresh to this *dhamma* and discipline. I am not able to teach you *dhamma* in full, but I can tell you its purport² briefly.”

Then the wanderer Sāriputta spoke thus to the venerable Assaji: “So be it, your reverence, tell me little or tell me much, (but) in any case explain to me its purport; I want just its purport. Why should you make a great elaboration³?”

Then the venerable Assaji uttered this terse expression⁴ of *dhamma* to the wanderer Sāriputta:

“Those things which proceed from a cause,
of these the Truth-finder has told the cause,
And that which is their stopping—
the great recluse has such a doctrine.”⁵

When the wanderer Sāriputta had heard this terse expression of *dhamma*, there arose *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, that “Whatever is of the nature to uprise all that is of the nature to stop.” He said: “If this is indeed *dhamma*, you have penetrated as far as the

¹ *nava*. If occurring with *bhikkhu* means a recently ordained monk. But not so combined here. It can also mean young, but other evidence is lacking to show that Assaji, the last of the group of five to attain *dhamma*-vision Kd 1.6.36 was young in years. He was however young in standing as a follower of Gotama, newly ordained.

² *attha*. This whole passage is controversial. MRS. RHYS DAVIDS takes *attha* here as “the well, the good,” *Sakya*, p.134f.; COOMARASWAMY, *Some Pali Words*, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, vol.4, no.2, July 1939, p.172f. as “purport”. On the whole I am inclined to agree with his interpretation of the passage. See also E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha*, etc., p.93f. ³ *vyāñjana*. See COOMARASWAMY, *Some Pali Words*, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, vol.4, no.2, July 1939, p.171ff. E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha as Legend and History*, p.94, n.1, says that this is a verse “in *āryā* metre ... even if now corrupted”, and he prints it as verse as does Norman at Dh-p-a.1.92.

⁴ *pariyāya*, formula, paraphrase, circumlocution, see COOMARASWAMY, *Some Pali Words*, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, vol.4, no.2, July 1939, p.172, n.1. Perhaps “epitome”. Cf. AN iv.63, where *dhamma-pariyāya* also appears to refer to verses.

⁵ Referred to at Ja i.85.

sorrowless path, unseen, neglected for many myriads of aeons.”¹

Then the wanderer Sāriputta approached the wanderer Moggallāna. Then the wanderer Moggallāna saw the wanderer Sāriputta coming in the distance, and seeing the wanderer Sāriputta, he spoke thus: “Friend, your faculties are quite pure, your complexion very bright, very clear. Can it be that you, friend, have attained the deathless?”

“Yes, friend, I have attained the deathless.”

“But how did you, friend, attain the deathless?”

“Now, I, friend, saw the venerable Assaji walking for almsfood in Rājagaha—pleasing whether he was approaching or departing ... (as at **Kd 1.23.2**) ...

“Then, friend, it occurred to me: ‘But it is not the right time to question this monk ... (as at **Kd 1.23.3, Kd 1.23.4**) ...

“Then, friend, the venerable Assaji uttered this terse expression of *dhamma*:

“Those things which proceed from a cause,
of these the Truthfinder has told the cause,
And that which is their stopping—
the great recluse has such a doctrine.”

When the wanderer Moggallāna had heard this terse expression of *dhamma* ... (as at **Kd 1.23.5**) ...

Then the wanderer Moggallāna spoke thus to the wanderer Sāriputta: “Let us go, friend, to the Lord, (for) this Lord is the teacher for us.”

“Friend, these two hundred and fifty wanderers are staying here because of us, looking to us; do let us consult them so that they may do what they think (right).” Then Sāriputta and Moggallāna approached

¹ = Tha-ap i.149. See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Sakya*, p.135. Vin-a 976 takes the phrase to mean “this sorrowless path, unseen by us for many myriads of aeons is neglected” (or passed by, *abbhatitam*). Or, taking *abbhatitam* to mean “in the past, what is passed and over”, this passage could be translated; “unseen by us for many myriads of aeons in the past.”

these wanderers; having approached, they spoke thus to these wanderers:

“We are going, friends, to the Lord, (for) this Lord is the teacher for us.”

“We, venerable ones, are staying here because of you, looking to you. If the venerable ones will fare the Brahma-faring under the great recluse all of us will fare the Brahma-faring under the great recluse.”

Then Sāriputta and Moggallāna approached the wanderer Sañjaya; having approached they spoke thus to the wanderer Sañjaya: “Sir, we are going to the Lord, (for) this Lord is the teacher for us.”

“No, friends, do not go; we three will one and all look after this group.” And a second time ... And a third time ... “... will look after this group.”

Then Sāriputta and Moggallāna, taking those two hundred and fifty wanderers, approached the Bamboo Grove; but on that self-same spot hot blood issued from the mouth of Sañjaya the wanderer.¹ The Lord saw Sāriputta and Moggallāna coming in the distance; seeing them, he addressed the monks saying:

“Monks, these two friends, Kolita and Upatissa,² are coming. This pair of disciples will be my chief, my eminent pair.”³

When, in the deep sphere of knowledge,
they had attained the matchless freedom
in which there is destruction of attachments,⁴
then the teacher explained about them
in the Bamboo Grove:

“These two friends,

¹ See *Vinaya Texts* i.149, n. 1. ² Moggallāna was named Kolita, probably after his village, where he was born; Upatissa was Sāriputta’s name, as he is recorded to say at MN i.150, “but my fellow Brahma-farers know me as Sāriputta”—a name derived from his mother’s, Rūpasārī. ³ Quoted at DhP-a i.95. ⁴ See *Vinaya Texts* i.149, n. 3, for note on “extraordinary grammatical construction” of this passage. Note by Sujato: The reason for the “extraordinary grammatical construction” is that the passage is in verse, which was not recognized by editor or translator. I have not changed the text, but I have formatted it as verse.

Kolita and Upatissa, are coming.
This pair of disciples will be my chief,
my eminent pair.”

Then Sāriputta and Moggallāna approached the Lord; having approached, having inclined their heads to the Lord’s feet, they spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may we receive the going forth in the Lord’s presence, may we receive ordination?”

“Come, monks,” the Lord said, “well taught is *dhamma* fare the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill.” So this was these venerable ones’ ordination.

Now at that time very distinguished young men belonging to respectable families of Magadha were faring the Brahma-faring under the Lord. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “The recluse Gotama gets along by making (us) childless, the recluse Gotama gets along by making (us) widows, the recluse Gotama gets along by breaking up families. A thousand matted hair ascetics have now been allowed to go forth by him, and these two hundred and fifty wanderers of Sañjaya have been allowed to go forth, and these very distinguished young men belonging to respectable families of Magadha are faring the Brahma-faring under the recluse Gotama.” Moreover, having seen the monks, they reprovved them in this verse:

“The great recluse has come
to Giribbaja of the Magadhese
Leading all Sañjaya’s (followers).
Who will now be led by him?”

Monks heard these who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, this noise will not last for long, it will last only for seven days, after seven days it will cease. Therefore, monks, if they reprove you in this verse:

‘The great recluse has come
to Giribbaja¹ of the Magadhese
Leading all Sañjaya’s (followers).
Who will now be led by him?’

You should reprove them in reply in this verse:

‘Verily great heroes, Truthfinders,
lead by what is true *dhamma*.
Who would be jealous of the wise,
leading by *dhamma*?’”

1.24.7
0 4.57
Now at that time the people, having seen the monks, reproved
them in this verse:

“The great recluse has come
to Giribbaja of the Magadhese
Leading all Sañjaya’s (followers).
Who will now be led by him?”

The monks reproved these people in reply in this verse:

“Verily great heroes, Truthfinders,
lead by what is true *dhamma*.
Who would be jealous of the wise,
leading by *dhamma*?”

1.144
With the people saying: “It is said that the recluses, sons of the
Sakyans, lead by *dhamma*, not by what is not-*dhamma*,” that noise
lasted exactly seven days, after seven days it ceased.

Told is the Going Forth of Sāriputta and Moggallāna

Told is the Fourth Portion for Repeating

ON THE DUTIES TO THE PRECEPTOR

1.25.1 Now at that time monks, being without preceptors, not being exhorted, not being instructed, walked for almsfood wrongly dressed, wrongly clothed, not befittingly attired.¹ While people were eating, they held their almsbowls close above the soft food for the remains,² and they held their almsbowls close above the solid food for the remains, and they held their almsbowls close above the savoury food for the remains, and they held their almsbowls close above the beverages³ for the remains, and having themselves asked for curry and boiled rice,⁴ they ate it, and they remained in the refectory making a loud noise, a great noise.⁵

People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, walk for almsfood, wrongly dressed, wrongly clothed, not befittingly attired? While people are eating, they hold their almsbowls close above the soft food ... and they remain in the refectory making a loud noise, a great noise, like brahmins at the meal-time of brahmins.”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks, contented, conscientious, scrupulous desirous of training ... spread it about, saying: “How can these monks walk for almsfood wrongly dressed ... and remain in the refectory making a loud noise, a great noise?”

Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks walk for almsfood wrongly dressed ... and remain in the refectory making a great noise, a loud noise?”

¹ A name for Rājagaha, cf. Snp 408. Literally “cow-pen”. Vin-a 97 says Giribbaja was a town in the country of the Magadhese. ¹ See Bu-Sk 1, Bu-Sk 2, Bu-Sk 3, Bu-Sk 4, Bu-Sk 23, Bu-Sk 24, and BD 2.369 for references. I think it is meant that they were not wearing their robes in the regulation ways. ² *uttiṭṭha-patta*. Vin-a 977, as noted in *Vinaya Texts* i.152, gives two explanations of this phrase, the one connecting it with *ucchittha*, left over, rejected; the other with *uttiṭṭhahati*, to rise. ³ Cf. Vin 3.72 (BD 1.124) for these four items. ⁴ *odana*, one of the five soft foods (Vin 4.83). ⁵ Cf. Bu-Sk 11–Bu-Sk 14.

“It is true, Lord.”

The awakened one, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“It is not fitting, monks, in these foolish men, it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is unworthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How, monks, can these foolish men walk for almsfood ... and remain in the refectory making a loud noise, a great noise? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increasing (the number of) those who are pleased, but it is, monks, for displeasing those who are not (yet) pleased as well as those who are pleased, and for causing wavering in some.”

Then the Lord,¹ having rebuked these monks, having in many a figure spoken in dispraise of difficulty in supporting and maintaining oneself, of great desires, of lack of contentment, of clinging (to the obstructions), of indolence; having in many a figure spoken in praise of ease in supporting and maintaining oneself, of desiring little, of contentment, of expunging (evil), of punctiliousness, of graciousness, of decreasing (the obstructions), of putting forth energy, having given reasoned talk on what is fitting, on what is becoming, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, I allow a preceptor.² The preceptor, monks, should arouse in the one who shares his cell³ the attitude of a son⁴; the one who shares his cell should arouse in the preceptor the attitude of a father.⁵ Thus these, living with reverence, with deference, with courtesy towards one another, will come to growth, to increase, to maturity in this *dhamma* and discipline.

“And thus, monks, should a preceptor be chosen⁶: having arranged the upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured his feet, having sat down on the haunches, having saluted with joined palms, he should speak to him thus: ‘Honoured sir, be my preceptor; honoured

¹ Cf. this passage with *Vin* 3.21 (BD 1.37). ² *upajjhāya*; Sanskrit *upadhyāya*, a tutor.

³ *saddhivihārika*, literally one who stays, resides, lives with (another), a co-resident, and so a pupil in the same *vihāra*. ⁴ *puttacitta*, a son’s mind. Cf. *SN* iv.11of., *mātucitta bhaginīcitta dhītucitta*, the mind of a mother, sister, daughter. ⁵ *pitucitta*, a father’s mind. ⁶ *gahetabbo*, literally should be taken. But words for “choosing” were almost lacking, and *gaṇhāti* was often made to do duty for them.

sir, be my preceptor; honoured sir, be my preceptor.’ If he¹ says: ‘Very well’ or ‘Certainly’ or ‘All right’ or ‘It is proper’ or ‘Manage it amiably’, and makes this understood by gesture, makes this understood by speech, makes this understood by gesture and by speech, the preceptor has been chosen; if he does not make this understood by gesture, if he does not make this understood by speech, if he does not make this understood by gesture and by speech, the preceptor has not been chosen.

“The one who shares a cell,² monks, should conduct himself properly towards the preceptor. This is the proper conduct in this respect: having got up early, having taken off his sandals,³ having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, he should give tooth-wood,⁴ he should give water for rinsing the mouth, he should make ready a seat. If there is conjei, having washed a bowl, the conjei should be placed near (the preceptor). When he has drunk the conjei, having given him water, having received the bowl, having lowered it,⁵ having washed it properly without rubbing it, it should be put away. When the preceptor has got up, the seat should be removed. If that place is soiled, that place should be swept.

“If the preceptor wishes to enter a village, his inner clothing⁶ should be given (to him), the inner clothing (that he is wearing)

¹ I.e. the preceptor, see Vin-a 977. ² From here to **BD 4.67** below, = **Vin 2.223-227**.

³ Vin-a 977 says he might have worn these for pacing up and down or for keeping his feet clean if he had got up early. ⁴ *dantakaṭṭha*, as used by Indians today, a piece of wood. Allowed at **Vin 2.138**. Vin-a 977 says that the *saddhivihārika*, the one who shares a cell, having brought a large, a middle-sized and a small one—whatever he (the preceptor) takes of these is for three days, and then on the fourth, day he should be given the same again. ⁵ *nīcaṃ katvā*. So as not to let drops of water from inside the bowl spoil his robes when one is washing it; in the case of an earthen bowl it might break if dropped from a height. ⁶ *nivāsana*; possibly another word for *antaravāsaka*, the putting on of which is denoted by *nivāseti*, cf. **BD 2.1, n. 2, BD 2.32, n. 2, n. 3**.

should be received (from him) in return,¹ the girdle should be given (to him); having folded them² (into two or four folds), the outer robes are to be given³ (to him); having washed it, a bowl with water⁴ is to be given (to him). If the preceptor desires an attendant, (the latter) having put on his inner robe all round so as to cover the three circles,⁵ having bound on the girdle, having folded them and having dressed in the outer robes, having fastened the ties, having washed, having taken a bowl, should be the preceptor's attendant. He should not walk too far away (from him), he should not walk too close. He should receive the bowl and its contents.⁶

“He should not interrupt the preceptor when he is speaking. (But) if the preceptor is bordering on an offence, then speaking himself, he should warn him. When he⁷ is returning,⁸ he⁹ should make a seat ready, having come back first; he should set out water for washing the feet, a foot-stool, a foot-stand¹⁰; having gone to meet him, he should receive his bowl and robe, he should give back the inner clothing (given) in return, he should receive his inner clothing. If a robe is

¹ *paṭṭinivāsanaṃ paṭiggahetabbaṃ*. Vin-a 978 is silent. *Vinaya Texts* i.155 suggests “house-dress?”. This would mean some kind of robe in addition to the three regulation ones. Bohtlingk and Roth, and Monier-Williams also both give “a kind of garment, for Buddhists”. It would look as if a monk might, and indeed must, enter village in a *nivasāna*, but not in a *paṭṭinivāsana*. I doubt the separate existence of such a garment. I suggest it is a *nivasāna* that is simply changed for another when a monk sets out on the begging round. If he has a change of *nivasāna* he could not be a *tecīvarika*. Monks in Ceylon often change their robes before they go out.

² *saṅgaṇaṃ katvā*. As at **Kd 18.4.3**. Vin-a 789 says “having made two robes of one” (i.e. having put two robes together), “two outer cloaks (*saṅghāṭiyo*) are to be given. Every robe is called a *saṅghati* if it is put together, *saṅghāṭittā*”. It thus seems that *saṅghāṭi* here stands both for the outer cloak and for the upper robe, *uttarāsanga*; not for the inner robe, however, since this, under the name *nivāsana*, had probably been given to the preceptor already. Usually there is only one robe called *saṅghāṭi*.

³ *saṅghāṭiyo*, literally outer cloaks. See above note. ⁴ *sa-udako* means with the drops of water remaining in the bowl after rinsing it, not drying it. ⁵ Cf. **Bu-Sk 1, Bu-Sk 2 (BD 3.121)**. ⁶ *pattapariyāpanna*. Vin-a 978 says that if the bowl is warm or heavy with the conjei or rice received, the one who shares a cell should take the preceptor's bowl and give him his own. ⁷ Presumably the preceptor. ⁸ To the monastery from the alms-round. ⁹ Presumably the one who shares a cell. ¹⁰ Cf. **Vin 1.9; Vin 4.231, Vin 4.310 (BD 3.191)**.

damp with perspiration, he should dry it for a short time in the sun's warmth, but a robe should not be laid aside in the warmth. He should fold up the robe. When folding up the robe, having made the corners turn back four finger-breadths, he should fold up the robe thinking: 'Mind there is no crease¹ in the middle.' The girdle should be placed in a fold (of the robe).² If there comes to be almsfood and the preceptor wishes to eat,³ having given him water, almsfood should be placed near (him).

"He should offer the preceptor drinking-water. When he has eaten, having given him water, having received the bowl, having lowered it,⁴ having washed it properly without rubbing it, having emptied out the water, he should dry it for a short time in the sun's warmth, but a bowl should not be laid aside in the warmth. He should lay aside the bowl and robes. When laying aside the bowl, having taken the bowl in one hand, having felt with the other hand under the couch or under the chair, the bowl should be laid aside, but the bowl should not be laid aside on the bare ground.⁵ When laying aside a robe, having taken the robe in one hand, having stroked the other hand along the bamboo for robes or the cord for robes, having got the edges away from him and the fold towards him, the robe should be laid aside.⁶ When the preceptor has got up, the seat should be removed, the water for washing the feet, the foot-stool, the foot-stand should be put away. If that place comes to be soiled, that place should be swept.

"If the preceptor wishes to bathe, he should prepare a bath. If he wants a cold (bath), he should prepare a cold one; if he wants a hot

¹ *bhaṅga*, breaking, splitting, dissolution, destruction. Vin-a 979 indicates that if the robe were folded up in the same crease every time, it would wear thin along that crease. ² *obhoga*. Vin-a 979 says "having folded up the girdle, it should be laid aside having arranged it in a fold (*bhoga*) of the robe". ³ Vin-a 979 says that this would only be if he had failed to obtain almsfood in the village; in this case the one who shares his cell should bring him the almsfood which he himself had obtained. ⁴ So as not to get dusty, Vin-a 979. ⁵ So as not to get dusty, Vin-a 979. ⁶ Vin-a 980, he is not to lay it aside by taking hold of the edges and throwing the robe over bamboo or cord, or the fold might be damaged by coming into contact with a wall.

(bath), he should prepare a hot one. If the preceptor wishes to enter a bathroom¹, he should knead chunam should moisten clay²; taking a chair for the bathroom,³ having gone close behind the preceptor, having given him the chair for the bathroom, having received his robe, he should lay it to one side. He should give him the chunam, he should give him the clay. If he is able to do so,⁴ he should enter the bathroom. When he is entering the bathroom, having smeared his face with clay, having covered himself front and back, he should enter the bathroom.

“He should not sit down so as to encroach upon (the space intended for) monks who are elders.⁵ He should not keep newly ordained monks from a seat. He should make preparation for the preceptor in the bathroom. When he is leaving the bathroom, taking the chair for the bathroom, having covered himself front and back, he should leave the bath-room. He should also make preparation for the preceptor in the water. When he is bathing, having come out (of the water) first, having dried his own body, having put on his inner robe, he should wipe off the water from the preceptor’s limbs, he should give him his inner clothing, he should give him his outer cloak⁶; taking the chair for the bathroom, having come back first, he should make ready a seat, he should put out water for washing the feet, a footstool, a footstand. He should offer the preceptor drinking-water.

“If he wishes to make him recite,⁷ he should make him recite. If he wishes to interrogate,⁸ he should be interrogated. In whatever dwelling-place the preceptor is staying, if that dwelling-place is

¹ *jantāghara*, see *Vinaya Texts* i.157, n. 2; iii.103. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.183, calls *jantāghara*, “a common bath”, and *jantāgharasālā*, “bath-rooms”. ² Clay for use on the face in the bath-room allowed at *Vin* 2.120. ³ Allowed at *Vin* 2.120.

⁴ *Vin*-a 980, if he is not ill. The bathroom must have been full of hot steam, and juniors as much as seniors had to be careful to protect their faces with a smearing of clay. ⁵ Cf. *Vin* 4.42, where monks must not lie down in the space meant for elders, and see *BD* 2.247, n. 3. This expression and the next also occur at *Kd* 18.4.2.

⁶ *saṅghāṭi*, perhaps here meaning the upper robe as well as the outer cloak, although then the plural might have been expected. See above, *BD* 4.60, n. 3. ⁷ No doubt meaning, if the preceptor wishes to make the one who shares the cell recite the *Pātimokkha* or give an exposition of the eight chief rules, cf. *BD* 2.271, n. 1. ⁸ Cf. *BD* 2.271, n. 2.

soiled, it should be cleaned if he¹ is able (to do so). When he is cleaning the dwelling-place, having first taken out the bowl and robes, he should lay them to one side. Having taken out the piece of cloth to sit upon and the sheet,² he should lay them to one side. Having taken out the mattress³ and the squatting-mat,⁴ he should lay them to one side.

“Having lowered the couch, having taken it out properly without rubbing it,⁵ without knocking it against the door or the posts,⁶ he should lay it to one side. Having lowered the chair, having taken it out properly without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts, he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the supports for the couch,⁷ he should lay them to one side. Having taken out the spittoon,⁸ he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the reclining-board,⁹ he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the ground-covering,¹⁰ having observed how it was laid down,¹¹ he should lay it to one side. If there come to be cobwebs in the dwelling-place, he should first remove them from the (floor-) covering¹²; he

¹ I.e. the one who shares a cell. ² *nisīdanapaccattharaṇa*. Cf. [BD 2.34, n. 1](#), [BD 2.46, n. 3](#), [BD 2.244, n. 6](#). ³ Cf. [BD 2.47, n. 1](#). ⁴ Cf. [BD 2.73, n. 6](#). ⁵ Vin-a 980, without rubbing it on the ground. ⁶ *kavāṭapiṭṭha*. Vin-a 980 explains as “not touching the door (*kavāṭa*) and the door-posts” (*piṭṭhasaṅghāṭa*). On *kavāṭa* and *piṭṭhasaṅghāṭa* see [BD 2.258, n. 3](#), [n. 8](#), and A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Indian Architectural Terms*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol.48, No.3, p.256 (under *dvāra*). *Kavāṭa* allowed at [Vin 2.142](#), and *kavāṭapiṭṭhasamghāṭa* at [Vin 2.153](#), [Vin 2.154](#). ⁷ A couch and a chair might have removable legs; cf. [BD 2.240](#). See [BD 4.64, n. 4](#). ⁸ Allowed at [Vin 2.175](#). ⁹ *apassenaphalaka*, a board for resting the head, arms or elbows upon. Allowed at [Vin 2.175](#). Some made of stone can be found at the entrance to dwelling-places among the ancient remains at Anuradhapura. ¹⁰ *bhummattharaṇa*; cf. [BD 2.46, n. 4](#). ¹¹ *Paññatta*; same word as is used for “laying down” a rule of training, see [BD 2.4, n. 1](#). ¹² *ullokā paṭhamam ohāretabbam*. Not, I think, “he should remove them as soon as he sees them”, as at *Vinaya Texts* i.159 and as favoured by *Pali-English Dictionary*. For *ulloka* occurs at [Vin 2.151](#) as meaning a cloth or covering for a couch or chair, and was something that could be spread, *santharati*. Thus it probably has a technical meaning, and is one of the numerous kinds of “cloths”. Buddhaghosa on [Vin 2.151](#) explains it as *cilimika*; and this he explains at Vin-a 775 as something made for preserving the texture of earth which is prepared with plaster.

4.64 should wipe the corners¹ of the window-holes.² If a wall that was coloured red³ becomes stained, he should wipe it, having moistened a rag, having wrung it out. If ground that was blacked⁴ becomes stained he should wipe it, having moistened a rag, having wrung it out. If the ground did not come to be treated, he should sweep it, having sprinkled it all over with water, thinking: 'Take care lest the dwelling-place is sullied with dust.' Having looked for (any) rubbish, he should remove it to one side.

25.16 "Having dried the ground-covering in the sun, having cleaned it, having shaken it, having brought it back, he should lay it down as it was laid down before. Having dried the supports for the couch⁵ in the sun, having wiped them, having brought them back, he should place them where they were before. Having dried the couch in the sun ... the chair in the sun, having cleaned it, having shaken it, having lowered it, having brought it back properly without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts, he should lay it down as it was laid down before. Having dried the mattress and the squatting-mat in the sun, having cleaned them, having shaken them, having brought them back, he should lay them down as they were laid down before. Having dried the piece of cloth to sit upon and the sheet in the sun, having cleaned them, having shaken them, having brought them back, he should lay them down as they were laid down before. Having dried the spittoon in the sun, having wiped it, having brought it back, he should place it where it was before. Having dried

¹ Vin-a 980, of the room. But it seems more probable that the corners of the window-holes are intended. ² *ālokaśandhi*. Cf. **BD 2.258 and n. 2; BD 2.259 and n. 1.** ³ *geruka-parikammakata*. *Geruka* is yellow ochre or red chalk. Cf. **BD 2.259 and n. 3.** ⁴ Cf. **BD 2.259.** *Setavaṇṇa*, whitewash or plaster, the third colouring (with red and black) allowed for use in *vihāras* (**Vin 2.150**) is not included above. ⁵ Allowed at **Vin 2.150**. It seems that these supports were detachable from the couches, for first they were to be taken out and put in the sun, and then the couch was to be taken out. *Vinaya Texts* iii.278, n. 3, says that the couch "was supported on movable tressels—the *paṭipādakā*", but A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Indian Architectural Terms*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 48, No. 3, p. 265, sees "no reason why the *paṭipādakā* of a *mañca* should not be fixed legs". On the other hand, *āhaccapādaka* (of couches and chairs) seems to mean "removable legs", **Bu-Pc 14**, and **Vin 2.149**.

the reclining-board in the sun, having wiped it, having brought it back, he should place it where it was before.

“He should lay aside the bowl and robes. When laying aside the bowl ... (as in [Kd 1.25.11](#)) ... the fold towards him, the robe should be laid aside.

“If dusty winds blow from the east, he should close the eastern windows.¹ If dusty winds blow from the west, he should close the western windows. If dusty winds blow from the north, he should close the northern windows. If dusty winds blow from the south, he should close the southern windows. If the weather is cool, he should open the windows by day, he should close them at night. If the weather is warm, he should close the windows by day, he should open them at night.

“If a cell is soiled, the cell should be swept. If a porch² ... If an attendance-hall³ ... If a fire-hall⁴ ... If a privy comes to be soiled, the privy should be swept. If there does not come to be drinking-water, drinking-water should be provided. If there does not come to be water for washing, water for washing should be provided. If there does not come to be water in the pitcher of water for rinsing,⁵ water should be tipped into the pitcher of water for rinsing.

“If dissatisfaction⁶ has arisen in the preceptor, the one who shares his cell should allay⁷ it or should get (another) to allay⁸ it, or he should give him a talk on *dhamma*. If remorse has arisen in the preceptor, the one who shares the cell should dispel it or should get (another) to dispel it, or he should give him a talk on *dhamma*. If wrong views have arisen in the preceptor, the one who shares his cell should dissuade him (from them) or should get another to dissuade him (from them),⁹

¹ *vātapāna*, see [BD 2.259, n. 1](#). Three kinds allowed at [Vin 2.148](#). ² *koṭṭhaka*, or gate-house, or store-room, allowed at [Vin 2.142](#), [Vin 2.153](#). ³ *upaṭṭhānasālā*, allowed at [Vin 2.153](#). See [BD 2.194, n. 4](#). ⁴ *aggisālā*, allowed at [Vin 2.154](#). ⁵ *ācamanakumbhī*, allowed at [Vin 2.142](#). ⁶ *anabhirati*, see [BD 1.114, n. 1](#); and [Vin 1.144](#). ⁷ *vūpakāsetabbā*. [Vin-a 981](#) says that he should take him elsewhere. ⁸ *vūpakāśepetabbā*. Another monk should be told: ‘Having taken the elder, go elsewhere’, [Vin-a 981](#). Cf. [Vin 1.142](#) (=below, [BD 4.190](#)). ⁹ Cf. [Vin 1.142](#) (=below, [BD 4.190](#)).

or he should give him a talk on *dhamma*.¹”

“If the preceptor has committed an offence against an important rule² and deserves probation,³ the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order grant the preceptor probation?’ If the preceptor deserves to be sent back to the beginning,⁴ the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order send the preceptor back to the beginning?’ If the preceptor deserves *mānatta* (discipline), the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order inflict *mānatta* (discipline) on the preceptor?’ If the preceptor deserves rehabilitation,⁵ the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order rehabilitate the preceptor?’

“If the Order desires to carry out a (formal) act against the preceptor—one of censure⁶ or one of guidance⁷ or one of banishment⁸ or one of reconciliation⁹ or one of suspension¹⁰—the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order not carry out a (formal) act against the preceptor or change it to a lighter one?’¹¹ Yet if a (formal) act—one of censure ... one of suspension—is carried out by the Order against him, the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the preceptor

¹ For above passage cf. AN v.72, where competence in these matters is one of the qualifications a monk must possess in order to confer the *upasampadā* ordination.

² At Vin 4.51, one of the qualities a monk must possess in order to exhort the nuns is that of not having offended against an “important rule”, *garudhamma*. There were eight “important rules” to be kept by nuns; see BD 2.266, n. 11 and BD 4.267. But, above, the important rules seem to refer to *Saṅghādisesa*, for what follows; probation, etc., are among the penalties for breaking *Saṅghādisesa* rules. ³ *parivāsa*, cf. BD 1.196, n. 3, and Vin 1.143, Vin 2.31ff. Not the same *parivāsa* as that granted to members of other sects on their wishing to enter the Order, see below, BD 4.85. ⁴ Cf. BD 1.196, n. 4, and for *mānatta* BD 1.196, n. 5, and Vin 1.143. ⁵ *abbhāna*, cf. BD 1.196, n. 6; BD 3.28, n. 4. ⁶ *tajjaniya*. Cf. Vin 1.143, Vin 2.2ff. See Vin 1.325, AN i.99 and DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.170, for this and the four following formal acts. ⁷ *nissaya*, tutelage. Cf. Kd 11.9.1ff. ⁸ *pabbājaniya*. Cf. Kd 11.13.1ff. ⁹ *paṭisāraniya*. Cf. Kd 11.18.1ff. ¹⁰ *ukkhepaniya*. Cf. Kd 11.25.1ff. ¹¹ Vin-a 981 indicates that the one who shares the cell should do his best to plead with the monks to cancel the formal act. But if they insist, he should beg the preceptor to conduct himself properly.

conduct himself properly,¹ be subdued, mend his ways, (so that) the Order could revoke that (formal) act?

“If the preceptor’s robe should be washed, the one who shares his cell should wash it or he should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the preceptor’s robe be washed?’ If the preceptor’s robe-material should be made up, the one who shares his cell should make it up or he should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the preceptor’s robe-material be made up?’ If dye should be boiled for the preceptor ... If the preceptor’s robe should be dyed ... ‘... could the preceptor’s robe be dyed?’ When he is dyeing the robe, he should dye it properly, turning it again and again, nor should he go away if the drips have not ceased.²

“Without asking the preceptor (for permission), he should not give an almsbowl to anyone nor should he receive an almsbowl from anyone; he should not give a robe to anyone nor should he receive a robe from anyone; he should not give a requisite to anyone nor should he receive a requisite from anyone; he should not cut off anyone’s hair nor should he have his hair cut off by anyone; he should not render a service to anyone nor should he cause a service to be rendered by anyone; he should not execute a commission for anyone nor should he cause a commission to be executed by anyone; he should not become an attendant on anyone nor should he take anyone as an attendant; he should not bring back alms-food for anyone nor should he have almsfood brought back by anyone. Without asking the preceptor (for permission), he should not enter a village, he should not go to a cemetery, he should not leave the district.³ If the preceptor becomes ill, he should tend him for as long as life lasts; he should wait (with him) until he recovers.⁴”

Told is what is due to a Preceptor

¹ Cf. **BD 1.323 and its n. 1, n. 2, n. 3** for these expressions. ² *acchinne theve*. Vin-a 981 says “he should not depart if even a little dye is falling down.” Proper methods for dyeing robe-material given at **Vin 1.286**. ³ *disā pakkamitabbā*. Cf. **Kd 2.21.1** where ignorant monks travelling to distant parts, *disaṅgamikā*, do not ask teachers and preceptors for permission. ⁴ *vuṭṭhānassa*, until he gets up from his illness, Vin-a 982. Cf. *Vism* 94.

ON THE DUTIES TO THE ONE WHO SHARES HIS CELL

1.26.1 “The preceptor,¹ monks, should conduct himself properly towards the
one who shares his cell. This is the proper conduct in this respect: the
one who shares the cell should be furthered,² he should be helped
4.68 by the preceptor in regard to recitation, interrogation, exhortation,
instruction.³ If there is a bowl for the preceptor but no bowl for the
one who shares his cell, a bowl should be given by the preceptor to
the one who shares his cell, or he should make an effort, thinking
‘How then could a bowl be procured for the one who shares my cell?’
If there is a robe for the preceptor ... If there is (another) requisite
in 1.51 for the preceptor ... ‘How then could (another) requisite be procured
1.26.2 for the one who shares my cell?’

“If the one who shares the cell becomes ill, having got up early he
should give tooth-wood, he should give water for rinsing the mouth,
he should make ready a seat. If there is conje⁴ ... that place should
be swept.

1.26.3 “If the one who shares a cell wishes to enter a village⁵ ... having
washed, a bowl with water is to be given to him. Thinking, ‘He will
be returning about now’, he should⁶ make ready a seat, he should set
out water for washing the feet, a foot-stool, a foot-stand ... He should
offer drinking water to the one who shares his cell.

6.4-7 “In whatever dwelling-place one who shares a cell is staying, if
that dwelling-place is soiled, it should be cleaned if he is able to do
so ...⁷ ... so that the Order could revoke that (formal) act.’

in 1.52 “If the robe of one who shares a cell should be washed, the pre-
ceptor should explain, saying: ‘Thus should you wash it or he should
5.8-11 make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the robe of the one who
shares my cell be washed?’ If the robe-material of one who shares a

¹ From here to **BD 4.69**, below = **Vin 2.227-Vin.2.230**. ² *saṃgahetabbo*, used with the next word, *anuggahetabbo*, below, **BD 4.157**. ³ These four words are used in definition of “should (neither) help” at **Vin 4.325 (BD 3.376)**; and cf. **BD 2.271, n. 2**. ⁴ As at **Kd 1.25.2**, reading “preceptor” for “one who shares a cell” and vice versa. ⁵ As at **Kd 1.25.9** (first half). ⁶ From here to the end of **Kd 1.26.6**, as at **Kd 1.25.10-Kd.1.25.13**, omitting the first two sentences of **Kd.1.25.10**. ⁷ As at **Kd 1.25.14-Kd.1.25.22**.

cell should be made up, the preceptor should explain, saying: ‘Thus should you make it up’, or ... ‘How then could the robe-material of the one who shares a cell’ ... ‘Thus should you boil it or ... ‘How then could dye be boiled for the one who shares my cell?’ If the robe of the one who shares a cell should be dyed ... ‘Thus should you dye it’, or ... ‘How then could the robe of the one who shares my cell be dyed?’ When he is dyeing the robe, he should dye it properly, turning it again and again, nor should he go away if the drips have not ceased. If the one who shares a cell becomes ill, he should tend him as long as life lasts; he should wait until he recovers.”

Told is what is due to one who shares a cell

ON DISMISSAL

Now at that time those who shared cells did not conduct themselves properly towards their preceptors. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can those who share cells not conduct themselves properly towards their preceptors?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that those who share cells do not conduct themselves properly towards their preceptors?”

“It is true, Lord.”

The enlightened one, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can those who share cells not conduct themselves properly towards their preceptors?”

Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “**Monks, those who share cells should not not conduct themselves properly towards their preceptors. Whoever should not conduct himself properly, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Even so, they did not conduct themselves properly. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to dismiss¹ one who does not conduct himself properly. And thus, monks, should he be

¹ pañāmetum.

dismissed: If he, saying: 'I dismiss you' or 'Do not come back here' or 'Bring back your bowl and robe' or 'I am not to be waited upon by you', makes this understood by gesture, if he makes this understood by voice, if he makes this understood by gesture and by voice, the one who shares the cell comes to be dismissed. If he does not make this understood by gesture, if he does not make this understood by voice, if he does not make this understood by gesture and by voice, the one who shares the cell does not come to be dismissed.

1.27.3
4.70
Now at that time those who shared a cell and who were dismissed did not apologise. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow (them), monks, to apologise." Even so, they did not apologise. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **"Monks, one who is dismissed is not not to apologise. Whoever should not apologise, there is an offence of wrong-doing."**

1.27.4
Now at that time preceptors, on being apologised to, did not forgive. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to forgive." Even so, they did not forgive. And those who shared a cell departed and they left the Order and they went over to (other) sects. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **"Monks, when you are being apologised to you should not not forgive. Whoever should not forgive, there is an offence of wrong-doing."**

1.27.5
Now at that time preceptors dismissed those who were conducting themselves¹ properly, they did not dismiss those who were not conducting themselves properly. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **"Monks, one who is conducting himself properly is not to be dismissed. Whoever should dismiss him, there is an offence of wrong-doing. And, monks, one who is not conducting himself**

¹ For use of singular, where we should use the plural, cf. [BD 3.364](#), [BD 3.367](#), [BD 3.369](#). Here the meaning is that each of several preceptors dismissed the particular monk who shared his cell.

properly is not not to be dismissed. Whoever should not dismiss him, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

“Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of five qualities he may be dismissed: if there does not come to be much affection for his preceptor, if there does not come to be much faith (in him), if there does not come to be much sense of shame (towards him), if there does not come to be much respect (for him), if there does not come to be much development¹ (under him). Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of these five qualities he may be dismissed. Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of five qualities he should not be dismissed: if there comes to be much affection for his preceptor ... if there comes to be much development. Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of these five qualities he should not be dismissed.

“Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of five qualities it is suitable² to dismiss him: if there does not come to be much affection for his preceptor ... if there does not come to be much development. Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of these five qualities, it is suitable to dismiss him. Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of five qualities it is not suitable to dismiss him: if there comes to be much affection for his preceptor ... if there comes to be much development. Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of these five qualities it is not suitable to dismiss him.

“Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of five qualities, a preceptor, in not dismissing him, becomes one who has gone too far; in dismissing him, he does not become one who has gone too far: if there does not come to be much affection for his preceptor... if there does not come to be much development. Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of these five qualities, a preceptor, in not dismissing him, becomes one who has gone too far; in dismissing him he does not become one who has gone too far. Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of five qualities, the preceptor, in dismissing him, becomes one who has gone too far; in not dismissing him, he does not become one who has gone too far: if there comes to be much

¹ *bhāvanā*. Vin-a 982 explains by *mettabhāvanā*, development of amity. ² *alam*, enough.

affection for the preceptor ... if there comes to be much development. Monks, if one who shares a cell is possessed of these five qualities, a preceptor, in dismissing him, becomes one who has gone too far; in not dismissing him, he does not become one who has gone too far.”

1.28.1 Now at that time a certain brahmin, having approached (some) monks, asked for the going forth. The monks did not want to let him go forth, and because he could not obtain the going forth among the monks, he became lean, wretched, of a bad colour, very yellow, his veins standing out all over his body.¹ The Lord saw this brahmin, lean ... all over his body, and seeing him, he addressed the monks, saying: “How is it, monks, that this brahmin is lean ... all over his body?”

“Lord, this brahmin asked the monks for the going forth. The monks did not want to let him go forth, and because he could not obtain the going forth among the monks, he is lean ... all over his body.”

1.28.2
1.28.3 Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Now, monks, who remembers a service² done by this brahmin?” When he had spoken thus the venerable Sāriputta spoke thus to the Lord: “I, Lord, remember a service done by this brahmin.”

“Now, what help (given) by this brahmin, Sāriputta, do you remember?”

“Lord, as I was walking for almsfood here in Rājagaha this brahmin had spoon-alms³ bestowed upon me. This, Lord, is the service done by this brahmin which I remember.”

n 1.56
1.28.3 “Good, Sāriputta, it is good. Indeed those who are truly men,⁴ Sāriputta, are thankful and grateful.⁵ Because of this do you, Sāriputta, let this brahmin go forth (and) ordain him.”

“How, lord, do I let this brahmin go forth, how do I ordain him?”

¹ Stock, cf. Vin 3.88 (BD 1.153–BD.1.154). ² *adhikāra*. ³ *kaṭacchubhikkhā*, alms given with a ladle to a monk (cf. Thag 934, Mil 9); contrasted with ticket-food and the gifts of robes, etc., at Dh-p-a 1.379, and with a “great gift”, *mahādāna*, given to a body of monks at Pv 2.9.56–Pv 2.9.58. ⁴ *sappurisa*. Cf. Vin 3.7. ⁵ Cf. SN ii.272.

Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“From this day forth, monks, I abolish that ordination by going to the three refuges which I allowed. I allow you, monks, to ordain by a (formal) act consisting of a motion and a resolution put three times.¹

“And thus, monks, should one ordain: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This (person) so and so wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may ordain so and so, through the preceptor so and so. This is the motion.

“‘Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This person so and so ... may ordain so and so. The Order is ordaining so and so through the preceptor so and so. If the ordination of so and so through the preceptor so and so is pleasing to the venerable ones let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... should speak.

“‘And a third time I speak forth this matter ... should speak. So and so is ordained by the Order through the preceptor so and so. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

Now at that time a certain monk immediately after he was ordained indulged in bad habits. Monks spoke thus: “Do not, your reverence, do that, it is not allowed.”² He spoke thus: “But indeed, I did not ask the venerable ones saying, ‘Ordain me’. Why did you ordain me without being asked (to do so)?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not ordain without being asked (to do so). Whoever should (so) ordain, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to ordain when you have been asked (to do so).

“And thus, monks, should one ask (for it): That one who wishes

¹ *ñatticatuttha*. See Kd 9.3.4–Kd.9.3.9, and DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 150.

² Cf. BD 1.309, BD 2.230, BD 2.393.

for ordination, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the monks' feet, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to it: 'Honoured sirs, I ask the Order for ordination; honoured sirs, may the Order raise me up,¹ out of compassion.' And a second time should he ask ... And a third time should he ask ...

1.29.3 "The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This (person) so and so wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. So and so asks the Order for ordination through the preceptor so and so. If it seems right to the Order the Order may ordain so and so through the preceptor so and so. This is the motion.

1.29.4 "Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This (person) so and so wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. So and so asks the Order for ordination through the preceptor so and so. If the ordination of so and so through the preceptor so and so is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... So and so is ordained by the Order through the preceptor so and so. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand this."

1.30.1 Now at that time in Rājagaha a succession of meals of sumptuous foods came to be arranged.² Then it occurred to a certain brahmin: "Now, these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are pleasant in character, pleasant in conduct; having eaten good meals they lie down on beds sheltered from the wind.³ What now if I should go forth among these recluses, sons of the Sakyans?" Then that brahmin, having

¹ *ullumpatu*, meaning according to Vin-a 984 "having made me arise from what is bad may they establish me in what is good; or, having raised me from the status of a novice may they establish me in the status of a monk". Cf. below, **BD 4.122**, and Vin-a 1033. See also A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Some Pali Words*, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Vol.4, No.2, p.145, where he takes *ullumpatu* as meaning "extract" (me from all evil). ² Cf. **Vin 1.248**, **Vin 4.75** (**BD 2.315**). ³ Cf. **Vin 1.72**, **Vin 4.129** (**BD 3.10-11**).

approached (some) monks, asked for the going forth. The monks allowed him to go forth (and) they ordained him.

The succession of meals dwindled away¹ after he had gone forth. Monks spoke thus: “Come along now, your reverence, we will walk for almsfood.” He spoke thus: “Your reverences, I did not go forth for this—that I should walk for almsfood. If you will give to me, I will eat, but if you will not give to me, I will leave the Order.”

“But, did you, your reverence, go forth for your belly’s sake?”

“Yes, your reverences.”

Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can this monk go forth in this *dhamma* and discipline which are well taught for his belly’s sake?” These monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, went forth for your belly’s sake?”

“It is true, Lord.”

The enlightened one, the Lord rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, go forth in this *dhamma* and discipline which are well taught for your belly’s sake? It is not foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increasing (the number of) those who are pleased.” Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, when you are ordaining, to explain four resources²: that going forth is on account of meals of scraps; in this respect effort is to be made by you for life. (These are) extra acquisitions: a meal for an Order, a meal for a special person, an invitation, ticket-food, (food given) on a day of the waxing or waning of the moon, on an Observance day, or the day after an Observance day.³ That going forth is on account of rag-robles; in this respect effort is to be made by you for life. (These are) extra acquisitions: (robles made

¹ *Khīyittha*; cf. *khīyanti* at **BD 2.236, n. 1, n. 2.** ² *nissaya*, cf. **Vin 1.96.** *Nissaya* is something which you depend upon, which supplies you, a source of supply. Not to be confused with the formal act called *nissaya*, referred to at **Vin 1.49 (BD 4.66, above)**, which is an act placing someone under guidance, giving him help. ³ For last four, cf. **BD 2.313–BD.2.314** and notes.

of) linen, cotton, silk, wool, coarse hemp, canvas.¹ That going forth is on account of a lodging at the root of a tree; in this respect effort is to be made by you for life. (These are) extra acquisitions: a dwelling-place, a curved house,² a long house,³ a mansion,⁴ a cave.⁵ That going forth is on account of ammonia as a medicine; in this respect effort is to be made by you for life. (These are) extra acquisitions: ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses.⁶”

Told is the Fifth Portion for Repeating: on what is due to a Preceptor

ON THE DUTIES TO THE TEACHER

131.1
0 4.76

Now at that time a certain brahmin youth, having approached (some) monks, asked for the going forth. The monks explained the resources to him beforehand. He spoke thus: “If honoured sirs, you had explained the resources to me after I had gone forth, I should have been satisfied, but now, honoured sirs, I will not go forth; the resources are disgusting and loathsome to me.” The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, the resources should not be explained beforehand. Whoever should (thus) explain them, there is an offence of wrongdoing. I allow you, monks, to explain the resources soon after ordaining (a person).”

¹ See [BD 2.7](#), [BD 2.143](#) and notes. ² *aḍḍhayoga*. Commentaries speak of it as *suvaṇṇavaṅkageha* (see *Pali-English Dictionary*), as *garuḷasaṅṭhānapāsāda* (see *Critical Pali Dictionary*), and as *suvaṇṇavaṅkageha* (see *Vinaya Texts* i.173, n. 1). It is possible that the curve refers only to the roof, curved upwards perhaps at the ends, like some forms of domestic architecture in present-day India, and this is the reason for the *aḍḍha*, half: that in some respect the building is half and not entirely curved. At [Vin 2.172](#) it is said that repairs may be made to an *aḍḍhayoga* during a period of seven or eight years. ³ *pāsāda*, see [BD 2.16](#), n. 5. ⁴ *hammiya*, see [BD 2.16](#), n. 6. ⁵ *guha*. These five are the five *lenāni*, abodes, allowed at [Vin 2.146](#); allowed at [Vin 1.107](#), as the site for an *uposatha* hall; at [Vin 1.239](#) as the site for *kappiyabhūmi*, a place for what is allowable, an outhouse; at [Vin 1.284](#) as the site for a store-room—in the last three cases the sites are to be agreed upon by the Order. ⁶ Cf. [BD 1.133](#), [BD 2.342](#). At [BD 2.131](#) these five medicines may be used by ill monks.

Now at that time monks ordained through a group of two and a group of three (monks). They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, you should not ordain through a group of less than ten (monks).¹ Whoever should (so) ordain, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to ordain through a group of ten or more than ten (monks).”

Now at that time monks of one year’s standing and of two years’ standing (severally) ordained the one who shared his cell. And when he was of one year’s standing,² the venerable Upasena, Vanganta’s son,³ ordained the one who shared his cell. When he was of two years’ standing, having kept the rains-residence, taking the one who shared his cell and who was of one year’s standing, he approached the Lord. Having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. Now, it is the custom for awakened ones, for Lords to exchange friendly greetings with in-coming monks.

Then the Lord spoke thus to the venerable Upasena, Vanganta’s son: “I hope, monk, that things go well with you, I hope you are keeping going, I hope you came here with but little fatigue on the journey.”

“Things do go well with me, Lord, I am keeping going, Lord, I came, Lord, with but little fatigue on the journey.”

Now Truthfinders (sometimes) ask knowing,⁴ and knowing (sometimes) do not ask; they ask, knowing the right time (to ask), and they do not ask, knowing the right time (when not to ask). Truthfinders ask about what belongs to the goal, not about what does not belong

¹ See [Vin 1.319](#). A group *gaṇa*, is usually in the Vinaya regarded as consisting of from two to four monks (or nuns), but here it is equivalent to an Order, a *saṅgha*.

² See [Ja ii.449](#), [Vin-a 194](#), [Ud-a 266](#), [AN-a i.271](#) for this same episode. [Ud-a](#) states that Upasena was of two years’ standing as a preceptor. But it is more likely that [AN-a](#) is right in saying that two years’ standing as a monk is meant, i.e. since his own ordination. ³ See [BD 2.83](#). ⁴ See also [Vin 1.158](#), [Vin 1.250](#), [Vin 3.6](#), [Vin 3.88–89](#) for this passage; and [BD 1.13](#), n. 1, n. 2.

to the goal. There is bridge-breaking¹, for Truthfinders in whatever does not belong to the goal. Awakened ones, Lords, question monks concerning two matters: “Shall we teach *dhamma*?” or “Shall we lay down a rule of training for disciples?”

Then the Lord spoke thus to the venerable Upasena, Vanganta’s son: “Of how many years’ standing are you, monk?”

“I, Lord, am of two years’ standing.”

“And of how many years’ standing is this monk?”

“He is of one year’s standing, Lord.”

“Who is this monk as regards you?”

“He is the one who shares my cell, Lord.”

The awakened one, the Lord rebuked (him), saying:

“It is not fitting, foolish man, it is not becoming, it is not proper, it is unworthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it should not be done. How can you, foolish man, when you should be exhorted and instructed by others, think to exhort and instruct another (monk)? Too quickly have you, foolish man, turned to abundance,² that is to say to acquiring a group. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increasing (the number of) those who are pleased.” Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, one who is of less than ten years’ standing should not ordain.³ Whoever (such) should (so) ordain, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to ordain through one who is of ten years’ standing or through one who is of more than ten years’ standing.”

Now at that time ignorant, inexperienced monks ordained thinking: “We are of ten years’ standing, we are of ten years’ standing.” (Consequently) there were to be found ignorant preceptors, wise (monks) who shared their cells; inexperienced preceptors, experi-

¹ See COOMARASWAMY, *The Perilous Bridge of Welfare*, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Vol. 8, No. 2, August, 1944, for a discussion of the Bridge mainly from Indian sources. ² Cf. *Vin* 1.287. ³ Cf. *Bi-Pc* 74, where a nun of less than twelve years’ standing should not ordain.

enced (monks) who shared their cells; preceptors who had heard little, (monks) who shared their cells who had heard much; preceptors of poor intelligence, intelligent (monks) who shared their cells; and a certain former member of another sect, when he was being spoken to by his preceptor regarding a rule, having refuted the preceptor, went over to the fold of that same sect¹ (as before.)

Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can these ignorant, inexperienced monks ordain, thinking: ‘We are of ten years’ standing, we are of ten years’ standing’? (So that) there are to be found ... intelligent (monks) who share their cells.” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that ignorant, inexperienced monks ordained, thinking: ... there are to be found ... intelligent (monks) who share their cells?”

“It is true, Lord.”

Then awakened one, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men, ignorant, inexperienced, ordain, thinking: ‘We are of ten years’ standing, we are of ten years’ standing’? ... intelligent (monks) who share their cells. It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, one who is ignorant, inexperienced should not ordain. Whoever (such) should ordain, there is an offence of wrong doing. I allow you, monks, to ordain through an experienced, competent monk who is of ten years’ standing or more than ten years’ standing.”

Now at that time monks, when their preceptors had gone away and had left the Order and had died and had gone over to another side (of the Order),² being without teachers,³ not being exhorted,

¹ *titthāyatanam saṅkhami*. Cf. Vin 4.217 (BD 3.167). ² Cf. BD 3.190.

not being instructed, walked for almsfood wrongly dressed, wrongly clothed, not befittingly attired. While people were eating ... (= Kd 1.25.1-1.25.2)

...

“It is true, Lord.”

Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying: “Monks, I allow a teacher. The teacher, monks, should arouse in his pupil¹ the attitude of a son; the pupil should arouse in his teacher the attitude of a father. Thus these, living with reverence, with deference, with courtesy towards one another, will come to growth, increase, maturity in this *dhamma* and discipline. I allow you, monks, to live ten years in dependence,² and when one is of ten years’ standing to give guidance.³

“And thus, monks, should a teacher be chosen: having arranged the upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured his feet, having sat down on the haunches, having saluted with joined palms, he should speak to him thus: ‘Honoured sir, be my teacher, I will live in dependence on the venerable one; honoured sir, be my teacher, I will live in dependence on the venerable one; honoured sir, be my teacher, I will live in dependence on the venerable one.’ If he says: ‘Very well’ or ‘Certainly’ or ‘All right’ or ‘It is proper’ or ‘Manage it amiably’, and makes this understood by gesture ... (= Kd 1.25.7-1.25.24, reading teacher and pupil for preceptor and one who shares a cell) ... If the teacher becomes ill, he should tend him as long as life lasts; he should wait until he recovers.”

Told is what is due to a Teacher

³ *ācariya*. See *Vinaya Texts* i.178, n. 2 for note comparing this with preceptor. *Vism* 94 says that in a dwelling-place are teachers, preceptors, those who share a cell, pupils, those having the same preceptors, those having the same teachers. It mentions teachers for the going forth, teachers for ordination, pupils ordained and allowed to go forth having the same preceptor; teachers in guidance, in the exposition (or recitation, of the *Pātimokkha*), pupils in the same having the same teacher.
¹ *antevāsika*. ² *nissāyaṃ vatthum*. ³ *nissayaṃ dātum*. There is also the formal act of *nissaya*, of placing under guidance, as in Kd 1.25.22. The word translated above, Kd 1.30.4, as “resource” is also *nissaya*, but it is there combined with the verb *ācikkhitum*.

ON THE DUTIES TO THE STUDENT

“The teacher, monks, should conduct himself properly towards his pupil. This is the proper conduct in this respect: the pupil should be furthered, he should be helped by the teacher ... (= Kd 1.26.1-1.26.2, reading teacher and pupil for preceptor and one who shares a cell) ... If the pupil becomes ill, he should tend him as long as life lasts; he should wait until he recovers.”

What is due to a Pupil

The Sixth Portion for Repeating

ON NOT FORGIVING WHEN DISMISSED

Now at that time pupils did not conduct themselves properly towards their teachers ... (= Kd 1.27.1-1.27.8, reading teacher and pupil as above) ... in not dismissing him he does not become one who has gone too far.”

THE STORY OF THE IGNORANT AND INEXPERIENCED

Now at that time ignorant, inexperienced monks, gave guidance, thinking: “We are of ten years’ standing, we are of ten years’ standing.” (So that) there were to be found ignorant teachers, wise pupils; inexperienced teachers, experienced pupils; teachers who had heard little, pupils who had heard much; teachers of poor intelligence, intelligent pupils. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can these ignorant inexperienced monks give guidance, thinking: ‘We are of ten years’ standing, we are of ten years’ standing’? (So that) there are to be found ignorant teachers ... intelligent pupils.”

Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that ignorant, inexperienced (monks)¹ are

¹ Omitted in Oldenberg’s text of the Vinaya.

giving guidance, thinking: ‘We are of ten years’ standing, we are of ten years’ standing?’”

“Is it true, Lord.” The enlightened one, the Lord rebuked them; having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying: **“Monks, one who is ignorant, inexperienced, should not give guidance. Whoever (such) should give it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to give guidance through an experienced, competent monk who is of ten years’ standing or of more than ten years’ standing.”¹

ON THE NULLIFICATIONS OF GUIDANCE

^{1.36.1} Now at that time monks, when their teachers and preceptors had gone away and had left the Order and had died and had gone over to another side (of the Order),² did not know about nullifications of guidance. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, there are these five nullifications of guidance from a preceptor: when a preceptor has gone away or left the Order or died or gone over to another side (of the Order), and command is the fifth.³ These, monks, are the five nullifications of guidance from a preceptor. Monks, there are these six nullifications of guidance from a teacher: when a teacher has gone away or left the Order or died or gone over to another side (of the Order), and command is the fifth, or if he⁴ has come to be connected with a preceptor.⁵ These, monks, are the six nullifications of guidance from a teacher.

¹ Cf. above, **Kd 1.31.6–1.31.8.** ² As in **Kd 1.32.1.** ³ Vin-a 986 says that the teacher dismisses the pupil from guidance in the words of **Kd 1.27.2.** ⁴ Meaning the pupil, if we follow Vin-a 988; but DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.181, takes it to mean the teacher. ⁵ Vin-a 988 says that if one who shares a cell, living in dependence on a teacher, sees a preceptor walking for alms in the same village or worshipping at the same shrine, or if he hears him teaching *dharmma* in a dwelling-place or among houses (the teacher’s) guidance lapses. This would suggest that the preceptor occupies a higher position than the teacher.

ON FIVE CASES WHEN ONE MAY ORDAIN

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities¹ he should not ordain, he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him: if he is not possessed of an adept’s body of moral habit ... body of concentration ... body of wisdom ... body of freedom ... body of vision and knowledge of freedom. Monks, if a monk is not possessed of these five qualities he should not ordain, he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him.

Kd 1:36

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities he may ordain, he may give guidance, a novice may attend him: if he is possessed of an adept’s body of moral habit ... body of vision and knowledge of freedom. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities he may ordain, he may give guidance, a novice may attend him.

Kd 1:36

Vin 1:6

Kd 1:36

“And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities he should not ordain, he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him: if he is neither himself possessed of an adept’s body of moral habit nor encourages another as to an adept’s body of moral habit ... if he is neither himself possessed of an adept’s body of vision and knowledge of freedom nor encourages another as to an adept’s body of vision and knowledge of freedom. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities he should not ordain, he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him.

BD 4.8

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities ... a novice may attend him: if he is himself possessed of an adept’s body of moral habit and encourages another as to an adept’s body of moral habit ... if he is himself possessed of an adept’s body of vision and knowledge of freedom and encourages another as to an adept’s body of vision and knowledge of freedom. Monks, if a novice is possessed of these five qualities he may ordain ... a novice may attend him.

Kd 1:36

“And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities he should not ordain ... a novice should not attend him: if he comes to

Kd 1:36

¹ Cf. DN iii.279; SN i.99; AN i.162, AN iii.271, AN v.16.

be lacking in faith,¹ if he comes to be without shame, if he comes to be reckless, if he comes to be lazy, if he comes to be of muddled mindfulness.² Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities he should not ordain ... a novice should not attend him.

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities he may ordain ... a novice may attend him: if he comes to have faith, if he comes to feel shame, if he comes to be cautious, if he comes to be of stirred up energy, if he comes to be of ready mindfulness³. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities he may ordain ... a novice may attend him.

“And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities he should not ordain ... a novice should not attend him: if, in regard to moral habit,⁴ he comes to have fallen away from moral habit; if, in regard to good habits,⁵ he comes to have fallen away from good habits; if, in regard to (right) view,⁶ he comes to have fallen away from (right) view; if he comes to have heard little, if he comes to be of poor intelligence. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities he should not ordain ...

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities he may ordain ... a novice may attend him: if, in regard to moral habit, he does not come to have fallen away from moral habit; if, in regard to good habits, he does not come to have fallen away from good habits; if, in regard to (right) view, he does not come to have fallen away from (right)

¹ On the following quintet, cf. DN iii.252, DN iii.282; MN i.43; AN ii.218; SN ii.159, also AN iii.421, AN iv.145 and see MN-a i.190. ² *mutṭhassati*. See definition at SN-a i.115. On this and *upaṭṭhitasati*, “ready mindfulness” (or recollection), see MORRIS, Journal of the Pali Text Society 1884, p.92. Cf. *sati mutṭha* at Thag 98, Thag 99. ³ *upaṭṭhitasati*; cf. also MN i.356. ⁴ *adhisīle*. Vin 1.172 says that the four *Pārājikas* and the thirteen *Saṅghādisesa*s are “falling away from moral habit”, as does Vin-a 989. Thus *adhisīla* is also the “higher morality”. ⁵ *ajjhācāra*. Vin 1.172 names the falling away from this as grave offences, offences of expiation, those which ought to be confessed, those of wrong-doing, those of wrong speech. Vin-a 989 calls them “the five other classes of offence” (i.e. excluding the *Pārājika* and *Saṅghādisesa*). *Ajjhācāra* can also mean “transgression”. ⁶ *atiditṭhi*. Vin 1.172 says that “falling away from right view means wrong view”, views of an extreme nature; while Vin-a 989 says that getting rid of right view, he is possessed of wrong view of an extreme nature.

view; if he comes to have heard much; if he comes to be intelligent. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities he may ordain ... a novice may attend him.

“And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities he should not ordain ... a novice should not attend him: if he is not competent to tend or to get (another) to tend a pupil or one who shares a cell and who is ill, to allay or get (another) to allay dissatisfaction that has arisen, to dispel or get (another) to dispel, by means of *dhamma*,¹ remorse that has arisen, if he does not know what is an offence, if he does not know the removal² of an offence. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities ... a novice should not attend him.

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities ... a novice may attend him.

“And monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities he should not ordain ... a novice should not attend him: if he is not competent to make a pupil or one who shares a cell train in the training regarding the fundamentals of conduct,³ to lead him in the training regarding the fundamentals of the Brahma-faring,⁴ to lead him in what pertains to *dhamma*,⁵ to lead him in what pertains to discipline,⁶ to discuss or get (another) to discuss, by means of *dhamma*, a false view that has arisen. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities ... a novice should not attend him.

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities ... a novice may attend him.

“And monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities ... a

¹ Cf. above **Kd 1.25.20**. ² *vuṭṭhāna*, the arising from. Cf. below, **BD 4.134**, *āpatti vuṭṭhitā*, an offence that is removed, and **BD 4.197**, *gāmo vuṭṭhāsi*, the village (was) removed. ³ *abhisamācārikā*. Vin-a 989–Vin-a 990 equates these with the duties (laid down) in the *Khandhakas*. ⁴ *ādibrahmacāriyikā*; see *Vinaya Texts* i.185, n. 1. Vin-a 990 speaks of this as *sekhapaññatti*, which might mean ideas, concepts, notions suitable to a *sekha*, a learner. ⁵ *abhidhamma*. Vin-a 990 takes this as a division by name and form; and clearly has the *Abhidhammapiṭaka* in mind. But, for this passage pre-dating the existence of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*, see Oldenberg, *Vin* i.xii, also **BD 3.xf.**, and my article: *Abhidhamma Abhivinaya Indian History Quarterly* Vol. XII, No. 3, September, 1941. ⁶ *abhivinaya*, taken by Vin-a 990 to mean the whole of the *Vinayapiṭaka*.

novice should not attend him: if he does not know what is an offence,¹ if he does not know what is not an offence, if he does not know what is a slight offence, if he does not know what is a serious offence, if the two Pātimokkhas² in full are not properly handed down to him, not properly classified, not properly intoned, not properly divided by rule and in respect of the explanation.³ Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities ... a novice should not attend him.

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities ... a novice may attend him.

“And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities he should not ordain, he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him: if he does not know what is an offence, if he does not know what is not an offence, if he does not know what is a slight offence, if he does not know what is a serious offence, if he is of less than ten years’ standing. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities he should not ordain, he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him.

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities he may ordain, he may give guidance, a novice may attend him: if he knows what is an offence, if he knows what is not an offence, if he knows what is a slight offence, if he knows what is a serious offence, if he is of ten years’ standing or of more than ten years’ standing.”

Told is the Portion of sixteen times five (cases) when one may ordain

ON SIX CASES WHEN ONE MAY ORDAIN

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of six qualities ... he should not ordain,

¹ Cf. Vin 2.249; AN iv.140, AN v.71, AN v.80, AN v.201. ² That for the monks and that for the nuns. On Pātimokkha see below, BD 4.131, n. 2. For this part of the passage see also Vin 4.51 (BD 2.266). In general Buddhaghosa, at Vin-a 790 and Vin-a 990, gives different explanations of the terms. This accounts for the different translations here and at BD 2.266. ³ Or, meaning, *anuvyañjanaso*. Vin-a 990 appears to explain this by *vibhaṅgato*, as to the *Vibhaṅga*, the explanatory material surrounding each rule; and *suttato*, “by rule”, by *mātikato*, by the “summaries”, the headings of, or key to, each set of rules (in Vin 3 and Vin 4).

he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him.¹

Vin 1.6

Told is the Portion of sixteen times² six (cases) when one may ordain

ON ONE WHO HAD FORMERLY BEEN A MEMBER OF ANOTHER SECT

Now at that time the one who had formerly been a member of another sect³ when he was being spoken to by his preceptor regarding a rule, having refuted the preceptor, went over to the fold of that same sect (as before), but having come back again, he asked the monks for ordination.⁴ The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

Kd 1.38

“Monks, he who was formerly a member of another sect ... having refuted the preceptor and going over to the fold of that same sect (as before), on coming back should not be ordained. But, monks, whoever else was formerly a member of another sect and desires the going forth in this *dhamma* and discipline and desires ordination, to him you should grant probation⁵ for four months.⁶

Kd 1.38

“And thus, monks, should it be granted: first, having made him have his hair and beard cut off, having got (someone) to present⁷

BD 4.8

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i.186, n. 1 points out that **BD 1.37** is “identical with **Kd 1.36.2–1.36.15**, but for the sixth case which, throughout **BD 1.37**, is added each time at the end of the five cases given in **BD 1.36**”: “if he is of less than ten years’ standing” and “if he is of ten years’ standing or more than ten years’ standing” respectively. ² *Vinaya Texts* i.186, n. 2, points out that this should be “Fourteen times”, for where the first four items in **Kd 1.36.15** and **Kd 1.36.17** are the same as one another and only the last in each is different, thus together making a total of six items, in **Kd 1.37.13**, **Kd 1.37.14** there is no repetition and these six items form one group and no more. ³ See above **Kd 1.31.6**.

⁴ Cf. **Vin 2.279**, in regard to nuns. ⁵ This is probation before ordination into the Order took place. It is not the probation which forms part of the penalty for breaking a *Saṅghādisesa* rule. Vin-a 990 says that it is called probation, *parivāsa*, for members of other sects and also probation for the unconcealed, *appaṭicchannaparivāsa*, and can be given to naked wanderers, naked ascetics, *ājīvakas*, and to unclothed ascetics, *acela*, but not to anyone who has a cloak or a blanket made of the skin of wild animals. Cf. *appaṭicchannaparivāsa* at **Vin 5.126**. If Buddhaghosa’s explanation is right, the “unconcealed probation” of *Critical Pali Dictionary* is erroneous. ⁶ Cf. this sentence with **Sn p.102**, **DN i.176**. ⁷ See **BD 2.53**, **BD 2.55**, etc.

him with yellow robes, having made him arrange his upper robes over one shoulder, having made him honour the monks' feet, having made him sit down on his haunches, having made him salute with joined palms, he should be told: 'Speak thus: "I go to the enlightened one for refuge, I go to *dhamma* for refuge, I go to the Order for refuge. And a second time I go ... And a third time I go ... to the Order for refuge."'¹

138.3 "Monks, if he who was formerly a member of another sect has approached the Order ... has saluted with joined palms, he should speak thus to it: 'I, honoured sirs, so and so, formerly a member of another sect, desire ordination in this *dhamma* and discipline. Therefore do I, honoured sirs, ask the Order for probation for four months.'² And a second time he should ask. And a third time he should ask. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This one, so and so, formerly a member of another sect, desires ordination in this *dhamma* and discipline. He asks the Order for probation for four months. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may grant probation to so and so, formerly a member of another sect, for four months. This is the motion.

138.4 "Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This one, so and so, formerly a member of another sect, desires ordination in this *dhamma* and discipline. He asks the Order for probation for four months. The Order is granting probation for four months to so and so, formerly a member of another sect. If the granting of probation for four months to so and so, formerly a member of another sect, is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. Probation for four months is granted by the Order to so and so, formerly a member of another sect. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.'

n 1.70
138.5
4.87 "Monks, a former member of another sect becomes one who succeeds thus, one who fails thus. And how, monks, does a former member of another sect become one who fails? Herein, monks, a former

¹ Same method used at [Kd1.54.3](#) for letting novices go forth. ² Quoted at DN-a ii.362.

member of another sect enters a village at too early a time,¹ he returns too late in the day.² Thus, monks, does a former member of another sect become one who fails. And again, monks, a former member of another sect comes to be one whose resort³ (for alms) is among prostitutes,⁴ or he comes to be one whose resort (for alms) is among widows,⁵ or he comes to be one whose resort (for alms) is among grown girls,⁶ or he comes to be one whose resort (for alms) is among eunuchs, or he comes to be one whose resort (for alms) is among nuns.⁷ Thus, too, monks, does a former member of another sect become one who fails.

“And again, monks, a former member of another sect in regard to those various things which have to be done by his fellows in the Brahma-faring, comes to be not dexterous therein, not vigorous, not possessed of consideration for those kinds of things,⁸ not able to act himself, not able to direct (others). Thus too, monks, does a former member of another sect become one who fails. And again, monks, a

¹ Vin-a 991 says that he enters a village when he ought to be doing services for the monks. ² Vin-a 991 says that he comes back when the monks are meditating or having the exposition and interrogation, and does not do what is due to a preceptor or teacher. ³ *gocara*, animals' feeding ground, pasture, then applied to places where monks accept alms-food. ⁴ *vesiyā*, also meaning a low-class woman. Vin-a 991 calls them women who fall easily into transgression on account of their beauty. On *vesiyagocara* see also Vb-a 339, AN-a iii.278 The *gocaras* are referred to below, **BD 4.417**. Also at AN iii.128, where it is said that if a monk goes to them he is thought of as a depraved monk and is mistrusted even if he is *kuppadhamma* (variant reading *akuppa*-), bound for the immovable (see GS iii.98, n. 1). At Vb 246 (quoted Vism 17) a sixth *gocara* is added: liquor-shop, and the six are called *agocara*. These are referred to at Dh-p-a iii.275. ⁵ Vin-a 990, Vb-a 339 define widows as women whose husbands are dead or absent. ⁶ *thullakumāriyo*. Cf. below, **BD 4.198**. Vin-a 991 says these are girls who have attained their youth or who are past it; Vb-a 339, AN-a iii.278 say that they are *mahallika*, i.e. grown-up girls, Vb-a adding that they are “not placed”, i.e. unmarried (cf. same expression in regard to *kulamāriyo* at AN-a iv.12). See Ja iv.219 where *thullakumārika* does not mean “coarse” but “grown-up”, of full age, *vayappatta*; unmarried is implied by the context. On *kumāribhūtā* as maiden, unmarried girl, see **BD 3, Introduction, p. xlix**. ⁷ Not necessarily visiting the nuns' quarters, for see story of Udāyin asking Uppalavaṇṇā for one of her robes when she visited the monks' dwelling-place, **Vin 3.208**. ⁸ Same expression occurs at **Vin 4.211**.

4.88 former member of another sect comes to be one who is not of keen desire¹ as to the recitation, as to the interrogation, as to the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher wisdom. Thus too, monks, does a former member of another sect become one who fails.

1:38:7 “And again, monks, a former member of another sect becomes angry, displeased, dissatisfied if dispraise is being spoken of the teacher, the views, the approval, the persuasion, the creed² of that fold of a sect from which he has come over; he becomes pleased, elated, satisfied if dispraise is being spoken of the awakened one or of *dhamma* or of the Order; or else he becomes pleased, elated, satisfied if praise is being spoken of the teacher, the views, the approval, the persuasion, the creed of that fold of a sect from which he has come over; he becomes angry, displeased, dissatisfied if praise is being spoken of the awakened one or of *dhamma* or of the Order. This, monks, is the knitting together³ in regard to what may be the failure⁴ of a former member of another sect. It is thus, monks, that a former member of another sect becomes one who fails. Therefore, monks, if there come a former member of another sect who has failed, he should not be ordained.

1:8-10 “And how, monks, does a former member of another sect become one who succeeds? Herein, monks, a former member of another sect does not enter a village at too early a time, he does not return too late in the day. Thus, monks, does a former member of another sect become one who succeeds. And again, monks ... (*point by point the contrary of Kd 1.38.5, Kd 1.38.6, Kd 1.38.7*) ... This, monks, is the knitting together in regard to what may be the success of a former member of another sect. It is thus, monks, that a former member of another sect becomes one who succeeds. Therefore, monks, if there come a former member of another sect who has succeeded, he may be ordained.

1 *tibbacchanda*; cf. DN iii.252, DN iii.283 for seven other matters for which a monk should have *tibbacchanda*. 2 *ādāya*, here used as a noun. 3 *saṅghātanikaṁ*, the unifying. The word also occurs at MN i.322, AN iii.10 in the simile of the house with the peaked roof. There is no justification for the “decisive moment” of *Vinaya Texts* i.190. The sentence comes as a conclusion to the ways, already mentioned, in which failure (and below, success) may be manifested. 4 *anārādhaniyasmim*.

“If, monks, a former member of another sect comes naked, a robe belonging to a preceptor¹ should be looked about for. If he comes without the hair of his head cut off, the Order should be asked for permission for shaving it close.² Monks, if those come who are fire-worshipping matted hair ascetics they may be ordained, probation should not be given to these. What is the reason for this? These, monks, affirm deeds, they affirm what ought to be done.³ If, monks, there come a former member of another sect who is a Sakyan by birth, he may be ordained, probation should not be given to him. I, monks, will give this special privilege to (my) relations.”

The Talk on Former Members of Another Sect

The Seventh Portion for Repeating

THE STORY OF FIVE DISEASES

Now at that time five diseases were prevalent among the people of Magadha: leprosy, boils, eczema, consumption, epilepsy.⁴ People, afflicted with the five diseases, having approached Jivaka Komārabhacca,⁵ spoke thus: “It were good, teacher, if you would attend us.”⁶

“But I, masters, am very busy, there is much to be done, and King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha is to be looked after by me, also the women’s quarters and the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head. I am not able to attend you.”

“All this property shall become yours, teacher, and we will be your slaves.⁷ It were good, teacher, if you would attend us.”

¹ *upajjhāyamūlaka cīvara*. According to Vin-a 994, having made a preceptor his master, *issara*, he has some claim on him as to bowl and robes. At Vin 3.204, there is the expression *mūlacīvara*. See Kd 1.26.1 where if one who shares a cell has no robe his preceptor should try to get one for him. ² *bhaṇḍukamma*. Cf. below, end of Kd 1.48.2. ³ *kammavādino kiriyavādino*. Cf. DN i.53, DN i.115, AN i.62, Vin 1.233, Vin 3.2. See also A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Some Pali Words*, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Vol.4, No.2, p.119ff. ⁴ As at Kd 1.76.1 below. Cf. Vin 4.8 (BD 2.180, where see n. 4 for further references). Mentioned also with many other diseases, at AN v.110. ⁵ See Kd 8.1. ⁶ *tikicchati*, to treat medically, to cure. ⁷ Cf. Vin 1.274.

1.39.2 “But I, masters, am very busy ... I am not able to attend you.”

0.4.90 Then it occurred to these people: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are of pleasant character, of pleasant conduct; having eaten good meals, they lie down, on beds sheltered from the wind. Suppose we were to go forth among the recluses, sons of the Sakyans? In that case monks would look after us and moreover Jīvaka Komārabhacca would attend us.” Then these people, having approached (some) monks, asked for the going forth. The monks let them go forth, they ordained them. These monks looked after them and moreover Jīvaka Komārabhacca attended them.

1.39.3 Now at that time monks, looking after many ill monks, lived intent on asking, intent on hinting, saying: “Give food for the sick, give food for those who look after the sick, give medicines for the sick.”¹ And Jīvaka Komārabhacca, attending many ill monks, omitted some of his duties towards the king.

1.39.4 A certain man, afflicted with the five diseases, having approached Jīvaka Komārabhacca, spoke thus: “It were good, teacher, if you would attend me.”

“But I, master, am very busy ... I am not able to attend you.”

“All this property shall be yours, teacher, and I will be your slave. It were good, teacher, if you would attend me.”

1.39.5 “But I, master, am very busy ... I am not able to attend you.”

Then it occurred to that man: “Now these recluses, sons of the Sakyans are of pleasant character ... Suppose I were to go forth among the recluses, sons of the Sakyans? In that case monks would look after me and moreover Jīvaka Komārabhacca would attend me; and when I am well I will leave the Order.”

Then that man, having approached (some) monks, asked for the going forth. These monks let him go forth, they ordained him. These monks looked after him and moreover Jīvaka Komārabhacca attended him. When he was well he left the Order. Jīvaka Komārabhacca saw that man who had left the Order; seeing him, he spoke

n.1.73 ¹ Three of the benefits that Visākhā was allowed to confer on the Order.

thus to that man: “Had not you, master, gone forth among the monks?”

“Yes, teacher.”

“Then why have you, master, acted in this way?” Then this man told this matter to Jīvaka Komārabhacca.

Jīvaka Komārabhacca looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these honoured sirs let one afflicted with the five diseases go forth?” Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Jīvaka Komārabhacca spoke thus to the Lord: “It were well, Lord, if the masters did not let one afflicted with (any one of)¹ the five diseases go forth.”

The Lord then gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Jīvaka Komārabhacca with talk on *dhamma*. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, one afflicted with (any one of) the five diseases should not be let go forth. Whoever should let (one such) go forth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

ON KING’S SERVICE

Now at that time there came to be a disturbance on the borderlands of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha commanded the generals, the chief ministers, saying: “Go, good sirs, search² the borderlands.”

“Very well, sire,” the generals, the chief ministers answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha in assent.

Then it occurred to (some) very distinguished warriors: “Because

¹ Taken separately at Vin-a 995f. in relation to going forth. ² Vin-a 996 says that thieves were giving trouble, but because Bimbisāra was a stream-winner he did not command: “Strike them, kill them.”

we delight in battle,¹ we do evil and we engender much demerit. Now by what means could we refrain from evil and do what is good?" Then it occurred to these warriors: "These recluses, sons of the Sakyans are *dhamma*-farers, even-farers, Brahma-farers, they are truth-speakers, of moral habit, of good character.² Now, if we were to go forth among these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, thus might we refrain from evil and do what is good." Then these warriors, having approached (some) monks, asked for the going forth. The monks let them go forth, they ordained them.

The generals, the chief ministers, asked those in the King's service³: "How is it, good sirs, that the warriors, so and so and so and so, are not to be seen?"

"Sirs,⁴ the warriors, so and so and so and so, have gone forth among the monks." The generals, the chief ministers ... spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, let one who is in the king's service go forth?" The generals, the chief ministers told this matter to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha asked the chief ministers of justice:

"Good sirs, what does he who lets one go forth who is in a king's service engender⁵ (for himself)?"

"Sire, a preceptor's head should be cut off, the tongue should be torn from the announcer of a proclamation,⁶ half the ribs of a (member of a) group should be broken."

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the Lord: "There are, Lord, kings who are of no faith, not believing; these might harm monks even for a trifling matter. It were well, Lord, if the masters did not let one in a king's service go forth." Then the Lord gladdened ...

¹ Cf. Vin 4.104. ² Cf. BD 1.70, BD 1.125, BD 1.200, BD 1.223. ³ *rājabhaṭṭa*. ⁴ *sāmi*, lords, masters. ⁵ *pasavati*, same word as used above in "engender much demerit".

⁶ *anussāvaka*. Vin-a 996 takes this as *ācariya*, teacher, which would be more in line with "preceptor" and "group", both of which might let a person go forth. The announcer of a proclamation had not, as such, this power.

delighted King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha with talk on *dhamma*. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, one in a king’s service should not be let go forth. Whoever should let (one such) go forth, there is an offence of wrongdoing.”

THE STORY OF A THIEF GARLANDED WITH FINGERS

Now at that time a thief (wearing) a garland of fingers¹ came to have gone forth among the monks. People, having seen (him), were perturbed, then alarmed, then they ran away, then they went by a different route, then they turned in another direction, then they closed the door.² People ... spread it about, saying: “How can the recluses, sons of the Sakyans let a thief wearing an emblem³ go forth?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. The Lord addressed the monks saying:

“Monks, a thief who wears an emblem should not be let go forth. Whoever should let (one) go forth, there is an offence of wrongdoing.”

THE STORY OF A THIEF BROKEN OUT OF JAIL

Now at that time it was decreed by King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: “There is nothing to do against those who go forth among the recluses, sons of the Sakyans. Well preached is *dhamma*, let them fare the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill.”¹ Now at that time a certain man, having committed a theft, was imprisoned in a jail; he, having broken out of jail, having run away, went forth among the monks.

People having seen (him) spoke thus: “This is the very² thief who has broken out of jail. Come along, let us bring him (back).³” Some spoke thus: “Do not, masters, speak thus, for it is decreed by King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: ‘There is nothing to do against those ... utter end of ill.’” People ... spread it about, saying:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans are safe and secure⁴; there is nothing to do against them. But how can they let a thief go forth who has broken out of jail?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, a thief who has broken out of jail should not be let go forth. Whoever should let (one such) go forth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

THE STORY OF AN THIEF WITH A “WANTED” NOTICE

1.43.1 Now at that time a certain man, having committed a theft, having run away, went forth among the monks. And in the royal palace, this was written:¹ “Wherever he may be seen, there he should be killed.” People, having seen (him), spoke thus: “This is the very thief who was written about. Come along, let us kill him.” Some spoke thus: “Do not, masters, speak thus ... utter end of ill.” People ... spread it about, saying:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans are safe and secure; there is nothing to do against them. But how can they let a thief go forth who has been written about?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, a thief who has been written about should not be let go forth. Whoever should let (one) go forth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

THE STORY OF A SCOURGED MAN

Now at that time a certain man who had been scourged as punishment² came to have gone forth among the monks. People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, let

¹ *aṅgulimāla*. Not the well-known bandit-thief of this name (as *Vinaya Texts* 1.196 and *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* take it), for in the absence of *nāma* or *ti* no proper name is denoted. The robber who came to be called *Aṅgulimāla* has verses ascribed to him at *Thag* 866–891. At *Thag* 869–870 he is shown as asking the Lord for the going forth, the Lord as saying, “Come, monk”, and this at constituting his monk-status, *bhikkhubhāva*. His story, and the verses are also given at *MN* 86. It is difficult to reconcile the above *Vinaya* ruling with the story of *Aṅgulimāla*’s going forth, for the Lord recognised his unusual potentialities, hardly to be expected in the common run of thieves. ² Cf. *Vin* 3.144 (BD 1.246). ³ *dhajabaddha*. ¹ Cf. *Vin* 4.226 (BD 3.182–183) where similar words are attributed to King Pasenadi. ² *ayaṃ so*, emphatic. ³ *nema*, as in *Kd* 1.46.1, *Kd* 1.47.1. ⁴ *abhayūvarā*. This is the word which gives the title to this portion for “repeating”. ¹ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2984.) ² *kasāhata katadaṇḍakamma*.

one who has been scourged as punishment go forth?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, one who has been scourged as punishment should not be let go forth. Whoever should let (one such) go forth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

THE STORY OF A BRANDED MAN

Now at that time a certain man who had been branded as punishment¹ ... (as in **Kd 1.44.1** to the end).

THE STORY OF A DEBTOR

Now at that time a certain man, a debtor, having run away, came to have gone forth among the monks. The creditors, having seen (him), spoke thus: “This is our very debtor. Come along, let us bring him (back).²” Some spoke thus: “Do not, masters, speak thus, for it is decreed by King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: “There is nothing to do against those who go forth among the recluses, sons of the Sakyans. Well preached is *dhamma*, let them fare the Brahma-faring for making an utter end of ill.” People ... spread it about, saying:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans are safe and secure; there is nothing to do against them. But how can they let a debtor go forth?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, a debtor should not be let go forth. Whoever should let (one such) go forth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

THE STORY OF A SLAVE

Now at that time a certain slave, having run away, came to have gone forth among the monks. The mistresses,³ having seen (him), spoke

¹ *lakkhaṇāhata katadaṇḍakamma*. ² *nema*, as in **Kd 1.42.2**, **Kd 1.47.1**. ³ *ayyikā*. At Vin 1.371, the variant reading *sāmikā* is given. A small piece of evidence that women ruled the household, rather than their husbands.

thus: “This is our very slave. Come along, let us bring him (back).¹”
... (as in **BD 1.46**) ...

**“Monks, a slave should not be let go forth. Whoever should let
(one such) go forth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

THE STORY OF A BALD-HEADED METAL-SMITH

Now at that time a certain bald-headed metal-smith,² having quarrelled with his parents, having gone to a monastery, went forth among the monks. Then the parents of that bald-headed metal-smith, searching for that bald-headed metal-smith, having gone to the monastery, asked the monks, saying: “Honoured sirs, have you seen a youth like that?” The monks, not knowing (him), merely said: “We do not know (him)”; not seeing (him), merely said: “We do not see (him).”

Then the parents of that bald-headed metal-smith, searching for that bald-headed metal-smith, having seen him gone forth among the monks ... spread it about, saying: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans are shameless, of bad conduct, liars; knowing, they merely say, ‘We do not know’; seeing, they merely say, ‘We do not see’ and this youth is gone forth among the monks.” Monks heard the parents of this bald-headed metal-smith who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to ask the Order for permission for shaving (the hair of the head) close.³”

¹ *nema*, as in **Kd 1.42.2** and **Kd 1.46.1**. ² *kammārabhaṇḍu*. Highly esteemed by king and people, Ja iii.281. No distinction was apparently made between workers in gold, silver and other metals, but Vin-a 1002 says he was a goldsmith's son. The exact point of his being a smith is obscure. ³ *bhaṇḍukamma*, cf. above **Kd 1.38.11**. Vin-a 1003 says that if there is a newly shaven one (*navamuṇḍa*) or one leaving the Order or if there is anyone among the Jains and so on whose hair is two finger-breadths long or less, there is no need to cut his hair, therefore such a one can be allowed to go forthwithout asking for the close shaving. But whoever has hair more than two finger-breadths long, even if it be only a top-knot, may only be allowed to go forth when the close shaving has been asked for.

THE STORY OF THE BOY UPĀLI

^{1.49.1} Now at that time in Rājagaha a group of seventeen boys were friends¹; of these the youth Upāli was the chief. Then it occurred to Upāli's parents: "By what means could Upāli, after our demise, live at ease and not be in want?" Then it occurred to Upāli's parents: "If Upāli should learn writing, so would Upāli, after our demise, live at ease and not be in want." Then it occurred to Upāli's parents: "But if Upāli ^{4.97}learns writing his fingers will become painful. If Upāli were to learn calculation, so would Upāli, after our demise, live at ease and not be in want."

^{1.49.2} Then it occurred to Upāli's parents: "But if Upāli learns calculation, his breast will become painful. If Upāli were to learn money-changing, so would Upāli, after our demise, live at ease and not be in want." Then it occurred to Upāli's parents: "But if Upāli learns money-changing his eyes will become painful. Now there are these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, pleasant in habit, pleasant in conduct; having eaten good meals, they lie down on beds sheltered from the wind. Now if Upāli were to go forth among the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, so would Upāli, after our demise, live at ease and not be in want."

^{1.49.3} The boy Upāli heard this conversation of his parents. Then the boy Upāli approached those boys; having approached, he spoke thus to these boys: "Come, masters, we will go forth among the recluses, sons of the Sakyans."

"If you, master, will go forth, we likewise will also go forth." Then these boys, having (each) approached his parents, spoke thus:

^{n1:78} "Consent that I may go forth from home into homelessness." Then the parents of those boys consented, thinking: "All these boys want the same thing, they are bent on what is good." These, having approached monks, asked for the going forth. These monks let them go forth, they ordained them.

^{1.49.4} Getting up in the night towards dawn, these cried out: "Give conje, give rice, give solid food."

¹ As at [Vin 4.128ff.](#) ([BD 3.10ff.](#)).

The monks spoke thus: “Wait, your reverences, until it turns light. Should there be conje you shall drink it; should there be rice you shall partake of it; should there be solid food you shall eat it. But should there not be conje or rice or solid food, then, having walked for alms, you shall eat.”

But these monks, being spoken to thus by the monks, cried out just the same: “Give conje, give rice, give solid food,” and they soiled and wetted the bedding.

Then the Lord, getting up in the night towards dawn, hearing this noise of boys, addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “Why ever, Ānanda, is there this noise of boys?” Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true as is said, monks, that monks knowingly ordain an individual¹ who is under twenty years of age?”

“It is true, Lord.” The awakened one, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men knowingly ordain an individual who is under twenty years of age?”

Monks, an individual under twenty years of age is not able² to endure cold, heat, hunger, thirst, the sting of gadflies or mosquitoes, wind and sun, creeping things, abusive, hurtful language; he is not the kind (of person) who endures bodily feelings which, arising, are painful, acute, sharp, shooting, disagreeable, miserable, deadly. But, monks, an individual of twenty years of age is able to endure cold, heat ... miserable, deadly. Monks, this is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increasing the number of those who are pleased.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, an individual who is under twenty years of age should not knowingly be ordained. Whoever should (so) ordain should be dealt with according to the rule.”³

¹ On the monkish intention of *puggala*, see **BD 3.xxiiiff.** ² As at **Vin 4.130, Bu-Pc 65 (BD 3.12).** ³ **Bu-Pc 65.**

THE STORY OF MALARIA

150.1 Now at that time a certain family came to pass away as a result of malaria.¹ (Only) the father and little son belonging to it survived.² These, having gone forth among the monks, walked even for alms-food together. Then that boy, when almsfood was given to his father, having run up to him, spoke thus: “Give to me too, father, give to me too, father.” People ... spread it about, saying: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are not chaste. This boy was born of a nun.” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, a boy of less than fifteen years of age should not be let go forth. Whoever should let (one such) go forth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”³

151.1 Now at that time the family, faithful, believing, who supported the venerable Ānanda, passed away as a result of malaria, but two boys survived. These, having seen monks, ran up to them according to their former allowable custom, (but) the monks sent them away. These cried on being sent away by the monks. Then it occurred to the venerable Ānanda: “It is laid down by the Lord that a boy of less than fifteen years of age should not be allowed to go forth, and these boys are less than fifteen years of age. Now by what means might these

¹ *ahivātakaroga*, should be “snake-wind-disease”. Word occurs at Ja ii.79, Ja iv.200. See note at Jataka Cambridge translation, ii.55. Cf. Mahāvastu i.253, a disease called *adhivāsa* (produced by non-human agency) which is said to attack a whole district.

² *sesā honti* “came to remain”. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 1003 explains the means by which a person may escape from the disease—by making a hole in the wall or roof and running away. This is also mentioned at Ja ii.79, Ja iv.200. See note at Jātaka translation, ii.55. The *rogāmādigato*, the reading which *Vinaya Texts* i.204, n. 1 ascribes to the Commentary, should be *tirogāmādigato*, reached a distant village (where he is free, *muccati*, of the disease). ³ Five years, therefore, were to elapse before the *upasampadā* ordination was allowed (see Bu-Pc 65 and below, Kd 1.75.1). (Note by Sujato: This last reference is, apparently by mistake, left blank in the text. I have supplied the probable referent.) This intervening period is referred to at Ja i.106: *ku-laputto ... pabbajitvā upasampadāya pañcavassiko hutvā*, a boy of good family, having gone forth, being five years off ordination ...

boys not be lost?” Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“But, Ānanda, are these boys able to scare¹ crows?”

“They are able (to do so), Lord.” Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to let a youth of less than fifteen years of age and who is a scarer of crows² go forth.”

THE STORY OF KAṆḌAKA

Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, had two novices, Kaṇḍaka³ and Mahaka.⁴ These committed sodomy with one another. Monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these novices indulge in a bad habit such as this?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, two novices should not attend one (monk). Whoever should make two novices attend⁵ to him, there is an offence of

¹ *uṭṭepetum*, meaning “to make fly up” or “to catch in snares”. See *Pali-English Dictionary* Vin-a 1003 is not helpful. ² *kākuṭṭepaka*. The word should probably read *uḍḍepaka*. Vin-a 1003 explains as “having taken a clod of earth in his left hand, he is able, sitting down and having made the crows fly up (*kāke uḍḍāpetvā*), to eat a meal put down in front of (him)”. This shows a certain amount of physical strength and endurance, not to be found in an infant. In a country where crows are as persistent as they are in India, it must have been useful to have had boys who could scare them away. Nevertheless this allowance forms a most singular exception to the general rule forbidding the going forth of a youth under fifteen years of age. ³ Also below, **BD 4.107**, where it was probably this Kaṇḍaka who was expelled. There is also a Kaṇḍaka, a novice, at **Vin 4.138**, but he was expelled for holding a wrong view, and is therefore perhaps not the same as Upananda’s novice. ⁴ Heard of nowhere but here, I think. ⁵ *upaṭṭhāpeti*. Cf. above, **Kd 1.36.2**. This word can also mean to look after, to cause to attend, e.g. one who is ill or another monk, whether a senior or a junior. See *Vinaya Texts* i.49, n. 5; also **Bu-Pc 70** where the same word is used in connection with the expelled Kaṇḍaka, and is there defined by the Old Commentary, in terms of giving material help and comfort. It does not mean “to ordain” as at *Vinaya Texts* i.205 and *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, article on *Karitaka*. Below, **Kd 1.55.1**, the ruling is amended.

wrong-doing.”

THE STORY OF WHEN IT WAS CROWDED

153.1 Now at that time¹ the Lord spent the rains just there, in Rājagaha, the cold weather there, the hot weather there. People ... spread it about, saying: “The district is crowded up, confused with recluses, sons of the Sakyans; because of them the district is not to be seen.” Monks, heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord.

153.2 Then the Lord addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “Go, Ānanda, and taking a key, announce to the monks in every cell: “Your reverences, the Lord wishes to set out on tour for Dakkhiṇāgiri. Whatever venerable one needs (to do so), let him come.”

153.3 “Yes, Lord,” and the venerable Ānanda, having answered the Lord in assent, taking the key, announced to the monks in every cell: “Your reverences, the Lord wishes to set out on tour for Dakkhiṇāgiri. Whatever venerable one needs (to do so), let him come.”

4.101 Monks spoke thus: “Reverend Ānanda, it is laid down by the Lord (that one is) to live ten years in dependence, and when one is of ten years’ standing (he is) to give guidance.² If we go there then guidance must be chosen³ (there), but the stop (there) may be short; then we must come back again and guidance must be chosen again. If our teachers and preceptors are going, we too will go; but if our teachers and preceptors are not going, then we will not go. Reverend Ānanda, we shall (otherwise) look feather-brained.”⁴

¹ Cf. Kd 1.53.1 with Bi-Pc 40, where a similar description of Rājagaha is given when it was crowded out by nuns. ² See Kd 1.32.1 above. ³ *nissayo ca gahetabbo bhavissati*. Cf. *upajjhāyo gahetabbo* at Kd 1.25.7 and *ācariyo gahetabbo* at Kd 1.32.2: “thus should a preceptor ... a teacher be chosen.” The reference in the above passage would appear to be back to this kind of choosing: choosing a preceptor or teacher, or both, to give guidance. If a pupil or preceptor leave one another then *nissaya* (guidance) is broken. ⁴ *lahucittakatā no paññāyissati*, a feather-brained (light minded) state will be apparent in us.

Then the Lord set out on tour for Dakkhiṇāgiri with an Order of monks numbering less than a group.¹

ON RELEASE FROM DEPENDENCE

Then the Lord, having stayed in Dakkhiṇāgiri for as long as he found suiting, came back again to Rājagaha. Then the Lord addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “How is it, Ānanda, that the Truthfinder set out on tour for Dakkhiṇāgiri with an Order of monks numbering less than a group?” Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, an experienced competent monk to live five years in dependence (but) an inexperienced one all his life.

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities he should not live independently² (of a preceptor or teacher): if he is not possessed of an adept’s body of moral habit ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... Monks, if a monk is not possessed of these five qualities he should not live independently. Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities he may live independently: if he is possessed of an adept’s body of moral habit ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities he may live independently.³

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities he should not live independently: if he comes to be of no faith ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... Monks, he should not live independently. Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities he may live independently: if he comes to have faith ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... Monks, ... he may live independently.

“... five further qualities he should not live independently: if, in regard to moral habit, he comes to have fallen away from moral habit

¹ *ogaṇena bhikkhusaṅghena*. Vin-a 1003 explains *ogaṇena* as *parihīnagaṇena*, lacking a group, and as *appamattaka bhikkhusaṅgha*, only a small Order of monks. Usually a “group” consisted of from two to four monks or nuns, but above, Kd 1.31.2, a group of ten monks is referred to. ² *anissitena*, in independence, without a teacher to give guidance. ³ Cf. below, Kd 1.73.1–1.73.4 where other cases are given where a monk may live independently, *anissita*.

... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities he may live independently: if, in regard to moral habit, he does not come to have fallen away ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... he may live independently.

“... five further qualities he should not live independently: if he does not know what is an offence ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities he may live independently: if he knows what is an offence ... (=Kd 1.36.15) ... he may live independently.

“... five further qualities he should not live independently: if he does not know what is an offence ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... if he is of less than five years' standing ... Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities he may live independently: if he knows what is an offence ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... if he is of five years' standing or of more than five years' standing ...

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of six qualities he should not live independently: if he is not possessed of an adept's body of moral habit ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... if he is of less than five years' standing. Monks, if a monk is not possessed of these six qualities he should not live independently. Monks, if a monk is possessed of six qualities he may live independently: if he is possessed of an adept's body of moral habit ... (=Kd 1.37.2) ... if he is of five years' standing or more than five years' standing ...

“... six further qualities he should not live independently: if he comes to have no faith ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... if he is of less than five years' standing ... possessed of six qualities he may live independently: if he comes to have faith ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... if he is of five years' standing or more than five years' standing ...

“... six further qualities he should not live independently: if, in regard to moral habit, he comes to have fallen away from moral habit ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... if he is of less than five years' standing ... possessed of six qualities he may live independently: if, in regard to moral habit, he does not come to have fallen away ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... if he is of five years' standing or more than five years' standing.

“... six further qualities he should not live independently: if he does not know what is an offence ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... if he is of less

than five years' standing ... possessed of six qualities he may live independently: if he knows what is an offence ... (=Kd 1.36.3) ... if he is of five years' standing or more than five years' standing. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these six qualities he may live independently."

Told is the Portion for Repeating on Safe and Secure.

Vin 1.8

THE STORY OF RĀHULA

Then the Lord, having stayed in Rājagaha for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Kapilavatthu. Walking on tour in due course he arrived at Kapilavatthu.¹ The Lord stayed there among the Sakyans in Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery.² Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of Suddhodana the Sakyan; having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. Then the lady, Rāhula's mother, spoke thus to the boy Rāhula: "This, Rāhula, is your father, go and ask him for your inheritance."

Kd 1.54

Then the boy Rāhula approached the Lord; having approached, he stood in front of the Lord and said: "Pleasant is your shadow, recluse." Then the Lord, rising up from his seat, departed. Then the boy Rāhula, following close behind the Lord, said: "Give me my inheritance, recluse, give me my inheritance, recluse." Then the Lord addressed the venerable Sāriputta, saying: "Well then, do you, Sāriputta, let the boy Rāhula go forth."³

"How do I, Lord, let the boy Rāhula go forth?"

Kd 1.54

Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: "I allow, monks, the going forth for novices by the three goings for refuge. And thus, monks, should you let one go forth: first, having made him have his hair and beard cut off, having got (someone) to present him with yellow robes, having made him arrange his upper robe over one

¹ Vin-a 1005 says it was a distance of sixty *yojanas* from Rājagaha; and going a *yojana* a day, the Lord's journey took two months. ² See BD 2.94, n. 1. ³ Story of "Rāhula's conversion" also given at Dhp-a i.116f.

4.104
shoulder, having made him honour the monks' feet, having made him sit down on his haunches, having made him salute with joined palms, he should be told: 'Speak thus: "I go to the awakened one for refuge I go to *dhamma* for refuge, I go to the Order for refuge. And a second time I go ... And a third time I go ... to the Order for refuge".'¹ I allow, monks, the going forth for novices by these three goings for refuge."

1.54.4
Then the venerable Sāriputta let the boy Rāhula go forth. Then Suddhodana the Sakyan approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance Suddhodana the Sakyan spoke thus to the Lord:

"I, Lord, ask the Lord for one boon."

"But, Gotama,² Truth-finders are beyond (granting) boons."³

"Lord, it is what is allowable, it is what is blameless."

"Speak on, Gotama."

1.54.5
"Lord, when the Lord went forth there came to be not a little sorrow, likewise when Nanda⁴ did; it was extreme when Rāhula did."⁵ Affection for a son, Lord, cuts into the skin, having cut into the skin it cuts into the hide, having cut into the hide it cuts into the flesh ... the ligaments ... the bones, having cut into the bones and reaching the marrow, it abides. It were well, Lord, if the masters did not let a child to go forth without the parents' consent."

1.54.6
Then the Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Suddhodana the Sakyan with talk on *dhamma*. Then Suddhodana the Sakyan gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side

¹ Same method employed at **Kd 1.38.2** for granting probation to former members of other sects. ² Gotama was the clan or family name. ³ *atikkaniavarā*. *Vinaya Texts*, in translating above and parallel passages at **Vin 1.280**, **Vin 1.292**, adds "before they know what they are". ROUSE, *Jātaka translation*, iv.198 (=Ja iv.315, quoting **Vin 1.292**) has "the Tathāgatas have boons beyond measure"; *Critical Pali Dictionary* "above (granting) boons". ⁴ The Lord's half-brother, son of Mahāpajāpati. On Nanda's going forth see *Vin-a 1008f.*, *Dhp-a i.116*. Verses at *Thag 157*. See *Ud 21ff.* ⁵ *Vin-a 1010* says that Suddhodana thinking the family line broken because these three went forth, asked where a king could come from.

towards him. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a child who has not his parents’ consent should not be let go forth. Whoever should let (one such) go forth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Then the Lord, having stayed in Kapilavatthu for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Sāvattthī. Walking on tour in due course he arrived at Sāvattthī. The Lord stayed there in Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the family who supported the venerable Sāriputta sent a youth to the venerable Sāriputta, saying: “May the elder let this youth go forth.” Then it occurred to the venerable Sāriputta: “A rule of training laid down by the Lord says that two novices should not attend one (monk),¹ and this Rāhula is my novice. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” He told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow, monks, two novices to attend one experienced, competent monk, or else as many to attend (him) as he is able to exhort, to instruct.”

ON TRAINING RULES

Then it occurred to the novices: “Now, how many rules for training are there for us and in which we are to train?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, I allow ten rules for training for novices² and novices to train in these:

1. **Restraint from onslaught on creatures;**³
2. **Restraint from taking what is not given;**⁴
3. **Restraint from unchastity;**⁵

¹ Above, **Kd 1.52.1.** ² Novice is defined at **Vin 4.122 (BD 2.412)** as one conforming to ten rules for training; also female novice is so defined at **Vin 4.343 (BD 3.411).**

³ **Bu-Pj 3, Bu-Pc 61.** These restraints or abstinences occur at e.g. **DN i.4ff., AN i.211, AN ii.209, AN iv.247ff., SN v.469, Pp 58. Cf. DN-a 69ff.** ⁴ **Bu-Pj 2.** ⁵ **Bu-Pj 1.**

4. Restraint from lying;¹
5. Restraint from the occasion of sloth (induced by) fermented liquor, spirits and strong drink;²
6. Restraint from eating at the wrong time;³
7. Restraint from seeing shows⁴ of dancing, singing and music;⁵
8. Restraint from the occasion of using garlands, scents, unguents and wearing finery;
9. Restraint from using high beds, large beds;⁶
10. Restraint from accepting gold and silver.⁷

“I allow monks, these ten rules for training for novices and novices to train in these.”

THE STORY OF AN ACT OF PUNISHMENT

Now at that time novices were not respectful, not deferential not courteous towards the monks. Monks ... spread it about saying: “How can these novices not be respectful ... towards the monks?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, I allow you to impose a punishment⁸ on a novice who is possessed of five qualities:

1. “If he tries for non-receiving (of gains)⁹ by monks.
2. “If he tries for non-profiting by monks.
3. “If he tries for non-residence for monks.
4. “If he reviles and abuses¹⁰ monks.

¹ Bu-Pj 4. ² Cf. Bu-Pc 61. ³ Bu-Pc 37. ⁴ *visūka* appears to mean twisting, wriggling, restless motion. On the miming nature of singing, dancing and music see BD 3.xl, note and BD 4.298, n. 2. These shows where movement was a feature were of quite a different character from shows of inanimate objects. Nuns were forbidden to visit these latter by their Bu-Pc 41. ⁵ A *dukkāṭa* for monks to see these, Vin 2.108; a *Pācittiya* for nuns to see them, Bi-Pc 10. ⁶ Cf. Bu-Pc 87. ⁷ Bu-NP 18. ⁸ *daṇḍakamma*; cf. above Kd 1.44.1, Kd 1.45.1, and Vin 2.262f. ⁹ So Vin-a 1013; “of requisites,” AN-a iv.160. Cf these with five qualities” at Vin 2.18, “eight qualities” at AN iv.345, Vin 2.125. ¹⁰ Cf. Vin 4.52, Vin 4.309 where nuns may not revile or abuse a monk.

5. “If he causes monk to break with monk.

“I allow you, monks, to impose a punishment on a novice who is possessed of these five qualities.”

Then it occurred to these monks: “Now, how should the punishment be imposed?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make a prohibition.”¹ Now at that time monks made a prohibition for novices in respect of an Order’s entire monastery. The novices, on being unable to enter the monastery, went away, and left the Order, and went over to (other) sects. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, an Order’s entire monastery should not be made (the subject of) a prohibition. Whoever should make (it such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to make a prohibition in respect of wherever he is staying or wherever he is entering.”²

Now at that time monks made a prohibition for novices in respect of nutriment taken by the mouth. People, making a drink of conje and also rice for an Order, spoke thus to the novices: “Come, honoured sirs, drink the conje, come, honoured sirs, partake of the rice.” The novices spoke thus: “It is not possible, sirs, the monks have made (this the subject of) a prohibition.” The people ... spread it about, saying: “How can these revered sirs make a prohibition for novices in respect of nutriment taken by the mouth?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nutriment taken by the mouth is not to be made (the subject of) a prohibition. Whoever should make (it such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Told is the Item on Punishment

¹ *āvāraṇa*, an obstacle, hindrance, barring off. Cf. *Vin* 2.262f. ² *paṭikkamati*, to return, *Vin*-a 1013 explains by *pavisati*, to enter. The meaning is entering a monastery in the sense of returning to it.

THE STORY OF MAKING A PROHIBITION WITHOUT ASKING

^{1.58.1}
^{n 1.85} Now at that time the group of six monks, without having asked preceptors (for permission), made a prohibition for novices. Preceptors hunted about, saying: “Now, where are our novices? They are not to be seen.” Monks spoke thus: “A prohibition was made, your reverences, by the group of six monks.” The preceptors ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks, without asking us (for permission), make a prohibition for our novices?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a prohibition is not to be made without asking preceptors (for permission). Whoever should make one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

THE STORY OF LURING AWAY

^{1.59.1} Now at that time the group of six monks lured away¹ the novices of monks who were elders. The elders, getting their own tooth-wood and water for rinsing the mouth, were incommoded.² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, another’s assembly should not be lured away. Whoever should lure it away, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

THE STORY OF KAṆḌAKA THE NOVICE

^{1.60.1}
^{4.108} Now at that time Kaṇḍaka,³ a novice of the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, seduced the nun Kaṇḍakā. Monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this novice indulge in a bad habit like this?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ *apalāṅenti*, to draw over (to themselves). Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 1014 hints at bribery, the group of six saying they would give bowls and robes to the novices.

² *kilamati*, more usually to go short of; to be tired, fatigued. Those who shared cells and pupils should get tooth-wood and water for rinsing the mouth for their preceptors and teachers respectively, **Kd 1.25.8, Kd 1.32.3.** ³ See above, **Kd 1.52.1** and **BD 3.31.**

“I allow you, monks, to expel a novice who is possessed of ten qualities:

1. “If he is one who makes onslaught on creatures.
2. “If he is one who takes what is not given.
3. “If he is one who is unchaste.
4. “If he is a liar.
5. “If he is a drinker of strong drink.
6. “If he speaks dispraise of the awakened one.
7. “If he speaks dispraise of *Dhamma*.
8. “If he speaks dispraise of the Order.
9. “If he is a holder of a false view.¹
10. “If he is a seducer of nuns.²

“I allow you, monks, to expel a novice who is possessed of these ten qualities.”

THE STORY OF A EUNUCH

Now at that time a certain eunuch came to have gone forth among the monks. Having approached a number of young monks, he spoke thus: “Come, venerable ones, commit an offence with me.” The monks refused, saying: “Be off³, eunuch, depart⁴, eunuch. What need have you?” Refused by the monks, having approached a number of large, fat⁵ novices, he spoke thus: “Come, your reverences, commit an offence with me.” The novices refused, saying: “Be off, eunuch, depart, eunuch. What need have you?” Refused by the novices, having approached mahouts and grooms⁶, he spoke thus: “Come, sirs, com-

¹ At Vin 4.138 (BD 3.31) a novice, Kaṇḍaka, was expelled on this ground. ² Vin-a 1015 explains that “one who is unchaste” may be ordained if he is willing to restrain himself in the future, but a seducer of nuns cannot even go forth. Cf. *Vinaya Texts* i.215, n. 1. At AN v.70, AN v.71 among ten specified occasions where the Pātimokkha may be suspended are included the presence of a seducer of nuns, and the presence of a eunuch (see next paragraph below). ³ *nassa*, disappear. ⁴ *vinassa* = *nassa*, Vin-a 871, which adds “go where we do not see you”. For *cara pi re vinassa* see Vin 4.139. ⁵ *Moligalla*; variant readings given at Vin 1.372: *moḷigalla*, *mukalla*.

mit an offence with me.” The mahouts and grooms committed an offence with him.

These ... spread it about, saying: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are eunuchs, and those of them who are not eunuchs, they too commit offences with eunuchs. Thus they are one and all unchaste.” Monks heard these mahouts and grooms who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, if a eunuch is not ordained, he should not be ordained; if he is ordained, he should be expelled.”¹

THE STORY OF ONE IN COMMUNION BY THEFT

Now at that time a certain descendant of an ancient family which had come down in the world was delicately nurtured. Then it occurred to this descendant of the ancient family which had come down in the world: “Now, I am delicately nurtured, I am not able to acquire wealth not (already) acquired, nor to increase the wealth (already) acquired.² Now by what means could I live at ease and not be in want?” Then it occurred to this descendant ... in the world: “Now these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are of pleasant conduct, of pleasant character; having eaten good meals, they lie down to sleep on beds sheltered from the wind. Suppose that I, having prepared a bowl and robe for myself, having cut off my hair and beard, having clothed myself in yellow robes, having gone to a monastery, should be in communion together with monks?”

⁶ *hatthibhaṇḍa assabhaṇḍa*. Vin-a 1015 explains *bhaṇḍa* by *gopaka*, guardian, watchman. ¹ Vin-a 1016 says he is to be expelled by the expulsion due to characteristic, *liṅganāsana*. Three kinds of expulsion are given at Vin-a 87of.: (1) expulsion from communion, meaning expulsion for not seeing an offence, not making amends for it, not giving up a false view; (2) expulsion due to characteristic, as an example of which the nun Mettiyā is cited (Vin 3.162-3); (3) expulsion as a punishment, with the words, ‘From today forth, reverend novice, the Lord cannot be referred to as your teacher’ (Vin 4.139 = BD 3.31). ² This inability is at AN i.129 given as a characteristic of a blind person (*puggala*), while the opposite, ability in this respect, is given as a characteristic of a one-eyed and of a two-eyed person.

Then that descendant ... in the world, having prepared a bowl and robe for himself, having cut off his hair and beard, having clothed himself in yellow robes, having gone to a monastery, greeted the monks. The monks spoke thus: “Of how many years’ standing are you, your reverence?” “What does this mean, your reverences: ‘how many years’ standing’?”

“But who, your reverence, is your preceptor?”

“What does this mean, your reverences: ‘preceptor’?”

The monks spoke thus to the venerable Upāli¹:

“Please, reverend Upāli, examine this one who has gone forth.”

Then as that descendant ... in the world was being examined² by the venerable Upāli, he told him this matter. The venerable Upāli told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, if one who is in communion by theft³ is not ordained, he should not be ordained; if he is ordained, he should be expelled. Monks, if one who has gone over to (another) sect⁴ is not ordained, he should not be ordained; if he is ordained, he should be expelled.”

THE STORY OF AN ANIMAL

Now at that time a certain serpent was troubled about his birth as a serpent, he was ashamed of it, loathed it⁵. Then it occurred to that serpent: “Now, by what means could I be freed quickly from birth

¹ No doubt the Vinaya expert. ² Vin-a 1016: as he was being asked about cutting off the hair and beard, accepting yellow robes, going for refuge, choosing a preceptor, and about proclamations and guidance. At Vin 3.212 Upāli was asked to examine monks who, having come naked, were taken to be Naked Ascetics. Vin-a 665 gives the nature of these questions (see BD 2.45, n. 6, n. 7). He examines below Kd 1.64.2. ³ *theyyasamvāsaka*. Word occurs also at Vin 1.307. *Samvāsa* is being in communion, see definition at end of each Pārājika rule (BD.1). *Theyya* is “by theft”, here of the signs or marks of a monk. ⁴ *titthiyapakkantaka*. This word also occurs with *theyyasamvāsaka* and others at Vin 1.307. All the words tell what monks, disappointed of robe-material, pretend to be. ⁵ Stock, as at AN i.145; MN i.423, MN iii.300.

as a serpent and get back¹ human status?” Then it occurred to that serpent: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are *dhamma*-farers, even-farers, Brahma-farers, they are truth-speakers, they are of moral habit, of good conduct. Now if I were to go forth among the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, so would I be freed quickly from birth as a serpent and could get back human status.”

Then that serpent, in the form of a brahmin youth, having approached the monks, asked for the going forth. The monks let him go forth, they ordained him. Now at that time that serpent, together with a certain monk, was living in a dwelling-place on the boundary.² Then that monk, getting up in the night towards dawn, paced up and down in the open air. Then that serpent, confident that that monk had gone out, fell asleep. The whole dwelling-place was full of the snake, his coils were protruding through the windows.

Then that monk, thinking: “I will enter the dwelling-place,” opening the door,³ saw the whole dwelling-place full of the snake, his coils protruding through the windows. Terrified at seeing this, he uttered a cry of distress. Monks, having run up, spoke thus to that monk: “Why did you, your reverence, utter a cry of distress?”

“Your reverences, this whole dwelling-place is full of a snake, his coils are protruding through the windows.” Then that serpent having awakened because of this noise, sat down on his own seat. Monks spoke thus: “Who are you, friend?”

“I am a serpent, honoured sirs.”

“But why did you, friend, act in this way?” Then that serpent told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord.

Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, spoke thus to this serpent: “Indeed,

¹ *paṭilabhati*. He had been unchaste (in a former birth), Vin-a 1022. If *paṭilabhati* does mean “to get back” here rather than to “acquire”, it indicates a belief in the possibility of losing human status for animal status. ² *paccantima*. *Vinaya Texts* i.218 say “(near the boundary wall of the Jetavana)”, and although this may be meant, there is no evidence for it at Vin-a 1022. *Paccantima* cannot well mean “neighbouring, adjoining” here, for the evidence is that monk and snake shared the same dwelling-place. ³ *kavātaṃ paṇāmento*. On this phrase see **BD 1.199, n. 3**.

you serpents are not liable to growth in this *dhamma* and discipline. You, serpent, go away, observe the Observance day precisely¹ on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth day of the half-month. Thus will you be freed quickly from birth as a serpent and get back human status.”

Then that serpent, thinking: “It is said that I am not liable to growth in this *dhamma* and discipline,” pained, afflicted, shedding tears, departed having uttered a cry of distress.

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Monks, there are these two cases of manifestation of a serpent’s true nature²: when he indulges in sexual intercourse with a female of his own species, and when he falls asleep in confidence. Monks, these are two cases of manifestation of a serpent’s true nature. **Monks, if an animal is not ordained, it should not be ordained; if it is ordained, it should be expelled.**”

THE STORY OF A MATRICIDE

Now at that time a certain brahmin youth deprived his mother of life. He was troubled about his evil deed, he was ashamed of it, loathed it.³ Then it occurred to that brahmin youth: “Now, by what means could I get rid of this evil deed?” Then it occurred to this brahmin youth: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are *dhamma*-farers, even-farers Brahma-farers, they are truth-speakers, of moral habit, of good conduct. Now, if I were to go forth among these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, so would I get rid of this evil deed.”

Then that brahmin youth, having approached (some) monks, asked for the going forth. The monks spoke thus to the venerable Upāli: “Formerly, indeed, reverend Upāli, a serpent in the form of a brahmin youth went forth among the monks. Please, reverend Upāli, examine this brahmin youth.”⁴ Then as that brahmin youth was being examined by the venerable Upāli he told him this matter.

¹ *tatth’eva*. ² Vin-a 1022 gives five cases: the time of its reinstatement, *paṭisandhi*, of its sloughing its skin, the two cases mentioned in the text, and the time of its passing away. ³ As at Vin 2.292. ⁴ Cf. above Kd 1.62.2.

The venerable Upāli told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, if a matricide is not ordained, he should not be ordained; if he is ordained, he should be expelled.”

THE STORY OF A PARRICIDE

^{1.65.1} At that time a certain brahmin youth deprived his father of life. He was troubled about his evil deed ... (=Kd 1.64.1, Kd 1.64.2) ... The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, if a parricide is not ordained, he should not be ordained; if he is ordained, he should be expelled.”

THE STORY OF A KILLER OF A PERFECTED ONE

^{1.66.1} Now at that time several monks were going along the highroad from Sāketa to Sāvattthī. Thieves, having issued forth on the road, robbed some monks and killed other monks. Those in the royal service, having set out from Sāvattthī, caught some thieves (but) other thieves ran away. Those who ran away went forth among the monks; those who were caught were led off to execution.

^{1.66.2} Those who had gone forth saw those thieves being led off to execution; seeing them, they spoke thus: “It is well that we ran away, for had we been caught then should we have been killed likewise.”

^{4.113}
^{1.89} Monks spoke thus: “But what have you done, your reverences?” Then those who had gone forth told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, those monks were perfected ones. Monks, if a murderer of a perfected one is not ordained, he should not be ordained; if he is ordained, he should be expelled.”

THE STORY OF A RAPER OF NUNS

1.67.1

Now at that time several nuns were going along the high-road from Sāketa to Sāvattthī. Thieves, having issued forth on the road, robbed some nuns and seduced other nuns. Those in the royal service, having set out from Sāvattthī ... (=Kd 1.66.1, Kd 1.66.1) ... The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, if a seducer of a nun is not ordained, he should not be ordained; if he is ordained, he should be expelled.”¹

“Monks, if a schismatic is not ordained, he should not be ordained; if he is ordained, he should be expelled.”

“Monks, if a shedder of (a Truth-finder’s²) blood is not ordained, he should not be ordained; if he is ordained, he should be expelled.”³

THE STORY OF A HERMAPHRODITE

Now at that time a certain hermaphrodite had gone forth among the monks. He acted and also made (another) act. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

Kd 1.68

“Monks, if a hermaphrodite is not ordained, he should not be ordained; if he is ordained, he should be expelled.”

THE STORY OF WITHOUT A PRECEPTOR, ETC.

Now at that time monks ordained one who had no preceptor. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

Kd 1.69

“Monks, one with no preceptor should not be ordained. Whoever should ordain (one such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Kd 1.69

¹ Cf. above BD 4.108, where a novice who seduces a nun is to be expelled. ² So the Commentary., Vin-a 1024. ³ Other prohibitions in regard to these classes of persons given at Vin 1.136, Vin 1.320.

Now at that time monks ordained one who had an Order as preceptor¹ ... He said:

“Monks, one who has an Order as preceptor should not be ordained. Whoever should ordain (one such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time monks ordained one who had a group as preceptor ... He said:

“Monks, one who has a group as preceptor should not be ordained ... offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time monks ordained one who had a eunuch² as preceptor ... one who had one living in communion as it were by theft as preceptor ... one who had one who had gone over to (another) sect as preceptor ... one who had an animal as preceptor ... one who had a matricide as preceptor ... one who had a parricide as preceptor ... one who had a murderer of a perfected one as preceptor ... one who had a seducer of a nun as preceptor ... one who had a schismatic as preceptor ... one who had the shedder of (a Truth-finder's) blood as preceptor ... one who had a hermaphrodite as preceptor. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, one who has a eunuch as preceptor ... one who has a hermaphrodite as preceptor should not be ordained. Whoever should ordain (one such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

THE STORY OF WITHOUT A BOWL, ETC.

1.70.1

Now at that time monks (each) ordained one who had no bowl.¹ They walked for almsfood (to be put) into their hands.² People ... spread it about, saying: “Like followers of (other) sects.”³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, one who has no bowl should not be ordained. Whoever should ordain (one such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time monks (each) ordained one who had no robe. They walked naked for almsfood. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like followers of other sects.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, one who has no robe should not be ordained. Whoever should ordain (one such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time monks (each) ordained one who had no bowl or robe. They walked naked for almsfood (to be put) into their hands ...

“Monks, one who has no bowl or robe should not be ordained. Whoever should ordain (one such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time monks (each) ordained by means of lending a bowl.⁴ When they were ordained, they returned (each one) his bowl and walked for almsfood (to be put) into their hands ...

¹ It is to be gathered from Vin-a 1025 that an Order might (inadvertently) contain any of the types of malefactors mentioned above from a matricide down to a hermaphrodite. ² The following classes of persons mentioned also above, **BD 4.108ff.** ¹ *apattaka*, see **BD 2.123, n. 6.** ² *hatthesu piṇḍāya caranti*. Same expression at **Vin 3.245**; see **BD 2.119, n. 3, n. 4.** For same expression in next paragraph, Vin 1.372 gives five variant readings all reading *carati*. But at Nuns' **Bu-Pc 63ff.** we get a singular noun followed by a plural verb, as above, with the meaning that each nun ordained a woman, and that then these were considered all together as a plurality: in referring to their actions a plural verb was needed and was used. ³ Cf. **Vin 3.245 (BD 2.119).** ⁴ *yācitakena pattaena*, by (using) a bowl that had been asked for, i.e. borrowed by the candidates for ordination.

Kd 1.70

BD 4.1

Kd 1.70

Kd 1.70

“Monks, one should not ordain by lending a bowl. Whoever should (so) ordain, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

^{1.70.5} Now at that time monks (each) ordained by means of lending a robe. When they were ordained, they returned (each one) his robe and walked naked for almsfood ...

“Monks, one should not ordain by lending a robe. Whoever should (so) ordain, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

^{1.70.6} Now at that time monks (each) ordained by means of lending a bowl and robe. When they were ordained, they returned the bowl and robe and walked naked for almsfood (to be put) into their hands
^{n.1.91} ...

“Monks, one should not ordain by lending a bowl and robe. Whoever should (so) ordain, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Told is the Portion on Twenty (Cases) where one should not ordain

THE PORTION ON THIRTY-TWO (CASES) WHERE ONE SHOULD NOT LET GO FORTH

^{1.71.1} Now at that time monks (each) let go forth one who had his hands cut off ... his feet cut off ... his hands and feet cut off ... his ears cut off ... his nose ... his ears and nose ... his fingers ... his nails¹ cut off ...
^{4.116}

¹ *alā*; see Journal of the Pali Text Society 1884, p.71, 1886, p.105.

who had the tendons (of his feet) cut ... one who had webbed fingers¹ ... a hunchback ... a dwarf ... one who had a goitre ... one who had been branded² ... one who had been scourged³ ... one who had been written about⁴ ... one who had elephantiasis ... one who was badly ill ... one who disgraced an assembly⁵ (by some deformity⁶) ... one who was purblind⁷ ... one with a crooked limb ... one who was lame ... one paralysed down one side ... a cripple ... one weak from old age ... one who was blind⁷ ... one who was dumb⁸ ... one who was deaf⁹ ... one who was blind and dumb ... one who was deaf and dumb ... one who was blind and deaf and dumb. They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: **“Monks, one who has had his hands cut off should not be let go forth; one who has had his feet cut off ... one who is blind and deaf and dumb should not be let go forth. Whoever should let (one such) go forth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Told is the Portion on Thirty-two (Cases) where one should not let go forth

Told is the Ninth Portion for Repeating: that on Inheritance

¹ *phaṇahatthaka*, with a hand like a snake’s hood. Cf. *hatthaphaṇaka* at Vin 2.107, “hands used as an instrument shaped like a snake’s hood” for smoothing the hair. Vin-a 1027, “one whose fingers were grown together like a bat’s wings”. See note by A.K. COOMARASWAMY on the *jālalakkhaṇa*, “The ‘Webbed Finger’ of Buddha”, Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. VII, 1931, p.365, where he is of the opinion that *jāla* does not mean a webbing connecting the fingers, but refers to the thin lines of rosy light which may be seen between the fingers when they are held together and the hand held up to the light. The fingers of the Buddha, as Mahāpuruṣa, would be straight and regularly formed, of one measure, *ekappamāṇā*, according to this *lakkhaṇa*, or sign. “It is even possible”, as Coomaraswamy adds in a postscript, “that ‘having webbed fingers’ represents the exact opposite of the meaning of the original *lakkhaṇa*.” ² Cf. Vin 1.76 (above, BD 4.95). ³ Cf. Vin 1.75 (above, BD 4.95).

⁴ |emphCf. Vin 1.75 (above, BD.4.95) ⁵ *parisadūsaka*. ⁶ Given at length at Vin-a 1027ff. ⁷ The two words for blind: *kāṇa* and *andha*, are used. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 1030 says that *kāṇa* means blind of one or both eyes (and not merely blind of one). He cites the Mahāpaccaṛī Commentary as asserting *kāṇa* to mean blind of one eye and *andha* of both, and he cites the Great Commentary, as saying that *andha* means blind from birth; he keeps this explanation at Vin-a 1031. “Purblind” and the next three terms occur at Vin 2.90, AN i.107, AN ii.85, AN iii.385, SN i.94, Pp 51.

⁸ Vin-a 1031 explains that if he were unable to say the complete formula for going for refuge, he could not go forth. ⁹ Vin-a 1031, if he could hear a loud noise he might go forth.

THE STORY OF GUIDANCE FOR THE UNCONSCIENTIOUS

4.117

Now at that time the group of six monks gave guidance to those who were unconscientious. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, guidance should not be given to those who are unconscientious. Whoever should give it to (such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time monks lived under the guidance of those who were unconscientious; these soon also became unconscientious, depraved monks. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, one should not live under the guidance of those who are unconscientious. Whoever should (so) live, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

1.72.2

Then it occurred to the monks: “It is laid down by the Lord that guidance should not be given to those who are unconscientious, and that one should not live under the guidance of those who are unconscientious. Now, how are we to know who is conscientious or who is unconscientious?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to wait for four or five days until (you can say), ‘I know what is the nature of the monks’¹.”

n 1.92

THE STORY OF GUIDANCE FOR ONE ON A JOURNEY, ETC.

1.73.1

Now at that time a certain monk was going along a highroad in the Kosala country. Then it occurred to that monk: “It is laid down by the Lord that one should not live independently.² I am in need of

¹ *bhikkhusabhāgata*. Vin-a 1031, “Until I know from monks that their conscientiousness is shared by the monk giving guidance”. Or, is *sabhāgata* equal to *sabhāva*, the nature (of a monk), as I take it to be? ² Above, **BD 4.101**.

guidance¹ but I am going along a high-road. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"I allow a monk, monks, if he is going along a high-road and is not receiving guidance to live independently."

Now at that time two monks were going along a high-road in the Kosala country. These arrived at a certain residence, and there one monk became ill. Then it occurred to that ill monk: "It is laid down by the Lord that one should not live independently. I am in need of guidance, but I am ill. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"I allow a monk, monks, if he is ill and is not receiving guidance to live independently."

Then it occurred to that monk who was tending the ill one: "It is laid down by the Lord ... I am in need of guidance but this monk is ill. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"I allow a monk, monks, if he is tending an ill one and is not receiving guidance, to live independently although being requested."²

Now at that time a certain monk was staying in a forest and there came to be comfort³ for him in this lodging. Then it occurred to this monk: "It is laid down by the Lord that one should not live independently. I am in need of guidance, but I am staying in a forest and there comes to be comfort for me in this lodging. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"I allow a monk, monks, if he is a forest-dweller and is thinking

¹ *ahañ c'amhi nissayakaraṇīyo*. ² By the ill one, Vin-a 1032. That is, as the Commentary says, the ill monk may ask the other to request him to give guidance; but if through pride he does not ask, he may go away. We must therefore assume that if he stays with the invalid but does not take guidance from him, he may live independently of guidance. ³ *phāsu*. Vin-a 1032, "there comes to be comfort in regard to obtaining tranquillity and vision".

about abiding in comfort¹ and is not receiving guidance, to live independently, thinking: ‘If a suitable giver of guidance comes along, I will live under his guidance’.”

PERMISSION TO PROCLAIM BY CLAN

Now at that time (a person) wished for ordination from the venerable Kassapa the Great.² Then the venerable Kassapa the Great sent a message to the venerable Ānanda, saying: “Let Ānanda come, he will proclaim³ this (person).” The venerable Ānanda spoke thus:

“I am not able to pronounce⁴ the elder’s⁵ name (for) the elder is my teacher⁶.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to proclaim merely by clan (-name).”

THE STORY OF TWO EXPECTING ORDINATION, ETC.

Now at that time two (persons) wished for ordination from the venerable Kassapa the Great. These quarrelled, saying: “I will be ordained first, I will be ordained first.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ *Phāsuvihāra*; cf. *brahmavihāra*, and the monk who was *phāsuvihārika*, below **BD 4.373, Kd 7.12.1.** ² At **AN i.23** called “chief of those who uphold the ascetic practices”. Verses at **Thag 1051–1090**. He exchanged robes with Gotama, **SN ii.221.**

³ *anussāveti*, in technical meaning of proclaiming the resolution three times after the motion for ordaining a person had been put before an Order. Cf. **Kd 1.28.3–Kd 1.28.6.** ⁴ *gahetuṃ*, a word with a variety of meanings; here meaning “to pronounce” in sense of “to take”, cf. “to take his name in vain”. Since Ānanda calls Kassapa his *guru* (*garu me*), and if we equate *guru* with *ācariya*, spiritual teacher or father (cf. *pitucitta*, **Vin 1.45, Vin 1.60**), it was not suitable for Ānanda to “take” (pronounce) his “father’s” name. The use of the *gotta* (clan) name is less intimate and therefore permissible. Cf. *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad 2.11.7* where the father “takes his son’s name”, *nāma asya gṛṇhati*. I am indebted for this note to A.K. Coomaraswamy. Mahākassapa’s reference to Ānanda as *kumāraka*, young boy at **SN ii.218** should also be noted. ⁵ I.e. Mahākassapa’s, as stated at *Vinaya Texts i.228*. For in making the proclamations, Ānanda would have had to say that so-and-so wished to be ordained by Kassapa. ⁶ *garu*, probably equivalent to *guru*, spiritual teacher. Cf. *garunissaya* at **Vin 2.303.**

“I allow you, monks, to make two proclamations together.”

Now at that time there were those wishing for ordination from several elders. These quarrelled, saying: “I will be ordained first, I will be ordained first.” The elders spoke thus: “Come, your reverences, we are making all the proclamations together.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to make two or three proclamations together if there is one preceptor, but not if there are different preceptors.”

PERMISSION FOR ORDINATION TWENTY YEARS FROM CONCEPTION

Now at that time the venerable Kassapa the Boy¹ became ordained twenty years after his conception. Then it occurred to the venerable Kassapa the Boy: “It is laid down by the Lord that an individual who is under twenty years of age should not be ordained,² and I am twenty years from my conception. Now am I ordained³ or am I not ordained?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“When in his mother’s womb the first thought has arisen, the first consciousness appeared,⁴ his birth is (to be reckoned as) from that time. I allow you, monks, to ordain one who is twenty years of age from his conception.”

¹ Kumāarakassapa. *Kumāra* has the meaning both of boy and of prince. Kumāarakassapa “went forth” when he was only seven years old and he had been reared by a king since his birth by a nun; see AN-a i.284, MN-a ii.120, Thag-a (*Psalms of the Brethren* p.147f.), Dh-p-a iii.144, Ja i.148. Verses are ascribed to him at Thag 201-202. Called “chief of those who are versatile speakers” at AN i.24. The *Vammīki Sutta* (MN i.142) was spoken to Kumāarakassapa; the *Nigrodhamigajāta* (Ja no.12) and Dh-p 160 on account of his mother. ² Bu-Pc 65, and above, BD 4.98. ³ Cf. Bu-Pc 65 where it is stated that if a person is ordained while he is under twenty he is not (really) ordained. He himself incurs no offence, but there is an offence for the monks who ordain him. ⁴ Cf. definition of *manussaviggaha*, human being, at Vin 3.73.

ORDINATION PROCEDURE

^{176.1} Now at that time ordained (monks) were to be seen who were (afflicted by) leprosy and boils and eczema and consumption and epilepsy.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, when one is being ordained to ask him about things which are stumbling-blocks² for him.³ And thus should he be asked: Have you diseases like this: leprosy, boils, eczema, consumption, epilepsy? Are you a human being? Are you a man? Are you a freeman? Are you without debts? Are you not in the royal service? Have you your parents’ consent? Are you full twenty years of age? Are you complete as to bowl and robes? What is your name? What is the name of your preceptor?”

^{176.2} Now at that time monks asked those wishing for ordination, but who were not instructed, about the things which are stumbling-blocks. Those wishing for ordination were at a loss, they were abashed, they were unable to reply. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

^{176.3} “I allow you, monks, having instructed first, afterwards to ask about the things which are stumbling-blocks.”

^{4.121} They instructed just there in the midst of the Order. As before, those wishing for ordination were at a loss, they were abashed, they were unable to reply. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

^{176.4} “I allow you, monks, having instructed aside, to ask about the things which are stumbling-blocks in the midst of the Order. And thus, monks, should one be instructed: First, he should be invited to choose⁴ a preceptor; having invited him to choose a preceptor, a bowl and robes should be pointed out to him (with the words): ‘This is a bowl for you, this is an outer cloak, this is an upper robe, this is an inner robe; go and stand in such and such a place.’”

Ignorant, inexperienced (monks) instructed them. Those wishing for ordination, but who were not (properly) instructed, were at

¹ Cf. above, *Kd* 1.39.1. ² *antarāyike dhamme*, cf. *Vin* 4.134 (*BD* 3.21, where see n. 5).

³ Cf. *Vin* 2.271f. for the questions put to nuns on their ordination. ⁴ *gāhāpetabbo*; cf. *gāhāpaka* at *Vin* 3.246 (*BD* 2.122, where see n. 1).

a loss, they were abashed, they were unable to reply. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, one should not be instructed by an ignorant, inexperienced (monk). Whoever (such) should instruct, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to instruct by means of an experienced, competent monk.”

Those who were not agreed upon instructed. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, one should not be instructed by one who is not agreed upon. Whoever should so instruct, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to instruct by means of one who is agreed upon. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon: oneself may be agreed upon by oneself or another may be agreed upon by another¹. And how is oneself to be agreed upon by oneself? The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. So and so wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. If it seems right to the Order, I would instruct so and so.’ Thus may oneself be agreed upon by oneself.

“And how is another to be agreed upon by another? The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. So and so wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. If it seems right to the Order, so and so could instruct so and so.’ Thus may another be agreed upon by another.

“The monk who is agreed upon, having approached the one who wishes for ordination, should speak thus to him: ‘Listen, so and so. This is for you a time for truth (-speaking), a time for fact (-speaking).

¹ Cf. below, **Kd 2.15.6.**

When I am asking you in the midst of the Order about what is,¹ you should say, 'It is,' if it is so; you should say, 'It is not,' if it is not so. Do not be at a loss, do not be abashed. Thus I will ask² you: 'Have you diseases like this ... What is your preceptor's name?'"

They³ arrived together. They should not arrive together. The instructor having come first, the Order should be informed by him, saying: "Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. So and so wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. He has been instructed by me. If it seems right to the Order, let so and so come." He should be told: "Come." Having made him arrange his upper robe over one shoulder, having made him honour the monks' feet, having made him sit down on his haunches, having made him salute with joined palms, he should be made to ask for ordination, saying: "Honoured sirs, I ask the Order for ordination; honoured sirs, may the Order raise me up out of compassion.⁴ And a second time, honoured sirs, ... And a third time, honoured sirs, I ask the Order for ordination; honoured sirs, may the Order raise me up out of compasson."

The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: "Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This one, so and so, wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. If it seems right to the Order I could ask so and so about the things which are stumbling-blocks. Listen, so and so. This is for you a time for truth (-speaking), a time for fact (-speaking). I am asking you about what is. You should say, 'It is', if it is so; you should say, 'It is not,' if

¹ *yaṃ jātam*. Vin-a 1033 says about that which is produced, *jāta*, has arisen, is existing in your body. This can only refer to the questions on the diseases. The Pali in such cases is idiomatic: "Is there for you a disease?" So one could say, "I am asking you about what exists, *yaṃ jātam* (as a disease for you), and you should say there is, *atthi* (such a disease for me) it being so, *santaṃ*; there is not, *n'atthi*, it being not so, *asantaṃ*". But since in fact not all the questions are about diseases, I have translated as above, the better to emphasise the general necessity to answer all the questions truthfully in accordance with the preliminary reminder, "This is a time for truth and fact". ² *pucchissāṃ*. ³ The instructor and his candidate. Nothing to show whether the Lord is supposed to continue to give these instructions, or whether they are incorporated without being attributed to him. ⁴ Cf. above, *Kd 1.29.2*.

it is not so. Have you diseases like this: ... What is your preceptor's name?"

Kd 1,76

The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: "Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This one, so and so, wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. He is quite pure in regard to the things which are stumbling-blocks, he is complete as to bowl and robes. So and so is asking the Order for ordination by means of the preceptor so and so. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order ordain so and so by means of the preceptor so and so. This is the motion.

Kd 1,76

"Honoured sirs, let the Order hear me. This one, so and so, wishes for ordination from the venerable so and so. He is quite pure in regard to the things which are stumbling-blocks, he is complete as to bowl and robes. So and so is asking the Order for ordination by means of the preceptor so and so. The Order is ordaining so and so by means of the preceptor so and so. If the ordination of so and so by means of the preceptor so and so is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak.

Kd 1,76

"And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. "So and so is being ordained by the Order by means of the preceptor so and so. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this."

FOUR REQUISITES

The shadow should be measured¹ at once, the length of the season² should be explained, the portion of the day³ should be explained, the formula⁴ should be explained, the four resources should be explained (with the words): ‘Going forth is on account of meals of scraps ... (as at Kd 1.30.4) ... These are extra acquisitions: ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses.’

Told are the Four Resources

FOUR THINGS NOT TO BE DONE

Now at that time monks, having ordained a certain monk, went away leaving him alone. Afterwards as he was going along alone, he met his former wife on the way. She spoke thus: “What, have you now gone forth?”

“Yes, I have gone forth.” She said:

“Sexual intercourse is difficult for those who have gone forth. Come and indulge in sexual intercourse.” Having indulged in sexual intercourse with her, he arrived late. Monks spoke thus: “What were you, your reverence, doing for such a long time?”

Then this monk told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, having ordained (a monk), to give him a companion and to explain four things which are not to be done. When

¹ This must mean the shadow of the candidate, cast by the sun. Vin-a 1033 says the shadow should be measured with the words, It is the length of one man or of two men, *ekaporisā dveporisā*. Cf. *porisa* meaning “height of a man.” at MN i.74, MN i.187, MN i.365. ² Vin-a 1033 “the seasons are the rains, the cold weather, the hot weather. If whichever season it is is not ended, that season is incomplete by so many days”, thus the number of days remaining in that season, or “the exact season” (*Pali-English Dictionary*) should be explained. ³ Vin-a 1033, morning or afternoon. ⁴ *sangīti*, chanting together. According to Vin-a 1034, having done all this together he should be asked about his measure, the season and portion of the day in order that he might give the correct answers and so make it clear that he has properly understood his age as a member of the Order.

a monk is ordained he should not indulge in sexual intercourse, even with an animal.¹ Whatever monk indulges in sexual intercourse, he becomes not a (true) recluse, not a son of the Sakyans. As a man with his head cut off could not become one to live by that bodily connection, even so a monk, having indulged in sexual intercourse, becomes not a (true) recluse, not a son of the Sakyans.² This is a thing not to be done by you as long as life lasts.

“When a monk is ordained he should not take by theft what has not been given, even if it is only a blade of grass.³ Whatever monk takes by theft a *pāda*⁴ or the worth of a *pāda* or more than a *pāda* that has not been given, he becomes not a (true) recluse, not a son of the Sakyans. As a withered leaf, freed from its stalk, could not become green again, even so a monk, having taken by theft a *pāda* or the worth of a *pāda* or more than a *pāda* that was not given, becomes not a (true) recluse, not a son of the Sakyans.⁵ This is a thing not to be done by you as long as life lasts.

“When a monk is ordained he should not intentionally deprive a living thing of life, even if it is only an ant.⁶ Whatever monk deprives a human being of life even down to causing abortion,⁷ he becomes not a (true) recluse, not a son of the Sakyans. As a flat stone, broken in half, becomes (something) not to be put together again, even so a monk, having intentionally deprived a human being of life, becomes not a (true) recluse, not a son of the Sakyans.⁸ This is a thing not to be done by you as long as life lasts.

“When a monk is ordained he should not lay claim to a state of further-men, even thinking: ‘I delight in solitude’.⁹ Whatever monk, of evil desires, filled with covetousness, lays claim to a state of further-men which is non-existent, not a fact¹⁰—to meditation or to a deliverance or to contemplation or to an attainment or to a way or

¹ Bu-Pj 1, Vin 3.22. ² Vin 3.28. ³ Bu-Pj 2. ⁴ See note at BD 1.71. ⁵ Cf. Vin 3.47.
⁶ Bu-Pj 3 (for human beings) and Bu-Pc 61 (for animals). ⁷ Vin 3.83f. ⁸ Vin 3.74.
⁹ *suññāgāra*. See Vin 3.91. Where “delight in solitude for the mind devoid of the hindrances” occurs in definition of “state of further-men”. ¹⁰ Vin 3.90, where such a one is called the “chief great thief”.

to a fruit¹—he becomes not a (true) recluse, not a son of the Sakyans. As a palmyra palm, cut off at the crown, could not become one for further growth,² even so a monk, of evil desires, filled with covetousness, having claimed a state of further-men which is nonexistent, not a fact, becomes not a (true) recluse, not a son of the Sakyans. This is a thing not to be done by you as long as life lasts.”

Told are the Four Things which are not to be done

THE STORY OF ONE SUSPENDED FOR NOT SEEING AN OFFENCE

Now at that time a certain monk, suspended³ for not seeing an offence, left the Order, (but) having come back again, he asked the monks for ordination. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, suspended for not seeing an offence, leaves the Order, (but) having come back again, asks the monks for ordination. They should speak thus to him: ‘Will you see this offence?’ If he says: ‘I will see it’, he may be let go forth. If he says: ‘I will not see it’, he should not be let go forth.

“Having let him go forth they should say (to him): ‘Will you see this offence?’ If he says: ‘I will see it’, he may be ordained. If he says: ‘I will not see it’, he should not be ordained. Having ordained him, they should say: ‘Will you see this offence?’ If he says: ‘I will see it’, he may be restored.⁴ If he says: ‘I will not see it’, he should not be restored. Having restored him, they should say: ‘Do you see this offence?’ If he sees it, that is good; if he does not see it, he may be suspended again if it possible to obtain unanimity⁵; if it is not possible to obtain

¹ Cf. the longer list of concepts enumerated in definition of “state of further-men” at Vin 3.91, Vin 3.92. ² Vin 3.92. ³ *ukkhitta*. Cf. Vin 4.113, Vin 4.137, Vin 4.218 and see BD 3.28, n. 4. ⁴ On *osāreti*, to restore after seeing an offence, making amends for it and giving up a false view, see BD 3.28, n. 4. ⁵ I.e. among the monks, for this further suspension.

unanimity there is no offence in eating with, in being in communion with (him).¹

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, suspended for not making amends for an offence, leaves the Order (but) having come back again, asks the monks for ordination. They should speak thus to him: ‘Will you make amends for this offence?’ If he says: ‘I will make amends’, he may be let go forth ... (as in **Kd 1.79.2** reading make amends for *instead* of see) ... in being in communion with (him).

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, suspended for not giving up a wrong view, leaves the Order (but) having come back again, asks the monks for ordination. They should speak thus to him: ‘Will you give up this wrong view?’ If he says: ‘I will give it up he may be let go forth ... (as in **Kd 1.79.2** reading give up *instead* of see) ... in being in communion with (him).

The Great Section²: the First

THIS IS ITS KEY

As to great matters in the Vinaya,
to bringing ease to the well-behaved
both in restraint of evil desires
and in strivings for conscientiousness,
And also bearing in mind the instruction
which is within the range of the all-knowing conqueror,
in a realm which has no other,
in peace from bondage,
in what is well laid down,
in that which has no doubt,
In Section in Vinaya, as well as in Parivāra and in Heading(s),
the good follows closely as though imitating.
Who does not understand cattle does not guard the herd,
so not knowing moral habit, how can he guard restraint?
Although the Suttantas and Abhidhamma be forgotten,
for all time the teaching persists
while Vinaya is not destroyed.
Therefore, because firmly supported,

¹ So Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 1034, *tena saddhim*, and as may be deduced from **Bu-Pc 69** and its Old Commentary’s definition of “has not acted according to the rule”.

² Mahākhandhaka. Called *pabbajjākkhandhaka* at DN-a ii.363.

I will declare the key in regular sequence
according to (my) knowledge.

Listen while I speak.

The matter, the provenance¹,
the offence, the methods and the abbreviations—
it is not easy not to leave something out;
discern that from the method.

Awakening, and the Rājāyatana, the Goatherds', Sahampati
Brahmā, Ālara, Uddaka, and monks, Upaka the seer,
Koṇḍañña, Vappa, Bhaddiya and Mahānāma, Assaji,
Yasa, four, fifty, all, he sent out (on tour), the quarters,

The subject,² as to Māra, and the thirty,
at Uruvelā, three matted hair ascetics,

fire-room, the Great Kings, Sakka,
and Brahmā, the entire (population),
Rag-robe, a tank, and a stone, *kakudha*-(tree),
a stone, a rose-apple, and a mango,

emblic myrobalam, he brought a flower from the Coral Tree,

4.128 'Kassapa, let them be chopped, let them be kindled,
and let them be extinguished',

they plunged into, fire-vessels, rain, Gayā,
and the Palm Grove, (King of) Magadha,

Upatissa, Kolita, and distinguished (young men), the going forth,
wrongly dressed, dismissal, and the lean wretched brahmin,

He indulged in bad habits, the stomach,
the brahmin youth, a group,

year's standing, by the ignorant, going away,
ten years' standing, guidance,

They did not conduct themselves (properly),
to dismiss, ignorant, nullification, five, six,

and whoever else, and naked, not with (his hair) cut off,
matted hair ascetic, a Sakyan.

Five diseases among the Magadhese, service,³ a thief (and) fingers,
and (the King of) Magadha decreed, jail, written about, scourged,

Branded, debtor, and a slave, close-shaving, Upāli, snake (-wind disease),⁴

¹ *nidāna*. This usually appears in the Vinaya to mean the place where the Lord was staying when such conduct occurred as led to the framing of a rule or allowance, thus the "provenance" of a rule or allowance. See also ks iii, Introduction xff.; ks iv, Introduction xivf. ² *vatthuri*. Appearing to refer to Kd 1.12.2, Kd 1.12.4, the going forth and ordination formula by the three refuges. Going forth and Ordination form the subject matter of Section i of the Mahāvagga. ³ Text reads *eko*. Oldenberg, Vin 1.373 thinks we ought to read *bhaṭo* (for *rājabhaṭa* in Kd 1.40.3). ⁴ See Kd 1.50.1; Kd 1.51.1.

a family with faith, and Kaṇḍaka, and then crowded up,
 About how to live,¹ the boy, trainings, and they were,² Now how?
 entire, by mouth, preceptors, luring away, Kaṇḍaka,
 Eunuch, theft,³ going over to,⁴ and a snake, on a mother, a father,
 perfected ones, a nun, schismatic,
 concerning blood,⁵ hermaphrodite,⁶
 Without a preceptor, through an Order, a group, eunuch,
 without a bowl, without a robe, both these,
 then those three on what was lent,
 Hands, feet, hands and feet, ears, nose, both these,
 fingers, nails, tendons, webbed hands, and a hunch-back, dwarf,
 Having goitre, and then a branded one,
 scourged, written about, elephantiasis,
 badly (ill), and one who disgraces an assembly, blind,
 and just then one with a crooked limb,
 And then a lame one, paralysed down one side,
 with a cripple, old age, blind from birth, dumb,
 deaf, blind and dumb, and what is thereto,
 Whatever is called blind and dumb, and then dumb and deaf,
 And blind and dumb and deaf,
 and guidance to the unconscientious,
 And one should (not) live, what is done on a journey,⁷ being asked, wishing
 for,
 'let him come',⁸ they quarrelled,⁹ if there is one preceptor, Kassapa,
 And ordained (monks) were to be seen pressing about diseases,
 the uninstructed were at a loss, instruction just there,
 And then in the Order, then an ignorant one, and not agreed upon,
 together, the 'may-it-raise-(me-)up' ordination, resource, alone, the three.¹⁰
 In this Section are one hundred and seventy-two items.

¹ *vatthumhi*, i.e. in dependence for five years or for life, **Kd 1.53.4**. Sinhalese edition *vatthusmiri*. ² *viharanti*, as in **Kd 1.57.1**. ³ I.e. in communion by theft, **Kd 1.62.3**.

⁴ I.e. going over to (another) sect, **Kd 1.62.3**. ⁵ *ruhirena*, here replacing *lohituppā-dako* of **Kd 1.67.1**, the shedder of a (*tathāgata*'s) blood. ⁶ Here called only *vyañjana* (accompanying attribute, distinctive characteristic) instead of *ubhatovyañjana* as at **Kd 1.68.1**. ⁷ *kataddhāna*, referring to **Kd 1.73.1**, **Kd 1.73.2**. Sinhalese edition reads *tathāddhānaṃ*. ⁸ Following *āgacchatu* of Sinhalese edition = **Kd 1.74.1**, instead of Text's *āgacchantarī*. ⁹ *vivadenti* (with variant reading *vivādentī*, Vin 1.373).

¹⁰ Doubtless referring to (1) not seeing an offence, (2) not making amends for an offence, (3) not giving up a wrong view (each a ground for a monk's suspension; and their opposites, each being a ground for his restoration dealt with at **Kd 1.79.1**, **Kd 1.79.4**).

Told is the First Key, that to the Great Section

2. OBSERVANCE (*UPOSATHA*)

PERMISSION TO GATHER

At one time the awakened one, the Lord was staying near Rājagaha on Mount Vulture Peak. Now at that time wanderers belonging to other sects, having collected together on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month.¹ spoke *dhamma*,² People came up to them to hear *dhamma*. They gained affection for the wanderers belonging to other sects, they gained faith (in them), the wanderers belonging to other sects gained adherents.³

Then reasoning arose thus in the mind of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha as he was meditating in seclusion: “At present wanderers belonging to other sects, having collected together on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month, speak *dhamma*. These people go up to them to hear *dhamma*. They gain affection for the wanderers belonging to other sects, they gain faith (in them), the wanderers belonging to other sects gain adherents. Suppose the masters should also collect together on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month?”

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance, As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King

¹ On *pakkha*, cf. *Vin* 4.75 (BD 2.313, and q.v. n. 3) where eating food given *pakkhikam* and *uposathikam*, “on a day of the waxing or waning of the moon” and “on an observance-day”, form exceptions to the rule prohibiting a group-meal. ² *Vin*-a 1034, what is and what is not to be done by them. ³ *pakkha* is literally a party, a side, a faction, not necessarily a schismatic one, as is shown by above context, and see BD 3.190, n. 3.

Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the Lord: “Now, Lord, as I was meditating in seclusion, a reasoning arose in my mind thus: ‘At present wanderers belonging to other sects ... should collect together on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month?’”

Then the Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha with talk on *dhamma*. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, gladdened, ... delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to assemble together on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month.”

Now at that time monks, thinking: “It is allowed by the Lord to assemble together on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month,” having assembled together, sat down in silence. Those people came up to hear *dhamma*. They looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, having assembled together on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month, sit in silence, like dumb pigs¹? Ought not *dhamma* to be spoken when they are assembled together?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, having assembled together on the fourteenth, fifteenth and eighth days of the half-month, to speak *dhamma*.”

PERMISSION TO RECITE THE PĀTIMOKKHA

Then as the Lord was meditating in seclusion a reasoning arose in his mind thus: “What now if I were to allow those rules of training,

¹ *mūgasūkarā*; Vin-a 1034 explains by *thūlasarīrasūkarā*, pigs that are fat in body.

laid down by me for monks, (to form) a recital of Pātimokkha¹ for them? It would be a (formal) act of observance² for them.”

Then the Lord, having emerged from his seclusion in the evening, on this occasion, in this connection having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “Now, monks, as I was meditating in seclusion a reasoning arose in my mind thus: ‘What now if I should allow those rules of training, laid down by me for monks, (to form) a recital of Pātimokkha for them? It would be a (formal) act of observance for them’. I allow you, monks, to recite a Pātimokkha.

“And thus, monks, should it be recited: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Today, the fifteenth (day), is an Observance (day). If it seems right to the Order, the Order may carry out Observance, it may recite the Pātimokkha. What is the Order’s first duty? Let the venerable ones announce entire purity.³ I will recite the Pātimokkha (while) one and all of us present⁴ listen properly and pay attention to it.⁵ He for whom there may be an offence should

¹ RHYS DAVIDS (E.R.E., article on Pātimokkha) says that from “the manner in which the word is used” in this passage it is not surprising” to find that the early Buddhists ascribed the institution ... of the Pātimokkha itself to a date long antecedent to that of the Buddha. If that be correct, the word Pātimokkha must have been current in Kosala when Buddhism arose, and ... among members of the previous orders”. Rhys Davids refers to DN ii.46–DN ii.49, where tradition ascribes a Pātimokkha to the time when Vipassin was Buddha, and to the verse (DN ii.49), repeated at DhP 185, which contains the words: *pātimokkhe ca saṃvaro ... etaṃ buddhānāsānaṃ*, “and restraint according to the Pātimokkha—this is the teaching of the Buddhas” (plural).

On suggested meanings of Pātimokkha, see **BD 1, Introduction, p. xiff.**; *Vinaya Texts* i., Introduction, p. xxvii. On the number of rules that the Pātimokkha contained, see WINTERNITZ, *History of Indian Literature*, ii.2, n. 5, which gives further references, and also B.C. LAW, *History of Pali Literature*, i.48f. ² *uposathakamma*. *Upasatha* stands for “observance” itself. The phrase *tad-ah-uposathe*, “on this day’s observance”, is usually used for an Observance day. ³ *pārisuddhi*, i.e. that only those are present who have committed no offences, or who have acknowledged any committed, or who have fulfilled the penalty for them. Cf. below, **BD 4.158**. ⁴ *sabbeva santā*. Cf. *ubho va santā* at **Vin 3.218**. ⁵ *Vinaya Texts* i.242 take these words (all of us ... to it) to be the answer of the monks then present. As there is no *ti* marking the end of a speech, I think Gotama is still supposed to be telling the monks the way in which the recitation is to be carried out.

reveal¹ it. If there is no offence, you should become silent. By your becoming silent I shall thus know that the venerable ones are quite pure. For as there is an answer for each question,² so it is proclaimed³ up to the third time in an assembly like this. Whatever monk remembering while it is being proclaimed up to the third time that there is an existent offence and should not reveal it, there comes to be conscious lying⁴ for him.⁵ Now, conscious lying, venerable ones, is a thing called a stumbling-block⁶ by the Lord. Therefore the existent offence should be revealed by a monk who remembers that he has fallen (into an offence) and who desires purity; for when it is revealed there comes to be comfort for him.’”

Pātimokkha⁷ means: this is the beginning, this is the head,⁸ this is the foremost of states that are good; therefore it is called Pātimokkha.

The venerable ones means: this—‘the venerable ones’—is a term of esteem,⁹ this is a term of respect, this is a deferential and honorific designation.¹⁰

I will recite means: I will explain, I will teach, I will lay down, I will establish, I will make clear, I will analyse, I will make plain.¹¹

To it means: to (what) is called the Pātimokkha.

One and all of us present means: as many as there are in this assembly—elders and newly ordained and those of middle standing—these are called ‘one and all of us present’.

¹ *āvikareyya*. *Āvikaroti* is to make clear, to manifest, thus to disclose, to bring to light. This method of clearing oneself of an offence is perhaps a forerunner to the more formal confession, *āpatti deseti*, to an Order, a group or to one individual monk.

² *paccekaputtḥassa*. ³ *anussāvita*. ⁴ Defined at **Vin 4.2 (BD 2.166)**. ⁵ Quoted Atthasālinī 92. ⁶ *antarāyiko dhammo*; see **BD 3.21, n. 5**. ⁷ On the inclusion of this Commentary in the Mahāvagga, see *Vinaya Texts* i, Introduction, p. xv and S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 91. ⁸ This derivative, Pātimokkha from *mukha* “is quite impossible”, WINTERNITZ, *History of Indian Literature*, ii.22, n. 2. But punning is not to be taken as serious scientific etymology, for this was unknown so early.

⁹ Or, of endearment, of affection, *piya*. ¹⁰ Cf. Cnd 130, Snp-a 536. ¹¹ Cf. SN ii.25, SN ii.154. SN iii.132, SN iv.166; AN i.286, AN ii.160.

(We) listen properly means: having applied ourselves, having attended,¹ we concentrate with all our mind.²

(We) pay attention means: we listen,³ minds one-pointed, minds not distracted, minds not perturbed.⁴

He for whom there may be an offence means: a certain offence of the five classes of offence or a certain offence of the seven classes of offence⁵ for an elder or for a newly ordained one or for one of middle standing.

He should reveal means: he should tell, he should make clear, he should open up, he should make plain in the midst of an Order or in the midst of a group or to one individual.

If there is no offence means: either one comes not to be committed or, if fallen into, it is removed.⁶

You should become silent means: you should not speak, you should consent.

I shall know⁷ that you are quite pure means: I will know, I will understand.

For as there is an answer for each question means: as one (person) if questioned about one (thing) would answer, so it should be known to that assembly: 'He questions me'.

An assembly like this (means): it is called an assembly of monks.

It is proclaimed up to the third time means: it is proclaimed once and it is proclaimed a second time and it is proclaimed a third time.

Remembering means: knowing, perceiving.

There is an existent offence means: either one comes to be committed or if fallen into is not removed.

¹ *aṭṭhikatvā manasikatvā*; cf. Vin 4.144. ² *sabbaṃ cetasā samannāharāma*; cf. SN i.112, SN i.189, SN n. ii.220; AN ii.116, AN iii.163, AN iii.402, AN iv.167; MN i.325. ³ *nisāmema*.

⁴ Cf. AN iii.174; Ds 11, Ds 15, Ds 24; Mnd 501. ⁵ The five classes of offence comprise the *Pārājika*, *Saṅghādisesa*, *Aniyata*, *Nissaggiya*, *Pācittiya* offences; the seven classes these five with the addition of the *Pāṭidesaniyas* and *Sekhiyas*. ⁶ *vuṭṭhitā*, feminine, agreeing with its subject *āpatti*. Vin-a 1034 reasonably explains: "here, either, whatever monk there comes to be not falling into an offence, or, having fallen is removed from it, this is the meaning of 'if there is no offence'". Cf. *āpattiyā vuṭṭhāna* in Kd 1:38.10. ⁷ *vedissāmi ... jānissāmi*.

Should not reveal means: should not tell, should not make clear, should not open up, should not make plain in the midst of an Order or in the midst of a group or to one individual.

There comes to be conscious lying for him means: What is conscious lying? It is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

A thing called a stumbling-block by the Lord means: a stumbling block to what? It is a stumbling-block to the attainment of the first (stage in) meditation, it is a stumbling-block to the attainment of the second (stage in) meditation ... the third (stage in) meditation, ... the fourth (stage in) meditation, it is a stumbling-block to the attainment of the meditations, of the deliverances, of the contemplations, of the attainments², of the renunciations, of the escapes,³ of the aloofnesses, of states that are good.

Therefore means: for that reason.

By (a monk) who remembers means: by (one) knowing, by (one) perceiving.

By (a monk) who desires purity means: by (one) wishing to remove (an offence), by (one) wishing to be purified.

Existent offence means: either one comes to be committed, or, if fallen into, is not removed.

Should be revealed means: it should be revealed in the midst of an Order or in the midst of a group or to one individual.

For when it is revealed there comes to be comfort for him means: In what is there comfort? There comes to be comfort in the attainment of the first (stage in) meditation, there comes to be comfort in the attainment in the second (stage in) meditation ... the third (stage in) meditation ... the fourth (stage in) meditation; there comes to be comfort in the attainment of the meditations, of the

¹ In the *Pācittiya*s, however, conscious lying appears as the first offence in this class. *Vinaya Texts* i.245, note says that because of this “we cannot interpret here *dukkaṭa* in the technical sense of a *dukkaṭa* offence”. I think, however, that the difference in the penalties laid down for conscious lying may point to different stages in the growth of the legislation. ² Cf. [Vin 3.91](#), [Vin 3.92](#), [Vin 4.25](#). ³ *nissaraṇa*. ‘Escapes’ mentioned at Ud 80; It p.37, It p.61; DN iii.275; AN iii.245, DN iii.239–DN iii.240; AN iii.290, DN iii.247; MN i.84ff., etc.

deliverances, of the contemplations, of the attainments, of the renunciations, of the escapes, of the aloofnesses, of states that are good.¹

Now at that time monks, thinking: “The recital of the Pātimokkha is allowed by the Lord,” recited the Pātimokkha daily. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, the Pātimokkha should not be recited daily. Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to recite the Pātimokkha on an Observance day.”

Now at that time monks, thinking: “The recital of the Pātimokkha on an Observance day is allowed by the Lord,” recited the Pātimokkha three times during the half-month—on the fourteenth, on the fifteenth and on the eighth (days) of the half-month. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, the Pātimokkha should not be recited three times in the half-month. Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to recite the Pātimokkha once in the half-month: either on this fourteenth or on the fifteenth (day).”

Now at that time the group of six monks recited the Pātimokkha according to assembly, each one before his own assembly. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, the Pātimokkha should not be recited according to assembly, each one before his own assembly, Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, a (formal) act of Observance for all together.”²

Then it occurred to the monks: “A (formal) act of Observance

¹ Cf. the forest or jungle dwelling monk who had comfort, *phāsu*, Kd 1.73.4. This example together with the one given above indicate that *phāsu* is by no means used exclusively to denote physical comfort. ² *samaggānaṃ*. Cf. *samagga* at Vin 4.52, “all come”, and see BD 2.267, n. 7; and cf. *samagga saṅgha* at Vin 4.154, Vin 4.218, Vin 4.231 meaning a complete Order.

for all together is allowed by the Lord. Now, how far does 'being all together'¹ (go)? As far as one residence, or the whole earth?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"I allow, monks, 'being all together' (to mean) as far as one residence."

THE STORY OF MAHĀKAPPINA

Now at that time the venerable Kappina the Great² was staying near Rājagaha at Maddakucchi in the deer-park. Then as the venerable Kappina the Great was meditating in seclusion a reasoning arose in his mind thus: "Should I go to an Observance or should I not go, should I go to a (formal) act of the Order or should I not go, I, nevertheless, am purified with the highest purification."

Then the Lord, knowing by mind the reasoning in the mind of the venerable Kappina the Great, as a strong man might stretch out his bent arm or might bend back his outstretched arm, even so did he, vanishing from Mount Vulture Peak appear in Maddakucchi in the deer-park before the venerable Kappina the Great. The Lord sat down on an appointed seat, and the venerable Kappina the Great, having greeted the Lord, sat down at a respectful distance.

As the venerable Kappina the Great was sitting down at a respectful distance the Lord spoke thus to him: "Now, Kappina, as you were meditating in seclusion did not a reasoning arise in your mind thus: 'Should I go to an Observance or should I not go, should I go to a (formal) act of the Order or should I not go, I, nevertheless, am purified with the highest purification?'"

"Yes, Lord."

¹ *sāmaggī*. ² At AN.i.25 called chief of the exhorters of monks. Verses at Thag 547-Thag 556. See *Psalms of the Bretheren* p.254ff., and N.B. that on BD 4.256 "taught the sisters" (or nuns) should read "taught the brethren" (or monks), as noticed at *Psalms of the Bretheren* p.417. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* ii.475, article: Mahākappina, should be corrected accordingly. See *Sakya*, p.140ff., for MRS. RHYS DAVIDS' suggestion that Kappina was Assaji's teacher.

“But if you brahmins¹ do not reverence, revere, esteem, honour the Observance, who is there who will reverence, revere, esteem, honour the Observance? You go along, brahmin, to the Observance, do not not go; go likewise to a (formal) act of the Order, do not not go.”

“Yes, Lord,” the venerable Kappina the Great answered the Lord in assent.

Then the Lord, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted the venerable Kappina the Great with talk on *dhamma*, as a strong man might stretch out his bent arm or bend back his outstretched arm, even so did he, vanishing from before the venerable Kappina the Great in Maddakucchi in the deer-park appear on Mount Vulture Peak.

PERMISSION FOR A BOUNDARY

Then it occurred to the monks: “It is laid down by the Lord that ‘being all together’ (means) as far as one residence. Now, how far does one residence (go)?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to agree upon a boundary. And thus, monks, should it be agreed upon: First, marks should be announced,² a mark consisting of a hillside, a mark consisting of a rock, a mark consisting of a grove, a mark consisting of a tree, a mark consisting of a road, a mark consisting of an anthill, a mark consisting of a river, a mark consisting of (a piece of) water. The Order, having announced the marks, should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. In as much as marks all round are announced, if it seems right to the Order the Order may agree upon a boundary in accordance with these marks for the same communion for one Observance. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. In as much as marks all round are announced, the Order is agreeing upon a boundary in accordance

¹ *Brahmin* probably being used here in its Buddhist sense of “best, highest”. Kappina was older than Gotama. ² *nimittā kittetabbā*.

with these marks for the same communion, for one Observance. If the agreement upon a boundary in accordance with these marks for the same communion, for one Observance, is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The boundary in accordance with these marks is agreed upon by the Order for the same communion, for one Observance. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent; thus do I understand this’.”

d2.7.1 Now at that time the group of six monks, thinking: “An agreement upon a boundary is allowed by the Lord,” agreed upon very extensive boundaries, of four *yojanas* and five *yojanas* and six *yojanas*. Monks coming for Observance arrived while the Pātimokkha was being recited, and they arrived just after it had been recited, and they stayed (a night) on the way. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, a very extensive boundary should not be agreed upon, of four *yojanas* or five *yojanas* or six *yojanas*. Whoever should (so) agree, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to agree upon a boundary of three *yojanas* at most.”¹

l2.7.2 Now at that time the group of six monks agreed upon the other side of a river as a boundary. Monks coming for Observance were carried away and their bowls were carried away and their robes were carried away. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, the other side of a river should not be agreed upon as a boundary. Whoever should (so) agree, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, when there may be a reliable boat”²

¹ According to Vin-a 1046 this means that having established the middle of the proposed residence, the boundary should not be more than one and a half *yojanas* from it in each direction. A triangle may be agreed upon, three *yojanas* from corner to corner. ² *dhuvanāvā*. Vin-a 1046 gives various possibilities, one of which is a boat which plies regularly at the fords.

or a reliable bridge¹ to agree upon the other side of such a river as a boundary.”

ON AN OBSERVANCE HALL

Now at that time monks recited the Pātimokkha in successive cells without (making) a rendezvous.² In-coming monks did not know or they thought, “Where will the Observance be carried out today?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, the Pātimokkha should not be recited in successive cells without (making) a rendezvous. Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to carry out the Observance having agreed upon an Observance-hall that the Order desires: a dwelling-place or a curved house or a long house or a mansion or a cave.³ And thus, monks, should it be agreed upon:

“The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon such and such a dwelling-place as an Observance-hall. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is agreeing upon such and such a dwelling-place as an Observance-hall. If the agreement upon such and such a dwelling-place as an Observance-hall is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. Such and such a dwelling-place as an Observance-hall is agreed upon by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent; thus do I understand this’.”

¹ *dhuvasetu*. Vin-a 1047 says “made of a collection of trees or boards joined together or a bridge where a caravan can go or what is suitable for the crossing over of elephants and horses is a large bridge; or a ‘reliable bridge’ means having even at that moment cut down a tree, a bridge that is suitable for people to cross over by one at a time. But it is not a ‘reliable bridge’ if it is not possible to cross by holding the jungle-rope and creepers twined above it”. ² On *samketa* see BD 1.74, BD 1.88, BD 1.128, BD 1.135, BD 2.164, BD 2.239 (and n. 3), BD 2.291, BD 2.294. ³ Cf. above, Kd 1.30.4 (and notes) and Vin 1.284.

4.140 Now at that time in a certain residence two Observance-halls came to be agreed upon. Monks assembled together in both thinking: “Observance will be carried out here,” “Observance will be carried out here.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

2.8.4 **“Monks, two Observance-halls in one residence should not be agreed upon. Whoever should (so) agree, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, having abolished¹ one, to carry out the Observance in one place (only).

“And thus, monks, should it be abolished: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may abolish such and such an Observance-hall. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is abolishing such and such an Observance-hall. If the abolition of such and such an Observance-hall is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. Such and such an Observance-hall is abolished by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent; thus do I understand this’.”

ON A MAXIMUM FOR OBSERVANCE

1.29.1 Now at that time in a certain residence a very small Observance-hall came to be agreed upon. A large Order of monks came to be assembled together on an Observance-day. Monks, sitting on ground that had not been agreed upon, heard the Pātimokkha. Then it occurred to these monks: “It is laid down by the Lord that the Observance is to be carried out having agreed upon an Observance-hall, but we heard the Pātimokkha while we were sitting on ground that was not agreed upon. Now was the Observance carried out for us or was it not carried out?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, if one is sitting on the ground, whether it has been agreed

¹ Vin-a 1039 explains this to mean “having abolished one of the proclamations”, i.e. having rescinded one of the agreements so that one of the places already agreed upon as an Observance-hall is no longer regarded in this light.

upon or not agreed upon, and hears the Pātimokkha from there, the Observance is carried out for him.

“Well, monks, if an Order desires a maximum for Observance¹ of a certain size let it agree upon a maximum for Observance of that size. And thus, monks, should it be agreed upon: First, marks should be announced. The Order, having announced the marks, should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. In as much as marks all round are announced, if it seems right to the Order the Order may agree upon a maximum for Observance in accordance with these marks. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. In as much as marks all round are announced, the Order is agreeing upon the maximum for Observance in accordance with these marks. If the agreement upon a maximum for Observance in accordance with these marks is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The maximum for Observance is agreed upon by the Order in accordance with these marks. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent; thus do I understand this’.”

Now at that time in a certain residence newly ordained monks,² being the first to have assembled together on an Observance day, saying: “The elders are not coming yet,” went away. The Observance was not at a right time.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow, monks, on an Observance day monks who are elders to assemble together first.”

¹ *uposathapamukhaṃ*. Not noticed in *Pali-English Dictionary*. It must refer to the size of a site for hearing the Observance by a maximum number of monks of which an Order might consist. ² These *navakā bhikkhū* were only “newly ordained” or junior in comparison with the *majjhimā bhikkhū*, those of middle standing and ordained for as long as five years, and with the *theras*, elders, ordained for as many as ten years. A monk is called *navaka* or *nava* for the first four years of his religious life after the date of his ordination. ³ I.e. not on the fourteenth or fifteenth day of a half-month.

Now at that time in Rājagaha several residences came to have the same boundary. Monks quarrelled about this, saying: “Let the Observance be carried out in our residence,” “Let the Observance be carried out in our residence.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“This is a case, monks, where several residences come to have the same boundary. Monks quarrel about this, saying: ‘Let the Observance be carried out in our residence’, ‘Let the Observance be carried out in our residence’. Monks those monks, one and all,¹ having assembled together in one place, should carry out the Observance, or, having assembled together they should carry out the Observance there where a monk who is an elder is staying. **But the Observance should not be carried out by an incomplete Order.**² **Whoever should (so) carry it out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

PERMISSION FOR A “NOT SEPARATED” BOUNDARY

Now at one time the venerable Kassapa the Great, going from Andhakavinda³ to Rājagaha for Observance and crossing a river⁴ on the way, was nearly⁵ carried away, and his robes got wet. Monks spoke thus to the venerable Kassapa the Great: “Why are your robes wet, your reverence?”

“Now I, your reverences, coming from Andhakavinda to Rājagaha for the Observance and crossing a river on the way, was nearly carried away. Because of this my robes are wet.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Whatever boundary, monks, is agreed upon by an Order for the same communion, for one Observance, let the Order agree (to regard)

¹ *sabbeḥ’eva*. ² *na tv eva vaggena saṅghena*, as below, **Kd 2.22.2**; **Kd 2.23.2** and subsequently. On *vagga*, see **BD 2.269, n.10**. ³ According to Vin-a 1049 Andhakavinda was at least a *gāvuta* from Rājagaha. Around Rājagaha were eighteen large *vihāras* having the same boundary, but the “being all together” of an Order took place in the Bamboo Grove. ⁴ Vin-a 1049 says the Sappinī (Sippinī), which they say rises in Mt. Vulture Peak, and because it flows quickly so near its source that is why the elder was nearly carried away. ⁵ *manam*, also at Ja i.149, Dh-p a iii.147.

that boundary (as a place where a monk is) not away, separated from the three robes.¹

“And thus, monks, should it be agreed upon: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Whatever boundary was agreed upon by the Order for the same communion, for one Observance, if it seems right to the Order the Order may agree (to regard) that boundary (as a place where a monk is) not away, separated from the three robes. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Whatever boundary was agreed upon by the Order for the same communion, for one Observance the Order is agreeing (to regard) that boundary (as a place where a monk is) not away, separated from the three robes. If the agreement (to regard) this boundary (as a place where a monk is) not away, separated from the three robes is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. This boundary is agreed upon the by Order (to be regarded as a place where a monk is) not away, separated from the three robes. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent; thus do I understand this’.”

Now at that time monks, thinking: “An agreement (for a monk to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes is allowed by the Lord,” laid aside robes in a house.² These robes were lost and burnt and eaten by rats. The monks became badly dressed, their robes worn thin. Monks spoke thus: “Why are you, your reverences, badly dressed, your robes worn thin?”

“Now we, your reverences, thinking: ‘An agreement (for a monk to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes is allowed

¹ *ticivarena avippavāsa*. Cf. **Bu-NP 2** where a monk incurs an offence if he is away from the three robes even for one night unless he has obtained the agreement of the monks. But one who is ill may obtain an agreement to be regarded as not separated from his robes, although in fact he is. The above ruling is to the same effect. See **BD 2.14, n.** ² In **Bu-NP 29** monks, if staying in jungle lodgings are allowed to lay aside one of their three robes in a house. But, except with the agreement of the monks, they must not be away from their robes for more than six nights.

by the Lord,' laid aside robes in a house. These robes have been lost and burnt and eaten by rats. That is why we are badly dressed, our robes worn thin." They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Whatever boundary, monks, is agreed upon by an Order for the same communion, for one Observance, let the Order agree (to regard) that boundary (as a place where a monk is) not away, separated from the three robes, except it be a village and the precincts of a village.¹

"And thus, monks, should it be agreed upon²: ... '... thus do I understand this'.

ABOLISHING A BOUNDARY

"When agreeing upon a boundary, monks, first the boundary for the same communion should be agreed upon, afterwards the (place where a monk is regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes should be agreed upon. In abolishing a boundary, monks, first the (place where a monk is regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes should be abolished, afterwards the boundary for the same communion should be abolished. And thus, monks, should the (place where the monk is regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes be abolished: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Whatever was agreed upon by the Order (as a place where a monk is to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes, if it seems right to the Order, the Order may abolish that (place where a monk is to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Whatever was agreed upon by the Order (as a place where a monk is to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes, the Order is abolishing (that place where a monk is to be regarded)

¹ Defined at [Vin 3.46](#); see [BD 1.74, n. 2](#). "Village having one precinct" defined at [Vin 3.200](#), see [BD 2.17](#) and note [Vin-a 1051](#) says that the above ruling is not for nuns because they live in a village; see also [Vinaya Texts i.256, n.1](#). ² The same as [Kd 2.12.2](#) above, but after the words "away, separated from the three robes" add "except it be a village and the precincts of a village."

as not away, separated from the three robes. If the abolition of (the place where a monk is to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. That (place where a monk is to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes is abolished by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent; thus do I understand this’.

“And thus, monks, should a boundary for the same communion¹ be abolished: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Whatever boundary has been agreed upon by the Order for the same communion, for one Observance, if it seems right to the Order, the Order may abolish that boundary. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Whatever boundary has been agreed upon by the Order for the same communion, for one Observance, the Order is abolishing that boundary. If the abolition of that boundary for the same communion, for one Observance is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. That boundary for the same communion, for one Observance is abolished by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent; thus do I understand this’.

A VILLAGE BOUNDARY, ETC.

“Monks, when a boundary is not agreed upon, not established, whatever village or little town² (a monk) lives depending on, whatever is the village boundary of that village or the little town boundary of that little town, this in that case is (the boundary) for the same communion, for one Observance. If, monks, he is in what is not a village, in a jungle,³ in this case the same communion, one Observance, is seven *abbhantaras*⁴ all round. No river, monks, is a boundary, no

¹ “For the same communion” omitted in Oldenberg’s text, but included in the Ceylon edition. ² *nigama*, see **BD 2.63, n. 2.** ³ “Jungle” defined at **BD 1.74, BD 1.85.** ⁴ See **BD 2, Introduction, p.1.**

sea is a boundary, no natural lake is a boundary. Where there is a river, monks, or a sea or a natural lake, that which in this case is (the boundary) for the same communion, one Observance, is the distance that a man of average (height) can throw water all round.”

2.13.1 Now at that time the group of six monks combined boundary with boundary.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, those for whom a boundary was agreed upon first, that (formal) act of theirs is legitimate, it is irreversible, fit to stand.² Monks, those for whom a boundary was agreed upon afterwards, that (formal) act of theirs is not legitimate, it is reversible, not fit to stand. **Monks, boundary should not be combined with boundary. Whoever should (so) combine, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

2.13.2 Now at that time the group of six monks placed boundary within boundary.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, those for whom a boundary was agreed upon first, that (formal) act of theirs is legitimate, it is irreversible fit to stand. Monks, those for whom a boundary was agreed upon afterwards, that (formal) act of theirs is not legitimate it is reversible, not fit to stand. **Monks, a boundary should not be placed within a boundary. Whoever should (so) place within, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, when a boundary is being agreed upon, having left an interspace between boundaries,⁴ to agree upon a boundary.”

INCOMPLETE OBSERVANCE, ETC.

2.14.1 Then it occurred to monks: “Now, how many Observance days are there?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, there are these two Observance days, the fourteenth and the fifteenth. These, monks, are the two Observance days.”

2.14.2 Then it occurred to monks: “Now, how many (formal) acts for

¹ *sīmāya sīmaṃ sambhindanti.* ² Cf. **BD 3.161 (Vin 4.214,)** and **Vin 1.313, Vin 1.316f.** The last two, *akuppa* and *ṭhānāraha*, are defined at Vb-a 330. ³ *sīmāya sīmaṃ ajjhottharanti.* ⁴ *sīmantarika.* This may be quite small: a *hattha* (on which see **BD 2, Introduction, p.li.**) according to Vin-a 1056; a span or four finger-breadths according to the two Sinhalese commentaries cited at Vin-a 1056.

Observance are there?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, there are these four (formal) acts for Observance: a (formal) act for Observance (carried out) not by rule when an Order is incomplete¹; a (formal) act for Observance (carried out) not by rule when an Order is complete; a (formal) act for Observance (carried out) by rule when an Order is incomplete; a (formal) act for Observance (carried out) by rule when an Order is complete. Now, monks, that which is a (formal) act for Observance carried out not by rule when an Order is incomplete, such a (formal) act for Observance, monks, should not be carried out, nor is such a (formal) act for Observance allowed by me.

“Then, monks, that which is a (formal) act for Observance (carried out) not by rule when an Order is complete, such a (formal) act for Observance, monks, should not be carried out nor is such a (formal) act for Observance allowed by me. Then, monks, that which is a (formal) act for Observance (carried out) by rule when an Order is incomplete, such a (formal) act for Observance should not be carried out nor is such a (formal) act for Observance allowed by me. Then, monks, that which is a (formal) act for Observance (carried out) by rule when an Order is complete, such a (formal) act for Observance, monks, may be carried out and such a (formal) act for Observance is allowed by me. Therefore, monks, thinking: ‘We will carry out a (formal) act for Observance like this, that is to say by rule when an Order is complete’ — thus you should train yourselves, monks.”

RECITING THE PĀTIMOKKHA IN BRIEF, ETC.

Then it occurred to monks: “Now, how many ways for the recital of the Pātimokkha are there?”. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, there are these five (ways for the) recital of the Pātimokkha: having recited the provenance,² the rest may be announced as though

¹ *adhammena vaggam*; cf. Vin 4.37, Vin 4.126, Vin 4.152, Vin 4.153, *adhammena vā vaggena vā*. See Kd 9.3 for elucidations of “not by rule” and “by rule”, and of “incomplete” and “complete assemblies”. ² *nidāna*, see above, BD 4.127.

it had been (already) heard¹; this is the first (way for the) recital of the Pātimokkha. Having recited the provenance, having recited the four offences involving defeat, the rest may be announced as though it had been (already) heard; this is the second (way for the) recital of the Pātimokkha. Having recited the provenance, having recited the four offences involving defeat, having recited the thirteen offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the rest may be announced as though it had been (already) heard; this is the third (way for the) recital of the Pātimokkha. Having recited the provenance, having recited the four offences involving defeat, having recited the thirteen offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, having recited the two undetermined offences, the rest may be announced as though it had been (already) heard; this is the fourth (way for the) recital of the Pātimokkha. (Recital) in full is the fifth. Monks, these are the five (ways for the) recital of the Pātimokkha.”

Now, at that time, monks, thinking: “Recital of the Pātimokkha in brief is allowed by the Lord,” all the time recited the Pātimokkha in brief. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, the Pātimokkha should not be recited in brief. Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time in a certain residence in the Kosala country there came to be a menace from savages² on an Observance day. The monks were unable to recite the Pātimokkha in full. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, if there is a danger, to recite the Pātimokkha in brief.”

Now at that time the group of six monks, although there was no danger, recited the Pātimokkha in brief. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, if there is no danger the Pātimokkha should not be recited in brief. Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, if there is a danger, to recite the Pātimokkha in brief. In this connection these are

¹ *avasesaṃ sutena sāvetaḥham.* ² *savara-bhaya*; cf. **Vin 1.168**. Vin-a 1057 reads *sañcarabhaya*.

dangers: a danger from kings,¹ a danger from thieves, a danger from fire, a danger from water, a danger from human beings, a danger from non-human beings, a danger from beasts of prey, a danger from creeping things, a danger to life, a danger to the Brahma-faring.² I allow you, monks, when there are dangers such as these, to recite the Pātimokkha in brief; in full if there is no danger.”

ON QUESTIONING REGARDING VINAYA

Now at that time the group of six monks, unbidden,³ spoke *dhamma* in the midst of an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, *dhamma* should not be spoken, by one who is not bidden (to do so), in the midst of an Order.⁴ Whoever should (so) speak it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to speak *dhamma* by means of a monk who is himself an elder, or (for him) to bid another (to speak it).”⁵

Now at that time the group of six monks, (although) not agreed upon asked about discipline in the midst of an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, discipline should not be asked about, by one not agreed upon, in the midst of an Order. Whoever should (so) ask, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to ask about discipline, by means of one who is agreed upon, in the midst of an Order. And thus, monks, may he be agreed upon:

¹ Same list again at [Vin 1.169](#), [Vin 2.244](#). Cf. also [Vin 1.148–Vin.1.149](#). See also list of seven dangers at [Divyāvadāna 544](#). ² On *brahmācariya*, see MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Wayfarer’s Words* ii.533, “A Technical Term”, where she regards it as a term taken over from the brahmins who used it to denote the student-day stage in their training.

³ By the elders. [Vin-a 1058](#). ⁴ *na bhikkhave saṅghamajjhe anajjhīṭṭhena dhammo bhāsitaṭṭho*. These cases probably mean that *dhamma* is not to be spoken or *vinaya* asked about (by one not qualified to do so) in the midst of an Order. They probably do not mean that one not bidden or not agreed upon in the midst of an Order might not speak or ask questions. ⁵ Cf. [AN iv.153](#) where if a monk “speaks *dhamma* himself or bids another (to do so)” it is one of the eight reasons for his development in the Brahma-faring.

either oneself may be agreed upon by oneself, or another may be agreed upon by another.¹

And how may oneself be agreed upon by oneself? The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, I could ask so and so about discipline’. Thus may oneself be agreed upon by oneself. And how may another be agreed upon by another? The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, so and so could ask so and so about discipline’. Thus may another be agreed upon by another.”

Now at that time well behaved monks who were agreed upon asked about discipline in the midst of the Order. The group of six monks took offence, they took umbrage, they threatened them with harm.² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to ask about discipline in the midst of the Order by means of one who is agreed upon, although³ having (first) looked round the assembly, having assessed⁴ (each) individual.”⁵

ON ANSWERING REGARDING VINAYA

Now at that time the group of six monks (although) not agreed upon answered questions on discipline in the midst of the Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, questions on discipline should not be answered in the midst of the Order by one not agreed upon. Whoever should (so) answer, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to answer questions in the midst of the Order by means of one who is agreed upon. And thus, monks,

¹ Cf. above, [BD 4.121](#), below, [BD 4.150](#). ² *vadhena*, also meaning with slaughter, with destruction. ³ *pi*. ⁴ *tulayitvā*, literally having weighed. Cf. *tulayitabbam* at [Vin 4.142](#). Vin-a 1059 says the one who is asking, having looked round the assembly, may ask about discipline if there is no risk for himself. ⁵ This allowance is an elaboration of that given in [Kd 2.15.6](#). This still holds good, but the above safeguard is added.

may he be agreed upon: either oneself may be agreed upon by oneself, or another may be agreed upon by another.

And how may oneself be agreed upon by oneself? The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, I, asked about discipline by so and so, could answer.’ Thus may oneself be agreed upon by oneself. And how may another be agreed upon by another? The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, so and so, asked about discipline by so and so, could answer.’ Thus may another be agreed upon by another.”

Kd 2.15

Vin 1.11

Now at that time well behaved monks who were agreed upon answered questions on discipline in the midst of the Order. The group of six monks took offence, they took umbrage, they threatened them with harm. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to answer questions on discipline in the midst of the Order by means of one who is agreed upon, although having (first) looked round the assembly, having assessed (each) individual.”

Kd 2.15

ON REPROVING

Now at that time the group of six monks reprovved, on account of an offence, a monk who had not given (them) leave.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, a monk who has not given leave should not be reprovved on account of an offence. Whoever should (so) reprove, there is an offence of wrong-dong.** I allow you, monks, having obtained leave by saying: ‘Let the venerable one give me leave, I want to speak to you to reprove him on account of an offence.’”

Kd 2.16

¹ *anokāsakata*, “to make an occasion”, to give, to grant leave; *okāsam kārāpeti*, to make to give, thus to obtain leave. Cf. [Vin 4.344](#) where nuns must not question monks unless they have obtained their leave to do so, and where *anokāsakata* is defined by *anāpucchā*, without having asked (for permission).

2.16.2
4.151
Now at that time well-behaved monks, having obtained the leave of the group of six monks, reproved them on account of an offence. The group of six months took offence, they took umbrage, they threatened them with harm. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, even if leave is given, to reprove for an offence after you have assessed the individual."

2.16.3
Now at that time the group of six monks, thinking: "Before¹ well-behaved monks obtain our leave," themselves obtained the pure monks' leave beforehand,² but there was no ground, no reason, since they were not offenders³. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, leave should not be obtained from pure monks when there is no ground, no reason, since they are not offenders. Whoever should (so) obtain it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to obtain leave after you have assessed the individuals."

PROTESTING AN ACT THAT IS NOT THE RULE, ETC.

2.16.4
1.115
Now at that time the group of six monks carried out a (formal) act that was not legally valid in the midst of an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, a (formal) act that is not legally valid should not be carried out in the midst of the Order. Whoever should (so) carry one out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**" Even so, they carried out a (formal) act that was not legally valid. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to protest⁴ when a (formal) act that is not legally valid is being carried out."

2.16.5
Now at that time well-behaved monks protested when a (formal)

¹ pure = paṭhamam, Vin-a 1059. Cf. Kd 4.16.3. ² paṭigacc'eva = paṭhamataram, Vin-a 1059. ³ anāpattika. ⁴ paṭikkosituṃ. Cf. BD 3.58.

act that was not legally valid was being carried out by the group of six monks. The group of six monks took offence, they took umbrage, they threatened them with harm. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, merely to express an opinion." They expressed an opinion to these themselves. The group of six monks took offence, they took umbrage, they threatened them with harm. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, when there are four or five, to protest, when there are two or three to express an opinion, when there is one, to determine: 'I do not approve of this'."

Now at that time the group of six monks, when the Pātimokkha was being recited in the midst of the Order, intentionally did not hear. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, a reciter of the Pātimokkha should not intentionally not be heard. Whoever should not hear, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**"

REQUESTING THE RECITING OF THE PĀTIMOKKHA, ETC.

Now at that time the venerable Udāyin came to be reciter of the Pātimokkha for an Order, but his voice was like a crow's. Then it occurred to the venerable Udāyin: "It is laid down by the Lord that a reciter of the Pātimokkha should be heard, but my voice is like a crow's. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow, monks, the one who is the reciter of the Pātimokkha to exert himself, thinking: 'How can I be heard? 'There is no offence for one who exerts himself.'"

Now at that time Devadatta recited the Pātimokkha before an assembly that contained laymen. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, the Pātimokkha should not be recited before an assembly that contains laymen. Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**"

Now at that time the group of six monks, unbidden, recited the Pātimokkha in the midst of an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, the Pātimokkha should not be recited in the midst of an Order by one who is not bidden (to do so). Whoever (such) should recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow, monks, that the Pātimokkha be in charge of an elder.**”¹

Told is the Portion for Repeating on Members of Other Sects

ALLOWANCE TO LEARN THE COUNTING OF THE FORTNIGHTS, ETC.

Then the Lord, having stayed in Rājagaha for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Codanāvattu. In due course, walking on a tour, he arrived in Codanāvattu. Now at that time several monks were staying in a certain residence; the monk who there was the elder was ignorant, inexperienced, he did not know the Observance or a (formal) act for Observance or the Pātimokkha or the recital of the Pātimokkha.

Then it occurred to these monks: “It is laid down by the Lord that the Pātimokkha be in charge of an elder, but this elder of ours is ignorant, inexperienced, he does not know the Observance ... or the recital of the Pātimokkha. Now what line of conduct should be followed by us?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, the Pātimokkha to be discharged² by whoever there is an experienced, competent monk.”

Now at that time several ignorant, inexperienced monks were staying in a certain residence on an Observance day. These did not

¹ *therādhikam Pātimokkham*. Vin-a 1059 says that the elder should recite it himself or call upon another to do so. Cf. the ruling which arose from speaking *dhamma* unbidden, above, **BD 4.148**. ² *tassādheyyam Pātimokkham*. *Ādheyya* means “to be appropriated”.

know the Observance or a (formal) act for Observance or the Pātimokkha or the recital of the Pātimokkha. These called upon an elder, saying: “Honoured sir, let the elder recite the Pātimokkha.” He spoke thus: “Your reverences, I am not able to do so¹.” They called upon a second elder ... He also spoke thus: ... They called upon a third elder ... In this way they called upon (all the monks) down to the most newly ordained in the Order, saying: “Let the venerable one recite the Pātimokkha.” He also spoke thus: “Honoured sirs, I am not able to do so.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“This is a case, monks, where several ignorant, inexperienced monks are staying in a certain residence ...² ... ‘Honoured sirs, I am not able to do so’. Monks, one monk should immediately be sent to a neighbouring residence by these monks, saying: ‘Do go, your reverence; having mastered the Pātimokkha in brief or in full, come back’.”

Then it occurred to monks: “Now, by whom should he be sent?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to enjoin a newly ordained monk through a monk who is an elder.” Newly ordained monks, (although) enjoined by an elder, did not go. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, one who is not ill should not not go when enjoined by an elder. Whoever should not go, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Then the Lord, having stayed at Codanāvattu for as long as he found suiting, returned again to Rājagaha. Now at that time people asked the monks as they were walking for almsfood: “Which (day) of the half-month is it, honoured sirs?” The monks spoke thus: “We, sirs, do not know.” The people ... spread it about, saying: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, do not even know the calculation³ of the half-months, so how can they know anything else that is good?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, you, monks, to learn the calculation of the half-months.”

¹ *na me vattati*, it is not for me. ² As in [Kd 2.17.3](#) above, but told in the present tense. ³ *gaṇanā*, see [BD 2.176, n. 5](#).

Then it occurred to monks: “Now by whom should the calculation of the half-months be learnt?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, one and all¹ to learn the calculation of the half-months.”

2.18.3 Now at that time people asked the monks as they were walking for almsfood: “How many monks are there, honoured sirs?” The monks spoke thus: “We, sirs, do not know.” The people ... spread it about, saying: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, do not even know one another, so how can they know anything else that is good?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to count the monks.”

2.18.4 Then it occurred to monks: “Now, how should the monks be counted?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, on an Observance day to count by way of groups² or to take (a count) by ticket³.”

2.19.1 Now at that time monks, not knowing, “Today is an Observance day,” walked to a distant village for almsfood. Not only did these come back while the Pātimokkha was being recited, but they came back just after it had been recited. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to announce, ‘Today is an Observance day’.”

4.15.5 Then it occurred to monks: “Now, by whom should it be announced?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to announce it in good time through a monk who is an elder.” Now at that time a certain elder did not remember in good time. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to announce it even at meal-time.” He did not remember even at mealtime. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to announce it at whatever time he⁴ remembers.”

¹ *sabbeh’eva.* ² *gaṇamaggena gaṇetuṃ.* ³ *salākaṃ gaḥetuṃ.* ⁴ I.e. the elder.

ALLOWANCE FOR PRELIMINARY DUTIES

Now at that time the Observance-hall in a certain residence came to be soiled. Incoming monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can these monks not sweep the Observance-hall?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to sweep the Observance-hall."

Then it occurred to monks: "Now, by whom should an Observance-hall be swept?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to enjoin a newly ordained monk through a monk who is an elder." Newly ordained monks, (although) enjoined by an elder, did not sweep. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, one who is not ill should not not sweep when enjoined by an elder. Whoever should not sweep, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**"

Now at that time a seat was not prepared in an Observance-hall. Monks sat on the ground. Their limbs and robes became covered with dust. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to prepare a seat in the Observance-hall." Then it occurred to monks: "Now, by whom should a seat in the Observance-hall be prepared?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to enjoin a newly ordained monk through a monk who is an elder." Newly ordained monks, (although) enjoined by an elder, did not prepare (a seat). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, one who is not ill should not not prepare (a seat) when enjoined by an elder. Whoever should not prepare (a seat), there is an offence of wrong doing.**"

Now at that time there came to be no light in an Observance-hall. Monks trod on (one another's) bodies and robes in the dark. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to make a light¹ in an Observance-hall." Then it occurred to monks: "Now, by whom is the light to be made in an Observance-hall?" They told this

¹ *padīpaṃ kātuṃ.*

matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to enjoin a newly ordained monk through a monk who is an elder." Newly ordained monks, (although) enjoined by an elder, did not light a lamp.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, one who is not ill should not not light a lamp when enjoined by an elder. Whoever should not light a lamp, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**"

At that time in a certain residence resident monks neither set out drinking water nor did they set out water for washing. Incoming monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can these resident monks neither set out drinking water nor set out water for washing?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to set out drinking water and water for washing."

Then it occurred to monks: "Now, by whom should drinking water and water for washing be set out?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to enjoin a newly ordained monk through a monk who is an elder." Newly ordained monks, (although) enjoined by an elder, did not set out (the water). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, one who is not ill should not not set out (water) when enjoined by an elder. Whoever should not set it out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**"

THE STORY OF THOSE TRAVELLING TO DISTANT PARTS, ETC.

Now at that time ignorant inexperienced monks, travelling to distant parts,² did not ask teachers and preceptors (for permission). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "This is a case, monks, where several ignorant inexperienced monks, travelling to distant parts, do not ask teachers and preceptors (for permission). Monks, they should be asked by these teachers and preceptors: 'Where will you go? With whom will you go?' **If, monks, these ignorant experi-**

¹ *padīpeti*, to light up, to light a lamp. ² *disaṃgamikā*; cf. Vin 1.263; and Kd 1.25.24 where those who share cells may not leave the district (*disā*) without asking the preceptors for permission.

enced ones should cite other ignorant inexperienced ones, then, monks, they should not be allowed to go by the teachers and preceptors. If they should allow them (to go), there is an offence of wrong-doing. And if, monks, these ignorant inexperienced ones should go (although) not allowed by¹ the teachers and preceptors, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

“This is a case, monks, where several ignorant inexperienced monks are staying in a certain residence on an Observance day. These do not know the Observance or a (formal) act for Observance or the Pātimokkha or the recital of the Pātimokkha. A certain monk arrives there. He has heard much, he is one to whom the tradition has been handed down,² he is an expert on *dhamma*, an expert on discipline, an expert on the summaries³; he is wise, experienced, clever; he is conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training. Monks, that monk should be furthered⁴ by those monks, he should be helped,⁵ he should be encouraged,⁶ he should be supported⁷ in regard to chunam, clay, tooth-wood, water for washing the face. If he should not be furthered, helped, encouraged, supported in regard to chunam, clay, tooth-wood, water for washing the face, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

“This is a case, monks, where several ignorant, inexperienced monks are staying in a certain residence on an Observance-day. These do not know the Observance ... or the recital of the Pātimokkha. Monks, one monk should immediately be sent to a neighbouring residence by these monks, saying: ‘Do go, your reverence, having mastered the Pātimokkha in brief or in full, come back’. If he thus manages this, it is good. If he does not manage it, then, monks, those monks, one and all, should go to a residence where they know the

¹ *anānuññatā*, defined at Vin 4.335 as *anāpucchā*, not asking (for permission). Permission has to be asked for before it can be given. ² *āgatāgama*. See BD 3.71, n. 1.

³ Cf. AN i.117, AN ii.147, AN iii.179f. ⁴ *saṃgahetabbo*. This word is used with the next (*anuggahetabbo*) above, BD 4.67. ⁵ *anuggahetabbo*. See definition of *anuggaṇheyya* at Vin 4.325 (BD 3.376). The word occurs above, BD 4.67. ⁶ *upalāpetabbo*. Cf. definition of *upalāpeyya* at Vin 4.140 (BD 3.34). ⁷ *upaṭṭhāpetabbo*. Cf. definition of *upaṭṭhāpeyya* at Vin 4.140 (BD 3.34).

1.120
2.21.4
Observance ... or the recital of the Pātimokkha. If they should not go, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

This is a case, monks, where several ignorant, inexperienced monks are spending the rains in a certain residence. These do not know ... (as above in **Kd 2.21.4**) ... If he thus manages this, it is good. If he does not manage it, then, monks, one monk should be sent off for seven days (with the words): ‘Do go, your reverence, having mastered the Pātimokkha in brief or in full, come back’. If he thus manages this, it is good. **If he does not manage it, then, monks, these monks should not spend the rains in that residence. If they should spend them (there), there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

ON GIVING ENTIRE PURITY

2.22.1
4.159
2.22.2
Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Gather together, monks, the Order will carry out the Observance.” When he had spoken thus, a certain monk spoke thus to the Lord: “There is, Lord, a monk who is ill. He has not come.” He said: “I allow you, monks, to declare¹ entire purity² on behalf of a monk who is ill. And thus, monks, should it be declared: That ill monk, having approached one monk, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to him: ‘I will declare entire purity; convey entire purity for me, announce entire purity for me.’ If he makes it understood by gesture, if he makes it understood by voice, if he makes it understood by gesture and voice, the entire purity comes to be declared. If he does not make it understood by gesture, if he does not make it understood by voice, if he does not make it understood by gesture and voice, the entire purity does not come to be declared.

“If he thus manages this, it is good; if he does not manage it, then,

¹ *dātuṃ*, literally to give. Cf. *chandam dātuṃ* at **Vin 4.151** (**BD 3.58**) and below, **BD 4.161**.

² *pārisuddhi*, cf. above, **BD 4.132**. It means that the ill monk believes that he has committed none of the offences specified in the Pātimokkha, or that, if he has, he has confessed them, so that in regard to them he is pure.

monks, that ill monk, having been brought to the midst of the Order on a couch or a chair, the Observance may be carried out. If, monks, it occurs to the monks who are tending the ill one: ‘If we move the ill one from (this) place, either the disease will grow much worse or he will die’¹, monks, the ill one should not be moved from (that) place; the Order, having gone there, should carry out the Observance. **The Observance should not be carried out by an incomplete Order.² If it should be (so) carried out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**

“If, monks, the conveyer of the entire purity goes away then and there,³ although the entire purity was declared (to him)⁴, the entire purity should be declared to another. If, monks, the conveyor of the entire purity leaves the Order then and there although the entire purity was declared (to him), if he passes away, if he pretends to be a novice,⁵ if he pretends to be a disavower of the training,⁶ if he pretends to be a committer of an extreme offence,⁷ if he pretends to be mad,⁸ if he pretends to be unhinged,⁹ if he pretends to have bodily pains,¹⁰ if he pretends to be one who is suspended¹¹ for not seeing an offence, if he pretends to be one who is suspended for not making amends for an offence, if he pretends to be one who is suspended for not giving up a wrong view, if he pretends to be a eunuch,¹² if he pretends to be one living in communion as it were by theft,¹³ if he pretends to be one who has gone over to another sect¹⁴, if he pretends

¹ *kālamkiriya bhavissati*, literally there will be a doing of (his) time. ² As above, **Kd 2.11.1**, and several times below. ³ *tatth’eva*. Vin-a 1062, if he goes elsewhere, not to the midst of the Order. ⁴ The one who has undertaken to convey the entire purity shelves his responsibility and does not carry out the message entrusted to him. ⁵ Cf. the following sequence and the three preceding items: going away and leaving the Order and passing away, with **Vin 1.135**, **Vin 1.167–Vin.1.168**, **Vin 1.307**, **Vin 1.320**, **Vin 2.173**. ⁶ See **BD 1.40ff.** At AN v.71 the presence of a “disavower of the training” is given as one of the reasons why the Pātimokkha may be suspended. ⁷ *antimavatthum ajjhāpannako*, meaning a Pārajika offence; cf. **BD 4.180**. ⁸ Reasons for exemption from the penalty for an offence as given in Suttavibhaṅga. ⁹ Reasons for exemption from the penalty for an offence as given in Suttavibhaṅga. ¹⁰ Reasons for exemption from the penalty for an offence as given in Suttavibhaṅga. ¹¹ *ukkhitta*, cf. **BD 3.28**, n. 4. ¹² Not to be ordained, above **BD 4.109**. ¹³ *theyyasamvāsaka*; not to be ordained, cf. above, **BD 4.110**. ¹⁴ *titthiyapakkantaka*; not to be ordained, see above, **BD 4.110**.

to be an animal,¹ if he pretends to be a matricide,² if he pretends to be a parricide,³ if he pretends to be a slayer of one perfected,⁴ if he pretends to be a seducer of a nun,⁵ if he pretends to be a schismatic,⁶ if he pretends to be a shedder of (a Truth-finder's) blood,⁷ if he pretends to be a hermaphrodite,⁸ the entire purity should be declared to another.

“If, monks, the conveyer of the entire purity goes away while he is on the road,⁹ although the entire purity was declared (to him), the entire purity comes to be not conveyed. If, monks, the conveyer of the entire purity leaves the Order while he is on the road, although the entire purity was declared (to him), if he passes away ... if he pretends to be a hermaphrodite, the entire purity comes to be not conveyed. If, monks, the conveyer of the entire purity, after the entire purity was declared (to him), having arrived at the Order, then goes away, the entire purity comes to be conveyed. If, monks, the conveyer of the entire purity, after the entire purity was declared (to him), having arrived at the Order, then leaves the Order, passes away, ... pretends to be a hermaphrodite, the entire purity comes to be conveyed. If, monks, the conveyer of the entire purity, after the entire purity was declared (to him), having arrived at the Order does not announce it because he has fallen asleep, does not announce it because he is indolent, does not announce it because he is attaining (what is higher¹⁰), the entire purity comes to be conveyed; there is no offence for the conveyer of the entire purity. **If, monks, the conveyer of the entire purity, although the entire purity was declared (to him), having arrived at the Order, intentionally does not announce it, the entire purity comes to be conveyed (but) there is an offence of wrong-doing for the conveyer of the entire purity.**”

¹ Not to be ordained, above **BD 4.111**. ² Not to be ordained, above **BD 4.112**. ³ Not to be ordained, above **BD 4.112** ⁴ Not to be ordained, above **BD 4.113**. ⁵ Not to be ordained, above **BD 4.113**. ⁶ Not to be ordained, above **BD 4.113**. ⁷ Not to be ordained, above **BD 4.113**. ⁸ Not to be ordained, above **BD 4.113**. ⁹ While he is on the way to the Order; if he goes elsewhere. ¹⁰ *samāpanno*, a term which has the technical sense of attaining the attainments, *samāpatti*. See **BD 2.177, n. 5, n. 6**.

ON GIVING CONSENT

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Gather together, monks, the Order will carry out a (formal) act.” When he had spoken thus a certain monk spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, there is a monk who is ill; he has not come.” He said: “I allow you, monks, to give the consent¹ for a monk who is ill. And thus, monks, should it be given: That ill monk, having approached one monk, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to him: ‘I will give the consent, convey the consent for me, announce the consent for me’. If he makes it understood by gesture, if he makes it understood by voice, if he makes it understood by gesture and voice, the consent comes to be given. If he does not make it understood by gesture, if he does not make it understood by voice, if he does not make it understood by gesture and voice, the consent does not come to be given.

“If he thus manages this, it is good. If he does not manage it, then, monks, having taken that ill monk to the midst of the Order on a couch or a chair, a (formal) act may be carried out. If, monks, it occurs to the monks who are tending the ill one: ‘If we move the ill one from (this) place, either the disease will grow much worse or he will die’, monks, the ill one should not be moved from (that) place; the Order, having gone there, should carry out the (formal) act. **A (formal) act should not be carried out by an incomplete Order. If it should be (so) carried out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**

“If, monks, the conveyer of the consent goes away then and there although the consent was given (to him), the consent should be given to another. If, monks, the conveyer of the consent leaves the Order then and there, although the consent was given (to him), if he dies ... if he pretends to be a hermaphrodite, the consent should be given to another. If, monks, the conveyer of the consent goes away while he is on the road, although the consent was given to him, the consent

¹ *chandariṃ dātuṃ*, see **BD 3.58**, **BD 3.61**. It is here the ‘consent’ to send leave of absence by proxy.

comes to be not conveyed. **If, monks, the conveyer of the consent leaves the Order while he is on the road ... (as in Kd 2.22.4) ... there is an offence of wrong-doing for the conveyer of the consent.** I allow you, monks, on an Observance day, to give the consent also, by declaring the entire purity; they are the Order's business¹."

ON BEING GRABBED BY RELATIVES

Now at that time his relations got hold of a certain monk on an Observance day. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "This is a case, monks, where his relations get hold of a monk on an Observance day. These relations should be spoken to thus by the monks: 'Please will you, venerable ones,² let go of this monk for a short time³ while this monk carries out the Observance?'

"If they manage this thus, it is good. If they do not manage it, these relations should be spoken to thus by the monks: 'Please will you, venerable ones, stand at a respectful distance for a short time while this monk declares his entire purity?' If they manage this thus, it is good. If they do not manage it, these relations should be spoken to thus by the monks: 'Please will you, venerable ones, take this monk outside the boundary⁴ for a short time while the Order carries out the Observance?' If they manage this thus, it is good. **If they do not manage it the Observance should not be carried out by an incomplete Order. If it should be (so) carried out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**

"This is a case, monks, where kings get hold of a monk on an Observance day ... thieves ... men of abandoned life⁵ ... monks who are opponents of monks⁶ get hold of a monk on an Observance day. These monks who are opponents of monks should be spoken to thus by the

¹ *santi saṅghassa karaṇīyaṃ*. Same expression occurs at beginning of Kd 2.25.1. Karaṇīya is something to be done, a duty; cf. Kd 4.3.5. ² An occasion where monks address lay people with the honorific title *āyasmā*. ³ *muhuttaṃ*, for a moment.

⁴ While outside an Order's boundary a monk would not be a member of that Order, and so his absence or his failure to get his entire purity declared would not render that Order "incomplete". ⁵ *dhutta*. See BD 1.234, n. 1. ⁶ Cf. BD 1.49f.

monks: ‘Please will you ... (as in [Kd 2.24.1](#), [Kd 2.24.2](#)) ... the Observance should not be carried out by an incomplete Order. If it should be (so) carried out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.’

AGREEMENT FOR THE MAD

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: ‘Gather together, monks, there is business for the Order.’¹ When he had spoken thus a certain monk spoke thus to the Lord: ‘There is, Lord, the mad monk Gagga²; he has not come.’ He said: ‘There are, monks, these two (kinds of) madmen: there is the mad monk who now remembers the Observance, now does not remember it; who now remembers a (formal) act of the Order, now does not remember it. He is one who does not remember aright.³ (And there is the one) who now comes for the Observance, now does not come for it, who now comes for a (formal) act of the Order, now does not come for it. He is one who does not come aright.

‘In a case, monks, where this madman now remembers the Observance, now does not remember it ... now comes for a (formal) act of the Order, now does not come for it, I allow you, monks, to give the agreement for a madman⁴ to such a madman.

And thus, monks, should it be given: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The mad monk Gagga now remembers the Observance, now does not remember it, now remembers a (formal) act of the Order, now does not remember it; he now comes for the Observance, now does not come for it; now comes for a (formal) act of the Order, now does not come for it. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should give the agreement for a madman to the mad monk Gagga, so that whether the monk Gagga⁵ remembers the Observance or does not remember it, whether he remembers a (formal) act of the Order or does not remember it, whether he comes for the Obser-

¹ *atthi saṅghassa karaṇiyam.* ² Cf. [Vin 2.8off.](#) ³ *eva.* ⁴ *ummattakasammuti.*

⁵ “mad” omitted here in text.

Vin 1.12

Kd 2.25

BD 4.11

Kd 2.25

Kd 2.25

vance or does not come for it, whether he comes for a (formal) act of the Order or does not come for it, the Order either with Gagga or without Gagga can carry out the Observance, can carry out a (formal) act of the Order. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The mad monk Gagga now remembers the Observance ... now comes for a (formal) act of the Order, now does not come for it. The Order is giving the agreement for a madman to the mad monk Gagga so that whether the monk Gagga remembers ... or does not come for it, the Order either with Gagga or without Gagga will carry out the Observance, will carry out a (formal) act of the Order. If the giving of the agreement for a madman to the mad monk Gagga so that whether he remembers ... or does not come for it, the Order either with Gagga or without Gagga will carry out the Observance, will carry out a (formal) act of the Order, is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The agreement for a madman is given by the Order to the mad monk Gagga, so that whether he remembers ... or does not come for it, the Order either with Gagga or without Gagga will carry out the Observance, will carry out a (formal) act of the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent; thus do I understand this'."

THE OBSERVANCE BY AN ORDER, ETC.

Now at that time four monks were staying in a certain residence on an Observance day. Then it occurred to these monks: "It is laid down by the Lord that the Observance should be carried out, but we are (only) four persons.¹ Now how can the Observance be carried out by us?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to recite the Pātimokkha when there are four (of you)."

Now at that time three monks were staying in a certain residence on an Observance day. Then it occurred to these monks: "It is allowed

¹ See the scope of the powers of the "five (kinds of) Order" at [Vin 1.319](#).

by the Lord to recite the Pātimokkha when there are four (of us), but we are (only) three persons. Now how can the Observance be carried out by us?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to carry out the Observance by way of entire purity¹ when there are three (of you).²

"And thus, monks, should it be carried out: These monks should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Let the venerable ones listen to me. Today is an Observance day, the fifteenth. If it seems right to the venerable ones, let us carry out the Observance with one another by way of entire purity'. A monk who is an elder, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to these monks: 'I, your reverences,³ am quite pure, understand that I am quite pure; I, your reverences, am quite pure, understand that I am quite pure; I, your reverences, am quite pure, understand that I am quite pure'.

"A newly ordained monk, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms should speak thus to these monks: 'I, honoured sirs,⁴ am quite pure, understand that I am quite pure; I, honoured sirs, am quite pure, understand that I am quite pure; I, honoured sirs, am quite pure, understand that I am quite pure'."

Now at that time two monks were staying in a certain residence on an Observance day. Then it occurred to these monks: "It is allowed by the Lord to recite the Pātimokkha when there are four (persons), to carry out the Observance by way of entire purity when there are three, but we are (only) two persons. Now how can the Observance be carried out by us?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to carry out the Observance by way of entire purity when there are two (of you).

¹ *pārisuddhiuposatham*. ² See next two paragraphs. ³ *āvuso*. It is apparently assumed that there is one elder at least and one or two juniors, otherwise the elder would doubtless have addressed the others as *bhante*. ⁴ *bhante*, because it appears to be assumed that at least one elder was present.

1.125 “And thus, monks, should it be carried out: The monk who is an
elder, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat
2.26.7 down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should
4.166 speak thus to the newly ordained monk: ‘I, your reverence, am quite
pure, understand that I am quite pure; I, your reverence, am quite
pure, understand that I am quite pure; I, your reverence, am quite
pure, understand that I am quite pure’.

“The newly ordained monk, having arranged his upper robe over
one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with
joined palms, should speak thus to the monk who is an elder: ‘I,
honoured sir, am quite pure, understand that I am quite pure; I,
honoured sir, am quite pure, understand that I am quite pure; I,
honoured sir, am quite pure, understand that I am quite pure’.”

2.26.8 Now at that time one monk was staying in a certain residence
on an Observance day. Then it occurred to this monk: “It is allowed
by the Lord to recite the Pātimokkha when there are four (persons),
to carry out the Observance by way of entire purity when there are
three, to carry out the Observance by way of entire purity when there
are two, but I am alone. Now how can the Observance be carried out
by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

2.26.9 “This is a case, monks, where one monk is staying in a certain
residence on an Observance day. That monk, having swept that place
to which monks return—an attendance hall or a pavilion or the root
of a tree—having put out drinking water and water for washing,
having made ready a seat, having made a light, should sit down. If
other monks arrive, the Observance should be carried out together
with them; if they do not arrive, it should be determined¹, ‘Today is
an Observance day for me’. **If he should not (so) determine, there
is an offence of wrong-doing.**

26.10 “Monks, there where four monks are standing, the Pātimok-
kha should not be recited by three (persons), having conveyed
the entire purity for one. If they should (so) recite it, there is

¹ *adhīṭṭhātabbāri*; see **BD 1.128, n. 3.**

an offence of wrong-doing. Monks, there where three monks are staying, the Observance by way of entire purity should not be carried out by two, having conveyed the entire purity for one. If they should (so) carry it out, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Monks, there where two monks are staying, it should not be determined by one having conveyed the entire purity for the other. If he should (so) determine, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

PROCEDURE FOR MAKING AMENDS FOR OFFENCES

Now at that time a certain monk came to have fallen into an offence on an Observance day. Then it occurred to this monk: “It is laid down by the Lord that the Observance should not be carried out by an offender,¹ but I have fallen into an offence. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “This is a case, monks, where a monk comes to have fallen into an offence on an Observance day. Monks, that monk, having approached one monk, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to him: ‘I, your reverence, have fallen into such and such an offence, I confess² it’. It should be said by him³: ‘Do you see it?’ ‘Yes, I see it’. ‘You should be restrained in the future’.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk becomes doubtful of an offence on an Observance day. Monks, that monk, having approached one monk, having arranged his upper robe ... having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to him: ‘I, your reverence, am doubtful as to such and such an offence. When I come to be without doubt, then will I make amends for that offence’. When he has spoken thus, the Observance may be carried out, the Pātimokkha may be heard, but no obstacle should be put in the way of the Observance from such a cause.”

¹ See Kd 19.2. ² *paṭidesemi*. ³ I.e. by the monk whom the offender approached.

Now at that time the group of six monks confessed¹ a collective² offence. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, a collective offence should not be confessed. Whoever should confess it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**” At that time the group of six monks acknowledged a collective offence. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, a collective offence should not be acknowledged. Whoever should acknowledge (such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

PROCEDURE FOR AN OFFENCE WITHOUT MAKING OBSTACLE

2.27.4
4.168
Now at that time a certain monk remembered an offence while the Pātimokkha was being recited. Then it occurred to this monk: “It is laid down by the Lord that the Observance should not be carried out by an offender, and I have fallen into an offence. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “This is a case, monks, where a monk remembers an offence while the Pātimokkha is being recited. Monks, this monk should speak thus to the monk next to him: ‘I, your reverence, have fallen into such and such an offence. Having removed from here I will make amends for that offence’. When he has spoken thus, the Observance may be carried out, the Pātimokkha may be heard, but no obstacle should be put in the way of the Observance from such a cause.

2.27.5
“This is a case, monks, where a monk becomes doubtful as to an offence while the Pātimokkha is being recited. Monks, this monk should speak thus to the monk next to him: ‘I, your reverence, am doubtful as to such and such an offence. When I come to be without doubt, then will I make amends for that offence’. When he has spoken thus, the Observance may be carried out, the Pātimokkha may be

¹ *desenti*. ² *sabhāgā*, shared in by them all, but whether acting together or singly is not clear. Vin-a 1064 instances eating at the wrong time or eating what has not been left over.

heard, but no obstacle should be put in the way of the Observance from such a cause.”

PROCEDURE FOR MAKING AMENDS FOR A SHARED OFFENCE

Now at that time the whole Order in a certain residence came to have fallen into a collective offence on an Observance day. Then it occurred to these monks: “It is laid down by the Lord that a collective offence should not be confessed, that a collective offence should not be acknowledged, but this whole Order has fallen into a collective offence. Now what line or conduct should be followed by us?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence the whole Order comes to have fallen into a collective offence on an Observance day. Monks, one monk should immediately be sent to a neighbouring residence by these monks, with the words: ‘Go along, your reverence, and come back having made amends for that offence, and we will make amends for the offence in your presence’.

“If they thus manage this, it is good. If they do not manage it, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This whole Order has fallen into a collective offence. When it shall see another monk, a pure one, not an offender, then it shall make amends for that offence in his presence’. When he has spoken thus, the Observance may be carried out, the Pātimokkha may be heard, but no obstacle should be put in the way of the Observance from such a cause.

“This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence the whole Order comes to be doubtful about a collective offence on an Observance day. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This whole Order is doubtful about a collective offence. When it comes to be without doubt, then will it make amends for that offence’. When he has spoken thus, the Observance may be carried out, the Pāti-

Kd 2.27

Vin 1.12

Kd 2.27

BD 4.1

Kd 2.27

mokkha may be heard, but no obstacle should be put in the way of the Observance from such a cause.

“This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence the Order, entered on the rains, has fallen into a collective offence. Monks, one monk should immediately be sent to a neighbouring residence by these monks with the words ... (as in *Kd 2.27.6*, *Kd 2.27.7*) ... If they do not manage it, one monk should be sent away for seven days, with the words: ‘Go along, your reverence, and come back having made amends for that offence, and we will make amends for that offence in your presence’.”

Now at that time in a certain residence the whole Order came to have fallen into a collective offence. It did not know the name or the class¹ of that offence. A certain monk came there; he had heard much, he was one to whom the tradition had been handed down²; he was an expert on *dhamma*, an expert on discipline, an expert on the summaries; he was wise, experienced, clever; he was conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training.³ A certain monk approached that monk; having approached, he spoke thus to him: “What kind of an offence does he fall into, your reverence, who does such and such a thing?”

He spoke thus: “Whoever does such and such a thing, your reverence, falls into this kind of offence. This is the kind of offence that you, your reverence, have fallen into; make amends for this offence.” He spoke thus: “I, your reverence, have not fallen into this offence altogether alone; this whole Order has fallen into this offence.” He spoke thus: “What has it to do with you, your reverence, whether another has fallen or has not fallen? Please do you, your reverence, remove⁴ your own offence.”

Then that monk, having at that monk’s bidding made amends for that offence, approached those monks; having approached them, he spoke thus to those monks: “It is said, your reverences, that whoever does such and such a thing falls into this kind of offence. This is the

¹ *gotta*. ² Cf. above, *BD 4.157*. ³ Cf. above, *BD 4.157*. ⁴ *vuṭṭhaha*.

kind of offence that you, your reverences, have fallen into; make amends for this offence.” But these monks did not want to make amends for that offence at that monk’s bidding. They told this matter to the lord. He said:

“This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence the whole Order comes to have fallen into a collective offence. It does not know the name or the class of that offence. A certain monk comes there; he has heard much ... desirous of training. A certain monk approaches that monk; having approached, he speaks thus to that monk: ‘What land of offence does he fall into, your reverence, who does such and such a thing?’

“He speaks thus: ‘Whoever does such and such a thing, your reverence, falls into this kind of offence. This is the kind of offence that you, your reverence, have fallen into; make amends for this offence’. He speaks thus: ‘I, your reverence, have not fallen into this offence altogether alone; this whole Order has fallen into this offence’. He speaks thus: ‘What has it to do with you, your reverence, whether another has fallen or has not fallen? Please do you, your reverence, remove your own offence.’

“Then if that monk, having at that monk’s bidding made amends for that offence, approaches those monks and having approached them speaks thus to those monks: ‘It is said, your reverence, that whoever does such and such a thing falls into this kind of offence. This is the kind of offence that you, your reverences, have fallen into; make amends for this offence’; and if, monks, these monks should make amends for that offence at that monk’s bidding, that is good. But if they should not make amends for it, then, monks, these monks need not be spoken to by that monk if he is not willing¹.”

Told is the Portion for Repeating on Codanāvattu

¹ *akāmā*, cf. Vin 3.186 (BD 1.328). If the offending monks do not wish to make amends, the other monk need not speak to them—perhaps meaning that he need not speak to them in the words given at the end of Kd 2.27.14 above. But cf. AN ii.113, “For this is destruction ... where a Truthfinder or his fellow Brahma-farers deem that he is one who should not be spoken to”.

FIFTY CASES OF NO OFFENCE

2.28.1 Now at that time in a certain residence several resident monks, four
or more, collected together on an Observance day. They did not know
1.129 that there were other resident monks who had not arrived. Thinking¹
of the rule,² thinking of discipline, thinking that they were complete,
they carried out the Observance, they recited the Pātimokkha while
they were incomplete. While the Pātimokkha was being recited by
them, other resident monks, a larger number,³ arrived. They told
2.28.2 this matter to the Lord.

He said: “This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence
... (as in **Kd 2.28.1** above) ... recite the Pātimokkha while they are
incomplete. While the Pātimokkha is being recited by them, other
resident monks, a larger number, arrive. Monks, the Pātimokkha
should be recited again by these monks,⁴ and there is no offence for
the reciters.

2.28.3 “This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence ... (as in **Kd 2.28.2**
above) ... While the Pātimokkha is being recited by them, other res-
ident monks, a like number, arrive. What has been recited is duly
recited, the rest should be heard, and there is no offence for the
reciters.

4.172 “This is a case, monks, ... (as in **Kd 2.28.2** above) ... While the Pāti-
mokkha is being recited by them, other resident monks, a smaller
number, arrive. What has been recited is duly recited, the rest should
2.28.4 be heard, and there is no offence for the reciters.

“This is a case, monks, ... When the Pātimokkha has just been re-
cited by them, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. Monks,
the Pātimokkha may be recited again by these monks, and there is
no offence for the reciters.

“This is a case, monks, ... When the Pātimokkha has just been re-

¹ *saññīno*. ² *dhamma*, i.e. the rules that Observance should be carried out by a complete assembly. ³ I.e. than those already assembled. ⁴ Presumably meaning by those already assembled together, and who have already recited part of it; cf. **Kd 2.29.1** below, where they incur an offence of wrong-doing for reciting it when they know that they are incomplete.

cited by them, other resident monks, a like number, arrive. What has been recited is duly recited, the entire purity should be announced in their presence,¹ and there is no offence for the reciters.

“This is a case, monks, ... a smaller number, arrive. What has been recited is duly recited, the entire purity should be announced in their presence, and there is no offence for the reciters.

“This is a case, monks, ... When the Pātimokkha has just been recited by them and the assembly has not risen, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. Monks, the Pātimokkha may be recited again by those monks, and there is no offence for the reciters.

“This is a case, monks ... a like number, arrive. What has been recited is duly recited, the entire purity should be announced in their presence, and there is no offence for the reciters.

“This is a case, monks, ... a smaller number, arrive. What has been recited is duly recited, the entire purity should be announced in their presence, and there is no offence for the reciters.

“This is a case, monks, ... When the Pātimokkha has just been recited by them and part of the assembly has risen, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive ... (as in **Kd 2.28.5** above) ... a like number ... a smaller number ...

“This is a case, monks, ... When the Pātimokkha has just been recited by them and the whole assembly has risen, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive ... (as in **Kd 2.28.6** above) ... a like number ... a smaller number ...

Told are the Fifteen Cases in which there is No Offence

FIFTY CASES OF PERCEIVING IT IS A GROUP OR NOT A GROUP

“This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence several resident monks, four or more, collect together on an Observance day. They

¹ This means that the monks arriving late must announce their entire purity to the ones already assembled and who had recited the Pātimokkha.

know that there are other resident monks who have not arrived. Thinking of the rule, thinking of discipline, thinking that they are incomplete, they carry out the Observance and recite the Pātimokkha while they are incomplete. While the Pātimokkha is being recited by them, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. **Monks, the Pātimokkha should be recited again by those monks, and there is an offence of wrong-doing for the reciters.**

2.29.2 “This is a case, monks, ... (as in **Kd 2.29.1**) ... a like number, arrive. **What has been recited is duly recited, the rest should be heard, and there is an offence of wrong-doing for the reciters.**

This is a case, monks (as in **Kd 2.29.1**) ... a smaller number, arrive. **What has been recited is duly recited, the rest should be heard, and there is an offence of wrong-doing for the reciters.**

2.29.3 “This is a case, monks ... When the Pātimokkha has just been recited by them and the assembly has not risen ... part of the assembly has risen ... the whole assembly has risen, and other resident monks, a larger number ... a like number ... a smaller number, arrive. **What has been recited is duly recited, the entire purity should be announced in their presence, and there is an offence of wrong-doing for the reciters.**

Told are the Fifteen Cases on thinking that (an Assembly) is incomplete when it is incomplete

FIFTY CASES OF DOUBT

2.30.1 “This is a case, monks ... They know that there are other resident monks who have not arrived. Thinking: ‘Now, is it allowable for us to carry out the Observance or is it not allowable?’ they carry out the Observance and recite the Pātimokkha (although) they are in doubt. While the Pātimokkha is being recited by them, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. **Monks, the Pātimokkha should be recited again by those monks ... (cf. **Kd 2.29.2, Kd 2.29.3**) ... an offence of wrong-doing for the reciters.**

“This is a case, monks, ... (cf. Kd 2.29.2, Kd 2.29.3) ... **an offence of wrong-doing for the reciters.**

Told are the Fifteen Cases on being in Doubt

FIFTY CASES OF ACTING BADLY

“This is a case, monks, ... They know that there are other resident monks who have not arrived. Thinking: ‘Indeed, it is allowable for us to carry out the Observance, it is not unallowable for us’, they, acting badly,¹ carry out the Observance and recite the Pātimokkha. While the Pātimokkha is being recited by them, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. **Monks, the Pātimokkha should be recited again by these monks, and there is an offence of wrong-doing for the reciters.**

“This is a case, monks, ... (cf. Kd 2.29.2, Kd 2.29.3) ... an offence of wrong-doing for the reciters.

Told are the Fifteen Cases on Acting Badly

FIFTY CASES OF AIMING AT SCHISM

“This is a case, monks, ... They know that there are other resident monks who have not arrived. Saying, ‘These are perishing, these are being destroyed, what good are these to you?’ they carry out the Observance and recite the Pātimokkha aiming at a schism, ... (as in Kd 2.29.2, Kd 2.29.3; instead of offence of wrong-doing read grave offence.)

Told are the Fifteen Cases on Aiming at a Schism

Told are the Seventy-five Cases.²

¹ *kukkucapakatā*, explained at Vin-a 1065 as overcome, doing as they wished.

² Five times fifteen cases, in Kd 2.28-Kd 2.32.

ABBREVIATED REPETITIONS ON ENTERING A BOUNDARY

^{2,33,1} “This is a case, monks, ... They know that other resident monks are entering within the boundary. They know that other resident monks have entered within the boundary. They see other resident monks entering within the boundary. They see other resident monks entered within the boundary. They hear that other resident monks are entering within the boundary. They hear that other resident monks have entered within the boundary.

^{4,175} “From a hundred and seventy-five triads referring to resident (monks) with resident (monks); to incoming (monks) with resident (monks); to resident (monks) with incoming (monks); to incoming (monks) with incoming (monks), there come to be seven hundred triads by means of (these) sets.¹

^{2,34,1} “This is a case, monks, where the fourteenth is (the Observance day) for resident monks, the fifteenth for incoming ones. If the resident ones are larger in number, the incoming ones should accommodate themselves to the resident ones. If they are equal in number, the incoming ones should accommodate themselves to the resident ones. If the incoming ones are larger in number, the resident ones should accommodate themselves to the incoming ones.

^{2,34,2} “This is a case, monks, where the fifteenth is (the Observance day) for resident monks, the fourteenth for incoming ones. If the resident ones are larger in number, the incoming ones should accommodate themselves to the resident ones. If ... (as in *Kd 2.34.1* above) ...

^{2,34,3} “This is a case, monks, where the first day of a lunar fortnight² is (the Observance day) for resident monks, the fifteenth for incoming ones. If the resident ones are larger in number, the resident ones, if they are not willing, need not hold a meeting³ with the incoming

¹ *peyyālamukhena*, as at *Vism 46*. *Peyyāla* = *pariyāya*, and is arrangement, order, disposition. Each “set” refers to each pair (resident with resident ... incoming with incoming) of triads in all its permutations and combinations: they know, they see, they hear, and they do not know, see and hear. ² *pāṭipada*, cf. *BD 2.314, n. 1*. ³ *na dātābbā sāmaggī*, need not give completion to.

ones. The Observance should be carried out by the incoming ones having gone outside the boundary. If they are equal in number, the resident ones, if they are not willing, need not hold a meeting with the incoming ones. The Observance should be carried out by the incoming ones having gone outside the boundary. If the incoming ones are larger in number, the resident ones should hold a meeting with the incoming ones or they should go outside the boundary.

“This is a case, monks, where the fifteenth is (the Observance day) for resident monks, the first day of the lunar fortnight for incoming ones. If the resident ones are larger in number, the incoming ones should hold a meeting with the resident ones or they should go outside the boundary. If they are equal in number, the incoming ones should hold a meeting with the resident ones or they should go outside the boundary. If the incoming ones are larger in number, the incoming ones, if they are not willing, need not hold a meeting with the resident ones. The Observance should be carried out by the resident ones having gone outside the boundary.

SEEING CHARACTERISTICS, ETC.

“This is a case, monks, where incoming monks see signs of residence of resident monks, features of residence, marks of residence, indications of residence, carefully prepared couches and chairs, mattresses and squatting mats, carefully arranged water for drinking and water for washing, carefully swept cells; but having seen (these signs) they come to be doubtful, thinking: ‘Now are there resident monks, or are there not?’

“If these, being doubtful, do not search and, not having searched, carry out the Observance, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If these, being doubtful, search and having searched do not see (any monks), and if not having seen (any) they carry out the Observance, there is no offence. If these, being doubtful, search and having searched see (some monks), and if having seen (them) they carry out the Observance together, there is no offence. If these, being doubtful, search

and having searched see (some monks), and if having seen (them) they carry out the Observance apart, there is an offence of wrongdoing. **If these, being doubtful, search and having searched see (some monks), and if having seen (them) they say: 'You are perishing, you are being destroyed, what is the good of these to you?'**¹ **and carry out the Observance aiming at a schism, there is a grave offence.**

^{234.7} “This is a case, monks, where incoming monks hear signs of residence of resident monks, features of residence, marks of residence, indications of residence, the sound of footsteps as they are pacing up and down, the sound of studying, the sound of coughing, the sound of sneezing; but having heard they come to be doubtful, thinking: ‘Now are there resident monks or are there not?’ **If these, being doubtful, do not search ... (=Kd 2.34.6) ... there is a grave offence.**

^{4.177} “This is a case, monks, where resident monks see signs of incoming of incoming monks, features of incoming, marks of incoming, indications of incoming, unknown bowls, unknown robes, unknown pieces of cloth to sit upon, water for washing the feet sprinkled about; but having seen (these signs), they come to be doubtful, thinking: ‘Now are there incoming monks or are there not?’ **If these, being doubtful, do not search ... (=Kd 2.34.6) ... there is a grave offence.**

^{234.8} “This is a case, monks, where resident monks hear signs of incoming of incoming monks, features of incoming, marks of incoming, indications of incoming, the sound of footsteps as they are arriving, the sound of sandals tapping, the sound of coughing, the sound of sneezing; but having heard they come to be doubtful, thinking: ‘Now are there incoming monks or are there not?’ **If these, being doubtful, do not search ... (=Kd 2.34.6) ... there is a grave offence.**

PERFORMING OBSERVANCE WITH THOSE OF A DIFFERENT COMMUNION, ETC.

^{34.10} “This is a case, monks, where incoming monks see resident monks belonging to a different communion. They get the (wrong) view that they belong to the same communion; having got the (wrong) view that they belong to the same communion, if they do not ask, and not having asked carry out the Observance together, there is no offence. **If they ask, and having asked pay no attention,¹ and having paid no attention carry out the Observance together, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** If they ask, and having asked pay no attention, and having paid no attention carry out the Observance apart, there is no offence.

“This is a case, monks, where incoming monks see resident monks belonging to the same communion. They get the (wrong) view that they belong to a different communion. **Having got the (wrong) view that they belong to a different communion, if they do not ask, and not having asked carry out the Observance together, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** If they ask, and having asked pay attention, and having paid attention carry out the Observance apart, **there is an offence of wrong-doing.** If they ask, and having asked pay attention, and having paid attention carry out the Observance together, there is no offence.

“This is a case, monks, where resident monks see incoming monks belonging to a different communion. They get the (wrong) view that they belong to the same communion ... (= Kd 2.34.10) ... there is no offence.

“This is a case, monks, where resident monks see incoming monks belonging to the same communion. They get the (wrong) view that

¹ As in **BD 2.32** above. ¹ *nābhivitaranti*. Vin-a 1066 says “they are not able to neglect the status of a differing communion; the meaning is: they do not make them give up that wrong view”. Cf. **Vin 3.73** where *abhivitaritvā* appears to mean “having committed”. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives for *abhivitarati* “to pay heed, to observe”, *Critical Pali Dictionary* merely says “to come to an end”.

they belong to a different communion ... (= Kd 2.34.11) ... there is no offence.

PORTION ON SHOULD NOT GO

2:35:1 “Monks, you should not go on an Observance day from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are no monks except with an Order,¹ except there be a danger.² Monks, you should not go on an Observance day from a residence where there are monks to what is not a residence³ where there are no monks except with an Order, except there be a danger. Monks, you should not go ... either to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are no monks except with an Order, except there be a danger.

2:35:2 “Monks, you should not go on an Observance day from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are no monks except ... Monks, you should not go on an Observance day from what is not a residence where, there are monks to what is not a residence where there are no monks except ... Monks, you should not go ... from what is not a residence where there are monks either to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are no monks, except with an Order, except there be a danger.

2:35:3 “Monks, you should not go on an Observance day from either a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are no monks except with an Order, except there be a danger. Monks, you should not go on an Observance day from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are no monks to what is not a residence where there are no monks except ... a danger. Monks, you should not go ... either from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are no monks either to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are no monks, except ... a danger.

2:35:4

¹ Unless there go sufficient monks to form an Order. Cf. 35 with Kd 12.1.3, Kd 12.1.4.

² See above, Kd 2.15.4, where ten “dangers” are enumerated. ³ Vin-a 1066 says to a place where a hall and so forth are undergoing repairs.

“Monks, you should not go on an Observance day from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are monks if the monks there should belong to a different communion, except with an Order, except there be a danger. Monks, you should not go ... from a residence where there are monks to what is not a residence where there are monks if the monks there should belong to a different communion ... a danger. Monks, you should not go ... from a residence where there are monks either to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks ... (cf. **Kd 2.35.1, Kd 2.35.2, Kd 2.35.3**) ... Monks, you should not go ... either from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks either to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks if the monks there belong to a different communion, except with an Order, except there be a danger.

PORTION ON SHOULD GO

“Monks, you may go on an Observance day from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are monks should the monks there belong to the same communion and if he knows, ‘I am able to arrive this very day’. Monks, you may go on an Observance day from a residence where there are monks to what is not a residence where there are monks should the monks there belong to the same communion, and if he knows, ‘I am able to arrive this very day’ ... to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks ... from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are monks ... to what is not a residence where there are monks ... to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks ... Monks, you may go on an Observance day from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are monks ... to what is not a residence where there are monks ... to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks should the monks there belong to the same communion and if he knows, ‘I am able to arrive this very day’.

Kd 2.35

BD 4.1

SEEING A BLAMEWORTHY PERSON

2.36.1 “Monks, the Pātimokkha should not be recited in a seated assembly (of monks) before a nun. Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Monks, the Pātimokkha should not be recited in a seated assembly (of monks) before a probationer ... a novice ... a woman novice ... one who has disavowed the training ... who has committed an extreme offence. Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

2.36.2 “The Pātimokkha should not be recited in a seated assembly before one suspended for not seeing an offence. Whoever should (so) recite it should be dealt with according to the rule.¹ The Pātimokkha should not be recited in a seated assembly before one suspended for not making amends for an offence ... before one suspended for not giving up a wrong view. Whoever should (so) recite it should be dealt with according to the rule.²

2.36.3 “The Pātimokkha should not be recited in a seated assembly before a eunuch.³ Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. The Pātimokkha should not be recited in a seated assembly before one living in communion as it were by theft ... before one who has gone over to a sect ... before an animal ... before a matricide ... before a parricide ... before a slayer of one perfected ... before a seducer of a nun ... before a schismatic ... before a shedder of (a Truth-finder’s) blood ... before a hermaphrodite.⁴ Whoever should (so) recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

2.36.4 “Monks, Observance should not be carried out by declaring the entire purity of one on probation⁵ unless the assembly has not risen. And, monks, Observance should not be carried out on a non-Observance day unless the Order be unanimous”⁶

4.181

The Third Portion for Repeating in the Section on Observance

IN THIS SECTION ARE EIGHTY-SIX ITEMS. THIS IS ITS KEY

¹ Probably referring to Bu-Pc 69. See BD 3.28, n. 4. ² Probably referring to Bu-Pc 69. See BD 3.28, n. 4. ³ As in Kd 2.22.3 above. ⁴ As in Kd 2.22.3 above. ⁵ pārivāsika. Rules for monks under probation detailed in Kd 12, Kd 13. ⁶ See Kd 10.5.14.

Other sects and Bimbisāra,
 they assembled together in silence,
 on *dhamma*, in private,
 on the Pātimokkha, daily, thenceforth once,
 According to assembly, for all together,
 being all together, and Maddakucchi,
 a boundary, extensive, about a river,
 successive, two, and small ones,
 Newly ordained (monks), and then in Rājagaha,
 a boundary (as a place where a monk)
 is not away from (his robes),
 in agreeing first on the boundary,
 afterwards on abolishing the boundary,
 When not agreed upon a village boundary,
 the throwing of water in river,
 sea, lake, they combined,
 and likewise they placed within,
 How many? (formal) acts, recital,
 savages, and if there is not,
dhamma, discipline, they threatened,
 again a threat to discipline,
 Reproof, if leave is given,
 a protest against what is not legally valid,
 more than four or five, opinion, intentionally,
 and if he would exert himself,
 With laymen, unbidden, in Codanā (vatthu),
 he did not know,
 several did not know, immediately,
 and if he should not go,
 Which? how many? and to announce at a distance,
 he did not remember,
 Soiled, a seat, a light, distant parts,
 another who has heard much,
 Immediately, Observance day and the rains,
 and a (formal) act of entire purity, relations,
 Gagga, four and three, two and one,
 an offence, collective (offence), he remembered,
 The whole Order, doubtful, they did not know,
 one who has heard much,
 a larger, a like, a smaller (number),
 and when the assembly has not risen,
 Some have risen, all,
 and they know, they are doubtful,

Those (acting) badly say, 'Indeed it is allowable',
knowing, seeing, and they hear,
Let them come if (a monk) is residing,
the four (sets of) fifteen (cases) again,
the first day of a fortnight (and) the fifteenth,
both communions (by) mark,
One on probation (and) a non-Observance day,
unless the Order be unanimous.
These partitioned keys are needed
for distinguishing the items.

3. RAINS (VASSA)

ALLOWANCE TO ENTER THE RAINS

At one time the awakened one, the Lord was staying at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. Now at that time (the use of) a rains-residence for monks had not come to be laid down by the Lord. So these monks¹ walked on tour during the cold weather and the hot weather and the rains.

People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, walk on tour during the cold weather and the hot weather and the rains, trampling down the crops and grasses, injuring life that is one-facultied and bringing many small creatures to destruction²? Shall it be that those members of other sects, whose rules are badly kept, cling to and prepare a rains-residence, shall it be that these birds, having made their nests in the tree-tops, cling to and prepare a rains-residence,³ while these recluses, sons of the Sakyans walk on a tour during the cold weather and the hot weather and the rains, trampling down the crops and grasses, injuring life that is one-facultied and bringing many small creatures to destruction?"

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks,

¹ *te'dha bhikkhū*. Vin-a 1067 says that *idha* is only a conjunction; this is borne out by the several variant readings given at Vin 1.376. ² Cf. Vin 4.296 (BD 3.320) where it is made a *pācittiya* for nuns to walk on tour during the rains. ³ Quoted AN-a ii.97.

saying: “I allow you, monks, to enter upon the rains.”¹

Then it occurred to these monks: “Now, when should the rains be entered upon?” They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: “I allow you, monks, to enter upon the rains in the rainy season².”

Then it occurred to these monks: “Now, how many (periods) are there for beginning the rains³?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, there are these two (periods) for beginning the rains: the earlier and the later.⁴ The earlier may be entered upon the day after (the full moon of) Āsāḷhī, the later may be entered upon a month after (the full moon of) Āsāḷhī.⁵ These, monks, are the two (periods) for beginning the rains.”

ON TOUR IN THE RAINS, ETC.

Now at that time the group of six monks, having entered upon the rains, walked on tour during the rains. People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, walk on tour during the cold weather and the hot weather and the rains, trampling down ... (as in **Kd 3.1.2**) ... bringing many small creatures to destruction?”

Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks, having entered upon the rains, walk on tour during the rains?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “**Monks, having entered upon the rains, but not having kept either the first three months or**

¹ *vassam upagantuṃ*. ² *vassāna*. Cf. **Vin 4.74, Vin 4.100, Vin 4.286**. *Vassāna*, the rainy season, lasts for four months. *Vassa*, as meaning the rains-retreat for monks, had to be kept for three out of the four months of the rainy season. ³ *vassupanāyikā*. See **GS i.47, n. 1**, and *Vinaya Texts i.299, n. 1*. ⁴ Cf. **AN i.51. AN-a ii.97** says that this was laid down twenty years after the lord had attained enlightenment. ⁵ These are two out of the three dates for allotting lodgings, **Vin 2.167**.

the last three months, one should not set out on tour. Whoever should (thus) set out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time the group of six monks did not want to enter upon the rains. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, one should not enter upon the rains. Whoever should not enter upon (them), there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time the group of six monks, on a day for beginning the rains, not desiring to enter upon the rains, intentionally passed a residence by.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, on a day for beginning the rains, a residence should not be intentionally passed by one who does not desire to enter upon the rains. Whoever should pass one by, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, desiring to postpone the rains, sent a messenger to the monks, saying: “What if the masters could enter upon the rains at the next full-moon day?”² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to obey kings.”

ALLOWANCE FOR SEVEN DAYS BUSINESS

Then the Lord, having stayed at Rājagaha for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Sāvattthī. Walking on tour, in due course he arrived at Sāvattthī. Then the Lord stayed there in Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time in the Kosala country a lay-follower, Udena,³ had had a dwelling-place built

¹ *āvāsariṃ atikkamanti*. ² *juṇhe*, explained at Vin-a 1068 as *māse*, month, and would therefore mean at the next period (a month later) for beginning the rains-retreat. This seems a better interpretation of *juṇhe* here than does the *Pali-English Dictionary*’s “bright fortnight of the month”. Cf. *kāḷe* and *juṇhe* below, BD 4.231. ³ Heard of nowhere but here I think.

for an Order.¹ He sent a messenger to monks, saying: “Let the revered sirs come; I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the monks.”

Monks spoke thus: “It is laid down by the Lord, sir, that one should not set out on tour, having entered upon the rains and not having kept the first three months or the last three months. Let Udena, the lay-follower, wait until the monks have kept the rains; when they have finished the rains they will go. But if there is something urgent to be done,² let him establish³ the dwelling-place in the presence of resident monks who are already there.”⁴

The lay-follower, Udena, ... spread it about, saying: “How can these revered sirs, when sent for by me, not come, for I am a benefactor, a builder,⁵ a supporter of the Order?” Monks heard the lay-follower, Udena, as he ... spread it about Then these monks told this matter to the Lord.

Then the Lord on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow you, monks, to go if you are sent for by seven (classes of people), and if the business can be done in seven days, but not if you are not sent for: by a monk, a nun, a probationer, a novice, a woman novice, a lay-follower, a woman lay-follower. I allow you, monks, to go if you are sent for by these (seven classes of people) and if the business can be done in seven days, but not if you are not sent for. The return should be made in seven days.

This is a case, monks, where a dwelling-place for an Order comes to have been built by a lay-follower. If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘Let the revered sirs come, I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the monks you should go, monks’, if you are sent for and if the business can be done in seven days, but not if you are not sent for. The return should be made in seven days.

“This is a case, monks, where a curved house⁶ for an Order comes

¹ Cf. Vin 4.287 (BD 3.302), where “a certain lay follower” did likewise and wanted to give robe-material to both the Orders. ² *accāyika karaṇīya*, see BD 2.151, n. 6 for explanation and references. ³ *patiṭṭhāpetu*. At Vin 4.287 there was a “festival (*maha*) for the dwelling-place”, but *patiṭṭhāpeti* probably does not imply this. ⁴ *tatth’eva*.

⁵ *kāraka*, also a worker and a doer of good works. ⁶ Cf. above, BD 4.75.

to have been built by a lay-follower ... a long house¹ ... a mansion² ... a cave³ ... a cell⁴ ... a porch ... an attendance hall⁵ ... a fire-hall ... a hut for what is allowable⁶ ... a privy ... a place for pacing up and down in⁷ ... a hall in the place for pacing up and down in⁸ ... a well ... a hall at the well ... a bathroom ... a hall in the bathroom ... a lotus pond ... a shed ... a monastery⁹ ... a site for a monastery comes to have been built by a lay-follower. If he should send a messenger to monks, saying:

‘Let the revered sirs come, I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the monks’, you should go, monks, if you are sent for and if the business can be done in seven days, but not if you are not sent for. The return should be made in seven days.

“This is a case, monks, where a dwelling-place ... a curved house ... a long house ... a site for a monastery (=Kd 3.5.6) ... for several monks, ... for one monk comes to have been built by a lay-follower ... The return should be made in seven days.

“This is a case, monks, where a dwelling-place ... a site for a monastery¹⁰ for an Order of nuns, ... for several nuns ... for one nun ... for several probationers ... for one probationer ... for several novices ... for one novice ... for several women novices ... for one woman novice comes to have been built by a lay-follower. If he should send a messenger to monks¹¹ saying: ‘Let the revered sirs come, I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the monks you should go, monks, if you are sent for and if the business can be done in seven days, but not if you are not sent for. The return should be made in seven days.

¹ Cf. above, BD 4.75. ² Cf. above, BD 4.75. ³ Cf. above, BD 4.75. ⁴ This occurs again at Vin 2.159 with all except the last two of the following buildings. ⁵ *upaṭṭhānasāla*. See BD 2.194, n. 4. ⁶ *kappiyakuṭi*. Cf. same word at Vin 2.159, and see *kappiyabhūmi* at Vin 1.239 (below, BD 4.328.) Note that this is replaced in Kd 3.5.9 by “kitchen”. ⁷ *caṅkama*, monk’s walk. See Kd 15.14.2, Kd 15.14.3. ⁸ *caṅkamanasālā*. ⁹ *ārāma*, translated “park” in Kd 3.5.9 below. See BD 2.2, n. 2. ¹⁰ Same as the edifices given in Kd 3.5.6, except for the privy, bathroom and hall in a bathroom, the two former of which nuns are not to use (Vin 2.280). Editors of *Vinaya Texts* i.304, n. 1 say that they think the two cases referring to women novices should be excepted. ¹¹ Apparently monks had to accept gifts on behalf of the nuns.

4.188 “This is a case, monks, where a dwelling comes to have been built by a lay-follower for himself ... a sleeping-room ... a stable¹ ... a watch-tower² ... a quadrangular building³ ... a shop ... a hall for a shop ... a long house ... a mansion ... a cave ... a cell ... a porch ... an attendance ball ... a fire hall ... a kitchen⁴ ... a privy ... a place for pacing up and down in ... a hall in the place for pacing up and down in ... a well ... a hall at the well ... a bathroom ... a hall in the bathroom ... a lotus pond ... a shed ... a park⁵ ... a site for a park comes to have been built by a lay-follower for himself, or there comes to be his son’s marriage, or there comes to be his daughter’s marriage, or he becomes ill, or he speaks a well known discourse.⁶ If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘Let the revered sirs come, they will master this discourse before this discourse falls into oblivion’; or if he has some business, something to be done, and should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘Let the revered sirs come, I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the monks’, you should go, monks, if you are sent for and if the business can be done in seven days, but not if you are not sent for. The return should be made in seven days.

3.5.10 “This is a case, monks, where a dwelling-place for an Order comes to have been built by a woman lay-follower. If she should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘Let the revered sirs come, I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the monks’, you should go, monks, if you are sent for and if the business can be done in seven days, but not if you are not sent for. The return should be made in seven days.

3.5.11 “This is a case, monks, where a curved house for an Order comes to have been built by a woman lay-follower ... (=Kd 3.5.6) ... a site for a monastery comes to have been built for an Order by a woman lay-follower. If she should send a messenger ... (=Kd 3.5.10) ... The

¹ *uddosita*. See BD 2.16, n. 2, BD 3.177, n. 2. ² *aṭṭa*, see BD 2.16, n. 3. Mentioned also, with the next (*māla*) as a “lodging” at DN-a 209. ³ *māla*, see BD 2.16, n. 4. ⁴ *rasavati*, “possessing flavours”. Very likely the word occurs nowhere but here. Vin-a 1068 calls it *bhattageha*, food-house, perhaps “larder”. It replaces the *kappiyakuṭi*, hut for what is allowable, which in Kd 3.5.6 a lay follower may build for an Order. ⁵ *ārāma*, also meaning a monastery. ⁶ *suttanta*.

return should be made in seven days.

“This is a case, monks, where a dwelling-place ... a site for a monastery for several monks ... for one monk ... for an Order of nuns ... for several nuns ... for one nun ... for several probationers ... for one probationer ... for several novices ... for one novice ... for several women novices ... for one woman novice comes to have been built by a woman lay-follower. If she should send a messenger ... (=Kd 3.5.8) ... The return should be made in seven days.

“This is a case, monks, where a dwelling-place comes to have been built by a woman lay-follower for herself ... (=Kd 3.5.9) ... or if she comes to be ill, or if she speaks a well known discourse. If she should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘Let the masters come, and they will master this discourse before this discourse falls into oblivion or if she has some business, something to be done, and should send a messenger to monks, saying: “Let the masters come, I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the monks you should go, monks, if you are sent for and if the business can be done in seven days, but not if you are not sent for. The return should be made in seven days.

“This is a case, monks, where a dwelling-place ... (=Kd 3.5.8) ... a site for a monastery for an Order ... for several monks, ... for one monk ... for an Order of nuns ... for several nuns ... for one nun ... for several probationers ... for one probationer ... for several novices ... for one novice ... for several women novices ... for one woman novice ... for him- (her-) self is built by a monk ... a nun ... a probationer ... a novice ... a woman novice. If he (she) should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘Let the revered sirs (masters) come. I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the monks you should go, monks, if you are sent for and if the business can be done in seven days, but not if you are not sent for. The return should be made in seven days.”

ALLOWANCE FOR FIVE EVEN WHEN NOT SENT FOR

Now at that time a certain monk came to be ill. He sent a messenger to monks, saying: “I, now, am ill, let monks come, I want monks to

come”. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to go even if not sent for, all the more if sent for, and if the business can be done in seven days, to five (classes of people): to a monk, a nun, a probationer, a novice, a woman novice. I allow you, monks, to go to these five (classes of people) even if not sent for, all the more if sent for, and if the business can be done in seven days. The return should be made in seven days.

3.6.2 “This is a case, monks, where a monk comes to be ill. If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘I, now, am ill, let monks come, I want monks to come’, you should go, monks, even if not sent for, all 4.190 the more if sent for, and if the business can be done in seven days, thinking: ‘I will look about for a meal for the invalid, or I will look about for a meal for the one who is tending the invalid, or I will look about for medicine for the invalid, or I will ask (after) him¹, or I will tend him’. The return should be made in seven days.

3.6.3 “This is a case, monks, where dissatisfaction comes to have arisen in a monk. If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘Dissatisfaction has arisen in me, let monks come, I want monks to come you should go, monks, even if not sent for, all the more if sent for, and it the business can be done in seven days, thinking: ‘I will allay his dissatisfaction or get (someone) to allay it, or I will give him a talk on *dhamma*’.² The return should be made in seven days.

3.6.4 “This is a case, monks, where remorse comes to have arisen in a monk. If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘Remorse has arisen in me ... I want monks to come’, you should go, monks, ... if the business can be done in seven days, thinking: ‘I will dispel his remorse or get (someone) to dispel it, or I will give him a talk on *dhamma*’.³ The return should be made in seven days.

3.6.5 “This is a case, monks, where a wrong view comes to have arisen in a monk. If he should send ... if the business can be done in seven days,

¹ *pucchāmi*, I think meaning to inquire after his health here (cf. “monks asking after ill ones”, BD 2.341, BD 2.399, BD 2.402), and not to “ask him (questions referring to the Dhamma)”, as at *Vinaya Texts* i.306, and which is more usually *paripucchati*. ² Cf. Kd 1.25. Kd 1.20, Kd 1.21; Kd 12.1-3. ³ Cf. Kd 1.25. Kd 1.20, Kd 1.21; Kd 12.1-Kd.12.3.

thinking: 'I will dissuade him from the wrong view or get (someone) to dissuade him, or I will give him a talk on *dhamma*'. The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a monk comes to have committed an offence against an important rule and to deserve probation.¹ If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: 'I have committed an offence against an important rule, I deserve probation, let monks come, I want monks to come', you should go, monks, even if not sent for, all the more if sent for, and if the business can be done in seven days, thinking: 'I will make an effort for placing (him) on probation, or I will make a proclamation, or I will become one who completes a group'.² The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a monk deserves to be sent back to the beginning.³ If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: 'I deserve to be sent back to the beginning, let monks come, I want monks to come you should go monks, even if not sent for, ... if the business can be done in seven days, thinking: 'I will make an effort for sending (him) back to the beginning, or I will make a proclamation, or I will become one who completes a group'. The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a monk deserves *mānatta* (discipline)⁴. If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: 'I desire *mānatta* (discipline), let monks come, I want monks to come', you should go, monks, even if not sent for, all the more if sent for, if the business can be done in seven days, thinking: 'I will make an effort for inflicting *mānatta* discipline (on him), or I will make a proclamation, or I will become one who completes a group'. The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a monk deserves rehabilitation.⁵ If he should send a messenger ... thinking: 'I will make an effort for (his) rehabilitation, or I will make a proclamation, or I will become

¹ Cf. Kd 1.25, Kd 1.20, Kd 1.21; Kd 12.1–Kd.12.3. ² For placing him on probation, for granting or giving it, *parivāsādāna*. ³ *mūlāya paṭikassanāraho*. Cf. Kd 1.25.21; and Vin 2.7, Vin 2.34, Vin 2.162, AN i.99. ⁴ Cf. Kd 1.25.21, Kd 12.5. ⁵ Cf. Kd 1.25.21; Kd 12.9.

one who completes a group'. The return should be made in seven days.

“This is a case, monks, where an Order becomes desirous of carrying out a (formal) act against a monk—either one of censure or one of guidance or one of banishment or one of reconciliation or one of suspension.¹ If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘The Order desires to carry out a (formal) act against me, let monks come, I want monks to come’, you should go ... if the return can be made in seven days, thinking: ‘How then may the Order not carry out a (formal) act or may change it to something lighter?’ The return should be made in seven days.

“Or a (formal) act comes to be carried out against him by the Order—either one of censure ... or one of suspension. If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘The Order carried out a (formal) act against me ... I want monks to come’, you should go monks, ... thinking: ‘How then may he conduct himself properly, be subdued, mend his ways, (so that) the Order can revoke that (formal) act?’² The return should be made in seven days.

“This is a case, monks, where a nun comes to be ill ... (=Kd 3.6.2.)
... where dissatisfaction comes to have arisen in a nun ... (=Kd 3.6.3.)
... where remorse comes to have arisen in a nun ... (=Kd 3.6.4.)
... where a wrong view comes to have arisen in a nun ... (=Kd 3.6.5.)
... where a nun comes to have committed an offence against an important rule and to deserve *mānatta* (discipline).³ If she should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘I have omitted an offence against an important rule and deserve *mānatta* (discipline), let the masters come, I want the masters to come’, you should go, monks, even if not sent for, all the lore if sent for, and if the business can be done in seven days, thinking: ‘I will make an effort for inflicting *mānatta* discipline) on her.’⁴ The return should be made in seven days.

“This is a case, monks, where a nun deserves to be sent back to the

¹ Cf. Kd 1.25.22. ² Cf. Kd 1.25.22. ³ Nuns did not undergo probation, *parivāsa*; cf. their *Saṅghādisesas*. ⁴ The monk does not say that he will make a proclamation or become one to complete a group.

beginning. If she should send a messenger ... (=Kd 3.6.7) ... thinking: 'I will make an effort for sending (her) back to the beginning'. The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a nun deserves rehabilitation (=Kd 3.6.9) ... thinking: 'I will make an effort for (her) rehabilitation'. The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where an Order becomes desirous of carrying out a (formal) act against a nun, either one of censure ... or one of suspension ... (=Kd 3.6.10) ... The return should be made in seven days.

"Or a (formal) act comes to be carried out against her by an Order—either one of censure ... or one of suspension ... (=Kd 3.6.11) ... The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a probationer comes to be ill ... (cf. Kd 3.6.2) ... in seven days.

"This is a case, monks where dissatisfaction comes to have arisen in a probationer ... where remorse comes to have arisen in a probationer ... where a wrong view comes to have arisen in a probationer ... where a probationer's training comes to be interrupted.¹ If she should send a messenger to monks, saying: 'My training is interrupted, let the masters come, I want the masters to come', you should go, monks, even if not sent for, all the more if sent for and if the business can be done in seven days, thinking: 'I will make an effort for her to undertake the training'.² The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a probationer becomes desirous of being ordained.³ If she should send a messenger to monks, saying: 'I am desirous of being ordained ... I want the masters to come', you should go, monks, ... thinking: 'Either I will make an effort for her ordination or I will make a proclamation or I will become one who completes a group'.⁴ The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a novice becomes ill ... Kd 3.6.2 ... The return should be made in seven days.

¹ *kupitā*, see BD 3,366. ² *sikkhāsamādānaṃ*. ³ With the *upasampadā* ordination. See BD 3, Introduction, p. xlviff. ⁴ Nuns' *upasampadā* ordination takes place before an Order of monks.

4.194 “... where dissatisfaction ... where remorse ... where a wrong view comes to have arisen in a novice ... where a novice becomes desirous of asking about his year’s standing.¹

3.6.26 If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘I am desirous of asking about my year’s standing ... I want monks to come’, you should go ... thinking: ‘I will ask or I will explain’. The return should be made in seven days.

3.6.27 “... where a novice becomes desirous of being ordained ... (as in Kd 3.6.22) ... The return should be made in seven days.

1.147 3.6.28 “This is a case, monks, where a woman novice comes to be ill ... Kd 3.6.2 ... The return should be made in seven days.

3.6.29 “... where dissatisfaction ... where remorse ... where a wrong view comes to have arisen in a woman novice ... where a woman novice becomes desirous of asking about her year’s standing ... Kd 3.6.25 ... The return should be made in seven days.

“... where a woman novice becomes desirous of undertaking the training.² If she should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘Now I am desirous of undertaking the training, let the masters come, I want the masters to come’, you should go, monks, even if not sent for, all the more if sent for, and if the business can be done in seven days, thinking: ‘I will make an effort for her to acquire the training’. The return should be made in seven days.”

ALLOWANCE FOR SEVEN WHEN SENT FOR

d3.7.1 Now at that time a certain monk’s mother became ill. She sent a messenger to her son, saying: “Now I am ill, let my son come, I want my son to come.” Then it occurred to that monk: “It is laid down by the Lord that, if the business can be done in seven days, one can go if sent for but not if not sent for to seven (classes of people); and, if the

¹ *vassa*. See above, BD 4.109. This must be the technical meaning of *vassam pucchitum*, which editors of *Vinaya Texts* i.310, note say “is unknown to us”. ² Balancing the “to be ordained” of probationers and male novices. The woman novice had to become a probationer and spend two years in training in the six rules for probationers before she could become ordained.

business can be done in seven days, to go even if not sent for, all the more if sent for to five (classes of people)¹; and my own mother² is ill, but she is not a lay-follower. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: "I allow you, monks, to go even if not sent for, all the more if sent for, if the business can be done in seven days, to seven (classes of people): to a monk, a nun, a probationer, a novice, a woman novice, a mother, a father. I allow you, monks, to go even if not sent for, all the more if sent for, if the business can be done in seven days, to these seven (classes of people). The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a monk's mother comes to be ill. If she should send a messenger to her son, saying: 'Now I am ill, let my son come, I want my son to come', you should go, monks, ... (=Kd 3.6.2) ... The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a monk's father comes to be ill. If he should send a messenger to his son, saying: 'Now I am ill, let my son come, I want my son to come', you should go ... (=Kd 3.6.2) ... The return should be made in seven days.

ALLOWANCE ONLY WHEN SENT FOR

"This is a case, monks, where a monk's brother comes to be ill. If he should send a messenger to his brother, saying: 'Now I am ill, let my brother come, I want my brother to come', you should go, monks, if sent for, but not if not sent for, if the business can be done in seven days. The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a monk's sister comes to be ill. If she should send a messenger to her brother, saying: 'Now I am ill, let my brother come, I want my brother to come', you should go ... (=Kd 3.7.5) ... The return should be made in seven days.

"This is a case, monks, where a monk's relative comes to be ill. If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: 'Now I am ill, let

¹ See above, BD 4.189. ² *ayañ ca me mātā*, and this my mother.

the revered sir come, I want the revered sir to come', you should go, monks, if sent for, but not if not sent for, if the business can be done in seven days. The return should be made in seven days.

“This is a case, monks, where a person living with monks¹ comes to be ill. If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: ‘Now I am ill, let monks come, I want monks to come’, you should go, monks, if sent for, but not if not sent for, if the business can be done in seven days. The return should be made in seven days.”

Now at that time an Order’s dwelling-place was falling to pieces. A certain lay-follower had the goods² removed into the jungle. He sent a messenger to monks, saying: “If the revered sirs would fetch away³ these goods, I would give them back these goods.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to go away on business connected with an Order. The return should be made in seven days.”

Told is the Portion for Repeating on Rains-residence

PORTION ON NO OFFENCE FOR CUTTING SHORT THE RAINS WHEN THERE IS DANGER

Now at that time in the Kosala country monks who had entered upon the rains in a certain residence came to be molested by beasts of prey who seized them and attacked them. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “This is a case, monks, where monks who have entered upon the rains come to be molested by beasts of prey who seize them and attack them. This is indeed a danger,⁴ and you should

¹ *bhikkhugatika*. Vin-a 1069 and Sinhalese edition read *bhatika*; Vin-a explains as “a man (*purisa*) living in one dwelling-place together with monks”. ² *bhaṇḍam chedāpitaṃ hoti*. No justification for “had a quantity of wood cut” as at *Vinaya Texts* i.312. Vin-a 1069 explains by *dabbasambhārabhaṇḍa*, goods forming a substantial collection. Cf. *bhaṇḍaka* at [Vin 4.304](#) referring to the goods or “things”, property that some nuns wanted to receive from Thullananda’s burning dwelling. ³ Oldenberg’s text *avahareyyuṃ*; Sinhalese edition *avahāpeyyuṃ*. ⁴ See above, [BD 4.148](#), where this and some of the following dangers are enumerated although not in quite the same order.

depart. There is no offence in cutting short the rains. This is a case, monks, where monks who have entered upon the rains come to be molested by creeping things which bite them and attack them. This is indeed ... in cutting short the rains.

“This is a case, monks, where monks ... are molested by thieves who rob them and thrash them. This is indeed ... in cutting short the rains. This is a case, monks, where monks ... are molested by demons¹ who take possession of² them and sap their vitality.³ This is indeed ... in cutting short the rains.

“This is a case, monks, where the village of monks who have entered upon the rains comes to be burnt by fire and the monks go short of almsfood. This is indeed a danger ... in cutting short the rains. This is a case, monks, where the lodgings of monks who have entered upon the rains come to be burnt by fire and the monks go short of lodgings. This is indeed ... in cutting short the rains.

“This is a case, monks, where the village of monks who have entered upon the rains comes to be carried away by water and the monks go short of almsfood. This is indeed ... in cutting short the rains. This is a case, monks, where the lodgings of monks who have entered upon the rains come to be carried away by water and the monks go short of lodgings. This is indeed a danger, and you should depart. There is no offence in cutting short the rains.”

Now at that time the village of certain monks who had entered upon the rains in a certain residence was removed⁴ on account of thieves. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to go to that village.” The village was split in two. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to go where there are the more (people).” The majority came to be of little faith, not believing. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to go to those who have faith and are believing.”

¹ *pisāca*. Not among the “ten dangers”. ² *āvisanti*, explained at Vin-a 1070 as “they enter into the body”. ³ *ojam haranti*, they carry off the life-strength. ⁴ *vuṭṭhāsi*, arose, got up; thus, went away.

Now at that time in the Kosala country monks who had entered upon the rains in a certain residence did not obtain a sufficiency, as much as they needed, of coarse or of sumptuous food. They told this matter to the Lord. He said “This is a case, monks, where monks who have entered upon the rains do not obtain a sufficiency, as much as they need, of coarse or of sumptuous food. This is indeed a danger,¹ and they should depart. There is no offence in cutting short the rains. This is a case, monks, where monks who have entered upon the rains obtain a sufficiency, as much as they need, of coarse or of sumptuous food, but they do not obtain beneficial foods. This is indeed a danger ... in cutting short the rains.

“This is a case, monks, where monks who have entered upon the rains obtain a sufficiency, as much as they need, of coarse or of sumptuous food, they obtain beneficial foods, but they do not obtain beneficial medicines. This is indeed a danger ... the rains. This is a case, monks, where monks who have entered upon the rains obtain a sufficiency, as much as they need, of coarse or of sumptuous food, they obtain beneficial foods, they obtain beneficial medicines, but they do not obtain a suitable attendant. This is indeed a danger ... in cutting short the rains.

“This is a case, monks, where a woman invites a monk who has entered upon the rains, saying: ‘Come, honoured sir, I will give you gold² or I will give you gold ornaments³ or I will give you a field or I will give you a site⁴ or I will give you a bull⁵ or I will give you a cow or I will give you a slave or I will give you a slave woman or I will give you (my) daughter as wife or I will be your wife or I will lead another wife to you.’ If it then occurs to the monk: ‘The mind is called quickly-changing⁶ by the Lord, and this may be a danger to my Brahma-faring’, he should depart. There is no offence in cutting

¹ This is a “danger to life”, the ninth danger listed at [Vin 1.113](#). ² *hirañña suvaṇṇa*. See [BD 1.28, n.](#) ³ *hirañña suvaṇṇa*. See [BD 1.28, n.](#) ⁴ *vatthu*. Probably meaning a site for a hut or a dwelling-place, as in [Bu-Ss 6, Bu-Ss 7](#). ⁵ *gāvurū*. ⁶ *lahuparivatta citta*. For this sentiment, cf. [SN ii.95, Thag 4](#); also the expression *vibbhantacitta* at [It p. 91](#); and *lahucittakata*, [BD 4.101](#), above.

short the rains.

“This is a case, monks, where a low class woman ... a grown girl¹ ... a eunuch invites a monk who has entered upon the rains ... where relations invite ... kings ... thieves ... men of abandoned life invite a monk who has entered upon the rains, saying: ‘Come, honoured sir, we will give you gold ... or we will give you a daughter as wife or we will lead another wife to you’. If it then occurs to the monk: ‘The mind is called quickly-changing by the Lord ...’ ... There is no offence in cutting short the rains. This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains sees a treasure² without an owner. If then it occurs to the monk: ‘The mind is called quickly changing ...’ ... There is no offence in cutting short the rains.

PORTION ON NO OFFENCE FOR CUTTING SHORT THE RAINS WHEN THERE IS SCHISM IN THE SAṄGHA

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains sees several monks striving for a schism in the Order. If then it occurs to the monk: ‘A schism in an Order is called serious by the Lord,³ do not let the Order be divided in my presence’, he should depart. There is no offence in cutting short the rains.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains hears: ‘It is said that several monks are striving for a schism in the Order’. If then it occurs to that monk ... in cutting short the rains.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains hears: ‘It is said that several monks in a certain residence are striving for a schism in the Order’. If it then occurs to the monk: ‘Now these monks are my friends. I should speak to them, saying: Indeed, your reverences, a schism in the Order is called serious by the Lord,

¹ *thullakumārī*; cf. above, BD 4.87, n. 6. ² *nidhi*; store, hoardings, treasure at Snp 285, DhP 76, Kp 8.2, Kp 8.9. At Ja vi.79 explained as *vākacīranivāsana*, putting on a bark dress. Cf. the ruling as to picking up treasure (*ratana*) at Bu-Pc 84. ³ At Vin 2.198, in speaking to Devadatta.

please do not let a schism in the Order be promoted by the venerable ones and if he thinks: 'They will do my bidding, they will attend, they will give ear he should depart. There is no offence in cutting short the rains.

3.11.7 "This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains hears: 'It is said that several monks in a certain residence are striving for a schism in the Order'. If it then occurs to the monk: 1.15.1 'Now these monks are not friends of mine, but those who are friends of theirs are friends of mine; to these I shall speak, and when I have spoken to them, they will speak to them,¹ saying: Indeed, your reverences, a schism in the Order is called serious by the Lord ...' (=Kd 3.11.6) ... in cutting short the rains.

3.11.8 "This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains hears: 'It is said that the Order in a certain residence is divided by several monks'. If it then occurs to the monk: 'Now these monks are friends of mine. I should speak to them, saying: ... (=Kd 3.11.6) ... 4.200 in cutting short the rains.

3.11.9 "This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains hears: 'It is said that an Order in a certain residence is divided by several monks'. If it then occurs to the monk: 'Now these monks are not friends of mine, but those who are friends of theirs are friends of mine; to these I shall speak, and when I have spoken to them, they will speak to them, saying: Indeed, your reverences, a schism in the Order is called serious by the Lord ...' (=Kd 3.11.6) ... There is no offence in cutting short the rains.

1.11.10 "This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains hears: 'It is said that several nuns in a certain residence are striving for a schism in the Order'. If it then occurs to the monk: 'Now these nuns are friends of mine. I should speak to them, saying: Sisters, a schism in the Order is called serious by the Lord, please do not let a schism in the Order be promoted by the sisters', and if he thinks: 'They will do my bidding, they will attend, they will give ear', he should depart. There is no offence in cutting short the rains.

3.11.11 ¹ I.e. to the schismatic monks.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains hears: ‘It is said that several nuns in a certain residence are striving for a schism in the Order’. If it then occurs to the monk: ‘Now these nuns are not friends of mine, but those who are friends of theirs are friends of mine; to these I shall speak, and when I have spoken to them, they will speak to them, saying: Sisters, a schism in the Order ...’ (=Kd 3.11.10) ... there is no offence in cutting short the rains.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains hears: ‘It is said that the Order in a certain residence is divided by several nuns’. If it then occurs to the monk: ‘Now these nuns are friends of mine. I should speak to them, saying: Sisters, a schism in the Order ...’ (=Kd 3.11.10) ... in cutting short the rains.

“This is a case ... hears: ‘It is said that the Order in a certain residence is divided by several nuns’. If it then occurs to the monk: ‘Now these nuns are not friends of mine, but those who are friends of theirs are friends of mine; to these I shall speak, and when I have spoken to them, they will speak to them, saying: Sisters, a schism in the Order ...’ (=Kd 3.11.10) ... in cutting short the rains.”

ENTERING THE RAINS IN A COW PEN, ETC.

Now at that time a certain monk became desirous of entering on the rains in a cow-pen.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to enter on the rains in a cow-pen.” The cow-pen was removed.² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to go to that cow-pen.”

Now at that time, as the beginning of the rains was approaching, a certain monk became desirous of going in a caravan. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to enter on the

¹ *vaja*. Vin-a1071 explains as the dwelling-place of cowherds. Word occurs at AN iii.393, Vism 166, Vism 279 in meaning of “cow-pen”. ² *vuṭṭhāsi*; cf. above BD 4.197, n. 1.

rains in a caravan.” Now at that time, as the beginning of the rains was approaching, a certain monk became desirous of going in a boat. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to enter on the rains in a boat.”

PLACES FOR NOT ENTERING THE RAINS

^{3.12.3} Now at that time monks entered on the rains in hollow trees. People looked down on, criticised, spread it about, saying: “Like demon-worshippers.”¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not enter on the rains in hollow trees. Whoever should (so) enter on them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

^{3.12.4} Now at that time monks entered on the rains in forks of trees. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like hunters.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not enter on the rains in the forks of trees. Whoever should (so) enter on them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

^{3.12.5} Now at that time monks entered on the rains in the open air. When the gods rained they ran up to the foot of trees and to the shelter of a nimb tree.² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not enter on the rains in the open air. Whoever should (so) enter on them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

^{3.12.6} Now at that time monks entered on the rains without lodgings. They suffered from cold and they suffered from heat. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not enter on the rains without lodgings. Whoever should (so) enter on them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

¹ *pisācillika*, or perhaps aborigines. See *Vinaya Texts* i.318, n., and **Kd 15.10.2; Kd 15.27.5**. Cf. *pisāca* above, **BD 4.196**. ² *nimbakosa*. *Kosa* can mean cavity, thus the hollow of a tree, or it might mean a sheath or enclosure, thus the shelter, the cover of a tree.

Now at that time monks entered on the rains in a charnel-house. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like those who burn corpses”. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, you should not enter on the rains in a charnel-house. Whoever ... wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks entered on the rains under a sunshade.¹ People ... spread it about, saying: “Like cowherds”. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, you should not enter on the rains under a sunshade. Whoever ... wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks entered on the rains in a water-jar.² People ... spread it about, saying: “Like followers of other sects”. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, you should not enter on the rains in a water-jar. Whoever ... of wrong-doing.”**

UNLAWFUL AGREEMENT

Now at that time an agreement came to be made by an Order in Sāvattthī that no one should be allowed to go forth during the rains. A nephew of Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, having approached monks, asked for the going forth. Monks spoke thus: “Sir, an agreement was made by the Order that during the rains no one should be allowed to go forth. Wait, sir, until the monks have kept the rains; when they have kept the rains they will allow you to go forth.” Then these monks, having kept the rains, spoke thus to the nephew of Visākhā, Migāra’s mother: “Come now, sir, go forth.” He spoke thus: “Honoured sirs, if I could have gone forth, I should have been pleased. But now, I, honoured sirs, will not go forth.”

Visākhā, Migāra’s mother ... spread it about, saying: “How can

¹ *chatta* is the regular word for sunshade. It can also mean a canopy. ² *cāṭi*, some big vessel; used for containing and transporting water at Ja i.99. Ja i.101. Perhaps above the long bath-like stone vessels still to be seen at Anurādhapura.

the masters make an agreement to the effect that no one should be allowed to go forth during the rains? At what time should *dhamma* not be followed?” Monks heard Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, as she ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, an agreement that no one should be allowed to go forth during the rains should not be made. Whoever should make (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

OFFENCE OF WRONG-DOING IN ASSENT

^{3.14.1} Now at that time a rains-residence belonging to King Pasenadi of Kosala came to be assented to for the earlier period¹ by the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. As he was going to that residence, he saw on the way two residences with many robes. It occurred to him: “Now, suppose I should spend the rains in these two residences? Thus would many robes accrue to me.” He spent the rains in these two residences. King Pasenadi of Kosala ... spread it about, saying: “How can this master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having assented to our rains-residence, break his word? Is not lying condemned in many a figure by the Lord and restraint from lying extolled?”

^{3.14.2} Monks heard King Pasenadi of Kosala as he ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having assented to a rains-residence belonging to King Pasenadi of Kosala, break his word? Is not lying condemned in many a figure by the Lord and restraint from lying extolled?”

^{3.14.3} Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, saying: “Is it true, as is said, Upananda, that you, having assented to a rains-residence belonging to King Pasenadi of Kosala, broke your word?”

^{4.204} “It is true, Lord.” The awakened one, the Lord, rebuked him, saying:

¹ *purimikāya*, that is, for the first three months of the rainy season.

“How can you, foolish man, having assented to a rains-residence belonging to King Pasenadi of Kosala, break your word? Foolish man, is not lying condemned in many a figure by me and restraint from lying extolled? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” and having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“This is a case, monks, where a rains-residence comes to be assented to by a monk for the earlier period. As he is going to that residence he sees on the way two residences with many robes. It occurs to him: ‘What now if I should spend the rains in these two residences? Thus would many robes accrue to me.’ He spends the rains in these two residences. **Monks, the earlier period is not valid for that monk, and also there is an offence of wrong-doing in the assent.**

“This is a case, monks, where a rains-residence comes to be assented to by a monk for the earlier period. As he is going to that residence he carries out Observance outside it, he reaches a dwelling-place on the day after the Observance day, he prepares a lodging, he sets out drinking-water and water for washing, he sweeps a cell, and, having nothing to do, he departs that self-same day. **Monks, the earlier period is not valid for that monk, and also there is an offence of wrong-doing in the assent.**

“This is a case, monks, ... (=Kd 3.14.5) ... he sweeps a cell, and, having something to do, he departs that self-same day. **Monks, ... in the assent.**

“This is a case, monks, ... and, having nothing to do, he departs, having spent two or three days. **Monks, ... in the assent.**

“This is a case, monks, ... and, having something to do he departs, having spent two or three days. **Monks, ... in the assent.**

“This is a case, monks, ... and, having stayed two or three days, he departs on some business that can be done in seven days. But he passes those seven days outside. **Monks, ... in the assent.**

“This is a case, monks, ... and, having stayed two or three days, he departs on some business that can be done in seven days. He returns

Kd 3.14

Kd 3.14

Kd 3.14

BD 4.2

Vin 1.15

within seven days. Monks, the earlier period is valid for that monk, and there is no offence in the assent.

“This is a case, monks, ... and having something to do before the Invitation,¹ he departs for seven days. Monks, whether that monk returns or whether he does not return to that residence, the earlier period is valid for that monk, and also there is no offence in the assent.

- “This is a case, monks, where a rains-residence comes to be assented to by a monk for the earlier period. Having arrived at that residence he carries out the Observance, he reaches a dwelling-place on the day after the Observance day² ...

“This is a case, monks, where a rains-residence comes to be assented to by a monk for the later period. As he is going to that residence he carries out Observance outside it ... (*the whole passage is identical with Kd 3.14.5–Kd.3.14.10; for earlier period read later period; for before the Invitation read before the komudī cātumāsini*³) ... and also there is no offence in the assent.”

The Third Section: that on beginning the Rains

THIS IS ITS KEY

To enter on (the rains), and just when? how many?
and during the rains,
and they did not want to, intentionally,
to postpone, a lay-follower,
Ill, and a mother, a father,
and a brother, then a relation,
a person living with monks, a dwelling-place,
and also beasts of prey, creeping things,
And so thieves, and demons, burnt,

¹ *Pavāraṇā*, a ceremony held at the end of the third month of the rains. See **Kd 4.**

² **Kd 3.14.5–Kd.3.14.7** are repeated, the only difference being that there the monk held Observance outside the residence to which he was going; here he holds it when he has arrived. ³ Cf. **BD 4.231**, below. This is the full moon day of the month Kattika, marks the end of the later period for keeping the rains, and thus the end of the fourth month of the rainy season. See *Vinaya Texts* i.324. n. 2 and *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.66, n. 1. According to DN-a 139 the white lotus, *kumuda*, blooms then.

and in regard to both¹,
 carried away by water, was removed,
 and the majority, benefactors²,
 And about coarse and sumptuous (foods),
 beneficial medicines, an attendant,
 a woman, a low class woman,
 and a grown girl, a eunuch, and about a relation,
 Kings, thieves, men of abandoned life,
 a treasure, schisms, and by what is eightfold³,
 a cow-pen, and a caravan,
 and a boat, in a hollow, and in a fork,
 A rains-residence in the open air,
 and about one who had no lodgings,
 a charnel-house, and under a sunshade,
 and these went upon (the rains) in a water-jar,
 An agreement, having assented,
 and Observance days outside,
 the earlier, the later,
 one should combine them after the same fashion⁴,
 He departs having nothing to do,
 and likewise because he has something to do,
 spending two or three days⁵,
 and on business that can be done in seven days,
 And then going away for seven days,
 whether he should return or should not come back,
 In the key to the items the order⁶

¹ *tadubhayena*. Word is not in the text. Reference is to **Kd 3.9.3**, where the case is taken of both a village and monks' lodgings being burnt. ² *dāyaka*. Word not in the text, but it probably refers to the minority who, because believing, may be presumed to have given alms to the monks, **Kd 3.10.1**. Indeed these three headings: "was removed, and the majority, benefactors" refer to one and the same episode, and should therefore not be counted as separate items in reckoning the total of "fifty-two items" in this Chapter. ³ I.e. the eight ways of making a schism which the monk hears about, **Kd 3.11.6–Kd.3.11.13**. The first way which he sees, **Kd 3.11.5**, has as its key-word the word "schisms" which also includes the next heading—"by what is eightfold". ⁴ *yathānāyena yojāyē*, referring to the similar permutations of events which are repeated for the later as for the earlier period of the rains. ⁵ The Sinhalese reading of *dvīhatihāṃ vasitvāna* is to be preferred to Oldenberg's *dvīhatihā ca puna*, "after two or three days and again", as it corresponds more closely to **Kd 3.14.6**. The latter, however, might be justified by the three cases there mentioned of "two or three days". ⁶ *antarikā*, sphere, compass; interval, i.e. the intervals between the items, the range they cover, hence their order.

should observe the woven way.¹

*In this Chapter there are fifty-two items.*²

¹ *tantimagga*, the way that is strung or woven together, so the sacred text or tradition. Cf. DN-a 2, MN-a i.2. *Tantibhadda* at Vin 1.312, *tantidhara* at Vism 99. ² This number is perhaps arrived at by (1) omitting “in regard to both” as a separate heading, being already included under “burnt”; (2) taking “was removed, majority, benefactors” as one heading (see BD 4.206 n. 2); (3) taking line 7 as one heading referring to Kd 3.11.1, Kd 3.11.2; (4) taking “schisms, and what is eightfold” as one heading (see BD 4.206 n. 3); (5) taking “the earlier, the later, one should combine them after the same fashion” as one heading (see BD 4.206 n. 4); (6) taking the last line but one as referring to one and the same eventuality, in Kd 3.14.7.

4. INVITATION (PAVĀRAṆĀ)

DWELLING NOT IN COMFORT

At one time the enlightened one, the Lord was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time several monks, friends and associates, entered on the rains in a certain residence in the Kosala country. Then it occurred to these monks: "Now by what means can we, all together, on friendly terms and harmonious, spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of almsfood?"

Then it occurred to these monks: "If we should neither address one another nor converse, but whoever should return first from the village for almsfood¹ should make ready a seat, should put out water for (washing) the feet, a footstool, a footstand, having washed a refuse-bowl² should set it out, should set out drinking water and water for washing.

Whoever should return last from the village for almsfood, if there should be the remains of a meal and if he should so desire, he may eat them; but if he does not so desire, he may throw them away where there is but little green grass³ or he may drop them into water where there are no living creatures,⁴ he should put up the seat, he should put away the water for (washing) the feet, the footstool, the footstand, he should put away the refuse-bowl having washed it, he

¹ From here to near the end of **Kd 4.1.4** cf. **Kd 10.4.5**; **Kd 18.5.3**; MN i.207. ² This is a receptacle for the leavings of meals. ³ *appaharita*, or few crops, or no green grass, MN-a i.94 explaining by *tiṇāni*, grasses, and referring to **Bu-Pc 11**. ⁴ This sentence occurs also at **Kd 6.26.6**, SN i.169, Snp p.15, MN i.13.

should put away the drinking water and the water for washing, he should sweep the refectory.

Whoever should see a vessel for drinking water or a vessel for washing water or a vessel (for water) for rinsing after evacuation,¹ void and empty, should set out (water); if it is impossible for him (to do this) he should set out (water) by signalling with his hand, having invited a companion (to help him) by a movement of his hand²; but he should not for such a reason break into speech. Thus may we, all together, on friendly terms and harmonious, spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of almsfood.”

Then these monks neither addressed one another nor conversed. Whoever returned first from the village for almsfood made ready a seat, put out water for (washing) the feet, a foot-stool, a footstand, set out a refuse-bowl having washed it, set out drinking water and water for washing.

Whoever returned last from the village for almsfood, if there were the remains of a meal ate them if he so desired; if he did not so desire he threw them away where there was but little green grass or he dropped them into water where there were no living creatures, he put up the seat, he put away the water for (washing) the feet, the footstool, the footstand, he put away the refuse-bowl having washed it, he put away the drinking water and the water for washing, he swept the refectory.

Whoever saw a vessel for drinking water or a vessel for washing water or a vessel (for water) for rinsing after evacuation, void and

¹ Cf. MN-a ii.242. ² MN-a ii.242 says that if any of these vessels is empty, having taken it to a pond and washed it inside and outside, having filtered water (into it), having set it down on the bank, they invite another monk (to help them) by a movement of the hand.

I think that *hatthavikārena* (“by a movement of the hand”) and *hatthavilañghakena* (“by signalling with the hand”) are complementary and are used to emphasise the gesture-language needed in place of speech. I therefore think that there should be no comma, as in Oldenberg’s edition, after *hatthavikārena* (there is none at MN i.207) since this makes the passage read “if it is impossible for him (to do this) by a movement of the hand”, i.e. if he is not able to move the vessel single-handed. This is of course a possible reading, but it is not elegant Pali and balance and emphasis are lost.

empty, set out water. If it was impossible for him (to do this) he set out water by signalling with his hand, having by a movement of his hand invited a companion (to help him); but not for such a reason did he break into speech.

Now it was the custom for monks who had kept the rains to go and see the Lord.¹ Then these monks, having kept the rains, at the end of the three months packed away their lodgings and taking their bowls and robes, set out for Sāvattthī. In due course they approached Sāvattthī, the Jeta Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery and the Lord. Having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. Now it is the custom for awakened ones, for Lords to exchange friendly greetings with in-coming monks.

Then the Lord spoke thus to these monks: "I hope that you were well, monks, I hope that you kept going, I hope that, all together, on friendly terms and harmonious, you passed a comfortable rainy season and did not go short of almsfood?"

"We were well, Lord, we kept going, Lord, and we, Lord, all together, on friendly terms and harmonious, passed a comfortable rainy season and did not go short of almsfood."

Now, Truthfinders (sometimes) ask knowing, and knowing (sometimes) do not ask; they ask, knowing the right time (to ask), and they do not ask, knowing the right time (when not to ask). Truthfinders ask about what belongs to the goal, not about what does not belong to the goal; there is bridge-breaking for Truthfinders in whatever does not belong to the goal. In two ways do awakened ones, Lords question monks, either: "Shall we teach *dhamma*?" or "Shall we lay down a rule of training for disciples?"² Then the Lord spoke thus to these monks:

"But in what way did you, monks, all together, on friendly terms and harmonious, spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of almsfood?"

"In that connection did we, Lord, several friends and associates, enter on the rains in a certain residence in the Kosala country. Then

¹ For following passage, cf. [BD 1.153f.](#)

² As at [Vin 1.59](#), [Vin 1.250](#), [Vin 3.6](#),

[Vin 3.88-Vin 3.89.](#)

1.159 it occurred to us, Lord: ‘Now by what means can we, all together, on friendly terms and harmonious, spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of almsfood?’ Then it occurred to us, Lord: ‘If we should neither address one another¹ ... Thus could we, all together, on friendly terms and harmonious, spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of almsfood.’ So we, Lord, neither addressed one another nor conversed. Whoever returned first from the village for almsfood made ready a seat² ... but not for such a reason did he break into speech. Thus did we, Lord, all together, on friendly terms and harmonious, spend a comfortable rainy season and not go short of almsfood.”

4.211
4.1.12 Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Indeed, monks, these foolish men, having spent an uncomfortable time, pretend to have spent an equally comfortable time. Indeed, monks, these foolish men, having spent communion like beasts, pretend to have spent an equally comfortable time. Indeed ... like sheep, pretend to have spent an equally comfortable time. Indeed ... having spent communion in indolence, pretend to have spent an equally comfortable time. How, monks, can these foolish men observe an observance of members of (other) sects: the practice of silence?³”

4.1.13 “It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, an observance of members of other sects, the practice of silence, should not be observed. Whoever should observe it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow, monks, monks who have kept the rains to ‘invite’⁴ in regard to three matters: what has been seen or heard or suspected. That will be what is suitable for

¹ As in Kd 4.1.2–Kd.4.1.4. ² As in Kd 4.1.5–Kd.4.1.7. ³ *mūgabbata*, custom of being dumb (*mūga*), according to Vin-a 1073, for three months. Cf. the monks who sat like dumb swine, *mūgasūkarā*, when they might have been speaking *dhamma*, above, BD 4.131. ⁴ *pavāretum*, a technical term used for a monk to “invite” others at the end of the rains to tell him if he has been seen or heard or suspected to have committed any offences. If they do so, and he acknowledges an offence by seeing it and making amends for it, he becomes rid of it, and is therefore pure to take his place in the Order’s business.

you in regard to one another, a removal of offences¹, an aiming at (grasping) the discipline.²

And thus, monks, should one invite. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Today is an Invitation day.³ If it seems right to the Order, the Order may invite.’ A monk who is an elder, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak to it thus: ‘Your reverences, I invite the Order in respect of what has been seen or heard or suspected. Let the venerable ones speak to me out of compassion, and seeing I will make amends.⁴ And a second time ... And a third time, your reverences, I invite the Order in respect of what has been seen or heard or suspected. Let the venerable ones speak to me out of compassion, and seeing I will make amends.’ A newly ordained monk, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder ... having saluted with joined palms, should speak to it thus: ‘Honoured sirs, I invite the Order in respect of what has been seen ... And a second time ... And a third time ... and seeing I will make amends.’”

Now at that time the group of six monks remained⁵ on seats while monks who were elders, sitting down on their haunches, were themselves inviting. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks remain on seats while monks who are elders, sitting down on their haunches, are themselves inviting?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks remained on seats ... were themselves inviting?”

¹ *āpattivuṭṭhānatā*, or a rising up from an offence (or offences). Cf. *āpattivuṭṭhitā* at **Kd 2.3.5**, and *vuṭṭhāsi* at **Kd 3.10.1**, a village was removed. ² *Vinaya-purekkhāratā*. Cf. *atthapurekkhāra dhammapurekkhāra* at e.g. **Vin 3.130**, **Vin 4.11**, **Vin 4.277**. ³ *pavāraṇā*, invitation. MN-a i.93 distinguishes four kinds of *pavāraṇā* and places first this one held at the end of the rains. ⁴ I.e. for the offence imputed to him and “seen” by him. ⁵ *acchanti*. Vin-a 1074 says they were sitting down, they did not stand up.

“It is true, Lord.” The awakened one, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men remain on seats ... are themselves inviting? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, you should not remain on seats while monks who are elders, sitting down on their haunches, are themselves inviting. I allow you, monks, to invite while each and every one is sitting down on his haunches.”

4.2.2 Now at that time a certain elder, feeble with age, thinking: “Until all have invited”, while sitting down on his haunches and waiting, fell down in a faint. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, (each one) to sit down on his haunches during the period until he invites, and having invited, to sit down on a seat.”

DIVISION OF THE INVITATION

4.3.1 Then it occurred to monks: “Now, how many Invitation (days) are there?” They told this to the Lord. He said: “Monks, there are these two Invitation (days), the fourteenth and the fifteenth. These, monks, are the two Invitation (days).”¹

4.3.2 Then it occurred to monks: “Now, how many (formal) acts for the Invitation are there?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, there are these four (formal) acts for the Invitation: a (formal) act for the Invitation (carried out) not by rule and when an assembly is incomplete... (=Kd 2.14.2, Kd 2.14.3; read act for the Invitation *instead of* act for Observance) ... you, monks, should train yourselves thus”.

ALLOWANCE TO GIVE INVITATION

433 Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: "Gather together, monks, the Order will invite."¹ When he had spoken thus a certain monk spoke thus to the Lord: "There is, Lord, a monk who is ill. He has not come." He said: "I allow you, monks, to give the Invitation on behalf of a monk who is ill. And thus, monks, should it be given: That ill monk, having approached one monk, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to him: 'I will give the Invitation, convey the Invitation for me, invite on my behalf.' If he makes it understood by gesture, if he makes it understood by voice, if he makes it understood by gesture and voice, the Invitation comes to be given. If he does not make it understood by gesture ... by gesture and voice, the Invitation does not come to be given.

If he thus manages this, it is good. If he does not manage it then, monks, that ill monk, having been brought to the midst of the Order on a couch or a chair, should invite. If, monks, it occurs to the monks who are tending the ill one ... (=Kd 2.22.2) ... the ill one should not be moved from (that) place; the Order having gone there may invite, **but one should not invite if an Order is incomplete. Whoever should so invite, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**

"**If, monks, the conveyor of the Invitation goes away then and there ... (=Kd 2.22.3, Kd 2.22.4; read Invitation, although the Invitation, the conveyor of the Invitation *instead of* entire purity, although the entire purity, the conveyor of the entire purity) ... there is an offence of wrong-doing for the conveyor of the Invitation.** I allow you, monks, on an Invitation day to give the consent also by giving the Invitation; they are the Order's business."²

ON BEING GRABBED BY RELATIVES

Now at that time his relations got hold of a certain monk on an Invitation day ... (as in **Kd 2.24.1-Kd.2.24.3**; read Invitation day for Observance day, and gives the Invitation for declares his entire purity, and invites for carries out the Observance) ...

DIVISION OF INVITATION BY SAṄGHA, ETC.

Now at that time five monks were staying in a certain residence on an Invitation day. Then it occurred to these monks: "It is laid down by the Lord that an Order may invite¹, but we are (only) five persons. Now, how can we invite?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to invite in an Order of five."²

Now at that time four monks were staying in a certain residence on an Invitation day. Then it occurred to these monks: "It is allowed by the Lord to invite in an Order of five, but we are (only) four persons. Now, how can we invite?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to invite one another when you are (only) four.

"And thus, monks, should one invite: These monks should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Let the venerable ones listen to me. Today is an Invitation day. If it seems right to the venerable ones, let us invite one another.' These monks should be spoken to thus by a monk who is an elder, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms: 'I, your reverences, invite the venerable ones in regard to what has been seen or heard or suspected. Let the

¹ Cf. **Kd 2.14.1**. ¹ Cf. **Kd 2.22.1**. ² Cf. **Kd 2.23.3**. ¹ Cf. **Kd 4.1.14**. ² The procedure for inviting an Order has been given in **Kd 4.1.14** and is not repeated here. "Inviting one another" when there are only four, three or two persons has not yet been explained, and so directions for the right method are given in the next paragraphs. Various sizes of *saṅghas* are given at **Kd 9.4.1**, with the formal acts they may not carry out. This whole passage should be compared with **Kd 2.26.1-Kd.2.26.10**.

venerable ones speak to me out of compassion, and seeing, I will make amends. And a second time ... And a third time ... and seeing, I will make amends.’ These monks should be spoken to thus by a newly ordained monk, having arranged ... ‘I, honoured sirs, invite the venerable ones in regard to what has been seen or heard or suspected ... And a second time ... And a third time ... and seeing, I will make amends.’”

Now at that time three monks were staying in a certain residence on an Invitation day. Then it occurred to these monks: “It is allowed by the Lord to invite in an Order of five persons, and to invite one another when there are four, but we are (only) three persons. Now how can we invite?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to invite one another when you are (only) three. And thus, monks, should one invite: These monks should be informed ... (= **Kd 4.5.3**) ... I will make amends.’”

Now at that time two monks were staying in a certain residence on an Invitation day. Then it occurred to these monks: “It is allowed by the Lord to invite in an Order of five (persons), to invite one another when there are four, to invite one another when there are three, but we are (only) two persons. Now, how can we invite?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to invite one another when you are (only) two.

“And thus, monks, should one invite: The monk who is the elder, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to the newly ordained monk: ‘I, your reverence, invite the venerable one in regard to what has been seen or heard or suspected. Let the venerable one speak to me out of compassion, and seeing, I will make amends. And a second time ... And a third time ... and seeing, I will make amends.’ The newly ordained monk, having arranged his upper robe ... with joined palms, should speak thus to the monk who is the

Kd 4.5.

Vin 1.16

Kd 4.5.

Kd 4.5.

elder: 'I, honoured sir, invite the venerable one ... And a third time ... and seeing, I will make amends.'”

4.5.7
4.216
4.5.8
Now at that time one monk was staying in a certain residence on an Invitation day. Then it occurred to that monk: “It is allowed by the Lord to invite in an Order of five (persons), to invite one another ... when there are (only) two, but I am alone. Now, how can I invite?” They told this matter to the Lord.

4.5.9
He said: “This is a case, monks, where one monk is staying in a certain residence on an Invitation day. Monks, that monk, having swept the place to which monks return—an attendance hall or a pavilion or the root of a tree—having put out drinking water and water for washing, having made ready a seat, having made a light, should sit down. If other monks arrive, he may invite together with them; if they do not arrive, he should determine: ‘Today is an Invitation day for me’. **If he should not (so) determine, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**

“**Monks, there where five monks are staying, four should not invite in an Order, having conveyed the invitation for one. If they should (so) invite, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**

“**Monks, there where four monks are staying, three should not invite one another, having conveyed the invitation for one. If they should (so) invite, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**

1.164
“**Monks, there where three monks are staying, two should not invite one another, having conveyed the invitation for one. If they should (so) invite, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**

“**Monks, there where two monks are staying, one should not determine, having conveyed the invitation for the other. If he should (so) determine, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

PROCEDURE FOR MAKING AMENDS

14.6.1

Now at that time a certain monk came to have fallen into an offence on an Invitation day.¹ Then it occurred to this monk: “It is laid down by the Lord that an offender should not invite,² and I have fallen into an offence. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “This is a case, monks, ... (cf. **Kd 2.27.1**, **Kd 2.27.2**; read Invitation day for Observance day)) ... When he has spoken thus, he may invite, but no obstacle should be put in the way of the Invitation from such a cause.”

PROCEDURE FOR NO OBSTACLE FROM OFFENCE

Now at that time a certain monk, as he was himself inviting, remembered an offence.³ Then it occurred to this monk: “It is laid down by the Lord that an offender should not invite, and I have fallen into an offence. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “This is a case, monks, where a monk, as he is himself inviting, remembers an offence. Monks, this monk should speak thus to the monk next to him: ‘I, your reverence, have fallen into such and such an offence; removing from here,⁴ I will make amends for that offence.’ When he has spoken thus, he may invite, but no obstacle should be put in the way of the Invitation from such a cause.

Kd 4.6.
BD 4.2

“This is a case, monks, where a monk as he is himself inviting, becomes doubtful about an offence. Monks ... (cf. **Kd 2.27.5**) ... When he has spoken thus he may invite, but no obstacle should be put in the way of the Invitation from such a cause.”

Kd 4.6.

¹ Cf. **Kd 2.27.1**. ² Cf. below, **BD 4.223**. ³ Cf. **Kd 2.27.4**. ⁴ Or, having risen up from here. ⁵ **OLDENBERG**, **Vin 1.164**, and *Vinaya Texts* i:336 compare this to **Kd 2.27.4–Kd 2.27.8**, which would mean that a monk also invited the Order collectively.

PROCEDURE FOR MAKING AMENDS FOR SHARED OFFENCE

(Note by Sujato: this section, which repeats the material from the corresponding section of the Uposathakkhandhaka, is not included in Horner's translation. See previous footnote.)

Told is the First Portion for Repeating

FIFTY CASES OF NO OFFENCE

Now at that time several resident monks, five or more, collected together in a certain residence on an Invitation day.¹ They did not know that the other resident monks had not arrived. Thinking of the rule, thinking of discipline, thinking that they were complete, they invited while they were incomplete. While they were inviting, other resident monks, a larger number, arrived. They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: "This is a case, monks, where several resident monks ... (as in Kd 4.7.1 above) ... While they are inviting, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. Monks, those monks should invite again; there is no offence for those who have invited."²

"This is a case, monks, ... other resident monks, a like number ... a smaller number, arrive. Those who have invited have duly invited; the remainder should invite, and there is no offence for those who have invited.

"This is a case, monks, where several resident monks, five or more, collect together in a certain residence on an Invitation day ... When they have just finished inviting, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. Monks, those monks should invite again; there is no offence for those who have invited.

"This is a case, monks, ... a like number ... a smaller number, arrive.

¹ Cf. Kd 2.28.1-Kd 2.28.7. ² *pavāritānam*, ¹ for the inviters, corresponding to the "reciters" of Kd 2.28.2.

Those who have invited have duly invited; they¹ should invite in their presence, and there is no offence for those who have invited.

“This is a case, monks, ... When they have just finished inviting but the assembly has not risen ... (=Kd 4.7.5) ... no offence for those who have invited.

“This is a case ... and part of the assembly has risen ... (=Kd 4.7.5) ... no offence for those who have invited.

“This is a case, monks, where ... the whole assembly has risen, and other resident monks, a larger number ... a like number ... a smaller number, arrive. Those who have invited have duly invited; they should invite in their presence, and there is no offence for those who have invited.”

Told are the Fifteen Cases in which there is No Offence

FIFTY CASES OF PERCEIVING IT IS A GROUP OR IS NOT A GROUP

“This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence several resident monks, five or more, collect together on an Invitation day.² They know that other resident monks have not arrived. Thinking of the rule, thinking of discipline, thinking that they are incomplete they invite while they are incomplete. While they are inviting, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. Monks, these monks should invite again, and there is an offence of wrong-doing for those who have invited.

“This is a case, monks, ... a like number ... a smaller number, arrive. Those who have invited have duly invited; the remainder should invite and there is an offence of wrong-doing for those who have invited.

“This is a case, monks, ... When they have just finished inviting ... and the assembly has not risen ... part of the assembly has risen ... the whole assembly has risen, and other resident monks, a larger

¹ I.e. the resident monks who arrive late. ² Cf. Kd 2.29.

number ... a like number ... a smaller number, arrive. Those who have invited have duly invited; they should invite in their presence, and there is an offence of wrong-doing for those who have invited.

Told are the Fifteen Cases on being Aware that an Assembly is incomplete when it is incomplete

FIFTY CASES OF DOUBT

^{4.9.1} “This is a case, monks, where several resident monks five or more, collect together on an Invitation day.¹ They know that other resident monks have not arrived. Thinking: ‘Now, is it allowable for us to invite or is it not allowable?’ they invite (although they are in doubt). While they are inviting, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. **Monks, these monks should invite again, and there is an offence of wrong-doing for those who have invited.**

^{4.9.2} “This is a case, ... (cf. **Kd 4.8.2, Kd 4.8.3**) ... **they should invite in their presence, and there is an offence of wrong-doing for those who have invited.**”

Told are the Fifteen Cases on Being in Doubt

FIFTY CASES OF ACTING BADLY

^{4.10.1} “This is a case,² ... (as in **Kd 4.9.1**) ... **Thinking, ‘Indeed, it is allowable for us to invite, it is not unallowable for us’, they, acting badly, invited. While they are inviting ... offence of wrong-doing for those who have invited.**

^{4.10.2} “This is a case,³ ... (cf. **Kd 4.8.2, Kd 4.8.3**) ... **they should invite in their presence, and there is an offence of wrong-doing for those who have invited.**”

Told are the Fifteen Cases on Acting Badly

¹ Cf. **Kd 2.30.** ² Cf. **Kd 2.31.1.** ³ Cf. **Kd 2.31.2.**

FIFTY CASES OF AIMING AT SCHISM

“This is a case,¹ They know that there are other resident monks who have not arrived. Saying: ‘These are perishing, these are being destroyed, what good are these to you?’ they invite, aiming at a schism. While they are inviting, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. **Monks, those monks should invite again, and there is a grave offence for those who have invited.**

“This is a case, ... (cf. **Kd 4.8.2, Kd 4.8.3**; *Read grave offence instead of offence of wrong-doing; in the case of a like number a smaller number read those who have invited have duly invited, the rest should invite.*) ... **they should invite in their presence, and there is a grave offence for those who have invited.**”

Told are the Fifteen Cases on aiming at a Schism

Told are the Seventy-five Cases

ABBREVIATED REPETITIONS ON ENTERING A BOUNDARY

“This is a case,² ... They know that other resident monks are entering within the boundary. They know that other resident monks have entered within the boundary. They see other resident monks entering within the boundary. They see other resident monks entered within the boundary. They hear other resident monks entering within the boundary. They hear other resident monks who have entered within the boundary.

“From a hundred and seventy-five triads referring to resident (monks) with resident (monks); to incoming (monks) with resident (monks); to resident (monks) with incoming (monks); to incoming (monks) with incoming (monks), there come to be seven hundred triads by means of (these) sets.

¹ Cf. **Kd 2.32.** ² Cf. **Kd 2.33.**

VARIOUS DAYS

^{4.13.1} “This is a case, monks, where the fourteenth is (the Invitation day) for resident monks, the fifteenth for incoming monks ... (= Kd 2.34.1-2.35.5. Read they should invite, they invite, on an Invitation day *instead of* Observance should be carried out, they carry out the Observance, on an Observance day.) ... if he knows, ‘I am able to arrive this very day’.

VISIBLE CHARACTERISTICS

(Note by Sujato: this section, which repeats the material from the corresponding section of the Uposathakkhandhaka, is not included in Horner’s translation.)

INVITATION WITH THOSE OF DIFFERENT COMMUNION, ETC.

(Note by Sujato: See previous note.)

PORTION ON SHOULD NOT GO

(Note by Sujato: See previous note.)

PORTION ON SHOULD GO

(Note by Sujato: See previous note.)

SEEING A BLAMEWORTHY PERSON

^{4.14.1} “Monks, one should not invite in a seated assembly before a nun ...¹
^{4.14.2}

^{4.14.3} ...

^{1.168}
^{1.14.4} ¹ See Kd 2.36.1, Kd 2.36.3.

“Monks, one should not invite by giving the Invitation of one on probation unless the assembly has not risen.¹ And, monks, one should not invite on a non-Invitation day unless the Order be unanimous.”

INVITATION WITH TWO STATEMENTS, ETC.

Now at that time in a certain residence in the Kosala country there came to be a menace from savages on an Invitation day.² The monks were unable to invite by using the threefold formula.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to invite by using a two-fold formula.” The menace from the savages became even greater. The monks were unable to invite by using the two-fold formula. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to invite by using a onefold formula.” The menace from the savages became even greater. The monks were unable to invite by using the onefold formula. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to invite those who keep the rains (all) together.”

Now at that time in a certain residence people were giving gifts on an Invitation day until the night was almost ended. Then it occurred to those monks: “People are giving gifts until the night is almost ended. If the Order invites by the threefold formula, then the Order will not be invited before dawn breaks. Now what line of conduct should be followed by us?” They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: “This is a case, monks, ... (as in [Kd 4.15.2](#)) ... before dawn breaks’. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. People are giving gifts until the night is almost ended. If the Order invites by the

¹ Cf. [Kd 2.36.4](#). ² Cf. [Kd 2.15.3](#). ³ See [Kd 4.1.14](#). As Buddhaghosa at [Vin-a 1077](#) seems to imply the motion (*ñatti*) could be shelved if the Order approves. Then the inviting monk had merely three times to repeat his request to invite the Order. Above, he is allowed to curtail the number of times he makes the request. Cf. *dvevācika* and *tevācika* above [Kd 1.4.5](#), [Kd 1.7.10](#).

threefold formula, then the Order will not be invited before dawn breaks. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may invite those who keep the rains together by a twofold formula, by a onefold formula.’

“This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence on an Invitation day monks are speaking *dhamma*, those versed in the discourses are chanting a discourse, the discipline experts are propounding discipline, the talkers on *dhamma* are discussing *dhamma*, monks are quarrelling¹ until the night is almost ended. If it then occurs to these monks: ‘Monks are quarrelling until the night is almost ended. If the Order invites by the threefold formula, then the Order will not be invited before dawn breaks’, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Monks are quarrelling ... the Order will not be invited before dawn breaks. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may invite those who keep the rains together by a twofold formula, by a onefold formula.’”

Now at that time in a certain residence in the Kosala country a large Order of monks came to have collected together on an Invitation day, and (only) a small (place) was sheltered from the rain and a great cloud had come up. Then it occurred to these monks: “Now this large Order of monks has collected together, and (only) a small (place) is sheltered from the rain and a great cloud has come up. If the Order invites by the threefold formula, then the Order will not be invited before this cloud pours down rain. Now what line of conduct should be followed by us?” They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: “This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence a large Order of monks has collected together on an Invitation day, and (only) a small (place) ... (as in *Kd 4.15.5* above) ... If it then occurs to these monks: ‘Now this large Order of monks ... pours down rain’, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This large Order of monks ... pours down rain. If it seems right to the Order, the Order

¹ “Quarrelling” really means arguing and disputing about points of *dhamma* and discipline.

may invite those who keep the rains together by a twofold formula, by a onefold formula.’

“This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence on an Invitation day there comes to be a danger from kings ... from thieves ... from fire ... from water ... from human beings ... from non-human beings ... from beasts of prey ... from creeping things ... to life ... to the Brahma-faring.¹ It then occurs to these monks: ‘Now this is a danger to the Brahma-faring. If the Order invites by the threefold formula, then the Order will not be invited before there is a danger to the Brahma-faring.’ The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This is a danger to the Brahma-faring. If the Order invites by the threefold formula, then the Order will not be invited before there is a danger to the Brahma-faring. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may invite those who keep the rains together by a twofold formula, by a onefold formula.’”

SETTING ASIDE THE INVITATION

Now at that time the group of six monks invited (while they were) offenders. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, an offender should not invite. Whoever (such) should invite, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, having obtained leave from whatever offender is inviting, to reprove him for the offence.”²

Now at that time the group of six monks, (although) obtaining leave, did not wish to give leave. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to suspend the invitation³ of one not giving leave. And thus, monks, should it be suspended: If on an Invitation day, whether the fourteenth or the fifteenth, one should say in the presence of that individual, in the midst of the Order: ‘Honoured sirs,

¹ Cf. above BD 4.148. ² Cf. Kd 2.16.1. ³ *pavāranam ṭhapetuṃ*, cf. Vin 2.5, Vin 2.22, Vin 2.32.

let the Order listen to me. The individual so-and-so is an offender; I am suspending his invitation; one should not invite in his presence', the invitation comes to be suspended."

4.16.3 Now at that time the group of six monks, saying: "Before well behaved monks suspend our invitation"¹, themselves suspended beforehand, without ground, without reason, the invitation of pure monks who were not offenders, and they also suspended the invitation of those who had (already) invited. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **"Monks, one should not suspend without ground, without reason, the invitation of pure monks who are not offenders. Whoever should (so) suspend it, there is an offence of wrongdoing. Nor, monks, should one suspend the invitation of those who have invited. Whoever should (so) suspend it, there is an offence of wrongdoing."**

4.16.4
4.224 "Monks, an invitation comes to be (duly) suspended thus, not (duly) suspended thus. And how, monks, does an invitation come to be not (duly) suspended? If, monks, one suspends an invitation when the invitation has been spoken, uttered and brought to a close by the threefold formula, the invitation comes to be not (duly) suspended. If, monks, one suspends an invitation when the invitation has been spoken, uttered and brought to a close by a twofold formula ... by a onefold formula ... by those keeping the rains together, an invitation comes to be not (duly) suspended. It is thus, monks, that an invitation comes to be not (duly) suspended.

1.171
4.16.5 "And how, monks, does an invitation come to be (duly) suspended? If, monks, one suspends an invitation when the invitation has been spoken, uttered, but not brought to a close² by the threefold formula, the invitation comes to be (duly) suspended. If, monks, one suspends ... but not brought to a close by the twofold formula ... by the onefold formula ... by those keeping the rains together, the invitation comes

¹ Cf. **Kd 2.16.3**. ² Correct in the Pali text *pariyositāya to apari-*, as noted at *Vinaya Texts* i.342, n. 1.

to be (duly) suspended. It is thus, monks, that an invitation comes to be (duly) suspended.

“This is a case, monks, when on an Invitation day a monk suspends (another) monk’s invitation. If other monks know concerning this monk: ‘This venerable one is not pure in the conduct of his body, he is not pure in the conduct of his speech, he is not pure in his mode of livelihood; he is ignorant, inexperienced; he is not competent when being himself questioned to give an explanation¹,’ and if having snubbed² him, they say: ‘That’s enough, monk, let there be no strife, let there be no quarrel, let there be no dispute, let there be no contention’, the Order may invite.

“This is a case, monks, ... (as in **Kd 4.16.6** above ‘... is pure in the conduct of his body, but he is not pure in the conduct of his speech, he is not pure in his mode of livelihood) ... to give an explanation’, ... the Order may invite.

“This is a case, monks, ... (as in **Kd 4.16.6** above ‘... is pure in the conduct of his body, he is pure in the conduct of his speech, but he is not pure in his mode of livelihood) ...’. the Order may invite.

“This is a case, monks ... (as in **Kd 4.16.6** above ‘... is pure in the conduct of his body, pure in the conduct of his speech, pure in his mode of livelihood; but he is ignorant, inexperienced; he is not competent when himself being questioned) ...’ ... the Order may invite.

“This is a case, monks, ... (as in **Kd 4.16.6** above ‘... is pure in the conduct of his body) ... pure in his mode of livelihood; he is learned, experienced; he is competent when being himself questioned to give an explanation’, one should speak thus to him: ‘If you, your reverence, suspend this monk’s invitation, why do you suspend it? Do you suspend it on account of a falling away from moral habit³? Do you suspend it on account of a falling away from good habits⁴? Do

¹ *anuyogaṃ dātumī*. ² *omadditvā*, having crushed. Vin-a 1078 says that it is here a verbal crushing. ³ Defined at AN i.268 as onslaught on creatures, taking what is not given, wrong conduct in sense-pleasures, lying, slandering, using harsh words, babbling. These three “falling aways” or failures are mentioned above **BD 4.82f**.

⁴ AN i.268 has *cittavipatti* for *ācāravipatti* of above.

you suspend it on account of a falling away from (right) view¹?

“If he should speak thus: ‘I suspend it on account of a falling away from moral habit ... a falling away from (right) view’, one should speak thus to him: ‘But does your reverence know what is a falling away from moral habit ... a falling away from (right) view?’ If he should speak thus: ‘I know, your reverence, what is a falling away from moral habit ... a falling away from (right) view’, one should speak thus to him: ‘But which, your reverence, is a falling away from moral habit, which is a falling away from good habits, which is a falling away from (right) view?’

“If he should speak thus: ‘This is a falling away from moral habit: the four offences involving defeat, the thirteen offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order. This is a falling away from good habits: a grave offence, an offence of expiation, an offence which ought to be confessed, an offence of wrong-doing, an offence of wrong speech. This is a falling away from (right) view: a wrong view, taking up an extreme view²’, one should speak thus to him: ‘But if you, your reverence, suspend this monk’s invitation, do you suspend it on account of what was seen, do you suspend it on account of what was heard, do you suspend it on account of what was suspected?’

“If he should speak thus: ‘I am suspending it on account of what

¹ Defined at AN i.268 in the terms of Ajita Kesakambalin’s annihilationist views (cf. DN i.55). ² *antaggāhikā diṭṭhi*. See MORRIS, Journal of the Pali Text Society, 1884, p.70, “the (heretical) doctrine of maintaining or holding the three *antas* or goals, which, according to the Sangīti Suttanta (DN iii.216) are *sakkāyo anto*, *sakkāyasamuddo anto*, *sakkāyanirodho anto*”. With DN iii.216, cf. AN iii.401, and see *Pali-English Dictionary* which questions Morris’ interpretation of *anta* as goal. *Antaggāhikā diṭṭhi* also occurs at DN iii.45, AN i.154, AN ii.240, AN iii.130, Vb 367. Various such “extreme views” are mentioned at SN ii.17, SN ii.19, SN ii.63, Ps.i.151ff. DN-a iii.839 explains: “this view is called ‘taking up an extreme’ through taking up the extreme (*anta*) of the annihilationists.” AN-a ii.254 explains “a view established having taken up the extreme (*anta*) of what is founded on the ten” (“doctrines of the annihilationist”, GS i.138, n. 1). AN-a iii.279 explains: “established having taken up (the position of) the eternalist or the annihilationist.” Ten “diverse views” are mentioned at SN iii.258, while ten “extreme views” are differentiated from ten “wrong views” at Nd-a i.162. These two sets of ten are mentioned at Mnd 113, with twenty *sakkāyadiṭṭhi* (Mnd 112).

was seen, or, I am suspending it on account of what was heard, or, I am suspending it on account of what was suspected', one should speak to him thus: 'But, if you, your reverence, are suspending this monk's invitation on account of what was seen, how have you seen, when have you seen, where have you seen? Have you seen him committing an offence involving defeat? Was he seen committing an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order? Was he seen committing a grave offence, an offence of expiation, an offence which ought to be confessed, an offence of wrong-doing, an offence of wrong speech? And where were you? And where was this monk? And what were you doing? And what was this monk doing?'

"If he should speak thus: 'But I, your reverences, am not suspending this monk's invitation on account of what was seen, but I am suspending the invitation on account of what was heard', one should speak to him thus: 'But, if you, your reverence, suspend this monk's invitation on account of what was heard, what have you heard, how have you heard, when have you heard, where have you heard? Did you hear that he had committed an offence involving defeat? Did you hear that he had committed an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order? Did you hear that he had committed a grave offence, an offence of expiation, an offence which ought to be confessed, an offence of wrong-doing, an offence of wrong speech? Did you hear from a monk? Did you hear from a nun ... a probationer ... a novice ... a woman novice ... a lay-follower ... a woman lay-follower ... kings ... king's ministers ... from leaders of (other) sects ... from disciples of (other) sects?'

"If he should speak thus: 'But I, your reverences, am not suspending this monk's invitation on account of what was heard, but I am suspending the invitation on account of what was suspected one should speak to him thus: 'But, if you, your reverence, are suspending this monk's invitation on account of what was suspected, what did you suspect, how did you suspect, when did you suspect, where did you suspect? Did you suspect that he had committed an offence involving defeat? Did you suspect that he had committed an offence

Kd 4.16

BD 4.2

Kd 4.16

Vin 1.17

entailing a formal meeting of the Order? Did you suspect that he had committed a grave offence, an offence of expiation, an offence which ought to be confessed, an offence of wrong-doing, an offence of wrong speech? Did you suspect, having heard from a monk ... from disciples of (other) sects?

“If he should speak thus: ‘But I, your reverences, am not suspending this monk’s invitation on account of what was suspected, moreover I do not know on account of what I am suspending this monk’s invitation’, and if, monks, the reproving monk does not satisfy his intelligent fellows in the Brahma-faring with his explanation, it is sufficient to say that the reprovved monk is blameless. But if the reproving monk satisfies his intelligent fellows in the Brahma-faring with his explanation, it is sufficient to say that the reprovved monk is blameworthy.

“If that reproving monk, monks, admits that he has defamed (another monk) with an unfounded charge of an offence involving defeat, then the Order, having charged him with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order,¹ may invite. If, monks, that reproving monk admits that he has defamed (another monk) with an unfounded charge of an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the Order, having had him dealt with according to the rule,² may invite. If, monks, that reproving monk admits that he has defamed (another monk) with an unfounded charge involving a grave offence, an offence of expiation, an offence which ought to be confessed, an offence of wrong doing, an offence of wrong speech, the Order, having had him dealt with according to the rule,³ may invite.

“If, monks, that reprovved monk admits that he has committed an offence involving defeat, the Order, having expelled him, may invite. If, monks, that reprovved monk admits that he has committed an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the Order, having charged him with an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, may invite. If, monks, that reprovved monk admits that he has

¹ See Bu-Ss 8. ² See Bu-Pc 76. ³ Cf. Bu-Ss 9 (Vin 3.170). Vin-a 1078 says that offences incurred in all these cases are those of wrong-doing.

committed a grave offence ... an offence of wrong speech, the Order, having had him dealt with according to the rule, may invite.

BASIS FOR A GRAVE OFFENCE, ETC.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk comes to have committed a grave offence on an Invitation day. Some monks view it as a grave offence, other monks view it as an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Monks, those monks who view it as a grave offence, having led that monk to one side, having had him dealt with according to the rule, having approached the Order, should speak to it thus: ‘Your reverences, the monk who has fallen into that offence has made amends for it according to rule. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may invite.’

“This is a case, monks, where a monk comes to have committed a grave offence on an Invitation day. Some monks view it as a grave offence, other monks view it as an offence of expiation. Some monks view it as a grave offence, other monks view it as an offence which ought to be confessed. Some monks view it as a grave offence, other monks view it as an offence of wrong-doing. Some monks view it as a grave offence, other monks view it as an offence of wrong speech. Monks, those monks who view it as a grave offence ... (=Kd 4.16.19) ‘... the Order may invite’.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk comes to have committed an offence of expiation on an Invitation day ... an offence which ought to be confessed ... an offence of wrong-doing ... an offence of wrong speech. Some monks view it as an offence of wrong speech, other monks view it as an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Monks, those monks who view it as an offence of wrong speech ... (=Kd 4.16.19) ‘... the Order may invite’.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk comes to have committed an offence of wrong speech on an Invitation day. Some monks view it as an offence of wrong speech, other monks view it as a grave offence; some monks ... as an offence of wrong speech, other monks ... of

Kd 4.16

Kd 4.16

Vin 4.17

Kd 4.16

BD 4.2

Kd 4.16

expiation; some monks ... offence of wrong speech, other monks ... which ought to be confessed; some monks view it as an offence of wrong speech, other monks view it as an offence of wrong-doing. Monks, those monks who view it as an offence of wrong speech ... (= Kd 4.16.19) '... the Order may invite'.

16.23 "This is a case, monks, where if on an Invitation day a monk should speak in the midst of the Order, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This matter is known but not the individual'¹. If it seems right to the Order, the Order, having set aside the matter, may invite'², and he should be spoken to thus: 'Your reverence, Invitation is laid down by the Lord for those who are pure. If the matter is known but not the individual, speak about that now at once.'

16.24 "This is a case, monks, where if on an Invitation day a monk should speak in the midst of the Order, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This individual is known but not the matter. If it seems right to the Order, the Order, having set aside the individual, may invite; and he should be spoken to thus: 'Your reverence, Invitation is laid down by the Lord for those who are complete.'³ If the individual is known but not the matter, speak about that now at once.'

16.25 "This is a case, monks, ... 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This matter is known and the individual. If it seems right to the Order, the Order, having set aside the matter and the individual, may invite', and he should be spoken to thus: 'Your reverence, Invitation is laid down by the Lord for the pure and for those who are complete. If the matter is known and also the individual, speak about that now at once.'

16.26 "If, monks, the matter is known before an Invitation day, the individual afterwards, it is right to say so. If, monks, the individual is known before an Invitation day, the matter afterwards, it is right to say so. If, monks, both the matter and the individual are known before an Invitation day, and (a monk) opens up (the cases) after the

¹ I.e., the person who committed the offence or "matter", *vatthu*. ² Vin-a 1078 says "when we know the person, then we will reprove him, but let the Order invite now". ³ A complete Order.

Invitation is finished, there is an offence of expiation for opening up.”¹

THE STORY OF MAKERS OF STRIFE

Now at that time several monks, friends and associates, entered on the rains in a certain residence in the Kosala country. In their neighbourhood other monks, makers of strife, makers of quarrels, makers of dispute, makers of contention, makers of legal questions in an Order, entered on the rains, saying: “When these monks have kept the rains we will suspend the invitation on an Invitation day.” But those monks heard: “It is said that in our neighbourhood other monks ... entered on the rains, saying: ‘When these monks ... on an Invitation day. ‘Now, what line of conduct should be followed by us?’ They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: “This is a case, monks, where several monks, friends and associates, enter on the rains in a certain residence. In their neighbourhood ... (as in [Kd 4.17.1](#)) ‘... on an Invitation day’ I allow you, monks, to carry out two or three Observances with these monks on the fourteenth (day),² thinking: ‘How can we invite before those monks (invite)?’ If, monks, those monks who are makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in an Order, arrive at a residence, then, monks, those resident monks, having gathered together quickly, may invite; and having invited, they should say (to the others): ‘We, your reverences, have invited; let the venerable ones do what seems fitting.’

“If, monks, those monks who are makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in the Order, arrive unexpectedly at that residence,

¹ See [Bu-Pc 63](#), where, it is an offence to open up for further discussion a matter already settled. ² Vin-a 1079 says, “here, the fourth and fifth are the two ‘fourteen (days)’, but there is usually a third ‘fourteenth’; therefore the third and fourth, or the third, fourth and fifth are the two or three ‘fourteenths’ that should be carried out. Thus there come to be two ‘fourteenths’. Proceeding thus—the thirteenth or fourteenth for the makers of strife—these will invite on an Invitation day that is a fifteenth (day)”.

those resident monks should make ready a seat, they should bring forward water for washing the feet, a footstool, a footstand, having gone to meet them they should receive their bowls and robes, they should offer them drinking water; having looked after them, (then) having gone outside the boundary, they may invite; having invited, they should say (to the others): ‘We, your reverences, have invited; let the venerable ones do what seems fitting.’

“If they should thus manage this, it is good. But if they do not manage it, the resident monks should be informed by an experienced, competent resident monk, saying: ‘Let the venerable ones who are residents listen to me. If it seems right to the venerables ones, we may now carry out the Observance, we may recite the Pātimokkha, we may invite on the next new-moon day¹’. If, monks, those monks who are makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in the Order, should speak thus to these monks: ‘All right, your reverences, but let us invite now at once’, they should be spoken to thus: ‘But you, your reverences, are not masters of our Invitation (-day), we will not invite yet’.

“If, monks, these monks who are makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in the Order, should stay on until that new-moon day, then, monks, the resident monks should be informed by an experienced, competent resident monk ... ‘... let us invite on the next full-moon day²’ ... (as in **Kd 4.17.4**) ‘... we will not invite yet’.

“If, monks, those monks who are makers of strife ... should stay on until that full-moon day, then monks, these monks, each and every one, must invite on the next full-moon day of the *komudī cātumāsini*,³ (even if) they are unwilling.

“If, monks, while these monks are themselves inviting, an ill one suspends the invitation of one who is not ill, he should be spoken to thus: ‘The venerable one is ill, and it is said by the Lord that one who is ill is not able to endure being questioned. Wait, your reverence, until you are well, when you are well you can reprove him if you desire to do so’. If being spoken to thus, he (nevertheless) reproves

¹ *kāle*. ² *junḥe*; cf. above, **BD 4.185**. ³ See above, **BD 4.205, n. 3**.

him, in disrespect there is an offence of expiation.¹

“If, monks, while these monks are themselves inviting, one who is not ill suspends an ill one’s invitation, he should be spoken to thus: ‘Your reverence, this monk is ill, and it is said by the Lord that one who is ill is not able to endure being questioned. Wait, your reverence, until this monk is well; when he is well you can reprove him if you desire to do so’. If being spoken to thus, he (nevertheless) reproves him, in disrespect there is an offence of expiation.

“If, monks, while these monks are themselves inviting, an ill one suspends an ill one’s invitation, he should be spoken to thus: ‘The venerable ones are ill ... being questioned. Wait, your reverence, until you are (both) well; when he is well you can reprove him if you desire to do so’. If, being spoken to thus, he (nevertheless) reproves him, in disrespect there is an offence of expiation.

“If, monks, while these monks are themselves inviting, one who is not ill suspends the invitation of (another) who is not ill, the Order having questioned both closely and cross-questioned them, having had them dealt with according to the rule, may invite.”

HARMONIOUS INVITATION

Now at that time several monks, friends and companions, entered on the rains in a certain residence in the Kosala country. While these were staying together on friendly terms and harmonious, a certain comfort was arrived at. Then it occurred to these monks: “While we are staying together ... arrived at. But if we should invite now, it may be that (some) monks, having invited, may set forth on tour, and so we will come to lose² this comfort. Now what line of conduct should be followed by us?” They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: “This is a case, monks, where several monks friends and companions, enter on the rains in a certain residence. While these are staying together ... arrived at. If it then occurs to these monks:

¹ Cf. also **Bu-Pc 54**. ² *paribāhirā*, external to, outside; as a noun, outsiders.

‘While we are staying together so we will come to lose this comfort’.
I allow you, monks, to make a protection of an Invitation day.¹

“And thus, monks, should it be made: Each and every one should gather together in the same place; when they have gathered together, the Order should be informed by an experienced competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While we were staying together ... so will we come to lose this comfort. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may make a protection of an Invitation day, it may carry out the Observance, it may recite the Pātimokkha now; the Order may invite on the next *komudī cātumāsini* day. This is the motion.

“‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While we were staying together ... so will we come to lose this comfort. The Order is making a protection of the Invitation day; it will carry out the Observance, it will recite the Pātimokkha now; it will invite on the next *komudī cātumāsini* day. If the making a protection of the Invitation day (by the Order) is pleasing to the venerable ones (so that) it will carry out the Observance, will recite the Pātimokkha now, and will invite on the next *komudī cātumāsini* day, you should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. A protection of the Invitation day is made by the Order, it will carry out the Observance, it will recite the Pātimokkha now, and it will invite on the next *komudī cātumāsini* day. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’

“If, monks, when these monks have made a protection of an Invitation day, any monk should speak thus: ‘I want, your reverences, to set forth on a tour of the country, I have business to do in the country’, he should be spoken to thus: ‘Very well, your reverence, you can go when you have invited.’ And if, monks, that monk, while he is invit-

¹ *pavāraṇāsaraṅgaha*. Vin-a 1080 says that “when the *pavāraṇāsaraṅgaha* has been given, there comes to be as it were an avoidance during the rains; incoming monks can not take their (the resident ones’) lodgings, nor should the rains be cut short by them, for, having invited, they get the chance to set out on tour even during (the rains)”. The monks protect their harmony by postponing the Invitation day to the end of the rainy season.

ing, suspends another's invitation, he should be spoken to thus: 'You, your reverence, are not master of my Invitation day, I will not invite yet'. And if, monks, any monk suspends that monk's invitation while that monk is inviting, the Order, having questioned both closely and cross-questioned them, should have them dealt with according to the rule.

"If, monks, that monk, having concluded his business in the country, returns again to that residence before the *komudī cātumāsinī* day and if, monks, while those monks are inviting, any monk suspends that monk's invitation, he should be spoken to thus: 'You, your reverence, are not master of my Invitation day, I have invited (already)'. If, monks, while those monks are inviting, that monk suspends any monk's invitation, the Order, having questioned both closely and having cross-questioned them, and having had them dealt with according to the rule, may invite."

The Fourth Section: that on Invitation

THIS IS ITS KEY

Having kept the rains they went to see the teacher in Kosala,
communion that was uncomfortable (and) like beasts,
suitable in regard to one another,
Inviting on a seat,¹ and two, (formal) act, ill one,
relations, kings, and thieves, and men of abandoned life,
likewise monks who are enemies of monks,
Five, four, three, two, one, fallen,
he doubted, he remembered,
the whole Order, being in doubt,
greater, like, smaller (number),
Resident monks, the fourteenth,
the two communions by mark,
should arrive, not in a seated (assembly),
giving leave of absence, non-invitation,
About savages, almost ended, great cloud,
and an obstacle, invitation,
they do not give (leave), 'in case our',
and not (duly) suspended, for a monk,
'Or on what?', and which in regard to what is seen, heard, suspected,

¹ *pavārentāpaṇā*. I follow the reading *pavārent āsane* of Sinhalese edition, and as suggested by OLDENBERG at Vin 1.379 (see Kd 4.18.2).

reproving and reprov'd, grave offence, matter, strife,
And a protection of an Invitation day,
not master, may invite.

5. LEATHER (CAMMA)

THE STORY OF SOᅇA KOᅇIVISA

At one time the awakened one, the Lord, was staying at Rājagaha on Mount Vulture Peak. Now at that time King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha ruled with supreme authority over eighty thousand villages. Now at that time, at Campā, a merchant's son called Soᅇa Koᅇivisa¹ was delicately nurtured and down came to have grown on the soles of his feet. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having had those eighty thousand village overseers² convened, sent a messenger to Soᅇa Koᅇivisa on some business, saying: "Let Soᅇa come, I want Soᅇa to come."

Then Soᅇa Koᅇivisa's parents spoke thus to Soᅇa Koᅇivisa: "The king, dear Soᅇa, wants to see your feet. Do not you, dear Soᅇa, stretch out your feet towards the king; sit down cross-legged in front of the king, and as you are sitting down the king will see your feet." Then they sent Soᅇa Koᅇivisa away in a palanquin. Then Soᅇa Koᅇivisa approached King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having approached, having greeted. King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, he sat down cross-legged in front of the king. So King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha saw the down that was growing on the soles of Soᅇa Koᅇivisa's feet.

¹ This Soᅇa episode recurs, in a shorter form, at AN iii.374-AN iii.379. Soᅇa's verses at Thag 632-644. Legend of how he came to be called Soᅇa (golden) given in Thag A. (see *Psalms of the Bretheren* p. 275f.), and AN-a i.233f. At AN i.24 he is called foremost of those who put forth energy; his clan name is there spelt Koᅇivīsa. ² Vin-a 1081 speaks of these as sons of (respectable) families living in these villages.

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having instructed those eighty thousand village overseers in matters concerning this world, dismissed them, saying: “You, good sirs, are now instructed by me in matters concerning this world; go along, pay homage to this Lord, and our Lord will instruct you in transcendental matters.” Then those eighty thousand village overseers approached Mount Vulture Peak.

5.1.4
4.237
1.180
Now at that time the venerable Sāgata¹ was the Lord’s attendant. Then those eighty thousand village overseers approached the venerable Sāgata; having approached, they spoke thus to the venerable Sāgata: “Honoured sir, these eighty thousand village overseers are approaching here to see the Lord. It were good, honoured sir, if we might have a chance to see the Lord.”

“Well, then, do you, venerable ones, remain² here for a moment until I have let the Lord know.”

d5.1.5
Then the venerable Sāgata, having stepped down³ from the moonstone (step)⁴ in front of the eighty thousand watching village overseers, having stepped up in front of the Lord, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, these eighty thousand village overseers are approaching here to see the Lord. Lord, does the Lord think it is now the right time for this?”

“Well, then, do you, Sāgata, make a seat ready in the shade of the dwelling-place.”

d5.1.6
“Very well, Lord,” and the venerable Sāgata having answered the Lord in assent, having taken a chair, having stepped down from in front of the Lord, having stepped up on the moonstone (step) in front of the eighty thousand watching village overseers, made ready a seat

¹ Cf. **Vin 4.108**, where Sāgata’s behaviour gave rise to the offence of drinking strong drink. See **BD 2.382, n. 6**. ² *hotha*. ³ *nimujjitvā ... ummujjitvā*. These two verbs are often used of plunging into and emerging from water. Here they seem to mean getting off one step and on to another. ⁴ *pāṭikā*, such as is (in the old cities of Ceylon) an architectural feature placed at the bottom of a short flight of steps leading up to a *vihāra* or a “temple”. See Mahāvamsa 31, Mahāvamsa 61. Nowadays it is called “moonstone step”, although in shape it is half a circle. It is called “half-moon stone”, *aḍḍhacandapāsāna*, at Vin-a 1081.

in the shade of the dwelling-place. Then the Lord, having issued from the dwelling-place, sat down on the seat made ready in the shade of the dwelling-place.

Then those eighty thousand village overseers approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. Then those eighty thousand village overseers paid respect only to the venerable Sāgata, not likewise to the Lord. Then the Lord, knowing by reasoning of mind the minds of those eighty thousand village overseers, addressed the venerable Sāgata, saying: “Well then, do you, Sāgata, abundantly show a state of further-men,¹ a wonder of psychic power.”

“Very well, Lord,” and the venerable Sagata, having answered the Lord in assent, having risen above the ground,² paced up and down in the air, in the atmosphere, and he stood, and he sat down, and he lay down, and he smoked³ and he blazed,⁴ and then he vanished.

Then the venerable Sagata, having shown in the air, in the atmosphere, various states of further-men and wonders of psychic power, having inclined his head towards the Lord’s feet, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the Lord is my teacher, I am a disciple; Lord, the Lord is my teacher, I am a disciple”. Then those eighty thousand village overseers, saying: “Indeed it is marvellous, indeed, it is wonderful, that even a disciple can be of such great psychic power, of such great might. What must the teacher be?” paid respect only to the Lord, not likewise to the venerable Sagata.

Then the Lord, knowing by reasoning of mind the minds of those eighty thousand village overseers, talked a progressive talk,⁵ that is to say talk on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven, he explained the peril, the vanity, the depravity of pleasures of the senses, the advantage in renouncing (them). When the Lord knew that their minds were ready, malleable, devoid of the hindrances, uplifted, pleased, then he explained to them that teaching on *dhamma* which

¹ *uttarimanussadhamma*. See **BD 1, Introduction, p.xxivff.** ² See **BD 1.79, n. 6.**

³ *dhūpāyati*. At **Vin 4.109** a verb used to describe his activities is *padhūpāsi*, he blew forth smoke. ⁴ He is also said to have blazed at **Vin 4.109** ⁵ Cf. **Vin 1.15-Vin.1.16.**

the awakened ones have themselves discovered: ill, uprising, stopping, the way. And as a clean cloth without black specks will easily take dye, even so as those eighty thousand village overseers were (sitting) on that very seat, *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose: that, “whatever is of the nature to uprise, all that is of the nature to stop.”

These, having seen *dhamma*,¹ attained *dhamma*, known *dhamma*, plunged into *dhamma*, having crossed over doubt, having put away uncertainty, having attained without another’s help to full confidence in the teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord: “Excellent, Lord, it is excellent, Lord. Just as, Lord, one should set upright what has been upset or should uncover what is covered or should point out the way to one who is astray or should bring a lamp into the darkness so that those with eyes might see forms, even so is *dhamma* explained in many a figure by the Lord. We, Lord, are those going to the Lord for refuge, to *dhamma* and to the Order of monks. May the Lord receive us as lay-followers gone for refuge on this day for as long as life lasts.”

Then it occurred to Soṇa Koḷivisa: “In so far as I understand *dhamma* taught by the Lord it is not easy for those who live in a house to lead the Brahma-faring that is wholly complete, wholly pure, and polished like a conch-shell. What now if I, having cut off hair and beard, having donned yellow robes, should go forth from home into homelessness?” Then those eighty thousand village overseers, delighted with the Lord’s speech, having given thanks for it, having risen from the seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping their right sides towards him.

Then Soṇa Koḷivisa, soon after those eighty thousand village overseers had departed, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Soṇa Koḷivisa spoke thus to the Lord: “In so far as I, Lord, understand *dhamma* taught by the Lord it is not easy for those who live in a house to lead the Brahma-faring

¹ Cf. Vin 1.12.

that is wholly complete, wholly pure and polished like a conch-shell. I want, Lord, having cut off hair and beard, having donned yellow robes, to go forth from home into homelessness. Lord, may the Lord let me go forth.” So Soṇa Koḷivisa received the going forth in the Lord’s presence, he received ordination. And soon after he was ordained the venerable Soṇa stayed in the Cool Grove.

Because of his great output of energy in pacing up and down his feet broke, the place for pacing up and down in became stained with blood as though there had been slaughter of cattle. Then as the venerable Soṇa was meditating in private a reasoning arose in his mind thus: “Those who are the Lord’s disciples dwell putting forth energy; I am one of these, yet my mind is not freed from the cankers with no grasping, and moreover there are my family’s possessions. It might be possible to enjoy the possessions and to do good. Suppose that I, having returned to the low life, should enjoy the possessions and should do good?”

Then the Lord, knowing by mind the venerable Soṇa’s reasoning of mind, as a strong man might stretch out his bent arm, or might bend back his outstretched arm, so did he, vanishing from Mount Vulture Peak, appear in the Cool Grove.¹ Then the Lord, touring the lodgings together with several monks, approached the venerable Soṇa’s place for pacing up and down in. The Lord saw that the venerable Soṇa’s place for pacing up and down in was stained with blood, and seeing (this), he addressed the monks, saying:

“Now why, monks, is this place for pacing up and down in stained with blood as though there has been slaughter of cattle?”

“Lord, because of the venerable Soṇa’s great energy in pacing up and down his feet broke, and this place for pacing up and down in is stained with his blood as though there had been slaughter of cattle.”

Then the Lord approached the venerable Soṇa’s dwelling-place, and having approached he sat down on an appointed seat. And the venerable Soṇa, having greeted the Lord, sat down at a respectful

¹ AN iii.374 adds, after Cool Grove, “in front of the venerable Soṇa”. This would balance end of Kd 5.1.17 below.

distance. The Lord spoke thus to the venerable Soṇa as he was sitting at a respectful distance:

“Soṇa, as you were meditating in private did not a reasoning arise in your mind like this: ‘Those who are the Lord’s disciples dwell putting forth energy ... (as in [Kd 5.1.13](#)) ... Suppose that I, having returned to the low life, should enjoy the possessions and should do good?’”

“Yes, Lord.”

“What do you think about this, Soṇa? Were you clever at the lute’s stringed music when formerly you were a householder?”

“Yes, Lord.”

“What do you think about this, Soṇa? When the strings of your lute were too taut, was your lute at that time tuneful and fit for playing?”

“No, indeed, Lord.”

What do you think about this, Soṇa? When the strings of your lute were too slack, was your lute at that time tuneful and fit for playing?”

“No, indeed, Lord.”

“What do you think about this, Soṇa? When the strings of your lute were neither too taut nor too slack, but were keyed to an even pitch,¹ was your lute at that time tuneful and fit for playing?”

“Yes, Lord.”

“Even so, Soṇa, does too much output of energy conduce to restlessness, does too feeble energy conduce to slothfulness.

“Therefore do you, Soṇa, determine upon evenness² in energy and pierce the evenness of the faculties³ and reflect upon it.⁴”

¹ *same guṇe paṭiṭṭhitā*. ² On the readings *samataṃ* (as here) and *samathaṃ*, see *gs iii.267*, n. 3. The former is perhaps the more likely to be meant, and would carry out the idea of the “even pitch”. ³ *indriyānaṃ ca samataṃ paṭivijjha*. Commentary says: “pierce the evenness, the even nature of the faculty of faith and so on, the evenness of the faculties that are connected: so faith with wisdom and wisdom with faith, energy with contemplation and contemplation with energy.” ⁴ *tattha ca nimittaṃ gaṇhāhi*. *Nimittaṃ gaṇhāti* can mean to grasp a sign, a salient feature; or to reflect on a mental object. *Vin-a 1081* says: mindfulness as to this evenness should arise; seize on that characteristic of (or, reflect on) tranquillity, insight, the ways, the fruits, and practise these.

“Yes, Lord,” the venerable Soṇa answered the Lord in assent. Then the Lord, having exhorted the venerable Soṇa with this exhortation,¹ as a strong man might stretch out his bent arm or might bend back his outstretched arm, so did he, vanishing from in front of the venerable Soṇa in the Cool Grove, appear on Mount Vulture Peak.

After that² the venerable Soṇa determined upon evenness in energy and he pierced the evenness of the faculties and reflected upon it. Then the venerable Soṇa, dwelling alone, aloof, earnest, ardent, self-resolute, having soon realised here and now by his own super-knowledge that supreme goal of the Brahma-faring for the sake of which young men of family rightly go forth from home into homelessness, abided in it, and he understood: Destroyed is birth, lived is the Brahma-faring, done is what was to be done, there is no more of being such and such. And so the venerable Soṇa became one of the perfected ones.

When the venerable Soṇa had attained perfection, it occurred to him: “Suppose I were to declare profound knowledge³ in the Lord’s presence?” Then the venerable Soṇa approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Soṇa spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, that monk who is one perfected, who has destroyed the cankers, lived the life, done what was to be done, shed the burden, won his own goal, destroyed utterly the fetter of becoming, and is wholly freed by profound knowledge, he comes to be intent upon⁴ six matters: he comes to be intent upon renunciation, he comes to be intent upon aloofness, he comes to be intent upon non-harming, he comes to be intent upon the destruction of grasping, he comes to be intent upon the destruction of craving, he comes to be intent upon non-confusion.

“Perhaps, Lord, one of the venerable ones here might think: ‘Could it be that this venerable one is intent upon renunciation depending

¹ Referred to at AN-a i.237 as *vinovāda*, the exhortation on the lute; cf. *Psalms of the Bretheren* p.276. ² *aparena samayena*. ³ *aññā*, gnosis. ⁴ *adhimutta*, striving for.

upon mere faith alone?' But this, Lord, is not to be regarded thus. Lord, the monk who has destroyed the cankers, has lived the life, done what was to be done, not seeing aught in himself to be done or to be added to what has been done, being passionless comes to be intent on renunciation because of the destruction of passion, being without hatred comes to be intent on renunciation because of the destruction of hatred, being without confusion comes to be intent on renunciation because of the destruction of confusion.

“Perhaps, Lord, one of the venerable ones here might think: ‘Could it be that this venerable one is intent on aloofness while hankering after gains, honour, fame?’ But this, Lord, is not to be regarded thus. Lord, the monk who has destroyed the cankers ... or to be added to what has been done, being passionless comes to be intent on aloofness because of the destruction of passion, being without hatred ... being without confusion comes to be intent on aloofness because of the destruction of confusion.

“Perhaps, Lord, one of the venerable ones here might think: ‘Could it be that this venerable one is intent on non-harming, is backsliding from the essence to the contagion of habit and custom¹?’ But this, Lord, is not to be regarded thus. Lord, the monk who has destroyed the cankers ... or to be added to what has been done, being passionless comes to be intent on non-harming because of the destruction of passion, being without hatred ... being without confusion comes to be intent on non-harming because of the destruction of confusion.

“Being passionless he comes to be intent on the destruction of grasping because of the destruction of passion, being without hatred he comes to be intent on the destruction of grasping because of the destruction of hatred, being without confusion he comes to be intent on the destruction of grasping because of the destruction of confusion; being passionless he comes to be intent on the destruction of craving because of the destruction of passion, being without hatred

¹ *sīlabbataparāmāsa*. Vin-a 1082 explains: *silañ ca vatañ ca parāmasitvā gahitaṃ gahaṇamattaṃ*, “the mere holding on to what is held to, having rubbed up against (come into contact with) moral habit (or, good works) and custom” (as though this were enough).

he comes to be intent on the destruction of craving because of the destruction of hatred, being without confusion he comes to be intent on the destruction of craving because of the destruction of confusion; being passionless he comes to be intent on non-confusion because of the destruction of passion, being without hatred he comes to be intent on non-confusion because of the destruction of hatred, being without confusion he comes to be intent on non-confusion because of the destruction of confusion.

“Thus, Lord, even if¹ shapes cognisable by the eye come very strongly into the field of vision of a monk whose mind is wholly freed, they do not obsess his mind for his mind comes to be undefiled,² firm, won to composure, and he notes its passing hence.³ If sounds cognisable by the ear ... if scents cognisable by the nose ... if tastes cognisable by the tongue ... if touches cognisable by the body ... if mental objects⁴ cognisable by the mind⁵ come very strongly into the field of thought of a monk whose mind is wholly freed, they do not obsess his mind for his mind comes to be undefiled, firm, won to composure, and he notes its passing hence.

“It is as if, Lord, there were a rocky mountain slope without a cleft, without a hollow, of one mass, and as if wild wind and rain should come very strongly from the eastern quarter—it would neither tremble nor quake nor shake violently; and as if wild wind and rain should come very strongly from the western quarter ... from the northern quarter ... from the southern quarter—it would neither tremble nor quake nor shake violently. Even so, Lord, if shapes cognisable by the eye come very strongly into the field of vision of a monk whose mind is wholly freed ... if mental objects cognisable by the mind come very strongly into the field of thought of a monk whose mind is wholly freed, they do not obsess his mind, for his mind comes to be undefiled, firm, won to composure, and he notes its passing hence.”

¹ As also at AN iv.404. ² *amissikata*. Vin-a 1082 explains this to mean unmixed with (or, undefiled by) the *kilesas* (obstructions). ³ Vin-a 1083 says this means: “he sees the arising and passing away of that mind”, *tassa cittassa uppādam pi vayam pi passati*. ⁴ *dhammā*. ⁵ *mano*.

If one is intent upon renunciation and mind's aloofness¹,
 If one is intent upon non-harming and destruction of
 grasping,
 If one is intent on destruction of craving and mind's non-
 confusion,
 Having seen sensations' rise, his mind is wholly freed.
 For that monk whose mind is calmed and wholly freed
 There is nothing to add to what has been done,
 there is naught to be done.

As a rock of one mass by wind is never moved,²
 So shapes, tastes, sounds, scents, touches and all
 Pleasant and unpleasant mental objects³ stir not a man
 like this.
 His mind is firm, well freed,⁴ and he notes its passing
 hence.

REJECTION OF DOUBLE-LINED SANDALS

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: "Thus, monks, do young men of family declare profound knowledge. The goal is spoken of but the self is not obtruded. But then it seems to me that there are some foolish men here who declare profound knowledge for fun; these

¹ These lines, to the end, form the conclusion of the verses ascribed to Soṇa Koḷivisa at Thag 640–Thag 644. They also occur at AN iii.378f. Metrical translations are at *Psalms of the Bretheren* 277 and *Gs* iii.269f. Version above, and that at *Vinaya Texts* ii.12 are rather more literal in places; but none of the others recognises that *dhammā* means mental objects (last line but one), and already referred to by Soṇa (as the sixth "sense-datum"). ² This line occurs at Dhp 81. ³ See note at *Kd* 1.11.2 (above) for further references. ⁴ Thag 644 reads *visaññuttam* instead of *vippamuttam* (as above and at AN iii.379).

afterwards come to disaster.”¹

Then the Lord addressed the venerable Soṇa, saying: “You, Soṇa, have been delicately nurtured. I allow for you, Soṇa, sandals with one lining.”

“But I, Lord, gave up eighty cartloads of gold² when I went forth from home into homelessness, and a herd of seven elephants.³ Because of this there will be speakers against me, saying: ‘Soṇa Koḷivisa gave up eighty cartloads of gold when he went forth from home into homelessness, and a herd of seven elephants; and now this very (person) is clinging on to⁴ sandals with one lining.’

“If the Lord will allow them to the Order of monks, I too will make use of them, but if the Lord will not allow them to the Order of monks, neither will I make use of them.” Then the Lord on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, I allow sandals with one lining. **Monks, doubly lined⁵ sandals should not be worn, trebly lined⁶ sandals should not be worn, sandals with many linings⁷ should not be worn. Whoever should wear (any of these), there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

REJECTION OF ALL DARK GREEN, ETC.

“Now at that time the group of six monks wore sandals that were entirely dark green⁸ ... that were entirely yellow ... that were entirely red ... that were entirely crimson ... that were entirely black

¹ This paragraph occurs at AN iii.359. Cf. AN i.218; GS i.198, n. 2; MN i.396. Vin-a 1083 explains “the goal is spoken of” by saying “if he is called an arahant, that is the goal spoken of. But properly (*eva*) it should be taken as ‘the meaning of a sutta from the explanation of a suttanta’” (*attha* means both goal and meaning). It explains “the self is not obtruded” as “if (the profound knowledge) is declared thus, ‘I am an arahant’, the self is not obtruded” (or mentioned or brought forward, *na upanīta*).

² Misprint at Vin 1.185 has been corrected at Vinaya Texts ii.13, n. 3 to *aṣṭisaṅgaṭṭavāhe hiraññam*. ³ Vin-a 1083 says that here this herd (retinue, array, *anīka*) is called six cow-elephants and one bull-elephant. ⁴ *satto* (with instrumental), or ‘is enamoured of’. ⁵ *diguṇa ... tiguṇa*. ⁶ *diguṇa ... tiguṇa*. ⁷ *gaṇaṅgaṇupāhanā*: Vin-a 1083 says “sandals with upwards of four linings”. ⁸ *nilīka*. See BD 2.407, n. 2, BD 2.408, n. 1, n. 2.

... that were dyed entirely orange¹ ... that were dyed entirely multi-coloured.² People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, sandals that are entirely dark green are not to be worn ... that are dyed entirely multi-coloured are not to be worn. Whoever should wear (such), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time the group of six monks wore sandals with dark green straps³ ... with yellow straps ... with red straps ... with crimson straps ... with black straps ... with dyed orange straps ... with dyed multi-coloured straps. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses”. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, sandals with dark green straps ... sandals with dyed multi-coloured straps are not to be worn. Whoever should wear (any of these), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time the group of six monks wore sandals with heel-coverings⁴ ... sandals that were knee-boots⁵ ... sandals that were top-boots⁶ ... sandals that were filled with cotton⁷ ... sandals of (many hues., like) partridges’ wings⁸ ... sandals pointed with rams’ horns ... sandals pointed with goats’ horns ... sandals (ornamented) with

¹ *mahāraṅgaratta*. Vin-a 1083, “the colour of a centipede’s back”. ² *mahānāmaratta*. Vin-a 1083 says, “it is when the colours are mixed, the colours of pale foliage, but the Kurundiya calls it the colours of the *paduma*-lotus flowers”. These could be red or white. *Mahānāma* may be the name of a plant, however. ³ *vaṭṭikā*. Vin-a 1084 reads *vaḍḍhikā*, and explains by *vaddha*. ⁴ *khallakabaddha*. Cf. Pv-a 127. See note at *Vinaya Texts* ii.15 on doubtful meaning of the nature of all these forms of foot-covering, so curiously called *upāhana*, sandals or slippers. ⁵ *puṭabaddha*. Vin-a 1084 says “it is called a Greek (*yonaka*) sandal; it covers the whole foot as far as the knee”. ⁶ *pālīguṇṭhima*. These covered the upper *pāda*, foot or leg, but not the knee, Vin-a 1084. ⁷ *tūlapuṇṇika*. On the three kinds of cotton, *tūla*, see [BD 3.92](#), and [n. 2](#) there. ⁸ *tittirapattika*. Vin-a 1084 explains by *tittirapattasadisā vicittavaddhā*, which is followed in above translation, although “dyed multi-coloured” has already been dealt with.

scorpions' tails ... sandals sewn round with peacocks' tail feathers ... embroidered¹ sandals. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses". They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Monks, sandals with heel-coverings should not be worn ... embroidered sandals should not be worn. Whoever should wear (any of these), there is an offence of wrong-doing."

Now at that time the group of six monks wore sandals decorated with lion-skins² ... with tiger-skins ... with panther-skins ... with black antelope-skins ... with otter³-skins ... with cat-skins ... with squirrel-skins ... with owl-skins⁴. People ... spread it about, saying: "Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses." They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Monks, sandals decorated with lion-skins ... with owl-skins are not to be worn. Whoever should wear (any of these) there is an offence of wrong-doing."

ALLOWANCE FOR CAST OFF SANDALS WITH MANY LININGS

Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Rājagaha for almsfood with a certain monk as his attendant. Then that monk went limping along behind the Lord. A certain lay follower, having put on sandals with many linings, saw the Lord coming from afar; seeing him, having taken off his sandals, he approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord,

¹ *citra*; often means variously coloured or gaily coloured. Cf. *citrūpāhana* at DN i.7.

² Vin-a 1084 "they are made having joined the lion-skin to the edges, as to a seam of a robe". ³ *udda*. Meaning uncertain, see *Vinaya Texts* ii.16, n. 5. Both COOMARASWAMY, *Some Pali Words*, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Vol. 4, No.2, p.133, and *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* sub. article Dabbapuppha Jātaka, take *udda* as otter. Cf. *uddapota* at Cariyāpiṭaka 1.x.2. ⁴ Vin-a 1084 explains *ulūka*, owl, by *pakkhibiḷāla*, flying fox.

he approached that monk; having approached, having greeted that monk, he spoke thus:

“Why, honoured sir, does the master limp?”

“My feet are split, sir.”

“See, honoured sir, here are sandals.”

“No, sir, sandals with many linings are objected to¹ by the Lord.”

“Take these sandals, monk.”² Then the Lord in this connection having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, sandals with many linings that have been cast off. **Monks, new sandals with many linings are not to be worn. Whoever should wear (these), there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

REJECTION OF SANDALS INSIDE A MONASTERY

Now at that time the Lord was pacing up and down without sandals in the open air. Monks who were elders, thinking: “The teacher is pacing up and down without sandals”, also paced up and down without sandals. The group of six monks, while the teacher was pacing up and down without sandals and while monks who were elders were pacing up and down without sandals, paced up and down with sandals on. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: How can this group of six monks, while the teacher is pacing up and down without sandals, and while monks who are elders are pacing up and down without sandals, pace up and down with sandals on?”

Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks, while the teacher ... with sandals on?”

“It is true, Lord.” The awakened one, the Lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How monks, can these foolish men, while the teacher was pacing up and down without sandals, and while monks who are elders

¹ *paṭikkhittā*. Note that he does not say “not allowed”. ² As pointed out at *Vinaya Texts* ii.17, n. 1, this must be understood as spoken by Gotama. A layman did not address a monk as “monk” but Gotama is constantly recorded to do so.

were pacing up and down without sandals, pace up and down with sandals on? For, monks, even these white-frocked householders, on account of procuring a craft for their livelihood, will be respectful, deferential, courteous¹ towards their teachers.

“Herein, monks, let your light shine forth so that you who have thus gone forth in this *dhamma* and discipline which are well taught may be² respectful, deferential, courteous towards teachers,³ grades of teachers,⁴ preceptors, grades of preceptors.⁵ It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” and having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, you should not pace up and down with sandals while teachers, grades of teachers, preceptors, grades of preceptors are pacing up and down without sandals. Whoever should (so) pace up and down, there is an offence of wrong-doing. And, monks, you should not wear sandals within a monastery. Whoever should wear them (there), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time a certain monk came to have an affliction of corns on his feet.⁶ Having taken hold of that monk, they made him go out to relieve himself. As the Lord was touring the lodgings he saw those monks who, having taken hold of that monk, were making him go out to relieve himself, and seeing (this), he approached those monks, having approached, he spoke thus to those monks:

“What, monks, is this monk’s disease?”

“Lord, this venerable one has an affliction of corns on the feet,

¹ These three words also at [Vin 1.45](#); AN iii.15. ² Cf. [Kd 10.2.20](#). ³ The four teachers meant here, according to [Vin-a 1085](#), are those for the going forth, for ordination, for the resources, for the recitation (of the *Pātimokkha*). Cf. [Vism 94](#). ⁴ *ācariyamatta*. [Vin-a 1085](#) says that one of six years’ standing is for one (i.e. to teach one) of no (full) year’s standing; so one of seven years’ standing will be for one of one year’s standing, one of eight for one of two, one of nine for one of three, one of ten for one of four years’ standing. ⁵ *upajjhāyamatta*. [Vin-a 1085](#): these are monks who are friends and companions of a preceptor, or of any who are ten years one’s senior (in the Order). ⁶ *pādakhilābādha*. *Khīla* may here mean an eruption. [Vin-a 1085](#): the flesh comes to have stood out from (or left, *nikkhanta*) the foot, like a stake (reading *khīla*; cf. [Ja v.204 khīlāni](#), variant reading *khilāni*, meaning “sharp stakes”).

4.250 and having taken hold of him, we are making him go out to relieve himself.” Then the Lord in this connection having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, he whose feet are painful or he whose feet are split or he who has an affliction of corns on the feet, to wear sandals.”

15.6.1 Now at that time monks got up on to couches and chairs with unwashed feet, and robes and lodgings were soiled.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, when you think: ‘I will get up now on to a couch or a chair’, to wear sandals.”

15.6.2 Now at that time, monks, going to an Observance-hut² and to a meeting-place at night, in the dark trod upon stumps of trees and on thorns, and their feet became painful. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to use sandals within a monastery, a torch, a light, a staff.³”

REJECTION OF WOODEN SANDALS

15.6.3 Now at that time the group of six monks, getting up in the night towards dawn, having put on wooden shoes,⁴ paced up and down in the open air talking in high, loud, rasping⁵ tones a variety of worldly talk,⁶ that is to say talk of kings, talk of thieves, talk of great ministers, talk of armies, talk of dangers, talk of battles, talk of food, talk of drink, talk of clothes, talk of beds, talk of garlands, talk of scents, talk of relations, talk of vehicles, talk of villages, talk of little towns, talk of towns, talk of the country, talk of women, talk of heroes,⁷

¹ Cf. Vin 2.174. ² *uposathagga*; cf. Vin 3.66. There is also *uposathāgāra*, translated above, e.g. Kd 2.9.1 as “Observance-hall”. ³ *kattaradaṇḍa*; cf. Vin 2.76, Vin 2.217, Vin 3.160. The last part of the rule of Kd 5.4.3 appears to be nullified by this rule at Kd 5.6.2. ⁴ *kaṭṭhapāduka*. ⁵ *khaṭṭakhaṭṭasaddā*, sounds of clearing the throat. ⁶ *tiracchānakathā*; cf. BD 3.82 for notes. ⁷ *sūrakathā* here; see BD 3.82, n. 5.

talk of streets, talk of wells, talk of those departed before, talk of diversity, speculation about the world, speculation about the sea, talk on becoming and not becoming thus or thus; and they both killed insects, having trodden on them, and also made monks fall away from contemplation.¹

Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticized, spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks getting up in the night towards dawn, having put on wooden shoes, pace up and down in the open air talking in high, loud rasping tones a variety of worldly talk ... and both kill insects, having trodden on them, and also make monks fall away from contemplation?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks, getting up in the night towards dawn ... and made monks fall away from contemplation?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, wooden shoes are not to be worn. Whoever should wear (them), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Then the Lord, having stayed at Rājagaha for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Benares. In due course, walking on tour, he arrived at Benares. The Lord stayed there near Benares at Isipatana in the deer-park. Now at that time the group of six monks, thinking, “Wooden shoes are objected to by the Lord”, having had young palmyra palms² cut, wore shoes of palmyra palm leaves; those young palmyra palms which were cut, withered. People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, having had young palmyra palms cut, wear shoes of palmyra palm leaves?”

¹ Cf. AN iii.343, AN iv.343. ² *tālataruṇa*, possibly meaning the shoots of the palm trees; but I think not, for it was probably the young trees themselves that withered once the monks had had some of their leaves cut off, and not just the cut leaves or sprouts or shoots.

These young palmyra palms which were cut, are withering. These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are harming life that is one-facultied¹".

Monks heard these people who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks, having had young palmyra palms cut, wear shoes of palmyra palm leaves, and that those young palmyra palms which were cut are withering?" "It is true, Lord." The awakened one, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, having had young palmyra palms cut, wear shoes of palmyra palm leaves (so that) the young palmyra palms wither? For, monks, people think that there are living things in a tree.² It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ..." and having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, you should not wear shoes of palmyra palm leaves. Whoever should wear (them), there is an offence of wrong-doing."

Now at that time the group of six monks, thinking: "Shoes of palmyra palm leaves are objected to by the Lord", having had young bamboos cut, wore shoes of bamboo leaves; those young bamboos that were cut withered ... (as in **Kd 5.7.1**, **Kd 5.7.2**. Read bamboo instead of palmyra palm) ... **Monks, you should not wear shoes of bamboo leaves. Whoever should wear (them), there is an offence of wrong-doing."**

Then the Lord, having stayed at Benares for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Bhaddiya. In due course, walking on tour, he arrived at Bhaddiya. The Lord stayed there at Bhaddiya in the Jātiyā Grove.³ Now at that time the monks of Bhaddiya were addicted to the practice of ornamenting their shoes in a variety of ways. They made *tiṇa*-grass shoes and had them made ... *muñja*-grass shoes and had them made ... shoes of reeds and had them made ... marshy date-

¹ Cf. **BD 2.223**, **BD 2.226**, **BD 3.320**. ² Cf. **BD 2.223**, **BD 2.227**. (omitted by mistake: insert before "It is not, foolish men ..."). ³ Mentioned at **Vin 1.241**, **Vin 3.37**; AN iii.36.

palm¹ shoes and had them made ... *kamala*-grass² shoes and had them made, they made woollen shoes and had them made; they neglected the recitation, the interrogation, the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher wisdom.³

Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these monks of Bhaddiya be addicted to the practice of ornamenting shoes in a variety of ways, and make *tiṇa*-grass shoes and have them made ... and neglect the recitation, the interrogation, the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher wisdom?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the monks of Bhaddiya are addicted to the practice of ... and neglect the recitation ... the higher wisdom?”

“It is true, Lord.” The awakened one, the Lord rebuked them saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men be addicted to the practice of ornamenting shoes ... and neglect the recitation ... the higher wisdom? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...”

Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, shoes of *tiṇa* grass should not be worn, shoes of *muñja* grass ... shoes of reeds ... marshy date-palm shoes ... *kamala* grass shoes ... woollen shoes should not be worn, shoes made with gold ... shoes made with silver ... shoes made with gems⁴ ... shoes made

¹ *hintāla*. Monier Williams gives: “the marshy date tree, a species of palm, Phoenix or Elate Paludosa.” Vin-a 1085 says they are shoes made of the leaves of *khajjūri* (not in *Pali-English Dictionary*, but Childers gives “the wild date palm tree, Phoenix *Sylvestris*”), but not the leaves of the *hintāla* itself. ² *kamala* seems not to be “lotus” here. Vin-a 1085 says, there is a grass (*tiṇa*) called *kamalavaṇṇa* (*kamala*-coloured, with variant reading of *-tiṇa* for *-vaṇṇa*), therefore they call the made-up shoes *khus-khus* shoes. For *khus-khus*, *usīra*, see BD 2.228, n. 1. ³ Cf. BD 2.94. ⁴ At DN i.7 it is said that Gotama abstains from using *maṇi*, gems or precious stones. Sometimes meaning crystal. At Vin 2.112 bowls made of any of these materials are not allowed.

with lapis lazuli¹ ... shoes made with crystal² ... with bronze ... with glass³ ... with tin⁴ ... with lead⁵ ... shoes made with copper should not be worn. Whoever should wear (any of these), there is an offence of wrong-doing. And any shoes, monks, that can be handed on⁶ should not be worn. Whoever should wear (any of these), there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow, monks, three (kinds of) shoes that are in fixed places and that cannot be handed on⁷: privy shoes, urinal shoes, rinsing shoes.⁸”

Then the Lord, having stayed in Bhaddiya for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Sāvattihī. In due course, walking on tour, he arrived at Sāvattihī. The Lord stayed there in Sāvattihī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks caught hold of cows, which were crossing the river Aciravatī, by their horns, and they caught hold of them by their ears, and they caught hold of them by their dewlaps, and they caught hold of them by their tails, and they mounted on their backs, and they touched their privy parts with lustful thoughts, and having ducked young calves, they killed them.

People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, catch hold of cows, which are crossing the river Aciravatī, by their horns ... like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks caught hold of cows ... and having ducked young calves, killed them?”

¹ *veḷuriya*, or beryl. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.82, n. 1. Ja iv.141 speaks of *veḷuriya* as *vaṃsarāga*, and Vb-a 64 as *vaṃsavaṇṇamaṇi*, a jewel the colour of bamboo. A word-play on *veḷuriya* and *veḷu* (bamboo) is probably the origin of such definitions. ² *phalika*, or quartz. ³ *kāca*. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.82, n. 2. ⁴ *tipu*. At Vin 2.112 tin and lead supports for bowls are allowed. At SN v.92 tin and lead are among the five corruptions (alloys) of gold, *jātarūpa*. Vb-a 63 classifies gold (*suvaṇṇa* as above), tin, lead, and the next, copper (*tambuloḥa*) under *jātiloḥa*, (seven) natural metals. It calls *tipu* white *tipu*, and *sīsa* dark *tipu*. ⁵ *sīsa*. ⁶ *kāci saṃkamaṇīyā pādukā*. ⁷ Vin-a 1085 says: well fixed to the ground, immovable, not to be folded up (or put away, collected, gathered up, *asamhāriya*). ⁸ For further references, see *Vinaya Texts* ii.24, n. 3.

“It is true, Lord.”

Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, you should not catch hold of cows by their horns ... (or) ... ears ... (or) ... dewlaps ... (or) ... tails, nor should you mount on their backs. Whoever should (so) mount, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Nor should you touch their privy parts with lustful thoughts. Whoever should (so) touch them, there is a grave offence. Nor should you kill young calves. Whoever should kill them should be dealt with according to the rule.¹”

REJECTION OF VEHICLES, ETC.

Now at that time² the group of six monks went in a vehicle, and there was a bull in the middle yoked with cows and there was a cow in the middle yoked with bulls.³ People ... spread it about, saying: “As at the festival of the Ganges and Mahī⁴”. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, you should not go in a vehicle. Whoever should (so) go, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁵”

Now at that time a certain monk, going through the Kosala country to Sāvattthī in order to see the Lord, became ill on the way. Then that monk, stepping aside from the road, sat down at the root of a certain tree. People, seeing that monk, spoke thus: “Where, honoured sir, will the master go?”

¹ Bu-Pc 61. ² From here to end of Kd 5.10.3 cf. Vin 2.276, which refers to the group of six nuns. ³ As *Vinaya Texts* ii.25, n. 2 remarks: “Buddhaghosa explains this passage in a different way.” He says, Vin-a 1085: *itthiyuttenā ti dhenuyuttana* (yoked with milch cows); *purisantarenā ti purisasārathinā* (with a male charioteer or driver); *purisayuttenā ti goṇayuttana* (yoked with oxen); *itthantarenā ti itthisārathinā* (with a female charioteer). ⁴ *Gangā-mahiyāya*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.25, n. 3 says that by Mahī is probably meant “the well-known affluent of the Ganges”. Vin-a 1085 explains by *Gangā-Mahikīlikā* (variant reading *kīlikāya*). ⁵ At Vin 4.339 (BD 3.403) any nun who was not ill fell into an offence of expiation if she went in a vehicle. “Vehicle” is defined e.g. at Vin 3.49, Vin 4.201.

5.10.2 “I will go to Sāvattthī, sirs, in order to see the Lord.”

“Come, honoured sir, we will go along.”

“I am not able to, sirs, I am ill.”

“Come, honoured sir, get into a vehicle.”

“No, sirs, a vehicle is objected to by the Lord,” and being scrupulous, he did not get into a vehicle. Then that monk, having arrived at Sāvattthī, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

5.10.3 “I allow, monks, a vehicle to one who is ill.”

Then it occurred to these monks: “Now, should (the vehicle be) yoked with cows or yoked with bulls¹? “They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

1.192
4.256 “I allow you, monks, a handcart yoked with a bull.²”

Now at that time a certain monk became extremely uncomfortable owing to the jolting of a vehicle. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow, monks, a palanquin,³ a sedan-chair⁴.”

REJECTION OF HIGH AND BROAD SEATS

5.10.4 Now at that time the group of six monks used high and broad things to recline upon,⁵ that is to say: a sofa,⁶ a divan,⁷ a long-haired coverlet,⁸

¹ *itthiyuttaṃ nu kho purisayuttaṃ nu kho.* ² *purisayuttaṃ hatthavaṭṭakaṃ.* Vin-a 1085 says: here yoked with men (of a man or bulls or a bull, *purisa*), a woman (*itthi*) or a man (*purisa*) may be the driver. For a handcart rolls along whether *itthiyo* or *purisā* move it. ³ *sivikā.* Vin-a 1085: *piṭaka-sivikā*, basket palanquin.

⁴ *pāṭaṅki.* Vin-a 1085: a woven cloth (? *paṭapoṭṭalika*, variant reading *paṭalika*) made up having hung it out on bamboos; perhaps what in South India is called a *dooly*.

⁵ *uccāsayanamahāsayana.* List recurs at Vin 2.163, DN i.7, AN i.181; some of the items only at MN i.76 = AN i.137. Cf. also MN-a ii.39. Vin-a 1086 says “*uccāsayana* is a couch exceeding the (right) measure” (the height of the legs of a couch is given as eight finger-breadths at Vin 4.168), and “*mahāsayana* is a sheet (*paccattharaṇa*) that is not (made) allowable”. ⁶ *āsandi*, see BD 3.326, n. 1, *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.11, n. 4. The use of this and of a divan is forbidden to nuns at Vin 4.299 (BD 3.326f.). ⁷ *pallaṅka.* See BD 3.271, n. 3, *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.11, n. 5. ⁸ *gonaka* (also spelled *goṇaka*).

Vin-a 1086 says a long-haired wide *kojava* (fleece counterpane or cover with long hair). On *kojava*, see below, BD 4.397, n. 5,

a many-coloured coverlet,¹ a white coverlet,² a wool coverlet besprent with flowers,³ a cotton quilt,⁴ a wool coverlet decorated with animals' forms,⁵ a wool covering with hair on the upper side,⁶ a wool covering with hair at one side,⁷ a silken sheet studded with jewels,⁸ a sheet made with silk threads and studded with jewels,⁹ a dancer's carpet¹⁰, an elephant rug, a horse rug, a chariot rug, rugs of black antelope skins, a splendid sheeting of the hide of the *kadali*-deer,¹¹ a sheet with an awning above¹², a couch with a red cushion at either end.¹³ People, engaged in touring the dwelling-places, having seen (all this), looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses." They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: "**Monks, high and broad things to recline upon should not be used, that is to say: a sofa ... a couch with a red cushion at either end. Whoever should use (any of these) there is an offence**

¹ *cittaka*, Vin-a 1086 says a coverlet (*attharaka*) made of wool of various colours (*citta*) (embroidered with) wild beasts (*vāla*, variant reading *vāna*; DN-a 86 reads *vāna*, with variant readings *cāna*, *vāta*). ² *paṭikā*. Vin-a 1086: a white (*seta*) coverlet made of wool. ³ *paṭalikā*. I follow WOODWARD's translation at GS i.164. Vin-a 1086 gives the meaning as "a covering made of wool, a mass of flowers", and further calls it a "cloth of the Greeks (*Yonaka*) and Tamils", with variant reading (as at AN-a ii.293) *yo āmalakapaṭṭo ti pi vuccati*. Perhaps a better reading for *āmalaka* (emblem myrobalan) occurs at DN-a i.87: *āmilāka* ("a woollen cover into which a floral pattern is woven," *Pali-English Dictionary*). ⁴ *tūlikā*. Vin-a 1086 says "just an ordinary *tūlikā*", while DN-a 87 and AN-a ii.293 say "a *tūlikā* stuffed with a certain one of the three kinds of cotton". These three kinds are given at Vin 2.150, Vin 4.170 as cotton from trees, from creepers and from the *poṭaki*-grass; see BD 3.93, n. 2. ⁵ *vikatikā*. Vin-a 1086 says, "a covering made of wool, ornamented (*vicitta*) with forms of lions, tigers, etc.". ⁶ Vin 1.192 and Vin-a 1086 both read *uddha-* (upper) *lomin* as against *udda-* (both) of DN i.7, AN i.181. ⁷ *ekantalomin*. ⁸ *kaṭṭhissa*. Commentaries say "a sheet (*paccattharaṇa*) made of *kaṭṭhissa* (?) and silk and sewn round with (*parisibbita*) jewels (*ratana*)". ⁹ *koseyya*. I take above rendering from Vin-a 1086. ¹⁰ Vin-a 1086, "a sheet made of wool suitable for the dances of sixteen dancing girls". ¹¹ *kadalimigapavarapaccattharaṇa*. Vin-a 1086, "it is called the hide of the *kadali*-deer; a splendid (*pavara*) sheet is made from this. It means the best (*uttama*) kind of sheet. They say they make it having spread out the deerhide and sewn it above white hangings" (*vattha*, also meaning clothes). ¹² *sauttaracchada*. Vin-a 1086 explains as "together with a dyed (or red, *ratta*) awning attached above", and mentions sheet (*paccattharaṇa*) in this connection. ¹³ *ubhatolohitakūpadhāna*. Vin-a 1087 explains as above.

of wrong-doing.”

REJECTION OF ALL LEATHER

^{5.10.6} Now at that time the group of six monks thinking, “High and broad things to recline upon are objected to by the Lord”, used large hides: a lion’s hide, a tiger’s hide, a panther’s hide, These were cut to the measurement of a couch and they were cut to the measurement of a chair, and they were laid inside the couches and they were laid outside the couches and they were laid inside the chairs and they were laid outside the chairs. People, touring the dwelling-places, having seen (this), looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses”. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, large hides should not be used: a lion’s hide, a tiger’s hide, a panther’s hide. Whoever should use (any of these), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

^{5.10.7} Now at that time the group of six monks, thinking: “Large hides are objected to by the Lord”, used cow-hides. These were cut to the measurement of a couch ... (as in [Kd 5.10.6](#) above) ... and they were laid outside the chairs.

^{4.25.8} A certain depraved monk came to be dependent upon a certain depraved lay-follower. Then that depraved monk, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of that depraved lay-follower; having approached, he sat down on the appointed seat. Then that depraved lay-follower approached that depraved monk; having approached, having greeted that depraved monk, he sat down at a respectful distance.

^{5.10.8} Now at that time that depraved lay-follower had a young calf, beautiful, good to look upon, charming; it was marked¹ like a panther cub. Then that depraved monk gazed longingly at and thought about²

¹ *citra*, variegated, beautiful. ² Cf. [BD 2.30](#) and [n. 3](#) there.

that calf. Then that depraved lay-follower spoke thus to that depraved monk: “Why, honoured sir, does the master gaze longingly at and think about this calf?”

“Sir, this calf’s hide is of use to me.” Then that depraved lay follower, having slaughtered that calf, having skinned it, bestowed the hide upon that depraved monk. Then that depraved monk, having hidden the hide in his outer cloak, went away.

Then that cow, longing for her calf¹, followed close after that depraved monk. Monks spoke thus: “Why, your reverence, is this cow following close after you?”

“I don’t know, your reverences, why this cow is following close after me.”

Now at that time this depraved monk’s outer cloak became stained with blood. Monks spoke thus: “But this outer cloak of yours, your reverence—what has happened to it?” Then that depraved monk told this matter to the monks. They said:

“But did you, your reverence, incite (someone) to onslaught on creatures?”

“Yes, your reverences.” Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this monk incite (someone) to onslaught on creatures? Is not onslaught on creatures condemned in many a figure by the Lord, restraint from onslaught on creatures extolled?” Then these monk told this matter to the Lord.

Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned that depraved monk, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, incited (someone) to onslaught on creatures?”

“It is true, Lord.”

“How can you, foolish man, incite (someone) to onslaught on creatures? Foolish man, has not onslaught on creatures been condemned by me in many a figure, restraint from onslaught on creatures extolled? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he

¹ *vacchagiddhini*, cf. SN iv.181.

addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, there should be no inciting (anyone) to onslaught on creatures. Whoever should (so) incite, should be dealt with according to the rule.¹ Nor, monks, should a cow-hide be used. Whoever should use one, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Nor, monks, should any hide be used. Whoever should use one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

ALLOWANCE FOR WHAT IS DISPLAYED BY HOUSEHOLDERS, ETC.

Now at that time people's couches and chairs came to be covered up² with hides, covered over with hides. Monks being scrupulous, did not sit down on them. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to sit down on what is displayed by householders³, but not to lie down on it.”

Now at that time dwelling-places were lashed together⁴ with thongs of hide. Monks, being scrupulous, did not sit down (in them). They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ Bu-Pj 1, where it is as bad to incite someone to cause the death of a human being as oneself to murder one. Cf. also Bu-Pc 11, Bu-Pc 61, Bu-Pc 62. ² *onaddha ... Vinaddha*. Cf. Vin 2.150 where *onaddhamañca* and *onaddhapīṭha* are allowed. Cf. also Vin 2.270; and *tūlonaddha* at Vin 2.163. ³ *gihivikata*. “To display” is one of the meanings of *vikartum* given by Monier-Williams. Same “allowance” made at Vin 2.163.

⁴ *ogumphiyanti*. Vin-a 1087 (reading *ogupphiyanti*, a variant reading not noticed in *Pali-English Dictionary*) says *bhittidaṇḍakādīsū veṭhetvā bandhanti*, having twisted them (the thongs) round, they tie them to wall-posts, etc. A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Early Indian Architecture*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol.48, No.3, p.266, says “this would seem to have been natural in the case of the wattle and daub walls of the simple *pañṇasālās*; but we do also find early pillars decorated with designs of interlacing ropes or thongs which may be vestigial ornament ... Atharva Veda, 9.3 refers to the parts of a house that are knotted and tied”.

“I allow you, monks, to sit down against¹ what is used only for lashing² (things together).”

Now at that time the group of six monks entered a village with their sandals on. People looked down upon, criticised spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not enter a village with your sandals on. Whoever should (so) enter it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time a certain monk became ill; he was not able to enter the village without his sandals. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a monk if he is ill to enter a village with his sandals on.”

THE STORY OF SOṆA KUṬIKAṆṆA

Now at that time³ the venerable Kaccāna the Great⁴ was staying among the people of Avanti⁵ at Osprey’s Haunt⁶ on Steep Rock moun-

¹ Vin-a 1087, to sit leaning against. ² *bandhanamatta*. Cf. Vin 1.254. Word occurs also at Vin 2.135, but there seems to have a different meaning. See also its use at Kd 7.1.5, “only by tacking”. ³ To end of Kd 5.13.10, cf. Ud 5.6, Dh-p-a iv.101ff. ⁴ At AN i.23 called foremost of the expounders in full of what was spoken in brief. Verses at Thag 494. One of the eleven or twelve leading *theras*; cf. *Vinaya Texts*, ii.317, *Vinaya Texts*, ii.359, BD 2.295, GS iii.215. See *Gotama the Man*, p. 113. ⁵ See S. DUTT, *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism*, Vol.1, p. 187ff. He points out that Avanti “under the guidance of Mahākaccāyana helped by Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa ... became an important centre of Buddhism” (p.189). On Avanti see also B.C. LAW, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 3, n. 1, 22f., p. 61. ⁶ Kuraraghara, the name of a town (*nagara*) or village where Kaccāna went for alms (*gocaragāma*), Vin-a 1087.

tain slope.¹ Now at that time the lay-follower, Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa², was a supporter of the venerable Kaccāna the Great. Then the lay-follower, Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa, approached the venerable Kaccāna the Great; having approached, having greeted the venerable Kaccāna the Great, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the lay-follower, Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa, spoke thus to the venerable Kaccāna the Great:

“In so far as I, honoured sir, understand *dhamma* taught by the master, Kaccāna the Great, it is no easy matter for one living in a house to lead the Brahma-faring which is utterly complete, utterly pure and polished like a conch-shell. I want, honoured sir, having cut off hair and beard, having donned yellow robes, to go forth from home into homelessness. Honoured sir, may the master Kaccāna the Great let me go forth.”

He said: “Difficult, Soṇa, for as long as life lasts are the solitary sleeping-place,³ the one meal (a day), the Brahma-faring. Please do you, Soṇa, being a householder as before,⁴ practise the instruction of the awakened ones for a short time⁵: the solitary sleeping-place, the one meal (a day), the Brahma-faring.”

Then the lay follower Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa’s strong aspiration for the

¹ He is recorded to stay here also at SN iii.9, SN iii.12, SN iv.115, AN v.46, Ud 57. Our text reads *papāte pabbate*; the others *pavatte* (with variant readings) *pabbate*. At Vin-a 1087, *papāta* is said to be the name of a mountain slope. Cf. however SN-a ii.258, which recognises the two readings, *papāte* and *pavatte*, and says of *papāte pabbate* that “it was steep (or had a precipice) on one side: it was as though one flank had been hewn off”. ² Chief of those of clear utterance, AN i.24. Verses at Thag 365. Vin-a 1087, AN-a i.237 say he wore ornaments worth a crore (*koṭi*) in his ears, and also give the reading *koṭikaṇṇa*, which can mean equally “Crore-eared” or “Pointed-eared, Prick-eared”; see *Vinaya Texts* ii.32, n. 3, *Psalms of the Bretheren* p.202, GS i.18, n. 4, *Verses of Uplift*, p.68. ³ *ekaseyyā*, exact significance obscure. At **BD 2.196** a monk is allowed to lie down in a sleeping place for two or three nights with one who is not ordained. It seems as if he might also do so with an ordained monk, for on this occasion there is no offence if he thinks a person is ordained and he is. At **BD 2.201** there is an offence if a monk so lies down with a woman. ⁴ *tatth’eva*. ⁵ *kālayutta*. This is to show how difficult these things are. *Kālayutta* could also signify connected with the right time (for doing things), and would then emphasise that now is not a right time for Soṇa to go forth, being not sufficiently ready spiritually to do so.

going forth abated.¹ But a second time ... a third time did the lay follower Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa approach the venerable Kaccāna the Great ... (as in **Kd 5.13.1**) “... Honoured sir, may the master Kaccāna the Great let me go forth.” Then the venerable Kaccāna the Great let the lay-follower Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa go forth. Now at that time the southern region of Avanti² came to be short of monks. Then did the venerable Kaccāna the Great at the end of three years, with difficulty, with trouble, having had convened from here and there an Order of monks consisting of ten,³ ordain the venerable Soṇa.

THE FIVE BOONS FOR MAHĀKACCANA

Then as the venerable Soṇa was keeping the rains and meditating in seclusion, a reasoning arose in his mind thus: “I have only heard that this Lord is such and such a one, but I have not seen him face to face. I would go and see this Lord, the perfected, the all-awakened one, if a preceptor would allow me.” Then the venerable Soṇa, emerging from seclusion towards the evening, approached the venerable Kaccāna the Great; having approached, having greeted the venerable Kaccāna the Great, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Soṇa spoke thus to the venerable Kaccāna the Great:

“Now, as I, honoured sir, was meditating in seclusion, a reasoning arose in my mind thus: ‘I have only heard that this Lord is such and such a one, but I have not seen him face to face. I would go to see this Lord, the perfected, the all-awakened one, if a preceptor would

¹ *pabbajjābhisāṅkhāra*. Cf. *gamikābhisāṅkhāra* at **Vin 1.233**. ² *Avantīdakkhīṇāpatha*, as at **Vin 2.298**, Ja iii.463. See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* under *Dakkhīṇāpatha*, RHYS DAVIDS, *Buddhist India*, p.30, and B.C. LAW, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p.22. At the time of the Council of Vesālī, about eighty-eight monks of *Avantīdakkhīṇāpatha*, some of them followers of ascetic practices, *dhutaṅga*, are said to have collected on the Ahogaṅgā mountain slope, **Vin 2.299**. ³ **Vin 1.319** says that an Order may consist of four, five, ten, twenty or more than twenty monks, and that various maximum numbers are required for carrying out various specific formal acts, ten monks being able to perform them all, except rehabilitation; but five monks were not able to ordain in the Middle Districts.

allow me.’ I, honoured sir, would go to see this Lord, the perfected, the all-awakened one, if the preceptor allows me.”

“Good, it is good, Soṇa. Do you, Soṇa, go to see this Lord, the perfected, the all-awakened one.

“You, Soṇa, will see this Lord, who is pleasant and inspires one to be pleased,¹ who is calmed in his sense-organs, calmed in mind, who has attained the uttermost taming and peace, the hero² tamed, guarded, controlled in his sense-organs. Well then, do you, Soṇa, in my name salute the Lord’s feet with your head, saying: ‘Lord, my preceptor, the venerable Kaccāna the Great, salutes the Lord’s feet with his head’,³ and then speak thus: ‘Lord, the southern region of Avantī is short of monks. At the end of three years (he), with difficulty, with trouble, having had convened for me from here and there an Order of monks consisting of ten, I received ordination. Perhaps the Lord would allow ordination by a smaller group in the southern region of Avantī.

“‘Lord, in the southern region of Avantī the surface-soil is dark, hard, trampled by the hooves of cattle.⁴ Perhaps the Lord would allow sandals with many linings in the southern region of Avantī. Lord, in the southern region of Avantī people attach importance to bathing, to purification by water.⁵ Perhaps the Lord would allow constant bathing⁶ in the southern region of Avantī. Lord, in the southern region of Avantī hides (are used as) coverings: sheep-hide, goat-hide, deer-hide. As, Lord, in the middle districts,⁷ *eragu*, *moraḡu*, *majjhāru*,

¹ *pasādaniya*, i.e. to be pleased with his teaching. ² *nāga*, explained at Vin-a 1087 as “empty of guilt (*āgu*), empty of the obstructions (*kilesa*)”. Cf. Snp 522: *āgu na karoti ... nāgo*, and Cnd 337. ³ *Udāna* version omits from here to end of Kd 5.13.7 and then proceeds much as Vinaya version to end of Kd 5.13.10. ⁴ *kharā gokaṇṭakahatā*; cf. AN i.136. ⁵ *udakasuddhika*. Cf. SN i.182 (KS i.231); also Vin 4.262, where however “purification by water” is not a rite, but a necessary ablution. ⁶ Cf. Bu-Pc 57, where it is an offence for a monk to bathe at intervals of less than a fortnight except “at a right time”, specified. ⁷ Not Majjhimadesa here, but *majjhimesu janapadesu*.

*jantu*¹ (are used), so, Lord, in the southern region of Avanti hides (are used as) coverings. Perhaps the Lord would allow hides (to be used as) coverings in the southern region of Avanti: sheep-hide, goat-hide, deer-hide.

“At present, Lord, people give robe-material to monks who have gone outside the boundaries, saying: “We are giving this robe material for so and so.” When these have come back (the others) announce: “Your reverences, robe-material was given for you by the people so and so”. But these, being scrupulous, do not consent to it, thinking: “Let there not be an offence involving forfeiture for us.”² Perhaps the Lord would explain the procedure³ in regard to robe-material.”

“Yes, honoured sir”, and the venerable Soṇa having spoken in assent to the venerable Kaccāna the Great, rising from his seat, having greeted the venerable Kaccāna the Great, having kept his right side towards him, having packed away his lodging, taking his bowl and robe, set out for Sāvattthī.

In due course he approached Sāvattthī, the Jeta Grove, Anātha-piṇḍika’s monastery, the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. Then the Lord addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “Ānanda, make ready a lodging for this incoming monk”. Then the venerable Ānanda thought:

“The Lord desires to stay in the same dwelling-place together with this monk, the Lord desires to stay in the same dwelling-place together with the venerable Soṇa; it is he in regard to whom the Lord enjoined me, saying: ‘Ānanda, make ready a lodging for this incoming monk’,” and he made ready a lodging for the venerable Soṇa in that dwelling-place where the Lord was staying.

¹ Vin-a 1088 says these are four kinds of grasses, *tiṇa*, from which are made *kaṭasāraka* (? , part of a monk’s lodging or bedding, see Vin-a 1088 under *senāsanam paññāpesi*) and straw mats. *Eragu* is also called *erakatiṇa* and is coarse. *Moraḡu* is copper coloured at the head, fine, pliable and pleasant to touch, and straw mats are made from it. They make upper cloaks from *majjāru* (Vin-a 1088 reading *majjāru*). The colour of *jantu* is like pearls. ² Cf. Bu-NP 1, where if a monk’s *kaṭhina* privileges have been removed he may use an extra robe for ten days. One of the grounds for removal of the privileges depends on a monk’s having gone outside the boundary, Vin 1.255. ³ *pariyāya*.

Then the Lord, having spent a great part of that night in the open air, entered the dwelling-place. The venerable Soṇa also, having spent a great part of that night in the open air, entered the dwelling-place. Then the Lord, getting up in the night towards dawn, requested the venerable Soṇa, saying:

“May (some) *dhamma* occur to you to speak, monk.”¹

“Very well, Lord”, and the venerable Soṇa, having replied in assent to the Lord, spoke from memory everything belonging to the Divisions in the Eights.² Then the Lord at the end of the venerable Soṇa’s recital³ expressed his approbation saying:

“Good, it is good, monk, that by you, monk, the Divisions in the Eights are well learnt,

well attended to, well reflected upon, and that you are endowed

¹ *paṭibhātu taṃ bhikkhu dhammo bhāsituṃ*, as at Ud-a 312, AN-a i.241. WOODWARD, *Verses of Uplift*, p. 71, n. 1, would translate this as “let *dhamma* arise in your mind for recital”. He notes that *paṭibhātu* is “let it occur to you, *placeat*”, but owing to *dhamma* being in the nominative the sentence cannot mean “let it occur to you to speak *dhamma*”. Vin-a 1088 says, “may there be (or become, *bhavatu*) an inclination (*abhimukha*) to speak of knowledge; of what is called understanding”. Ud-a 312 says “Monk, may *dhamma* to speak arise in you, let it come to the forefront of knowledge, recite *dhamma* as you have heard it, as you have learnt it”. Cf. Vin 2.200, Ud 59, SN i.155. N.B. the Lord addresses Soṇa as “monk” and not by his name. ² *Aṭṭhakavaggikāni*. *Aṭṭhakavagga* is the name of the fourth Vagga in the Sutta Nipāta. Cited at SN iii.12, Ud 59. This latter (and also Dh-p-a iv.101–Dh-p-a iv.102) have the “specific amplification that Soṇa recited (or ‘intoned’) ‘all the sixteen’ *Aṭṭhakavaggika Suttas*”, as CHALMERS remarks, *Buddha’s Teachings*, p. xvi, n. 1; and Ud-a 312 the still further amplification that the sixteen Suttas begin with the *Kāmasutta*. AN-a i.241 reads *Aṭṭhakavaggiyāni*, one manuscript adding *suttāni*. See Journal of the Pali Text Society 1895, p. 93 on identification of Divyāvādāna’s (p. 20) *arthavadgiyāni* (recited by Soṇa) with the “sixteen poems”, *aṭṭhakavaggikāni*, of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. The work is also mentioned at Divyāvādāna 35. For references to Chinese versions see ANESAKI, Journal of the Pali Text Society 1906–1907, p. 50; and ÉTIENNE LAMOTTE, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse*, Vol. i, p. 39, n. 2. ³ *sarabhañña*. *Pali-English Dictionary* calls this “intoning, a particular mode of reciting”. Cf. Vin 2.108, where the Lord “allows” *sarabhañña*, but not the singing of *dhamma* in a singing voice. Oldenberg quotes Vin-a at Vin 2.316: *sarabhaññan ti sarena bhaṇanam*, which means “*sarabhañña* is called repeating (or reciting) by intonation (*sara*)”. There is perhaps in the text a play upon the word *sara*, which also means remembering.

with lovely speech, distinct, without hoarseness, so as to make the meaning clear.¹ Of how many years' standing are you, monk?"²

"I, Lord, am of one year's standing."

"But what have you, monk, done thus long?"

"For long, Lord, I have seen peril in pleasures of the senses, but household lives are crowded,³ there is much to be done, much business." Then the Lord, having understood this matter, at that time uttered this utterance:

"Having seen peril in the world,
having known *dhamma* without attachment, /
the noble one delights not in evil,
the pure one delights in instruction."⁴

Then the venerable Soṇa, thinking: "The Lord is much pleased with me, this is the time for that for which the preceptor prepared⁵ me," rising from his seat, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having inclined his head to the Lord's feet, spoke thus:

"Lord, my preceptor, the venerable Kaccāna the Great, salutes the Lord's feet with his head, and speaks thus: 'The southern region of Avanti, Lord ... (as in **Kd 5.13.5**, **Kd 5.13.6**) ... perhaps the Lord would explain the procedure in regard to robe-material.'" Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, the southern region of Avanti is short of monks. I allow, monks, in all border districts ordination by a group⁶ with, as fifth, an expert on discipline.

¹ Stock as at DN i.114, SN i.189, SN ii.280, AN ii.51, AN iii.114. ² I.e. how many years since his ordination. Cf. above, **BD 4.76f.** ³ *sambādhā gharāvāsā*. Ud 59, SN ii.219, SN v.350, DN i.63, DN i.250 read *sambādhō gharāvāso*. ⁴ *sāsane ramati sucī*; Ud 59 reading *pāpe na ramati sucī*, ⁵ *paridassi*. Vin-a 1088, "this should be the time for that which the preceptor made known to me, saying: 'You should say this and that'; come, I will give the message now". ⁶ Usually two to four monks.

“For this purpose,¹ these are the border districts²: the little town³ called Kajaṅgala⁴ is in the eastern direction, beyond it is Mahāsālā,⁵ further than that are border districts, on this side are the middle (districts). The river called Sallavatī⁶ is in the south-eastern direction, further than that are border districts, on this side are the middle (districts). The little town called Setakaṅṅika is in the southern direction, further than that are border districts, on this side are the middle (districts). The brahmin village called Thūṇa⁷ is in the western direction, further than that are border districts, on this side are the middle (districts). The mountain slope called Usīraddhaja⁸ is in the northern direction, further than that are border districts, on this side are the middle (districts). I allow, monks, in such border districts as these, ordination by a group with, as fifth, an expert on discipline.

“In the southern region of Avantī, monks, the surface-soil is dark, hard, trampled by the hooves of cattle. I allow, monks, in all border districts, sandals with many linings. In the southern region of Avantī, monks, people attach importance to bathing, to purification by water. I allow, monks, in all border districts, constant bathing. In the southern region of Avantī, monks, hides (are used as) coverings: sheep-hide, goat-hide, deer-hide. As, monks, in the middle

¹ *tatra*. ² This passage is quoted at Ja i.49, DN-a 173, Kh-a 132, MN-a ii.200, AN-a i.97 in order to define the boundaries of *majjhima (pa)desa*, the Middle Country, i.e. the middle of Jambudīpa (India). See B.C. LAW *Geography Of Early Buddhism*, p. 2, for some of the place-names mentioned below. ³ *nigama*, see BD 2.63, n. 2. ⁴ Occurring at AN v.54, MN iii.298, DN-a 429. Also Ja iii.226, Ja iv.310 The scholiast tells us (Ja iv.311) that it was a town where materials were easily got, *dabbasambhārā sulabhā*, not where they “were hard to be got” (Jātaka translation iv.195, n. 1). ⁵ Called Mahāsālā at Ja i.49. ⁶ Spelled Salalavatī at Ja i.49, DN-a 173, Kh-a 132, Salaṭavatī at MN-a ii.200 (with variant readings) and in *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. See variant readings at DN-a 173; these do not include Sallavatti as at AN-a i.97. ⁷ Mentioned at Ud 78, Ud-a 377 as belonging to the Mallas: also at Ja vi.62 (with variant reading Dhunna). B.C. LAW, *India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism*, p. 21, n. 1 says “Consult CUNNINGHAM, *Ancient Geography of India*, Introduction xliii, n. 2 as to the identification of Thūṇa with Sthānesvara”. ⁸ According to B.C. LAW, *India as Described in Early Texts*, p. 21, n. 2, “it may be said to be identical with Usiragiri, a mountain to the north of Kaṅkhal, I.A., 1905, 179”.

districts *eragu*, *moraḡu*, *majjhāra*, *jantu* (are used), so, monks, in the southern region of Avanti hides (are used as) coverings: sheep-hide, goat-hide, deer-hide.¹ I allow, monks, in all border districts, hides (to be used as) coverings: sheep-hide, goat-hide, deer-hide. And moreover, monks, people give robe-material for monks who have gone outside the boundaries, saying: ‘We are giving this robe-material for so and so’. I allow you, monks, to consent (to it). That reckoning is not necessary until it reaches the hand.^{2”}

The Fifth Section: that on Hides

IN THIS SECTION THERE ARE SIXTY-THREE ITEMS. THIS IS ITS KEY

The King of Magadha, Soṇa,
and eighty-thousand chieftains,
Sāgata showed much that was further on Vulture Peak, /
They were broken by his output (of energy) on going forth,
the lute, with one lining,
dark green, yellow, red, crimson, and indeed black, /
Orange, multi-coloured, and he objected to edgings,
heels, knee-boots, top-boots,
cotton, partridges, rams, goats, /
Scorpions, peacocks, and embroidered,
decorated with lions, tigers and panthers,
antelopes, beavers and cats, squirrels, owls, /
Sandals for split (feet), corns,
unwashed, tree-stumps, rasping,

¹ Vin-a 1088 here gives a list of six kinds of deer, and says their hides may be used, but not the hides of other kinds of deer, *miga*, including the *kadalīmiga*, nor (with a play on words) the hides of beasts of prey, *vālamiga*, which it defines as lions, tigers, panthers, bears and hyenas. Skins of cows, buffaloes, hares and cats may not be used either. ² *na tāva taṃ gaṇanūpaḡaṃ yāva na hatthaṃ gaḡchati*. This refers to **Bu-Pc 1**, where an extra robe may be worn for at most ten days. The above phrase means that a monk need not begin to count these ten days until he has actually received the robe-material. Vin-a 1089 says, “So long as having conveyed but not given, or (so long as) having sent but not announced that ‘This robe-material has accrued for you, honoured sirs’; he does not begin the reckoning (*gaṇanaṃ na upeti*), it (i.e. the robe-material) is not allotted, one does not begin to take up what is not allotted. But when, having conveyed it it is given, or when having sent it it is announced, or when having heard that it has accrued, from then on there is occasion for attention to the ten days”. On *upaga*, see **BD 2.7, n. 4**; and on *anadhīṭṭhita*, “not allotted” see *ibid.*, n. 1.

palm, bamboo, and indeed grass,
munja; *babbaja*, marshy date-palm, /
Kamala, woollen, golden, silver, gems, lapis lazuli,
crystal, bronze, and glass, and tin, lead, copper, /
Cows, a vehicle and ill,
4.268 yoked with bulls, a palanquin,
things to recline on, large hides,
and the depraved one with a cowhide, /
On what belongs to householders, with thongs of hide,
they enter, on one being ill,¹
Kaccāna the Great, Soṇa (recites) from memory
what belongs to the Divisions in the Eights, /
A group of five for ordination, many linings, constant bathing,²
he allowed hides (to be used as) coverings,
reckoning not necessary until:
1.199 The leader gave these five boons to the Elder Soṇa.

¹ *gilāyano*; Sinhalese edition *gilānakā*.

² Sinhalese edition *upasampadam pañcahi*

gaṇamgaṇā dhuvasināyanā.

6. MEDICINE (BHESAJJA)

ON FIVE MEDICINES

At that time the Lord was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks, afflicted by an affection occurring in the autumn, brought up the conje^y they had drunk and brought up the rice they had eaten; because of this they became lean, wretched, of a bad colour, yellowish, the veins standing out on their limbs. The Lord saw these monks who were lean ... standing out on their limbs; seeing them, he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: "Now, how is it Ānanda, that at present monks are lean ... standing out on their limbs?"

"At present, Lord, monks, afflicted by an affection occurring in the autumn, bring up the conje^y they have drunk and bring up the rice they have eaten; because of this they are lean ... standing out on their limbs."

Then as the Lord was meditating in seclusion, a reasoning arose in his mind thus: "At present monks, afflicted by an affection occurring in the autumn, bring up ... standing out on their limbs. What now if I should allow medicine for monks—whatever is medicine as well as what may be agreed upon as medicine—and although it may serve as nutriment for people¹ yet could not be reckoned as substantial food?" Then it occurred to the Lord: "These five medicines, that is to say ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses, are medicines² and are also

¹ lokassa. ² Cf. Bu-NP 23, where a monk, having accepted these five medicines may keep them in store for at most seven days. They are defined at Vin 3.251.

agreed upon as medicines, and although they serve as nutriment for people yet they cannot be reckoned as substantial food. What now if I should allow monks to make use of these five medicines at the right time, if they have accepted them at a right time?"

Then the Lord, having emerged from seclusion towards the evening, having given reasoned talk on this occasion, addressed the monks, saying:

"Now, monks, as I was meditating in seclusion ... '... yet could not be reckoned as substantial food'. Monks, concerning this, it occurred to me: 'These five medicines, that is to say ... Suppose I were to allow monks to make use of these five medicines at the right time, if they have accepted them at a right time?' I allow you, monks, to make use of these five medicines at the right time, if you have accepted them at a right time."

Now at that time monks, having accepted these five medicines at a right time, made use of them at the right time. But even with these they did not digest ordinary coarse meals, much less greasy ones. And because of this they were afflicted by the affection occurring in the autumn, and in consequence there was also a loss of appetite, and as a result of both these (factors) they became increasingly lean, wretched, of a bad colour, yellowish, with the veins standing out on their limbs. The Lord saw these monks who were increasingly lean ... standing out on their limbs; seeing them, he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying:

"Now, why is it, Ānanda, that at present monks are increasingly lean ... standing out on their limbs?"

"At present, Lord, monks, having accepted those five medicines at a right time, make use of them at the right time ... and as a result of both of these (factors) they are increasingly lean ... standing out on their limbs."

Then the Lord, having given reasoned talk on this occasion, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, having accepted these five medicines,¹ to make use of them both at the right time and also at the wrong time.”²

Now at that time ill monks had need of tallows as medicines. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make use of tallows as medicines by using them with oil: tallow from bears, tallow from fish, tallow from alligators, tallow from swine, tallow from donkeys,³ (if each) is accepted at a right time, cooked at a right time, mixed at a right time.”⁴

“If, monks, one should make use of that which is accepted at a wrong time, cooked at a wrong time, mixed at a wrong time, there is an offence of three wrong-doings. If, monks, one should make use of that which is accepted at a right time, cooked at a wrong time, mixed at a wrong time, there is an offence of two wrong-doings. If, monks, one should make use of that which is accepted at a right time, cooked at a right time, mixed at a wrong time, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, monks, one should make use of that which is accepted at a right time, cooked at a right time, mixed at a right time, there is no offence.”⁵

ON ROOT MEDICINE, ETC.

Now at that time ill monks had need of roots as medicines. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, if there is a reason, to make use of roots as medicines: turmeric,⁶ ginger, orris root, white orris root, garlic, black hellebore, khus-khus, nut-grass,

¹ N.B. “at a right time” does not occur here. ² This must refer to the right time and the wrong time for eating solid foods and soft foods. When “solid food” is defined at [Vin 4.83](#) by excluding “food that may be eaten during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life”, there is reason to suppose that these expressions refer to medicines, see [BD 2.330, n. 1, n. 2, n. 3](#). ³ Quoted at [Vin-a 714](#). This passage explains that tallow from the flesh of all animals which it is allowable to eat is allowed, and also, with the exception of human tallow, the tallow of the ten animals which it is not allowable to eat. These ten are prohibited at [Vin 1.218ff](#). ⁴ Quoted at [Vin-a 714](#), which, in reference to tallow, regards “the right time” as before a meal, “the wrong time” as after. ⁵ Quoted at [Vin-a 714](#). ⁶ This list of roots also given at [Vin 4.35](#). For notes, see [BD 2.227f](#). Cf. also [Vin-a 833](#).

or whatever other roots there are that are medicines, if they do not serve, among solid foods, as a solid food, if they do not serve, among soft foods, as a soft food; and having accepted them, to preserve¹ them for as long as life lasts.² **If there is no reason, there is an offence of wrong-doing for one who makes use of (any of these medicines)."**

16.3.2
4.27.2
Now at that time ill monks had need, as medicines, of what was pounded off roots. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, a (lower) grindstone, a (small) grindstone."³

16.4.1
Now at that time ill monks had need of astringent decoctions as medicines. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, if there is a reason, to make use of astringent decoctions as medicines: astringent decoctions from the nimb-tree, astringent decoctions from the *kuṭaja*,⁴ astringent decoctions from the *pakkava*,⁵ astringent decoctions from the *nattamāla*,⁶ or whatever other astringent decoctions there are that are medicines if they do not serve, among solid foods, as a solid food, if they do not serve, among soft foods, as a soft food; and having accepted them, to preserve them for as long as life lasts. **If there is no reason, there is an offence of wrong-doing for any one who makes use of (any of these medicines)".**

16.5.1
Now at that time ill monks had need of leaves as medicines. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, if there is a

¹ *pariharitum*. ² Passage quoted at Vin-a 833. See **BD 2.330, n. 3**, on this expression, "as long as life lasts". The medicines mentioned in **Bu-NP 23** may, unlike the root medicines which may be stored for life, be stored for at most seven days. ³ *nisada nisadapota*. Vin-a 1090 says *piṃsanasilā ca piṃsanapotako ca*, a stone for grinding and a small (thing) for grinding. This latter must be a pounder to use in the hand on the larger grindstone. ⁴ *Wrightia antidysenterica* or *Nericum antidysentericum* (*Pali-English Dictionary*), *Holarrhena antidysenterica* (*Watt's Commercial Products of India*). ⁵ A creeper, Vin-a 1090 (reading *paggava* as at Ja ii.105, where it is called *vallī*, a creeping plant). ⁶ At Vin-a 1090 called *karañja* which, according to *Pali-English Dictionary*, is the tree *Pongamia glabra*.

reason, to make use of leaves as medicines: nimb-leaves, *kuṭaja*-leaves, cucumber¹-leaves, basil²-leaves, cotton-tree leaves, or whatever other leaves there are that are medicines if they do not serve ... (any of these medicines).”³

Now at that time ill monks had need of fruits as medicines. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, if there is a reason to make use of fruits as medicines: *vilaṅga*,⁴ pepper,⁵ black pepper,⁶ yellow myrobalan,⁷ beleric myrobalan,⁸ emblic myrobalan, *goṭha*-fruit⁹ or whatever other fruits there are that are medicines if they do not serve ... (any of these medicines).”

Now at that time ill monks had need of resins as medicines. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, if there is a reason, to make use of resins as medicines: *hiṅgu*,¹⁰ *hiṅgu*-resin, *hiṅgu*-gum,¹¹ gum,¹² *gum-patti*,¹³ *gum-paṇṇī*, or whatever other resins there are that are medicines if they do not serve ... (any of these medicines).”¹⁴

Now at that time ill monks had need of salts as medicines. They

¹ *paṭola*, a kind of cucumber, *Trichosanthes Dioeca*. ² *sulasī*; cf. Sanskrit *surasī*, given by Böhtlingk-Roth as “basilienkraut”. The word translated as “basil” at **BD 2.228** is *ajjuka*. ³ Quoted at Vin-a 835. ⁴ *Erycibe paniculata*. ⁵ *pippala*, see *Vinaya Texts* ii.46, n. 6. ⁶ *marica*. ⁷ *harītaka*, cf. **BD 3.245, n. 4 (Vin 4.259)**. ⁸ *vibhī-taka*, also at Ja vi.529. WATT, *Commercial Products of India*, under *Terminalia belerica*, says “it has various medicinal qualities ascribed to it; and the oil expressed from the seed is used by the Natives”. Under *Phyllanthus emblica* Watt says “the fresh ripe fruits are largely employed as astringent and laxative medicines”. ⁹ *goṭhaphala*. *Pali-English Dictionary* says “medicinal seed”. Monier Williams, under *gotravriksha* compares to *dhanvana*. This he gives as the “plant Alhagi Maurorum which grows in a dry soil”. ¹⁰ Assafoetida. ¹¹ *hiṅgu-sipāṭikā*. *Pali-English Dictionary* says that this is a *sipāṭikā* (pod pericarp) yielding gum. Monier Williams says it is the same as *varṇsa-patṭrī*. This he calls a “particular kind of grass = *nāḍī-hiṅgu*”. Vin-a 1090 says that *hiṅgu*, *hiṅgu-jatu*, *hiṅgu-sipāṭikā* are just kinds of *hiṅgu*. ¹² *taka*, a medicinal gum. ¹³ Vin-a 1090 says that *taka* and these two varieties are all of them kinds of lac or resin. ¹⁴ Quoted at Vin-a 835.

told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, if there is a reason, to make use of salts as medicines: sea(-salt), black salt,¹ rock-salt,² culinary-salt, red-salt³ or whatever other salts there are that are medicines if they do not serve, among solid foods, as a solid food, if they do not serve, among soft foods, as a soft food; and having accepted them, to preserve them for as long as life lasts. **If there is no reason, there is an offence of wrong-doing for one who makes use of (any of these medicines).**”

Now at that time⁴ the venerable Belaṭṭhasīsa,⁵ the venerable Ānanda’s preceptor, had an affliction of thick scabs.⁶ Because of the discharge his robes stuck to his body. Monks, having repeatedly moistened these with water, loosened them. As the Lord was touring the lodgings he saw these monks loosening the robes, having repeatedly moistened them with water; and seeing (this) he approached these monks; having approached, he spoke thus to these monks: “What, monks, is this monk’s affliction?”

“Lord, this venerable one has an affliction of thick scabs; because of the discharge, his robes stick to his body; having repeatedly moistened them with water, we are loosening them.”

Then the Lord in this connection having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow, monks, for one who has itch⁷ or a small boil or a running sore or an affliction of thick scabs or for one whose body smells nasty, chunams as medicines; for one who is not ill dung, clay, boiled colouring matter.⁸ I allow you, monks, a pestle and mortar.⁹”

¹ Vin-a 1090 calls this common salt. ² This is white in colour, Vin-a 1090. ³ Vin-a 1090: cooked together with all kinds of ingredients, it is red in colour. ⁴ Opening part of this story = Vin 1.295. ⁵ See BD 2.338, n. 1. ⁶ Cf. Bu-Pc 90.2. ⁷ At Vin 4.172 (BD 3.97) “itch-cloth” is defined as: for covering anyone who has any of these afflictions. ⁸ *rajana-nipakka*. Vin-a 1090 says *rajana-kasaṭa*, acrid colouring matter or dye-stuff. But *kasaṭa* can also mean dregs or leavings, and this sense is more likely here. Vin-a 1090 explains: “having ground ordinary chunam, having moistened it with water, one may wash (or bathe with it).” These three things were for applying to the body and not for taking as a medicine. ⁹ *udukkhala musala*, different from the grinding stones of Kd 6.3.2.

Now at that time ill monks had need of sifted chunams as medicines ... “I allow you, monks, a chunam-sifter.¹” They had need of very fine ones. “I allow you, monks, a cloth sifter.”

Now at that time a certain monk had an non-human affliction. Teachers and preceptors, although nursing him, were unable to get him well. He, having gone to the swine’s slaughter-place, ate raw flesh and drank raw blood, and his non-human affliction subsided.² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, when one has a non-human affliction, raw flesh and raw blood.”

Now at that time a certain monk came to have an illness affecting his eyes. Having taken hold of that monk, they made him go out to ease himself. As the Lord was touring the lodgings, he saw those monks who, having taken hold of that monk, were making him go out to ease himself; seeing (this) he approached those monks; having approached, he spoke thus to those monks:

“What, monks, is this monk’s affliction?”

“Lord, this venerable one has an illness affecting his eyes; we, having taken hold of him, are making him go out to ease himself.” Then the Lord in this connection having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, these ointments³: black collyrium,⁴ rasa-ointment,⁵

¹ *cunṇacālani*. ² There seems at Vin-a 1090 the idea that a non-human being “possessed” the monk. For it explains that it was not the monk who ate and drank the raw things, but the non-human being; on its departing, his (the monk’s) non-human affliction is said to have subsided. ³ *añjana* is here a generic term, as is clear from the first three to be specified: *kāḷañjana rasañjana sotañjana*. Vin-a 1090 also says of *añjana*, “comprising all”. ⁴ Vin-a 1090 says “one kind of *añjana*, cooked with all ingredients”. ⁵ Vin-a 1090 says “made from a variety of ingredients”. Böhtlingk-Roth say it is made with vitriol.

sota-ointment,¹ yellow-ochre,² lamp-black.”³ They had need of ointment powders.⁴ ... “I allow, monks, the use of sandal-wood, rosebay, black gum,⁵ *tālisa*,⁶ nut-grass.”⁷

6.12.1 Now at that time monks used to place pulverised ointments in small bowls and saucers. They were littered with powdered grass and dust ... “I allow, monks, an ointment-box.”⁸ Now at that time the group of six monks used various kinds of ointment-boxes, made of gold, made of silver. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses”. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

4.276 **“Monks, various kinds of ointment-boxes should not be used. Whoever should use (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow (them), monks, (to be) made of bone,⁹ made of reed, made of bamboo, made of a piece of stick, made of lac, made of crystal,¹⁰ made of copper, made of the centre of a conch-shell.”**

6.12.2 Now at that time ointment-boxes were not covered. They were littered with powdered grass and dust ... “I allow, monks, a lid.”¹¹ A lid fell off ... “I allow you, monks, having tied it with thread, to tie it to the ointment-box.” An ointment-box split open.¹² ... “I allow you, monks, to sew it round with thread.”

6.12.3 ¹ Vin-a 1090–91 says “an ointment originating in rivers and streams”. Böhlingk-Roth say it is made with antimony. ² *geruka*, or red chalk. ³ *kapalla* taken from the flame of a lamp, Vin-a 1091. *Pali-English Dictionary* says *kapalla* is here in error for *kajjala*. ⁴ *añjanupapisana*, as at Vin 2.112. ⁵ See GS v.17, n. 1. ⁶ *Flacourtia cataphracta*. ⁷ As in Kd 6.3.1, and Vin 4.35. See BD 2.228, n. 2. ⁸ *añjanī*. See BD 3.89, n. 2. Allowed also at Vin 2.135. ⁹ At Vin 4.167 these three materials are allowed for making needle-cases. “Bone” is there defined as whatever is bone. But Vin-a 1091 says “made of bone” means of every kind of bone with the exception of human bone. This list recurs at Vin 2.117. ¹⁰ *Pali-English Dictionary* suggests that *phalamaya* “stands in all probability for *phalikamaya*”. ¹¹ Allowed also at Vin 2.122 for a well. ¹² Reading *phalati* with Sinhalese edition instead of Oldenberg’s *nipalati*.

Now at that time monks put on ointment with (their) fingers. (Their) eyes became painful ... “I allow, monks, an ointment-stick.”¹ Now at that time the group of six monks used various kinds of ointment sticks, made of gold, made of silver. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” ... **“Monks, various kinds of ointment sticks should not be used.”² Whoever should use one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow (them), monks, (to be) made of bone ... made of the centre of a conch-shell.”

Vin 1.2

Now at that time an ointment-stick, falling to the ground, became rough ... “I allow, monks, a case for the sticks.”³ Now at that time monks carried about ointment-boxes and ointment-sticks in their hands ... “I allow, monks, a bag for the ointment-box.” There was no strap at the edge⁴ ... “I allow, monks, a strap at the edge, a thread for tying⁵.”

Kd 6.12

Bd 4.2

THE STORY OF PILINDAVACCHA

Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha⁶ had a head-ache⁷ ... “I allow, monks, a small quantity of oil for the head.” He did not get better ... “I allow, monks, (medical) treatment through the nose”.⁸

Kd 6.13

¹ Allowed again, with ointment-box, at [Vin 2.135](#). At [Vin 4.168](#) there is “no offence” if an ointment-stick is used as a needle-case. ² Cf. above [Kd 6.12.1](#). ³ Vin-a 1091 says, “because they put down the sticks, I allow a piece of hollow wood or a bag for them”. ⁴ *amisa-bandhaka* (variant readings *vadhaka*, *vaddhaka*). Vin-a 1091 says this is for (or, on) the ointment-bag. The same thing allowed at [Vin 2.114](#) for a bowl. At [Kd 6.13.2](#) there is a similar “allowance” for a bag for tubes for steam. Thus the monks had different bags for different portable articles. It would seem as if each bag had a strap attached to its edge, rather than that monk, carried the bags by means of straps going over the shoulder (also called *amisa*). ⁵ *bandhana-suttaka*, probably for tying the box to the strap. Cf. [Vin 2.114](#). ⁶ See [BD 1.112, n. 2](#). ⁷ A “certain monk” had this, *sisābhitāpa*, at [Vin 3.83](#) ([BD 1.143](#)). ⁸ *natthukamma*. Cf. *natthum adamsu* at [Vin 3.83](#) (see [BD 1.143, n. 2](#)). Mentioned also at [MN i.511](#).

His nose ran ... “I allow, monks, a nose-spoon.”¹ Now at that time the group of six monks used various kinds of nose-spoons, made of gold, made of silver. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” ... **“Monks, various kinds of nose-spoons should not be used. Whoever should use one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow (them), monks, (to be) made of bone ... made of the centre of a conch-shell.”

They poured it up the nose in uneven quantities.² ... “I allow, monks, a double nose-spoon.”³ He did not get better ... “I allow you, monks, to inhale steam.”⁴ So they inhaled it after they had lit a wick.⁵ It burnt their throats ... “I allow you, monks, a tube for the steam.”⁶ Now at that time the group of six monks used all kinds of tubes for the steam ... (as in **Kd 6.13.1**) ... “I allow (them), monks, (to be) made of bone ... made of the centre of a conch-shell.” Now at that time tubes for the steam were not covered, and small creatures got in. “I allow, monks, a lid.” Now at that time monks carried about tubes for the steam in their hands. “I allow, monks, a bag for the tubes for the steam.” They got rubbed together ... “I allow, monks, a double bag.” There was no strap at the edge.⁷ ... “I allow, monks, a strap at the edge, a thread for tying.”

Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha had an affliction of wind. Physicians spoke thus: “Oil must be boiled.” ... “I allow, monks, a decoction of oil.” Now strong drink had to be mixed in

¹ *natthu-karaṇī*. I translate as at *Vinaya Texts* ii.54. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives “pocket-handkerchief”, but next sentence makes this unlikely. ² *natthum visamaṇ āsiṅcanti*. In pouring the medicament up the nose, monks probably poured more up one nostril than the other. The spoon, therefore, was not to catch the discharge from the nose but was to hold it up “so that the medicinal oil does not run out” (*Vinaya Texts* ii.54, n. 1); it was an instrument with which to pour up the medicinal oil itself. ³ I.e. one giving an equal stream in respect of its two measures, *Vinaya* 1091. ⁴ *dhūmaṇ pātuṇ*, literally to drink steam, or smoke. Below, **Kd 6.14.5**, cf. *dhūmaṇ kātuṇ*. Cf. “drinking” (not smoking) a huqqa, by reason of the water in it. ⁵ Cf. *Vinaya Texts* ii.54, n. 3, which states that they smeared a wick with the drugs and then burnt them. ⁶ *dhūmanetta*. Also at *Ja* iv.363; translated *Jātaka Translation* iv.229 as “smoking-pipe”. ⁷ As in **Kd 6.12.4**.

that decoction of oil. “I allow you, monks, to mix strong drink in a decoction of oil.” Now at that time the group of six monks boiled oils mixed with too much strong drink. Having drunk these, they were intoxicated.¹ “Monks, oil mixed with too much strong drink should not be drunk. Whoever should (so) drink should be dealt with according to the rule.² I allow you, monks, if neither the colour nor the smell nor the taste of strong drink³ appears in any decoction of oil, to drink oil mixed with strong drink if it is like this.”

Now at that time monks came to have much boiled oil mixed with too much strong drink. Then it occurred to these monks: “Now what course of conduct should be followed when there is oil mixed with too much strong drink?” ... “I allow you, monks, to employ it as an unguent.”⁴ Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha came to have a quantity of boiled oil, but there was no receptacle for oil. “I allow you, monks, three kinds of vessels: a copper vessel, a wooden vessel, a vessel (made of) fruit.”

Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha had rheumatism in the limbs. “I allow, monks, the sweating-treatment.”⁵ He got no better ... “I allow, monks, sweating by the use of all kinds of herbs.”⁶ He got no better. “I allow, monks, the great sweating.”⁷ He got no better. “I allow, monks (the use of) hemp-water.”⁸ He got no better. “I allow monks, (the use of) a water-vat.”⁹

¹ *majjanti*, or “were elated”. ² *Bu-Pc 51*. ³ *Cf. Bu-Pc 51.2.3*. ⁴ *abbhañjana*, an oiling. *Cf.* the same word in the “key” at *Vin 3.79* used in referring to *abbhañjimsu*, they oiled or rubbed (an ill monk), on *BD 4.83*. ⁵ *sedakamma*. ⁶ *sambhāraseda*. *Vin-a 1091*, “sweating by the use of hemp and a variety of leaves”. ⁷ *mahāseda*. *Vin-a 1091* explains that they heap charcoal into a pit the size of a man, cover it with dust, sand and leaves, and the patient lies down there with his limbs smeared with oil and sweats by rolling round. ⁸ *bhaṅgodaka*, i.e. hemp leaves boiled in water. The patient should sweat by repeatedly sprinkling himself with this preparation, *Vin-a 1091*. See *Vinaya Texts ii.57*, n. 1. ⁹ *udakakoṭṭhaka*. “I allow the application of the sweating treatment (*sedakammakaraṇa*), having got into a vessel or vat filled with hot water.” *Vin-a 1091*. *Koṭṭhaka* is usually a store-room.

Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha had rheumatism in the joints. “I allow you, monks, to let blood.”¹ He got no better. “I allow you, monks, having let blood, to cup with a horn.”² Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha’s feet came to be split. “I allow you, monks, an unguent for the feet.” He got no better. “I allow you, monks, to prepare a foot-salve.”³ Now at that time a certain monk came to have boils. “I allow, monks, treatment with a lancet.”⁴ There was need of astringent water. “I allow, monks, astringent water.” There was need of sesamum paste. “I allow, monks, sesamum paste.”

There was need of a compress.⁵ “I allow, monks, a compress.” There was need of a piece of cloth for tying over the sore. “I allow, monks, a piece of cloth for tying over the sore.” The sore itched. “I allow you, monks, to sprinkle it with mustard-powder.”⁶ The sore festered. “I allow you, monks, to make a fumigation.”⁷ The flesh of the sore⁸ stood up. “I allow you, monks, to cut it off with a piece of salt-crystal.” The sore did not heal. “I allow, monks, oil for the sore.” The oil ran. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a linen bandage⁹ (and) every treatment for curing a sore.”

Now at that time a certain monk was bitten by a snake.¹⁰ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to give the four great irregular things¹¹: (a decoction of) dung, urine, ashes, clay.”¹² Then it occurred to the monks: “(May they be used) even if they are

¹ By using a knife (or lancet), Vin-a 1091. ² See *Vinaya Texts* ii.57, n. 3, which, quoting Wise, says, “bad blood may be removed by means of cupping, which is performed by a horn”. ³ *pajja*, cf. DN ii.240. ⁴ *sattakamma*. ⁵ *kabaḷikā*. ⁶ *sāsapakuṭṭa*. Cf. Vin 2.151 *sāsapakuḍḍa*, as at Vin-a 1092, where explained as “ground (*piṭṭha*) mustard”. ⁷ *dhūmaṃ kātuṃ*. Cf. Kd 6.13.2. ⁸ *vaṇamaṃsa*, Vin-a 1092 reading *vaḍḍhamaṃsa*, and saying that the upper or covering (*adhika*) flesh stood up like a peg. ⁹ *vikāsika*; Vin-a 1092, “a piece of cloth for covering up the sore”. ¹⁰ Cf. Vin 4.166. ¹¹ *mahāvikaṭāni*. Mentioned at Vin 4.90, where a monk may himself take these even if there is no one to make them “allowable”, for they do not count as “nutriment”. Also at MN i.79, DN i.167. ¹² These things are, or are by Indians, regarded as great purifiers.

not (formally) received, or should they be (formally) received?"¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to make use of them if someone to make them allowable² is there (formally) to offer³ them to you; having taken them yourselves, if there is no one to make them allowable."

Now at that time a certain monk came to have drunk poison. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to make him drink (a concoction of) dung." Then it occurred to the monks: "(May it be drunk) even if it is not (formally) received, or should it be (formally) offered?"⁴ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow, monks, that if he receives (formally) that which (someone) is making allowable,⁵ when he has once (formally) received it that it need not be (formally) offered again."

Now at that time a certain monk had an affliction resulting from drinking something poisonous.⁶ "I allow you, monks, to make him drink (a decoction of) mud turned up by the plough."⁷

Now at that time a certain monk was constipated. "I allow you, monks, to make him drink raw lye."

Now at that time a certain monk had jaundice. "I allow you, monks, to make him drink (a compound of cow's⁸) urine and yellow myrobalan."⁹

¹ *paṭiggahetabbāni*. Oldenberg proposes to read *paṭiggahāpetabbāni*, Vin 1.382. ² Cf. BD 2.346, n. 1, n. 2. ³ *paṭiggahāpetuṃ*. ⁴ *paṭiggahāpetabbo*; see BD 2.122. ⁵ *yaṃ karonto paṭiggaṇhāti*. ⁶ Vin-a 1092 takes this to mean he was suffering from the results of sorcery, i.e. from a disease arising from drinking under the mastery of another. ⁷ *sītāloḷi*, explained at Vin-a 1092 as "I allow you to make him drink, mixed with water, the clay clinging to the ploughshare when tilling with a plough". ⁸ So Vin-a 1092. ⁹ Cf. Vin 1.276 where Jīvaka gave ghee as a cure for jaundice.

Now at that time a certain monk had a skin disease. “I allow you, monks, to make a perfume-paste.”

Now at that time a certain monk’s body came to be full of (bad) humours.¹ “I allow him, monks, to drink a purgative.” There was need of clarified conje. “I allow, monks, clarified conje.” There was need of unprepared broth.² “I allow, monks, unprepared broth.” There was need of prepared and unprepared.³ “I allow, monks, prepared and unprepared.” There was need of meat-broth.⁴ “I allow, monks, meat-broth.”

6.15.1 Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha,⁵ desiring to make a cave, had a (mountain) slope cleared near Rājagaha. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the venerable Pilindavaccha; having approached, having greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the venerable Pilindavaccha: “What, honoured sir, is the elder having made?”

1.207 “Sire, desiring to make a cave, I am having a (mountain) slope cleared.”

“Honoured sir, does the master require an attendant for a monastery?”

“Sire, an attendant for a monastery is not allowed by the Lord.”

“Well, honoured sir, having inquired of the Lord, you should tell him of me.”

6.15.2 “Very well, sire,” the venerable Pilindavaccha answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha in assent.

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha gladdened, roused, rejoiced,

¹ *abhisannakāya*. Cf. Vin 2.119, also Kd 8.1.30, *kāya dosābhisanna*. ² *akaṭayūsa*. Vin-a 1092 says “a beverage cooked with beans but not oily”. ³ *kaṭākaṭa*. Vin-a 1092 reads *so’va thokaṇ* (variant reading *dhota*) *siniddho*, this is only a little oily. ⁴ *paṭicchādaniya*. Cf. below, Kd 6.23.3. Vin-a 1092 explains by *maṃsarasa*, flavour of meat. ⁵ From here towards end of Kd.6.15.10 = Vin 3.248–Vin.3.251. See BD 2.126ff. for notes.

delighted King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha with talk on *dhamma*. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, gladdened ... delighted by the venerable Pilindavaccha's talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, having greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the venerable Pilindavaccha sent a messenger to the Lord to say: "Lord, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha desires to present an attendant for a monastery. Now, Lord, what line of conduct is to be followed?" Then the Lord on this occasion having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks saying:

BD 4.2

"I allow, monks, a monastery attendant."

And a second time did King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approach the venerable Pilindavaccha; having approached, having greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was fitting down at a respectful distance King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the venerable Pilindavaccha:

Kd 6.15

"Honoured sir, has the Lord allowed a monastery attendant?"

"Yes, sire."

"Well then, honoured sir, I will give the master a monastery attendant."

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having promised the venerable Pilindavaccha a monastery attendant, (but) having forgotten, having recalled it after a time, addressed a chief minister who was concerned with all the affairs, saying: "My good sir, has that monastery-attendant whom I promised to the master been given?"

"Your majesty, a monastery attendant has not been given to the master."

"My good sir, how long is it since it was considered?"

Kd 6.15

Then that chief minister, having counted up the days, spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: "It is five hundred days, your majesty."

"Well then, give five hundred monastery attendants to the master."

"Yes, your majesty," and the chief minister having answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha in assent, bestowed five hundred mo-

1.208
4.283
6.15.5
nastery attendants on the venerable Pilindavaccha, and a distinct village established itself. They called it “The Village of the Monastery Attendants” and they also called it “Pilinda Village”. Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha frequented families in that village. Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Pilinda Village for almsfood.

Now at that time there came to be a festival in this village; young girls wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, were celebrating it. Then the venerable Pilindavaccha as he was walking for almsfood on unbroken round¹ in Pilinda Village, approached the dwelling of a certain monastery attendant; having approached, he sat down on the appointed seat. Now at that time the daughter of the monastery attendant’s wife, having seen other little girls wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, cried and said: “Give me a garland, give me an ornament.”

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha said to that monastery attendant’s wife: “Why is this little girl crying?”

6.15.6
“Honoured sir, this little girl is crying because, having seen other little girls wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, she says: ‘Give me a garland, give me an ornament.’ Whence is there a garland for us who are poor, whence an ornament?”

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, having taken a roll of grass, spoke thus to that monastery attendant’s wife: “Now set this roll of grass on this little girl’s head.” Then that monastery attendant’s wife, having taken that roll of grass, set it on that little girl’s head. It became a golden chaplet, beautiful, good to look upon, charming; there was no golden chaplet like it even in the king’s women’s quarters. People spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

“Your majesty, in the house of a certain monastery attendant there

¹ *sapadānam*, derivation uncertain. Enjoined at Bu-Sk 33. Explanations given at Vin-a 893 (cited BD 3.129, n. 3); SN-a i.205: the houses reached, one walking to them successively (in succession, in order); Snp-a 118: one who walks successively, not having rejected (departed from) the order (succession) of the houses, entering a rich household and a poor household without interruption (without a break, “just as it comes”), for almsfood.

is a golden chaplet, beautiful, good to look upon, charming; there is no golden chaplet like it even in your majesty's women's quarters. As he is poor, where (could he have got it) from? Undoubtedly it was taken by theft." Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha had that monastery attendant's family imprisoned.

And a second time did the venerable Pilindavaccha, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, enter Pilinda Village for almsfood. As he was walking in Pilinda Village on unbroken round for almsfood he approached the dwelling of that monastery attendant; having approached, he asked the neighbours: "Where has this monastery attendant's family gone?"

"Honoured sir, they have been imprisoned by the king on account of that golden chaplet."

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha approached the residence of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha; having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the venerable Pilindavaccha; having approached, having greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha he sat down at a respectful distance. The venerable Pilindavaccha spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha as he was sitting down at a respectful distance:

"How is it, sire, that the monastery attendant's family is imprisoned?"

"Honoured sir, in that monastery attendant's house there was a golden chaplet, beautiful, good to look upon, charming; there is no golden chaplet like it even in our women's quarters. Where (could he have got it) from, as he is poor? Undoubtedly it was obtained by theft."

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha exercised volitional force, and said: "The palace of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha is golden," and it became made all of gold. He said: "Now, sire, from where have you got so much gold?"

Saying: "I understand, honoured sir, this is the master's majesty of psychic power," he set free the monastery attendant's family.

People, delighted, full of satisfaction because they heard that a

state of further men, a wonder of psychic power had been shown by master Pilindavaccha to the king and his retinue, presented the five (kinds of) medicine to the venerable Pilindavaccha, that is to say ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey and molasses. Now the venerable Pilindavaccha was customarily a receiver, so whenever he received the five (kinds of) medicine he gave them away among his company. And his company came to live in abundance; whatever they received, filling pots and pitchers, they put them away, and filling water strainers and bags, they hung them up in the windows. These (pots, etc.) leaked, and the dwelling-places became beset and overrun by rats. People, having seen (this) as they were touring the dwelling-places, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are storing up goods indoors, like King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha.”

Monks heard these people who were ... spreading it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can these monks strive after abundance like this?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks are striving after abundance such as this?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them,¹ having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Those medicines which may be partaken of by ill monks, that is to say ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses—having accepted these, they may be used as a store for at most seven days. He who exceeds that (period) should be dealt with according to the rule.”²

The First Portion for Repeating: that on Medicines that are Allowed

ALLOWANCE FOR SUGAR, ETC.

Then the Lord, having stayed at Sāvathī for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Rājagaha. And on the way the venerable

¹ Vin 3.251 (BD 2.131) reads: The lord rebuked them saying: “... this rule of training should be set forth ...” ² Bu-NP 23.

Revata the Doubter¹ saw a sugar-factory; having stepped aside, (he saw the men) putting flour and syrup² into the sugar; seeing this and thinking: “Sugar with food³ is unallowable; it is not allowable to make use of sugar at a wrong time,” being scrupulous,⁴ he and his company did not make use of the sugar, neither did those make use of the sugar who deemed that he should be listened to. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Why, monks, did they put flour and syrup into the sugar?”

“So as to make it firm, Lord.”

“If, monks, they put flour and syrup into the sugar so as to make it firm, and if it is still called ‘sugar’, I allow you, monks, to make use of as much sugar as you like.”⁵

Then on the way the venerable Revata the Doubter saw a kidney-bean growing on a dunghill; having seen it and thinking: “Kidney-beans are not allowable, for ripe kidney-beans are also growing,”⁶ being scrupulous he and his company did not make use of the kidney-bean, neither did those who deemed that he should be listened to make use of the kidney-bean. They told this matter to the Lord. He

¹ Kankhārevata. At AN i.24 called “chief of musers”; verses at Thag 3, Thi-ap 491. Mentioned at Ud 5.7, MN i.212, MN i.462. He was scrupulous about and doubted what was allowable, *kappiya*. Cf. Thag-a 37, Ud-a 314, AN-a i.230, MN-a ii.247, GS i.18, n. 2. ² *chārikam* cannot here be ashes, which is its most usual meaning. But cf. Sanskrit *kṣāra*, treacle, molasses. Perhaps some confused reference back to the “four irregular things” of Kd 6.14.6 is intended here. The allowability of the first two has been emphasised in specific cases (in Kd 6.14.6 and Kd 6.14.7), and “mud turned up by the plough” (of Kd 6.14.7) is probably intended as an example of the fourth irregular thing, namely clay. Here occurs the same word as is used for the third irregular thing, *chārika*, there translated “ashes” where syrup or treacle would hardly fit; but here translated “syrup”, as people would not put ashes into sugar to stiffen it, nor would ashes be called “food”, *āmisā*. ³ *sāmisa*; cf. Vin 4.198. ⁴ *kukkuccāyanta*. AN-a i.230, in explanation of Kaṅkhārevata’s name, says “doubting means, having scruples; the meaning is being scrupulous”. ⁵ *yathāsukhaṃ*. ⁶ Meaning of this passage is not clear. Vin-a 1092 says, “if ripe kidney-beans are also growing they may be used as much as you like, for these are allowed just because they are ripe”. On *mugga* see BD 1.83, n. 4.

said: “Monks, even if ripe kidney-beans are growing, I allow you to make use of kidney-beans as much as you like.”

Now at that time a certain monk had an affliction of wind in the stomach. He drank salted sour gruel.¹ Because of this his affliction of wind in the stomach subsided. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, salted sour gruel for one who is ill; when one is not ill to make use of it by using it as a beverage mixed with water.”

ON REJECTION OF WHAT IS PREPARED INDOORS, ETC.

Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Rājagaha. The Lord stayed there in Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels’ feeding place. Now at that time the Lord came to have an affliction of wind in the stomach. Then the venerable Ānanda, thinking: “On a former occasion the Lord’s affliction of wind in the stomach was eased by conje^y containing the three pungent ingredients,”² having himself prepared sesamum and rice-grain and kidney-bean, having cured³ them indoors, having himself cooked them indoors, brought them to the Lord, saying: “Lord, drink the conje^y containing the three pungent ingredients.”

Now Truth-finders (sometimes) ask knowing,⁴ and knowing (sometimes) do not ask; they ask knowing the right time (to ask), and they do not ask knowing the right time (when not to ask). Truth-finders ask about what belongs to the goal, not about what does not belong to the goal; bridge-breaking for Truth-finders is among what does not belong to the goal. Awakened ones, Lords question monks concerning two matters: either, “Shall we teach *dhamma*?” or “Shall we lay down a rule of training for disciples?” Then the Lord addressed

¹ *loṇasovīra*ka. At Vin 3.86 it is called *suvīra*ka. See BD 1.149, n. 3. ² *tekaṭṭulayāgu*. See BD 1.111, n. 1. ³ *vāsetvā*. I follow *Pali-English Dictionary* (under *vāseti*) rather than the “kept” of *Vinaya Texts* ii.68. Monks are allowed to cure (or purify) clay at Vin 2.120. ⁴ Cf. BD 1.12, and see there n. 3 for further references.

the venerable Ānanda, saying: “Where does this conje^y come from, Ānanda?” Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the Lord.

The awakened one, the Lord rebuked him, saying: “It is not becoming, Ānanda, it is not fitting, it is not suitable, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. And how can you, Ānanda, strain after abundance such as this? Moreover, Ānanda, that which is cured indoors is unallowable, and that which is cooked indoors is also unallowable, and that which is cooked by oneself is also unallowable. It is not, Ānanda, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, one should not use what is cured indoors, cooked indoors, cooked by oneself. Whoever should make use (of any of these things), there is an offence of wrong-doing.

“If, monks, it is cured indoors, cooked indoors, cooked by oneself, and one should make use of it, there is an offence of three wrong-doings. If, monks, it is cured indoors, cooked indoors, (but) cooked by others, and one should make use of it, there is an offence of two wrong-doings. If, monks, it is cured indoors, cooked out of doors, cooked by oneself, and one should make use of it, there is an offence of two wrong-doings.

“If, monks, it is cured out of doors, cooked indoors, cooked by oneself, and one should make use of it, there is an offence of two wrong-doings. If, monks, it is cured indoors, cooked out of doors, cooked by others, and one should make use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, monks, it is cured out of doors, cooked out of doors, (but) cooked by oneself, and one should make use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, monks, it is cured out of doors, cooked out of doors, cooked by others, and one should make use of it, there is no offence.”

Now at that time, monks, thinking: “Cooking for oneself¹ is objected to by the Lord,” were doubtful about² a second cooking.³ They

¹ *sāmañpāka*. ² *kukkuccāyanti*. ³ *punapāka*, i.e. a reheating of food already cooked once.

told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to cook a second cooking.”

6.17.7
Now at that time Rājagaha became short of food. People conveyed salt and oil and husked rice and solid food¹ to the monastery. The monks cured these out of doors, but vermin² ate them and also thieves carried them off.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to cure indoors.”⁴ When they had cured (the things) indoors, they cooked them out of doors, (but) those who live on the remains of food⁵ crowded round. The monks, not trusting them, made use of (the food). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to cook indoors.” When food was short those who made it allowable carried away the larger (portion) and gave the monks the lesser (portion). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, yourselves to cook. I allow you, monks, what is cured indoors, what is cooked indoors, what is cooked by yourselves.”

1.212
4.289

PICKED UP AND RECEIVED

6.17.8
Now at that time several monks, having spent the rains in Kāsi, going to Rājagaha to see the Lord, did not obtain on the way sufficient mediocre or fine meals, as much as they needed. Yet there was much solid food that was fruit,⁶ but there was no one to make it allowable.⁷ So these monks weary in body, approached Rājagaha, the Bamboo Grove, the squirrels’ feeding place, the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. Now

¹ These four items are mentioned also at [Vin 1.220](#), [Vin 1.238](#), [Vin 1.243](#), [Vin 1.249](#).

² *ukkapiṇḍaka*. Vin-a 1093 explains as cats, mice, lizards, mongeese (? *maṅgusā*).

³ As at [Vin 1.239](#). ⁴ This, and subsequent allowances, refer only to times of scarcity, and were all rescinded for times of plenty, see [Kd 6.32.1](#), [Kd 6.32.2](#). ⁵ Here called *damakā*. Vin-a 1093 explains by *vighāsādā*, a word which occurs at e.g. [Kd 6.24.1](#) below, and [Vin 4.91](#). See [BD 2, Introduction, p. xliii](#) and [BD 4.347, n. 3](#). ⁶ *phalakhā-daniya*. See note on *piṭṭhakhādaniya* at [Kd 6.36.6](#) below. ⁷ *kappiyakāraka*. These make things allowable by offering them. See [Kd 6.21.1](#); [Kd 6.38.1](#).

it is the custom for awakened ones, for Lords, to exchange friendly greetings with incoming monks. So the Lord spoke thus to these monks: “I hope, monks, things are going well with you, I hope you are keeping going, I hope you have come here with but little fatigue on the journey? And where, monks, do you come from?”

“Things are going well with us, Lord, but we, Lord, having spent the rains in Kāsi, coming to Rājagaha to see the Lord ... no one to make it allowable; thus we have come on the journey weary in body.”

Then the Lord on this occasion having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, if one anywhere sees solid food that is fruit, but if there is no one to make it allowable, having taken¹ it oneself, having carried it away, having seen someone to make it allowable, having laid it down on the ground, to make use of it, (he) having (formally) offered² it to you. I allow you, monks, to receive (formally) what you have picked up.”³

Now at that time fresh sesamum and fresh honey had accrued to a certain brahmin. Then it occurred to that brahmin: “Suppose I were to give the fresh sesamum and fresh honey to the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head?”

Then that brahmin approached the Lord; having approached, he exchanged friendly greetings with the Lord. Having exchanged greetings of friendliness and courtesy he stood at a respectful distance; and standing at a respectful distance, that brahmin spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, may the revered⁴ Gotama together with the Order of monks consent to a meal with me to-morrow.” The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then that brahmin departed, having understood the Lord’s consent.

Then that brahmin having had, towards the end of that night,

¹ *gahetvā*. ² *paṭiggahāpetvā*. Cf. note on *patta-gāhāpaka* at **BD 2.122**, and above, **BD 4.280**. ³ *uggahitaṃ*. This is an “allowance” only for a time of scarcity. See the much simpler “allowance” at **Kd 6.21.1** for more normal times. ⁴ *bhavaṃ*, as at **Vin 3.2**.

sumptuous solid food and soft food prepared, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: “It is time, good Gotama, the meal is ready”. Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached that brahmin’s dwelling; having approached, he sat down together with the Order of monks on the appointed seat. Then that brahmin, having with his own hand served and satisfied with sumptuous solid food and soft food the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head, sat down at a respectful distance when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl. While that brahmin was sitting down at a respectful distance the Lord, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted him with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, departed.

Then it occurred to that brahmin soon after the Lord had departed: “I forgot to give those things for the sake of which I invited the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head, thinking: ‘I will give fresh sesamum and fresh honey.’ Suppose I were to have the fresh sesamum and the fresh honey conveyed to the monastery in pots and pitchers?” Then that brahmin, having had the fresh sesamum and the fresh honey conveyed to the monastery in pots and pitchers, approached the Lord; having approached, he stood at a respectful distance; and as he was standing at a respectful distance this brahmin spoke thus to the Lord:

“I forgot to give those things, good Gotama, for the sake of which I invited the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head, thinking: ‘I will give fresh sesamum and fresh honey’. May the revered Gotama accept from me fresh sesamum and fresh honey?”

“Well, then, brahmin, give them to the monks.”

Now at that time because food was scarce¹ and they offered them only a little, monks considerately refused. But a whole Order was offered (food); the monks, being scrupulous, did not accept it.² (The

¹ *dubbhikkhā* means scarcity of food and of (in consequence) almsfood. ² See **Bu-Pc 32** and its definition of “great scarcity”, and its saying that at such a time a “group-meal” may be eaten (**BD 2.312**).

Lord said:)

“Accept (the food), monks, make use of it. I allow you, monks, having eaten and being satisfied,¹ to make use of food that is not left over,² if it was taken back from there”.³

ALLOWANCE FOR WHAT IS RECEIVED, ETC.

Now at that time the family who supported the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sent solid food for the Order,⁴ saying: “Having pointed it out as for master Upananda, it should be given to the Order.” Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, had entered the village for almsfood. Then these people, having gone to the monastery, asked the monks: “Where, honoured sirs, is master Upananda?”

“Sirs, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, has entered the village for almsfood.”

“Honoured sirs, having pointed out this solid food as for master Upananda, it should be given to the Order.”

They told this matter to the Lord.⁵ He said: “Well, then, monks, having accepted it, put it aside until Upananda comes back.”

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having visited the families before the meal, came back during the day.⁶ Now at that time because food was scarce and they offered them only a

¹ See [BD 2.326, n. 2](#) and definitions at [BD 2.328](#). ² See [Bu-Pc 35](#), to which the above allowance is an exception made in a time of scarcity. See [BD 2.328, n. 4](#), and definition of “what is not left over” at [BD 2.329](#). ³ *tato nīhatam*, i.e. having taken the food to the monastery from the place where it was received. Cf. *tato niharitvā* at [Vin 4.80](#) and its “definition” at [Vin 4.81](#). ⁴ As at [Vin 4.98–Vin.4.98 \(BD 2.363f.\)](#). ⁵ Here [Vin 4.99](#) inserts: “Then the Lord on that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “Well then ...” ⁶ At [Vin 4.99](#) Upananda is represented as thinking it to be forbidden by the Lord to call upon families before a meal, so having visited them after a meal he returned during the day. “Before a meal”, “after a meal” are defined at [Vin 4.100](#), and differently at [Vin 4.272](#), [Vin 4.273](#). Nuns’ [Bu-Pc 15](#), [Bu-Pc 16](#) seem to take it for granted that *nuns* approach families before and after meals.

little, monks considerately refused; but a whole Order was offered (food); the monks, being scrupulous, did not accept. (The Lord said:)

“Accept (the food), monks, make use of it. I allow you, monks, having eaten and being satisfied, to make use of (food) that is not left over if it was accepted before a meal.”

Then the Lord, having stayed at Rājagaha for as long as he found suiting, set out on a tour for Sāvattthī. In due course, walking on tour, he arrived at Sāvattthī. Then the Lord stayed there at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time the venerable Sāriputta had fever. Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great approached the venerable Sāriputta; having approached, he spoke thus to the venerable Sāriputta:

“When you, reverend Sāriputta, previously had fever, by what means was it eased?”

“I had lotus fibres and stalks, your reverence.”

Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great, as a strong man might stretch out his bent arm or might bend back his outstretched arm, even so did he, vanishing from the Jeta Grove appear on the banks of the Mandākinī lotus-tank.¹

A certain elephant² saw the venerable Moggallāna the Great coming in the distance; seeing him he spoke thus to the venerable Moggallāna the Great:

“Honoured sir, let master Moggallāna the Great come; there is a welcome, honoured sir, for master Moggallāna the Great. What, honoured sir, does the master need? What can I give him?”

“I need lotus fibres and stalks, friend.” Then that elephant commanded another elephant, saying:

“Well now, good fellow, give the master as many lotus fibres and stalks as he needs.” Then that elephant, having plunged into the Mandākinī lotus-tank, having with his trunk pulled lotus fibres and stalks, having washed them clean,³ having tied them into a bundle,

¹ One of the seven great lakes of the Himalayas, part of it being covered with white lotuses. See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ² *nāga*, elephant, rather than serpent here; the *soṇḍā*, trunk, is mentioned a little later.

approached the venerable Moggallāna the Great.

Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great, as a strong man might stretch out his bent arm or might bend back his outstretched arm, even so did he, vanishing from the bank of the Mandākinī lotus-tank, appear in the Jeta Grove. And that elephant too, vanishing from the bank of the Mandākinī lotus-tank, appeared in the Jeta Grove. Then that elephant, having offered the venerable Moggallāna the Great the lotus fibres and stalks, vanishing from the Jeta Grove, appeared on the bank of the Mandākinī lotus-tank. Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great brought the lotus fibres and stalks to the venerable Sāriputta. Then as the venerable Sāriputta was making use of the lotus fibres and stalks, his fever abated. Many lotus fibres and stalks came to be left over.

Now at that time because food was scarce and they offered them only a little,¹ monks considerably refused; but a whole Order was offered (food). The monks, being scrupulous, did not accept. (The Lord said:)

“Accept (the food), monks, make use of it. I allow you, monks, having eaten and being satisfied, to make use of (food) that is not left over if it grows in a wood, if it grows in a lotus-tank.”²

Now at that time there was a great quantity of solid food that was fruit³ at Sāvattihī, but there was no one to make it allowable. The monks, being scrupulous, did not make use of the fruit. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to make use of fruit that is without seed (or) whose seed is discharged,⁴ (even if) it is not made allowable.”

³ Cf. Vin 2.201, SN ii.269. ¹ As above, Kd 6.18.4 and Kd 6.19.2. ² This therefore seems an exception to Bu-Pc 11, which makes the destruction of vegetable growth an offence. ³ Cf. above Kd 6.17.8; below Kd 6.38.1, and note on piṭṭhakhādanīya at Kd 6.36.6. ⁴ nibbattabīja. Vin-a 1093 says bījaṃ nibbatetvā (variant reading nippaṭṭetvā) apānetvā, having got rid of the seed, having discharged it. The idea seems to be that monks must not eat the seeds of fruits. At Kd 6.38.1 all solid food that is fruit is allowed.

ON REJECTION OF SURGERY

6.22.1 Then the Lord, having stayed at Sāvattthī for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Rājagaha. In due course, walking on tour, he arrived at Rājagaha. And the Lord stayed there at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. Now at that time a certain monk was afflicted by an ulcer.¹ The surgeon, Ākāsagotta,² lanced it. Then the Lord, as he was touring the lodgings, approached this monk's dwelling-place.

6.22.2 The surgeon, Ākāsagotta, saw the Lord coming in the distance; seeing him, he spoke thus to the Lord: "Let the revered Gotama come, let him see this monk's orifice; it is like a lizard's mouth." Then the Lord, thinking, "This foolish man is making fun of me", becoming silent, having turned back, having had the Order of monks convened, on this occasion, in this connection, questioned the monks, saying: "Is there, as is said, monks, an ill monk in such and such a dwelling-place?"

1.216 "There is, Lord."

"What, monks, is this monk's affliction?"

6.22.3 "Lord, the venerable one's affliction is an ulcer. The surgeon, Ākāsa-gotta, lanced it."

The awakened one, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

"It is not becoming, monks, in this foolish man, it is not suitable, it is not fitting, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it should not be done. How, monks, can this foolish man let a lancing be done on the private parts? The skin, monks, is tender at the private parts, a wound is hard to heal, a knife hard to guide. It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ..." Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, one should not let a lancing be done on the private parts. Whoever should let it be done, there is a grave offence."

5.22.4
4.295 Now at that time the group of six monks, thinking: "Lancing is

¹ Cf. Vin 1.272. ² Mentioned, I think, nowhere but here.

objected to by the Lord”, let a clyster be used. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks let a clyster be used?” Then monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks let a clyster be used?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, one should not have lancing done within a distance of two finger-breadths of the private parts nor a clyster-treatment. Whoever should have either of these things done, there is a grave offence.”

ON REJECTION OF HUMAN FLESH

Then the Lord, having stayed at Rājagaha for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Benares. In due course, walking on tour, he arrived at Benares. The Lord stayed there near Benares at Isipatana in the deer-park. Now at that time in Benares the lay-follower, Suppiya, and the woman lay-follower, Suppiyā,¹ were both pleased²; they were benefactors, servitors,³ supporters of the Order. Then the woman lay-follower, Suppiyā, having gone to the monastery, having approached dwelling-place after dwelling-place, cell after cell, asked the monks: “Who, honoured sirs, is ill? What may be conveyed for whom?”

Now at that time a certain monk had drunk a purgative. Then that monk spoke to the woman lay-follower, Suppiyā, thus:

“I have drunk a purgative, sister. I need meat-broth.”⁴ She said:

¹ Suppiyā is at AN i.26 called chief of the laywomen disciples who tend the sick, a position she had resolved to achieve during a life in the time of Padumuttara Buddha, AN-a i.453-AN-a i.454. Her name occurs in a list of eminent women at AN iv.348. At Mil 115 she is mentioned with seven other persons as experiencing ease (*sukha*) here and now. ² I.e. with the teaching. ³ *kāraṅkā*, literally doers. ⁴ Allowed at Kd 6.14.7.

“Very well, master, it shall be conveyed (to you),” and having gone to her house, she enjoined a servant,¹ saying:

“Go, good fellow, find meat that is to hand.”²

“Yes, lady,” but that man, having answered the woman lay-follower Suppiya in assent, touring the whole of Benares, saw no meat that was to hand. Then that man approached the woman lay-follower Suppiyā; having approached the woman lay-follower Suppiyā, he spoke thus: “There is no meat, lady, that is ready to hand; today is a non-slaughter (day).”³

Then it occurred to the woman lay-follower, Suppiyā: “If that ill monk is unable to obtain meat-broth his affliction will greatly increase or he will pass away. It is not fitting in me, that I, having answered him in assent, should not have meat-broth conveyed”, and having taken a butcher’s knife,⁴ having cut flesh from her thigh, she gave it to a slave-woman, saying:

“Come now, having prepared⁵ this meat—in such and such a dwelling place there is an ill monk, you may give it to him, and if anyone asks for me, let it be known that I am ill,” and having wrapped her upper robe round her thigh, having entered an inner room, she lay down on a couch.

Then the lay-follower, Suppiya, having gone to the house, asked the slave-woman, saying: “Where is Suppiyā?”

“She, master, is lying down in an inner room.” Then the lay follower Suppiya, approached the woman lay-follower Suppiyā, and having approached he spoke thus to the woman lay-follower Suppiyā:

“Why are you lying down?”

¹ *antevāsin*. Cf. Bu-Pc 84 (Vin 4.162) where Anāthapiṇḍika enjoins his *antevāsin* to prepare rice for the monks. ² *pavattamaṃsa*, i.e. already killed, and not to be killed on purpose for the monk. For monks might eat no fish or meat which they saw, heard or suspected had been specially killed for them, Vin 3.172. ³ *māghāta*. Cf. Ja iii.428, Ja iii.434; also Asoka’s Pillar Edict V, where “on fifty-six days in the year the capture and sale of fish was prohibited, and on the same days, even in game-preserves, animals might not be destroyed (VINCENT SMITH, *Asoka*, 3rd edition, p.57). Vin-a 1094 says “on this day it is not possible for anyone to deprive anything of life”. ⁴ *potthanikā*. At Vin-a 1094 it is called “a knife for cutting meat”. ⁵ *sampādetvā*, as at Vin 3.208.

“I am ill,” she said.

“What is your affliction?” Then the woman lay-follower Suppiyā told this matter to the lay-follower Suppiya. Then the lay-follower Suppiya, thinking: “Indeed, it is marvellous, indeed, it is wonderful, that this Suppiyā is so faithful and believing that she gives up even her own flesh. What other thing could there be that she would not give?” and joyful, elated, he approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance.

As he was sitting down at a respectful distance the lay-follower Suppiya spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may the lord consent to a meal with me on the morrow together with the Order of monks”. The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then the lay-follower Suppiya, having understood the Lord’s consent, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the lay-follower Suppiya, towards the end of that night, having had sumptuous solid foods, soft foods, prepared, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: “It is time, Lord, the meal is ready”. Then the Lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of the lay-follower Suppiya; having approached, he sat down together with the Order of monks on the appointed seat.

Then the lay-follower Suppiya approached the lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he stood at a respectful distance. As the lay-follower Suppiya was standing at a respectful distance, the Lord spoke thus to him:

“How is Suppiyā?”

“She is ill, Lord.”

“Well then, let her come.”

“She is not able to do so, Lord.”

“Well then, having taken hold of her, bring her along.” Then the lay-follower Suppiya, having taken hold of the woman lay-follower Suppiyā, brought her along. When the Lord saw her, even that great wound became healed, the skin was (made) good with (small) hairs growing on it.

Then the lay-follower Suppiya and the woman lay-follower Sup-

piyā, saying: “Wonderful indeed, marvellous indeed are the great psychic power and the great potency of the Truth-finder, inasmuch as when the Lord sees (someone) even a great wound will be healed, the skin (made) good with (small) hairs growing on it,” and joyful, elated, having with their own hands served, and satisfied the Order of monks with the enlightened one at its head with sumptuous foods, solid and soft, when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from the bowl, they sat down at a respectful distance. Then the Lord having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted the lay-follower Suppiya and the woman lay-follower Suppiya with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, departed.

Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying: “Who, monks, asked the woman lay-follower Suppiyā for meat?” When he had spoken thus, that monk spoke thus to the Lord:

“I, Lord, asked the woman lay-follower Suppiyā for meat.”

“Has it been conveyed (to you), monk?”

“It has been conveyed, Lord.”

“Did you, monk, make use of it?”

“I, Lord, made use of it.”

“Did you, monk, inquire about¹ it?”

“I, Lord, did not inquire about it.”

The enlightened one, the Lord rebuked him, saying: “How an you, foolish man, make use of meat without having inquired about it? Foolish man, human flesh has been made use of by you. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“There are, monks, people who are faithful and believing; even their own flesh is given up by these. **Monks, you should not make use of human flesh. Whoever should make use of it, there is a grave offence. Nor, monks, should you make use of flesh without**

¹ *paṭivekkhi*, which Vin-a 1094 explains by *vīmaṃsi*, examined, considered, and by *paṭipucchi*, questioned. It explains *appaṭivekkhitvā* by *appaṭipucchitvā* not having questioned.

inquiring about it. Whoever should (so) make use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

ON REJECTION OF ELEPHANT FLESH

Now at that time a king's elephant died. Because food was scarce people made use of elephant-flesh; they gave elephant-flesh to monks who were walking for almsfood, and the monks made use of the elephant-flesh. The people looked down upon,¹ criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans make use of elephant-flesh? Elephants are a king's emblem; if the king should find out, not for these would be his favour.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, you should not make use of elephant-flesh. Whoever should make use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Now at that time a king's horses died ... (same as **Kd 6.23.10** reading horses, horse-flesh for elephants, elephant-flesh) “... **offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time, because food was scarce people made use of dog-flesh; they gave dog-flesh to monks who were walking for almsfood, and the monks made use of the dog-flesh. The people looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans make use of dog-flesh? A dog is loathsome, disgusting.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ From this passage it would appear that the people did not as a rule eat elephants' flesh; and it is to my mind not clear whether any did so even in a time of scarcity, but merely used it for offering to monks. Those who criticised monks could hardly have eaten it themselves. The same applies to the cases following.

Above at **Kd 6.23.9** a monk is blamed for accepting uncritically what was offered him. In the case of robes, on the contrary, monks might put forward no suggestions (see **Bu-NP 8, Bu-NP 9, Bu-NP 27**).

“Monks, dog-flesh should not be made use of.¹ Whoever should make use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time, because food was scarce people made use of snake-flesh; they gave snake-flesh to monks who were walking for almsfood, and the monks made use of the snake-flesh. The people ... spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans make use of snake-flesh? A snake is loathsome, disgusting.”

Then Supassa, the serpent-king, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance Supassa, the serpent-king, spoke thus to the Lord:

“There are, Lord, serpents who are without faith, unbelieving, and these might do harm to monks even for a trifle. It were good, Lord, if the masters did not make use of snake-flesh.”

Then the Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Supassa, the serpent-king, with talk on *dhamma*; and Supassa, the serpent-king, gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the Lord on this occasion having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, snake-flesh should not be used. Whoever should make use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time hunters, having killed a lion, made use of its flesh; they gave the lion's flesh to monks who were walking for almsfood. The monks, having made use of the lion's flesh, stayed in a jungle (but) lions attacked the monks because they smelt of lion's flesh. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, lion's flesh should not be made use of. Whoever should make use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

¹ Vin-a 1094 says the flesh of jungle wolves may be used; but the flesh of the offspring of a wolf and village dog may not be used.

Now at that time hunters, having killed a tiger ... having killed a panther ... having killed a bear ... having killed a hyena,¹ made use of its flesh; they gave the hyena's flesh to monks who were walking for almsfood. The monks, having made use of the hyena's flesh, stayed in a jungle (but) hyenas attacked the monks because they smelt of hyena's flesh. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, hyena's flesh should not be used. Whoever should use it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

ALLOWANCE FOR CONJEU AND HONEY-LUMPS

Then the Lord, having stayed in Benares for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Andhakavinda² together with the large Order of monks, with the twelve hundred and fifty monks. Now at that time the country people, having loaded much salt and oil and husked rice and solid food into wagons, followed close after the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head, saying:

“When we get our turn, then we will make a meal (for them),”³ and there were at least five hundred of those who eat the remains of food. Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Andhakavinda.

Then it occurred to a certain brahmin who did not receive his turn: “For the last two months I have been following the Older of monks with the awakened one at its head, thinking: ‘When I get my turn, I will make a meal (for them),’ but I do not get my turn. I am alone, and many of my household affairs are going to ruin. Suppose I were to look into the refectory⁴ and prepare that which I do not see

¹ Names of wild animals occur in this order at [Vin 3.151](#), AN iii.101. Cf. [Vin 3.58](#) where “bears” drop out and “wolves” follow hyenas. There is a longer list at Mil 267 = Ja v.416.

² A village in the Magadha country. ³ Cf. [Kd 6.33.1](#). ⁴ Cf. [Kd 6.36.6-Kd 6.36.8](#).

in the refectory?” Then that brahmin, looking into the refectory, did not see two things: conje and honey-lumps.¹

Then that brahmin approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached, he spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda: “Now, it occurred to me, good Ānanda, as I did not get a turn: ‘For the last two months ... Suppose I were to look into the refectory and prepare that which I do not see in the refectory?’ So I, good Ānanda, looking into the refectory, did not see two things: conje and honey-lumps. If I, good Ānanda, were to prepare conje and honey-lumps, would the revered Gotama accept them from me?”

“Well then, brahmin, I will ask the Lord.”

Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Well then, Ānanda, let him prepare them.” (Ānanda) said: “Well then, brahmin, prepare them”. Then that brahmin towards the end of that night, having had a quantity of conje and honey-lumps prepared, brought them to the Lord saying: “May the revered Gotama accept conje and honey-lumps from me.”

“Well then, brahmin, give them to the monks.” The monks, being scrupulous, did not accept them. (The Lord said:) “Accept them, monks, make use of them.” Then that brahmin, having with his own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head with a quantity of conje and honey-lumps, when the Lord had washed his hand² and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl, sat down at a respectful distance.

Then as this brahmin was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord spoke thus to him:

“Brahmin, there are these ten advantages from conje. What ten? In giving conje one gives life, one gives beauty, one gives ease, one gives strength, one gives intelligence; conje when it is drunk checks hunger, keeps off thirst, regulates wind, cleanses the bladder, digests

¹ *madhugoḷaka*, perhaps honey-combs. At Mahāvaiṃsa 22.42; Mahāvaiṃsa 34.52 we find *madhugaṇḍa*, translated by Geiger as “honey-combs”. ² *dhotahattha*, an unusual expression occurring at Kd 6.35.4; Kd 6.36.8. Used in explanation of *allapāṇi* at Pv-a 116. Technically *hattha* is the forearm from elbow to finger-tip, see **BD 2, Introduction, p.li**. Perhaps *pāṇi* is the hand itself.

raw remnants of food.¹ These, brahmin, are the ten advantages of conjei.”

“To the discerning whoso gives conjei duly
At the right time to one who lives on others’ food,
It confers ten things on him:
Life and beauty, ease and strength;²

“For him intelligence arises from it,
It dispels hunger, thirst and wind,
It cleanses the bladder, it digests food;
This medicine is praised by the well-farer.

“Therefore conjei should be given constantly
By a man longing for ease,
By those aspiring to deva-like joys
Or wanting human prosperity.”

Then the Lord having given thanks to that brahmin in these verses, rising from his seat, departed. Then the Lord, having on this occasion given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, conjei and honey-lumps.”

THE STORY OF THE MINISTER YOUNG IN FAITH

The people heard: “It is said that conjei is allowed by the Lord and honey-lumps.” These prepared eating-conjei³ and honey-lumps early in the morning. The monks, (each) satisfied⁴ in the early morning with eating-conjei and a honey-lump, did not eat as much as expected in the refectory. Now at that time a certain chief minister,

¹ The last five advantages occur also at AN iii.250. ² Cf. AN ii.64, where a similar verse occurs, but reading *bhojana*, food, instead of *yāgu*, conjei, and “four things” instead of “ten”. ³ *bhojjayāgu*, apparently as opposed to the more ordinary, and presumably more liquid, conjei which was drunk. *Bhojja* therefore here must be meant to stand for stiff, set, firm. ⁴ *dhātā*, in the sense of having eaten their fill, rather than in the sense of having been offered, and therefore satisfied, as is the meaning conveyed by *pavārta*.

young in faith came to have invited the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head for the morrow. Then it occurred to that chief minister, young in faith: “Suppose I were to prepare twelve hundred and fifty bowls of meat for the twelve hundred and fifty monks, and should take one bowl of meat up to each monk?”

Then that chief minister, young in faith, towards the end of that night, having had sumptuous solid food, soft food, prepared and twelve hundred and fifty bowls of meat, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: “Lord, it is time, the meal is ready.” Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of that great minister, young in the faith; having approached, he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks.

Then that chief minister, young in faith, attended on the monks in the refectory. The monks spoke thus: “Give a little,¹ sir, give a little, sir.” (He said) “Do not you, honoured sirs, accept so very little thinking: ‘This chief minister is young in faith.’ Much solid food, soft food, and twelve hundred and fifty bowls of meat have been prepared by me, thinking: ‘I will take one bowl of meat up to each monk’. Accept, honoured sirs, as much as you want.”

“Sir, it is not for this reason that we are accepting so very little, but we were (each) satisfied in the early morning with eating-conjey and a honey-lump; that is why we are accepting so very little.”

Then that chief minister, young in faith, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these revered sirs make use of someone else’s² eating-conjey? It is not that I am not competent to give as much as they want”³ and angry, displeased, longing to insult the monks, he went round filling their bowls and saying: “Eat it or take it away”. Then that chief minister, young in faith, having with his own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head with sumptuous foods, solid and soft, sat down at a respectful distance when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn

¹ Cf. Vin 3.66, Vin 4.76, Vin 4.81. ² Here *aññasa*, not *aññatra*, “elsewhere”, as in the cases cited in the previous note. ³ Reading here *na cāham na paṭṭibalo*; see

his hand from the bowl. As this chief minister, young in faith, was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted him with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, departed.

But soon after the Lord had departed, that chief minister, young in faith, became remorseful and conscience-stricken and thought: “For me it is unprofitable, for me it is not profitable, for me it is ill-gotten, for me it is not well-gotten, that I, angry, displeased, longing to insult the monks, went round filling their bowls and saying: ‘Eat it or take it away’. Now, is much merit produced for me or demerit?”

Then that chief minister, young in faith, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, that chief minister, young in faith, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Now I, Lord, soon after the Lord had departed, became remorseful and conscience-stricken, thinking: ‘For me it is unprofitable ... Now, Lord, is much merit produced for me or demerit?’”

“From the time when, sir, the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head was invited by you for the morrow much merit was produced for you; from the time when one of your lumps of boiled rice¹ was accepted by each monk much merit was produced for you. Heaven worlds are assured for you.”

Then that chief minister, young in faith, thinking: “It is said that it was profitable for me, it is said that it was well-gotten by me, it is said that much merit was produced for me, it is said that heaven worlds are assured for me,” joyful, elated, rising up from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him.

Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks, (although) invited elsewhere,² made use of someone else’s eating-conjey?”

¹ *sittha*, instead of, as before, *maṃsapāti*. Cf. *sitthāni* at Vin 2.165 and *sa-sittha-ka* at Vin 2.214, and *sitthāvākāraka* at Vin 2.214, Vin 4.196. ² *aññatra* here.

“It is true, Lord.”

The awakened one, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men, invited elsewhere, make use of someone else’s eating-conjey? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, if one is invited elsewhere, someone else’s eating-conjey should not be made use of. Whoever should (so) make use of it should be dealt with according to the rule.”¹

THE STORY OF BELAṬṬHAKACCĀNA

Then the Lord, having stayed at Andhakavinda for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Rājagaha together with the large order of monks, with twelve hundred and fifty monks. Now at that time Belaṭṭha Kaccāna² was going along the highroad from Rājagaha to Andhakavinda with five hundred wagons all filled with jars of sugar. Then the Lord saw Belaṭṭha Kaccāna from afar, and seeing him, he stepped aside from the road and sat down at the root of a certain tree.

Then Belaṭṭha Kaccāna approached the Lord, having approached, having greeted the Lord, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance, Belaṭṭha Kaccāna spoke thus to the Lord:

“I, Lord, want to give one jar of sugar to each monk.”

“Well then, do you, Kaccāna, bring just one jar of sugar.”

“Yes, Lord,” and Belaṭṭha Kaccāna, having answered the Lord in assent, bringing just one jar of sugar approached the Lord; having

¹ Vin-a 1095 says “he should be dealt with for the offence of *paramparabhojana*,” an out-of-turn meal, i.e. not taking the invitations in the order in which they were issued; made an offence in Bu-Pc 33. See BD 2.317, n. 3. ² Mentioned, I think, nowhere but here. Buddhaghosa has no note. The absence of a descriptive epithet is unusual. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* calls him “a sugar-dealer”, which seems likely.

approached, he spoke thus to the Lord: “The jar of sugar is brought, Lord. What line of conduct do I follow, Lord?”

“Well then, do you, Kaccāna, give the sugar to the monks.”

“Yes, Lord,” and Belaṭṭha Kaccāna having answered the Lord in assent, having given the sugar to the monks, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, the sugar is given to the monks, and I have much sugar over. What line of conduct do I follow, Lord?”

“Well then, Kaccāna, give the monks as much sugar as they want.”

“Yes, Lord,” and Belaṭṭha Kaccāna having answered the Lord in assent, having given the monks as much sugar as they wanted, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, as much sugar as they wanted has been given to the monks, and I have much sugar over. What line of conduct do I follow, Lord?”

“Well then, do you, Kaccāna, serve the monks with sugar.”

“Yes, Lord,” and Belaṭṭha Kaccāna having answered the Lord in assent, served the monks with sugar. Some monks filled bowls and they filled water-strainers and bags.

Then Belaṭṭha Kaccāna, having served the monks with sugar, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the monks are served with sugar, and I have much sugar over. What line of conduct do I follow, Lord?”

“Well then, do you, Kaccāna, give sugar to those who eat the remains of food.”¹

“Yes, Lord,” and Belaṭṭha Kaccāna having answered the Lord in assent, having given sugar to those who eat the remains of food, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, sugar has been given to those who eat the remains of food, and I have much sugar over. What line of conduct do I follow, Lord?”

“Well then, Kaccāna, give those who eat the remains of food as much sugar as they want.”

“Yes, Lord,” and Belaṭṭha Kaccāna, having answered the Lord in assent, having given those who eat the remains of food as much sugar as they wanted, spoke thus to the Lord:

¹ Mentioned above in [Kd 6.24.1](#). It seems as if they had attached themselves to the company of monks, doing the journeys from Benares to Andhakavinda and from there to Rājagaha.

“Lord, as much sugar as they wanted has been given to those who eat the remains of food, and I have much sugar over. What line of conduct do I follow, Lord?”

“Well then, Kaccāna, do you serve with sugar those who eat the remains of food.”

“Yes, Lord,” and Belaṭṭha Kaccāna having answered the Lord in assent, served with sugar those who eat the remains of food. Some of those who eat the remains of food filled pots and pitchers and they filled baskets and (their) clothes.¹

Then Belaṭṭha Kaccāna, having served with sugar those who eat the remains of food, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, those who eat the remains of food have been served with sugar, and I have much sugar over. What line of conduct do I follow, Lord?”

“I do not see anyone,² Kaccāna, in the world with its *devas*, Māras, and Brahmās, nor in the race of recluses and brahmins, *devas* and men who having made use of that sugar could digest it properly except a Truth-finder or a Truth-finder’s disciple.³ Well then, Kaccāna, throw away that sugar where there is but little green grass or drop it into water where there are no living creatures.”⁴

“Yes, lord”, and Belaṭṭha Kaccāna having answered the Lord in assent, dropped that sugar into water where there were no living creatures.

Then that sugar, thus placed in the water, sizzled and hissed and sent forth steam and smoke. As a ploughshare heated the live-long day if placed in water sizzles and hisses and sends forth steam and smoke, so did this sugar when placed in the water sizzle and hiss and send forth steam and smoke. Then Belaṭṭha Kaccāna, alarmed and with his hair standing on end, approached the Lord; having

¹ *ucchariga*, lap or hip. Here probably meaning that they knotted the sugar into the cloths they were wearing. This is still a customary way of carrying packages in India. At MN i.366 the word appears to have the same meaning as above. ² For following passage, cf. SN i.168–9, Snp p.15. ³ For explanation of this “curious reply” see KS i.211, n. 3. ⁴ Cf. Kd 4.13, where this sentence also occurs.

approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance.

As Belaṭṭha Kaccāna was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord talked a progressive talk to him,¹ that is to say, talk on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven; he explained the peril, the vanity, the depravity of pleasures of the senses, the advantage in renouncing (them). When the Lord knew that the mind of Belaṭṭha Kaccāna was ready, pliable, devoid of the hindrances, uplifted, pleased, then he explained to him that teaching on *dhamma* which the awakened ones have themselves discovered: ill, uprising, stopping, the Way. And as a clean cloth without black specks will easily take dye, even so as he was (sitting) on that very seat *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose to Belaṭṭha Kaccāna, that “whatever is of the nature to uprise, all that is of the nature to stop”.

Then Belaṭṭha Kaccāna, as one who had seen *dhamma*,² attained *dhamma*, known *dhamma*, plunged into *dhamma*, who had crossed over doubt, put away uncertainty, who had attained without another’s help to full confidence in the teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Excellent, Lord! Excellent, Lord! Even, Lord, as one might set upright what had been upset ... even so is *dhamma* explained by the Lord in many a figure. I myself, Lord, am going to the Lord for refuge, to *dhamma* and to the Order of monks. May the Lord accept me as a lay-follower going for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts.”

Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Rājagaha. The Lord stayed there at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels’ feeding place. At that time there was abundant sugar in Rājagaha. Monks, thinking, “Sugar is allowed by the Lord only to one who is ill, not to one who is not ill”, being scrupulous, did not partake of sugar. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ From here to end of **Kd 6.26.8** cf. above, e.g. **Kd 1.7.5–Kd 1.7.6**. ² For this passage see **Kd 1.6.32**, etc.

“I allow, monks, sugar for one who is ill, sugar-water for one who is not ill.”¹

THE STORY OF PĀṬALIGĀMA

Then the Lord,² having stayed at Rājagaha for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Pāṭaligāma³ together with the large Order of monks, with the twelve hundred and fifty monks. Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Pāṭaligāma. Lay-followers at Pāṭaligāma heard: “It is said that the Lord has reached Pāṭaligāma.” Then the lay-followers of Pāṭaligāma approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. The Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted the lay-followers of Pāṭaligāma with talk on *dhamma* as they were sitting down at a respectful distance.

Then the lay-followers of Pāṭaligāma, gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, spoke thus to the Lord⁴: “Lord, may the Lord consent (to come) to our rest-house⁵ together with the Order of monks.” The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then the lay-followers of Pāṭaligāma, having understood the Lord’s consent,⁶ rising from their seats, having greeted the Lord, having kept their right sides towards him, approached that rest-house; having approached, having spread that test-house so that a spreading was

¹ Note that above, when the monks received a quantity of sugar from Belaṭṭha, the verb used was *paribhuñjati*, (to make use of). In the story of **Kd 6.27.1**, it is said that they did not partake of, (*na bhuñjanti*,) any sugar. ² Chapters 28–30 are, with a few unimportant variations, word for word the same as the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta DN16.1.19–DN16.2.3; DN16.2.16–DN16.2.24. See RHYSDAVIDS’ Introduction to his translation of the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, pp. xxxiv seq., and his note there at DN16.2.16, thus *Vinaya Texts* ii.97, n. Also from here to end of 28 is, again with a few minor variations, the same as Ud 85–Ud 90. ³ The modern Patna. On *pāṭali*, see below, **BD 4.312, n. 4**. ⁴ This passage occurs also at DN ii.84ff. ⁵ *āvasathāgāra*, as at **Vin 4.17**; see **BD 2.198** for Buddhaghosa’s interpretation. ⁶ For preamble to the discourse see also MN i.354, SN iv.182.

spread everywhere,¹ having made ready seats,² having had a water-jar set up, having prepared an oil lamp, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they stood at a respectful distance.

As they were standing at a respectful distance, the lay-followers of Pāṭaligāma spoke thus to the Lord: “The rest-house is spread with a spreading everywhere, Lord, seats are made ready, a water-jar is set up, an oil lamp is prepared; Lord, the Lord does that for which it is now the right time.” Then the Lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached that rest-house together with the Order of monks; having approached, having washed his feet, having entered the rest-house, he sat down leaning against a central pillar facing the east. The Order of monks too, having washed their feet, having entered the rest-house, sat down leaning against the western wall facing the east with the Lord in view. The lay-followers of Pāṭaligāma too, having washed their feet, having entered the rest-house, sat down leaning against the eastern wall, facing the west with the Lord in view.

Then the Lord addressed the lay-followers of Pāṭaligāma, saying: “There are these five disadvantages,³ householders, to one of wrong moral habit, falling away from moral habit. What five? Now, householders, one of wrong moral habit, falling away from moral habit, suffers great diminution of wealth owing to sloth; this is the first disadvantage to one of wrong moral habit, falling away from moral habit.

Then again, householders, an evil reputation is noised abroad of one of wrong moral habit, falling away from moral habit; this is the second disadvantage ...

Then again, householders, if one of wrong moral habit, falling away from moral habit, approaches any company, whether a company of nobles, a company of brahmins, a company of householders,

¹ *sabbasanthariṃ santhataṃ āvasathāgāraṃ santharivā*. On *santharati* and *santhata* see **BD 2, Introduction, p. xxii**f. Ud 86 omits *santhataṃ*. ² All these processes are described at MN-a iii.18f., Ud-a 409f. ³ As at AN iii.252f., DN ii.85–DN ii.86, DN iii.236, Ud 86. Noticed at Vism 54.

a company of recluses, he approaches it diffidently, being ashamed; this is the third disadvantage ...

“Then again, householders, one of wrong moral habit, falling away from moral habit, passes away bewildered; this is the fourth disadvantage ...

“Then again, householders, one of wrong moral habit, falling away from moral habit, at the breaking up of the body after dying arises in the waste, the Bad-bourn, the Downfall, Niraya Hell; this is the fifth disadvantage to one of wrong moral habit, falling away from moral habit. These, householders, are the five disadvantages to one of wrong moral habit, falling away from moral habit.

“There are these five advantages, householders, to one of moral habit, accomplished in moral habit. What five? Now, householders, one of moral habit, accomplished in moral habit, acquires a great mass of wealth owing to zeal; this is the first advantage to one of moral habit, accomplished in moral habit.

“Then again, householders, a lovely reputation is noised abroad of one of moral habit, accomplished in moral habit; this is the second advantage ...

“Then again, householders, if one of moral habit, accomplished in moral habit, approaches any company, whether a company of nobles, a company of brahmins, a company of householders, a company of recluses, he approaches it confidently, not being ashamed; this is the third advantage ...

“Then again, householders, one of moral habit, accomplished in moral habit, passes away unbewildered; this is the fourth advantage

...

“Then again, householders, one of moral habit, accomplished in moral habit, at the breaking up of the body after dying arises in the Happy-bourn, in a heaven-world; this is the fifth advantage to one of moral habit, accomplished in moral habit. These, householders, are the five advantages to one of moral habit, accomplished in moral habit.”

When the Lord had gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted the

lay-followers of Pāṭaligāma far into the night with talk on *dhamma*, he dismissed them, saying: “The night is now far spent, householders; now do that for whatever it is the right time.”

“Yes, Lord,” and the lay-followers of Pāṭaligāma, having answered the Lord in assent, rising from their seats, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping their right sides towards him.

Then the Lord, soon after the lay-followers of Pāṭaligāma had departed, entered into solitude.¹

THE STORY OF SUNIDHA AND VASSAKĀRA

Now at that time Sunidha² and Vassakāra, chief ministers in Magadha, were building a (fortified) town³ at Pāṭaligāma for repelling the Vajjis. Then the Lord, getting up at the end of that night towards dawn, saw with *deva*-sight, pure and surpassing that of men, many⁴ *devatās* occupying the sites at Pāṭaligāma. Now in whatever region powerful *devatās* occupy sites, they bend the minds of powerful kings and the kings’ chief ministers to build dwellings there; in whatever region *devatās* of middling (power) occupy sites, they bend the minds of kings of middling (power), and the kings’ chief ministers to build dwellings there; in whatever region *devatās* of lowly (power) occupy sites, they bend the minds of kings of lowly (power) and the kings’ chief ministers to build dwellings there.

Then the Lord addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “Now, who, Ānanda, are these who are building a (fortified) town at Pāṭaligāma?”

“Sunidha and Vassakāra, Lord, chief ministers in Magadha, ... for repelling the Vajjis.”

“As though, Ānanda, having consulted together with the *Devas* of the Thirty, even so, Ānanda, do Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief minis-

¹ *suññāgāra*, see above, **Kd 1.78.5**, and *Minor Anthologies* ii, p.107, n. 1. ² Sunidha at **DN ii.86** and **Ud 87**. ³ *nagara*, see **BD 2.63, n. 2**. ⁴ *sambahulā*, often in Vinaya when used of monks being equivalent to *gaṇa*, a group of from two to four monks. **DN ii.87**, **Ud 88** say *sambahulā devatāyo sahaṣṣassa*, many *devatās* (in companies) of a thousand.

ters in Magadha, build a (fortified) town at Pāṭaligāma for repelling the Vajjis. Now I, Ānanda, getting up at the end of this night towards dawn, saw with *deva*-sight ... in whatever region *devatās* of lowly (power) occupy sites, they bend the minds of kings of lowly (power) and the kings' chief ministers to build dwellings there. Ānanda, as far as the *ariyan* region¹ (extends), as far as there is trading,² this will be a leading town, Pāṭaliputta³, (where there was) the breaking of the seed-boxes.⁴ But, Ānanda, there will be three dangers to Pāṭaliputta: from fire or from water or from internal dissension."⁵

Then Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief ministers in Magadha, approached the Lord; having approached they exchanged friendly greetings with the Lord; having exchanged greetings of friendliness and courtesy, they stood at a respectful distance. As they were standing at a respectful distance, Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief ministers in Magadha, spoke thus to the Lord: "May the revered Gotama together with the Order of monks consent to a meal with us today." The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief ministers in Magadha, departed⁶ having understood the Lord's consent.

Then Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief ministers in Magadha, having had sumptuous solid food and soft food prepared, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: "It is time, good Gotama, the meal is ready." Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the food distribution⁷ of Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief ministers in Magadha; having approached, he sat down together with the Order of monks on the appointed seat. Then Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief ministers in Magadha, having with

¹ *ariya āyatana*. Cf. AN iii.441. Vin-a 1095 says "as far as the place where *ariyan* people go to". ² *vaṇṇipatha*. ³ The modern Patna. The name is omitted at Ud 88. ⁴ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2984.) ⁵ On the event prophesied here. Pāṭaliputta's becoming the capital of the Magadha empire, and the possibility of the notice of the event's late insertion into the text, see *Vinaya Texts* ii.102, n and *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.92, n. 3. ⁶ DN ii.88, Ud 89 say they went to their own residence, *āvasatha*. ⁷ *parivesanā*; DN ii.88, Ud 89 read *āvasatha*. Cf. Snp p.13, SN i.172.

their own hands served and satisfied with sumptuous food, solid and soft, the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head, when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl, sat down at a respectful distance; and as Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief ministers in Magadha, were sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord gave thanks in these verses:

“Wherever the prudent man shall take up his abode,
Having offered food to those here of moral habit,
good Brahma-farers, if he makes an offering
To those¹ *devatās* who may be there—
These revered, do revere, honoured, do honour him.
Hence they sympathise with him,
as a mother with her own child.
The man with whom *devatās* sympathise, ever sees good
luck.”

Then the Lord, having in these verses given thanks to Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief ministers in Magadha, rising from his seat, departed.

Then Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief ministers in Magadha, following close behind the Lord, thought: “By whichever gate the recluse Gotama goes out today, that shall be called Gotama’s Gate; by whichever ford he crosses the river Ganges, that shall be called Gotama’s Ford.” Accordingly the gate by which the Lord departed came to be called Gotama’s Gate.

Then the Lord approached the river Ganges. Now at that time the river Ganges was full, level with the banks, so that a crow could drink² (from it). Since they were desirous of going from the hither to the further (bank),³ some people looked about for a boat, some looked about for a float,⁴ others put together a raft.⁵

¹ Cf. Thig.307, Thig.211; Mil 294. ² As at MN i.435; SN ii.134; DN i.244; AN iii.27. ³ *orā pāraṃ*; DN: *aparāparaṃ*; Ud: *apārā paraṃ*, which WOODWARD (*Minor Anthologies* ii.109, n. 4) proposes to correct to DN reading. ⁴ *uḷumpa*. This may be a wooden or a bamboo raft. Vin-a 1096 says that it is made, having knocked in pegs. ⁵ *kulla*. Vin-a 1096 says that it is made, having put together reeds and so on.

The Lord saw these people, of whom some were looking about for a boat, some were looking about for a float, others were putting together a raft since they were desirous of going from the hither to the further (bank). Seeing them, as a strong man might stretch out his bent arm or might bend back his outstretched arm, even so did he, vanishing from the hither bank¹ of the river Ganges, reappear² on the further bank together with the Order of monks. Then the Lord, having understood this matter, at that time uttered this solemn utterance:

“Those cross the deeps, the rivers,³
making a bridge, spanning the swamps.
See! people tie their rafts—
but crossed over⁴ are the wise.”⁵

ON THE TRUTHS AT KOṬIGĀMA

Then the Lord approached Koṭigāma. The Lord stayed there at Koṭigāma. Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Monks, it is by not understanding, not penetrating the four *ariyan* truths that there is this long long running-on and faring-on both for me and for you. What four? Monks, it is through not understanding, not penetrating the *ariyan* truth of ill that there is this long long running-on and faring-on both for me and for you. Monks, it is through not understanding, not penetrating the *ariyan* truth of the uprising of ill, the *ariyan* truth of the stopping of ill, the *ariyan* truth of the course leading to the stopping of ill that there is this long long running-on and faring-on both for me and for you.

“Therefore, monks, if the *ariyan* truth of ill is understood, is pene-

¹ *orimatīre*. ² *paccuṭṭhāsi*, instead of the more usual *pāturaḥosi*. ³ *sara*, here a river, Vin-a 1096. ⁴ *tiṇṇa*, a technical term frequent in the Suttas, meaning “crossed over” the four-fold flood of sense-pleasures, becoming, false view and ignorance, or over some other undesirable state, and so “crossed over” Māra’s stream, a river of death. See my *Man Perfected*, Ch. 8. ⁵ To here, from beginning of Kd 6.28.1, the same as Ud 85, with a few minor variations.

trated, if the *ariyan* truth of the uprising of ill ... if the *ariyan* truth of the stopping of ill ... if the *ariyan* truth of the course leading to the stopping of ill is understood and penetrated, then cut off is the craving for becoming,¹ destroyed is the conduit for becoming,² there is not now again-becoming.”

Not seeing the four *ariyan* truths as they really are
Long is the journey fared-on in birth after birth;
When these are seen, removed is the conduit for becoming,
The root of ill cut off, there is not now again-becoming.³

THE STORY OF AMBAPĀLĪ

Then the courtesan Ambapālī⁴ heard⁵: “They say that the Lord has reached Koṭṭigāma”. Then the courtesan Ambapālī, having had very magnificent vehicles harnessed, having mounted a magnificent vehicle, went off with the very magnificent vehicles from Vesālī to see the Lord. Having gone by vehicle as far as the ground was (suitable) for a vehicle, she alighted from the vehicle and approached the Lord on foot; having approached, having greeted the Lord, she sat down at a respectful distance.

The Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted the courtesan Ambapālī with talk on *dhamma* as she was sitting down at a respectful distance. The courtesan Ambapālī, having been, gladdened ... delighted with talk on *dhamma* by the Lord, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with me on the morrow together with the Order of monks.” The Lord consented by becoming silent. The courtesan Ambapālī, having understood the Lord’s con-

¹ *bhavataṇhā*. ² *bhavanetti*. ³ To here from 28.1 = DN ii.84–91. ⁴ Her verses are at Thig. 252–Thig.270. See also Thig-a 206–Thig-a 7, Thig-a 213; Thi-ap 613ff. She was the mother of Vimāla-Koṇḍañña, while Bimbisāra is said to have been his father, Thag-a 156. Mentioned below, BD 4.379. ⁵ From here to Kd 6.30.6 = DN ii.95. See *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.102, n. for some remarks on the discrepancies shown by the two versions in their localisation of the incidents narrated.

sent, rising from her seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping her right side towards him.

THE STORY OF THE LICCHAVĪS

Then the Licchavis of Vesālī heard: “They say that the Lord has reached Koṭṭigāma”. Then the Licchavis of Vesālī, having had very magnificent vehicles harnessed, having (each) mounted a magnificent vehicle, went off with the very magnificent vehicles from Vesālī to see the Lord. Some Licchavis were dark green,¹ dark green in colour, their clothes were dark green, their ornaments were dark green. Some Licchavis were yellow, yellow in colour ... their ornaments were yellow. Some Licchavis were red, red in colour ... their ornaments were red. Some Licchavis were white, white in colour, their clothes were white, their ornaments were white. Then the courtesan Ambapālī drove up against the many young Licchavis, pole to pole, yoke to yoke, wheel to wheel, axle to axle.

Then these Licchavis spoke thus to the courtesan Ambapālī: “Now then,² why do you, Ambapālī, drive up against the many young Licchavis pole to pole, yoke to yoke, wheel to wheel, axle to axle?”

“Indeed, young gentlemen,³ it is because the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head is invited by me for the morrow.”

“Now then, Ambapālī, give up this meal to us for a hundred thousand.”⁴

“But if, young gentlemen, you were to give up Vesālī with its produce,⁵ I would not give up this meal.”

Then these Licchavis snapped their fingers,⁶ saying: “Truly we

¹ *nila* is defined at [Vin 4.120](#). Vin-a 1096 says that these colours are for the sake of distinguishing the Licchavis. They are not “dark green” and so on by nature, but are coloured with a dark green cosmetic—as some of the faces of the Ajanta frescoes are meant to be. ² *je*. ³ *ayyaputta*. ⁴ Probably *kahāpaṇas* are to be understood. ⁵ *sāhāra* = *sa-āhāra*, with its food. Vin-a 1097, DN-a 545 explain by *sa-janapada*. No justification for “with its subject territory” of *Vinaya Texts* ii.107, *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.103. ⁶ *aṅgulī pothesuṃ*. Vin-a 1097 explains by *cālesuṃ*, to move, to shake.

are beaten by this mango-girl,¹ truly we are defeated by this mango-girl.”

Then these Licchavis approached the Lord. The Lord saw these Licchavis coming from afar, and seeing them, he addressed the monks, saying:

“By whatever monks, monks, the *Devas* of the Thirty have not been seen before, look, monks, at the Licchavi company, look again, monks, at the Licchavi company, compare, monks, the Licchavi company to the company of the *Devas* of the Thirty.” Then these Licchavis, having gone by vehicle as far as the ground ... (as in [Kd 6.30.1](#), [Kd 6.30.2](#) down to:): “Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with us on the morrow?”

“I have promised, Licchavis, (to take) a meal with the courtesan Ambapālī to-morrow.” Then these Licchavis snapped their fingers, saying:

“Truly we are beaten by this mango-girl; truly we are defeated by this mango-girl.”

Then these Licchavis, having approved of what the Lord had said and having given thanks for it, rising from their seats, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping their right sides towards him.

Then the Lord, having stayed in Koṭigāma for as long as he found suiting, approached Ñātikā. The Lord stayed there at Ñātikā in the Brick Residence. Then the courtesan Ambapālī, having had sumptuous food, solid and soft, prepared towards the end of that night in her own park, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: ... (as in [Kd 6.28.10](#) down to:²) ... sat down at a respectful distance. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance, the courtesan Ambapālī spoke thus to the Lord: “I, Lord, would give this Ambapālī Grove to the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head.”

The Lord accepted the park. Then the Lord, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted the courtesan Ambapālī with talk on

¹ *ambakā*, with probably intended a play on her name, itself connected with the mango-grove she owned. See *Dialogues of the Buddha* ii.103, n. 1; *Vinaya Texts* ii.107, n.

² Replace “Sunidha and Vassakāra, chief ministers of Magadha” by “the courtesan Ambapālī,” and “good Gotama” by “Lord”.

dhamma, rising from his seat,¹ approached the Great Grove. The Lord stayed there at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the Hall with the Peaked Gable.

Told is the Portion for Repeating on the Licchavis

THE STORY OF GENERAL SĪHA

6.31.1 Now at that time² many distinguished Licchavis, sitting together assembled in a mote-hall, were in many a figure speaking praise of the awakened one, praise of *dhamma*, praise of the Order. Now at that time the general Sīha,³ a disciple of the Jains,⁴ came to be sitting in that company. Then it occurred to the general Sīha: “Undoubtedly this will be a Lord, a perfected one, a wholly awakened one, since these distinguished Licchavis, sitting together assembled in the mote-hall, are in many a figure speaking praise of the awakened one, praise of *dhamma*, praise of the Order. Suppose I were to go up to see this Lord, perfected one, wholly awakened one?”

6.31.2 Then the general Sīha approached Nātaputta the Jain⁵; having approached, he spoke thus to Nataputta the Jain: “I want, honoured sir,⁶ to go along to see the recluse Gotama.”

“But how can you, Sīha, being one who asserts an ought- to-be-done,⁷ go along to see the recluse Gotama who asserts an ought-not-to-be-done⁸? For, Sīha, the recluse Gotama asserts an ought-not-

¹ To here from **Kd 6.30.1** is in all material respects the same as DN ii.95. The DN version says the Lord went to Beluva. ² From there to nearly the end of

Kd 6.31.14 = AN iv.179. ³ Cf. AN iii.38f., AN iv.79. His interest in giving gifts may have been due to Gotama’s talk to him (below **Kd 6.31.11**) just after he became a lay-follower. ⁴ Nigaṇṭhas. Literal meaning “without bonds”. See GS iv.124, n. 2.

⁵ The leader of the Nigaṇṭhas, identified by Bühler and Jacobi with Mahāvīra (*Vinaya Texts* ii.109, n. 1). His views are given at DN i.57. ⁶ *bhante*. ⁷ *kiriya-vāda*. This and *akiriya-vāda* each had its own adherents. Gotama put his own interpretation on each theory, see below **Kd 6.31.6** and **Vin 3.2**. Thus he is able to say, as at AN i.62, *kiriya-vādī c’aham akiriya-vādī ca*. At **Vin 1.71** he is reputed to say of the Jāṭilas that they are *kiriya-vādino* and *kammavādino*, and it is apparently for this reason that he grants them a concession. ⁸ *akiriya-vāda*. See A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Some Pali Words*, Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, vol. iv, No. 2, July 1939, p. 119ff.

to-be-done, he teaches a doctrine of an ought-not-to-be-done and in that he trains¹ disciples.” Then that which had been the strong aspiration of general Siha for going² to see the Lord abated.

Then a second time did the distinguished Licchavis, sitting together assembled in the mote-hall ... And a second time did it occur to the general Sīha: “Undoubtedly this will be a Lord, a perfected one ... Suppose I were to go up to see this Lord, perfected one, wholly awakened one?” And a second time did the general Siha approach Nātaputta the Jain “... and in that trains disciples”. And a second time did that abate which had been the strong aspiration of the general Siha for going to see the Lord. And a third time it occurred to the general Sīha: “Undoubtedly this will be a Lord, perfected one, wholly awakened one, since these distinguished Licchavis, sitting together assembled in the mote-hall, are in many a figure speaking praise of the awakened one, praise of *dhamma*, praise of the Order. What can these Jains do to me whether I have asked for permission or have not asked for permission? Suppose that I, although I have not asked for permission from the Jains, were to go along to see this Lord, perfected one, wholly awakened one?”

Then the general Sīha with some five hundred chariots departed from Vesālī in broad daylight to see the Lord. Having gone by vehicle as far as the ground was (suitable) for a vehicle, having alighted from the vehicle, he approached the Lord on foot; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, general Sīha spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, I have heard this: ‘The recluse Gotama affirms an ought-not-to-be-done, he teaches a doctrine of an ought-not-to-be-done, and in that trains disciples.’ I assume that these, Lord, who say: ‘The recluse Gotama affirms an ought-not-to-be-done ... and in that trains disciples,’ are, Lord, asserting (fairly) what the Lord affirms,³ and are not

¹ *Vineti*, to lead away, and so to pervert, divert, avert. Cf. below [Kd 6.34.12](#), where in the same terms leaders of other sects try to dissuade Menḍaka from going to see the Lord. ² *gamikābhisamkhāra*. Cf. *pabbajjābhisamkhāra* at [Vin 1.194](#) (above, [Kd 5.13.2](#)).

³ *bhagavato vuttavādī*.

misrepresenting the Lord by what is not fact, but are putting forth a doctrine which conforms to¹ his doctrine. I assume that no one who is his fellow *dhamma*-man, a holder of his views, comes to a position incurring blame. Indeed, we, Lord, do not want to misrepresent the Lord.”²

“There is, *Sīha*, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say³: ‘The recluse Gotama asserts an ought-not-to-be-done, he teaches a doctrine of an ought-not-to-be-done, and in this he trains disciples.’ There is, *Sīha*, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: ‘The recluse Gotama asserts an ought-to-be-done⁴ ... trains disciples.’ There is, *Sīha*, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: ‘The recluse Gotama asserts annihilation ... trains disciples.’ There is, *Sīha*, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: ‘The recluse Gotama is one who detests, he teaches a doctrine of detestation, and in this he trains disciples.’ There is, *Sīha*, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: ‘The recluse Gotama is a leader away, he teaches a doctrine of leading away, and in this he trains disciples.’ There is, *Sīha*, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: ‘The recluse Gotama is a “burner up”, he teaches a doctrine of “burning up”, and in this he trains disciples.’ There is, *Sīha*, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: ‘The recluse Gotama is not destined to another (kind of) becoming, he teaches a doctrine of no other kind of becoming, and in this he trains disciples. There is, *Sīha*, a way in which one speaking truly of me could say: ‘The recluse Gotama is confident,⁵ he teaches a doctrine of confidence,⁶ and in this he trains disciples.’

“And what, *Sīha*, is the way in which one speaking truly of me could say: ‘The recluse Gotama is one who asserts an ought-not-to-be-done, he teaches a doctrine of an ought-not-to-be-done and in this he

¹ *anudhamma*, explained by *anukāraṇa*, perhaps meaning “minor tenet”, at Vin-a 1097, DN-a 349, MN-a iii.46. ² Stock, e.g. at DN i.161, DN iii.115; MN i.368, MN i.482; AN i.161; SN ii.33. SN iii.6, SN iv.340; Vin 2.297. ³ Cf. Vin 3.2–Vin.3.3 for this passage, and for notes see BD 1.4–BD.1.6. ⁴ Not included at Vin 3.2. Cf. AN i.62. ⁵ Not included at Vin 3.2. “Confident” is Pali *assattha*, rendered at GS iv.127 “found consolation”. ⁶ *assāsa*. Cf. one who has *assāsa* in *dharmavinaya* at SN ii.50; translated at KS ii.38 as “comfort”.

trains disciples’? Indeed I, Sīha, assert of misconduct in body, speech and thought that it ought not to be done; I assert of manifold evil and wrong states (of mind) that they ought not to be done. This is the way, Sīha, in which one speaking truly of me could say: ‘The recluse Gotama asserts what ought-not-to-be-done, he teaches a doctrine of what ought-not-to-be-done and in this he trains disciples.’

“And what, Sīha, is the way in which one ... could say: ‘The recluse Gotama asserts what ought-to-be-done ... trains disciples’? Indeed I, Sīha, assert of good conduct in body, speech and thought that it ought to be done; of manifold right states (of mind) that they ought to be done. This is the way, Sīha ...

“And what, Sīha, is the way in which one ... could say: ‘The recluse Gotama asserts annihilation ... trains disciples’? Indeed I, Sīha, assert the annihilation of passion, hatred, stupidity; I assert the annihilation of manifold evil and wrong states (of mind). This is the way, Sīha ...

“And what, Sīha, is the way in which one ... could say: ‘The recluse Gotama is one who detests, he teaches a doctrine of detestation and in this he trains disciples’? Indeed, Sīha, I detest misconduct in body, speech and thought; I teach a doctrine of detestation for entering upon manifold evil wrong states (of mind). This is the way, Sīha ...

“And what, Sīha, is the way in which one ... could say: ‘The recluse Gotama is one who is a leader away, he teaches a doctrine of leading away and in this he trains disciples’? Indeed I, Sīha, teach a doctrine of the leading away of passion, hatred, stupidity; I teach a doctrine of the leading away of manifold evil wrong states (of mind). This is the way, Sīha ...

“And what, Sīha, is the way in which one ... could say: ‘The recluse Gotama is one who is a “burner-up”, he teaches a doctrine of burning up and in this he trains disciples’? Indeed I, Sīha, speak of evil wrong states which are searing: misconduct in body, speech and thought. He for whom, Sīha, evil wrong states that axe searing are destroyed, cut off at the root, made like a palm-tree, so utterly done away with that they can come to no future existence—him I call one who is

4.322 a 'burner-up'. For a Truth-finder, Sīha, evil wrong states that are searing ... existence. This is the way, Sīha, in which one ... could say: 'The recluse Gotama is one who is a "burner-up", he teaches a doctrine of burning-up, and in this he trains disciples.'

1.236
6.31.9 "And what, Sīha, is the way in which one ... could say: 'The recluse Gotama is one who is not destined to another (kind of) becoming, he teaches a doctrine of no other (kind of) becoming and in this he trains disciples'? He for whom, Sīha, future conception in a womb, becoming again and rebirth are destroyed, cut off at the root, made like a palm-tree, so utterly done away with that they can come to no future existence—him I call one not destined to another (kind of) becoming. For a Truth-finder, Sīha, future conception ... can come to no future existence. This is the way, Sīha ...

"And what, Sīha, is the way in which one speaking truly of me could say: 'The recluse Gotama is one who is confident, he teaches a doctrine of confidence and in this he trains disciples'? Indeed I, Sīha, am confident with the highest confidence,¹ I teach a doctrine of confidence and in this I train disciples.² This is the way, Sīha, in which one speaking truly of me could say: 'The recluse Gotama is confident, he teaches a doctrine of confidence and in this he trains disciples'."

31.10 And when he had spoken thus,³ Sīha, the general, spoke thus to the Lord: "Excellent, Lord! Excellent, Lord! ...⁴ May the Lord accept me as a lay-follower going for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts."

"Now, Sīha, make a proper investigation. Proper investigation is good in the case of well-known men like yourself."⁵

"I, Lord, am even exceedingly pleased, satisfied with that which

¹ AN-a iv.98 says "with the highest confidence in the four ways and the four fruits".

² Cf. DN iii.39 where wanderers are recorded to ask Gotama the name of the doctrine in which he trains disciples and in which they, trained and attained to confidence, *assāsa*, acknowledge a desire for (or a support in) the Brahma-faring. DN-a iii.835 explains *assāsa* by *tuṭṭhi*, joy, and *somanassa*, happiness. ³ From here to middle of Kd 6.31.12 = MN i.378f., in connection with Upāli the householder. ⁴ Stock; as at Kd 1.7.10. ⁵ As at MN i.379, AN iv.185.

the Lord said to me: 'Now, Siha, make a proper investigation ... like yourself.' For if, Lord, members of other sects had secured me as a disciple, they would have paraded a banner all round Vesālī, saying: 'Siha, the general, has joined our discipleship.' But then the Lord spoke to me thus: 'Now, Siha, make a proper investigation ... like yourself.' So I, Lord, go for a second time to the Lord for refuge and to *dhamma* and to the Order of monks. May the Lord accept me as a lay-follower going for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts."

"For a long time, Siha, your family¹ has been a well-spring² to the Nigaṇṭhas. You will bethink you to give alms to those who approach you?"

"I, Lord, am even exceedingly pleased, satisfied with that which the Lord said to me: 'For a long time, Siha, your family ... those who approach you? I have heard, Lord: The recluse Gotama speaks thus: 'Gifts should be given to me only, not to others should gifts be given; gifts should be given to my disciples only, not to the disciples of others should gifts be given. What is given to me is alone of great fruit, what is given to others is not of great fruit; what is given to my disciples is alone of great fruit, what is given to the disciples of others is not of great fruit.' But then the Lord urged upon me giving to the Nigaṇṭhas too. Indeed, Lord, we shall know the right time for that. So I, Lord, go for a third time to the Lord for refuge and to *dhamma* and to the Order of monks. May the Lord accept me as a lay-follower going for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts."

Then the Lord talked a progressive talk³ to Siha, the general, that is to say talk on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven; he explained the peril, the vanity, the depravity of pleasures of the senses, the advantage in renouncing (them). When the Lord knew that the mind of Siha, the general, was ready, malleable, devoid of the hindrances, uplifted, pleased, then he explained to him that teaching on *dhamma* which the awakened ones have themselves

¹ *kula*, explained by *nivesana*, a dwelling, at Vin-a 1097, MN-a iii.89. ² *opānabhūta*. See *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.177, n. 3 for further references. ³ As at Kd 1.7.5-Kd 1.7.6.

4.324 discovered: ill, uprising, stopping, the Way. And as a clean cloth without black specks will easily take dye, even so as he was (sitting) on that very seat, *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose to Sīha, the general, that “whatever is of the nature to uprise all that is of the nature to stop”. Then Sīha, the general, as one who¹ had seen *dhamma*, attained *dhamma*, known *dhamma*, plunged into *dhamma*, who had crossed over doubt, put away uncertainty, who had attained without another’s help to full confidence in the teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord²: “Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with me on the morrow together with the Order of monks.” The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then Sīha, the general, having understood the Lord’s consent, rising from his seat, departed keeping his right side towards him.

Then Sīha, the general, enjoined a certain man, saying: “Go, good fellow, find out if there is meat to hand.”³ Then Sīha, the general, towards the end of that night having had sumptuous food, solid and soft, prepared, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: “It is time, Lord, the meal is ready.” Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of Sīha, the general; having approached he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks.

3.1.13 Now at that time many Nigaṇṭhas, waving their arms, were moaning⁴ from carriage road⁵ to carriage road, from cross road⁶ to cross road in Vesālī: “Today a fat beast,⁷ killed by Sīha, the general, is made into a meal for the recluse Gotama, the recluse Gotama makes use of this meat, knowing that it was killed on purpose (for him),⁸ that the deed was (done) for his sake.”⁹ Then a certain man approached Sīha, the general; having approached he whispered into Sīha, the

¹ As at **Kd 1.6.32**. ² To here from **Kd 6.31.10 = MN i.378**. ³ As at **Vin 1.217** (above, **Kd 6.23.2**). ⁴ *kandanti*. ⁵ Defined at **Vin 4.271 (BD 3.268)**. ⁶ Defined at **Vin 4.271 (BD 3.268)**. ⁷ *pasu*, meaning uncertain, but not necessarily an animal of the cow-tribe. AN-a iv.102 says: “a fat beast with a large body such as an elk or buffalo or pig”. Vin-a 363 says of *pasuka* that all four-footed animals beginning with the elephant should be called *pasuka*. ⁸ Cf. Ja ii.262: the Telovāda-jātaka was spoken concerning Sīha. ⁹ *paṭicchakamma*.

general's ear:

“Please, honoured sir, you should know that many of these Ni-gaṇṭhas, waying their arms, are moaning from carriage road to carriage road, from cross road to cross road in Vesālī:

“Today a fat beast ... the deed was (done) for his sake’.”

“Enough, master, for a long time now these venerable ones have been desiring dispraise of the awakened one, have been desiring dispraise of *dhamma*, have been desiring dispraise of the Order. But these venerable ones, bad, vain, lying, do not harm this Lord because they are misrepresenting him by what is not fact—why, even we, for the sake of our livelihood, would not intentionally deprive a living thing of life.”¹

Then Siha, the general, having with his own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the enlightened one at its head with sumptuous food, solid and soft, when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl, sat down at a respectful distance. Then the Lord having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Siha, the general, with talk on *dhamma* as he was sitting down at a respectful distance, rising from his seat, departed.² Then the Lord on this occasion having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, one should not knowingly make use of meat killed on purpose (for one). Whoever should make use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, fish and meat that are quite pure in three respects: if they are not seen, heard, suspected (to have been killed on purpose for a monk).”³

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 61. ² To here from Kd 6.31.1 = AN iv.179. ³ Cf. Vin 3.172 (BD 1.298) where Devadatta, wanting a schism, tries to make the Lord say that monks should eat no fish or meat. But Gotama answers him that fish and meat are “pure” if they have the three points which are also mentioned above. *Macchamamsa* is I think not “the flesh of fish” (as at GS iv.130, n. 1) but “fish and meat”. The story leading up to this allowance is concerned with meat; and many instances show that monks ate this without incurring criticism or blame.

ALLOWANCE FOR A PLACE FOR WHAT IS ALLOWABLE

6:32.1 Now at that time Vesālī was well off for food, crops were good, alms-food was easy to obtain, and it was easy to keep oneself going by gleaning and by favour. Then as the Lord was meditating in seclusion a reasoning arose in his mind thus: “Those things which were allowed by me to monks when food was scarce, crops bad, and almsfood difficult to obtain: what was cured indoors, cooked indoors, cooked by oneself¹; receiving (formally) what was picked up²; what was taken back from there³; what was accepted before a meal⁴; what grows in a wood, what grows in a lotus-tank⁵—do the monks still make use of these things today?”

Then the Lord, arising from his meditation towards evening, addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “Those things which were allowed by me to monks when food was scarce ... do the monks still make use of these things today?”

“They make use of them, Lord.”

5:32.2 Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “Those things, monks, allowed by me to monks when food was scarce, crops bad and almsfood difficult to obtain: what was cured indoors ... what grows in a lotus-tank—these things I object to from this day forth. **Monks you should not make use of what is cured indoors, cooked indoors, cooked by yourselves; of (formally) receiving what is picked up (by you). Whoever should make use of (any of these things), there is an offence of wrong-doing. Nor should you, monks, having eaten, being satisfied, make use of food that is not left over if it is brought back from there; if it is accepted before a meal; if it grows in a wood, grows in a lotus-tank. Whoever should make use of (any of these things) should be dealt with according to the rule.**”⁶

6:33.1 Now at that time country people, having loaded much salt and oil, and husked rice and solid food into wagons,⁷ having made an

¹ Kd 6.17.7. ² Kd 6.17.9. ³ Kd 6.18.4. ⁴ Kd 6.19.2. ⁵ Kd 6.20.4. ⁶ Bu-Pc 35.

⁷ As at Kd 6.24.1, Kd 6.34.17.

enclosure for the wagons in a porch outside a monastery, waited, thinking: “When our turn comes, then we will make a meal,”¹ but a great cloud came up. Then these people approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached, they spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda:

“Now, honoured Ānanda, having loaded much salt ... solid food into wagons, they are standing (there), but a great cloud has come up. What line of conduct, honoured Ānanda, should be followed by us?” Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the Lord.

“Well then, Ānanda, the Order having agreed upon a place for what is allowable² near³ a dwelling-place: a dwelling-place or a curved house or a long house or a mansion or a cave,⁴ let there be kept⁵ there whatever the Order desires. And thus, monks, should it be agreed upon: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may agree upon such and such a dwelling-place as a place for what is allowable. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is agreeing upon such and such a dwelling-place as a place for what is allowable. If the agreement on such and such a dwelling-place as a place for what is allowable is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. Such and such a dwelling-

¹ As at **Kd 6.24.1**, **Kd 6.34.17**. ² *kappiyabhūmi*. The commentary does not explain this word, but in commenting on the three kinds of places allowed at the end of **Kd 6.33.4**, Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 1098f., uses the word *kappiyakuṭī*, hut for what is allowable. It seems probable that the *kappiyabhūmi* was a place for doing certain operations some of which were allowable only in times of scarcity: cooking for oneself, cooking indoors and curing indoors. Buddhaghosa at Vin-a 1099 appears to connect these with a *kappiyabhūmi*. It should however be noticed that at **Kd 3.5.9** the “kitchen” which a lay follower may build for himself replaces the *kappiyakuṭī* which he may build for an Order or a member of it at **Kd 3.5.6**. For in normal times monks did not cook, and hence a place for doing allowable operations (of this nature) would be superfluous. A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Indian Architectural Terms*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol.48, No.3, p. 260 calls *kappiyabhūmi* an “outhouse site”. ³ *paccantima*. Vin-a 1098 says this is only an expression. ⁴ For these five “abodes” cf. above, **Kd 1.30.4** and notes. ⁵ *vāsetu*.

place is agreed upon by the Order as a place for what is allowable. Therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand this’.”

6:33:3
Now at that time the people boiled conjeys, boiled rice, prepared soups, cut up meats, chopped wood, just there at a place for what was allowable and which had been agreed upon. As the Lord was getting up at the end of the night towards dawn he heard a loud noise, a great noise, a noise (like) the cawing of crows,¹ and hearing it, he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “What, Ānanda, is this loud noise, this great noise, this noise (like) the cawing of crows?”

5:33:4
4:32:8
“At present, Lord, people boil conjeys ... chop sticks just there at a place for what is allowable and which has been agreed upon. It is this loud noise, great noise, noise (like) the cawing of crows that the Lord (hears).”² Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“**Monks, one should not make use of a place for what is allowable that has been agreed upon.**³ **Whoever should make use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, three places for what is allowable: that depending upon a proclamation,⁴ that con-

¹ = Vin 4.82. ² *so eso bhagavā uccāsaddo ... kākoravasaddo*. One would have expected *bhante* here instead of *bhagavā*, and the sentence then to be translated: it is this, Lord, that is the loud noise ... ³ Presumably there is the risk of being in the lay-people’s way and also of being disturbed by the noise they make. ⁴ *ussāvanantika*. *Ussāvana* is not a proclamation in a technical sense and has nothing to do with proceedings at formal acts of the Order. But Buddhaghosa explains, Vin-a 1098, that having made all preparations with pillars, walls and stones, the people utter the phrase (*vācam nicchārenti*) “We are making a *kappiyakuṭi*”. The two Commentaries which he quotes also mention a *kappiyakuṭi* as being spoken about or resolved upon. *Antika* is used in the same sense as above at Kd 7.1.7.

nected with what is fortuitous,¹ that (given by) a householder.”²

Now at that time the venerable Yasoja³ came to be ill. Medicines were conveyed for him. Monks put these outside, but vermin ate them and also thieves carried them off.⁴ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make use of a place for what is allowable⁵ and which has been agreed upon. I allow four places for what is allowable: that depending upon a proclamation,

¹ *gonisādika*. Cf. *gonisādi* at Vin 3.46, where a village arranged “fortuitously” comes into the definition of village. *Gonisādi* is not an ox-stall (*Vinaya Texts* ii.121). Vin-a 298 explains that as two or three cows sit down here and there, so, having built two or three houses, they are arranged here and there. The idea is that something is left to a haphazard element. Vin-a 1099 explains that there are two kinds of *gonisādika*: one of the monastery (type), one of the dwelling-place. Wherever neither the monastery itself is fenced in nor the lodgings, this is the monastery-type of what is “fortuitous”. Wherever all or some of the lodgings are fenced in but not the monastery, this is the dwelling-place type. So in both kinds the non-fencing in of the monastery is a criterion. The commentary does not say which kind is intended here; perhaps both are. ² *gahapati*. Vin-a 1099 says, “people having built a residence say, ‘we are giving a *kappiyakutl*, make use of it’—this is called *gahapati*. It means this too if they say, ‘We are giving (something) to build a *kappiyakuṭi*’”. Vin-a on this whole passage uses *kappiyakuṭi* and never *kappiya-bhūmi*. Cf. *kappiyakuṭiyo* which, among other things, Anāthapiṇḍika caused to be built in the Jeta Grove, at Vin 2.159, and the *kappiyakuṭi* which a lay disciple might cause to be built for an Order, at Vin 1.139 (above, BD 4.186). ³ Verses at Thag 243–Thag 245. There is a story about five hundred monks with Yasoja at their head at Ud 24–Ud 27. The lord dismissed them for making a great noise; they spent the rains in earnest endeavour and realised the three knowledges; they were then able to spend a whole night in as concentrated meditation as the Lord himself. Vin-a 1098 says “At the conclusion of the Kapilasutta he (Yasoja) was the chief person of the five hundred who had gone forth”. Snp-a i.312, Dh-p-a iv.45 call these five hundred “fishermen’s sons”. See Dh-p-a iv.37ff. (*Kapilamacchavatthu*), Snp-a i.305ff. (both of which tell about the golden fish, Kapila), Ud-a 179. *Psalms of the Bretheren*, p.166 for the circumstances in which the Kapilasutta was spoken to Yasoja. This Sutta is referred to at Dh-p-a iv.42 as being in the *Suttanipāta*. Kapilasutta is there (Snp p. 49) a variant reading for Dhammacariyasutta, but the Commentary (Snp-a i.312) refers to it as Kapilasutta. ⁴ As at Kd 6.17.7. ⁵ This paragraph probably refers to allowable medicines. See too Vin-a 1101 which refers to *sappi*, ghee, which was a medicine.

that connected with what is fortuitous, that given by a householder, that which is agreed upon.”

Told is the Twenty-fourth Portion for Repeating

THE STORY OF THE HOUSEHOLDER MEṄḌAKA

634.1 Now at that time the householder Meṅḍaka¹ lived in the town of Bhaddiya.² He came to have this kind of eminence in psychic power: having washed his head, having had a granary swept, he sat down just outside the door, and a shower of grain, having fallen down through the air, filled the granary. His wife³ came to have this kind of eminence in psychic power: having sat down beside only one bowl of the capacity of an *ālḥaka*⁴ and one helping of curry and condiments, she served food⁵ to slaves, workmen and servants⁶; not until she got up was it exhausted. His son⁷ came to have this kind of eminence in psychic power: having taken hold of only one purse containing a

4.330
¹ Father of Dhanañjaya, who was Visākhā's father. At Dhp-a i.384 Meṅḍaka is called “householder”, at Dhp-a i.385, Vism 383 “merchant”, *seṭṭhi*, and he and his wife, son, daughter-in-law and slave are said to be five people of great merit. His story is told in detail at Dhp-a iii.363ff. Cf. Dhp-a iv.203, Dhp-a iv.217. According to Dhp-a iii.363 the Dhammapada verse (252) was spoken by the Lord while he was staying in the Jātiyā Grove at Bhaddiya concerning Meṅḍaka. ² In the Aṅga kingdom. ³ Her name was Candapadumā (because she came to have the moon and the lotus represented on the palms of her hands and the soles of her feet), Dhp-a i.385, Dhp-a iii.363; or Candapadumasirī at Vism 383. Her meritorious act is noticed at Dhp-a iii.369. ⁴ *ālḥakathālikā*. See **BD 1.103, n. 1**. ⁵ *bhatta* can also mean rice, the staple dish, but here in all likelihood meaning food, for probably no implication that she served rice without the curry and condiments is intended. ⁶ *dāsa-kammakara-porisā*. Same compound at AN i.145, AN i.206, AN ii.78, AN iii.45 (*puttadārādāsa-*), AN iii.260. AN-a ii.241 explains as “slaves as well as workmen earning a daily wage of food, and people living in dependence on (one)”, *jīvamānapurisā*. See definitions of “slave” and “workman” at **BD 3.180**. ⁷ Called Dhanañjaya the merchant, *seṭṭhi*, at Dhp-a i.386ff., Dhp-a iii.363, Vism 383, and Meṅḍaka's eldest son at Dhp-a i.385. His psychic power is referred to at Dhp-a iii.370. He was lent by Bimbisāra to Pasenadi; and the latter built Sāketa to house Dhanañjaya's retinue during the night's halt on the way to Sāvattḥī, Dhp-a i.386f. Dhanañjaya was the father of Visākhā and of her youngest sister, Sujātā, in respect of whom the Sujāta-Jātaka Ja 269 was told.

thousand,¹ he gave six months' wages to (each) slave, workman and servant; not until he removed his hand was it² exhausted.

His daughter-in-law³ came to have this kind of eminence in psychic power; having sat down beside only one basket of the capacity of four *doṇas*⁴ she gave six months' food⁵ to (each) slave, workman and servant; not until she got up was it exhausted. His slave⁶ came to have this kind of eminence in psychic power: when he ploughed with one ploughshare seven furrows came from (it).⁷

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha heard: "They say that the householder Meṇḍaka is living in our kingdom in the town of Bhaddiya. He has this kind of eminence in psychic power ... (as in **Kd 6.34.1, Kd 6.34.2**) ... when he ploughs with one ploughshare seven furrows come from (it)."

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha addressed a certain chief minister who was concerned with all the affairs,⁸ saying: "It is said, my good man,⁹ that the householder Meṇḍaka is living in our kingdom in the town of Bhaddiya; he has this kind of psychic power: having washed his head ... seven furrows come from (it). Go along, my good man, and find out. When you have seen, it will be the same as if I myself saw."

"So be it, your majesty", and that chief minister, having answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha in assent, marched forth¹⁰ for Bhaddiya with a four-winged army.¹¹

In due course he approached Bhaddiya and Meṇḍaka the house-

¹ The word *kahāpaṇa* supplied at Dhp-a iii.370. ² I.e., the contents of the purse.

³ Called Sumanādevī at Dhp-a i.384, Sumanadevī at Dhp-a iii.363, Vism 383. She was Dhanañjaya's chief wife, *aggamahesi*, Dhp-a i.384, and Visākhā's mother, SN-a i.148. Her act of psychic power referred to at Dhp-a iii.370. ⁴ A measure of capacity, generally equivalent to four *āḷhaka*s, see **BD 1.103, n.**

⁵ *bhatta*, see above, **BD 4.329, n. 7.** ⁶ Called *Puṇṇa* at Dhp-a i.385, Dhp-a iii.363, Vism 383. His psychic gift referred to at Dhp-a iii.370. ⁷ According to Dhp-a iii.370 one in the middle and three at each side.

⁸ *sabbatthaka mahāmatta* as at **Vin 3.249.** ⁹ *bhaṇe*, as at **Vin 3.249** where Bimbisāra is again recorded to be addressing a chief minister concerned with all the affairs. *Bhaṇe* is a common mode of address from a superior to an inferior.

¹⁰ *pāyāsi*. Cf. *payāta* at **Vin 4.105.** ¹¹ Elephants, horses, chariots and infantry. See definition of army at **Vin 4.105**; and **BD 2.375, n. 3.**

holder; having approached he spoke thus to Menḍaka the householder: “Now I, householder, have been enjoined by the King, saying: ‘It is said, my good man, that the householder Menḍaka is living in our kingdom ... When you have seen, it will be the same as if I myself saw.’ Let us see, householder, your eminence in psychic power.” Then the householder Menḍaka, having washed his head, having had a granary swept, sat down outside the door, and a shower of grain, having fallen down through the air, filled the granary. “Your eminence in psychic power has been seen, householder. We will see your wife’s eminence in psychic power.”

Then the householder Menḍaka enjoined his wife, saying: “Well now, serve this four-winged army with food.” Then the wife of Menḍaka the householder, having sat down beside only one bowl of the capacity of an *ālhaka* and one helping of curry and condiments, served food to the four-winged army; not until she got up was it exhausted. “Your wife’s eminence in psychic power has been seen, householder. We will see your son’s eminence in psychic power.”

Then the householder Menḍaka enjoined his son, saying: “Well now, my dear, give this four-winged army six months’ wages.” Then the son of Menḍaka the householder, having taken hold of only one purse containing a thousand, gave the four-winged army six months’ wages; not until he removed his hand was it exhausted. “Your son’s eminence in psychic power has been seen, householder. We will see your daughter-in-law’s eminence in psychic power.”

Then Menḍaka the householder enjoined his daughter-in-law, saying: “Well now, give this four-winged army six months’ food.” Then the daughter-in-law of Menḍaka the householder, having sat down beside only one basket of the capacity of four *doṇas*, gave six months’ food to the four-winged army; not until she got up was it exhausted. “Your daughter-in-law’s eminence in psychic power has been seen, householder. We will see your slave’s eminence in psychic power.”

“Our slave’s eminence in psychic power, sir,¹ can be seen in the field.”

¹ *sāmi*.

“Enough, householder, your slave’s eminence in psychic power has been seen.”

Then that chief minister went back again to Rājagaha with the four-winged army, and approached King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha; having approached, he told this matter to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha.

Then the Lord, having stayed in Vesālī for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Bhaddiya with the large Order of monks, together with the twelve hundred and fifty monks. Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Bhaddiya. The Lord stayed there in Bhaddiya in the Jātiyā Grove.¹

Then the householder Meṇḍaka heard: “Verily,² the recluse Gotama, the son of the Sakyans, who has gone forth from a Sakyan family, has reached Bhaddiya and is staying at Bhaddiya in the Jātiyā Grove. A lovely reputation has gone forth concerning the Lord Gotama, thus: he is indeed Lord, perfected one, fully awakened one, endowed with knowledge and conduct, well-farer, knower of the worlds, unrivalled charioteer of men to be tamed, teacher of *devas* and mankind, the awakened one, the Lord. Having realised by his own super-knowledges, he makes known this world with its *devas*, with its Māras, with its Brahmās, a race with recluses and brahmins, with *devas* and men. He teaches *dhamma*, lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle and lovely at the ending. He explains with the spirit and the letter the Brahmā-life completely fulfilled and wholly pure. Good indeed it were to see perfected ones like this.”

Then the householder Meṇḍaka, having had many magnificent vehicles harnessed,³ having mounted a magnificent vehicle, went off with the magnificent vehicles from Bhaddiya to see the Lord. But many members of (other) sects⁴ saw the householder Meṇḍaka

¹ Mentioned at Vin 1.189f., Vin 3.37; AN iii.36. ² To end of Kd 6.34.11 is stock and recurs at e.g. Vin 1.35, Vin 1.245, Vin 3.1. DN i.87. For notes on above passage, see BD 1.1ff. ³ As in Kd 6.30.1, Kd 6.30.3. ⁴ A highly compressed version of the following incidents occurs at Dhp-a iii.374f.

coming in the distance, and seeing him they spoke thus to the householder Meṇḍaka: “Where are you going, householder?”

“I am going, honoured sirs, to see the Lord, the recluse Gotama.”

“But how can you, householder, being one who asserts an ought-to-be-done,¹ go along to see the recluse Gotama who asserts an ought-not-to-be-done? For, householder, the recluse Gotama asserts an ought-not-to-be-done, he teaches a doctrine of an ought-not-to-be-done and in this he trains disciples.”

Then it occurred to the householder Meṇḍaka: “Undoubtedly this will be a Lord, a perfected one, a fully awakened one² inasmuch as these members of (other) sects are jealous of him,” and having gone by vehicle as far as the ground was (suitable) for a vehicle, having alighted from the vehicle, he approached the Lord on foot; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As Meṇḍaka the householder was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord talked a progressive talk³ to him, that is to say talk on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven ... Then the householder Meṇḍaka, as one who had ... attained without another’s help to full confidence in the teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Excellent, Lord! Excellent, Lord!⁴ ... May the Lord accept me as a lay-follower going for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts; Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with me on the morrow together with the Order of monks.” The Lord consented by becoming silent.

Then the householder Meṇḍaka, having understood the Lord’s consent, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then Meṇḍaka the householder towards the end of that night having had sumptuous food, solid and soft, prepared, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: “It is time, Lord, the meal is ready.” Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of

¹ As in Kd 6.31.2. ² As in Kd 6.31.1. ³ As in Kd 6.31.12. ⁴ Stock, as at Kd 1.7.10; Kd 6.31.10.

the householder Meṇḍaka; having approached, he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks.

Then the wife and son and daughter-in-law and slave of the householder Meṇḍaka approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. The Lord talked a progressive talk to these, that is to say talk on giving ... Then these as ones who had ... attained without another's help to full confidence in the teacher's instruction, spoke thus to the Lord: "Excellent, Lord! Excellent, Lord! ... We, Lord, are going to the Lord for refuge and to *dhamma* and to the Order of monks. May the Lord accept us as lay-followers going for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts."

Then the householder Meṇḍaka, having with his own hand served and satisfied with sumptuous food, solid and soft, the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head, when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl, sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Meṇḍaka the householder spoke thus to the Lord:

"Lord, for as long as the Lord stays at Bhaddiya, for so long will I (supply) with perpetual food the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head." Then the Lord, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted the householder Meṇḍaka with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, departed.

ALLOWANCE FOR FIVE DAIRY PRODUCTS, ETC.

Then the Lord, having stayed at Bhaddiya for as long as he found suiting, without asking the householder Meṇḍaka (for permission)¹ set out on tour for Aṅguttarāpa² together with the large Order of monks, with the twelve hundred and fifty monks. Then Meṇḍaka

¹ *anāpucchā*, not asking (for permission) is defined, at Vin 4.343, by *anapaloketvā*, not having obtained permission, while this is defined at Vin 4.226, Vin 4.232, Vin 4.316 by *anāpucchā*. ² An Aṅga country north of the river Mahī (MN-a iii.34, Snp-a 437). Mentioned at Snp p.102, MN i.359, MN i.447, Dh-p a iii.363.

the householder heard: “They say that the Lord is setting out on tour for Aṅguttarāpa together with a large Order of monks, with twelve hundred and fifty monks.” Then Meṇḍaka the householder enjoined slaves and workmen saying: “Well now, my good men, having loaded much salt and oil and husked rice and solid food into wagons,¹ come along, and let there come along twelve hundred and fifty cowherds bringing twelve hundred and fifty milch cows. Wherever we see the Lord there will we offer him fresh milk.”

Then Meṇḍaka the householder met the Lord on a wilderness road. Then Meṇḍaka the householder approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance, Meṇḍaka the householder spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with me on the morrow together with the Order of monks.” The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then Meṇḍaka the householder, having understood the Lord’s consent, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then Meṇḍaka the householder, towards the end of that night having had sumptuous food, solid and soft, prepared, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: “It is time, Lord, the meal is ready.”

Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the food distribution of Meṇḍaka the householder; having approached he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks. Then Meṇḍaka the householder enjoined the twelve hundred and fifty cowherds, saying: “Well now, my good men, let each one (of you) having each taken a milch cow, look after a monk, and we will offer them fresh milk.” Then Meṇḍaka the householder with his own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head with sumptuous food, solid and soft, and (offered² them) fresh milk. The monks, being scrupu-

¹ As at Kd 6.24.1; Kd 6.33.1. ² I think this verb, *bhojeti* (literally to make to eat, to feed, so to offer, to regale, to entertain with), which Meṇḍaka has already used, should be inserted here. For the monks refused the milk until told, as recorded, to accept it. So long as they refused it, it cannot be said that they were “served and satisfied with” it.

lous, did not accept the milk. (The Lord said:) “Accept it, monks, make use of it.”

Then Meṇḍaka the householder, having with his own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the enlightened one at its head with sumptuous food, solid and soft and with fresh milk, when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl, sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance Meṇḍaka the householder spoke thus to the Lord:

“There are, Lord, wilderness roads with little water, with little food¹; it is not easy to go along them without provisions for the journey.² It were good, Lord, if the Lord allowed monks provisions for the journey.” Then the Lord, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted the householder Meṇḍaka with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, departed.

Then the Lord on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow you, monks, five products of the cow: milk, curds, butter-milk, butter, ghee. There are, monks, wilderness roads with little water, with little food; it is not easy to go along them without provisions for the journey. I allow you, monks, to look about for provisions for a journey: husked rice for him who has need of husked rice; kidney-beans for him who has need of kidney-beans; beans for him who has need of beans; salt for him who has need of salt; sugar for him who has need of sugar; oil for him who has need of oil; ghee for him who has need of ghee. There are, monks, people who have faith and are believing; these deposit gold (coins)³ in the hands of those who make things allowable,⁴ saying: ‘By means of this give the master that which is allowable.’ I allow you, monks, thereupon⁵ to consent to that which is allowable. But this, monks, I do not say:

¹ To these kinds of wilds, *kantāra*, three others are added at Ja i.99 (which gives a short explanation of each), SN-a ii.103: *cora*°, *vāḷa*°, *amanussa*°. See BD 1.147, n. 1.

² As at Vin 1.270. Cf. Vin 4.79f. ³ *hirañña*, see BD 1.28, n. ⁴ *kappiyakāraka*, see Kd 6.17.8. ⁵ *tato*.

that by any method¹ may gold and silver² be consented to, may be looked about for.”

THE STORY OF KENIYA THE MATTED-HAIR ASCETIC

6:35:1 Then the Lord, walking on tour,³ in due course arrived at Āpaṇa.⁴
4:33:2 The matted hair ascetic Keniya⁵ heard: “Verily, the recluse Gotama, the son of the Sakyans, who has gone forth from a Sakyan family, has reached Āpaṇa and is staying in Āpaṇa. A lovely reputation⁶ has gone forth concerning the Lord Gotama, thus: ... He explains with the spirit and the letter the Brahma-faring completely fulfilled and wholly pure. Good indeed it were to see perfected ones like this.” Then it occurred to Keniya the matted hair ascetic: “Now, what could I get conveyed to the recluse Gotama?”

6:35:2 Then it occurred to Keniya the matted hair ascetic: “Now, those who were⁷ formerly seers,⁸ of the brahmins, makers of mantras,⁸ preservers of mantras, whose ancient mantras as sung, taught,⁹ and composed the brahmins of today still sing, still speak; they still speak what was spoken, they still teach what was taught, that is to say (by)

¹ *pariyāya*, perhaps here “in any circumstances”. ² *jātarūparajata*. See BD 1.28, n.; BD 2.100, n. 2, BD 2.102, n. 1. If a monk takes gold and silver or gets another to do so for him or consents to its being kept in deposit for him, he incurs a *Nissaggiya* offence (No.18). ³ From here to end of Kd 6.35.5, cf. Snp 102ff. = MN ii.146ff. ⁴ This is called a market town, *nigama*, of Aṅga at SN v.225; a market town of Aṅguttarāpa at Snp 103, MN i.359, MN i.447. Āpaṇa was so named because it had a quantity of shops, Snp-a ii.440, MN-a iii.37. ⁵ Spelt Keniya at Snp p.103, MN-a iii.399. He is mentioned at Tha-ap 318. According to Snp-a 440, MN-a iii.399 he was a very wealthy (*mahāsāla*) brahmin who became a *jaṭila* (matted hair) ascetic so as to protect his wealth, and he was also the protector of five thousand families; but although he wore the yellow robes by day, by night he indulged in pleasures of the senses. At DN-a i.270 he is given as an example, among eight types of ascetics, of the type who supports wife and children (*sa-puttabhāriya*). See also Dh-p-a i.323, Ud-a 241. ⁶ As above, BD 4.332. ⁷ Down to the name Bhagu = DN i.104, DN i.238, DN i.242; AN iii.224, DN i.229; MN ii.169, DN i.200. ⁸ I.e. the Vedas. ⁹ *pavutta*, explained at DN-a 273 as “spoken for others,” taught (*vācīta*, made to speak).

Aṭṭhaka,¹ Vāmaka,² Vāmadeva,³ Vessāmitta, Yamataggi,⁴ Angirasa, Bhāradvāja, Vāseṭṭha, Kassapa,⁵ Bhagu—these abstaining from food at night, restrained from eating at the wrong time,⁶ (yet) consented to such things as drinks.

“The recluse Gotama also abstains from food at night and is restrained from eating at the wrong time⁷; the recluse Gotama also is worthy⁸ to consent to such things as drinks,” and having had abundant drinks prepared, having had them taken on carrying-poles,⁹ he approached the Lord; having approached, he exchanged greetings with the Lord; having exchanged greetings of friendliness and courtesy with the Lord, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance, Keniya the matted hair ascetic spoke thus to the Lord: “Let the revered Gotama accept drink from me.”

“Well then, Keniya, give it to the monks.” The monks, being scrupulous, did not accept it. (The Lord said:) “Accept it, monks, make use of it.”

Then Keniya the matted hair ascetic, having with his own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the enlightened one at its head with abundant drinks sat down at a respectful distance when the Lord had washed his hand¹⁰ and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl. Then as Keniya the matted hair ascetic was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted him with talk on *dhamma*. Then Keniya the matted hair ascetic, gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, spoke thus to the Lord: “May the revered Gotama together with the Order of monks consent to a meal with me on the morrow.”

¹ On the names of these ṛṣis or seers, see *Vinaya Texts* ii.130, n. 3. Aṭṭhaka is usually identified with Aṣṭaka, mentioned as author of Ṛg Veda 10.104. ² Cf. Ṛg Veda 10.99. ³ Cf. Ṛg Veda 4.26. ⁴ Under Jamadagni in *Vedic Index* he is connected with Ṛg Veda 362, Ṛg Veda 318; Ṛg Veda 8101, Ṛg Veda 88; Ṛg Veda 962, Ṛg Veda 924; Ṛg Veda 965, Ṛg Veda 925. ⁵ Cf. Ṛg Veda 9.114.2. ⁶ “Wrong time” for eating defined at [Vin 4.86](#) as “after noon has passed until sunrise”. ⁷ Cf. DN i.5. ⁸ *arahati samaṇo pi Gotamo*. The meaning is that he is worthy enough to confer a boon on the giver of the things which he consents to accept. ⁹ *kāja*, cf. MN iii.148. ¹⁰ As at [Kd 6.24.4](#); [Kd 6.36.8](#).

“But, Keniya, the Order of monks is large, twelve hundred and fifty monks, and you are in favour of the brahmins.” Then Keniya the matted hair ascetic spoke a second time to the Lord thus: “Although, good Gotama, the Order of monks is large, twelve hundred and fifty monks, and I am in favour of the brahmins, (yet) may the revered Gotama together with the Order of monks consent to a meal with me on the morrow.”

“But, Keniya, the Order of monks is large, twelve hundred and fifty monks, and you are in favour of the brahmins.” Then Keniya the matted hair ascetic spoke a third time to the Lord thus:

“Although, good Gotama, the Order of monks is large, twelve hundred and fifty monks, and I am in favour of the brahmins, (yet) may the revered Gotama together with the Order of monks consent to a meal with me on the morrow.” The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then Keniya the matted hair ascetic, having understood the Lord’s consent, rising from his seat departed.

Then the Lord, on this occasion having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, eight (kinds of) drinks¹: mango drink,² rose-apple drink, plantain³ drink, banana⁴ drink, honey drink, grape drink, edible lotus root drink,⁵ *phārusaka*⁶ drink. I allow you, monks,

¹ At Mnd 372 two lists of eight drinks each are given, the first being the same as this Vinaya list. These drinks occur in a controverted point at Kv 552. ² Made from raw or cooked mangoes. Vin-a 1101.

³ *coca*, which may however be coconut or cinnamon. But Vin-a 1102 = Nd-a ii.396 declare this to be a drink made from the fruit of bananas (or plantains, *kadali*) which have kernels, *aṭṭhika* (stone or kernel of a fruit). The meaning therefore is not clear, and is further confused by the next drink, *moca*, which Vin-a 1102 = Nd-a ii.396 say is made of plantain fruits without kernels, *anaṭṭhika*. See *Vinaya Texts* ii.132, n. ⁴ *moca*, *Musa sapientum*. ⁵ *sāluka-pāna*. Vin-a 1102 = Nd-a ii.396 say it is a drink that is made having crushed the edible roots of the red and the blue lotuses and so on. ⁶ *Vinaya Texts* ii.133, n. 2 says “this is *Grewia Asiatica* of Linnaeus”, Monier Williams (under *parūsha*(ka)) adding “from the berries of which a cooling beverage is prepared”. *Phārusaka* occurs also at Dhp-a iii.316.

the juice of all fruits except the juice of the fruit of corn.¹ I allow you, monks, the juice of all leaves except vegetable² juice. I allow you, monks, the juice of all flowers except liquorice³ juice. I allow you, monks, sugarcane juice.”⁴

Then Keniya the matted hair ascetic, towards the end of that night having had sumptuous food, solid and soft, prepared in his own hermitage,⁵ had the time announced to the Lord saying: “It is time, good Gotama, the meal is ready.” Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the hermitage of Keniya the matted hair ascetic; having approached, he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks. Then Keniya the matted hair ascetic, having with his own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head with sumptuous food, solid and soft, sat down at a respectful distance when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl.

As Keniya the matted hair ascetic was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord thanked him in these verses:

“Sacrifices⁶ are chief in fire-worship,⁷
Sāvitrī⁸ chief of (Vedic) metres,

¹ Vin-a 1102 refers to the seven kinds of grain or corn, *dhañña*, which probably are those enumerated at Vin 4.264, Nd-a ii.396. See BD 1.83, n. 4. Toddy and arrack are prepared from grain. The use of toddy was one of the ten points not allowed by the Council of Vesālī, Vin 2.301. ² *ḍāka* (= Sanskrit *sāka*), vegetable, herb, potherb. Vin-a 1102 explains as cooked *ḍāka*. See below, Kd 6.36.8 where all kinds of vegetables are allowed. ³ *madhuka*. This is the tree *Bassia latifolia*. ⁴ Vin-a 1103 says “in allowing these drinks (mango drink and so on), these four (kinds of) juices are allowed as well”. ⁵ Snp p.104 here breaks off the account, although it adds, before going on to the Sela story, that Keniya’s friends, servants and relations helped him in all kinds of ways in the preparation of the meal. Snp p.110 then takes up the account again, as Vinaya above, and thus includes the two verses appearing below. The Sutta Nipāta version naturally does not include the “allowances” of Kd 6.35.6.

⁶ These two verses = Snp 568–Snp 569. ⁷ The Jaṭilas were fire-worshippers. *Yañña*, sacrifice, became under Buddhist usage an alms-gift to an Order or to monks, a *deyyadhamma*, gift of faith, Cnd 523. ⁸ A Vedic metre. Cf. Snp 457, “three lines (*pada*) twenty-four syllables”. Snp-a ii.403 states that Sāvitrī in the discipline of the nobles would be: *buddhaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi / dhammaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi / saṅghaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi*.

A king is chief of men,
the ocean chief of waters,

“The moon is chief of the lamps of night,¹
the sun chief of luminaries,²
For those giving alms, desiring merit,
the Order is indeed the chief.”

Then the Lord, having thanked Keniya the matted hair ascetic in these verses, rising from his seat, departed.

THE STORY ROJA THE MALLA

Then the Lord, having stayed in Āpaṇa for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Kusinārā with the large Order of monks, with the twelve hundred and fifty monks. The Mallas of Kusinārā heard: “It is said that the Lord is coming to Kusinārā³ together with a large Order of monks, with twelve hundred and fifty monks.” These made a compact that, ‘Whoever does not go out to meet the Lord is fined five hundred’.⁴ Now at that time Roja the Malla was a friend of the venerable Ānanda.⁵ Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Kusinārā.

Then the Mallas of Kusinārā went out to meet the Lord. Then Roja the Malla, having gone out to meet the Lord approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached, having greeted the venerable Ānanda, he stood at a respectful distance. As Roja the Malla was

¹ *nakkhatta*, usually meaning a constellation or lunar mansion. Snp-a ii.456 says, “According to the conjunction of the moon, so that from a sign, from its brightness (*ālokakaraṇa*) and from its gentleness one can say, “Today is Kattikā, today is Rohinī” (name of two months or lunar mansions) it is said “The moon is chief of the *nakkhattas*”.” ² *tapataṃ = tapantānaṃ*, of shining, of bright, of radiant (things).

³ One of the two capitals of the Malla country, the other being Pāvā. The Lord died at Kusinārā, and the Pāvēyyaka Mallas sent to claim their share of his relics (DN ii.165), showing that the Malla country was divided into two separate parts (see *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*). ⁴ Doubtless *kahāpaṇas*. ⁵ As at Vin 1.296. The Vacchanakha-jātaka (Ja 235) is said to have been spoken concerning Roja.

standing at a respectful distance, the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to him: “This is splendid of you, friend Roja, that you have come out to meet the Lord.”

“I, honoured Ānanda, am not much impressed by¹ the awakened one or *dhamma* or the Order, but a compact was made among the kinsfolk that whoever does not go out to meet the Lord is fined five hundred. It was only from fear of the kinsfolk’s compact that I, honoured Ānanda, went out to meet the Lord.” Then the venerable Ānanda was disappointed and thought: “How can this Roja the Malla speak thus?”

Then the venerable Ānanda approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, this Roja the Malla is a distinguished, well-known man. Surely the faith² in this *dhamma* and discipline of well-known men like this is very efficacious.³ It were well, Lord, if the Lord acted in such a way that Roja the Malla could have faith in this *dhamma* and discipline.”

“But, Ānanda, it is not difficult for a Truthfinder (to do) that by which Roja the Malla could have faith in this *dhamma* and discipline.”

Then the Lord, having suffused Roja the Malla with a mind of love,⁴ rising from his seat, entered a dwelling-place. Then Roja the Malla, suffused by the Lord with a mind of love, even as young calves (follow) kine, so having approached dwelling-place after dwelling-place, cell after cell, he asked the monks: “Where, honoured sirs, is this Lord staying at present. the perfected one, the fully awakened one? For I long to see this Lord, perfected one, all awakened one.”⁵

“This,⁶ friend Roja, is his dwelling-place, the door is closed; having

¹ *bahukata*. Vin-a 1103 says this means, “I have not come here out of respect for and belief in the awakened one and the rest” (i.e. *dhamma* and the Order). ² *pasāda*. This phrase is the same as that put into the mouth of Anāthapiṇḍika concerning Prince Jeta, Kd 16.4.10. ³ *mahiddhiya*. Here having no connection with psychic powers. Cf. *iddha*, effective, at Vin 4.50, Vin 4.54, Vin 4.313. ⁴ See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *What was the Original Gospel in Buddhism?*, p. 92ff., *Sakya*, p. 222ff., *Outlines*, p. 30. Amity, *mettā*, is the first of the *brahmavihāras*. ⁵ As at MN ii.119, AN v.65; cf. DN i.89. ⁶ As at DN i.89, spoken by monks to Ambaṭṭha; MN ii.119, AN v.65 by monks to Pasenadi.

approached quietly, having entered the verandah¹ (but) without crossing it, having coughed, tap on the door-bolt.² The Lord will open the door to you.”

Then Roja the Malla, having quietly approached that dwelling-place with its closed door, having entered the verandah (but) not crossing it, having coughed, tapped on the bolt. The Lord opened the door. Then Roja the Malla, having entered the dwelling-place, having greeted the Lord, sat down at a respectful distance. The Lord talked a progressive talk³ to Roja the Malla as he was sitting down at a respectful distance, that is to say talk on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven, he explained the peril, the vanity, the depravity of pleasures of the senses, the advantage in renouncing (them). When the Lord knew that the mind of Roja the Malla was ready, malleable, devoid of the hindrances, uplifted, pleased, then he explained to him that teaching on *dhamma* which the awakened ones have themselves discovered: ill, uprising, stopping, the Way. And as a clean cloth without black specks will easily take dye, even so as he was (sitting) on that very seat *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose to Roja the Malla, that “whatever is of the nature to uprise, all that is of the nature to stop”. Then Roja the Malla, as one who had seen *dhamma*, attained *dhamma*, known *dhamma*, plunged into *dhamma*, who had crossed over doubt, put away uncertainty, who had attained without another’s help to full confidence in the teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord:

“It were well, Lord, if the masters might receive the requisites of

¹ *ālinda*, terrace or verandah in front of the door of a dwelling-place. COOMARASWAMY questions this meaning (*Indian Architectural Terms*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol.48, No.3, p.252) as used by GEIGER in Mahāvamsa translation, p.246. Geiger cites DN i.89 (=above passage) as evidence that *ālinda* “is the terrace before the house-door”. There is also the word *pamukha* meaning verandah as at Vin 4.45. But DN-a 252 = MN-a iii.351 explain *ālinda* by *pamukha*. *Ālinda* allowed at Vin 2.153, while at Vin 2.169 Visākḥā wanted to build a palace with an *ālinda* supported on pillars with elephant capitals (*hatthinakha*); in this passage therefore *ālinda* may have the meaning of a gallery or balcony.

² *aggaḷa*, bolt or crossbar, but explained at DN-a 252 = MN-a iii.351 by *kavāta*, i.e. the door itself, that which closes the aperture. ³ As at Vin 1.15.

robes, almsfood, lodgings, medicines for the sick only from me, not from others.”

“But those, Roja, who with the knowledge of a learner with the vision of a learner have seen *dhamma*, as you have done, would also think: ‘Now indeed the masters should receive the requisites of robes, almsfood, lodgings, medicines for the sick only from us, not from others.’ Well then, Roja, they shall receive them from you as well as from others.”

Now at that time in Kusinārā a succession of meals of sumptuous foods came to be arranged.¹ Then because Roja the Malla did not obtain a turn,² he thought: “Suppose I were to look into the refectory and prepare that which I do not see in the refectory?”³ Then Roja the Malla, looking into the refectory, did not see two things: vegetables⁴ and solid food (made) with flour.⁵ Then Roja the Malla approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached, he spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda:

“Now, honoured Ānanda, it occurred to me because I did not obtain a turn: ‘Suppose I were to look into the refectory and prepare that which I do not see in the refectory?’ So I, honoured Ānanda, looking into the refectory, did not see two things: vegetables and solid food (made) with flour. If I, honoured Ānanda, were to prepare vegetables

¹ As at [Vin 1.57](#) (at Rājagaha), [Vin 2.119](#), [Vin 4.75](#) (at Vesālī). “Succession of meals” is *bhatta-paṭipāti*. *Paṭipāti* is succession, order; but “turn” (place in the succession) is the better English rendering in the next sentence above and at [Vin 1.220](#) (above, [BD 4.300](#)). Cf. *paṭipātiya*, one after the other, successively, in order, at [Vin 4.91](#).

² *paṭipāti*. ³ Cf. [Kd 6.24.2–6.24.4](#). ⁴ *ḍāka*, as above in [Kd 6.35.6](#). ⁵ *piṭṭhakhādaniya*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives “‘flour-eatables’, i.e. pastry”. But we cannot assume that the only thing made with flour is pastry. *Khādaniya* has two meanings, the technical one of “solid food”, and the untechnical one of what may be eaten, edible. The definition of solid food, *Khādaniya*, at [Vin 4.83](#) by the exclusion of soft foods and certain medicines raises the question whether in many cases where *khādaniya* occurs it should not be translated as “solid” food in preference to “edible”. Thus at [Vin 1.215](#) we should get “solid food that is fruit” (or “fruit that is solid food”) and not “edible fruit”. Vin-a 1193 explains *piṭṭhakhādaniya* as *piṭṭhamayakhādaniya*, “solid food (or something edible) made with flour”.

and solid food (made) with flour, would the Lord accept them from me?”

“Well then, Roja, I will inquire of the Lord.”

Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Well then, Ānanda, let him prepare them.” (Ānanda said:) “Well then, Roja, prepare them.” Then Roja the Malla towards the end of that night having had a quantity of vegetables and solid food (made) with flour prepared, brought them to the Lord, saying: “Lord, may the Lord accept from me vegetables and solid food (made) with flour.”

“Well then, Roja, give them to the monks.” The monks, being scrupulous, did not accept them. (The Lord said:) “Accept them, monks, make use of them.”

Then Roja the Malla, having with his own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head with a quantity of vegetables and solid food (made) with flour, sat down at a respectful distance when the Lord had washed his hand¹ and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl. The Lord, rising from his seat, departed, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Roja the Malla with talk on *dhamma* as he was sitting down at a respectful distance. Then the Lord on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, all (kinds of) vegetables² and all (kinds of) solid food (made) with flour.”

THE STORY OF ONE GONE FORTH WHEN OLD

Then the Lord having stayed in Kusinārā for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Ātumā³ together with the large Order of monks, with the twelve hundred and fifty monks. Now at that time a

¹ *dhotahattha*, as above, e.g. Kd 6.35.4. ² See Kd 6.35.6 where the juice of vegetables forms an exception to an “allowance”. Vin-a 1103 says “whatever is a vegetable, whether it is cooked or not with ghee”. ³ Mentioned also at DN ii.131.

certain (person), formerly a barber,¹ who had gone forth when old, was living in Ātumā. He had two boys, sweet-voiced,² intelligent,³ skilled, accomplished in their craft,⁴ in the barber's profession (as learnt from) their own teachers.⁵

Then that (man) who had gone forth when old⁶ heard: "They say that the Lord is coming to Ātumā together with a large Order of monks, with twelve hundred and fifty monks". Then that (man) who had gone forth when old spoke thus to his boys: "It is said, my dears,⁷ that the Lord is coming to Ātumā together with a large Order of monks, with twelve hundred and fifty monks. Do you go, my dears,

¹ *vuḍḍhapabbajito nahāpitapubbo*, identified by Buddhaghosa at DN-a 599 with the Subhadda mentioned at DN ii.162 who felt relief at the Lord's death. In neither the Dīgha Nikāya passage nor above is he called *āyasmā*, the venerable, and *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* says that at the time of the Buddha's visit to Ātumā he had been a *sāmaṇera*. DN-a 599f. refers to the above Vinaya episode at some length. ² *mañjuka*. I see no reason to object, as does *Vinaya Texts* ii.140, n. 2, to Buddhaghosa's exegesis as *madhuravacana*, sweet-voiced. ³ *paṭibhāneyyaka*, explained at Vin-a 1103 as "endowed with *paṭibhāna* in their own craft". Here again *Vinaya Texts* ii.140, n. 3 objects to Buddhaghosa's exegesis, and translates as "skilled in discourse". Cf. AN i.25, *paṭibhāneyyakānaṃ* (of Radha), translated at GS i.21 as "of impromptu speakers". CHILDERS, besides giving "understanding, intelligence, wisdom; readiness or confidence of speech, promptitude, wit", refers to Ja i.60 and translates *paṭibhāna* as "skill", a rendering followed by RHYS DAVIDS in *Buddhist Birth Stories*, p.79. The whole Vinaya context above suggests the meaning of "persuasive". ⁴ At Vin 4.6 the barber's is placed among the "low crafts". ⁵ *sake ācariyake*. Cf. *sakaṃ ācariyakam uggahetvā* at DN ii.104. DN-a ii.556 explains as "the speech of their own teachers", *attano ācariyavādānaṃ*. ⁶ *Vinaya Texts* ii.140 now and henceforth calls him "dotard" on the grounds that "it is impossible to repeat this long phrase" (translated at *Vinaya Texts* ii.140 in the first instance as "a certain man who had entered the Order in his old age"), and that *vuḍḍhapabbajita* "connotes contempt, and even censure", thus justifying the translation "dotard". At AN iii.78 there are two not entirely disparate lists of things hard to attain by one gone forth in old age. But it would be against the whole spirit of Buddhism to censure or penalise anyone for not having entered the Order when young. ⁷ *tāta*, not *tātā*, although more than one person is being addressed, as pointed out at *Vinaya Texts* ii.141, n. 1. But *tātā* at DN-a 599 where this passage is quoted.

and taking a barber's equipment,¹ tour from house to house for *nāti* measures of offerings,² and collect salt and oil and husked rice and solid food, and when the Lord comes we will make him a conje drink."

"Very well, father," and these boys, having answered him who had gone forth when old in assent, taking a barber's equipment toured from house to house for *nāti* measures of offerings, collecting salt and oil and husked rice and solid food. Those people who, having seen these sweet-voiced, intelligent boys, but had not wanted to have (offerings) made, even they had them made, and having had them made, also gave much. So these boys collected much salt and oil and husked rice and solid food.

Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Ātumā. The Lord stayed there in Ātumā in the House with the threshing-floor.³ Then he who had gone forth when old having had a quantity of conje prepared towards the end of that night, brought it to the Lord, saying: "Lord, may the Lord accept conje from me." Now Truthfinders (sometimes) ask knowing,⁴ and knowing (sometimes) do not ask; they ask, knowing the right time (to ask), and they do not ask, knowing the right time (when not to ask). Truthfinders ask about what belongs to the goal, not about what does not belong to the goal; there is bridge-breaking for Truthfinders in whatever does not belong to the goal. Awakened ones, Lords, question monks concerning two matters, either: "Shall we preach *dhamma*?" or, "Shall we lay down a rule of training for disciples?" Then the Lord spoke

¹ *khurabhaṇḍa*. That this is not "a barbers' lad" (*Vinaya Texts* ii.141) is made clear at **Vin 2.134**: "I allow a razor (*khura*), a whetstone (*khurasilā*), a razor-case (*khurasipātikā*), a piece of felt (*namataka*), a whole barber's equipment (*sabba khurabhaṇḍa*)." It is a shaving set, the outfit for a razor. ² *nāḷiyāvāpakena*. *Vin-a* 1103 says *nāḷiyā ca āvāpakena ca*, and adds that *āvapaka* is also wherever they offer (*āvapanti*), deposit what is received. On *nāti* see **BD 1.12, n. 2; BD 1.103, n. 1**. ³ Reading here and in Siamese edition *bhūsāgāra*. Sinhalese edition and **DN** ii.131 read *bhusāgāra*, as also *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* under *Bhusāgāra*, but *bhūsāgāra* under Ātumā; cf. *bhusāgāra* at **AN** i.241. **DN-a** ii.569, **AN-a** ii.355 explain by *khala-sālā*, hall with a threshing-floor, which I follow. *Bhūsāgāra* would mean the House with the Ornaments. ⁴ As at **Vin 1.59, Vin 1.158, Vin 3.6**, etc.

thus to him who had gone forth when old:

“Where is this conje from, monk?” Then he who had gone forth when old told this matter to the Lord.

The awakened one, the Lord rebuked him, saying: “It is not suitable, foolish man, it is not fitting, it is not becoming, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. For how can you, foolish man, one who has gone forth, cause (others) to take what is not allowable? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, one who has gone forth should not make (others) take what is not allowable. Whoever should make (others) take (these things), there is an offence of wrong-doing. Nor, monks, should one who was formerly a barber carry about a barber’s equipment. Whoever should carry it about, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Then the Lord, having stayed at Ātumā for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Sāvathī. In due course, walking on tour, he arrived at Sāvathī. The Lord stayed there at Sāvathī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time there was a great quantity of solid food that was fruit¹ at Sāvathī. Then it occurred to monks: “Now, what solid food that is fruit is allowed by the Lord, what is not allowed?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, all solid food that is fruit.”

Now at that time seeds belonging to an Order were sown on ground belonging to an individual, and seeds belonging to an individual were sown on ground belonging to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “When, monks, seeds belonging to an Order are sown on ground belonging to an individual, having given

¹ *phalakhādaniya*. Cf. above, Kd 6.17.8, Kd 6.17.9; Kd 6.21.1, and cf. *piṭṭhakhādaniya* and note at above Kd 6.36.6.

back a portion,¹ (the rest) may be made use of. When seeds belonging to an individual are sown on ground belonging to an Order, having given back a portion, (the rest) may be made use of.”

ON THE FOUR GREAT REFERENCES

5.40.1 Now at that time scruples arose in the monks as to this and that occasion, thinking: “Now, what is permitted by the Lord? What is not permitted?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Whatever, monks, has not been objected to by me, saying: ‘This is not allowable’, if it fits in with what is not allowable, if it goes against what is allowable, that is not allowable to you. Whatever, monks, has not been objected to by me, saying: ‘This is not allowable’, if it fits in with what is allowable, if it goes against what is not allowable, that is allowable to you. And whatever, monks, has not been permitted by me, saying: ‘This is allowable’, if it fits in with what is not allowable, if it goes against what is allowable, that is not allowable to you. Whatever, monks, has not been permitted by me, saying: ‘This is allowable if it fits in with what is allowable, if it goes against what is not allowable, that is allowable to you.’”

5.40.2
4.348 Then it occurred to monks: “Now, is (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night² allowable with (food that may be eaten) during a short period,³ or it is not allowable? Now, is (food that may be eaten) during seven days⁴ allowable with (food that may be eaten) during a short period or is it not allowable? Now, is (food that may be eaten) during life⁵ allowable with (food that may be eaten) during a short period or is it not allowable? Now, is (food that may be eaten) during seven days allowable with (food that may be eaten) during a

¹ *bhāgaṃ datvā*. There is no justification for *Vinaya Texts* ii.143 “half the produce, O bhikkhus, you may have”. *Vin-a* 1103 says “having given a portion that is a tenth. This, they say, is an old practice in India, therefore having made ten shares, one share should be given to the owners of the ground”. So presumably if the Order is the owner it gets one share. ² *yāmakālika*, see **BD 2.330, n. 1**. These “foods” really refer to medicines. ³ *yāvakālika*, see **BD 2.330, n1I**. ⁴ *sattāhakālika*, see **BD 2.330, n. 2**. ⁵ *yāvajīvika*, see **BD 2.330, n. 3**.

watch of the night or is it not allowable? Now, is (food that may be eaten) during life allowable with (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night or is it not allowable? Now, is (food that may be eaten) during life allowable with (food that may be eaten) during seven days or is it not allowable?" They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: "Monks, (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night with (food that may be eaten) during a short period is allowable at the right time¹ on the day it is accepted; it is not allowable at the wrong time.² Monks, (food that may be eaten) during seven days with (food that may be eaten) during a short period is allowable at the right time on the day it is accepted; it is not allowable at the wrong time. Monks, (food that may be eaten) during life with (food that may be eaten) during a short period is allowable at the right time on the day it is accepted; it is not allowable at the wrong time. Monks, (food that may be eaten) during seven days with (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night is allowable in a watch of the night on the day it is accepted; it is not allowable after the watch of the night is ended. Monks, (food that may be eaten) during life with (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night is allowable in a watch of the night on the day it is accepted; it is not allowable after the watch of the night is ended. Monks, (food that may be eaten) during life with (food that may be eaten) during seven days is allowable for (the length of) seven days; it is not allowable after the seven days are ended."

The Section on Medicines: the Sixth

IN THIS SECTION THE ITEMS ARE ONE HUNDRED AND SIX ITEMS. THIS IS ITS KEY

In the autumn, also at the wrong time, tallow, roots, (they had need of) what was pounded off, of astringent decoctions, leaves, fruits, resin, salt, and dung, / chunam, sifter,³ and flesh, ointment, powder, ointment-box, all kinds,⁴ not covered,⁵ sticks, case for sticks, /

¹ Before noon from sunrise. ² After noon until sunrise, [Vin 4.86](#), [Vin 4.166](#).

³ Reading here *cālinī*, above *cālanī*. ⁴ Reading here *ucca-parutā*. ⁵ Reading here *ucca-parutā*.

A bag, strap at the edge, thread, oil for the head, and the nose,
 nose-spoon, and steam, a pipe, and a lid, a bag,¹ /
 Decoction of oil, and strong drink,
 too much, an ointment, a vessel,
 sweating, and all kinds of herbs,
 thereupon the great (sweating), hemp-water, /
 Water-vat, and blood, a horn, foot-unguent, foot-salve, lancet,
 and astringent (water), sesamum paste, a compress, /
 Piece of cloth, and mustard-powder, fumigation, and crystal,
 oil for the sore, linen bandage,
 and the irregular things, and what is (formally) received, /
 A (decoction of) dung, is making,
 and mud turned up by the plough,
 lye, urine and yellow myrobalan, perfumes, and a purgative,
 clarified, unprepared, prepared-unprepared, /
 Meat-broth, (mountain-) slope,
 monastery attendant, and for seven days,²
 sugar, kidney-bean, sour gruel,
 cooking for oneself, one may cook again,³ /
 He allowed it however,⁴ short of almsfood,
 and fruit, sesamum, solid food,
 before a meal, fever, and discharged, an ulcer, /
 And clyster-treatment and Suppi(yā),⁵ and indeed human flesh,
 elephants, horses, and a dog, a snake, lion, tiger, leopard, /
 And the flesh of bears (and) hyenas, and a turn, and conjei,
 a certain one who was young, sugar, Sunidha, rest-house, /
 And Ambapālī, the Licchavis, the Ganges,
 the Koṭi(gāma) talk on truths,
 killed on purpose,
 he objected when (they were) well off again for food, /
 A cloud, Yasoja, and Meṇḍaka, products of the cow,
 and provisions for a journey,
 Keni(ya), mango, rose-apple, plantain,
 banana, honey, grape, edible lotus root, /
 Phārusakas, vegetables, flour, the barber at Ātumā,
 fruit and seed at Sāvattthī,
 and On what occasion?, as to the right time.

¹ Reading *thavi*. Sinhalese edition reads *yamakaththavī*, double bag **Kd 6.13.2**.

² Sinhalese edition *ārāmā satā pañcāhi*, referring to the five hundred monastery attendants of **Kd 6.15.4**. ³ *punā pace*, replacing the *punapakā* of **Kd 6.17.6**.

⁴ *punānuññāsi*. ⁵ Reading Suppi, as below Koti and Keni.

7. KAṬHINA

ALLOWANCE FOR KAṬHINA

At that time the awakened one, the Lord was staying at Sāvattḥī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time as many as thirty monks of Pāvā,¹ all forest-dwellers, all almsmen, all wearers of rag-robes,² all wearers of the three robes,³ going to Sāvattḥī so as to see the Lord when the beginning of the rains was approaching, were unable to reach Sāvattḥī for the beginning of the rains; they entered upon the rains on the way, at Sāketa. They spent the rains

¹ *tiṃsamattā Pāṭheyyakā bhikkhū*, mentioned also at SN ii.187, where called Paveyyakā, and also described as *sabbe sasamyojanā*, all (still) with the fetters; it is said that they all became freed from the *āsavas* (cankers) with no substrate remaining after the Lord had given them a discourse on the incalculability of the beginning of this faring-on, *anamataggāyaṃ saṃsāro*, which is part of the *Anamatagga-saṃyutta*. This event is referred to at Vin-a 1106; and also at Dh-p-a ii.32 (called *anamataggadhammadesanā*), from which it appears that Dh-p 65 was uttered in connection with these monks. See also above, BD 4.31, n. 2 for their identification with the *tiṃsamattā bhaddavaggiyā sahāyakā*.

Dictionary of Pali Proper Names takes Pāveyyakā (also a variant reading at Vin 1.253) as the right one and says that it is the "name given to the inhabitants of Pāvā". Pāvā is mentioned at e.g. DN ii.162. At DN iii.207 it is called a city of the Mallas, the people being referred to as Pāveyyakā Mallā. According to Vin-a 1105 Pāṭheyya is a kingdom situated to the west of the Kosala country. See *Vinaya Texts* ii.146, n. ² Cf. Vin 3.230ff., where it is specifically stated in an "allowance" ascribed to Gotama that the first three of these types of monks may, if they so wish, come up to see the Lord. Cf. also MN iii.40ff. These three, combined with the monk who is *tecīvariko*, wearer of the three robes, occur at MN i.214; and cf. AN i.38. These four practices (*aṅga*) are explained in much detail at Vism 59ff. At AN ii.26 it is said that "among robes, rag-robes are trifling, easy to get, blameless", quoted at Vism 64. ³ Prescribed at Bu-NP 1. The three robes would be made of rags. See also Kd 8.12.

in a state of longing,¹ thinking: “The Lord is staying close² to us, six *yojanas* from here, but we are not getting a chance to see the Lord.”

Then these monks having, after the lapse of three months, kept the rains, after the Invitation³ had been carried out, while the god was raining, while waters were gathering, while swamps were forming,⁴ with drenched robes and in a state of weariness approached Sāvattthī, the Jeta Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery, the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance.

Now it is the custom⁵ for awakened ones, for Lords to exchange friendly greetings with in-coming monks. So the Lord spoke thus to these monks:

“I hope, monks, that things went well with you, I hope you had enough to support life, I hope that, in unity, being on friendly terms and harmonious, you spent a comfortable rainy season and did not go short of almsfood?”

“Things did go well with us, Lord, we had enough to support life, Lord, and in unity we, Lord, being on friendly terms and harmonious, spent the rainy season⁶ and did not go short of almsfood. Here are we, Lord, as many as thirty monks of Pāvā, coming to Sāvattthī so as to see the Lord, (but) when the beginning of the rains was approaching, we were unable to reach Sāvattthī for the beginning of the rains; we entered on the rains on the way, at Sāketa. We spent the rains, Lord, in a state of longing for you, thinking: ‘The Lord is staying close to us, six *yojanas* from here, but we are not getting a chance to see the Lord.’ Then we, Lord, having, after the lapse of three months, kept the rains, and after the Invitation had been carried out, while the god was raining, while waters were gathering, while swamps were forming, with drenched robes and in a state of weariness came along on the journey.”

¹ *ukkaṅṭhitarūpā*. ² *āsanneva*, right near. ³ *Pavāraṇā*; see **Kd 4**; also **BD 1.283, n. 5**; **GS iv.183, n. 3**. ⁴ *udakacikkhale*. ⁵ Cf. **Vin 3.88 (BD 1.154)**. ⁶ *Vin-a 1106* says that on account of their longing to see the Lord, they did not say that they had spent a “comfortable” rainy season.

Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given dhamma-talk¹ addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to make up kaṭhina-cloth² when monks have completed the rains. Five (things) will be allowable to you, monks, when the kaṭhina-cloths have been made up: going (to families for alms) without having asked for permission,³ walking (for alms) not taking the three robes,⁴ a group-meal,⁵ as many robes as you require,⁶ and whatever robe-material accrues⁷ there, that will be for

¹ According to Vin-a 1106 this was the talk on the incalculability of the beginning of this faring-on, see above, **BD 4.351, n. 1.** ² *kaṭhinaṃ attharituṃ*, i.e. the formal or ceremonial making of the kaṭhina-cloth, given by the laity, into robes. See **BD 2.5, n. 1; BD 2.26, n. 3.** ³ *anāmantacāra*. Vin-a 1106 says that “so long as the kaṭhina privileges are not removed, it is allowable to go (to families for alms) *anāmantetvā*”, i.e. not having asked for permission, “and it will be no offence in regard to the Cārit-tasikkhāpada”, i.e. **Bu-Pc 46**. In this *Pācittiya*, if a monk, although invited, *nimantita*, but not having asked (for permission, *anāpucchā*) if a monk be there, should call upon families, except at a right time, there is a *Pācittiya* offence. One of the right times is the time of making robes, although the making up of the kaṭhina-cloth is not specifically mentioned in this *Pācittiya* rule. *Vinaya Texts* ii.150, n. 1 says that *āmanteti* must be equal to *āpucchati*; while *Critical Pali Dictionary*, under *anāmantacāra*, refers to **Vin 4.100**, *santaṃ bhikkhuṃ anāpucchā*. The Sanskrit Dictionaries give “invitation” and “interrogation” among the meanings of *āmantraṇa*. The word occurs at AN iii.259; AN-a iii.330 quotes **Vin 4.100.** ⁴ *asamādānacāra*. Vin-a 1107 says “walking not taking with one the three robes, *ticivaraṃ asamādāya*, the meaning is that it will be allowable to be away, separated from a robe”. This therefore is a relaxation of **Bu-NP 2**. At **Vin 1.298** it is also said that an outer cloak may be laid aside when the kaṭhina cloth has been made. ⁵ *gaṇabhojana*; thus a relaxation of **Bu-Pc 32**, although as the formulation of this rule developed, one of the exceptions to its general terms came to be the legality of eating a group-meal at the time of making robes. ⁶ *yāvadatthacīvaraṃ*. Vin-a 1107 says that as many robes as are required will be allowable as long as they are not allotted, not assigned. Cf. **Bu-NP 1** where it is said that an extra robe may be worn for at most ten days when the kaṭhina privileges have been removed and the robes settled. “Till that has taken place, a bhikkhu may use (temporarily, and without actually appropriating them) as many robes as he likes” (*Vinaya Texts* ii.151, n. 3. q.v.). According to *Vism 64f.* the strict wearer of the three robes, *tecīvarika*, should not accept a fourth robe, which, to less ascetic monks, would be of use when washing and dyeing the set of three robes. ⁷ *cīvaruppāda*.

them.¹ These five (things) will be allowable to you, monks, when the *kaṭhina*-cloths have been made. And thus, monks, should *kaṭhina* cloth be made:

“The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This material for *kaṭhina*-cloth² has accrued to the Order. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should give this material for *kaṭhina*-cloth to the monk so and so for making *kaṭhina*-cloth.³ This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This material for *kaṭhina*-cloth has accrued to the Order. The Order is giving this material for *kaṭhina*-cloth to the monk so and so for making *kaṭhina*-cloth. If the giving of this material for *kaṭhina*-cloth to the monk so and so for making *kaṭhina*-cloth is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent. He to whom it is not pleasing should speak. This material for *kaṭhina*-cloth is given by the Order to the monk so and so for making *kaṭhina*-cloth. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand this.’

“Monks, *kaṭhina*-cloth becomes made thus, not made thus. And how, monks, does *kaṭhina*-cloth become not made? *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by marking it,⁴ *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by washing it; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by calculating (the number of) robes (that it will make)⁵; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by cutting it; *kaṭhina*-cloth

¹ *nesaṃ bhavissati*. Vin-a 1107 says that this may be the robe of a dead monk, or a gift to the Order, or a robe that accrues to the Order in any way. ² *kaṭhinadussa*. ³ Vin-a 1109 says that neither a *saṅgha*, Order, nor a *gaṇa*, group, makes the *kaṭhina* cloth, but an individual. ⁴ *ullikhitamattena*, according to Vin-a 1110 for the purpose of measurement lengthwise and across. The monk marks it, *ullikhati*, with his nails, showing the measurement of each strip, *padesa*, so that he can recognise it. ⁵ *cīvaravicāraṇamattena*, Vin-a 1110 saying, “let it be for five or seven nine or eleven”.

does not become made only by tacking it¹; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by making the lengths²; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by marking with a piece of cloth³; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by strengthening the work⁴; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by making a braiding⁵; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by making a binding⁶; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by patching⁷; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made only by dyeing the garment⁸; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not

BD 4.3

¹ *bandhanamattenā ti moghasuttakāropanamattena*, so Vin-a 1110, i.e. by putting false threads in (the material). *Vinaya Texts* ii.153 reading “when it has only been pieced together”, takes it that the false threads are “put in the cloth to show where it is to be cut or sewn”. But in the series of actions necessary for completing the making of *kaṭhina*-cloth “cutting”, or cutting out, has been done already. *Moghasuttaka*, allowed at Vin 2.116, is defined by Buddhaghosa in an exegesis on Kd 15.11.3, see Vin-a 1206. Cf. *bandhanamatta* above, BD 4.260, n. 2; and also at Vin 2.135 although here it seems to have a different meaning. ² *ovaṭṭikakaraṇamattenā ti moghasuttakānusārena dīghasibbitamattena*, so Vin-a 1110, i.e. only by sewing a long (strip) by following the “false threads”. *Ovaṭṭika* allowed at Vin 1.290. ³ *kaṇḍūsakaraṇamattenā ti mud-dhiyapaṭabandhanamattena*, so Vin-a 1110, i.e. only by putting on a piece of cloth as a sign. *Kaṇḍūsaka* allowed at Vin 1.290, on which Vin-a 1128 says *kaṇḍūsakaṃ vuccati muddikā*, a mark (or sign) (the disfigurement) is called *kaṇḍūsaka*. ⁴ *dalḥikam-makaraṇamattena*. This is apparently done by sewing the cloths, *cimilikā*, together, Vin-a 1110; *Vinaya Texts* ii.153 reading “when it has only been made strong (in the seams)”. *Dalḥikamma* allowed at Vin 1.290. ⁵ *anuvātakaraṇamattena*. It appears from Vin-a 1110 that the *anuvāta* was put along the back (of the cloth). See Vin 4.121 (= BD 2.409 q.v. n. 7.) where the Commentary, on the rule for disfiguring a new robe says there is no offence if it is on a braiding, *anuvāta*. *Anuvāta* allowed at Vin 2.116. ⁶ *paribhaṇḍakaraṇamattena*. The *paribhaṇḍa* appears to have been put inside the cloth. Again see Vin 4.121, and BD 2.409, n. 8. Allowed at Vin 2.116. ⁷ *ovaddheyyakaraṇamattena*. Vin-a 1111 says, “only by putting it on the in-coming cloth. Or taking cloth from a *kaṭhina*-robe, only by putting the cloth on another *kaṭhina*-robe”. The variant reading for this last is *akaṭhinacivara*, what is not *kaṭhina*-cloth. The whole meaning is obscure. It perhaps refers to the *saṅghātī*, the outer cloak, which had to be made of double cloth. On the other hand *ovaddheyya* may mean “patching”. ⁸ *kambalamaddanamattena*. *Kambala*, usually a garment or blanket made of wool, is allowed at Vin 1.281. But the *kaṭhina* material was of cotton cloth. *Maddana* too usually means crushing or kneading. But Vin-a 1111 says “throwing it once into the dye, *rajana*, for the colour of ivory, for the colour of withered leaves”. Monks’ robes are of the colour of old ivory, and russets, yellows, browns and reds.

become made by insinuation¹; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made by roundabout talking²; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made by its being temporary³; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made by postponement⁴; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made if it has to be abandoned⁵;

4.356

¹ *nimittakatena*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives for *nimittam karoti*, “to pick out the aim, to mark out”, and Childers “to drop a hint”. There is nothing in the Commentary to support the rendering given at *Vinaya Texts* ii.154, and the alternative suggestion put forward, *Vinaya Texts* ii.154, n. 5 is more pertinent: “Or perhaps according to some commentators, when it has been decided to accept the gift as a *kaṭhina*, that is, when it has been decided that the cloth is of a suitable kind to make robes out of.” For Vin-a 1111, defining *nimittakatena*, says “I will make a *kaṭhina* (-robe) with this cloth (*dussena*)”, this is called *nimittakatena*. For it is called just this in the *Parivāra*” (see [Vin 5.172](#) which defines *nimittakamma* as *nimittam karoti iminā dussena kaṭhinam attharissāmī ti*). “But” Vin-a 1111 continues, “in some commentaries it is said that he (i.e. the monk) says, “this cloth (or cloak, *sāṭaka*) is excellent, it is possible to make a *kaṭhina* (-robe) with this”; this means: having thus insinuated (dropped a hint, or made a sign, *nimittakammaṃ katvā*) as to getting it.” *Critical Pali Dictionary* gives for *a-nimittakata*, “of which no decision has been made”.

Vism 23=Vb 352 asks, “What here is *nemittakata*?” i.e. insinuation. The answer is (following translation at *Path of Purity*, i.27) “What to others is a sign, *nimitta*, making a sign, *nimittakamma*, a hint, *obhāsa*, giving a hint, roundabout talk, winding speech, *parikathā* (see next term in *Vinaya* text and next note) on the part of one of evil desires”, etc. Vism 28 explains *nimitta* and *nimittakamma* so as to leave no doubt that by them “hinting” or “insinuating” is meant. Cf. also Vb-a 483.

² *parikathākatena*. Vin-a 1111 says “he ought to give *kaṭhina* cloth, the benefactor giving *kaṭhina*-cloth produces much merit”, thus is meant “by making *parikathā*”, roundabout talk. At Vism 23=Vb 353 *parikathā* is included in definition of *nemittakata*, see previous note. It is defined at Vism 29=Vb-a 484 as “speaking round and round until one gets what is wanted”. [Vin 5.172](#) says “*parikathā* means that he makes roundabout talk, saying, ‘I will bring forth *kaṭhina*-cloth by this roundabout talk’”.

Critical Pali Dictionary gives for *a-parikathākata*, not “obtained by speaking of its worth”. ³ *kukkukatenā ti tāvakālikena*, Vin-a 1111. [Vin 5.172](#) says that it is called a gift that is not appropriated.

⁴ *sannidhikatena*, so *Vinaya Texts* ii.154 and *Pali-English Dictionary* [Vin 5.172](#)=Vin-a 1111 says that there are two “postponements” or “storings up”, *sannidhi*, that of *karaṇa*, doing or making, and that of *nicaya*, possessions. Vin-a 1111 further explains, “postponement of doing (or making) is not doing (or making) it today) putting the doing (or making) to one side; postponement of possessions means that the Order, receiving *kaṭhina*-cloth today, gives it (to the monks) the next day”. *Sannidhikata* occurs at [Vin 2.270](#) in reference to food.

⁵ *nissaggiyena*. [Vin 5.172](#)=Vin-a 1111 saying “while it is being made the dawn breaks”. All the various processes in the making of the *kaṭhina* robes had to be carried out on one and the same day.

kaṭhina-cloth does not become made if it is not made allowable¹; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made if it is (made) except for the outer cloak²; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made if it is (made) except for the upper robe; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made if it is (made) except for the inner robe; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made unless five parts³ or more than five parts⁴ (of *kaṭhina*-cloth) are cut out, are hemmed together⁵ on that same day; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made unless the making is by an individual.⁶ And even if *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be quite properly made, but if no one gives thanks for it standing outside the boundary,⁷ thus also *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be not made. And thus, monks, does *kaṭhina*-cloth come to be not made.

Vin 1.29

Kd 7.1.6

“And how, monks, does *kaṭhina*-cloth come to be made? *Kaṭhina*

¹ *akappakatenā*. Cf. **Bu-Pc 58**, where a new robe has to be disfigured so that the owner can identify it. The three modes of disfigurement consisted in applying some kind of smudge (*bindu*) to the robe. Cf. **BD 2.409, n. 5**, and Vin-a 1111 *anādinna-kappabindunā*, by not giving the smudge (that makes the robe) allowable. ² *aññātra saṅghāṭṭiya*, if the outer cloak is lacking, not finished. ³ Cf. **Vin 1.287** where each of the three robes of a monk was allowed to be worn *chinnaka*, cut up into pieces to resemble the divisions of a paddy field; and **Vin 1.297** where it is said that one of the three robes might be worn *acchinnaka*, not cut up. Vin-a 1111 says that five or more parts are to be made by taking pieces, showing *mahāmaṇḍala-a ḍḍhamaṇḍala*, i.e. either circular or semi-circular seams (see *Critical Pali Dictionary* under *aḍḍhamaṇḍala*) or “the greater circles and the lesser circles” (see *Vinaya Texts* ii.209 and Vin-a 1127), or “the seams and the short seams” (cf. **Vin 1.287**). Vin-a 1111 continues, “thus it (the robe) comes to be made with seams (or circles); setting that to one side there ought not to be another that is not cut up or that is in (only) two, three or four pieces”. ⁴ *atirekapañcaka*, *Critical Pali Dictionary* gives “more than one of the five parts”. ⁵ *samaṇḍalīkatena*, see last note but one. ⁶ *aññātra puggalassa atthārā*. Vin-a 1111 says “setting to one side the making by an individual, it does not become made because of another making by either an Order or a group”. It seems that each monk must make up the *kaṭhina* cloth distributed to him by the Order, and not rely upon the Order or a group to do so for him; see above **Kd 7.1.4** and cf. Vin-a 1109. ⁷ *nissīmaṭṭho anumodati*. Vin-a 1111 merely says, “if he (or, one) gives thanks standing, *ṭhito*, outside, *bahu*, the boundary of the precincts” (i.e. of the residence where the work is being done). *Anumodati* more likely refers to a monk thanking the Order than to an Order thanking the donors of the *kaṭhina*-cloth, for see **Kd 7.1.4** where the Order gives the monks the material for making into *kaṭhina*-cloth.

cloth comes to be made when it is unsoiled¹; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made when what is allowable is unsoiled²; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made when it is (made) out of pieces of cloth³; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made when it is (made) out of rag-robles⁴; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made when it is (made) out of (bits picked up near) a shop⁵; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if there is no insinuation; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if there is no roundabout talking; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if it is not temporary; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if there is no postponement; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if it has not to be abandoned; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if it is made allowable; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if there is the outer cloak; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if there is the upper robe; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if there is the inner robe; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if five parts or more than five parts are cut out, are hemmed together on that same day; *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made if the making is by an individual. And if *kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be quite properly made, and if one gives thanks for it standing on the boundary, *kaṭhina*-cloth thus also comes to be made. And thus, monks, does *kaṭhina*-cloth come to be made.

d7.17

“And how, monks, do the *kaṭhina* (privileges) become removed⁶?”

¹ *ahatena*, which Vin-a 1111 explains by *aparibhuttana*, not used. ² *ahatakappena*. Vin-a 1111 says “by washing it once or twice (so as to make it) as though unsoiled”.

³ *pilotikāya*, which Vin-a 1111 explains by *hatavatthakasāṭakena*, out of a cloak or garment which are soiled; variant reading *gatavatthukasāṭakena*. ⁴ Vin-a 1112 says “when rag-robles have accrued in twenty-three fields”; the idea being that a monk must wander about in order to acquire his rags. Vin-a , quoting another commentary, says that the meaning there is that when a monk who is a rag-robe wearer is touring for alms and rags, *colaka*, then (*kaṭhina*-cloth comes to be made) when the robe is made up from the rags received. ⁵ *pāpaṇikena*. Vin-a 1112 saying

“if taking pieces of cloth, *pilotika*, dropped at the door of a shop, he gives them for *kaṭhina*-cloth, the meaning is because of this”. Cf. Vin-a 1128, *pāpaṇike ti antarāpaṇato patitapilotikacīvare*, robes of piles of cloth taken amidst a shop. At Vism 62, *pāpaṇika*, “shop-rag” is included under *paṃsukūla*, rag-robles. ⁶ *ubbhataṃ kaṭhinaṃ*. See Bu-NP 1, Bu-NP 2, Bu-NP 3, and BD 2.5, n. 3; BD 2.6, n. 5; BD 2.13, n. 2.

Monks, there are these eight grounds¹ for the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges): that depending on (a monk) going away; that depending on (his robe) being settled²; that depending on his resolves³ (not to have it made up and not to come back); that depending on (the robe) being lost; that depending on his hearing (of the general removal of the privileges in the residence to which he has gone); (that depending on) the disappointment of his expectation⁴ (that a special gift of a robe would be made to him); that depending on his having crossed the boundary⁵; (that depending on) the removal (of the *kaṭhina* privileges) together with (those of the other monks)".⁶

SEVEN ON BRINGING

"A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking a robe that is made up,⁷ goes away, thinking: "I will not come back". That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his going away.⁸ A monk,

Kd 7.2.

¹ *mātikā*, channels, headings. See *Vinaya Texts* ii.157 for these eight grounds for the removal of the five *kaṭhina* privileges being "closely connected" with the description in **Kd 7.13** of the two so-called *palibodhas*. "*Palibodha* seems to mean the continued existence of a claim on the bhikkhu's side to a share in the distribution of the *kaṭhina*". There are in this connection two *palibodhas*, that concerned with the monk's residence, *āvāsa*, and that concerned with his robes, *cīvara*. The *mātikā* are exemplified in the following stories. See also **Vin 5.177** and **BD 2.5, n. 3; BD 2.6, n. 5**. ² *niṭṭhāna*. Cf. *niṭṭhita*, "settled", **BD 2.6**. ³ *sanniṭṭhāna*. Word occurs at Ja 1187, Ja iv.167+ *katvā*. ⁴ *āsāvacchedikā*. Cf. **BD 2.6, n. 4**. ⁵ I.e. of the residence to which *kaṭhina*-cloth had been given, and where he should have made up his portion. ⁶ Editors of *Vinaya Texts* ii.156, n. 4 thinks that this section should have begun "the new chapter". I hold it to be correct as it is, for with it cease the words ascribed to Gotama. The stories that follow, **Kd 7.2–Kd 7.12** inclusive, are not supposed to have been told by him, but are exemplifications of the grounds for removing the *kaṭhina* privileges, and which some later person or persons apparently thought wise to incorporate in the "text". ⁷ *katacīvara*, a robe that is finished, ready to wear. Cf. **BD 2.6, n. 2**. ⁸ Vin-a 1112 says that in this removal of the *kaṭhina* privileges on the ground of his going away, first the robes-impediment, *cīvarapalibodha*, is cut off, afterwards the residence-impediment, *āvāsapalibodha*. For by going thus, the robes-impediment is cut off inside the boundary, the residence-impediment when he has crossed the boundary. See also **Vin 5.177**.

after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material¹ goes away. When he has gone outside the boundary,² it occurs to him,³ “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

4.359 A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away. When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him: “I will not get this robe-material made up nor will I come back”. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.⁴

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away. When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (the robe-material) being lost.⁵

17.2.2 A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary he gets that robe-material made up; when that robe has been made up,⁶ he hears: “The *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed in this residence.” That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his hearing (this news).⁷

1.256 A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe material,

¹ Vin-a 1112 calls this *akatacīvara*, a robe, or robe-material, that is not made up, not ready to wear. ² Vin-a 1112, “when he has gone to another neighbouring residence”. ³ Ibid., “it occurs to him seeing comfortable lodgings or the happiness of friends. In this removal of the *kaṭhina* privileges on the ground of (the robes) being settled, first the residence-impediment is cut off, for he thinks, ‘I will not come back’; when no more than the thought has arisen, it is cut off”. Cf. Vin 5.178 *cīvare niṭṭhite cīvara-palibodho chijjati*, when the robes are settled the impediment to robes is cut off. ⁴ Vin-a 1113 says “because of the resolves, *sanniṭṭhānantike*, “I will not have this robe-material made up” and “I will not come back”, the two impediments are both cut off when no more than these thoughts have arisen”. Vin 5.178 says that they are cut off simultaneously. ⁵ Vin-a 1113 says of this that first the residence-impediment is cut off; the robes-impediment is cut off when the robe is lost. Cf. Vin 5.178. ⁶ *katacīvara*. ⁷ Vin-a 1113 says that first the robes-impediment is cut off; the residence-impediment is cut off with his hearing (the news). Cf. Vin 5.178.

goes away, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary he gets that robe-material made up; when that robe has been made up, he, thinking again and again, “I will come back”, spends the time outside (the boundary) until the *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his having crossed the boundary.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary he gets that robe-material made up; when that robe is made up, he, thinking again and again, “I will come back”, (his return) coincides with¹ the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges). That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed together with (those of the other) monks.²

*Told are the seven cases on Taking.*³

SEVEN ON TAKING

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking with him⁴ a robe that is made up, goes away, thinking, “I will not come back”. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his going away ...⁵

Told are the seven cases on Taking with him.

SIX ON BRINGING

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking a robe that is imperfectly executed,⁶ goes away. When he has gone outside the

¹ *sambhuṇāti*. ² This must mean a general removal for all monks resident within one *sīma*, boundary. ³ *ādāyasattakam niṭṭhitam*. ⁴ *samādāya*. ⁵ *Vinaya Texts* ii.160, n. 1 says, “This chapter is word for word identical with Chapter 2: only instead of ‘takes’ (*ādāya*) read ‘takes with him’ (*samādāya*). We cannot say what different meanings these two words are intended to convey”. ⁶ *vippakatacīvara*. Cf. *vippakata* at [Vin 3.155](#), [Vin 3.225](#), [Vin 3.227](#), [Vin 3.229](#).

boundary it occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina*, (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being settled ... (=Kd 7.2; read taking a robe that is imperfectly executed *instead of* taking a robe) ... That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed together with (those of the other) monks.

*Told are the six cases on Taking*¹

SIX ON TAKING

^{d7.5.1} A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking with him a robe that is imperfectly executed, goes away. When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being settled ... (=Kd 7.3; read taking with him a robe that is imperfectly executed *instead of* taking with him a robe) ... That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed together with (those of the other) monks.²

The six cases on Taking with him

FIFTY ON BRINGING

^{d7.6.1} A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away. When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and

¹ “Six of the seven cases specified in Kd 7.2 (with the exception of the first of the seven) ... The first case is necessarily omitted, because it is essential to that case, that the bhikkhu going away takes with him a robe ready for wear”, so *Vinaya Texts*, ii.160, n. 3. ² Again the first case is omitted. If there is, on the monk’s part, no going away with a robe ready to wear, there is no ground for removing the *kaṭhina* privileges depending on “going away”. These can only be removed if the monk has gone away taking, or taking with him, a robe that is (already) made up, ready to wear.

he gets that robe-material made up. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being settled ...¹

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, "I will not come back". When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him: "I will get this robe-material made up here", and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being settled.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, "I will not come back". When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him, "I will not get this robe-material made up". That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, "I will not come back". When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs, to him, "I will get this robe-material made up here", and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (the robe) being lost.²

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away without having determined,³ for it neither occurs to him that "I will come back" nor does it occur to him that "I will not come back". When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him, "I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back", and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being settled.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away without having determined, for it neither occurs to him that "I will come back", nor does it occur to him that "I will not come back". When he has gone outside the boundary, it occurs to him: "I

¹ "This case is word for word identical with the second case in **Kd 7.2.1**. After it follow the third and fourth case of **Kd 7.2.1**, which it is unnecessary to print here again in full extent. The triad of these cases is repeated here in order to serve as a basis for the variations which are to follow in **Kd 7.2**, **Kd 7.3**," so *Vinaya Texts* ii.161, n. 1. ² In these clauses, the monk, before he has got to the boundary and not after, as in **Kd 7.6.1** thinks that he will not return. ³ *anadhīṭṭhitena*.

will not get this robe-material made up, nor will I come back”. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away without having determined, for it neither occurs to him that “I will come back”, nor does it occur to him that “I will not come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up; but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.¹

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him, “I will not get this robe-material made up, nor will I come back”. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, “I will come back.” When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back,” and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary he gets that robe-material made up. When that robe is made up he hears, “The *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed in this residence.” That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of

¹ The same as **Kd 7.6.1** except for the words added in each case in **Kd 7.6.3**, “without having determined ... ‘I will not come back’.”

his hearing this news).¹

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary he gets that robe-material made up. When that robe is made up, he, thinking again and again, “I will come back,” spends the time outside (the boundary) until the *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his having crossed the boundary.²

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary he gets that robe-material made up. When that robe is made up, he, thinking again and again, “I will come back,” (his return) coincides with the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges). That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed together with (those of the other) monks.

Vin 1.29

FIFTY ON TAKING, ETC.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking with him robe-material, goes away ... it should be given in full thus, like the portion on “going away, taking” ... A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth is made, taking a robe that is imperfectly executed, goes away ... it should be given in full thus, like the portion on “going away, taking with him” ... A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth is made, taking with him a robe that is imperfectly executed, goes away ...

Kd 7.7.1

FIFTY ON TAKING WHAT IS IMPERFECTLY EXECUTED

(=Kd 7.6; read taking with him a robe that is imperfectly executed instead of taking robe-material) ... That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges)

BD 4.3

¹ =Kd 7.2.2. ² =Kd 7.2.2.

are removed together with (those of the other) monks.¹

Told is the Portion for Repeating on Taking

TWELVE CASES CONTRARY TO EXPECTATION

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe.² When he has gone outside the boundary he attends to³ that expectation of a robe; he obtains one contrary to his expectation, he does not obtain one in accordance with his expectation. It occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being settled.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe ... It occurs to him, “I will not get this robe-material made up, nor will I come back”. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made ... It occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (the robe) being lost.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe. When he has gone outside the boundary, it occurs to him, “I will attend to this expectation of a robe here, I will not come back”, and he attends to that expectation of a robe, but that expectation of a robe is disappointed for him.⁴ That monk’s

¹ “The whole Chapter 6 is repeated here three times, the first time replacing the words ‘takes a robe’ by ‘takes a robe with him’ (cf. Chapter 3); the second time replacing ‘takes a robe’ by ‘takes a robe not ready’ (imperfectly executed) (cf. Chapter 4); and the third time with these two modifications combined (cf. Chapter 5)” — so *Vinaya Texts*, ii.162, n. 2. ² see *Bu-NP 3, BD 2.26*, and *Bu-NP 3, BD 2.27*, definition of “expectation”. ³ *payirupāsati*. ⁴ *tassa sā cīvarāsā upacchijati*.

kaṭhina (privileges) are removed because of the disappointment of his expectation.¹

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, thinking, “I will not come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary he attends to that expectation of a robe; he obtains one contrary to his expectation, he does not obtain one in accordance with his expectation. It occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here”, and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made ... It occurs to him, “I will not get this robe-material made up”. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made ... It occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here”, and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (the robe) being lost.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, thinking, “I will not come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary, it occurs to him, “I will attend to this expectation of a robe here”, and he attends to that expectation of a robe, but that expectation of a robe is disappointed for him. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of the disappointment of his expectation.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, (but) without having determined, for it neither occurs to him, “I will come back”, nor does it occur to him, “I will not come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary he attends to that expectation of a robe; he obtains one contrary to his expectation, he does not obtain one in accordance with his expectation. It occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come

¹ *āsāvachhedikā*. Vin-a 1113 says that first the residence-impediment is cut off; the robes-impediment is cut off when the expectation of a robe is disappointed. Cf. above, BD 4.358, n. 3.

back”, and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being settled.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made ... It occurs to him, “I will not get this robe-material made up, nor will I come back”. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made ... It occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (the robe) being lost.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, (but) without having determined, for it neither occurs to him, “I will come back”, nor does it occur to him, “I will not come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary, it occurs to him, “I will attend to this expectation of a robe here, I will not come back”, and he attends to that expectation of a robe, but that expectation of a robe is disappointed for him. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of the disappointment of his expectation.

*Told are the twelve cases on Contrary to Expectation.*¹

TWELVE CASES IN ACCORDANCE WITH EXPECTATION

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary he attends to that expectation of a robe; he obtains one in accordance with his expectation, he does not obtain one contrary to his expectation. It occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

A monk ... It occurs to him, “I will not have this robe-material

¹ *anasādoḷāsakaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ.*

made up, nor will I come back”. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk ... It occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary it occurs to him, “I will attend to this expectation of a robe here, I will not come back and he attends to that expectation of a robe, but that expectation of a robe is disappointed for him. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of the disappointment of his expectation.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, thinking, “I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary he hears that “In this residence the *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed”. It occurs to him, “Inasmuch as in this residence the *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed, I will attend to this expectation of a robe here”, and he attends to that expectation of a robe; he obtains one in accordance with his expectation, he does not obtain one contrary to his expectation. It occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

A monk ... It occurs to him, “I will not get this robe-material made up, nor will I come back”. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk ... It occurs to him, “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, thinking, “I will come back” ... It occurs to him, “I will attend to this expectation of a robe here, I will not come back”,

and he attends to that expectation of a robe, but that expectation of a robe is disappointed for him. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of the disappointment of his expectation.

1793

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, thinking, "I will come back". When he has gone outside the boundary he attends to that expectation of a robe; he obtains one in accordance with his expectation, he does not obtain one contrary to his expectation. He gets that robe-material made up; when that robe is made up, he hears, "The *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed in this residence". That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his hearing (this news).

4,368

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, thinking, "I will come back". When he has gone outside the boundary, it occurs to him, "I will attend to this expectation of a robe, I will not come back", and he attends to that expectation of a robe, but that expectation of a robe is disappointed for him. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of the disappointment of his expectation.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, thinking, "I will come back". When he has gone outside the boundary, he attends to that expectation of a robe; he obtains one in accordance with his expectation, he does not obtain one contrary to his expectation. He gets that robe-material made up; when that robe is made up, he, thinking again and again, "I will come back", spends the time outside (the boundary) until the *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his having crossed the boundary.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away with the expectation of a robe, thinking, "I will come back". When he has gone outside the boundary he attends to that expectation of a robe; he obtains one in accordance with his expectation, he does not obtain one contrary to his expectation. He gets that robe-material made up; when that robe is made up, he, thinking again and again, "I will come back", (his return) coincides with the removal of the *kaṭhina*

(privileges). That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed together with (those of the other) monks.

*Told are the six cases on Taking*¹

TWELVE ON BUSINESS

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away on some business. When he has gone outside the boundary there arises² the expectation of a robe. He attends to that expectation of a robe; he obtains one contrary to his expectation, he does not obtain one in accordance with his expectation. It occurs to him, "I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back", and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being settled.

A monk ... It occurs to him, "I will not get this robe-material made up, nor will I come back". That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk ... It occurs to him, "I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back", and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away on some business. When he has gone outside the boundary there arises the expectation of a robe. It occurs to him, "I will attend to this expectation of a robe here, I will not come back", and he attends to that expectation of a robe, but that expectation of a robe is disappointed for him. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of the disappointment of his expectation.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away on some business, thinking, "I will not come back". When he has gone outside

¹ "Six of the seven cases specified in [Kd 7.2](#) (with the exception of the first of the seven) ... The first case is necessarily omitted, because it is essential to that case, that the bhikkhu going away takes with him a robe ready for wear", so *Vinaya Texts*, ii.160, n. 3. ² *uppajjati*.

the boundary there arises the expectation of a robe. He attends to that expectation of a robe; he obtains one contrary to his expectation, he does not obtain one in accordance with his expectation. It occurs to him, "I will get this robe-material made up here", and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

A monk ... It occurs to him, "I will not get this robe-material made up". That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolve.

A monk ... It occurs to him, "I will get this robe-material made up here", and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.

4:370 A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away on some business, thinking, "I will not come back". When he has gone outside the boundary there arises the expectation of a robe. It occurs to him, "I will attend to this expectation of a robe here", and he attends to that expectation of a robe, but that expectation of a robe is disappointed for him. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of the disappointment of his expectation.

7:10:3 A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away on some business, (but) without having determined, for it neither occurs to him, "I will come back", nor does it occur to him, "I will not come back". When he has gone outside the boundary there arises the expectation of a robe. He attends to that expectation of a robe; he obtains one contrary to his expectation, he does not obtain one in accordance with his expectation. It occurs to him, "I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back", and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

1:263 A monk ... It occurs to him, "I will not get this robe-material made up, nor will I come back". That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk ... It occurs to him, "I will get this robe-material made up

here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away on some business, (but) without having determined, for it neither occurs to him, “I will come back”, nor does it occur to him, “I will not come back”. When he has gone back outside the boundary there arises the expectation of a robe. It occurs to him, “I will attend to this expectation of a robe here, I will not come back”, and he attends to that expectation of a robe, but that expectation of a robe is disappointed for him. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of the disappointment of his expectation.

Told are the twelve cases on Business

NINE CASES ON WITHOUT COLLECTING

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away, travelling to distant parts,¹ without collecting² his share of the robe-material. While he is thus travelling to distant parts, monks ask him, “Where have you, your reverence, spent the rains, and where is your share of the robe-material?”

He speaks thus, “I spent the rains in such and such a residence, and my share of the robe-material is there.”

These speak thus, “Go, your reverence, fetch that robe-material. We will make up that robe-material for you here.”

He, going to that residence, asks the monks: “Where, your reverences,³ is my-share of the robe-material?”

¹ *disaṅgamika*. Cf. **Vin 1.119**. ² *apacinayamāno*. *Pali-English Dictionary, Critical Pali Dictionary, Vinaya Texts* ii.166 all suggest “guarding his claim”, as from *apacināti*. It would seem however to be the negative of *pacinati*, “to take up, to collect”. The monk, according to the context, leaves his robe-material behind, he then goes away without gathering it up and taking it with him. It is true however that in going away he does not renounce his claim to his share of the robe-material. ³ This seems the only time that this monk uses a form of address, *āvuso*, in speaking to other monks.

These speak thus: “This, your reverence, is your share of the robe-material. Where are you going?”

He speaks thus: “I am going to such and such a residence. The monks will make up the robe-material for me there.”

These speak thus: “No, your reverence, do not go; we will make up the robe-material for you here.”

It occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back,” and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

A monk ... That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk ... That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away, travelling to distant parts without collecting his share of the robe-material ...

“This, your reverence, is your share of the robe-material.”

He, taking that robe-material, goes to that residence. On the way (some) monks ask him: “Your reverence, where are you going?”

He speaks thus: “I am going to such and such a residence. The monks will make up the robe-material for me there.”

These speak thus: “No, your reverence, do not go; we will make up the robe-material for you here.”

It occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back,” and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

A monk ... It occurs to him: “I will not get this robe-material made up, nor will I come back.” That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk ... It occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back,” and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.

A monk, after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, goes away, travelling to distant parts without collecting his share of the robe-material ...

“This, your reverence, is your share of the robe-material.”

He, taking the robe-material, goes to that residence; while he is going to that residence, it occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

A monk ... It occurs to him: “I will not get this robe-material made up, nor will I come back.” That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk ... It occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back”, and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk’s *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.

Told are the nine cases on Without collecting

FIVE ON LIVING IN COMFORT

A monk, one who lives in comfort,¹ after *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made, taking robe-material, goes away, thinking, “I will go to such and such a residence; if there comes to be comfort for me there, I will stay, but if there does not come to be comfort for me, I will go to such and such a residence; if there comes to be comfort for me there, I will stay, but if there does not come to be comfort for me, I will go to such and such a residence; if there comes to be comfort for me there, I will stay, but if there does not come to be comfort for me, I will come back”. When he has gone outside the boundary, it occurs to him: “I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back,” and

¹ *phāsuvihārika*. “Intent on finding a comfortable place (to live in)” of *Vinaya Texts* ii.168, although justified by the context, ascribes both more and less to the compound, *phāsuvihārika*, than it actually contains. Cf. the jungle-dweller who, if he was thinking about *phāsuvihāra*, might live independently of guidance, at [Kd 1.73.4](#) (above [BD 4.118](#)).

he gets that robe-material made up. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

A monk ... When he has gone outside the boundary, it occurs to him, "I will not get this robe-material made up, nor will I come back". That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his resolves.

A monk ... When he has gone outside the boundary, it occurs to him: "I will get this robe-material made up here, I will not come back," and he gets that robe-material made up, but while that robe-material is being made up, it is lost. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robe) being lost.

A monk ... When he has gone outside the boundary, he has that robe-material made up; when that robe-material is made up, he, thinking again and again, "I will come back", spends the time outside (the boundary) until the *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed. That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of his having crossed the boundary.

A monk ... When he has gone outside the boundary, he has that robe-material made up; when that robe-material is made up, he, thinking again and again, "I will come back (his return) coincides with the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges). That monk's *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed together with (those of the other) monks.

ON OBSTACLES AND NOT-OBSTACLES

7.13.1 “Monks, there are these two impediments,¹ these two non-impediments to (the removal of) the *kaṭhina* (privileges). And what, monks, are the two impediments to (the removal of) the *kaṭhina* (privileges)? The residence-impediment and the robes-impediment. And how, monks, does the residence-impediment come to be? Monks, in this case a monk who is either staying in or who is longing for that residence, goes away, thinking, ‘I will come back’.² Thus, monks, does the residence-impediment come to be. And how, monks, does the robes-impediment come to be? Monks, in this case, a monk’s robe-material comes to be not made up or it is imperfectly executed or the expectation of a robe is not fulfilled. Thus, monks, does the robes-impediment come to be. Monks, these are the two impediments to (the removal of) the *kaṭhina* (privileges).

Kd 7.13

“And what, monks, are the two non-impediments to (the removal

¹ *palibodha*, obstruction, hindrance, obstacle, impediment, drawback. Ten *palibodhas* are enumerated at Kh-a 39, and explained in detail at Vism 90ff. But in its explanation of *āvāsapalibodha*, the first on the list, the Visuddhimagga makes no reference to *kaṭhina*; *cīvarapalibodha* does not occur here or in Kh-a.

The idea of the *palibodhas* and *apalibodhas* is somewhat difficult to follow. After *kaṭhina*-cloth is made, five privileges are allowable to monks (Kd 7.1.3), and there are eight grounds for the removal of these privileges (Kd 7.1.7). But then, it seems, these eight grounds are in turn subject to the two impediments and the two non-impediments. That is to say, the *kaṭhina* privileges cannot be removed if there is present an impediment to the grounds for removing them, but only if there is no impediment to these grounds. Vin-a 1114 says, “Having shown the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges), now whatever are impediments are said to be cut off in regard to these *kaṭhina* (privileges).” See *Vinaya Texts* ii.149, n. and *Vinaya Texts* ii.157, n. 2.

² The first of the grounds for removing the *kaṭhina* privileges is that depending on a monk having gone away. But here, although he goes away, he intends to come back. Thus the ground for removing the privilege meets with an obstruction.

Text here reads, *idha bhikkhave bhikkhu vassati vātasmim āvāse sāpekkho vā pakkamati* (with variant reading *vesati*) which has led translator at *Vinaya Texts* ii.169 to render, “A bhikkhu, O bhikkhus, goes away (for a time), when it is raining or storming, with the intention of returning to that residence.” But Sinhalese edition 1933, ii.322 and Siamese edition both read, *idha bhikkhave bhikkhu vassāti vā tasmim āvāse sapekho vā pakkamati*, which I follow as making more sense.

of) the *kaṭhina* (privileges)? The residence-non-impediment and the robes-non-impediment. And how, monks, does the residence-non-impediment come to be? In this case, monks, a monk goes away from that residence because of giving up, because of renunciation, because of sacrifice, because of indifference, thinking, ‘I will not come back’.¹ Thus, monks, does the residence-non-impediment come to be. And how, monks, does the robes-non-impediment come to be? In this case, monks, a monk’s robe-material comes to be made up or it is lost or destroyed or burnt or the expectation of a robe is disappointed.² Thus, monks, does the robes-non-impediment come to be. These, monks, are the two non-impediments to (the removal of) the *kaṭhina* (privileges).”

The Section on kaṭhina³: the Seventh

IN THIS SECTION ARE TWELVE ITEMS, THE WORDS OF ABRIDGEMENT ARE ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTEEN. THIS IS ITS KEY

Thirty monks of Pāvā stayed longing in Sāketa,
at the end of the rains they went
with drenched (robes) to see the Conqueror. /

This item of *kaṭhina*-cloth, and the five things called allowable.⁴

Without asking permission, nor taking three robes,
a joint-meal likewise, /

As much as is required, and one that accrues will be for the makers.

The motion, and just what is made and just what is not made. /

Marking, washing, and calculating, and cutting, tacking,

making lengths, using a piece of cloth, and strengthening, braiding, /

Binding, patching, dyeing, talk with hints,⁵ temporary,

postponement, abandonment,

not (made) if it is not allowable, but for these three, /

¹ As he does not intend to return there is no reason why his *kaṭhina* privileges should not be removed. His intention provides the non-impediment. ² These are

no impediments to the grounds for removing the *kaṭhina* privileges. They may be removed, as we have seen, because a monk’s robe is made up, because he resolves not to have it made up, because it is lost, or because his expectation of a robe is disappointed. Cf. **Bu-NP 1**, definition of “when the robes are settled”, and see **BD 2.6**, **BD 2.15**. ³ *Kaṭhinakkhandhaka*. Cf. *Kaṭhinavagga*, **Vin 3.195-223**. ⁴ *kappiyan ti*;

Sinhalese edition *kappissantī*, will be allowable. ⁵ *nimitta-kathā* here. It may be a composite word for *nimittakata* and *parikathākata*; otherwise the latter is not included in this part of the “key”, although it is mentioned lower down.

Unless five parts or more when they are cut out are hemmed together,
not (made) unless by an individual,
if properly (made) he gives thanks standing outside the boundary: /
kaṭhina-cloth comes to be not made,
thus it is taught by the awakened one.

Unsoiled, when what is allowable (is unsoiled),
pieces of cloth, rags, and bits near a shop, /

Not insinuation, nor roundabout talking,
not temporary and no postponement,
not abandoned, made allowable,

and inasmuch as it is for (a set of) three robes, /

If five parts or more are cut out and hemmed together,

if the making is by an individual,

if properly (made) he gives thanks standing on the boundary: /

Thus the making of *kaṭhina*-cloth.

Eight grounds for removal:

that depending on going away,

on being settled, on resolve and on loss, /

On hearing, on disappointment of an expectation,

over the boundary,

and the eighth is with the removal (of other monks').

Taking a robe that is made up, he goes away, thinking,

“I will not come back”, /

His *kaṭhina* (privileges) become removed

because of his going away.

Taking robe-material he goes away,¹ when he is outside the boundary, he
thinks, /

“I will have it made up here,

I will not come back”;

his *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed because of (his robes) being settled.

Taking it, when he is outside the boundary, he intends,

thinking, “Neither that nor will I come back”, /

His *kaṭhina* (privileges) become removed depending on that² of resolve.

Taking robe-material he goes away, when he is outside the boundary, he
thinks, /

“I will have it made up here, I will not come back,”

but while it is being made up, it is lost;

his *kaṭhina* (privileges) become removed depending on that of loss. /

Taking it, he goes away, thinking, “I will come back”,

and has the robe-material made up outside,

when the robe has been made up,

he hears that the *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed there; /

¹ *yāti*. ² *taṃ*, doubtless “ground” is to be understood.

His *kaṭhina* (privileges) become removed depending on that of hearing.

Taking it, he goes away, thinking, “I will come back”, and has the robe-material made up outside, / When the robe has been made up, (staying) outside he does not go back¹

until the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges);

his *kaṭhina* (privileges) become removed depending on that of having crossed the boundary. / Taking it, he goes away, thinking, “I will come back”, and has the robe-material made up outside,

when the robe has been made up, thinking, “I will come back”,

(his return) coincides² with the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges); /

The removal of his *kaṭhina* (privileges) is because it occurs³ with (that of) the other monks.

Taking and taking with him, the going away⁴ is seven times sevenfold. /

There is no sixfold⁵ going away,

(the robes) imperfectly executed depending on “going away”.

Taking it, this arises, “I will have it made up when I am outside the boundary”; /

Settled and resolves and loss, these three.

Taking it, thinking, “I will not come back”,

“I am making it up outside the boundary”; /

Settled, then resolves, then loss, this is three (fold).

Without having determined, for it does not (occur) to him, the threefold meaning below.⁶ /

1.267
4:378

Taking it, he goes away, thinking, “I will come back”,

“I am making it up outside the boundary”,

thinking, “I will not come back”, he gets it made up;

his *kaṭhina* (privileges) are removed

because of (his robes) being settled. /

Resolves and loss, hearing, having crossed the boundary,

it may arise with (those of the other) monks;

thus there is going away fifteen times. /

Taking with him, imperfectly executed,

taking it with him likewise again,

these are four turns⁷ where all is fifteen-fold. /

And contrary to expectation, in accordance with expectation,

¹ *nāmeti*, cf. Snp 1143, *nāpentī* with variant reading *nāmenti*. ² *sambhoti*. ³ *jāyati*.

⁴ *gati*. ⁵ *chaccā*. Sinhalese edition *chaṭṭhe*. ⁶ Pali has “below”, referring to the leaves of the palm-leaf manuscripts, where we say “above”. ⁷ *vārā*, i.e. for recitation.

and business, these three.

One should understand this from what has been said:¹

there are three that are each twelve (-fold). /

Here are nine on “without collecting”,

there is a set of five on comfort;

impediments, non-impediments;

the key is made from what has been said.

Vin 1.2

¹ *Nayato*, perhaps “from the method”.

8. ROBES (CĪVARA)

THE STORY OF JĪVAKA

At one time the awakened one, the Lord was staying at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeling-place. Now at that time Vesālī was prosperous and flourishing, full of folk, thronged with people,¹ and it was well off for food; and there were seven thousand seven hundred and seven long houses,² and seven thousand seven hundred and seven gabled buildings, and seven thousand seven hundred and seven parks,³ and seven thousand seven hundred and seven lotus-tanks. There was the courtesan Ambapālī,⁴ beautiful, good to look upon, charming, she was possessed of the utmost beauty of complexion, was clever at dancing and singing and lute-playing, much visited by desirous people and she went for a night for fifty,⁵ and through her Vesālī shone forth all the more.

Then the urban council⁶ of Rājagaha went to Vesālī on some business. The urban council of Rājagaha saw that Vesālī was prosperous and flourishing, full of folk, thronged with people, and well off for food; and (they saw) the seven thousand seven hundred and seven long houses ... seven thousand seven hundred and seven lotus-tanks, and Ambapālī, the courtesan, beautiful, good to look upon, charming ... and (they saw) that through her Vesālī shone forth all the more. Then the urban council of Rājagaha, having transacted that business

¹ Cf. DN i.211, DN ii.146, MN i.377, AN iii.215. ² *pāsāda*, cf. BD 2.16, n. 5. ³ *ārāma*, not "monasteries" here. See BD 2.2, n. 2. ⁴ Here called Ambapālikā. Mentioned above, BD 4.315. ⁵ Vin-a 1114 says, "taking fifty *kaḥāpaṇas* she goes night by night."

⁶ *negama*. Vin-a 1114 calls this a *kuṭumbikagaṇa*, a group of leading men. Cf. *negama* at Vin 3.220.

in Vesālī, came back again to Rājagaha; they approached King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha; having approached they spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

“Sire, Vesālī is prosperous and flourishing ... and through her Vesālī shines forth all the more. It were good, sire, if we too might establish a courtesan.” “Well now, good sirs,¹ do find such a girl as you might establish as a courtesan.”

Now at that time there was in Rājagaha a girl called Sālavatī, who was beautiful, good to look upon, charming, she was possessed of the utmost beauty of complexion. Then the urban council of Rājagaha established the girl, Sālavatī,² as courtesan. And the courtesan Sālavatī soon came to be clever at dancing and singing and lute-playing; she was much visited by desirous people, and she went for a night for the fee of a hundred.³ Then the courtesan Sālavatī soon became pregnant. Then it occurred to the courtesan Sālavatī: “Men do not like a pregnant woman. If anyone should find out concerning me that ‘The courtesan Sālavatī is pregnant’, all respect for me would dwindle. What now if I should make it known that I am ill?”

Then the courtesan Sālavatī enjoined the door-keeper, saying: “Good door-keeper, do not let any man come in, and if anyone asks for me, make it known that I am ill.”

“Very well, lady,” that door-keeper answered the courtesan Sālavatī in assent.

Then the courtesan Sālavatī when (the child of) her womb was mature, gave birth to a son. Then the courtesan Sālavatī enjoined a slave-woman, saying: “Now then, come along, having put this boy

¹ *bhaṇe*, a form of address sometimes used by kings to their subjects. ² Cf. Sn-p-a i.244. ³ *paṭisatena*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.172 takes this to mean that she asked for a hundred *kahāpaṇas* a night which undoubtedly balances Ambapālī’s price of fifty *kahāpaṇas*, see *Vin-a* 1114. The Commentary in its exegesis of *paṭisatena* does not mention coinage or currency. *Paṭisatena* however probably means “for a hundred in return”, “against a hundred”.

into a winnowing-basket,¹ having taken him out, throw him away on a rubbish-heap.”²

“Very well, lady,” and that slave-woman having answered the courtesan Sālavatī in assent, having put that boy into a winnowing-basket, having taken him out, threw him away on a rubbish-heap.

Now at that time the king’s son, Abhaya³ by name, going in the morning to the royal audience, saw that boy surrounded by crows; seeing this, he asked the people: “Good sirs, what is this that is surrounded by crows?”

“It is a boy, sire.”

“Is he alive, good sirs?”

“He is alive, sire.”

“Well now, good sirs, having brought that boy to our women’s quarters, give him to foster-mothers to care for.”

“Very well, sire,” and these people having answered Abhaya, the king’s son, in assent, having brought that boy to the women’s quarters of Abhaya, the king’s son, gave him to foster-mothers saying, “Care for him”.

Because it was said of him, “He is alive”,⁴ they gave him the name of Jīvaka; because the prince⁵ caused him to be cared for, they gave him the name of Komārabhacca.⁶

And before long Jīvaka Komārabhacca attained to years of discretion. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca approached Abhaya, the king’s son, and having approached he spoke thus to Abhaya, the king’s son:

“Who, sire, is my mother? Who my father?”

¹ Vin-a 1114 calls this *jiṅṅasuppa* an old winnowing-basket. ² Cf. Dh-p-a i.174.

³ See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ⁴ *jīvati*. ⁵ *kumāra*. ⁶ Meaning perhaps “the Prince-fed” (so GS i.24). See note at *Vinaya Texts* ii.174, at end of which it is said, “We believe therefore, that this surname Komārabhacca really means ‘master of the *kaumārabhṛīya* science’”, i.e. a part of the medical science which comprises the treatment of infants. Short account of his history given at AN-a i.398f. At DN-a 133, where brief synopsis of his story also appears, he is called Komārabhaṇḍa, and at Divyāvadāna 506ff. Kumārabhūta. At AN i.26 he is called chief of lay followers who are liked by people. MN v. is addressed to him.

“Not even I, good Jīvaka, know your mother, but I am your father, for I had you cared for.”

Then it occurred to Jīvaka Komārabhacca:

“Without a craft, it is not easy to depend upon these royal families. Suppose I were to learn a craft?¹” Now at that time there lived a world-famed² doctor at Taxilā.

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, without having asked (permission) of Abhaya, the king’s son, set out for Taxilā; in course of time he arrived at Taxilā and that doctor; having approached, he spoke thus to that doctor:

“I want, teacher,³ to train in the craft.”

“Well then, good Jīvaka, train in it.”

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca learnt much and learnt it quickly, and he reflected upon it well, and he did not forget what he had learnt. Then at the end of seven years, it occurred to Jīvaka Komārabhacca: “I am learning much and learning it quickly, and I am reflecting upon it well, and I do not forget what I have learnt, but after studying for seven years the end of this craft is not visible to me. When will the end of this craft be visible?”

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca approached that doctor; having approached he spoke thus to that doctor:

“I, teacher, am learning much and learning it quickly, and I am reflecting upon it well, and I do not forget what I have learnt, but after studying for seven years the end of this craft is not visible to me. When will the end of this craft be visible?”

“Well now, good Jīvaka, taking a spade, touring a *yojana* all round Taxilā, bring whatever you should see that is not medicinal.”

“Very well, teacher,” and Jīvaka Komārabhacca having answered that doctor in assent, taking a spade, touring a *yojana* all round Taxilā, did not see anything that was not medicinal. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca approached that doctor; having approached he spoke thus to

¹ Vin-a 1114 says that he thought of the doctor’s craft for this is on the side of amity towards men and their welfare, whereas elephant-lore and horsemanship are connected with the injury of others. ² *disāpāmokkha*. Word occurs at Ja i.166.

³ *ācariya*.

that doctor:

“Teacher, while I was touring for a *yojana* all round Taxilā, I did not see any thing that was not medicinal.”

“You are trained, good Jīvaka, this much is enough for a livelihood for you,” and he gave him trifling provisions for the journey.

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, taking those trifling provisions for the journey, set out for Rājagaha. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca’s trifling provisions for the journey became used up on the way, at Sāketa. Then it occurred to Jīvaka Komārabhacca:

“These wilderness roads have little water, little food; it is not easy to go along them without provisions for the journey.¹ Suppose I were to look about for provisions for the journey?”

THE STORY OF THE MERCHANT’S WIFE

Now at that time in Sāketa a merchant’s wife had had a disease of the head for seven years. Many very great, world-famed doctors who had come had not been able to cure her; taking much gold,² they went away. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, entering Sāketa, asked the people: “Who, good sirs, is ill? Whom shall I attend?”³

“Teacher, this merchant’s wife has had a disease of the head for seven years; go, teacher, attend this merchant’s wife.”

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca went up to the dwelling of that householder, the merchant, and having gone up, he enjoined the door-keeper, saying: “Go, good door-keeper, say to the merchant’s wife, ‘Lady, a doctor is come who wants to see you’”.

“Very well, teacher,” and that door-keeper having answered Jīvaka Komārabhacca in assent, approached that merchant’s wife; having approached, he spoke thus to that merchant’s wife: “Lady, a doctor is come who wants to see you.”

“What sort of a doctor is he, good door-keeper?”

“He is young, lady.”

¹ Cf. Vin 1.244, above, BD 4.335–BD.4.336. ² *hirañña*. ³ *tikicchati*, to treat medically, to cure.

“That’s enough, good door-keeper. What could a young doctor do for me? Many very great, world-famed doctors who have come have not been able to cure me; they have gone away taking much gold.”

Then that door-keeper went up to Jīvaka Komārabhacca; having gone up, he spoke thus to Jīvaka Komārabhacca: “Teacher, the merchant’s wife speaks thus: ‘That’s enough, good door-keeper ... taking much gold’.”

“Go, good door-keeper, say to the merchant’s wife: ‘Lady, the doctor speaks thus: Do not, lady, give anything beforehand; when you become well, then you may give what you like’.”

“Very well, teacher,” and that door-keeper having answered Jīvaka Komārabhacca in assent, went up to that merchant’s wife; having gone up, he spoke thus to that merchant’s wife: “Lady, the doctor speaks thus ... ‘... then you may give what you like’.”

“Well then, good door-keeper, let the doctor come.”

“Very well, lady,” and that door-keeper having answered the merchant’s wife in assent, went up to Jīvaka Komārabhacca; having gone up, he spoke thus to Jīvaka Komārabhacca:

“The merchant’s wife, teacher, summons you.”

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca went up to that merchant’s wife; having gone up, having observed her uneasiness,¹ he spoke thus to the merchant’s wife:

“Lady, a handful² of ghee is wanted.”

Then that merchant’s wife had a handful of ghee given to Jīvaka Komārabhacca. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, cooking up that handful of ghee with various medicines, made that merchant’s wife lie down on her back on a couch and gave it (to her) through the nose. Then that ghee, given through the nose, came out through the mouth. Then that merchant’s wife, spitting it into a receptacle, enjoined a slave-woman, saying:

“Come, now, take up this ghee with cotton.”³

¹ *vikāra*. ² *pasata*, a small measure of capacity; explained at Vin-a 1116 as *ekahatthapūṭa*, what is contained in one hand. See *Vinaya Texts* ii.178, n.. ³ *picu*, which Vin-a 1116 explains by *kappāsapaṭala*, a cotton covering.

1.272 Then it occurred to Jīvaka Komārabhacca: “It is astonishing how stingy this housewife¹ is, in that she has this ghee, which ought to be thrown away, taken up with cotton; many of my very precious medicines went into it, and what kind of a fee² will she give me?”

Then that merchant’s wife, having observed Jīvaka Komārabhacca’s uneasiness, spoke thus to Jīvaka Komārabhacca: “Teacher, why are you perturbed?”

“It occurred to me in this case: it is astonishing ... will she give me?”

8.1.13 4.385 “But, teacher, we householders know about this economy³; this ghee is excellent for the servants or workmen for rubbing their feet, or poured out into a lamp. Do not you, teacher, be perturbed, your fee will not be lacking.”⁴

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca removed the merchant’s wife’s seven year old disease of the head by just the one treatment through the nose.⁵ Then that merchant’s wife, being well, gave four thousand⁶ to Jīvaka Komārabhacca; her son, thinking, “My mother is well”, gave four thousand; her daughter-in-law, thinking, “My mother-in-law is well”, gave four thousand; the householder, the merchant, thinking, “My wife is well”, gave four thousand and a slave and a slave-woman and a horse-chariot. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, taking these sixteen thousand and the slave and the slave-woman and the horse-chariot, set out for Rājagaha; in due course he approached Abhaya, the king’s son, at Rājagaha; having approached he spoke thus to Abhaya, the king’s son:

“Sire, this is for my first work: sixteen thousand and a slave and a slave-woman and a horse-chariot. May your highness⁷ accept it as a tribute for having had me cared for.”⁸

“No, good Jīvaka, let it be for you yourself; but do build a dwelling

¹ *gharaṇī*, see **BD 2.203, n. 1.** ² *deyyadhamma*. ³ *saṇḍhama*. ⁴ *hāyati*, to waste away, to disappear, diminish, dwindle. ⁵ *natthukamma*. Allowed to monks at **Vin 1.204.** Cf. **Vin 3.83** and **BD 1.143, n. 2.** At DN i.12 called by some recluses and brahmins a low or worldly lore from which Gotama abstains. ⁶ probably *kahāpaṇas*. ⁷ *deva*, masculine singular here. ⁸ *posāvanika*.

in our palace¹.”

“Very well, sire,” and Jīvaka Komārabhacca having answered Abhaya, the king’s son, in assent, built a dwelling in the palace of Abhaya, the king’s son.

THE STORY OF KING BIMBISĀRA

Now at that time King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha came to suffer from a fistula; his outer garments were stained with blood. The queens, seeing this, made fun of him, saying: “Now the king is in his courses, the king is having a period, soon the king will give birth.” On account of this the king became ashamed. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to Abhaya, the king’s son:

“Good Abhaya, I have such a disease that my outer garments are stained with blood. The queens, seeing this, make fun of me, saying, ‘... the king will give birth’. Please, good Abhaya, do find a doctor such as could attend me.”

“Sire, there is this Jīvaka of ours, a young doctor of high repute, he will attend your majesty.”

“Very well, good Abhaya, command the doctor, Jīvaka, so that he shall attend me.”

Then Abhaya, the king’s son, commanded Jīvaka Komārabhacca, saying: “Go, good Jīvaka, attend the king.”

“Very well, sire,” and Jīvaka Komārabhacca having answered Abhaya, the king’s son, in assent, taking medicine under his nail, approached King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha; having approached, he spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

“Sire, let me see the disease.”

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca removed King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha’s fistula with just the one ointment. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, being well, having had five hundred women adorned with all kinds of ornaments, having made them take (these) off, having had them made into a pile, spoke thus to Jīvaka Komāra-

¹ antepura, not women’s quarters here.

bhacca: “Let all these ornaments of the five hundred women be yours, good Jīvaka.”

“No, sire, may your majesty remember my office.”

“Well then, good Jīvaka, may you tend me and the women¹ and the Order of monks with the awakened one at its head.”

“Very well, sire,” Jīvaka Komārabhacca answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha in assent.

THE STORY OF THE MERCHANT OF RĀJAGAHA

8.1.16 Now at that time a merchant of Rājagaha had had a disease of the head for seven years. Many very great, world-famed doctors who had come had not been able to cure him. Taking much gold, they went away. Moreover he came to be given up by the doctors. Some doctors spoke thus: “The householder, the merchant will pass away² on the fifth day.” Some doctors spoke thus: “The householder, the merchant will pass away on the seventh day.” Then it occurred to the urban council of Rājagaha: “This householder, the merchant is very useful to the king as well as to the urban council, but yet he has been given up by the doctors. Some doctors speak thus: ‘The householder, the merchant will pass away on the fifth day.’ Some doctors speak thus: ‘The householder, the merchant will pass away on the seventh day.’ Now, this Jīvaka, the king’s doctor, is young and of good repute. Suppose we should ask Jīvaka, the king’s doctor, to attend the householder, the merchant?”

8.1.17
4.387 Then the urban council of Rājagaha approached King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha; having approached they spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

“Sire, this householder, the merchant is very useful to your majesty as well as to the citizens; but then he is given up by the doctors ... ‘... will die on the seventh day’. It were good if your majesty were to command Jīvaka, the doctor, to attend the householder, the merchant.”

1.274
¹ *itthāgāra*. ² *kālam karissati*, will complete his time (here, in this birth), will die.

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha commanded Jīvaka Komārabhacca, saying: “Go, good Jivaka, attend the householder, the merchant.”

“Very well, sire,” and Jīvaka Komārabhacca having answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha in assent, approached that householder, the merchant; having approached, having observed the uneasiness of the householder, the merchant, he spoke thus to the householder, the merchant:

“If I, householder, should make you well, what would be my fee?”

“All my property shall become yours, teacher, and I will be your slave.”

“Now, householder, are you able to lie down on one side for seven months?”

“I am able, teacher, to lie down on one side for seven months.”

“Now, householder, are you able to lie down on the other side for seven months?”

“I am able, teacher, to lie down on the other side for seven months.”

“Now, householder, are you able to lie down on your back for seven months?”

“I am able, teacher, to lie down on my back for seven months.”

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, having made the householder, the merchant lie down on a couch, having strapped him to the couch, having cut open the skin of his head, having opened¹ a suture in the skull,² having drawn out two living creatures,³ showed them to the people, saying:

“Do you see, masters, these two living creatures, the one small, the other large? This large living creature was seen by those teachers who spoke thus: ‘The householder, the merchant will pass away on the fifth day’; on the fifth day it would have destroyed the brain of the householder, the merchant, and when the brain had been destroyed the householder, the merchant would have passed away. It was rightly seen by those teachers. This small living creature was seen by those teachers who spoke thus: ‘The householder, the mer-

¹ *vināmetvā*, Vin-a 1117 explains by *vivaritvā*. ² *sibbinī*, cf. Ja vi.339, *sibbāni* (plural).

³ *pāṇaka*.

chant will pass away on the seventh day'; on the seventh day it would have destroyed the brain of the householder, the merchant, and when the brain had been destroyed the householder, the merchant would have passed away. It was rightly seen by those teachers." And having closed the suture of the skull, having sewn up the skin of the head, he applied an ointment.

Then the householder, the merchant, when seven days had passed, spoke thus to Jīvaka Komārabhacca:

"I am not able, teacher, to lie down on one side for seven months."

"But did you not, householder, answer me in assent, saying: 'I am able, teacher, to lie down on one side for seven months'?"

"It is true, teacher, that I answered thus, but I will die, I am not able to lie down on one side for seven months."

"Well then, householder, you lie down on the other side for seven months."

Then the householder, the merchant, when seven days had passed, spoke thus to Jīvaka Komārabhacca:

"I am not able, teacher, to lie down on the other side for seven months."

"But did you not, householder, answer me in assent, saying: 'I am able, teacher, to lie down on the other side for seven months'?"

"It is true, teacher, that I answered thus, but I will die, I am not able to lie down on the other side for seven months."

"Well then, householder, you lie down on your back for seven months."

Then the householder, the merchant, when seven days had passed, spoke thus to Jīvaka Komārabhacca:

"I am not able, teacher, to lie down on my back for seven months."

"But did you not, householder, answer me in assent, saying: 'I am able, teacher, to lie down on my back for seven months'?"

"It is true, teacher, that I answered thus, but I will die I am not able to lie down on my back for seven months."

"If I, householder, had not spoken to you thus, you would not have lain down so long (as this); but I knew beforehand that the

householder, the merchant would become well in three times seven days. Rise up, householder, you are well; find what is my fee.”

“All my property shall become yours, teacher, and I will be your slave.”

“No, householder, do not give me all your property and do not be my slave; give a hundred thousand to the king and a hundred thousand to me.”

Then the householder, the merchant, being well, gave a hundred thousand to the king and a hundred thousand to Jīvaka Komārabhacca.

THE STORY OF THE MERCHANT’S SON

Now at that time the son of a merchant of Benares,¹ while playing at turning somersaults,² came to suffer from a twist in the bowels, so that he did not properly digest the conje³ that he drank nor did he properly digest the food that he ate or relieve himself regularly. Because of this he became thin, wretched, his colour bad, yellowish, the veins showing all over his body.³ Then it occurred to the merchant of Benares:

“Now what kind of affliction has my son? He does not properly digest the conje that he drinks and he does not properly digest the food that he eats and he does not relieve himself regularly. Because of this he is thin, wretched, of a bad colour, yellowish, the veins showing all over his body. What now if I, having gone to Rājagaha, should ask the king for Jīvaka, the doctor, to attend my son?”

Then the merchant of Benares, having gone to Rājagaha, approached King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha; having approached, he spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

“Sire, my son has this kind of affliction: he does not properly digest ... the veins showing all over his body. It were good if your majesty

¹ *Bārāṇaseyyaka*, an inhabitant of Benares, *Bārāṇasī*; on the analogy of *Pāveyyaka*, an inhabitant of Pāvā, see above, **BD 4.31, n. 2.** ² *mokkha^cicāya kiḷantassa*. Cf. **BD 1.316, n. 1, n.12.** ³ stock-phrase.

were to command Jīvaka, the doctor, to attend my son.”

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha commanded Jīvaka Komārabhacca, saying: “Go, good Jīvaka, having gone to Benares, attend the son of the merchant of Benares.”

“Very well, sire,” and Jīvaka Komārabhacca having answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha in assent, having gone to Benares, approached the son of the merchant of Benares; having approached, having observed the uneasiness of the son of the merchant of Benares, having caused the people to be turned away, having surrounded him with a curtain,¹ having tied him to a post, having placed his wife in front (of him), having cut open the skin of his stomach, having drawn out the twisted bowel, showed it to his wife, saying: “See, this was your husband’s affliction; because of this he did not properly digest the conje^y that he drank and did not properly digest the food that he ate and did not relieve himself regularly; because of this he is thin, wretched, his colour bad, yellowish, the veins showing all over his body.” Having straightened out the twisted bowel, having put back the bowel again, having sewn up the skin of the stomach, he applied an ointment. Then the son of the merchant of Benares soon became well. Then the merchant of Benares, saying: “My son is well,” gave sixteen thousand to Jīvaka Komārabhacca. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, taking those sixteen thousand, went back again to Rājagaha.

THE STORY OF KING PAJJOTA

Now at that time King Pajjota² came to be suffering from jaundice.³ Many very great, world-famed doctors, who had come had not been able to cure him; taking much gold, they went away. Then King Pajjota sent a messenger to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, saying: “I have this kind of disease; it would be good if your majesty were to

¹ *tirokaraṇī*, as at Vin 2.152. ² King of Avantī, capital Ujjenī; cf. Dh-p-a i.192.

³ *paṇḍurogābādha*. Cf. Vin 1.206 where a monk had this disease. The cure “allowed” him was different from the one administered to Pajjota.

command Jīvaka, the doctor, so that he should attend me.” Then King Bimbisāra of Magadha commanded Jīvaka Komārabhacca, saying: “Go, good Jīvaka, having gone to Ujjenī, attend King Pajjota.”

“Very well, sire,” and Jīvaka Komārabhacca having answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha in assent, having gone to Ujjenī, approached King Pajjota, and having approached, having observed his uneasiness, he spoke thus to King Pajjota:

“Sire, I will cook up some ghee, and your majesty will drink it.”

“No, good Jīvaka, do what you can to make (me) well without ghee; ghee is abhorrent to me, loathsome.” Then it occurred to Jīvaka Komārabhacca: “The king’s disease is of such a kind that it is not possible to make him well without ghee. Suppose I should cook up the ghee (so that it has) the colour of an astringent decoction, the smell of an astringent decoction, the taste of an astringent decoction¹?”

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca cooked up the ghee with various medicines (so that it had) the colour of an astringent decoction, the smell of an astringent decoction, the taste of an astringent decoction. Then it occurred to Jīvaka Komārabhacca: “When the king has drunk and digested the ghee, it will make him sick. This king is violent,² he might have me killed. Suppose I should ask (for permission to go away) beforehand?” Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca approached King Pajjota; having approached he spoke thus to King Pajjota:

“Sire, we doctors at such a moment³ as this are pulling up roots, gathering medicines. It were good if your majesty were to command at the stables⁴ and at the gateways, saying: ‘Let Jīvaka go out by means

¹ *kasāvavaṇṇaṃ kasāvagandhaṃ kasāvarasaṃ*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.187 reads “so that it takes the colour, lie smell and the taste of an astringent decoction”. *Pali-English Dictionary* suggests “of reddish-yellow colour, having a pungent smell, having an astringent taste.” Four kinds of *kasāva*, astringent decoctions, to be used as medicine in flavouring food, are allowed at [Vin 1.201](#), and *kasāvodaka*, a watery astringent decoction, at [Vin 1.205](#). At [Vin 2.151](#) the *kasāva* allowed was an astringent liquid to be applied to the colouring matter given to walls so as to make the colouring stick on. ² *caṇḍa*. Pajjota’s full name was Caṇḍapajjota. ³ *muhutta* is a short period of time, its use here presumably implying that it was urgent for him to get away on his business. ⁴ *vāhanāgāra*, the room for the conveyances, mounts, vehicles or beasts of burden, so stables, coach house.

of whatever conveyance¹ he desires, let him go out by whatever gateway he desires, let him go out at whatever time he desires, let him come in at whatever time he desires’.” Then King Pajjota commanded at the stables and at the gateways, saying: “Let Jīvaka go out by means of whatever conveyance he desires, let him go out by whatever gateway he desires, let him go out at whatever time he desires, let him come in at whatever time he desires.”

Now at that time King Pajjota had a she-elephant, called Bhaddavatikā, who could do fifty *yojanas*.² Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca offered the ghee to King Pajjota, saying: “Let your majesty drink an astringent decoction.” Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca having made King Pajjota drink the ghee, having gone to the elephant stable, hastened out of the city on the she-elephant, Bhaddavatikā.

Then King Pajjota, when he had drunk and digested the ghee, was sick. Then King Pajjota spoke thus to the people: “Good sirs, the wicked Jīvaka has made me drink ghee. Well now, good sirs, look for the doctor, Jīvaka.”

“Sire, he has hastened out of the city on the she-elephant, Bhaddavatikā.”

Now at that time King Pajjota came to have a slave called Kāka,³ who could do sixty *yojanas* and who was born of a non-human being. Then King Pajjota commanded the slave, Kāka, saying: “Go, good Kāka, make Jīvaka, the doctor, return, saying, ‘The king, teacher, orders you to come back’.”⁴ Now, good Kāka, these doctors are full of cunning, so do not accept anything from him.”

And the slave, Kāka, caught up Jīvaka Komārabhacca on the road to Kosambī as he was having breakfast. Then Kāka, the slave, spoke thus to Jīvaka Komārabhacca: “The king, teacher, orders you to come back.”

¹ *vāhana*, mount. ² *Vinaya Texts* ii.188 adds “(in one day)”; this information is given at Dh-p-a i.196: *ekadivasam paññasa yojanāni gacchati*. Above she is described as *paññāsayojanikā*. ³ Mentioned at Dh-p-a i.196. ⁴ *nivattāpeti*, “is having you sent back”.

“Wait, good Kāka, until we have eaten; come, good Kāka, you eat.”

“No, teacher, I am commanded by the king, saying: ‘Now good Kāka, these doctors are full of cunning, so do not accept anything from him’.”

Now at that time Jīvaka Komārabhacca, having stripped off¹ the medicinal (part) with his nail, was eating an emblic myrobalan² and drinking water. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca spoke thus to Kāka, the slave: “Here, good Kāka, eat the emblic myrobalan and drink the water.”

Then Kāka, the slave, thinking: “This doctor is eating the emblic myrobalan and drinking the water, there should not be anything harmful,”³ ate half the emblic myrobalan and drank the water. But he ejected that half emblic myrobalan that he was eating, on the spot. Then Kāka, the slave, spoke thus to Jīvaka Komārabhacca:

“Is there life for me, teacher?”

“Do not be afraid, good Kāka, for you will get well; but the king is violent, that king might have me killed, so I am not coming back,” and giving the she-elephant, Bhaddavatikā, into Kāka’s charge, he set out for Rājagaha; in due course he approached Rājagaha, and King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha; having approached he told this matter to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha.

“You did well, good Jīvaka, in not going back, that king is violent, he might have you killed.”

Then King Pajjota, being well, sent a messenger to Jīvaka Komārabhacca, saying: “Let Jīvaka come, I will grant him a boon.”

“No, master, let his majesty remember my office.”

¹ *olumpetvā*, with variant reading (see Vin 1.390) *ulumpetvā*, *odametvā*, *oḷumpetvā*. Vin-a 1117 explains by *odahitvā pakkhipitvā*, having put in, having inserted.

² *āmalaka*, phyllanthus emblica. The fruit allowed as a medicine at Vin 1.201. ³ *na arahati kiñci pāpakam hotum*.

ON A PAIR OF SIVEYYAKA CLOTHS

Now at that time there accrued to King Pajjota a pair of Siveyyaka cloths¹ which were the chief and best and foremost and most excellent and loveliest of many cloths, of many pairs of cloths, of many hundred pairs of cloths, of many thousand pairs of cloths, of many hundred thousand pairs of cloths. Then King Pajjota sent this pair of Siveyyaka cloths to Jīvaka Komārabhacca. Then it occurred to Jīvaka Komārabhacca:

“This pair of Siveyyaka cloths, sent me by King Pajjota, is the most excellent and loveliest of many cloths ...; no one else is worthy of it but the Lord, the perfected one, the wholly awakened one, or King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha.”

ON EXACTLY THIRTY PURGES

Now at that time the Lord came to have a disturbance of the humours of his body.² Then the Lord addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “Ānanda, the Truth-finder has a disturbance of the humours of his

¹ *Siveyyaka dussayuga*. Vin-a 1117 gives two explanations of *Siveyyaka*: either it means the cloths used in the Uttarakuru country for covering the dead bodies brought to the cemeteries, *sivatthika*, in which case a certain kind of bird taking a piece of flesh to the Himalayas, eats it and throws aside the cloth; then a forest-wanderer seeing the cloth brings it to the king; this cloth was obtained by Pajjota in this way. Or, *Siveyyaka* means that the good women of the Sivi kingdom think, ‘thread is spun from these filicules’ and they speak of a cloth woven of this thread by this name. “Because of this *siveyyaka* means cemetery-cloth in the Uttarakuru country, and cloth produced in the Sivi kingdom”. *Vinaya Texts* ii.190 says “No doubt the latter explication is the right one”. Cf. Pāvā, Pāveyyaka, above, **BD 4.31, n. 2** and Bārāṇasī, Bārāṇaseyyaka, above, **BD 4.389, n. 1**.

Dussayuga means the two cloths, the loin-cloth or *dhoti*, and the upper cloth, which are usually worn by laymen. ² *kāyo dosābhisanno*. Cf. **Vin 1.206** where a certain monk was *abhisannaskāya*, “had a superfluity of humours in his body”; various purgative, were allowed. At **Vin 2.119** some monks also became *abhisannakāya*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.60, n. 6 says that *dosa* “is a disturbance of the so-called humours in the body.” *Dosa* is used in sense of some kind of sickness at Mil 43. At Mil 172 we get *tikicchako abhisanne kāye kupite dose sinehaniyāni bhesajjāni deti*, “does a physician give softening medicines when the body is full of humours and afflicted by them?”

body; the Truth-finder desires to take¹ a purgative.”² Then the venerable Ānanda approached Jīvaka Komārabhacca; having approached he spoke thus to Jīvaka Komārabhacca:

“Jīvaka, sir, the Truth-finder has a disturbance of the humours of his body; the Truth-finder desires to take a purgative.”

“Well now, revered Ānanda, lubricate³ the Truth-finder’s body for a few days.” Then the venerable Ānanda, having lubricated the Truth-finder’s body for a few days, approached Jīvaka Komārabhacca; having approached he spoke thus to Jīvaka Komārabhacca:

“Jīvaka, sir, the Truth-finder’s body has been lubricated; what do you think is right for him now?”

Then it occurred to Jīvaka Komārabhacca: “It is not suitable that I should give a strong purgative to the Lord,” and having had three handfuls of lotuses⁴ mixed⁵ with various medicines, he approached the Lord; having approached he offered the Lord one handful of lotuses, saying: “Lord, may the Lord sniff up⁶ (the scent of) this first handful of lotuses; this will purge the Lord ten times.” Then he offered the Lord the second handful of lotuses, saying: “Lord, may the Lord sniff up (the scent of) this second handful of lotuses; this will purge the Lord ten times.” Then he offered the Lord the third handful of lotuses, saying: “Lord, may the Lord sniff up (the scent of) this third handful of lotuses; this will purge the Lord ten times”; thus, he thought that the Lord would be purged all together thirty times.⁷ Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, having given the Lord a purgative for thirty times all together, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him.

Then it occurred to Jīvaka Komārabhacca when he had gone outside the porch: “A purgative has been given by me to the Lord for all together thirty times. The Lord has a disturbance of the humours of

¹ *pātuṃ*, literally to drink; cf. same phrase at [Vin 1.206](#), where purging drinks are allowed. ² *virecana*. This and three other kinds are held (at [DN i.12](#)) by some recluses and Brahmins to be worldly lore—abstained from by Gotama. ³ *sinehetha*. Cf. *sinehaniyāni bhesajjāni* at [Mil 172](#). ⁴ *uppalahatthāni*. ⁵ *paribhāvetvā*, or supplied with, treated with. ⁶ *upasiṅghatu*, cf. [SN i.204](#). ⁷ Passive construction. Literally: thus will there be for the Lord a purge thirty times.

his body; it will not purge the Lord all together thirty times, it will purge the Lord twenty-nine times, but then the Lord, being purged, will bathe; when he has bathed, the Lord will purge once, thus the Lord will be purged all together thirty times.” Then the Lord, knowing by mind the reasoning in the mind¹ of Jīvaka Komārabhacca, addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying:

“Now, Ānanda, it occurred to Jīvaka Komārabhacca when he had gone outside the porch: ‘A purgative has been given by me to the Lord ... thus the Lord will be purged all together thirty times.’ Well now, Ānanda, prepare (some) hot water.”

“Very well, Lord,” and the venerable Ānanda having answered the Lord in assent, prepared (some) hot water.

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Jīvaka Komārabhacca spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, is the Lord purged?”

“I am purged, Jīvaka.”

“Now, Lord, it occurred to me after I had gone outside the porch: ‘A purgative has been given by me to the Lord ... thus the Lord will be purged all together thirty times.’ Lord, let the Lord bathe, let the well-farer bathe.” Then the Lord bathed in the hot water; when he had bathed the Lord purged once; thus the Lord purged all together thirty times. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, until the Lord’s body comes to be normal, almsfood of juices will be enough.”²

ON ASKING FOR A BOON

And the Lord’s body soon became normal.

Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, taking that pair of Siveyyaka cloths, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord,

¹ *cetasā cetoparivitakkam aññāya*, stock; cf. SN i.103, SN i.178. ² *alam yūsapīṇḍapātena*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.193 translates “you had better abstain from liquid food”. Natural juices, *akaṭṭayūsa*, are allowed at [Vin 1.206](#) as a purgative.

he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Jīvaka Komārabhacca spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, I ask one boon of the Lord.”

“Jīvaka, Truth-finders are beyond (granting) boons.”¹

“Lord, it is what is allowable and what is blameless.”

“Speak on, Jīvaka.”

“Lord, the Lord and the Order of monks are wearers of rag-robcs.² Lord, this pair of Siveyyaka cloths was sent me by King Pajjota; of many cloths, of many pairs of cloths, of many hundred pairs of cloths, of many thousand pairs of cloths, of many hundred thousand pairs of cloths, it is the chief and best and foremost and most excellent and loveliest. Lord, may the Lord accept my pair of Siveyyaka cloths, and may he allow householders’ robes³ to the Order of monks.” The Lord accepted the pair of Siveyyaka cloths. Then the Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Jīvaka Komārabhacca with *dhamma*-talk.⁴ And when Jīvaka Komārabhacca had been gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with *dhamma*-talk, rising from his seat, greeting the Lord, he departed keeping his right side towards him.

Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given *dhamma*-talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, householders’ robes. Whoever wishes may be a rag-robe wearer; whoever wishes may consent to (accept) householders’ robes.⁵ And I, monks, commend satisfaction with the one or the other.”⁶

People in Rājagaha heard: “Householders’ robes are allowed to monks by the Lord,” and these people became joyful, elated, thinking:

¹ *atikhantavarā*. Cf. Vin 1.82, Vin 1.292. See above, BD 4.104. ² Vin-a 1119 says that neither the Lord during the twenty years since his attainment of enlightenment until this event happened, nor any monk, had accepted householders’ robes; all were rag-robe wearers. ³ Vin-a 1119 makes the point that these were robes (or robe-material) given by householders. ⁴ Vin-a 1119 says “with talk connected with the advantage of giving clothes”. ⁵ Cf. Vin 3.172 (BD 1.298). ⁶ *itaritarena*. Cf. Kd 8.3.2. Vin-a 1119 says “with one of little value, with one of great value, with whatever it is”. Thus CHILDERS is, I think, right in understanding the phrase as “whether the robes are good or bad”, see *Vinaya Texts* ii.194, n. 2.

“Now we will give gifts, we will work merit,¹ inasmuch as householders’ robes are allowed to monks by the Lord.” And in just one day many thousand robes were produced in Rājagaha.

Countrysidepeople heard: “Householders’ robes are allowed to monks by the Lord,” and these people became joyful and elated, thinking: ‘Now we will give gifts, we will work merit, inasmuch as householders’ robes are allowed to monks by the Lord.’ And in just one day many thousand robes were produced in the country.

Now at that time a mantle² accrued to the Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a mantle.” A silk mantle accrued. “I allow you, monks, a silk mantle,” he said. A fleecy coverlet accrued.³ “I allow you, monks, a fleecy coverlet,” he said.

Told is the First Portion for Repeating

ON PERMISSION FOR WOOLLEN GARMENTS, ETC.

Now at that time the king of Kāsi⁴ sent woollen stuff⁵ that was worth

¹ *puññam karissāma*. This literal translation best preserves the Indian notion of *karma*, *kamma*, deeds, actions, or working whose result is held to be either good or bad, meritorious or lacking in merit. ² *pāvāra*, or cloak. Word occurs at Ja v.409. Vin-a 1119 says *salomako kappāsikapāvāro*, a cotton *pāvāra* with something woolly—*loma* being the wool or hair of an animal. ³ *kojava*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives a “rug or cover with long hair, a fleecy counterpane”, and CHILDERS “a goat’s hair coverlet of fine workmanship,” (cf. *Abhidhānappadīpa* 312). Vin-a 1119 distinguishes between the ordinary *kojava*, meant here, and *kojava* which is *mahāpiṭṭhiya*, large at the back (?), and says that like a *pāvāra* it is made of wool. Word occurs again at Dh-p-a i.177, translated BURLINGAME, *Buddhist Legends*, i.259, “coverlet of goat’s hair”; and at Dh-p-a iii.297, as *pāvāra-kojava*, translated *Buddhist Legends* iii.96, “cloak and goats’ hair coverlet”. *Kojava* occurs in definition of *goṇaka*, a woollen cover with long fleece, at Vin-a 1086, DN-a 86, Thig-a 253, SN-a ii.325. ⁴ Kāsi was a *mahājanapada*, whose capital was Benares. Vin-a 1119 says that the king was brother to Pasenadi by the same father. ⁵ *kambala*, or a woollen blanket or garment.

half a *kāsi*, being valued at half a *kāsi*,¹ to Jīvaka Komārabhacca. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, taking that woollen stuff that was worth half a *kāsi*, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Jīvaka Komārabhacca spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, this woollen stuff that is worth half a *kāsi*, being valued at half a *kāsi*, was sent to me by the king of Kāsi. Lord, may the Lord accept the woollen stuff from me that it may be for me a blessing and a happiness for a long time.” The Lord accepted the woollen stuff. Then the Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Jīvaka Komārabhacca with *dhamma*-talk. Jīvaka Komārabhacca, gladdened ... with *dhamma*-talk, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow you, monks, woollen stuff.”

At that time various kinds² of robe-material accrued to the Order. Then it occurred to the monks: “Now, what (kind of) robe-materials are allowed by the Lord, what are not allowed?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, I allow six (kinds of) robe-materials³:

¹ *aḍḍhakāsikaṃ kambalaṃ pahesi upaḍḍhakāsinaṃ khamamānaṃ*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.195 has “a woollen garment made half of Benares cloth ...” with note that “our translation of *aḍḍhakāsikaṃ kambalaṃ* is merely conjectural.” Vin-a 1119 says “here *kāsi* means a thousand, a thing worth that is *kāsiya*, but this is worth five hundred, therefore it is called half-*kāsi*; for this same reason it is said *upaḍḍhakāsinaṃ khamamānaṃ*”. The whole passage is obscure. Benares was famous for its silks and muslins, but the stuff sent by the king was of wool. I am therefore following the Commentary’s lead in taking *kāsi*, *kāsika* and *kāsinaṃ* as representing worth, cost or value in the above passage. *Critical Pali Dictionary* under *aḍḍhakāsika* says that it “seems originally to mean a sort of ‘half-muslin’ (cf. *kāsika*), but here taken in the sense of a piece of stuff sufficient for half the people of Kāsi”. See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* under *Aḍḍhākāsī*, the courtesan, for suggestions that she derived her name from the fact that she charged her patrons “five hundred” (i.e. probably *kahāpaṇas*). Pp-a 315 gives the value of brand new, neither new nor old, and worn Kāsi cloths. Ja vi.151, Ja vi.450 says that a garment of Kāsi cloth is worth a hundred thousand. ² *uccāvacaṇi*. Vin-a 1119 says “nice and nasty.” ³ At [Vin 1.58](#), [Vin 1.96](#) these six are called benefits extra to rag-robes. At [AN iv.394](#) the first four are mentioned as forming part of a rich gift. See [BD 2.143](#) for notes. They are, naturally, identical with the six kinds of thread or yarn, [Vin 3.256](#).

linen, cotton, silk, wool, coarse hempen cloth, canvas.”

Now at that time these monks consented to householders’ robes; (but) being scrupulous, they did not consent to rag-robes, thinking: “Only one (kind of) robe is allowed by the Lord, not two (kinds).” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, I allow him who consents to householders’ robes to consent also to rag-robes. And I, monks, commend satisfaction with both.”¹

ON SEARCHING FOR RAG-ROBES

Now at that time several² monks came to be going along a high-road in the Kosala country. Some monks went into a cemetery for rag-robes,³ other monks did not wait. Those monks who went into the cemetery for rag-robes obtained rag-robes; those monks who did not wait spoke thus: “Your reverences, give us also a portion.”

These spoke thus: “Your reverences, we will not give you a portion; why did you not wait?”

They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, you, monks, not to give a portion, if you are not willing, to those who do not wait.”

Now at that time several monks came to be going along a high-road in the Kosala country. Some monks went into a cemetery for rag-robes, other monks waited. Those monks who went into the cemetery for rag-robes obtained rag-robes; those monks who waited spoke thus: “Your reverences, give us also a portion.”

These spoke thus: “Your reverences, we will not give you a portion; why did you not go in?”

They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to give a portion, (even) if you are not willing, to those who wait.”

Now at that time several monks came to be going along a high-road in the Kosala country. Some monks went into a cemetery for

¹ Cf. *Kd* 8.1.35. ² *sambahulā*. ³ At *Vism* 62 cemetery-rags, *śosānika*, head the list of rags from which rag-robes can be made.

rag-robes first, other monks went in afterwards. Those monks who went into the cemetery for rag-robes first, obtained rag-robes. Those monks who went in afterwards did not obtain them; these spoke thus: “Your reverences, give us also a portion.”

These spoke thus: “Your reverences, we will not give you a portion; why did you go in afterwards?”

They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, not to give a portion, if you are not willing, to those who go in afterwards.”

Now at that time several monks came to be going along a high-road in the Kosala country. These went into a cemetery together¹ for rag-robes; some monks obtained rag-robes, other monks did not obtain them. Those monks who did not obtain them spoke thus: “Your reverences, give us also a portion.”

These spoke thus: “Your reverences, we will not give you a portion; why did not you obtain (any)?”

They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to give a portion, (even) if you are not willing, to those who go in together with (you).”

Now at that time several monks came to be going along a high-road in the Kosala country. These, having made an agreement,² went into a cemetery for rag-robes; some monks obtained rag-robes, other monks did not obtain them. Those monks who did not obtain them, spoke thus: “Your reverences, give us also a portion.”

These spoke thus: “Your reverences, we will not give you a portion; why did you not obtain (any)?”

They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having made an agreement, to give a portion, (even) if you are not willing, to those who go in.”

¹ *Sadisā okkamimsu*, Vin-a 1120 gives two explanations: either they all, *sabbe*, went in, or, they went in at one part (or quarter), *ekadisāya*. ² Vin-a 1120 says that “the rag-robes obtained having been distributed to all, they say, ‘We will take them’”.

ON AN AGREEMENT FOR THE RECEIVER OF CLOTH

18.5.1 Now at that time people, taking robe-material, came to a monastery; these, not finding an acceptor,¹ conveyed it back; little robe-material accrued. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

4.401 “I allow you, monks, to agree upon a monk endowed with five qualities as acceptor of robe-material²: one who would not follow a wrong course through partiality, 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 taken and what is not taken.³

18.5.2 “And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon. First, a monk is to be requested. Having requested (him), the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon the monk so and so as acceptor of robe-material. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is agreeing upon the monk so and so as acceptor of robe-material. If the agreement upon the monk so and so as acceptor of robe-material is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The monk so and so is agreed upon by the Order as acceptor of robe-material. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

18.6.1 Now at that time the monks who were acceptors of robe-material, having accepted robe-material, leaving it just there, went away; the robe-material was lost. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I
1.284 allow you, monks, to agree upon a monk endowed with five quali-

¹ *paṭiggāhaka*, or distributor. ² At [Vin 2.176](#) it is said that at that time there was no acceptor of robe-material, *cīvaraṭṭiggāhaka*. One is to be agreed upon by the monks in precisely the same way as above, which was indeed the regular manner for appointing all the functionaries of the Order. Vin-a 1120 says that the *cīvaraṭṭiggāhaka* takes the robe-material which is being given to the Order by the householders. Cf. AN iii.274. ³ For *gahitāgahita*. cf. [Vin 2.167](#), [Vin 2.176](#), [Vin 3.246](#).

ties as keeper of robe-material¹: one who would not follow a wrong course through partiality ... one who would not follow a wrong course through fear, and one who would know what is laid by and what is not laid by.²

“And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon ...” (as in **Kd 8.5.2** reading keeper of robe-material *instead of* accepter of robe-material.)

ON AN AGREEMENT FOR A STOREROOM, ETC.

Now at that time the monks who were keepers of robe-material kept the robe-material in a shed³ and at the root of a tree and in the hollow of a nimb-tree⁴; it was eaten by rats and white ants. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to agree upon a store-room that the Order desires: a dwelling-place or a curved house⁵ or a long house⁶ or a mansion⁷ or a cave.⁸

“And thus, monks, should it be agreed upon. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon such and such a dwelling-place as a store-room. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is agreeing upon such and such a dwelling-place as a store-room. If the agreement upon such and such a dwelling-place as a store-room is pleasing to the venerable ones let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. Such and such a dwelling-place is agreed upon by the Order as a store-room. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this’.”

Now at that time an Order’s robe-material came to be unguarded⁹ in the store-room. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ *cīvaranidāhaka*, the one who lays aside or puts away the robe-material, until it is wanted. ² *nihitānihita*. ³ *maṇḍapa*. ⁴ *nimbakosa*. Cf. **Vin 1.152**. ⁵ *aḍḍhayoga*. See above, **BD 4.75, n. 4**. ⁶ *pāsāda*, see **BD 2.16, n. 5**. ⁷ *hammiya*, see **BD 2.16, n. 6**. ⁸ *guha*. On these five, see above, **BD 4.75**. ⁹ Vin-a 1121 says from rain, mice, white ants, crumbling walls.

4.403
1.285
“I allow you, monks, to agree upon a monk endowed with five qualities as guardian of the store-room¹: one who would not follow a wrong course through partiality ... one who would not follow a wrong course through fear, and one who would know what is guarded and what is not guarded.² And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon ... ‘... The monk so and so is agreed upon by the Order as guardian of the store-room. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this’.”

8.8.2
At that time the group of six monks turned away³ the guardian of a store-room. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, a guardian of a store-room is not to be turned away.⁴ Whoever should turn him away, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

8.9.1
Now at that time robe-material came to be heaped up in an Order’s store-room. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to distribute it by means of the Order that is present.”⁵ Then the whole Order, distributing the robe-material, made a tumult.⁶ They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to agree upon a monk endowed with five

¹ *bhaṇḍāgārika*. Cf. AN iii.274. At Vin 2.176 it is said that there was no *bhaṇḍāgārika* at that time. The Lord allowed one to be appointed, as above. ² According to Vin-a 1122 he should guard against the pests (note before the last above), should close the doors and window-holes in the cold weather and open them in the hot weather to let the wind come in. The accepter of robe-material—whether accepted at the right time or the wrong time, whether given for urgent reasons, whether robes for the rains, rugs, sheets or towels—should give these things to the keeper of robe-material, who should give them to the guardian of the storeroom. Thus, put by in the storeroom, when the time comes, they can be given to a monk as a set of three robes, or as two robes or as one. ³ *vuṭṭhāpentī*, made get up, removed; cf. Vin 4.42.

⁴ Vin-a 1122 says that there are four kinds of persons not to be turned away: an older monk (older than the one who would turn him out), a guardian of a storeroom, an ill monk, one who has received lodgings from the Order. ⁵ *sammukhībhūta*. Vin-a 1123 says “being within the precincts and boundary.” ⁶ Vin-a 1123 says that they made a great noise, saying, ‘Give for our teacher, give for our preceptor.’

qualities as distributor of robe-material¹: one who would not follow a wrong course through partiality ... one who would not follow a wrong course through fear, and one who would know what is distributed and what is not distributed. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon ... ‘... The monk so and so is agreed upon by the Order as distributor of robe-material. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this’.”

Then it occurred to the monks who were the distributors of robe-material: “Now, how should we distribute the robe-material?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having first examined² it, having estimated³ it, having equalised⁴ it, having counted the monks, having formed them into sections,⁵ to arrange⁶ a share of the robe-material (for each section).”

Then it occurred to the monks who were the distributors of robe-material: “Now, how should a share of the robe-material be given to novices?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to give half a share to novices.”

Now at that time a certain monk became desirous of crossing

¹ *cīvarabhājaka*. Cf. *Vin* 2.176 where it is said that at that time there was no distributor of robe-material; one was allowed to be appointed, as above. ² *uccinitvā*, *Vin-a* 1123 saying: examining the clothes thus, saying, “This is thick, this is fine, this is massive, this is small, this is used, this is not used, this is so much in length, this is so much across”. ³ *tulayitvā*, weighed or measured; estimated or assessed. *Vin-a* 1123 says, “thinking, ‘this is worth so much, this so much’, thus determining by value”. ⁴ *vaṇṇāvaṇṇaṃ katvā*, having made it fair. *Vin-a* 1123 says, “if each (monk) obtains one (robe or piece of material) worth ten (*kaḥāpaṇas?*), that is right; but if he does not obtain it, then taking what is worth nine or eight together with another (piece) worth one or two, thus the meaning is: in this way arranging (or establishing) equal shares”. ⁵ *vaggam bandhītvā*. *Vin-a* 1123 says that in case the robe-material cannot be given to each one on one day, then counting the monks by tens, the portions of robe-material by tens, having formed a section one by one, having made one collection (or heap of the material), he says, “I allow you to arrange one portion of robe-material”. When the portion of robe-material is arranged thus, lots should be cast, and when this is done the portion should be distributed among those monks who win the casting of the lots. ⁶ *ṭhapetuṃ*, or to set aside.

over¹ with his own portion. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to give his own portion to one who is crossing over.” Now at that time a certain monk became desirous of crossing over with more than one portion. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monk, to give more than one portion if he gives a compensation.”²

Then it occurred to the monks who were the distributors of robe-material: “Now, how should a share of the robe-material be given: in the order in which they came in,³ or according to seniority?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having made good anything lacking,⁴ to cast lots with kusa-grass.”⁵

ON DYING ROBES

Now at that time monks dyed robe-material with dung⁶ and with yellow clay⁷; the robe-material came to be a bad colour. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, six (kinds of) dyes: dye from roots, dye from stems,⁸ dye from bark, dye from leaves, dye from flowers, dye from fruits.”

¹ *uttaritukāma*. Vin-a 1124 says a river or the wilds. ² *anukkhepa*. Word apparently only occurs here. Vin-a 1125 says it means, “whatever goods are allowable may be delivered in return, may be handed over”, i.e. by the monk receiving more than one portion. It seems like a system of barter. ³ *āgatapaṭipāṭiya*. ⁴ *vikalake tosetvā*. Vin-a 1125 mentions two kinds of deficiencies, that of robes and that of individuals. Deficiency of robes is met by cutting up the robes that are left over into strips, so that the insufficiency is remedied. Deficiency of individuals is when monks have been counted ten by ten into sections, *vagga*, and one *vagga* is not complete, consisting of only eight or nine monks. *Kusa* lots should then be cast. ⁵ *kusapātam kātuṃ*. If the deficiency of robes cannot be satisfied, lots may be cast for another requisite, Vin-a 1125. This would hardly get over the difficulty of inadequate clothing. ⁶ *chakanenā ti gomayena*, Vin-a 1126. *Chakana* allowed at Vin 1.202 to monks who are not ill for use on the body. ⁷ *paṇḍumattikā*. Vin-a 1126 explains by *tambamattikā*, copper-coloured clay. ⁸ *mūla* and *khandha* with *bīja* at Vin 4.34f.

Now at that time monks dyed robe-material with cold water;¹ the robe-material came to smell nasty. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, a little dye-pot in which to boil the dye."² The dye was spilt.³ They told this matter to the Lord.⁴ He said: "I allow, you, monks, to arrange a basin (to prevent the dye from) spilling."⁵ Now at that time the monks did not know whether the dye had boiled or had not (fully) boiled. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to put a drop⁶ into water or on to the back of your nail."

BD 4.4

Now at that time monks, pouring out the dye, upset the pot; the pot was broken. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, a ladle for the dye, a scoop with a handle." Now at that time the monks did not have a dye-vessel.⁷ They told this matter to the Lord. He said "I allow you, monks, a pitcher for the dye,⁸ a bowl for the dye."⁹ Now at that time monks steeped robe-material in a dish¹⁰ and also in a bowl, the robe-material was split. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, a trough for the dye."¹¹

Kd 8.10

Now at that time monks spread out robe-material on the ground; the robe-material became dusty. They told this matter to the Lord.

Kd 8.11

¹ *sītunnakāya*, see *Vinaya Texts* ii.390 for variant readings also Sinhalese edition ii.343, *situndikāya*. Vin-a 1126 says *situdakā ti apakkarajanam vuccati*, cold water means that it is called unboiled dye. ² *rajanam pacitum cullarajanahumbhinti*. ³ *uttariyati*. *Uttarati* is to flow over (of water), to boil over. ⁴ Omitted in text, inserted in Sinhalese edition ⁵ *uttarāḷumpam bandhitum*, variant readings *uttarāḷumpakam*, *uttarāḷavam* *uttarāḷuvam*. Passage is somewhat obscure. *Vinaya Texts* ii.205 has "I prescribe that you put basins (under the dye-pots) to catch the spilt (dye)". Vin-a 1126 reads *uttarāḷuvan ti vaṭṭādhāraḷakam rajanakumbhīyā majjhe ṭhapetvā tam ādhāraḷakam parikkhipitvā rajanam pakkhipitum anujānāmi ti attho. evam hi kate rajanam na uttarati*, i.e. "uttarāḷuva means a round basin. The meaning is, 'I allow you to put in the dye, having placed it middle of the dye-pot, having enclosed that basin; having done this, dye does not spill'." ⁶ *thevakam dātum*. ⁷ *rajanabhājana*. ⁸ *rajanakolamba*. ⁹ *rajanaghaṭa*. ¹⁰ *pāti*. ¹¹ *rajanadoṇikā*. At *Vin 2.120 matikādoṇikā* are allowed; cf. *udakadoṇikā* at *Vin 2.220*.

He said: “I allow you, monks, a grass matting.”¹ The grass matting was eaten by white ants. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a bamboo (for hanging up) robe-material, a cord for (hanging up) robe-material.” They hung it up² by the middle; the dye dripped down³ on both sides. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to fasten it at a corner.”⁴ The corner wore out. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a corner- thread.”⁵ The dye dripped down on one side. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks to dye it, turning it and turning it, and not to go away if the drips have not ceased.”⁶

Now at that time robe-material became stiff.⁷ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to put it into water.” Now at that time robe-material became harsh. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to beat it with the hands.”

Now at that time monks wore yellow robes, (the colour) of ivory,⁸

¹ *tiṇa-santhāra*ka; also allowed at Vin 2.113 to protect bowls set down on the ground.

² *laggenti*, cf. BD 2.130, n. 5. ³ *galati*; cf. BD 2.130, n. 6. ⁴ *kaṇṇa*. See Vin 1.51, where the way in which one who shares a cell is to hang up his preceptor's robe is briefly described. ⁵ *kaṇṇasuttaka*, a thread or line, “a string from corner to corner, a clothes line”, so *Pali-English Dictionary*. This must differ therefore from *rajju*, “a rope”, above, so that possibly *rajju* there is in sense of “wicker”, thus in substance not differing greatly from *vaṃsa*, bamboo. But more likely *kaṇṇasuttaka* means a thread put in at the corner of the robe to prevent the corner from wearing out; previously the monks had hung up the robe-material at the middle, i.e. they had hung it over the *rajju* and *vaṃsa*, so that the dye dripped down at both sides of these. If *kaṇṇasuttaka* were really a “clothes line,” surely the dye would still run down at both sides; but hanging something up by its corner would cause dye to run down at one side only. These allowances seem to be framed so as to prevent drops and splashes of dye spoiling the appearance of the place. ⁶ *na ca acchinne theve pakhamituri*. Vin-a 1126 says that he is not to go elsewhere until the dripping drops of dye have been cut off (ceased). Cf. the same expression at Vin 1.50, Vin 1.53, Vin 2.227, Vin 2.230. ⁷ *patthinna*, Vin-a 1126 says that it was hard from too much dye, too full (of dye). ⁸ *dantakāsāvāni*. Vin-a 1127 says “dyeing them once or twice, they wore them the colour of ivory (*dantavaṇṇāni*).”

not cut up.¹ People looked down, criticised, spread-it about, saying: “Like the householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, robes that are not cut up are not to be worn. Whoever should wear one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

ALLOWANCE FOR CUT-UP CLOTH

Then the Lord, having stayed in Rājagaha for as long as he found suitable, set out on tour for Dakkhiṇāgiri.² The Lord saw the field of Magadha,³ laid out in strips,⁴ laid out in lines,⁵ laid out in embankments,⁶ laid out in squares,⁷ and seeing this, he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying:

“Now, do you Ānanda, see the field of Magadha laid out in strips ... laid out in squares?”

“Yes, Lord.”

¹ *acchinnakāni*, or untorn. See above, BD 4.356, n. 4, and next paragraph below.

² *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* says “a *janapada* (district) in India, the capital of which was Ujjeni ... Dakkhiṇāgiri lay to the south of Rājagaha, beyond the hills that surrounded the city—hence its name”. See MN-a iii.429, Snp-a 1.136, SN-a i.242, SN-a ii.176. ³ *Magadhakhetta*. See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* for suggestion that this was “probably an extensive rice-field which at once caught the eye on account of its terraces,” and size, one might add; see Ja iii.293. ⁴ *accibandha*, as Siamese edition. Sinhalese edition reads *accibaddha*, Vin-a 1127 *acchibaddha*. *Acci* is usually a “ray”, but does not mean that here, see *Vinaya Texts* ii.207, n. 3. *Pali-English Dictionary* says “we should prefer the conjecture *acchibaddha*, ‘in the shape of cubes or dice’, i.e. with square fields”. Vin-a 1127 says *acchibaddhan ti caturassakedārabaddham*, which means “divided (or set out) in square-shaped irrigated fields”. *Bandha* is much more “set out, placed, formed, arranged, united or put together” than the “divided” of *Vinaya Texts* ii.207. The analogy is that the pieces of a monk’s robe are to be arranged or put together (not “divided”) like the parts of the field.

⁵ *pāḷibandha*. Vin-a 1127 says “arranged (or linked, *baddha*) by boundaries that are long in length and breadth”. ⁶ *mariyābandha*; perhaps terraces. The knowledge of terraced irrigation is very old. *Vinaya Texts* ii.208 gives (divided) “by outside boundaries (or ridges)”. Vin-a 1127 says *mariyābandha* is so called because of a short *mariyāda* at intervals. ⁷ *siṅgātakabandha*. Vin-a 1127 says that this is having pierced an embankment, *mariyāda*, with an embankment at the place where they meet, *gataṭṭhānena*; the meaning is, the form of a square, *catukkasatṭhāna*.

“Are you able, Ānanda, to provide¹ robes like this for the monks?”

“I am able, Lord.”

Then the Lord, having stayed at Dakkhiṇāgiri for as long as he found suitable, went back again to Rājagaha. Then the venerable Ānanda, having provided robes for several monks, approached the Lord; having approached he spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, let the Lord see the robes provided by me.”

Then the Lord, on that occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, clever is Ānanda; monks, of great intelligence is Ānanda, inasmuch as he can understand in detail the meaning of that which was spoken of by me in brief, and can make a cross-seam² and can make a short cross-seam³ and can make a circular seam⁴ and can make a short circular seam⁵ and can make a central piece⁶ and can make side pieces⁷ and can make a neck-piece⁸ and can make a knee-piece⁹ and can make an elbow-piece;¹⁰ and what is cut up must be

¹ *saṃvidahituṃ*. Vin-a 1127 gives *dātuṃ*; *Vinaya Texts* ii.208, n. 4, quoting Buddhaghosa, reads *kātuṃ*. ² *kusi*. This and the following words recur at **Kd 16.21.3**.

³ *aḍḍhakusi*. *Critical Pali Dictionary* gives “an intermediate cross-seam” following *Vinaya Texts* ii.209. ⁴ *maṇḍala*. Vin-a 1127 says *maṇḍalan ti pañcakhaṇḍikacīvarassa ekekasmīṃ khaṇḍe mahāmaṇḍalaṃ*, a *maṇḍala* means there is a large *maṇḍala* (seam) to each piece of a robe of five pieces. Cf. above, **BD 4.356, n. 4**.

⁵ *aḍḍhamaṇḍalan ti khuddakamaṇḍalaṃ*, Vin-a 1127. ⁶ *vivaṭṭan ti maṇḍalaṃ ca aḍḍhamaṇḍalaṃ ca ekato katvā sibbitaṃ majjhima-khaṇḍaṃ*, the middle piece is sewn putting together the circular seam and the short circular seam, Vin-a 1127. ⁷ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2984.)

⁸ *gīveyyakan ti gīvaveṭhanaṭṭhāne daḷhikaraṇatthaṃ aññaṃ suttasaṃsibbitaṃ āgantukapaṭaṃ*, a *gīveyyaka* means an added (piece of) cloth sewn together with another thread for the sake of strengthening in the place going round the neck, Vin-a 1127. ⁹ *jaṅgheyyakan ti jaṅghapāpuṇaṭṭhāne tath’eva saṃsibbitaṃ paṭaṃ*, it means a piece of cloth sewn together just in the place to which the knee reaches, Vin-a 1127. ¹⁰ *bāhantan ti anuvivaṭṭānaṃ bahi ekekaṃ khaṇḍaṃ*.

iti pañcakhaṇḍikacīvaren’ etaṃ vicāritan ti, “a *bāhanta* means a piece outside each of the sidepieces. It is thought of thus in regard to the robe of five pieces”, so Vin-a 1127, to which it adds, *bāhantan ti suppaṃāṇacīvaraṃ pārupantena saṃharitvā bāhāya upari ṭhapitā ubho antā bahimukhā tiṭṭhanti tesam tesam nāmaṃ*, a *bāhanta* means, if one puts on a robe of good measure, folding it together and holding up the arms, both ends stand outside the face; it is the name of these (ends).

¹⁰ *bāhantan ti anuvivaṭṭānaṃ bahi ekekaṃ khaṇḍaṃ*. *iti pañcakhaṇḍikacīvaren’ etaṃ vicāritan ti*, “a *bāhanta* means a piece outside each of the sidepieces. It is thought of thus in regard to the robe of five pieces”, so Vin-a 1127, to which it adds, *bāhantan ti suppaṃāṇacīvaraṃ pārupantena saṃharitvā bāhāya upari ṭhapitā ubho antā bahimukhā tiṭṭhanti tesam tesam nāmaṃ*, a *bāhanta* means, if one puts on a robe of good measure, folding it together and holding up the arms, both ends stand outside the face; it is the name of these (ends).

¹⁰ *bāhantan ti anuvivaṭṭānaṃ bahi ekekaṃ khaṇḍaṃ*. *iti pañcakhaṇḍikacīvaren’ etaṃ vicāritan ti*, “a *bāhanta* means a piece outside each of the sidepieces. It is thought of thus in regard to the robe of five pieces”, so Vin-a 1127, to which it adds, *bāhantan ti suppaṃāṇacīvaraṃ pārupantena saṃharitvā bāhāya upari ṭhapitā ubho antā bahimukhā tiṭṭhanti tesam tesam nāmaṃ*, a *bāhanta* means, if one puts on a robe of good measure, folding it together and holding up the arms, both ends stand outside the face; it is the name of these (ends).

¹⁰ *bāhantan ti anuvivaṭṭānaṃ bahi ekekaṃ khaṇḍaṃ*. *iti pañcakhaṇḍikacīvaren’ etaṃ vicāritan ti*, “a *bāhanta* means a piece outside each of the sidepieces. It is thought of thus in regard to the robe of five pieces”, so Vin-a 1127, to which it adds, *bāhantan ti suppaṃāṇacīvaraṃ pārupantena saṃharitvā bāhāya upari ṭhapitā ubho antā bahimukhā tiṭṭhanti tesam tesam nāmaṃ*, a *bāhanta* means, if one puts on a robe of good measure, folding it together and holding up the arms, both ends stand outside the face; it is the name of these (ends).

roughly darned together,¹ suitable for recluses and not coveted by opponents. I allow you, monks, an outer cloak that is cut up, an upper robe that is cut up, an inner robe that is cut up.”

ALLOWANCE FOR THREE ROBES

Then the Lord, having stayed at Rājagaha for as long as he found suitable, set out on tour for Vesālī. As the Lord was going along the high-road between Rājagaha and Vesālī he saw several monks coming along smothered up in robes, having put a mattress of robes² on their heads and a mattress of robes on their backs and a mattress of robes on their hips, and seeing (them) it occurred to the Lord: “These foolish men are turned too quickly to abundance of robes;³ suppose I were to set a limit, were to establish bounds⁴ as to robes for the monks?”

Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Vesālī. The Lord stayed there in Vesālī in the Gotamaka shrine.⁵ Now at that time on the cold winter nights between the “eights”,⁶ in a time of snowfall, the Lord sat down in the open air at night with (only) one robe; the Lord was not cold. As the first watch of the night was ending the Lord became cold. The Lord put on a second robe; the Lord was not cold. As the middle watch of the night was ending the Lord became cold. The Lord put on a third robe; the Lord was not cold. As the last watch of the night was ending, as the sun was rising,

¹ Text reads *sattalūkha*; Sinhalese and Siamese editions *satthalūkha*, rough knife, possibly referring to it as the instrument with which monks cut up the robes; while *Vinaya Texts* ii.209, on analogy of *suttalūkha* in *Kd 8.21.1* below, adopts “that reading here” (see *Vinaya Texts* ii.209, n.10), and translates “roughly sewn together”.

² *cīvarabhisi*. For *bhisi* see *BD 2.47, n. 1*. Mattresses made of five kinds of material are mentioned in *Bu-Pc 14*. *Bhisi* is neither roll, bolster nor mat, see *Vinaya Texts* ii.210, n. 2. ³ Cf. *Vin 1.59* (above, *BD 4.77*). ⁴ *sīmaṃ bhandeyyaṃ mariyādaṃ ṭhapeyyaṃ*.

⁵ Cf. *BD 2.1, n. 1*. ⁶ *antarattḥakāsu*. Cf. *Vin 1.31*, and see above, *BD 4.41, n. 3*.

in the flush of dawn,¹ the Lord became cold. The Lord put on a fourth robe; the Lord was not cold.

Then it occurred to the Lord: “Even those who in this *dhamma* and discipline² are sons of respectable families,³ susceptible to cold, afraid of cold, even these are able to keep themselves going with three robes. Suppose I were to set a limit, were to establish bounds as to robes for monks—were to allow three robes?” Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Now as I, monks, was going along the high-road between Rājagaha and Vesālī, I saw several monks coming along smothered up in robes, having put a mattress of robes on their heads and a mattress of robes on their backs and a mattress of robes on their hips; seeing them, it occurred to me: ‘These foolish men have turned too quickly to abundance of robes; suppose I were to set a limit, were to establish bounds as to robes for monks?’

“Then I, monks, on the cold winter nights between the ‘eights’, in a time of snowfall, sat down in the open air at night with (only) one robe; I was not cold. As the first watch of the night was ending I became cold. I put on a second robe; I was not cold. As the middle watch of the night was ending I became cold. I put on a third robe; I was not cold. As the last watch of the night was ending, as the sun was rising, in the flush of dawn, I became cold. I put on a fourth robe; I was not cold. Then, monks, it occurred to me: ‘Even those who in this *dhamma* and discipline are sons of respectable families, susceptible to cold, afraid of cold, even these are able to keep themselves going

¹ *nandimukhiyā rattiya*. *Nandimukhī* is literally “joy-faced”; cf. Homer’s “rosy-fingered dawn”. Same expression occurs at Vin 2.236. *Vinaya Texts* iii.299, n. 1 quotes Buddhaghosa as saying *nandimukhiyā rattiya ti aruṇadhatakāle pītimukhā viya ratti khāyāti ten’ āha nandimukhiyā ti*, “when the night is joy-faced means, at the time of sunrise the night appears like a face of delight, because of this it is called: when the night is joy-faced”. See also *Vinaya Texts* ii.211, n. 2. ² Vin.1.391 says that “after *dhammavinaye* B inserts *pabbajitā*”, gone forth, as does the Sinhalese edition (B is of course a manuscript.) ³ *ye pi kho te kulaputtā*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.211, n. 3 says “in the text read *ye pi kho kulaputtā*”, but this is not borne out by either the Sinhalese or the Siamese editions.

with three robes. Suppose I were to set a limit, were to establish bounds as to robes for monks and were to allow three robes? ' I allow you, monks, three robes: a double outer cloak, a single upper robe, a single inner robe.'¹

Vin 1.28

ON EXTRA ROBES

Now at that time² the group of six monks, saying: "Three robes are allowed by the Lord," entered a village in one set of three robes, remained in the monastery in another set of three robes, went down to bathe in another set of three robes. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can the group of six monks wear an extra robe?" Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

Kd 8.13

"Monks, an extra robe should not be worn; whoever should wear (one) should be dealt with according to the rule."³

Now at that time⁴ an extra robe accrued to the venerable Ānanda; and the venerable Ānanda wanted to give this robe to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable Sāriputta was staying at Sāketa. Then it occurred to the venerable Ānanda: "It is laid down⁵ by the Lord that an extra robe should not be worn. And this extra robe has accrued to me, and I want to give this robe to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable Sāriputta is staying at Sāketa. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the Lord. He said:

Kd 8.13

BD 4.4

¹ See **BD 2.iX, n. 2**. Vin-a 1128 says that as the Lord kept himself going with four robes, he allowed the outer cloth to be double, the others single; thus there come to be four robes. ² = **Bu-NP 1**, where also the rule against wearing an extra robe and the penalty for doing so are laid down. ³ i.e. **Bu-NP 1**, suggesting that this, or at least the first draft of the rule, had been formulated by the time that this portion of the Vinaya was compiled. ⁴ This paragraph = a portion of **Bu-NP 1** (**Vin 3.195**). ⁵ **Vin 3.195** inserts *sikkhāpadaṃ* (a rule for training) before *paññattam* (laid down).

“But how long, Ānanda, before Sāriputta will come (here)?”

“Lord, on the ninth or tenth day,” he said.

Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to wear an extra robe for at most ten days.”¹

8.13.8 Now at that time an extra robe accrued to monks. Then it occurred to these monks: “Now what line of conduct should be followed in regard to an extra robe?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to assign an extra robe.”²

8.14.1 Then the Lord, having stayed at Vesālī for as long as he found suitable, set out on tour for Benares. Walking on tour, in due course he arrived at Benares. The Lord stayed there near Benares in the deer-park at Isipatana. Now at that time a certain monk’s inner robe came to be torn. Then it occurred to that monk: “Three robes are allowed by the Lord: the double outer cloak, the single upper robe, the single inner robe. But my inner robe is torn. Suppose I were to insert a patch,³ so that it⁴ will be double cloth all round, single in the middle?”

8.14.2 Then that monk inserted a patch. As the Lord was touring the lodgings he saw that monk inserting the patch; seeing (him) he approached that monk, having approached, he spoke thus to that monk:

“What are you doing, monk?”

“I am inserting a patch, Lord.”

4.413 “It is very good, monk, it is good that you, monk, insert a patch.”

Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

¹ Cf. second draft of rule in Bu-NP 1, Vin 3.196. ² At Vin 3.196 an extra robe is defined as “one that is not allotted, not assigned”. Presumably if it is either allotted, or assigned, it ceases to be an extra robe. At Vin 1.297 the three robes (excluding any extra one) are allowed to be allotted but not assigned. ³ *aggalaṃ acchupeyyaṃ*. On *aggala* see BD 2.409, n. 6. ⁴ i.e. the robe.

“I allow you, monks, when clothes¹ are unsoiled,² when what is allowable is unsoiled,³ a double outer cloak, a single upper robe, a single inner robe; when garments are thin from use⁴ a fourfold outer cloak, a double upper robe, a double inner robe. As far as possible an effort⁵ is to be made (to get patches) from a rag-robe, from (bits picked up near) a shop.⁶ I allow, monks, a patch, a means of fastening,⁷ a length,⁸ a marking (with a piece of cloth),⁹ a strengthening.”¹⁰

THE STORY OF VISĀKHĀ

Then the Lord, having stayed at Benares for as long as he found suitable, set out on tour for Sāvattihī. Walking on tour, in due course he arrived at Sāvattihī. The Lord stayed there at Sāvattihī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, she sat down at a respectful distance. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord gladdened ... delighted Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, with *dhamma*-talk. Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, when she had been gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with *dhamma*-talk, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, may the Lord consent (to accept) from me a meal on the morrow together with the Order of monks.”

The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, having understood the Lord’s consent, rising from her seat, greeting the Lord, departed keeping her right side towards him.

¹ *dussānam*. DN-a ii.403, citing this passage, reads *vatthānaṃ* (garments). ² *ahata* and *ahatakappa*, see above, BD 4.356, n. 9, BD 4.357, n. 1. ³ *ahata* and *ahatakappa*, see above, BD 4.356, n. 9, BD 4.357, n. 1. ⁴ *utuddhaṭṭa*, literally drawn out by the seasons. ⁵ *ussāha*, explained at Vin-a 1128 by *pariyesanā*, search. ⁶ *pāpaṇika*; see above, BD 4.357, n. 4. ⁷ *tunna*. Vin-a 1128 says *suttakena saṃsibbanam tunnam*, “sewing together with threads is *tunna*”; it is a means of fastening, hence perhaps a needle, although *suci* is the more usual word. Cf. however *tunnavāya* “needle-weaver”, tailor, at Vin 2.159. ⁸ For these expressions cf. above BD 4.354, and notes. ⁹ For these expressions cf. above BD 4.354, and notes. ¹⁰ For these expressions cf. above BD 4.354, and notes.

Then towards the end of that night a great cloud rained down in the four continents.¹ Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, even as it is raining in the Jeta Grove, so it is raining in the four continents. Let your bodies get wet with the rain,² monks, this is the last great cloud over the four continents.”

“Very well, Lord,” and these monks having answered the Lord in assent, with their robes laid aside let their bodies get wet with the rain.

Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, having had sumptuous food, solid and soft, prepared, commanded a woman-slave, saying:

“Go now,³ having gone to the monastery, announce the time, saying, ‘Lord,⁴ it is time, the meal is ready’.”

“Very well, lady,” and this slave-woman, having answered Visākhā, Migāra’s mother in assent, having gone to the monastery, saw the monks, their robes laid aside, letting their bodies get wet with the rain. Seeing them, she thought: “There are no monks in the monastery, naked ascetics are letting their bodies get wet with the rain.” She approached Visākhā, Migāra’s mother; having approached, she spoke thus to Visākhā, Migāra’s mother:

“Lady, there are no monks in the monastery, naked ascetics are letting their bodies get wet with the rain.” Then it occurred to Visākhā, Migāra’s mother—she being clever, experienced, wise: “But undoubtedly it is the masters, their robes laid aside, who are letting their bodies get wet with the rain; this foolish woman thinks that there are no monks in the monastery, (but) that naked ascetics are letting their bodies get wet with the rain.” She commanded the woman-slave, saying: “Go now, having gone to the monastery, announce the time, saying, ‘Lord, it is time, the meal is ready’.”

Then these monks, having cooled their limbs, being refreshed in body, having taken up their robes, entered (each) his own dwelling-

¹ *cātuddīpiko*. ² As at this time cloths for the rains had not been “allowed” monks could not incur the offence of wrong-doing mentioned at [Vin 3.253](#), for letting their naked bodies get wet with the rain although they had cloths for the rains. ³ *je*, often used in speaking to female slaves. ⁴ *bhante*, or perhaps here “honoured sir”.

place.¹ Then that woman-slave, having gone to the monastery, not seeing the monks, thinking: “There are no monks in the monastery, the monastery is empty,” approached Visākhā, Migāra’s mother; having approached, she spoke thus to Visākhā, Migāra’s mother:

“Lady, there are no monks in the monastery, the monastery is empty.” Then it occurred to Visākhā, Migāra’s mother—she being clever, experienced, wise: “But undoubtedly the masters, having cooled their limbs, being refreshed in body, having taken up their robes, have (each) entered his own dwelling-place; this foolish woman thinks that there are no monks in the monastery, that the monastery is empty.” She commanded the woman-slave, saying: “Go now, having gone to the monastery, announce the time, saying, ‘Lord, it is time, the meal is ready’.”

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Monks, arrange your bowls and robes, it is time for the meal.”

“Very well, Lord,” these monks answered the Lord in assent.

Then the Lord, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, having vanished from the Jeta Grove, just as a strong man might stretch out his bent arm, or might bend back his outstretched arm, became visible in the porch belonging to Visākhā, Migāra’s mother. Then the Lord sat down on an appointed seat together with the Order of monks.

Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, saying: “Wonderful, good sirs, marvellous, good sirs, is the great psychic power, the great majesty of the Truth-finder, in that although the floods are rolling on knee-deep, and although the floods are rolling on waist-deep, yet neither the feet nor the robes of a single monk have become wet,” and joyful, exultant, having with her own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the awakened one at their head with sumptuous solid and soft food, she sat down at a respectful distance after the Lord had eaten and had removed his hand from the bowl. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance, Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, spoke thus to the Lord:

¹ *yathāvihāra*, as at [Vin 4.15](#).

“Lord, I ask eight boons of the Lord.”

“Visākhā, Truth-finders are beyond (granting) boons.”¹

“Lord, they are those which are allowable and those which are blameless.”

“Speak on, Visākhā.”

“I, Lord, want to give for life to the Order cloths for the rains,² to give food for those coming in,³ to give food for those going out, to give food for the sick,⁴ to give food for those who tend the sick,⁵ to give medicine for the sick, to give a constant supply of conje, to give bathing-cloths for the Order of nuns.”⁶

“But having what special reason in mind,⁷ do you, Visākhā, ask the Truth-finder for eight boons?”

“Now I, Lord, commanded a slave-woman, saying, ‘Go now, having gone to the monastery, announce the time, saying: Lord, it is time, the meal is ready’; but then, Lord, that slave-woman, having gone to the monastery, saw the monks, their robes laid aside, letting their bodies get wet with the rain; seeing them, she thought, ‘There are no monks in the monastery, naked ascetics are letting their bodies get wet with the rain’. She approached me, having approached, she spoke thus to me, ‘Lady, there are no monks in the monastery, naked

¹ Cf. above, [BD 4.104](#), [BD 4.396](#). ² [Bu-NP 24](#) and [Bu-Pc 91](#) are both based on the assumption that an “allowance” to use cloths for the rains had already been given. The rule in [Bu-NP 24](#) is against putting on cloths for the rains during all but the last part of the hot weather, for these cloths had become worn out and monks had gone naked during the rains. See [BD 2.134](#), [n. 1](#). [Bu-Pc 91](#) is concerned with the right measurements for the rain-cloths. ³ Cf. [Vin 2.16](#) where the householder Citta invited in-coming monks who were elders to accept a meal with him. At [Vin 2.209ff.](#) certain regulations are laid down for the behaviour to be observed by and towards in-coming monks. ⁴ At [Vin 1.142](#) monks were allowed in the rains, as long as the business took no more than seven days, to visit ill monks; and they might look about for food for the sick, for food for those tending the sick, and for medicine for the sick. ⁵ At [Vin 1.303ff.](#) qualities necessary in those who tend the sick are enumerated. Moreover they are “allowed” to receive the bowl and robes of ill monks who have died. ⁶ In the instructions given at [Vin 2.272](#) for teaching women who wish to receive the *upasampadā*, it is said that the bathing-cloth, together with the bowl, three robes and vest, should be pointed out to them. At [Vin 4.279](#) the right measurements for nuns’ bathing-cloths are prescribed. ⁷ *atthavasāṃ sampassamānā*.

ascetics are letting their bodies get wet with the rain'. Impure, Lord, is nakedness,¹ it is objectionable' I, Lord, having this special reason in mind, want to give for life to the Order cloths for the rains.

"And again, Lord, an in-coming monk, not accustomed to² the roads, not accustomed to the resorts for alms³ is (still) walking for alms (when he is) tired. But having eaten my food for those coming in, (then when) he is accustomed to the roads, accustomed to the resorts for alms, he will walk for alms without getting tired. I, Lord, having this special reason in mind, want to give for life to the Order food for those coming in.

"And again, Lord, an out-going monk, while looking about for food for himself, may be left behind by the caravan, or if he set out tired on a journey he may arrive at the wrong time⁴ at the habitation to which he wishes to go. But having eaten my food for those going out, he will not be left behind by the caravan, nor will he set out tired on a journey (and so) he will arrive at the right time at the habitation to which he wishes to go. I, Lord, having this special reason in mind, want to give for life to the Order food for those going out.

"And again, Lord, if a monk who is ill does not obtain suitable meals, either his disease will grow very much worse, or he will pass away.⁵ When he has eaten my food for the sick, the disease will not grow very much worse, he will not pass away. I, Lord, having this special reason in mind, want to give for life to the Order food for the sick.

"And again, Lord, a monk who tends the sick, looking about for food for himself, will bring back⁶ food for the sick after the sun is

¹ Nakedness was disparaged; see below, [BD 4.418](#), and [Vin 3.212](#), [Vin 3.252f.](#), [Vin 4.278](#). ² *na kusala*, not expert in, clever, skilled. ³ *gocara*, literally a cow's grazing, a pasturage, thus a place where a monk can obtain food, the houses at which food is put into his bowl. ⁴ Cf. [Bu-Pc 85](#) where monks are forbidden to enter a village at the wrong time. ⁵ As above, [Vin 1.120](#). ⁶ i.e. to the monastery.

4.418 right up¹ (and) he will miss his meal.² But having eaten my food for those who tend the sick, he will bring back food for the sick during the right time (and) he will not miss his meal. I, Lord, having this special reason in mind, want to give for life to the Order food for those who tend the sick.

15,10 “And again, Lord, if a monk who is ill does not obtain suitable medicines, either his disease will grow very much worse or he will pass away. When he has made use of my medicines for the sick, the disease will not grow very much worse, he will not pass away. I, Lord, having this special reason in mind, want to give for life to the Order medicines for the sick.

15,11 “And again, Lord, conje was allowed by the Lord at Andhakavinda when he had its ten advantages in mind.³ I, Lord, having this special reason in mind, want to give for life to the Order a constant supply of conje.

15,11 “There was a case⁴ (where nuns bathed) naked together with prostitutes at the same ford of the river Aciravatī.⁵ Lord, these prostitutes made fun of the nuns, saying: ‘Why in the world, ladies, is the Brahma-faring led by you while you are young? Surely the pleasures of the senses should be enjoyed? When you become old, then you can fare the Brahma-faring; thus will both extremes be experienced by you.’⁶ Lord, these nuns, being made fun of by these prostitutes, became ashamed. Impure, Lord, is nakedness for women, it is abhorrent, it is objectionable. I, Lord, having this special reason in mind, want to give for life bathing-cloths for the Order of nuns.”

15,12 “But having what advantage in mind do you, Visākḥā, ask the Truth-finder for eight boons?”

¹ *ussūre*, after sun-turn, mid-day. In **Bu-Pc 37** eating at the “wrong time”, i.e. “after noon has passed until sunrise” (**Vin 4.86 = Vin 4.166**) is an offence. Cf. at AN iii.260 the five disadvantages to a family *ussūrabhatte*, who eat when the sun is right up.

² *bhattachedaṃ karissati*, literally he will make a ‘cut’ in his food. For, since eating at the wrong time was an offence, a monk who could not take his meal during the right time, would have to miss it altogether. Cf. Ja i.156, *bhattachedaṃ katvā*.

³ Enumerated at **Vin 1.221**; conje allowed at **Vin 1.222**. ⁴ *idha*. ⁵ As in **Bi-Pc 21**. ⁶ This passage occurs again in Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 21**, where it is made an offence of expiation for nuns to bathe naked.

“Now, Lord, monks who have passed the rains in (various) places¹ will come to Sāvattthī so as to see the Lord; having approached the Lord, they will ask: ‘Lord, such and such a monk has passed away; what is his bourn, what his future state?’² The Lord will explain this saying: ‘It is in the fruit of stream-attaining or it is in the fruit of once-returning or it is in the fruit of not-returning or it is in the fruit of perfection.’ I, having approached these, will ask: ‘Honoured sirs, was Sāvattthī previously visited³ by this master?’

“If they say to me: ‘Sāvattthī was previously visited by this monk,’ I shall come to the conclusion that undoubtedly cloths for the rains or food for those coming in or food for those going out or food for the sick or food for those who tend the sick or medicines for the sick or a constant supply of conje was enjoyed by this master. On my calling that to mind, delight will be born; from delight, joy will be born; because my mind is joyful my body will be calm; with the body calm I will experience ease; because I am at ease my mind will be contemplative; this will be for me growth as to the sense-organs, growth as to the powers, growth as to the factors of enlightenment. I, Lord, having this advantage in mind, am asking the Truth-finder for the eight boons.”

“It is very good, Visākhā, it is good that you, Visākhā, having this advantage in mind, are asking the Truth-finder for the eight boons. I allow you, Visākhā, the eight boons.” Then the Lord blessed Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, with these verses:

“Whatever (woman), much delighted,
endowed with virtue, a disciple of the well-farer,

“Gives food and drink—having overcome avarice—
the gift is heavenly,⁴ dispelling sorrow,
bringing happiness;

“She gains a deva-like span⁵

¹ *disāsu*. ² A conversation on these lines is recorded at DN ii.91ff. to have taken place at Nādika. ³ *āgatapubbā*. ⁴ *sovaggiham*. Vin-a 1128 says “made for the sake of heaven”. ⁵ *dibba āyu*.

owing to the spotless, stainless way,

“She, desiring merit, at ease, healthy,
delights long in a heavenly company.”¹

Then the Lord, having blessed Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, with these verses, rising from his seat, departed.

Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, cloths for the rains, food for those coming in, food for those going out, food for the sick, food for those who tend the sick, medicines for the sick, a constant supply of conje, bathing-cloths for the Order of nuns.”

The Portion for Repeating on Visākhā

ALLOWANCE FOR A SITTING-CLOTH, ETC.

Now at that time² monks, having eaten abundant food, fell asleep, thoughtless, careless. While they were sleeping, thoughtless, careless, impurity was emitted as the result of a dream; the lodging was stained by the impurity. Then the Lord, as he was touring the lodgings with the venerable Ānanda as his attendant,³ saw the lodging stained by impurity; seeing it, he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying “Why, Ānanda, is this lodging stained by impurity?”

“Now, Lord, monks having eaten abundant food fell asleep, thoughtless, careless ... as the result of a dream; that is why, Lord, the lodging is stained by impurity.”

“Thus it is, Ānanda, thus it is, Ānanda, that when they fell asleep, thoughtless, careless, impurity was emitted as the result of a dream. Ānanda, those monks who fall asleep calling up mindfulness, careful, by these impurity is not emitted; and, Ānanda, those who are ordinary people, passionless in regard to pleasures of the senses, by

¹ *saggamhi kāyamhi.* ² This introductory sentence = **Vin 3.112.** ³ *pacchāsamaṇa;* this was Ānanda also at **Vin 3.10, Vin 4.78,** and below, **BD 4.431.**

these impurity is not emitted. It is impossible, it cannot come to pass, Ānanda, that impurity should be emitted by one perfected.” Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Now as I, monks, was touring the lodgings with Ānanda as my attendant, I saw a lodging stained by impurity, and seeing this I addressed Ānanda, saying: ‘Why, Ānanda, ... (= Kd 8.16.1, Kd 8.16.2) ... by one perfected.’

“Monks,¹ there are these five disadvantages to one who falls asleep, thoughtless, careless: badly he sleeps, badly he wakes, he sees an evil dream, *devatās* guard him not, impurity is emitted. Monks, these are the five disadvantages to one who falls asleep, thoughtless, careless. And, monks, there are these five advantages to one who falls asleep calling up mindfulness, careful: well he sleeps,² well he wakes, he does not see an evil dream, *devatās* guard him, impurity is not emitted. Monks, these are the five advantages to one who falls asleep, calling up mindfulness, careful. I allow you, monks, a (piece of cloth) to sit upon³ for protecting the body, for protecting the robes, for protecting the lodgings.”

Now at that time a (piece of cloth) to sit upon was too small,⁴ it did not protect the whole lodging. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make a sheet⁵ is large as one desires.”

Now at that time⁶ the venerable Belaṭṭhasīsa, the venerable Ānanda’s preceptor, came to have a disease of thick scabs. Because of its discharge his robes stuck to his body; monks laying moistened these again and again with water, loosened them. The Lord, as he was touring the lodgings, saw these monks loosening these robes, having moistened them again and again with water; seeing them, he

¹ = AN iii.251. ² Cf. AN iv.150; AN v.342; Ja ii.61. ³ *nisīdana*. Defined at Vin 3.232. Vin 4.123. See BD 2.87, n. 2. ⁴ Bu-Pc 89 lays down a prescribed size. ⁵ *pac-cattharaṇa*. See BD 2.34, n. 1. ⁶ = Vin 1.202, where *chunam* was allowed as a medicine.

approached these monks; having approached, he spoke thus to these monks:

“Monks, what disease has this monk?”

“Lord, this venerable one has a disease of thick scabs; because of its discharge his robes stick to his body, and we, having moistened these again and again with water, loosened them.” Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, an itch-cloth¹ to one who has an itch or a small boil or a running sore or a thick scab disease.”²

Now at that time Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, taking a cloth for wiping the face, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, she sat down at a respectful distance. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance, Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, may the Lord accept from me a cloth for wiping the face, that it may be for a blessing, a happiness for a long time.”

The Lord accepted the cloth for wiping the face. Then the Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, with *dhamma*-talk. Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, having been gladdened ... delighted with *dhamma*-talk by the Lord, rising up from her seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping her right side towards him. Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, a cloth for wiping the face.”

Now at that time Roja, the Mallan, was a friend of the venerable Ānanda.³ A linen cloth belonging to Roja, the Mallan, was placed in the venerable Ānanda’s hand, and the venerable Ānanda had need of a linen cloth. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ Right measure prescribed in **Bu-Pc 90**. ² Buddhaghosa’s explanations of these words (*Vin*-a 884) are given at **BD 3,98**, notes. ³ Mentioned as a friend of Ānanda’s also at **Vin 1.247**.

“I allow you, monks, to take something on trust when it belongs to one endowed with five qualities: if he is an acquaintance and if he is a companion and if he has spoken about¹ it and if he is alive and if he knows, ‘When it is taken he will be pleased with me’. I allow you, monks, to take something on trust when it belongs to one endowed with these five qualities.”

Now at that time monks had complete sets of the three robes but they had need both of water-strainers² and bags. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a cloth for the requisites.”³

ON THE LEAST ROBE TO BE ASSIGNED, ETC.

Then it occurred to the monks: “Those things that are allowed by the Lord—the three robes or the cloths for the rains or the piece of cloth to sit upon or the sheet or the itch-cloth or the cloth for wiping the face or the cloth for the requisites (of water-strainers and bags)—are all these things to be allotted⁴ or are they to be assigned?”⁵ They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to allot the three robes, not to assign them;⁶ to allot the cloths for the rains during the four months of the rains, after that (time) to assign them; to allot a piece of cloth to sit upon, not to assign it; to allot a sheet, not to assign it; to allot an itch-cloth while the disease lasts, after that (time) to assign it; to allot a cloth for wiping the face, not to assign it; to allot a cloth for the requisites (of water-strainers and bowls), not to assign it.”

Then it occurred to the monks: “Now what is the least robe to be assigned?”⁷ They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to assign as the least robe one that is eight

¹ *ālapita*. Vin-a 1129 says, “If he has said this, ‘whatever property of mine you may wish for, that you may take’”. ² *parissāvana*. Allowed at Vin 2.118. ³ *parikkhāra-colaka*. Cf. Vin 2.118, where the *colaka* did not suffice. ⁴ *adhiṭṭhātabbāni*. See notes on *an-adhiṭṭhita* at BD 2.7, BD 2.121. ⁵ *vikappetabbāni*. See note on *a-vikappita* at BD 2.7. *Vikappana*, assignment, is defined at Vin 4.122. ⁶ Cf. Vin 3.196 where an extra robe is defined as one that is “not allotted, not assigned”. ⁷ See definition of robe (-material) at Vin 3.196 = BD 2.7.

finger-breadths in length and four finger-breadths wide according to the accepted finger-breadth.” Now at that time the made-up rag-
4.424 robes of the venerable Kassapa the Great became heavy.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make a rough darn.”² It became misshapen at the corner.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to pull off the misshapen corner.”⁴ The threads were frayed out.⁵ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to insert a braiding,⁶ a binding.¹ Now at that time the cotton cloth of the outer cloaks gave way.⁷ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make a net-work.”⁸

8.21.2
Now at that time when a set of three robes was being made by a certain monk, there was not enough for all (three) to be cut up (into pieces).

“I allow you, monks, two (robes that are) cut up, one that is not cut up.” There was not enough for two to be cut up and one not cut up.

“I allow you, monks, two (robes that are) not cut up, one that is

¹ According to Vin-a 1129 because of the patches sewn on to the worn places. Kassapa the Great always wore rag-robes. ² *suttalūkhaṃ kātum*. Vin-a 1129 *sutten’ eva aggaḷaṃ kātun ti attho*, “to make a patch only of thread”, so perhaps *suttalūkha* is a rough darn; cf. **Kd 8.12.2**. ³ *vikaṇṇa*. Vin-a 1129 says that when they had cut off the thread as they were sewing, one corner of the outer cloak became long. At **Vin 2.116** *cīvaraṃ vikaṇṇaṃ hoti*, the robe-material became misshapen. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.92, n.7. ⁴ *vikaṇṇam uddharitum*. Vin-a 1129 says that this means to cut off the long corner. ⁵ *okiriyanti*. Vin-a 1129 mentions that the robe fell down, or hung down, at the cut corner. ⁶ See **BD 2.409, n.7, n.8**; and above, **BD 4.354**. ⁷ As at **Kd 15.28.2**. The word translated as “cotton cloth” is *pattā*. *Vinaya Texts* ii.231, n.3 says “we probably ought to read *paṭṭā*, not *pattā*,” and cf. *Vinaya Texts* iii.141, n.6. *Paṭṭā* are perhaps strips of cloth used as braidings and bindings. Vin-a 1129 says *pattā lujjanti* means that the threads put in front of the large *pattā* fall out, and thus the *pattā* give way. ⁸ *aṭṭhapadaka*, perhaps a “patch”, *Pali-English Dictionary* “Net-work” tentatively suggested in *Critical Pali Dictionary* Commentary simply says that *aṭṭhapadakaṃ kātum* means to sew the front of a piece of cloth with an *aṭṭhapadaka*-covering (*aṭṭhapadacchannena*). The word occurs at **Vin 2.150** with *vetum*, and is translated at *Vinaya Texts* iii.167 as “to weave the string across and across”; see *Vinaya Texts* iii.167, n.1

cut up.” There was not enough for two to be not cut up and one cut up.

“I allow you, monks, to insert an extra supply.¹ **But, monks, the whole (set of three robes) should not be worn not cut up. Whoever should so wear it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”²

Now at that time much robe-material accrued to a certain monk, and he was desirous of giving that robe-material to his parents. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Because he is himself giving to his parents, monks, what can we say? I allow you, monks, to give to parents.³ **But, monks, a gift of faith should not be brought to ruin.**⁴ **Whoever should bring (one) to ruin, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time a certain monk, laying aside a robe⁵ in the Blind Men’s Grove,⁶ entered a village for almsfood with (only) his upper and inner robes.⁷ Thieves carried off that robe. That monk became badly dressed, wearing shabby robes. Monks spoke thus:

“Why are you, your reverence, badly dressed, wearing shabby robes?”

“Now I, your reverences, laying aside a robe in the Blind Men’s Grove, entered a village for almsfood with (only) the upper and inner robes. Thieves carried off that robe; that is why I am badly dressed,

¹ *anvādhikam pi āropetum*. Vin-a 1129 says “to give an added (or extra, *āgantuka*) piece of cloth. This may be put in if there is not enough; if there is enough there must not be an added piece of cloth, (for then, what there is) should be cut up”.

² See above, **Kd 8.11**. ³ *Vinipātetabbarū*. Vin-a 1129, “if the parents stand begging in the dust it should be given”. The point is that the robe-material had been given to the monk, and should therefore, unless there is strong reason to the contrary, be retained by him. At all events it was not to be wasted. ⁴ Cf. **Vin 4.286**, where it is “no offence” for a nun to give recluses’ robe-material to her parents. ⁵ “*cīvara* (robe) must here be used for *saṅghāṭi*. See ... section 2, below, where *saṅghāṭi* occurs”, *Vinaya Texts* ii.232, n.3. See **Bu-NP 29** on the laying aside of robes. ⁶ Cf. **BD 2.36, n.3**. ⁷ *santaruttara*. See **BD 2.12, n.1**. At **Bu-NP 2** it is an offence for a monk to be away from his three robes, even for one night, unless there is the agreement of the monks.

wearing shabby robes.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a village should not be entered by (a monk wearing only) the upper and inner robes; whoever should so enter (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**¹

Now at that time the venerable Ānanda, through unmindfulness, entered a village for almsfood with (only) his upper and inner robes. Monks spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda:

“Reverend Ānanda, has it not been laid down by the Lord that a village should not be entered (by a monk wearing only) the upper and inner robes? Why do you, your reverence, enter a village with (only) your upper and inner robes?”

“It is true, your reverences, that it was laid down by the Lord that a village should not be entered (by a monk wearing only) the upper and inner robes, but I entered through unmindfulness.”

They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: “Monks, there are five reasons for laying aside the outer cloak: if one becomes ill,² or if he comes to be spending the rains,³ or if he comes to go to the other side of a river, or if the dwelling-place comes to be secured with a bolt,⁴ or if the *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made.⁵ These, monks, are the five reasons for laying aside the outer cloak. And, monks, there are five reasons for laying aside the upper robe, the inner robe: if one becomes ill ... or if the *kaṭhina*-cloth has been made. These, monks, are the five reasons for laying aside the upper robe, the inner robe. And, monks, there are five reasons for laying aside a cloth for the rains: if one becomes ill, or if he comes to

¹ Cf. Bu-Sk 1–Bu-Sk.4. At Kd 7.1.3, above, among the five *kaṭhina* privileges is included that of going for alms without wearing the three robes. ² Then, according to Bu-NP 2 he has to get the agreement of the monks to be regarded as not away, separated from his three robes, although he is in actual fact separated from them, since he does not feel well enough to go on a journey taking all of them with him. ³ *vassikasamketa*, at the rendezvous for the rains. During the rains monks are allowed to wear cloths for the rains instead of their usual three robes, in order to save these from the damp and wet. ⁴ *aggalaḡutti*. *Aggaḡa* here in sense of “bolt”, not “patch”. ⁵ See Bu-NP 2 and above, Kd 7.1.3.

go outside the boundary,¹ or if he comes to go to the other side of a river, or if the dwelling-place comes to be secured with a bolt, or if a cloth for the rains comes to be not made or imperfectly executed.² These, monks, are the five reasons for laying aside a cloth for the rains.”

ON WHEN A ROBE BECOMES THE SAṄGHA’S

Now at that time a certain monk spent the rains alone. People there, saying, “We are giving for an Order,” gave robes. Then it occurred to that monk: “It is laid down by the Lord that the least Order is fourfold,³ but I am solitary, and these people, saying, ‘We are giving for an Order’ gave robes. What now if I should convey these robes belonging to an Order to Sāvattthī?” Then that monk, taking those robes, having gone to Sāvattthī, told this matter to the Lord. He said: “These robes, monk, are for you yourself⁴ until the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges).⁵

“This is a case, monks,⁶ where a monk is spending the rains alone. People there, saying, ‘We are giving for an Order’ give robes. I allow, monks, those robes (to be) for him himself until the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges).”

¹ When, presumably he must put on his set of three robes. Travelling in the rains was allowed only if the business was urgent and if the monk was not absent from the rains-residence for more than seven days. See **Kd 3** ² Cf. **Vin 3.155**, **Vin 3.225**, **Vin 3.229**, etc., for *vippakata*, imperfectly executed. Cloths for the rains allowed at **Kd 8.15.15**. ³ At **Vin 1.319** five kinds of *saṅghas*, classified by the number of their members, are given together with the official acts that each might perform. ⁴ *tuyh’eva*, just for you. ⁵ See **Bu-NP 1**, **Bu-NP 2**, **Bu-NP 3**. ⁶ Although the preceding sentence ends with *iti*, it appears from the vocative *bhikkhave*, no less than from the *anujānāmi*, just below, that Gotama is regarded as still addressing the monks.

Now at that time a certain monk spent a favourable time of year¹ alone. People there, saying: “We are giving for an Order,” gave robes. Then it occurred to that monk: “It is laid down by the Lord that the least Order is fourfold, but I am solitary, and these people, saying, ‘We are giving for an Order’, gave robes. What now if I should convey these robes belonging to an Order to Sāvattthī?” Then that monk, taking those robes, having gone to Sāvattthī, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to distribute (these robes) to the Order that is present.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk is spending a favourable time (of year) alone. People there, saying, ‘We are giving for an Order’, give robes. I allow, monks, that monk to allot² those robes, saying: ‘These robes are for me.’ If, monks, that monk does not allot that robe-material³ (and) another monk comes, an equal portion should be given (to him). If, monks, the *kusa*-lot was not cast while that robe-material was being distributed by those monks (and) another monk comes, an equal portion should be given (to him). If monks, the *kusa*-lot was cast while that robe-material was being distributed by those monks (and) another monk comes, a portion need not be given (to him) if they are not willing.”⁴

Now at that time two brothers who were elders, the venerable Isidāsa⁵ and the venerable Isibhatta,⁶ having spent the rains at Sāvattthī, went to a certain village-residence. People, saying: “It is long since the elders came (here),” gave food with robes. The resident monks asked the elders:

“Honoured sirs, thanks to the elders, these robes belonging to the

¹ *utukāla*. Vin-a 1130 says “another time than the rains”. At Vin 2.167 *utukāla* stands in opposition to “the three months of the rains”. AN iv.138 discriminates between three seasons: *gimha*, the hot weather, *vassa*, the rains, and *hemanta*, the cold weather. *Utukāla* above doubtless means a time of year that was not the rains, thus balancing the preceding paragraphs. ² See above, Kd 8.20.2. ³ Singular here; plural above. ⁴ Cf. Kd 16.11.3. ⁵ Mentioned apparently nowhere but here, see *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. ⁶ Mentioned apparently nowhere but here, see *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*.

Order, have accrued. Let the elders consent (to accept) a portion.”
The elders spoke thus:

“In so far as we, your reverences, understand *dhamma* as taught by the Lord, these robes are for you yourselves until the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges).”

Now at that time three monks were spending the rains in Rājagaha. People there, saying: “We are giving for an Order,” gave robes. Then it occurred to these monks: “It is laid down by the Lord that the least Order is fourfold, but we are three persons, and these people, saying, ‘We are giving for an Order’, gave robes. Now what line of conduct should be followed by us?” Now at that time several elders, the venerable Nilavāsin¹ and the venerable Sāṇavāsin² and the venerable Gopaka and the venerable Bhagu³ and the venerable Phalikasandāna, were staying at Pāṭaliputta⁴ in the Cock’s monastery.⁵ Then these monks, having gone to Pāṭaliputta, asked the elders. The elders spoke thus: “In so far as we understand *dhamma* as taught by the Lord, it is that these robes are for you yourselves until the removal of the *kaṭhina* (privileges).”

THE STORY OF UPANANDA THE SAKYAN

Now at that time the venerable Upananda,⁶ the son of the Sakyans, having spent the rains at Sāvattthī, went to a certain village-residence. And there the monks assembled, wishing to distribute robe-material.

¹ Mentioned apparently nowhere but here, see *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*.

² *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* says “an epithet of Sambhūta *thera*”. *Vinaya Texts* ii.238, n. 1 thinks he is probably the same as the Sāṇavāsī who took part in the Council of Vesālī. ³ *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* in its account of a Bhagu *thera* thinks that this one “is probably a different person” from the Bhagu of [Vin 1.350](#), etc.

⁴ Or Patna, the capital of Magadha before Asoka’s time. See above, [BD 4.312](#); [DN ii.87](#); *Buddhist India*, p. 262; B.C. LAW, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, p. 10, p. 11; C.H.I.i.189. ⁵ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2985.) ⁶ See [BD 2.42](#), n. 1.

These spoke thus: “These robes, your reverence, belonging to the Order, will be distributed. Will you consent (to accept) a portion?”

“Yes, your reverences, I will consent,” and taking up a portion of the robe-material from there, he went to another residence. The monks there also assembled, wishing to distribute robe-material. These also spoke thus: “These robes, your reverence, belonging to the Order, will be distributed. Will you consent (to accept) a portion?”

“Yes, your reverences, I will consent,” and taking up a portion of the robe-material from there too, he went to another residence. The monks there also assembled, wishing to distribute robe-material. These also spoke thus: “These robes, your reverence, belonging to the Order, will be distributed. Will you consent (to accept) a portion?”

“Yes, your reverences, I will consent,” and taking up a portion of the robe-material from there too, taking a great bundle of robe-material, he came back again to Sāvattḥī.

8.25.2 Monks spoke thus: “You, reverend Upananda, are of great merit;¹ much robe-material has accrued to you.”

“Whence, your reverences, is there merit for me? Now I, your reverences, having spent the rains at Sāvattḥī, went to a certain village-residence. The monks were there assembled, wishing to distribute robe-material. They spoke thus to me: ‘These robes, your reverence, belonging to the Order, will be distributed. Will you consent (to accept) a portion?’ ‘Yes, your reverences, I will consent,’ and taking up a portion of the robe-material from there, I went to another residence. The monks there also assembled, wishing to distribute robe-material. These also spoke thus to me: ‘These robes, your reverence, belonging to the Order, will be distributed. Will you consent (to accept) a portion?’ ‘Yes, your reverences, I will consent,’ and taking up a portion of the robe-material from there too, I went to another residence. The monks there also assembled, wishing to distribute robe-material. These also spoke thus to me: ‘These robes ... a portion?’ ‘Yes, your reverences, I will consent,’ and I took up a portion of robe-material from there too. Thus much robe-material accrued to me.”

¹ Same thing said to him at [Vin 3.215](#).

“But is it that you, reverend Upananda, having spent the rains somewhere else, will consent (to accept) a portion of robe-material elsewhere?”¹

“Yes, your reverences,” he said. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having spent the rains somewhere else, consent (to accept) robe-material elsewhere?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, having spent the rains somewhere else, consented (to accept) a portion of robe-material elsewhere?”

“It is true, Lord.” The awakened one, the Lord rebuked him saying:

“How can you, foolish man, having spent the rains somewhere else, consent (to accept) a portion of robe-material elsewhere? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increasing (the number of) those who are pleased.”

Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a portion of robe-material is not to be consented to elsewhere by one who has spent the rains somewhere else. Whoever should consent (to accept), there is an offence of wrong doing.”

Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, spent the rains alone in two residences, thinking: “Thus will much robe-material accrue to me.” Then it occurred to these monks: “Now, how should a share of robe-material be given to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, give one share² to the foolish man. For this is a case, monks, where a monk is spending the rains alone in two residences, thinking, ‘Thus will much robe-material accrue me’. If he stays half

¹ Cf. Vin 3.66, Vin 4.76f., Vin 4.81f. ² *ekādhippāya*, of which Vin-a 1132 says *ekapuggalapaṭivim̐sa*, one man’s share.

4.431 (the time) at one, half (the time) at the other, half a share of robe-material should be given (to him) at the one, half at the other; or where he spends the more (time), from there is the share of the robe-material to be given (to him).”

ON THE STORY OF ONE ILL

3.26.1 Now at that time a certain monk was suffering from dysentery; he lay fallen in his own excrements. Then the Lord, as he was touring the lodgings with the venerable Ānanda as his attendant,¹ approached that monk’s dwelling-place. The Lord saw that monk lying fallen in his own excrements; seeing him he approached that monk, and having approached he spoke thus to that monk:

“What is your disease, monk?”

“Lord, I have dysentery.”

“But, monk, have you anyone who tends you?”

“I have not, Lord,” he said.

1.302 “Why do not the monks tend you?”

3.26.2 “I, Lord, am of no use to the monks, therefore the monks do not tend me.”

Then the Lord addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “Go, Ānanda, bring water, we will bathe this monk.”

“Very well, Lord,” and the venerable Ānanda, having answered the Lord in assent, when he had brought the water, the Lord sprinkled on the water, the venerable Ānanda washed him over; the Lord took him by the head, the venerable Ānanda by the feet, and having raised him up, they laid him down on a couch.

3.26.3 Then the Lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the monks:

“Is there, monks, in such and such a dwelling-place a monk who is ill?”

“There is, Lord.”

“What, monks, is that monk’s disease?”

¹ Cf. above, **BD 4.420**.

“Lord, the venerable one has dysentery.”

“But, monks, is there anyone who is tending that monk?”

“There is not, Lord.”

“Why do not the monks tend him?”

“Lord, this monk is of no use to the monks, therefore the monks do not tend that monk.”

“Monks, you have not a mother, you have not a father who might tend you. If you, monks, do not tend one another, then who is there who will tend you? Whoever, monks, would tend me, he should tend the sick.

“If he has a preceptor he should be tended for life by the preceptor, who should wait for his recovery.¹ If he has a teacher he should be tended for life by the teacher, who should wait for his recovery. If he has one who shares a dwelling-place ... If he has a pupil ... If he has a fellow-preceptor ... If he has a fellow-teacher he should be tended for life by the fellow-teacher, who should wait for his recovery. If he has neither a preceptor nor a teacher nor one who shares a dwelling-place nor a pupil nor a fellow-preceptor nor a fellow-teacher, he should be tended by the Order. If it should not tend him, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

“Endowed with five qualities,² monks, does one who is ill become difficult to tend: he becomes one who does not do what is beneficial;³ he does not know moderation in what is beneficial; he becomes one who does not take medicine;⁴ he becomes one who does not make clear the disease just as it comes to be to one who tends the sick and

¹ At [Vin 1.50](#) it is said that a preceptor should be tended by the one who shares his cell; one who shares the cell by his preceptor ([Vin 1.53](#)); a teacher by his pupil and a pupil by his teacher ([Vin 1.61](#)). ² From here to end of [Kd 8.26](#) = AN iii.143. The five qualities, *aṅgā* here, are called *dhammā* there. ³ *asappāyakārin*, a doer of what is not beneficial. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives for Mil 215, *sappāyakiriyā*, “giving a drug”. GS iii.110 translates “he treats not himself with physic”, and doubtless that which is beneficial has come to have the sense of medicine, drug. But at [Vin 1.292](#) *sappāyāni bhojanāni* must mean suitable or beneficial meals, and not meals that are medicines, for it comes under Visākhā’s boon called “food for the sick”. There is also *sappāyāni bhesajjāni*, suitable, beneficial medicines, when she is asking to give medicines for the sick. ⁴ *bhesajjāṃ na paṭisevitā hoti*.

4.433
1.303
3.26.6
who wishes him well, saying as it is getting worse, 'it is getting worse', or as it is getting better, 'It is getting better', or as it is stationary, 'It is stationary'; he becomes not the kind (of man) who endures bodily feelings which, arising, are painful, acute, sharp, shooting, disagreeable, miserable, deadly.¹ Endowed with these five qualities, monks, does one who is ill become difficult to tend.

8.26.7
"Endowed with five qualities, monks, does one who is ill become easy to tend: he becomes one who does what is beneficial; he knows moderation in what is beneficial; he becomes one who takes medicine; he makes clear the disease just as it comes to be to one who tends the sick and who wishes him well, saying as it is getting worse, 'It is getting worse', or as it is getting better, 'It is getting better' or as it is stationary, 'It is stationary'; he becomes the kind (of man) who endures bodily feelings which, arising, are painful, acute, sharp, shooting, disagreeable, miserable, deadly. Endowed with these five qualities, monks, does one who is ill become easy to tend.

3.26.8
"Endowed with five qualities, monks, is one who tends the sick not fit to tend the sick: he comes to be not competent to provide the medicine; he does not know what is beneficial and what is not beneficial; he brings forward what is not beneficial, he takes away what is beneficial; he tends the sick in the hope of gain,² not (from) amity of mind;³ he becomes one who loathes to remove excrement or urine or sweat or vomit; he does not come to be competent to gladden, rejoice, rouse, delight the sick from time to time with *dhamma*-talk. Endowed with these five qualities, monks, one who tends the sick is not fit to tend the sick.

"Endowed with five qualities, monks, is one who tends the sick fit to tend the sick: he comes to be competent to provide the medicine; he knows what is beneficial and what is not beneficial; he takes away what is not beneficial, he brings forward what is beneficial; he tends

¹ Stock. For references see **BD 3.12, n. 2.** ² *āmisantaro*. Commentary on AN iii.144 says "expecting (gifts of) robes, etc." Vin-a 1133 mentions that *antara* means *kāraṇa*, and that *āmisantara* means *āmisarṇassa antaram*, gain is his motive. ³ *no mettacitto*, the mind, or heart, not in amity. *Mettā* at some time came to be one of the four *brahmāvihāras*, Brahma-abidings; See MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Sakya*, p.216ff.

the sick (from) amity of mind, not in the hope of gain; he does not become one who loathes to remove excrement or urine or sweat or vomit; he comes to be competent to gladden ... delight the sick from time to time with *dhamma*-talk. Endowed with these five qualities, monks, is one who tends the sick fit to tend the sick.”

BD 4.4

ON INHERITANCE

Now at that time two monks came to be going along a high-road in the Kosala country. They arrived at a certain residence where a certain monk was ill. Then it occurred to these monks: “Your reverences, tending the sick is praised by the Lord. Come, let us tend this monk,” and they tended him. While he was being tended by them he passed away. Then these monks, taking that monk’s bowl and robes, having gone to Sāvattthī, told this matter to the Lord.

Kd 8.27

He said: “Monks, the Order is the owner of the bowl and robes of a monk who has passed away. But truly those who tend the sick are of great service. I allow you, monks, to give through the Order the three robes and the bowl to those who tended the sick. And thus, monks, should they be given: that monk who tended the sick, having approached the Order, should say to it: ‘Honoured sirs, the monk so and so has passed away; these three robes and the bowl were his.’ The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The monk so and so has passed away; these three robes and the bowl were his. If it seems right to the Order let the Order give these three robes and the bowl to those who tended the sick. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The monk so and so has passed away; these three robes and the bowl were his. The Order is giving these three robes and the bowl to those who tended the sick. If the giving of these three robes and the bowl to those who tended the sick is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. These three robes and the bowl are given

Kd 8.27

Vin 1.30

through the Order to those who tended the sick. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this'.”

8.27.3

4.435

Now at that time a certain novice came to pass away. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, the Order is the owner of the bowl and robes of a novice who has passed away. But truly those who tend the sick are of great service. I allow you, monks, to give through the Order the robe and the bowl to those who tended the sick. And thus, monks, should they be given: That monk who tended the sick, having approached the Order, should say to it: ‘Honoured sirs, the novice so and so has passed away; this robe and the bowl were his.’ The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The novice so and so has passed away; this robe and bowl were his. If it seems right to the Order let the Order give this robe and bowl to those who tended the sick. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The novice so and so has passed away; this robe and bowl were his. The Order is giving this robe and bowl to those who tended the sick. If the giving of this robe and bowl to those who tended the sick is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. This robe and bowl are given through the Order to those who tended the sick. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this’.”

3.27.4

1.305

Now at that time a certain monk and a novice tended one who was ill. While he was being tended by these he passed away. Then it occurred to that monk who had tended the one who was ill: “Now what share of the robes is to be given to the novice who tended the one who was ill?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to give an equal share to a novice who tended the sick.”

8.27.5

Now at that time a certain monk who had many goods, many requisites, came to pass away. They told this matter to the Lord. He

said: “Monks, the Order is the owner of the bowl and robes of a monk who has passed away. But truly those who tend the sick are of great service. I allow you, monks, to give through the Order the three robes and the bowl to those who tended the sick; to distribute through the Order that is present whatever few goods, few requisites are there; but whatever many goods, many requisites are there, these are for the Order of the four quarters¹—those who have come in, those who have not come in—they are not to be disposed of,² not to be divided up.”³

BD 4.4

ON REJECTION OF NAKEDNESS

Now at that time a certain monk, having become naked, approached the Lord; having approached he spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, in many a figure is the Lord a speaker in praise of desiring little, of contentment, of expunging (evil), of punctiliousness, of graciousness, of decreasing (the obstructions), of putting forth energy.⁴ Lord, this nakedness is, in many a figure, useful for desiring little, for contentment, for expunging (evil), for punctiliousness, for graciousness, for decreasing (the obstructions), for putting forth energy. It were good, Lord, if the Lord were to allow nakedness for monks.”

Kd 8.28

The awakened one, the Lord rebuked him, saying: “It is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not fitting, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man,

¹ *cātuddisa saṅgha*. For discussion on this see S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, 1924, p. 83ff. Cf. same expression at [Vin 2.147](#). ² *avissajjika*. Five classes of things that are *avissajjiyāni*, untransferable, not to be disposed of, are given at [Vin 2.170](#).

³ *avebhaṅgika*. The same five classes of things that are *avebhaṅgiyāni*, inalienable, are given at [Vin 2.171](#). If a monk disposes of or divides up any of these things he incurs a *thullaccaya* offence, and the disposal or division is reckoned to be null and void. ⁴ Stock in Vinaya. See [BD 1.37](#) for notes and references.

observe nakedness, an observance of members of other sects?¹ It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...”

Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks saying: “**Monks, nakedness, an observance of members of other sects, is not to be observed.**² Whoever should observe it, there is a grave offence.”

ON REJECTION OF GARMENTS OF GRASS, ETC.

Now at that time a certain monk, having put on a *kusa*-grass garment ... a bark garment ... a garment of wood-shavings³ ... a hair-blanket ... a horsehair blanket ... (a dress of) owls' wings ... (a cloak made of strips of) black antelope hide,⁴ approached the Lord; having approached he spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, in many a figure is the Lord a speaker in praise of desiring little ... of putting forth energy. Lord, this (cloak made of strips of) black antelope hide is, in many a figure, useful for desiring little ... for putting forth energy. It were good, Lord, if the Lord were to allow (cloaks made of strips of) black antelope hide for the monks.”

The awakened one, the Lord rebuked him, saying: “It is not becoming ... it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, wear (a cloak made of strips of) black antelope hide, an emblem of members of other sects?⁵ Foolish man, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...”

¹ *titthiyāsamādāna*. Word-play probably intended here; for *samādāna* means both going for alms without taking the three robes with one (cf. *asamādānacāra* at [Vin 1.254](#)), and also adopting, undertaking, taking upon oneself. Here the latter must be meant, for cf. [Vin 1.159](#), where the same phrase is used with regard to the *titthiyās* ‘vow of silence’ *mūgabbata*. ² Cf. [Kd 8.15.7](#), [Kd 8.15.11](#). ³ *Phalaka* is usually a panel, board or plank. *Vinaya Texts* ii.246 and A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Indian Architectural Terms*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol.48, no.3, p. 268 (referring to this passage) take it as a kind of cloth. ⁴ See [BD 1.52f.](#) for notes and references. The story at [Vin 3.34](#) (= [BD 1.52](#)) preceding those of monks dressed in these kinds of garments, is about a naked monk; this itself is preceded by a story of a monk clothed in a layman’s dress. ⁵ (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 2985.)

Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, (a cloak made of strips of) black antelope hide, an emblem of members of other sects, is not to be wom. Whoever should wear (one), there is a grave offence.”

Now at that time a certain monk, having put on (a garment made of) stalks of swallow-wort¹ ... having put on (a cloth of) fibre,² approached the Lord; having approached, he spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, in many a figure is the Lord a speaker in praise of desiring little ... of putting forth energy. Lord, this (cloth of) fibre is, in many a figure, useful for desiring little ... for putting forth of energy. It were good, Lord, if the Lord were to allow (a cloth or) fibre for the monks.” The awakened one, the Lord rebuked him, saying: “It is not becoming ... it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, put on (a cloth of) fibre? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, (a cloth of) fibre is not to be put on. Whoever should put (one) on, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

ON REJECTION OF ALL DARK GREEN

Now at that time the group of six monks wore robes that were all dark green,³ they wore robes that were all yellow, they wore robes that were all red, they wore robes that were all crimson, they wore robes that were all black, they wore robes that were all dyed brownish-

¹ *akkanāla*. *Akka* is the plant *Calotropis gigantea*. Word occurs at MN i.429. ² (This footnote proved troublesome to typeset due to its length, so it has been moved to an appendix with other long notes on page 1859.) ³ *nīlaka*, or blue; see BD 2.408, n. 1, BD 2.408, n. 2. For this sequence of colours cf. Vin 1.185=Vin 2.267, and see Buddhaghosa's explanations at Vin-a 1083. This passage, with the omission of the last item, recurs at Vin 2.267 for the group of six nuns.

yellow,¹ they wore robes that were all dyed reddish-yellow,² they wore robes with borders that were not cut up, they wore robes with long borders, they wore robes with borders of flowers, they wore robes with borders of snakes' hoods, they wore jackets,³ they wore (garments of) the Tirīṭa tree,⁴ they wore turbans. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses." They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Monks, robes that are all dark green are not to be worn, robes that are all yellow are not to be worn ... a jacket is not to be worn, (a garment made from) the Tirīṭa tree is not to be worn, a turban is not to be worn. Whoever should wear (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing."

ON WHEN THERE IS NO ROBE AFTER THE RAINS

Now at that time monks, having spent the rains, and no robe-material having accrued, went away and left the Order⁵ and passed away; and they pretended to be novices and they pretended to be disavowers of the training and they pretended to be committers of an extreme offence and they pretended to be mad and they pretended to be un-hinged and they pretended to have bodily pains and they pretended to be suspended for not seeing an offence and they pretended to be suspended for not making amends for an offence and they pretended to be suspended for not giving up a wrong view and they pretended to be eunuchs and they pretended that they were living in commu-

¹ *mahāraṅgaratta*, Vin-a 1083 saying that it is the colour of a centipede's back.

² *mahānāmaratta*, Vin-a 1083 saying that it is the colour of withered leaves, a mixed colour. ³ *kañcuka*, cf. AN i.145. ⁴ *tirīṭaka*. *Symplocos racemosa*. Vin-a 1135 explains by *rukkhaḥallimayaṃ taṃ pādapuñchanāṃ kātuṃ vaṭṭati*, made of the bark of a tree, one can make a foot-towel of it. Cf. AN i.295 where the wearing of this comes among the practices of the "self-tormentors", or wasters-away. ⁵ This sequence = Vin 1.121 = Vin 2.173. Cf. also Vin 1.135, Vin 1.167, Vin 1.320.

nion, though it was by theft,¹ and they pretended that they had gone over to other sects² and they pretended to be animals³ and they pretended to be matricides⁴ and they pretended to be parricides⁵ and they pretended to be slayers of men perfected⁶ and they pretended to be seducers of nuns and they pretended to be schismatics⁷ and they pretended to be shedders of (a Truthfinder's) blood⁸ and they pretended to be hermaphrodites.⁹ They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: "This is a case, monks, where a monk, having spent the rains, no robe-material having accrued, goes away. If there is a suitable receiver,¹⁰ (robe-material) should be given (to him). This is a case, monks, where a monk, having spent the rains, no robe-material having accrued, leaves the Order, passes away, pretends to be a novice, pretends to be a disavower of the training, pretends to be a committer of an extreme offence. The Order is the owner. This is a case, monks, where a monk, having spent the rains, no robe-material having accrued, pretends to be mad ... pretends to be suspended for not giving up a wrong view. If there is a suitable receiver, (robe-material) should be given (to him). This is a case, monks, where a monk, having spent the rains, no robe-material having accrued,

¹ *theyyasaṁvāsaka*. At **Vin 1.86** it is said that if such a one has not been ordained, he should not be ordained; if he has been ordained he should be expelled. This passage makes it clear that a monk, called a *theyyasaṁvāsaka* in the rule, took on himself the attributes of a monk without undergoing the training, and tried to become a *saṁvāsaka*, one in communion (see definition of *saṁvāsa* in the *Pārājikas*) by theft, *theyya*, of a monk's attributes. Explained at Vin-a 1016ff. ² *tittihiyapakkantaka*. At **Vin 1.86** same is said of this as of *theyyasaṁvāsaka*. Explanation given at Vin-a 1021.

³ Same is said as of the two previous terms, **Vin 1.88**. Explained at Vin-a 1022f.

⁴ Same is said as of the two previous terms, **Vin 1.88**. Explained at Vin-a 1022f.

⁵ Same is said as of the two previous terms, **Vin 1.88**. Explained at Vin-a 1022f.

⁶ Same is said as of previous terms at **Vin 1.89**. Explained at Vin-a 1022. ⁷ Same is said as of previous terms at **Vin 1.89**. Explained at Vin-a 1022f. ⁸ Same is said as of previous terms at **Vin 1.89**. Explained at Vin-a 1022f. ⁹ Same is said as of previous terms at **Vin 1.89**. Explained at Vin-a 1022f.

¹⁰ *paṭirūpe gāhake*. Vin-a 1135 says "if there is some monk who takes (robe-material), thinking, 'I am taking as for that monk', the meaning is that it should be given to him". Vin-a 1135 also points out that among these twenty-three types of men, sixteen do not receive the material and seven do.

pretends to be a eunuch ... pretends to be a hermaphrodite. The Order is the owner.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, having spent the rains, robe-material having accrued, but not having been distributed, goes away. If there is a suitable receiver, (robe-material) should be given (to him). This is a case, monks, where a monk, having spent the rains, robe-material having accrued, but not having been distributed, leaves the Order ... pretends to be a committer of an extreme offence. The Order is the owner. This is a case, monks, where a monk, having spent the rains, robe-material having accrued, but not having been distributed, pretends to be mad ... pretends to be suspended for not giving up a wrong view. If there is a suitable receiver, (robe-material) should be given (to him). This is a case, monks, where a monk, having spent the rains, robe-material having accrued, but not having been distributed, pretends to be a eunuch ... pretends to be a hermaphrodite. The Order is the owner.

ON A ROBE FOR A DIVIDED SAṄGHA

“This is a case, monks, where monks, having spent the rains, robe-material not having accrued, the Order is divided.¹ People there saying: ‘We are giving for an Order,’ give water² to one part,³ they give robe-material to the other part. This is for the Order.⁴ This is a case, monks, where monks, having spent the rains, robe-material not having accrued, the Order is divided. People there saying: ‘We are giving for an Order,’ giving water to one part, they give robe-material

¹ *bhijjati*. Vin-a 1135 says that being divided, like the (quarrelsome) monks of Kosambī, there come to be two parts (or divisions). ² *udaka*. Vin-a 1135 saying that they give *dakkhiṇodakañ ca gandhādīni ca*, water that is *dakkhiṇa* (i.e. either ceremonial, or to wash in) and perfumes and so on. ³ *pakkha*, side, party, faction. Cf. *pakkha* at Vin 3.173 in definition of “should go forward with a schism”; and at Vin 3.175 in definition of “take his part”. See also BD 3.190, n. 3. ⁴ Vin-a 1135 says that “this, *etaṃ*, is for the two divisions of the whole Order. It should be distributed among the two sides after a gong has been beaten”. By “whole Order” Buddhaghosa means that part of it which spent the rains together in the same residence.

to the same part. This is for the Order.

“This is a case, monks, where monks, having spent the rains, robe-material not having accrued, the Order is divided. People there saying: ‘We are giving for a part,’ give water to one part, they give robe-material to the other part. This is for a part. This is a case, monks, where monks, having spent the rains, robe-material not having accrued, the Order is divided. People there saying: ‘We are giving for a part,’ give water to one part, they give robe-material to the same part. This is for the part.

“This is a case, monks, where monks, having spent the rains, robe-material having accrued (but) not being distributed, the Order is divided. It should be equally distributed among all.”

ON RIGHTLY AND WRONGLY ALLOTTED

Now at that time the venerable Revata sent robe-material for the venerable Sāriputta by the hand of a certain monk, saying: “Give this robe-material to the elder.” Then on the way that monk took that robe-material on trust¹ for the venerable Revata. Then the venerable Revata, having met the venerable Sāriputta, asked:

“I, honoured sir, sent robe-material for the elder. Has that robe-material arrived?” “I have not seen that robe-material, your reverence.” Then the venerable Revata spoke thus to that monk: “I, your reverence, sent robe-material by the venerable one’s hand for the elder. Where is that robe-material?”

“I, honoured sir, took that robe-material on trust for the venerable one.” They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: “This is a case, monks, where a monk is sending robe-material by a monk’s hand, saying: ‘Give this robe-material to so and so.’ If he, while on the way, takes it on trust for him who sends it, it is rightly taken. If he takes it on trust for him to whom it was being sent, it is wrongly taken. This is a case, monks, where a monk is sending robe-material by a monk’s hand, saying, ‘Give this robe-material to

¹ I.e. he used it himself. On *vissāsaṃ gaṇhāti*, see **Kd 8.19.1** and **BD 2.10, n. 5**.

so and so'. If he, while on the way, takes it on trust for him to whom it was being sent, it is wrongly taken. If he takes it on trust for him who sent it, it is rightly taken. This is a case, monks, where a monk ... '... to so and so'. While he is on the way he hears that he who sent it has passed away. If he allots to him¹ the robe-material of the one who is deceased, it is rightly allotted. If he takes it on trust for him to whom it was being sent, it is wrongly taken. This is a case, monks, where a monk ... '... to so and so'. While he is on the way he hears that he to whom it was being sent has passed away. If he allots to him the robe-material of the one who is deceased, it is wrongly allotted. If he takes it on trust for him who sent it, it is rightly taken. This is a case, monks, where a monk ... '... to so and so'. While he is on the way he hears that both have passed away. If he allots to him the robe-material of the one who is deceased—of him who sent it—it is rightly allotted. If he allots to him the robe-material of the one who is deceased—of him to whom it was being sent—it is wrongly allotted.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk sends robe-material by the hand of a monk, saying, ‘I am giving this robe-material to so and so’. If he, while on the way, takes it on trust for him who sends it, it is wrongly taken. If he takes it on trust for him to whom it is being sent, it is rightly taken. This is a case, monks, where a monk ... ‘... to so and so’. If he, while on the way, takes it on trust for him to whom it was being sent, it is rightly taken. If he takes it on trust for him who sends it, it is wrongly taken. This is a case, monks, where a monk ... ‘... to so and so’. While he is on the way, he hears that he who sent it has passed away. If he allots to him the robe-material of the one who is deceased, it is wrongly allotted. If he takes it on trust for him to whom it was being sent, it is rightly taken. This is a case, monks, where a monk ... ‘... to so and so’. While he is on the way, he hears that he to whom it was being sent has passed away. If he allots to him the robe-material of the one who is deceased, it is rightly allotted. If he takes it on trust for him who sent it, it is wrongly taken. This is a case, monks, where a monk ... ‘... to so and so’. While he is on

¹ *tassa*.

the way, he hears that both have passed away. If he allots to him the robe-material of the one who is deceased—of him who sent it—it is wrongly allotted. If he allots to him the robe-material of the one who is deceased—of him to whom it was being sent—it is rightly allotted.”¹

BD 4.4

EIGHT CHANNELS FOR THE ACCRUING OF ROBES

“There are, monks, these eight channels² for the accruing of robe-material:³ if he gives on a boundary,⁴ if he gives on agreement, if he gives with an announcement of almsfood, if he gives for an Order, if he gives for both Orders, if he gives for an Order which has spent the rains, if he gives having offered,⁵ if he gives to an individual.

Kd 8.32

“He gives on a boundary: it should be distributed to as many monks as are within the boundary.

“He gives on agreement: several residences come to be equal receivers; what is given in each residence is given for all.

“He gives with an announcement of almsfood: they say, ‘We give it there where the Order’s constant services are done’.

“He gives for an Order: it should be distributed among the Order that is present.

“He gives for both Orders: even if there are many monks (but only one nun, a half should be given; even if there are many nuns (but only) one monk, a half should be given.

“He gives for an Order which has spent the rains: it should be distributed to as many monks as have spent the rains in that residence.

Vin 1.31

“He gives, having offered: conjeys or rice or solid foods or robes or lodgings or medicines.

¹ *Vinaya Texts* ii.253, n. 1 says “The reason of all this is, that if the sender (A) says to the messenger (B), ‘Give this robe to the sendee (C)’, the property in the robe does not pass; if A says to B, ‘I give this robe to C’, it does pass.” ² *mātikā*, as in *Kd* 7.1.7.

³ *civarassa uppādāyā*. ⁴ *simāya*. Buddhaghosa at *Vin-a* 1136 enumerates fifteen kinds of boundaries. ⁵ *ādissa*. Buddhaghosa at *Vin-a* 1144 explains as *ādisitvā paricchinditvā*, having dedicated, having decided.

“He gives to an individual: he says, ‘I am giving this robe-material to so and so’.”¹

The Section on Robe-material: The Eighth

THIS IS ITS KEY

Urban council of Rājagaha, having seen the courtesan at Vesālī,
having gone back to Rājagaha made this known to the king. /
Indeed Sālavatīka’s child was Abhaya’s son,²
known as Jīvaka because the prince asked, “Is he alive?” /
Then he, having gone to Taxila, having studied, very famous,³
dispelled a seven year old disease by treatment through the nose, /
He removed the king’s fistula with an ointment (the king saying),
“Tend me and the women and the awakened one’s Order”.⁴ /
And the merchant of Rājagaha, the tending on the twist in the bowels.
He dispelled Pajjota’s great disease by a drink of clarified butter. /
And office, Siveyya (ka cloths), he lubricated the humours,
the purging thirty times all together with three handfuls of lotuses. /
He asked for the boon of good behaviour,⁵ and he accepted Siveyya (ka
cloths),
and the Truth-finder allowed the gift of householders’ robes. /
Many robes accrued in Rājagaha (and) in the country.
A mantle, and likewise a silken one,⁶ a fleecy coverlet, worth half a *kāsi*, /
And various kinds, satisfaction, they did not wait and they waited,
first, afterwards, together, and an agreement, they conveyed it back, /
Store-room, and unguarded, and likewise they turned away,
heaped up, and a tumult. How is it to be divided? How is it to be given? /
About his own and more than one portion. How is a share to be given?
With dung and with cold water, to overflow, they did not know, /
Pouring out, and a vessel, and in a dish, and on the ground,
white ants, in the middle, they wore out, on one side, and about being stiff,
Harsh, not cut up, laid out in strips, he saw the bundles,
having thought it over the Sakyan sage allowed three robes. /
About another that is extra, it accrued, and then it was torn,
the four quarters, she asked for the boon to give cloths for the rains, /
(Food for) the incoming, the outgoing, the sick,
those who tend the sick and medicine, constant supply,

¹ Vin-a 1145, “he may say, ‘I am giving this to you, honoured sir’, or ‘I am giving this to you and to your pupils’”. ² *atraja*, usually meaning “own son”. ³ *mahābhisa*, variant reading *mahābhañña*. ⁴ *buddhasaṅgha*, in place of text’s (Kd 8.1.15) *buddhapamukha bhikkhusaṅgha*. It is not clear to me whether the king was enjoining Jīvaka to tend the Buddha himself or only the Order. ⁵ *pakatatta vara*. ⁶ *kosika*, replacing *koseyyapāvāra* of Kd 8.1.36.

and bathing cloths, abundant, too small, /
Thick scabs, for the face, linen, complete, what is allotted,
the least, it was made heavy, the comer, the thread frayed out, /
They gave way, and they were not enough, extra supply, and many,
in the Blind Men's Grove, through thoughtlessness,
the rains alone, and during a favourable time, /
Two brothers, in Rājagaha, Upananda, again in two,
dysentery, the ill one and the two, on what belongs to the sick,¹ /
Naked one, *kusa*-grass, bark garment, wood shavings, hair blanket,
horse-hair, and owls' wings, black antelope, and stalks of swallow-wort, /
Fibre, green and yellow, red, and about crimson,
black, brownish-reddish-yellow, then borders not cut up, /
Long, flowers, snakes' hoods, jackets, Tirīṭa-tree, turbans,
not having accrued, he went away,² the Order is divided at all the times, /
They give to a part, for the Order, the venerable Revata sent,
he takes on trust, if he allots, eight channels for robe-material.

Vin 1.31

Vin 1.31

¹ Text and Siamese edition read *gilāyanā*. Sinhalese edition reads *gilānakā*, which I follow. ² *pakkamati*; text, [Vin 1.307](#), *pakkamanti*.

9. THE MONKS FROM CAMPĀ (CAMPEYYA)

THE STORY OF THE MONK KASSAPAGOTTA

At one time the awakened one, the Lord was staying at Campā¹ on the bank of the Gaggarā lotus-pool.² Now at that time in the Kāsi country there was a village named Vāsabha;³ a monk called Kassapagotta⁴ was a resident there, he was attached to the tradition,⁵ he had made an effort⁶ so that well behaved monks who had not come should come, and so that well behaved monks who had come should live in comfort,⁷ and so that that residence should attain growth, expansion, maturity. Now at that time several monks walking on tour among the Kāsi people arrived at the village of Vāsabha. The monk Kassapagotta saw these monks coming in the distance; seeing them he made ready a seat,⁸ he put out water for washing the feet, a foot-stool, a foot-stand, having gone out to meet them he received their bowls and

¹ Capital of Aṅga. Called Campā according to MN-a iii.1 because of its number of *campaka* (white jasmine) trees. ² MN-a iii.1 = DN-a i.279 say that it was excavated by a chief consort (Vin-a 1145 by a woman) called Gaggarā. ³ Mentioned also at Pv iii.1.2. ⁴ This as the name of a monk occurs at AN i.236 and SN i.198. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* suggests that the Saṃyutta one is to be identified with either the Vinaya or the Aṅguttara Kassapagotta. N.B. that here and at AN i.236 he is called “a (the) monk called Kassapagotta”, while at SN i.198 he is called “the venerable Kassapagotta”. The name may be a clan name or a personal one. ⁵ *tantibaddha*, Vin-a 1145 saying “he was fettered by the *tanti* (tradition, sacred text, thread, string) of things to be done (duties, obligations) in that residence”. Cf. *tantimagga* at Vin 1.156 (see above, BD 4.206). ⁶ *ussukkaṃ āpanno*, cf. *ussukkaṃ akāsi* below and *ussukkaṃ karoti* at Vin 4.280, Vin 4.301. ⁷ *phāsu vihareyyuṃ*. *Phāsuvihāra* is perhaps a technical expression, see Vin 1.92 (above BD 4.118, n. 2). ⁸ As at Vin 4.231, Vin 4.310.

robes, he offered them drinking water, he made an effort in the matter of bathing (for them), he also made an effort in the matter of conje, solid food, rice. Then it occurred to these incoming monks: “Good indeed is this resident monk, your reverences, he makes an effort in the matter of bathing (for us), he also makes an effort in the matter of conje, solid food, rice (for us). Come now, let us, your reverences, settle down just here at Vāsabha village.” Then these incoming monks settled down just there at Vāsabha village.

Then it occurred to the monk Kassapagotta: “What was travel-weariness in these incoming monks has abated; further they, who did not know which alms-resorts¹ were appointed,² now know these alms-resorts which were appointed. It is indeed arduous to make an effort all one’s life among strangers,³ and hinting is not liked by the people.⁴ Suppose I were to make no effort in the matter of conje, solid food, rice?” He made no effort in the matter of conje, solid food, rice. Then it occurred to those incoming monks:

“Formerly, your reverences, this resident monk made an effort in the matter of bathing (for us), he also made an effort in the matter of conje, solid food, rice (for us), but now he makes no effort in the matter of conje, solid food, rice (for us). This resident monk, your reverences, is now corrupt. Come now, your reverences, let us suspend⁵ the resident monk.”

Then these incoming monks, having assembled together, spoke thus to the monk Kassapagotta: “Now, formerly you, your reverence, used to make an effort in the matter of bathing (for us), you also used to make an effort in the matter of conje, solid food, rice (for us), but now you make no effort in the matter of conje, solid food, rice (for us). You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence; do you see this offence?”

“There is no offence of mine, your reverences, that I can see.”

¹ *gocara*, cf. [Vin 1.292](#) (above, [BD 4.417](#)). ² *appakataññu*, cf. [BD 2.390](#), [n. 3](#).
³ *parakulesu*. Probably “strangers” because they were not the families who supported Kassapagotta himself, but he went to them for alms for the “incoming monks”. ⁴ Cf. [Vin 3.144](#) ([BD 1.246](#)), [Vin 3.227](#) ([BD 2.79](#)). ⁵ *ukkipāma*. *Ukkhipati* is not to “pronounce expulsion” as translated at *Vinaya Texts* ii.257. See [BD 3.28](#), [n. 4](#).

Then these incoming monks suspended the monk Kassapagotta for not seeing the offence.¹ Then it occurred to the monk Kassapagotta: “Indeed I do not know this: whether this is an offence or is no offence, and whether I have fallen or have not fallen, and whether I am suspended or am not suspended, or whether it is by (an act) that is legitimate² or that is not legitimate, or by (one) that is reversible³ or that is irreversible, or by (one) that is fit to stand⁴ or that is not fit to stand. Suppose that I, having gone to Campā, were to ask the Lord about this matter?”

Then the monk Kassapagotta, having packed away his lodging, taking his bowl and robe, set out for Campā; in due course he approached Campā and the Lord. Having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. Now it is the custom for awakened ones, for lords to exchange friendly greetings with incoming monks. So the Lord spoke thus to the monk Kassapagotta: “I hope, monk, that things went well with you, I hope you had enough to support life, I hope you have come on the journey with but little fatigue. But where, monk, have you come from?”

“Things did go well with me, Lord, I had enough to support life, Lord, and I, Lord, came on the journey with but little fatigue.

“There is, Lord, in the Kāsi country a village called Vāsabha. I, Lord, a resident there, attached to the tradition, had made an effort so that well behaved monks who had not come should come, and so that well behaved monks who had come should live in comfort, and so that that residence should attain growth, expansion, maturity. Then, Lord, several monks walking on tour among the people of Kāsi arrived at the village of Vāsabha. I, Lord, saw those monks coming in the distance; seeing them I made ready a seat ... Then, Lord, it occurred to these incoming monks: ‘Good indeed is this resident monk ...’ ... Then, Lord, these incoming monks settled down, just

¹ Cf. *Kd* 11.25-30. ² *dhammika*; cf. *Vin* 4.284-Vin.4.285; cf. “definition” of *dhammikakamma* at *Vin* 4.152; and see below, *BD* 4.453 (*adhammikakamma*). Possibly *kamma* is omitted above unintentionally. ³ *Kuppa*; cf. *Vin* 4.153. ⁴ *ṭhānāraha*. These three expressions, and their opposites occur at *Vin* 1.111 (above, *BD* 4.146).

there in Vāsabha village. Then, Lord, it occurred to me: ‘... Suppose I were to make no effort in ... the matter of conje, solid food, rice (for them)?’ So then I made no effort ... Then, Lord, these incoming monks, having assembled together, spoke thus to me: ‘Now, formerly, your reverence ... Do you see this offence?’ Then, Lord, these incoming monks suspended me for not seeing the offence. Then, Lord, it occurred to me: ‘Indeed I do not know ... Suppose that I, having gone to Campā, were to ask the Lord about this matter?’ That is why, Lord, I have come.”

“This is no offence, monk, this is not an offence; you are unfallen, you have not fallen; you are unsuspending, you were not suspended; you were suspended by a (formal) act that was not legitimate, that was reversible, that was not fit to stand. Go you, monk, settle down there at Vāsabha village.”

“Very well, Lord,” and the monk Kassapagotta having answered the Lord in assent, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, keeping his right side towards him, set out for Vāsabha village.

Then these incoming monks became doubtful, they became remorseful. They thought: “Indeed it was unprofitable for us, indeed it was not profitable for us, indeed it was ill-gotten by us, indeed it was not well-gotten by us, that we suspended a pure¹ monk, not an offender, without cause, without reason. Come now, your reverences, having gone to Campā, let us confess the transgression as a transgression to the Lord.” Then these incoming monks, having packed away their lodgings, taking their bowls and robes, set out for Campā; in due course they approached Campā and the Lord. Having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. Now it is the custom for awakened ones, for lords to exchange friendly greetings with incoming monks. So the Lord spoke thus to those monks: “I hope, monks, that things went well with you, I hope you had enough to support life, I hope you have come on the

¹ *suddha* in such a connection means that a monk has committed no offences, or that if he has he has confessed them, and so is “pure” to take his place at the Pātimokkha recitation; Cf. [Vin 1.114](#) (above, [BD 4.151](#)), and epilogue to each class of rules in the *Vibhaṅgas*.

journey with but little fatigue. But where, monks, have you come from?”

“Things have gone well with us, Lord, we had enough to support life, Lord, and we came on the journey. Lord, with but little fatigue. There is, Lord, in the Kāsi country a village called Vāsabha. We come from there, Lord.”

“Did you, monks, suspend a resident monk?”

“Yes, Lord.”

“For what cause, monks, for what reason?”

“There was no cause, Lord, no reason.” The awakened one, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“It is not fitting, monks, it is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish men, suspend a pure monk, not an offender, without cause, without reason? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” and having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a pure monk, not an offender, is not to be suspended without cause, without reason. Whoever should suspend one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Then these monks, rising from their seats, having arranged their upper robes over one shoulder, having inclined their heads towards the Lord’s feet, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, a transgression has overcome us,¹ in that we, foolish, misguided, wrong that we were, suspended a pure monk, not an offender, without cause, without reason. Lord, let the Lord acknowledge our transgression as a transgression for the sake of restraint in the future.”

“Truly, monks, a transgression has overcome you, in that you, foolish, misguided, wrong that you were, suspended a pure monk, not an offender, without cause, without reason. But if you, monks, having seen the transgression as a transgression, confess according to the rule, we acknowledge it for you; for, monks, in the discipline for an *ariyan* this is growth: whoever having seen a transgression as

¹ Cf. Vin 4.18-Vin.4.19, and see BD 2.200, notes.

a transgression confesses it according to the rule, he attains restraint in the future.”

ON AN ACT NOT BY RULE IN AN INCOMPLETE ASSEMBLY, ETC.

Now at that time at Campā monks carried out (formal) acts like these: they carried out a (formal) act not by rule, in an incomplete assembly, they carried out a (formal) act not by rule, in a complete assembly, they carried out a (formal) act by a rule, in an incomplete assembly, they carried out a (formal) act, by what had the appearance of a rule, in an incomplete assembly, they carried out a (formal) act by what had the appearance of a rule, in a complete assembly; and one¹ suspended one and one suspended two and one suspended several and one suspended an Order, and two suspended one and two suspended two and two suspended several and two suspended an Order, and several suspended one and several suspended two and several suspended several and several suspended an Order, and an Order suspended an Order.²

Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these monks at Campā carry out (formal) acts like these? How can they carry out a (formal) act by rule, in an incomplete assembly? ... How can they carry out a (formal) act by what has the appearance of a rule, in a complete assembly? And how can one suspend one ... and how can an Order suspend an Order?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks at Campā carry out (formal) acts like these? Do they carry out a (formal) act not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... and does an Order suspend an Order?”

“It is true, Lord.” The awakened one, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“Monks, it is not fitting in these foolish men, it is not becoming, it

¹ I.e. an individual monk. ² See *Vinaya Texts* ii.262, n.

is not suitable, it is unworthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How, monks, can these foolish men carry out (formal) acts like these? How can they carry out a (formal) act not by rule, in an incomplete assembly? ... and how can an Order suspend an Order? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“If, monks, a (formal) act is carried out not by rule, in an incomplete assembly, it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out. A (formal) act carried out not by rule, in a complete assembly, is not a formal act and ought not to be carried out ... A (formal) act carried out by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly, is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out; and if one suspends one it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out ... and if an Order suspends an Order it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.

“Monks, there are these four (formal) acts: a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule, in an incomplete assembly; a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule in a complete assembly; a (formal) act (carried out) by rule in an incomplete assembly; a (formal) act (carried out) by rule in a complete assembly. Herein, monks, that which is a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule, in an incomplete assembly, this (formal) act, monks, because it lacks reference to rule,¹ because of the incompleteness² (of the assembly), is reversible, is not fit to stand. Monks, a (formal) act like this should not be carried out, and a (formal) act like this is not allowed by me. Herein, monks, that which is a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule, in a complete assembly, this (formal) act, monks, because it lacks reference to rule, is reversible, is not fit to stand ... and a (formal) act like this is not allowed by me. Herein, monks, that which is a (formal) act (carried out) by rule, in an incomplete assembly, this (formal) act, monks, because of the incompleteness (of the assembly), is reversible ... is not allowed by me. Herein, monks, that which is a (formal) act (carried out) by rule,

¹ *adhammattā*, not “wickedness” as *Critical Pali Dictionary* gives. ² *vaggattā*.

in a complete assembly, this (formal) act, monks, because it has reference to rule, because of the completeness (of the assembly), is irreversible, it is fit to stand. Monks, a (formal) act like this may be carried out and a (formal) act like this is allowed by me. Therefore, monks, thinking: ‘We will carry out a (formal) act like this, that is to say by rule, in a complete assembly’—it is thus that you must train yourselves.”

ON AN ACT WITHOUT A MOTION, ETC.

Now at that time the group of six monks carried out (formal) acts like these: they carried out a (formal) act not by rule in an incomplete assembly; they carried out a (formal) act not by rule in a complete assembly; they carried out a (formal) act by rule in an incomplete assembly; they carried out a (formal) act by what had the appearance of a rule in an incomplete assembly; they carried out a (formal) act by what had the appearance of a rule in a complete assembly; they also carried out a (formal) act for which a motion had not been furnished¹ although a proclamation had been furnished;² they also carried out a (formal) act for which a proclamation had not been furnished although a motion had been furnished; they also carried out a (formal) act for which a motion had not been furnished and for which a proclamation had not been furnished; they also carried out a (formal) act that was against the rule; they also carried out a (formal) act that was against discipline;³ they also carried out a (formal) act that was against the Teacher’s instruction;⁴ they also carried out a (formal) act that had been protested against,⁵ that was

¹ *ñattivipanna*. ² *anussāvanasampanna*, i.e. a proclamation of a *kammavācā*, the resolution. See S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 150. ³ Vin-a 1146 says that discipline here means “reproving, making (someone) remember”, i.e. giving the person against whom one is about to carry out a formal act a chance to confess his offence.

⁴ Vin-a 1146 says that this provides for a motion and a proclamation.

⁵ *paṭikuṭṭhakata*. Vin-a 1146 says that it was protested against (*paṭikuṭṭha*) but was also carried out (*kata*)—it was carried out in spite of the protests of others. See *paṭikkosati* at beginning of Bu-Pc 79, where the monks protest when a formal act is being carried out.

not legitimate, reversible, not fit to stand. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can this group of six monks carry out (formal) acts like these? How can they carry out a (formal) act not by rule in an incomplete assembly? ... How can they carry out a (formal) act that has been protested against, that is not legitimate,¹ reversible, not fit to stand?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks carried out (formal) acts like these; that they carried out a (formal) act not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... a (formal) act that has been protested against, that is not legitimate, reversible, not fit to stand?”

“It is true, Lord.” ... Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule, in an incomplete assembly, is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out ... A (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of a rule in a complete assembly is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out. Monks, a (formal) act for which a motion is not furnished, although a proclamation is furnished, is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out. Monks, a (formal) act for which a proclamation is furnished, although a motion is not furnished, is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out. Monks, a (formal) act for which a motion is not furnished and for which a proclamation is not furnished, is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out. Monks, a (formal) act carried out against the rule ... against the discipline ... against the Teacher’s instruction is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out. Monks, a (formal) act that has been protested against, that is not legitimate, reversible, not fit to stand, is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.

“Monks, there are these six (formal) acts: a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule, a (formal) act (carried out) in an incomplete assembly, a (formal) act (carried out) in a complete assembly, a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of rule in an incomplete

¹ Omitted in Oldenberg’s text, but contained in the Sinhalese edition.

assembly, a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of rule in a complete assembly, a (formal) act (carried out) by rule in a complete assembly.

“And what, monks, is a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule? If, monks, when it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution,¹ one carries out the (formal) act by means of the one motion but does not proclaim the resolution, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule. If, monks, when it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution, one carries out the (formal) act by means of two motions but does not proclaim the resolution, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule. If, monks, when it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution, one carries out the (formal) act by means of the one resolution but does not propose the motion, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule. If, monks, when it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution, one carries out the (formal) act by means of two resolutions but does not propose the motion, it is a (formal) act carried out not by rule.

“If, monks, when it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution to be put three times,² one carries out the (formal) act by means of one motion but does not proclaim the resolution, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule. If monks, when it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution to be put three times, one carries out the (formal) act by means of two motions ... three motions ... four motions but does not proclaim the resolution, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule. If, monks, when it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution to be put three times, one carries out the (formal) act by means of one proclamation ... two proclamations ... three proclamations ... four proclamations, but does not propose the motion, then it is a (formal) act carried out not by rule. This, monks, is called a (formal) act (carried out) not by rule.

¹ *ñattidutiya*. This is a formal act in two parts, the motion, *ñatti*, being the first; the second part, *dutiya*, which consists of one proclamation, has to be made before the decision of an Order can be arrived at. ² *ñatticatuttha*, a formal act in four parts: the motion, and then the resolution, but this has to be proclaimed not once, but three times, have no neat expressions for such procedure.

“And what, monks, is a (formal) act (carried out) in an incomplete assembly? If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution, and as many monks as are entitled (to take part in the formal) act¹ are not come, if the leave for absence of those fit (to declare their) leave of absence is not sent, if those who are present protest, it is a (formal) act in an incomplete assembly. If, monks, ... as many monks as are entitled (to take part in the formal) act are come, if the leave for absence ... is not sent, if those who are present protest, it is a (formal) act in an incomplete assembly. If, monks, ... as many monks as are entitled (to take part in the formal) act are come, if the leave for absence of those fit (to declare their) leave for absence is sent, if those who are present protest, it is a (formal) act (carried out) in an incomplete assembly.

“If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution put three times ... (*the same three cases as above are repeated here*) ... it is a (formal) act in an incomplete assembly. This, monks, is called a (formal) act (carried out) in an incomplete assembly.

“And what, monks, is a (formal) act (carried out) in a complete assembly? If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution, and as many monks as are (entitled to take part in the formal) act are come, if the leave for absence of those fit (to declare their) leave for absence is sent, if those who are present do not protest, it is a (formal) act (carried out) in a complete assembly.

“If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution to be put three times ... (*the same three cases as above are repeated here*) ... it is a (formal) act (carried out) in a complete assembly. This, monks, is called a (formal) act (carried out) in a complete assembly.

“And what, monks, is a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly? If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution, and one first proclaims the resolution and afterwards proposes the motion, if as many monks as are entitled (to take part in a formal) act have not come, if the leave for absence of those fit (to declare their) leave for absence is not sent,

¹ *kammappatta*.

if those who are present protest, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly.

“If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution, and one first proclaims the resolution and afterwards proposes the motion, if as many monks as are entitled (to take part in the formal) act have come, if the leave of absence ... is not sent, if those who are present protest, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly.

“If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution, and one first proclaims the resolution and afterwards proposes the motion, if as many monks as are entitled (to take part in the formal) act have come, if the leave for absence of those (fit to declare) leave for absence is sent , if those who are present protest, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly.

“If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution to be put three times ... (*the same three cases as above are repeated here*) ... This, monks, is called a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly.

“And what, monks, is a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly? If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution, and one first proclaims the resolution and afterwards proposes the motion, if as many monks as are entitled (to take part in the formal) act have come, if the leave of absence of those fit (to declare their) leave of absence is sent, if those who are present do not protest, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly.

“If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution to be put three times ... (*the same as above is repeated here*) ... it is a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of the rule in a complete assembly. This, monks, is called a (formal) act (carried out) by what has the appearance of rule in a complete assembly.

“And what, monks, is a (formal) act (carried out) by rule in a complete assembly? If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion

Vin 1,31

Kd 9,3-

BD 4,4

Kd 9,3-

and a resolution, and if one first proposes the motion and after one resolution carries out the (formal) act, if as many monks are entitled (to take part in the formal) act have come, if the leave of absence of those fit (to declare their) leave of absence is sent, if those who are present do not protest, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) by rule in a complete assembly.

“If, monks, it is a (formal) act with a motion and a resolution to be put three times, and if one first proposes the motion and after (having put) the resolution three times, carries out the (formal) act, if as many monks as are entitled (to take part in the formal) act have come, if the leave of absence of those who are fit (to declare their) leave of absence is sent, if those who are present do not protest, then it is a (formal) act (carried out) by rule, in a complete assembly. This, monks, is called a (formal) act (carried out) by rule, in a complete assembly.¹

CARRYING OUT BY A FOURFOLD ORDER, ETC.

^{19.4.1} “Five (kinds of) Orders: a fourfold Order of monks, a fivefold Order of monks, a tenfold Order of monks, a twentyfold Order of monks, an Order of monks that is more than twenty-fold. In the case, monks, of an Order of monks being fourfold, it is entitled (to take part) in all (formal) acts, if by rule, if it is complete, excepting three (formal) acts: ordination,² invitation,³ rehabilitation.⁴ In the case, monks, of an Order of monks being fivefold, it is entitled (to take part) in all (formal) acts, if by rule, if it is complete, excepting two (formal) acts: ordination in the middle districts,⁵ rehabilitation. In the case, monks, of an Order of monks being tenfold, it is entitled (to take part) in

¹ Oldenberg’s edition omits this last sentence. It is contained, rightly, in the Sinhalese edition. ² See [Vin 1.58](#). At [Vin 4.130](#) if a monk wants to ordain an individual and looks about for a group, he incurs an offence of wrong-doing. ³ See [Kd 4.5.2](#) where monks, if they number only four, are allowed to invite one another, but where they are five ([Kd 4.5.1](#)) they should invite in an Order. ⁴ See [BD 3.28, n. 4](#), and also [BD 1.328](#). ⁵ In bordering districts a “group” (i.e. here four monks) may ordain with an expert on Vinaya as the fifth officiating monk, [Vin 1.197](#).

all (formal) acts, if by rule, if it is complete, excepting one (formal) act: rehabilitation. In the case, monks of an Order of monks being twentyfold, it is entitled (to take part) in all (formal) acts, if by rule, if it is complete. In the case, monks, of an Order of monks being more than twentyfold, it is entitled (to take part) in all (formal) acts, if by rule, if it is complete.

Vin 1.32

CARRYING OUT BY A FOURFOLD (ORDER)

“If, monks, a fourfold Order, carrying out a (formal) act, should carry out the (formal) act with a nun as the fourth (member), then it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out. If, monks, a fourfold Order, carrying out a (formal) act, should carry out the (formal) act with a probationer as the fourth (member) ... with a novice ... with a woman novice ... with a disavower of the training¹ ... with one who has committed an extreme offence ... with one who is suspended for not seeing an offence ... with one who is suspended for not making amends for an offence ... with one who is suspended for not giving up a wrong view ... with a eunuch ... with one living in communion as it were by theft² ... with one who has gone over to a sect³ ... with an animal ... with a matricide ... with a parricide ... with a slayer of ones perfected ... with a seducer of a nun ... with a schismatic ... with a shedder of (a *tathāgata*’s) blood ... with a hermaphrodite ... with one belonging to a different communion ... with one staying in a different boundary ... with one standing above the ground⁴ by psychic potency ... with one against whom an Order is carrying out a (formal) act as the fourth (member), it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.

Kd 9.4.

BD 4.4

CARRYING OUT BY A FIVEFOLD (ORDER)

“If, monks, a fivefold (Order), carrying out a (formal) act, should carry out the (formal) act with a nun as the fifth (member) ... with one against whom the Order is carrying out a (formal) act as the fifth (member), it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.

Kd 9.4.

CARRYING OUT BY A TENFOLD (ORDER)

^{9.4.4} “If, monks, a tenfold (Order), carrying out a (formal) act, should carry out the (formal) act with a nun as the tenth (member) ... with one against whom the Order is carrying out a (formal) act as the tenth (member), it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.

CARRYING OUT BY A TWENTYFOLD (ORDER)

^{9.4.5} “If, monks, a twentyfold Order, carrying out a (formal) act, should carry out the (formal) act with a nun as the twentieth (member) ... with one against whom the Order is carrying out a (formal) act as the twentieth (member), it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.

ON ONE ON PROBATION, ETC.

^{9.4.6} “If, monks, one on probation as the fourth (member) should grant probation,¹ should send back to the beginning, should inflict *mānatta*, if he, as the twentieth (member), should rehabilitate, it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.

“If, monks, one deserving to be sent back to the beginning as the fourth (member) should grant probation, should send back to the

¹ For the following sequence of terms, down to hermaphrodite, cf. [Vin 1.121](#). [Vin 1.135](#), [Vin 1.167](#), and above, [BD 4.160](#). ² At [Vin 1.86](#) not to be ordained. ³ At [Vin 1.86](#) not to be ordained. ⁴ On *vehāsa*, as “above the ground”, see [BD 1.79, n. 5](#). ¹ All these constitute part of the penalty for committing a Sānghadisesa offence. Those undergoing the penalty cannot inflict it on others, nor can they rehabilitate them when the penalty is duly over. Cf. [Kd 12.1.4](#).

beginning, should inflict *mānatta*, if he, as the twentieth (member), should rehabilitate, it is not a (formal) and ought not to be carried out.

“If, monks, one deserving *mānatta* as the fourth (member) should grant probation, should send back to the beginning, should inflict *mānatta*, if he, as the twentieth (member) should rehabilitate, it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out. “If, monks, one undergoing *mānatta* as the fourth (member) should grant probation, should send back to the beginning, should inflict *mānatta*, if he, as the twentieth (member), should rehabilitate, it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.

“If, monks, one deserving rehabilitation as the fourth (member) should grant probation, should send back to the beginning, should inflict *mānatta*, if he, as the twentieth (member), should rehabilitate, it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.

“Monks, the protest of some (people) in the midst of an Order is valid, of others is not valid. And, monks, of whom is a protest in the midst of an Order not valid? Monks, the protest of a nun in the midst of an Order is not valid ... of a probationer ... of a novice ... of a woman novice ... of a disavower of the training ... of one who has committed an extreme offence ... of one who is mad ... of one who is unhinged ... of one who is in pain ... of one who is suspended for not seeing an offence¹ ... of one against whom an Order is carrying out a (formal) act. Monks, a protest of these in the midst of an Order is not valid.

“And, monks, of whom is a protest in the midst of an Order valid? Monks, a protest of a regular² monk in the midst of an Order is valid if he belongs to the same communion, if he is staying within the same boundary, even if he only informs the monk next (to him).³ Monks, his protest in the midst of an Order is valid.

¹ Same list as that at [Kd 9.4.2](#). ² *pakatatta*. Vin-a 1147 says he is one who has not fallen from moral habit and has not committed a *pārajika* offence. Cf. [Vin 2.6](#), [Vin 2.32f](#). ³ *ānantarikassāpi bhikkhuno viññāpentassa*. Vin-a 1147 says, “if he immediately sits down himself” (in the assembly). Cf. the *anantarikā* nun at [Vin 4.234](#), i.e. the next nun in an almsfood procession.

ON TWO SENT AWAY, ETC.

9.4.9 “There are, monks, these two (kinds of) being sent away.¹ There is, monks, the individual who has not arrived at the point of being sent away,² but if an Order sends him away he may be rightly sent away, or he may be wrongly sent away. And which, monks, is an individual who has not arrived at the point of being sent away, but who, if an Order sends him away, is wrongly sent away? Now this is a case, monks, where there is a pure monk, not an offender; if the Order sends him away, he is wrongly sent away. This, monks, is called an individual who has not arrived at the point of being sent away, and who, if the Order sends him away, is wrongly sent away. And which, monks, is an individual who has not arrived at the point of being sent away, but who, if an Order sends him away, is rightly sent away? Now this is a case, monks, where there is an ignorant, inexperienced monk, full of offences, not rid of them,³ one who lives in company with householders in inappropriate association with householders; if an Order sends him away, he is rightly sent away. This, monks, is called an individual who has not arrived at the point of being sent away, but who, if the Order sends him away, is rightly sent away.

1.322 9.4.10 “There are, monks, these two (kinds of) restoration.⁴ There is, monks, the individual who has not arrived at the point of restoration, but if an Order restores him, he may be rightly restored, or he may be wrongly restored. And which, monks, is the individual who has not arrived at the point of restoration, but who, if an Order restores him, is wrongly restored? A eunuch,⁵ monks, does not arrive⁶ at the point of restoration; if the Order restores him, he is wrongly restored.

¹ *nissāraṇā*. Cf. Nuns' *Saṅghādisesas*, and see **BD 3, Introduction, p. xxxvi**. Vin-a 1147 explains that the Order sends away, *nissāreti*, by an act of banishment, censure and so on. ² *appatto nissāraṇam*; he is not guilty enough to be sent away. ³ *anapadāna*. Vin-a 1148 explains *apadāna* by *pariccheda*, and says that the meaning of *anapadāna* is “without the *pariccheda* of offences”. Cf. below **Kd 9.7.6**. ⁴ *osāraṇā*, see **BD 3.28, n. 4**. ⁵ Same list recurs above, **Kd 9.4.2**. ⁶ Again, *appatta*; but none of these may be ordained, or, if ordained, they should be expelled, *nāseti*. They therefore cannot be restored, not being in a position to obtain restoration.

Monks, one living in communion, as it were by theft, ... one gone over to a sect ... an animal ... a matricide ... a parricide ... a slayer of one perfected ... a seducer of a nun ... a schismatic ... a shedder of (a Truthfinder's) blood ... a hermaphrodite does not arrive at the point of restoration; if an Order restores him, he is wrongly restored. These, monks, are called individuals who do not arrive at the point of restoration, and who, if the Order restores them, are wrongly restored.

“And which, monks, is an individual who has not arrived at the point of restoration, and who if an Order restores him, is rightly restored? One with his hands cut off,¹ monks, who has not arrived at the point of restoration, if an Order restores him, is rightly restored. Monks, one with his feet cut off ... one with his hands and feet cut off ... his ears cut off ... his nose cut off ... his ears and nose cut off ... his fingers cut off ... his nails cut off ... one with his tendons cut ... one who has webbed hands ... a hunchback ... a dwarf ... one who had goitre ... one who has been branded ... one who has been scourged ... one who has been written about ... one who has elephantiasis ... one who is badly ill ... one who has disgraced an assembly (by some deformity) ... one who is blind ... one with a crooked limb ... one who is lame ... one paralysed down one side ... a cripple ... one weak through old age ... one who is blind from birth ... one who is dumb ... one who is deaf ... one who is blind and dumb ... one who is blind and deaf ... one who is deaf and dumb ... one who is blind and deaf and dumb who has not arrived at the point of restoration, if an Order restores him, is rightly restored. These, monks, are called individuals who have not arrived at the point of restoration, and who, if an Order restores them, are rightly restored.

Kd 9.4.

BD 4.4

ON AN ACT NOT BY RULE, ETC.

“This is a case, monks, where there is not an offence of a monk’s that should be seen.¹ If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence. Do you see this offence?’ and if he speaks thus: ‘There is not, your reverence(s), an offence of mine that I can see,’ and if the Order suspends him for not seeing the offence,² it is not a legally valid (formal) act. This is a case, monks, where there is not an offence of a monk’s for which amends should be made. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence. Make amends for this offence,’ and if he speaks thus: ‘There is not, your reverences, an offence of mine for which I should make amends,’ and if the Order suspends him for not making amends for the offence,³ it is not a legally valid (formal) act. This is a case, monks, where there is not a wrong view of a monk’s that should be given up.⁴ If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘This is a wrong view of yours, your reverence. Give up this wrong view,’ and if he speaks thus: ‘There is not, your reverence, a wrong view of mine that I should give up,’ and if the Order suspends him for not giving up the wrong view,⁵ it is not a legally valid (formal) act.

“This is a case, monks, where there is not an offence of a monk’s that should be seen, not an offence for which amends should be made. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence. Do you see this offence? Make amends for this offence,’ and if he speaks thus: ‘There is not, your reverence(s), an offence of mine that I can see; there is not, your reverence(s), an offence of mine for which I should make amends,’ and if the Order suspends him for not seeing or for not making amends, it is not a legally valid (formal) act.

“This is a case, monks, where there is not an offence of a monk’s

¹ Same list at **Vin 1.91**, where such people may not “go forth”. See above, **BD 4.116** for notes. ¹ I.e. by him. ² Cf. **Kd 11.25–Kd.11.30**. ³ Cf. **Kd 11.31**. ⁴ *paṭhissaj-jetā* = *paṭhissajjitabbā*, *Vin*-a 1147. ⁵ Cf. **Kd.11.32–Kd.11.35**.

that should be seen, not a wrong view that should be given up. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: 'You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence. Do you see this offence? This is a wrong view of yours; give up this wrong view'; and if he speaks thus: 'There is not, your reverence(s), an offence of mine that I can see; there is not a wrong view of mine that I should give up,' and if the Order suspends him for not seeing or for not giving up, it is not a legally valid (formal) act.

"This is a case, monks, where there is not an offence of a monk's for which amends should be made, there is not a wrong view that should be given up. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: 'You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence; make amends for this offence. This is a wrong view of yours, give up this wrong view,' and if he speaks thus: 'There is not, your reverence(s) an offence of mine for which I should make amends; there is not a wrong view of mine that I should give up,' and if the Order suspends him for not making amends or for not giving up, it is not a legally valid (formal) act.

"This is a case, monks, where there is not an offence of a monk's that should be seen, there is not an offence for which amends should be made, there is not a wrong view that should be given up. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: 'You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence. Do you see this offence? Make amends for this offence. This is a wrong view of yours; give up this wrong view,' and if he speaks thus: 'There is not, your reverence(s), an offence of mine that I can see; there is not, your reverence(s), an offence of mine for which I should make amends; there is not a wrong view of mine that I should give up,' and if the Order suspends him for not seeing or for not making amends or for not giving up, it is not a legally valid (formal) act.

"This is a case, monks, where there is an offence of a monk's that should be seen. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: 'You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence. Do you see this offence?' and if he speaks thus: 'Yes, your

Kd 9.5.

BD 4.4

Kd 9.5.

Vin 1.32

Kd 9.5.

reverence(s), I see it,' and if the Order suspends him for not seeing the offence, it is not a legally valid (formal) act.

“This is a case, monks, where there is an offence of a monk’s for which amends should be made. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence. Make amends for this offence,’ and if he speaks thus: ‘Yes, your reverence(s), I will make amends,’ and if the Order suspends him for not making amends for the offence, it is not a legally valid (formal) act.

4.4.65
19.5.7
“This is a case, monks, where there is a wrong view of a monk’s that should be given up. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘This, your reverence, is a wrong view of yours. Give up this wrong view,’ and if he speaks thus: ‘Yes, your reverence(s), I will give it up,’ and if the Order suspends him for not giving up the wrong view, it is not a legally valid (formal) act.

“This is a case, monks, where there is an offence of a monk’s that should be seen, where there is an offence for which amends should be made ... where there is an offence of a monk’s that should be seen, where there is a wrong view that should be given up ... where there is an offence of a monk’s for which amends should be made, where there is a wrong view that should be given up ... where there is an offence of a monk’s which should be seen, where there is an offence for which amends should be made, where there is a wrong view that should be given up. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence. Do you see this offence? Make amends for this offence. This is a wrong view of yours; give up this wrong view,’ and if he speaks thus: ‘Yes, your reverence(s), I see, yes, I will make amends, yes, I will give it up,’ and if the Order suspends him for not seeing or for not making amends or for not giving up, it is not a legally valid (formal) act.

9.5.8
“This is a case, monks, where there is an offence of a monk’s that should be seen. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘You, your reverence, have fallen into an

offence. Do you see this offence?’ and if he speaks thus: ‘There is not, your reverence(s), an offence of mine that I can see,’ and if the Order suspends him for not seeing, it is a legally valid (formal) act.

Vin 1.32

“This is a case, monks, where there is an offence of a monk’s for which amends should be made ... If he speaks thus: ‘There is not, your reverence(s), an offence of mine for which I should make amends,’ and if the Order suspends him for not making amends, it is a legally valid (formal) act.

“This is a case, monks, where there is a wrong view of a monk’s that should be given up ... If he speaks thus: ‘There is not, your reverence(s), a wrong view of mine, that should be given up,’ and if the Order suspends him for not giving up the wrong view, it is a legally valid (formal) act.

“This is a case, monks, where there is an offence of a monk’s that should be seen, where there is an offence for which amends should be made ... where there is an offence that should be seen, where there is a wrong view that should be given up ... where there is an offence for which amends should be made, where there is a wrong view that should be given up ... where there is an offence that should be seen, where there is an offence for which amends should be made, where there is a wrong view that should be given up. If an Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence. Do you see this offence? Make amends for this offence. This is a wrong view of yours; give up this wrong view,’ and if he speaks thus: ‘There is not, your reverence(s), an offence of mine which I should see, there is not, your reverence(s), an offence of mine for which I should make amends, there is not a wrong view of mine that I should give up,’ and if the Order suspends him for not seeing or for not making amends or for not giving up, it is a legally valid (formal) act.”

Kd 9.5.

BD 4.4

ON THE QUESTIONS OF UPĀLI

Kd 9.6.

Then the venerable Upāli approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Upāli spoke thus to the Lord: “Does an Order, Lord, that is complete carry out a (formal) act that should be carried out in the presence of¹ (an accused monk) if he is absent? Lord, is that a legally valid (formal) act, is it a disciplinarily valid (formal) act?”²

“This, Upāli, is not a legally valid (formal) act, it is not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act.”

“Does an Order, Lord, that is complete carry out a (formal) act that should be carried out by the interrogation³ (of an accused monk) if there is no interrogation? Does it carry out a (formal) act that should be carried out on the acknowledgement⁴ (of an accused monk) if there is no acknowledgement? Does it give a verdict of past insanity⁵ to one who merits a verdict of innocence?⁶ Does it carry out a (formal) act for specific depravity⁷ against one who merits a verdict of past insanity? Does it carry out a (formal) act of censure⁸ against one who merits a (formal) act for specific depravity? Does it carry out a (formal) act of placing under guidance for one who merits a (formal) act of censure? Does it carry out a (formal) act of banishment against one who merits a (formal) act of placing under guidance? Does it carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for one who merits a (formal) act of banishment? Does it carry out a (formal) act of suspension against one who merits a (formal) act of reconciliation? Does

¹ *sammukhākaraṇīyaṃ*. Cf. Vin 2.93. ² *dhammakamma vinayakamma* and their opposites (*adhamma-*, *avinaya-*) occur at AN i.74, AN i.75. AN-a ii.149 explains *adhamma-* and *avinaya-* as *uddhamma* and *ubbinaya*, where *ud-* means “off” and therefore “wrong” as in *ummagga*. ³ *paṭipucchākaraṇīyaṃ*. ⁴ *paṭiññāya*. Cf. BD 3.153, n. 5; AN i.99; MN ii.248. ⁵ *amūḷhavinaya*. See BD 3.153, n. 5; AN i.99; MN ii.248. ⁶ *sativinayārahassa*. On *sativinaya* see BD 3.153, n. 3.; MN ii.247. Word occurs at AN i.99; GS i.85 translates “proceedings about mindfulness”. ⁷ *tassapāpiyyasikā*. Cf. BD 3.154, n. 1; AN i.99; MN ii.249, Vin 1.85f. ⁸ For this and the four following formal acts, cf. Vin 1.49 (above, BD 4.66) and AN i.99.

it grant probation¹ to one who merits a (formal) act of suspension? Does it send back to the beginning one who merits probation? Does it inflict *mānatta* on one who merits being sent back to the beginning? Does it rehabilitate one who merits *mānatta*? Does it ordain one who merits rehabilitation? Is this a legally valid (formal) act, Lord, is it a disciplinarily valid (formal) act?”

“This, Upāli, is not a legally valid (formal) act, it is not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act. Whatever Order, Upāli, that is complete carries out a (formal) act that should be carried out in the presence of (an accused monk) if he is absent—it thus comes to be, Upāli, not a legally valid (formal) act, not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that goes too far.² Whatever Order, Upāli, that is complete carries out a (formal) act which should be carried out on the interrogation (of an accused monk) if there is no interrogation ... carries out a (formed) act which should be carried out with the acknowledgement (of an accused monk) if there is no acknowledgement ... ordains one meriting rehabilitation—it thus comes to be, Upāli, not a legally valid (formal) act, not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act”, and thus the Order comes to be one that goes too far.”

“If, Lord, an Order that is complete carries out a (formal) act that should be carried out in the presence of (an accused monk) when he is present, is this, Lord, a legally valid (formal) act, is it a disciplinarily valid (formal) act?”

“This, Upāli, is a legally valid (formal) act, it is a disciplinarily valid (formal) act.”

“If, Lord, an Order that is complete carries out a (formal) act that should be carried out on the interrogation (of an accused monk) when there is interrogation, if it carries out a (formal) act that should be carried out on the acknowledgement of (an accused monk) when there is his acknowledgement, if it gives a verdict of innocence to one who merits a verdict of innocence ... if it rehabilitates one who

¹ This and the next three (not ordination) occur at AN 1.99. They are each part of the penalty incurred for a *Saṅghādisesa* offence. ² *sātisāra*, as at Vin 1.55 (above, BD 4.71).

merits rehabilitation, if it ordains one who merits ordination, is this, Lord, a legally valid (formal) act, is it a disciplinarily valid (formal) act?”

“This, Upāli, is a legally valid (formal) act, it is a disciplinarily valid (formal) act. Whatever Order, Upāli, that is complete carries out a (formal) act that should be carried out in the presence of (an accused monk) when he is present—it thus comes to be, Upāli, a legally valid (formal) act, a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that does not go too far. Whatever Order, Upāli, that is complete carries out a (formal) act that should be carried out on the interrogation (of an accused monk) when there is interrogation ... ordains one meriting ordination—it thus comes to be, Upāli, a legally valid (formal) act, a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that does not go too far.”

“If, Lord, an Order that is complete gives a verdict of past insanity to one meriting a verdict of innocence, gives a verdict of innocence to one meriting a verdict of past insanity, is this, Lord, a legally valid (formal) act, is it a disciplinarily valid (formal) act?”

“This, Upāli, is not a legally valid (formal) act, it is not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act.”

“If, Lord, an Order that is complete carries out a (formal) act for specific depravity against one meriting a verdict of past insanity, if it gives a verdict of past insanity to one meriting a (formal) act for specific depravity; if it carries out a (formal) act of censure against one meriting a (formal) act for specific depravity, if it carries out a (formal) act for specific depravity against one meriting a (formal) act of censure; if it carries out a (formal) act of placing under guidance against one meriting a (formal) act of censure, if it carries out a (formal) act of censure against one meriting a (formal) act of placing under guidance; if it carries out a (formal) act of banishment against one meriting a (formal) act of placing under guidance, if it carries out a (formal) act of placing under guidance against one meriting a (formal) act of banishment; if it carries out a (formal) act of reconciliation against one meriting a (formal) act of banishment, if it carries

out a (formal) act of banishment against one meriting a (formal) act of reconciliation; if it carries out a (formal) act of suspension against one meriting a (formal) act of reconciliation, if it carries out a (formal) act of reconciliation against one meriting a (formal) act of suspension; if it grants probation to one meriting a (formal) act of suspension, if it carries out a (formal) act of suspension against one meriting probation; if it sends back to the beginning one meriting probation, if it grants probation to one meriting being sent back to the beginning; if it inflicts *mānatta* on one meriting being sent back to the beginning, if it sends back to the beginning one meriting *mānatta*; if it rehabilitates one meriting *mānatta*, if it inflicts *mānatta* on one meriting rehabilitation; if it ordains one meriting rehabilitation, if it rehabilitates one meriting ordination, is that, Lord, a legally valid (formal) act, is it a disciplinarily valid (formal) act?

“This, Upāli, is not a legally valid (formal) act, it is not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act. Whatever Order, Upāli, that is complete gives a verdict of past insanity to one meriting a verdict of innocence, gives a verdict of innocence to one meriting a verdict of past insanity—it thus comes to be, Upāli, not a legally valid (formal) act, not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that goes too far. Whatever Order, Upāli, that is complete carries out a (formal) act for specific depravity against one meriting a verdict of past insanity ... that rehabilitates one meriting ordination—it thus comes to be, Upāli, not a legally valid (formal) act, not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that goes too far.”

“If, Lord, an Order that is complete gives a verdict of innocence to one meriting a verdict of innocence, if it gives a verdict of past insanity to one meriting a verdict of past insanity, is this, Lord, a legally valid (formal) act, is it a disciplinarily valid (formal) act;”

“This, Upāli, is a legally valid (formal) act, it is a disciplinarily valid (formal) act.”

“If, Lord, an Order that is complete gives a verdict of past insanity to one meriting a verdict of past insanity, if it carries out a (formal)

Kd 9.6.

BD 4.4

Kd 9.6.

act for specific depravity against one meriting a (formal) act for specific depravity ... if it rehabilitates one meriting rehabilitation, if it ordains one meriting ordination—is this, Lord, a legally valid (formal) act, is it a disciplinarily valid (formal) act?”

“This, Upāli, is a legally valid (formal) act, it is a disciplinarily valid (formal) act. Whatever Order, Upāli, that is complete gives a verdict of innocence to one meriting a verdict of innocence, gives a verdict of past insanity to one meriting a verdict of past insanity—it thus comes to be, Upāli, a legally valid (formal) act, a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that does not go too far. Whatever Order, Upāli, that is complete gives a verdict of past insanity to one meriting a verdict of past insanity, ... ordains one meriting ordination—it thus comes to be, Upāli, a legally valid (formal) act, a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that does not go too far.”

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Whatever Order, monks, that is complete gives a verdict of past insanity to one meriting a verdict of innocence—it thus comes to be, monks, not a legally valid (formal) act, not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that goes too far. Whatever Order, monks, that is complete, carries out a (formal) act for specific depravity against one meriting a verdict of innocence, carries out a (formal) act of censure against one meriting a verdict of innocence¹ ... ordains one meriting a verdict of innocence—it thus comes to be, monks, not a legally valid (formal) act, not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that goes too far. Whatever Order, monks, that is complete carries out a (formal) act for specific depravity against one meriting a verdict of past insanity ... carries out a (formal) act of censure ... ordains one meriting a verdict of past

¹ As explained at *Vinaya Texts* ii.279, n. 2, in this paragraph all possible combinations of two different formal acts are arranged in this way: first, verdict of innocence is combined with verdict of past insanity and all the rest, down to ordination; then verdict of past insanity with all terms from specific depravity down to innocence, and so on; the whole series ends thus with the combination of meriting ordination with all terms from verdict of innocence down to rehabilitation.

insanity, gives a verdict of innocence to one meriting a verdict of past insanity—it thus comes to be, monks, not a legally valid (formal) act, not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that goes too far. Whatever Order, monks, that is complete, carries out a (formal) act of censure against one meriting a (formal) act for specific depravity ... rehabilitates one meriting ordination—it thus comes to be, monks, not a legally valid (formal) act, not a disciplinarily valid (formal) act, and thus the Order comes to be one that goes too far.”

The Second Portion for Repeating: that on Upāli’s Questions

ON AN ACT OF CENSURE

“This is a case, monks, where a monk is a maker of strife, a maker of dispute, a maker of contention, a maker of brawls, a maker of legal questions in an Order.¹ It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your reverences, is a maker of strife ... a maker of legal questions in the Order. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of censure against him’; and they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly. He goes from that residence to another residence. It occurs to the monks there: ‘A (formal) act of censure, your reverences, was carried out against this monk, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of censure against him’; and they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him not by rule, in a complete assembly. He then goes from that residence to another residence. It occurs to the monks there: ‘A (formal) act of censure, your reverences, was carried out against this monk, not by rule, in a complete assembly. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of censure against him’; and they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, by rule, in an incomplete assembly. He goes from that residence to another residence. It occurs to the monks there: ‘A (formal) act of censure, your reverences, was carried out

¹ As at [Vin 4.45](#), [Vin 4.230](#). See [BD 3.191, n. 3](#) for further references.

Kd 9.7:

BD 4.4

Vin 1.3:

against this monk, by rule, in an incomplete assembly. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of censure against him'; and they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly. He goes from that residence to another residence. It occurs to the monks there: 'A (formal) act of censure, your reverences, was carried out against this monk, by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of censure against him'; and they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him by what has the appearance of rule in a complete assembly.

19.7.2 "This is a case, monks, where a monk is a maker of strife ... a maker of legal questions in an Order. It then occurs to monks: 'This monk, your reverences, is a maker of strife ... a maker of legal questions in the Order. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of censure against him'; and they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, not by rule, in a complete assembly. He goes from that residence to another residence. It occurs to the monks there: 'A (formal) act of censure, your reverences, was carried out against this monk, not by rule, in a complete assembly. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of censure against him'; and they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, by ride, in an incomplete assembly. He then goes from that residence ... they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly. He then goes from that residence ... they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, by what has the appearance of a rule, in a complete assembly. He then goes from that residence ... they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly.

19.7.3 "This is a case, monks, ... (as above) ... they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule in a complete assembly ... not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... not by rule, in a complete assembly.

19.7.4 "This is a case, monks, ... (as above) ... they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, by what has the appearance of rule, in

an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly ... not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... not by rule, in a complete assembly, by rule, in an incomplete assembly.

“This is a case, monks, ... (as above) ... they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly ... not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... not by rule, in a complete assembly ... by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of a rule, in an incomplete assembly.

ON AN ACT OF GUIDANCE

“This is a case, monks, where an ignorant, inexperienced monk,¹ full of offences, not rid of them, lives in company with householders in inappropriate association with householders. It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your reverences, ignorant, inexperienced, ... in inappropriate association with householders. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of guidance for him’; and these carry out a (formal) act of guidance for him, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly. He goes from that residence to another residence ... (as above in **Kd 9.7.1**) ... not by rule, in a complete assembly ... by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly. The cycle should be worked out as it is below.²

ON AN ACT OF BANISHMENT

“This is a case, monks, where a monk is one who brings families into disrepute and is of depraved conduct.³ It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your reverences, ... is of depraved conduct. Come, let us carry

¹ Cf. above, **Kd 9.4.9**. ² I.e. in **Kd 9.7.1- Kd.9.7.5**. The “wheel”, *cakka*, series, cycle, is the “arrangement of five categories on which this exposition is based ...” (as said in note at *Vinaya Texts* ii.281). “Below” stands for our “above”, from the fact that the palm-leaf manuscripts are arranged with the first leaf at the bottom of the pile of leaves of which any work or “book” is made up. ³ As in **Bu-Ss 13**, and see below, **Kd 9.7.18**.

out a (formal) act of banishment against him'; and they carry out a (formal) act of banishment against him, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... (as in **Kd 9.7.6**) ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly. The cycle should be worked out.

ON AN ACT OF RECONCILIATION

9.7.8

“This is a case, monks, where a monk reviles, abuses¹ householders. It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your reverences, reviles, abuses householders. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for him’; and they carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for him, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... (as in **Kd 9.7.6**) ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly. The cycle should be worked out.

ON AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT SEEING AN OFFENCE

9.7.9

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, having fallen into an offence, does not want to see the offence.² It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your reverences, having fallen into an offence, does not want to see the offence. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of suspension against him for not seeing the offence’; and they carry out a (formal) act of suspension against him for not seeing the offence, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly. The cycle should be worked out.

ON AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT MAKING AMENDS

9.7.10 “This is a case, monks, where a monk, having fallen into an offence, does not want to make amends for the offence.¹ It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your reverences, having fallen into an offence, does not want to make amends for the offence. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of suspension against him for not making amends for the offence’; and they carry out a (formal) act of suspension against him for not making amends for the offence, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly. The cycle should be worked out.

Vin 1.33

ON AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT RELINQUISHING

“This is a case, monks, where a monk does not want to give up a wrong view. It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your reverences, does not want to give up a wrong view. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of suspension against him for not giving up a wrong view’; and they carry out a (formal) act of suspension against him for not giving up a wrong view, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly. The cycle should be worked out.

Kd 9.7.1

BD 4.4

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF CENSURE

“This is a case, monks, where a monk against whom a (formal) act of censure has been carried out by the Order, conducts himself properly,² is subdued, mends his ways,³ and asks for the revocation of the (formal) act of censure. It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your

Kd 9.7.1

¹ Cf. Vin 3.184; Vin 4.309; BD 3.344. ² Cf. Kd 11.25–Kd 11.30. ¹ Cf. Kd 11.31.

² “Proper conduct” given at Kd 11.5.1. ³ Cf. Vin 1.49 (above, BD 4.66).

reverences, against whom a (formal) act of censure was carried out by the Order is conducting himself properly, is subdued, is mending his ways. Come, let us revoke the (formal) act of censure¹ against him'; and they revoke the (formal) act of censure against him, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly. He goes from that residence to another residence. It occurs to the monks there: 'A (formal) act of censure, your reverences, against this monk was revoked by an Order, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly. Come, let us revoke the (formal) act of censure against him'; and they revoke the (formal) act of censure against him, not by rule, in a complete assembly ... by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly.

9.7.13 "This is a case, monks, where a monk against whom a (formal) act of censure has been carried out by an Order conducts himself properly, is subdued, mends his ways, and asks for the revocation of the (formal) act of censure. It then occurs to monks: 'This monk, your reverences, against whom a (formal) act of censure has been carried out by the Order, conducts himself properly ... asks for the revocation of the (formal) act of censure. Come, let us revoke the (formal) act of censure against him and they revoke the (formal) act of censure against him, not by rule, in a complete assembly ... (as in **Kd 9.7.2–Kd 9.7.5**) ... by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly.

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF GUIDANCE

9.7.14
4.476 "This is a case, monks, where a monk for whom a (formal) act of guidance² has been carried out by an Order, conducts himself properly, is subdued, mends his ways, and asks for the revocation of the (formal) act of guidance ... (as in **Kd 9.7.12, Kd 9.7.13**)

¹ Cf. **Kd 11.6.2–Kd 11.8.2**. ² See **Kd 11.9.1–Kd 12.2**.

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF BANISHMENT

“This is a case, monks, where a monk against whom a (formal) act of banishment ...¹

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF RECONCILIATION

... a (formal) act of reconciliation ...²

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT SEEING AN OFFENCE

... a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing an offence ...³

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT MAKING AMENDS

...a (formal) act of suspension for not making amends for an offence ...⁴

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT RELINQUISHING

... a (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view ...⁵
has been carried out by an Order.

The cycle should be worked out.

ON DISPUTING AN ACT OF CENSURE

Kd 9.7.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk is a maker of strife, a maker of disputes a maker of contention, a maker of brawls, a maker of legal questions in the Order. It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your reverences, is a maker of ... legal questions in the Order. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of censure against him’; and they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly. In this case the Order disputes saying: ‘A (formal) act not by rule, in an incomplete assembly; a (formal) act not by rule, in a complete assembly; a (formal) act by rule, in an incomplete assembly; a (formal) act by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly; a (formal) act by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly; the (formal) act is not carried out, the (formal) act is badly carried out, the (formal) act should be carried out again’¹ Herein, monks, those monks who speak thus: ‘A (formal) act not by rule, in an incomplete assembly’, and those monks who speak thus: ‘The (formal) act is not carried out, the (formal) act is badly carried out, the (formal) act should be carried out again’, these monks are here speakers of what is right.²

9.7.16

4.477

“This is a case, monks, where a monk is a maker of strife ... and they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him, not by rule, in a complete assembly. In this case the Order disputes saying: ... Herein, monks, those monks who speak thus: ‘A (formal) act not by rule, in a complete assembly’ and those monks who speak thus: ‘The (formal) act is not carried out, the (formal) act is badly carried out, the (formal) act should be carried out again these monks are here speakers of what is right. This is a case, monks, where a monk is a maker of strife ... and they carry out a (formal) act of censure against him by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly ... these monks are here

¹ See Kd 11.13.1–Kd 11.17.2. ² See Kd 11.18.5–Kd 11.24.1. ³ See Kd 11.25.1–Kd 11.30.

⁴ See Kd 11.31. ⁵ See Kd 11.32–Kd 11.35. ¹ As at Vin 4.126 (BD 3.5).

² *dhammavādino*.

speakers of what is right.

ON DISPUTING AN ACT OF GUIDANCE

“This is a case, monks, where an ignorant, inexperienced monk, full of offences, not rid of them, lives in company with householders in inappropriate association with householders. It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your reverences, ignorant, inexperienced, lives ... with householders. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of guidance for him’; and they carry out a (formal) act of guidance for him, not by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... not by rule, in a complete assembly ... by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly. In this case the Order disputes ... these monks are here speakers of what is right. These five occasions in brief.

Kd 9.7.1

ON DISPUTING AN ACT OF BANISHMENT

“This is a case, monks, where a monk brings families into disrepute and is of depraved conduct.¹ It then occurs to monks: ‘... let us carry out a (formal) act of banishment against him ... These five, occasions in brief.

Kd 9.7.1

ON DISPUTING AN ACT OF RECONCILIATION

“This is a case, monks, where a monk reviles, abuses householders. It then occurs to monks: ‘... let us carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for him’ ... These five occasions in brief.

Vin 1.33

¹ Cf. Bu-Ss 13, and above Kd 9.7.7.

ON DISPUTING AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT SEEING AN OFFENCE

“This is a case, monks, where a monk having fallen into an offence does not want to see the offence ...

ON DISPUTING AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT MAKING AMENDS FOR AN OFFENCE

... having fallen into an offence does not want to make amends for the offence ...

ON DISPUTING AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT RELINQUISHING

... does not want to give up a wrong view. It then occurs to monks: ‘... let us carry out a (formal) act of suspension against him for not giving up the wrong view’ ... These five occasions in brief.

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF CENSURE

^{9.7.19}
^{4.478} “This is a case, monks, where a monk against whom a (formal) act of censure has been carried out by an Order conducts himself properly, is subdued, mends his ways, and asks for the revocation of the (formal) act of censure. It then occurs to monks: ‘This monk, your reverences, against whom a (formal) act of censure has been carried out by the Order, conducts himself properly ... and asks for the revocation of the (formal) act of censure. Come, let us revoke the (formal) act of censure against him’, and these revoke the (formal) act of censure against him not by rule, in an incomplete assembly. In this case the Order disputes ... these monks here are speakers of what is right. This is a case, monks, where a monk against whom a (formal) act of censure has been carried out by an Order, conducts himself properly

... they revoke the (formal) act of censure against him, not by rule, in a complete assembly ... by rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in an incomplete assembly ... by what has the appearance of rule, in a complete assembly ... these monks are here speakers of what is right.

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF GUIDANCE

“This is a case, monks, where a monk for whom a (formal) act of guidance has been carried out by an Order ...

Kd 9.7.

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF BANISHMENT

... of banishment ...

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF RECONCILIATION

... of reconciliation ...

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT SEEING AN OFFENCE

... of suspension for not seeing an offence ...

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT MAKING AMENDS

... of suspension for not making amends for an offence ...

ON REVOKING AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT RELINQUISHING

... of suspension for not giving up a wrong view, has been carried out by an Order, conducts himself properly ... these monks are here speakers of what is right.”

The Ninth Section: that on (the monks) at Campā

IN THIS SECTION THERE ARE THIRTY-SIX ITEMS. THIS IS ITS KEY

The Lord was at Campā, case at Vāsabha village,
he made an effort for in-coming monks
in regard to what they wanted,¹ /
Having known “They are appointed” henceforth he made no effort,
Thinking “Suspended, one does not carry out”, he went to the Victor, /
A (formal) act not by rule,
in an incomplete assembly,
by rule in a complete assembly,
and a (formal) act by rule in an incomplete assembly,
by what has the appearance of rule in an incomplete assembly, /
By what has the appearance of rule in a complete assembly,
one suspends one,
and one two, several, one suspends an Order, /
Then two, then several, and an Order suspends an Order,
the distinguished, omniscient one, having heard, objects,
saying, “It is not the rule”, /
Whatever (formal) act for which the motion is not furnished
(although) a proclamation is furnished
And that for which the proclamation is not furnished
although it is furnished with a motion, /
If neither is furnished and it is also not by rule,
against the teacher’s (instruction), protested against,
reversible, not fit to stand, /
Not by rule, in an incomplete assembly—these two,
but just this: by rule, in a complete assembly
is allowed by the Truthfinder. /
Fourfold, fivefold, tenfold and twenty
and more than twentyfold—an Order is thus of five kinds. /
Having excluded ordination and whatever
(formal) act for Invitation (there is)

¹ Oldenberg’s text *icchitabbake*; Sinhalese edition -ko.

together with the (formal) act of rehabilitation—
 the carrying out is by means of a fourfold Order, /
 Excluding two (formal) acts:
 ordination in the middle districts
 (and) rehabilitation—
 the carrying out is by means of a fivefold Order. /
 Excluding rehabilitation alone—
 these monks are tenfold,
 an Order of twenty carries out all (formal) acts,
 it is the carrier out of everything. /
 Nun, probationer and novice, woman novice,
 disavower, (one who has committed) an extreme offence,
 one suspended for not seeing an offence, /
 For not making amends for,
 (for not giving up) a wrong view, eunuch,
 one living in communion as it were by theft,
 (one gone over to) a sect, an animal, slayer of mother, of father, /
 Of one perfected, seducer of a nun, schismatic,
 shedder of (a Truthfinder's) blood,
 hermaphrodite, one belonging to a different communion,
 staying within a different boundary,
 (standing above the ground) by psychic power, /
 One against whom an Order is carrying out a (formal) act—
 these come to be twenty-four
 (and) they are objected to by the Awakened One
 for they are not completers of a group./
 If one undergoing probation should
 as the fourth member grant probation
 or should rehabilitate one (sent back to) the beginning
 or (undergoing) *mānatta* it is not a (formal) act
 and should not be carried out. /
 So too, if one deserving the beginning
 or *mānatta* (should rehabilitate)
 one deserving rehabilitation—
 this is not in accordance with a (formal) act—
 the five are explained by the All-awakened One. /
 Nun, probationer, novice, woman novice,
 disavower, (one who has committed)
 an extreme (offence), who is mad,
 unhinged, in pain, (suspended) for not seeing, /
 For not making amends for, for (not giving up) a wrong view,
 and a eunuch and a hermaphrodite,
 one belonging to a different communion (or) boundary

(or standing) above the ground (by psychic power)
and one against whom a (formal) act is being carried out, /

Of these eighteen the protest is not valid,
the protest is valid of a regular monk. /

A pure one may be wrongly sent away,
and an ignorant one rightly sent away,
eunuch, one living in communion as it were by theft,
going over (to a sect), an animal, /
(Slayer) of mother, of father, of one perfected,
seducer (of a nun), schismatic of the Order,
shedder of (a Truth-finder's) blood
and also a hermaphrodite and whichever /

Of these eleven is not meant for restoration.

Hands, feet, both these, ears, nose, both these, /
Fingers, nails, tendons, one who has webbed hands,
hunchback, and dwarf,
one who has goitre, who has been branded, scourged,
and who has been written about
and one who has elephantiasis, /

One who is badly ill, who has disgraced an assembly, who is blind,
and one with a crooked limb, lame, and also one who is paralysed,
a cripple, one weak through age, blind from birth, dumb, and deaf, /
Blind and dumb, (blind and) deaf, and dumb and deaf likewise,
and blind-deaf-dumb: all these thirty-two—/

Their restoration was explained by the all enlightened one.

(An offence) that should be seen,
for which amends should be made,
(a wrong view) to be given up does not exist, /

There are seven (formal) acts suspending him which are not legally valid,
And these seven that are not legally valid for one complying with his falling,
Among (formal) acts there are seven that are legally valid
for one not complying with his falling,
in the presence of, interrogation,
and according as it is and on the acknowledgement,

Innocence, past insanity, depravity,¹ and on account of censure,
banishment, reconciliation, and suspension, probation, /

The beginning, *mānatta*, rehabilitation, and thus ordination:

These sixteen² are not legally valid if it should carry out one for another,³ /
These sixteen are quite legally valid

¹ Here *pāpikā* for *tassapāpiyyasika*. ² Only fifteen listed above: *nissaya* (placing under) guidance, is omitted. ³ "It" is an Order, see *Kd 9.6.2*, but if it carries out a formal act that is not appropriate and does not fit the case, that formal act is not legally valid.

if it should carry out the appropriate one for that one,¹
 reciprocally they should explain
 how these sixteen are not legally valid, /
 When conditioned for it paired²:
 these sixteen are also legally valid,
 when conditioned (for it) singly:
 the conqueror said the cycle³ is not legal. /
 One who makes strife⁴:
 the Order carries out a (formal) act of banishment
 not by rule, in an incomplete assembly;
 he goes to another residence, /
 There they carried out a (formal) act of censure against him,
 not by rule,⁵ in a complete assembly,
 elsewhere they carried out a (formal) act of banishment against him
 by rule, in an incomplete assembly, /
 And they likewise carried out one which in both cases
 had the appearance of rule,
 in an incomplete assembly, in a complete assembly,
 and not by rule in a complete assembly,
 also by rule in an incomplete assembly, /
 And by what had the appearance of rule
 in an incomplete assembly, and in a complete assembly:
 these cases, having done what is conditioned singly,
 put the cycle together. /
 Guidance for one who is ignorant, inexperienced,
 banishment for one who brings a family into disrepute,
 And they carried out a (formal) act of reconciliation for a reviler, /
 And for whoever does not see, does not make amends for (an offence),
 does not give up a (wrong) view:
 for these a (formal) act of suspension
 was decreed by the leader of the caravan. /
 The wisdom of these (formal) acts of suspension
 should be applied to censure,
 and if, being subdued, conducting himself properly, he has asked, /
 The revocation of these or those (formal) acts
 is according to the (formal) acts below.⁶
 And if in this or that case he disputes some (formal) act /
 And says, “It was not carried out, it was badly carried out,

¹ *taṃ taṃ kareyya taṃ tassa soḷas’ete sudhammikā.* ² *dvedvetamūlakarī.* ³ *cakka*
 wheel, cycle series. ⁴ OLDENBERG, at Vin 1.394, notes that “all three manuscripts
 read *bhaṇḍanakāra*”, where the accusative would have been expected. ⁵ OLD-
 ENBERG’s text reads *dhammena*; Sinhalese edition *tatthādhhammena* and see Kd 9.7.1.
⁶ *heṭṭhā*, “below” is equivalent to our “above”.

it should be carried out again”,
further, concerning the revocation of the (formal) act:
these monks are speakers of what is right. /
The Great Sage, having seen falling away from shakiness¹
in one entitled (to take part in a formal) act
prescribed revocation, as a surgeon medicine.

1.337

¹ *vipattivādhite*. Sinhalese edition -*dhitā*.

10. THE MONKS FROM KOSAMBĪ (KOSAMBAKA)

ON THE DISPUTE AMONG THE MONKS FROM KOSAMBĪ

At one time the awakened one, the Lord was staying at Kosambī in Ghosita's monastery. Now at that time a certain monk had fallen into an offence; he saw that offence as an offence but other monks saw that offence as no offence. After a time he saw that offence as no offence, while the other monks saw that offence as an offence. Then these monks spoke thus to that monk: "You, your reverence, have fallen into an offence. Do you see this offence?"

"There is not an offence of mine, your reverences, that I can see." Then these monks, having obtained unanimity, suspended that monk for not seeing the offence.

But that monk had heard much,¹ he was one to whom the tradition had been handed down; he was an expert on *dhamma*, an expert on discipline, an expert on the summaries; he was wise, experienced, clever; he was conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training. Then that monk, having approached monks who were his comrades and intimates, spoke thus: "This is no offence,² your reverences, this is not an offence; I am unfallen, I have not fallen; I am unsuspended, I am not suspended; I was suspended by a (formal) act that was not legally valid, reversible, not fit to stand. Let the venerable ones be my partisans on account of the rule, on account of discipline." And

¹ Cf. Vin 1.119 (above, BD 4.157). ² As above, BD 4.449.

that monk gained as partisans the monks who were his comrades and intimates. And he sent a messenger to monks in the country who were his comrades and intimates, saying: “This is no offence, your reverences ... not fit to stand. Let the venerable ones be my partisans on account of the rule, on account of discipline.” And that monk gained as partisans those monks in the country who were his comrades and intimates.

Then these monks who took the part of the suspended one approached those monks who had suspended him; having approached, they spoke thus to the monks who had suspended him: “This is no offence, your reverences, this is not an offence; this monk is unfallen, this monk has not fallen; this monk is unsuspended, this monk is not suspended; he was suspended by a (formal) act that was not legally valid, reversible, not fit to stand.” When they had spoken thus, the monks who had suspended him spoke thus to the monks who took the part of the suspended one:

“This is an offence, your reverences, this is not no offence; this monk has fallen, this monk is not unfallen; this monk is suspended, this monk is not unsuspended; he was suspended by a (formal) act that was legally valid, irreversible, fit to stand. Do not you, your reverences, take the part of this suspended monk, do not side with him.” But those monks who took the part of the suspended (monk), although being spoken to thus by the ones who had suspended him, still took the part of that suspended monk and sided with him.

Then a certain monk approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, that monk spoke thus to the Lord: “This is a case, Lord, where a certain monk has fallen into an offence. He saw that offence as an offence but other monks saw that offence as no offence. After a time he saw that offence as no offence, while the other monks saw that offence as an offence. Then, Lord, those monks spoke thus to that monk: ... (as in [Kd 10.1.1](#)) ... ‘... Do you see this offence?’ He said: ‘There is not an offence of mine, your reverences, that I can see Then, Lord, these monks, having obtained

unanimity, suspended that monk for not seeing the offence. But, Lord, that monk had heard much, he was one to whom the tradition had been handed down ... desirous of training. Then, Lord, that monk, having approached monks who were his comrades and intimates ... (as in **Kd 10.1.2**) ... And, Lord, that monk gained as partisans the monks who were his comrades and intimates ... And, Lord, that monk gained as partisans those monks in the country who were his comrades and intimates. Then, Lord, those monks who took the part of the suspended one ... (as in **Kd 10.1.3**) ... When they had spoken thus, Lord, the monks who had suspended him spoke thus: ... But those monks, Lord, who took the part of the suspended (monk) although being spoken to thus by the ones who had suspended him, still took the part of that suspended monk and sided with him.”

Then the Lord, thinking: “The Order of monks is divided, the Order of monks is divided”, rising from his seat approached the monks who had suspended (that monk); having approached, he sat down on the appointed seat. As he was sitting down, the Lord spoke thus to the monks who had suspended (that monk): “Do not you, monks, thinking: ‘It appears so to us, it appears so to us deem that a monk should be suspended on every occasion.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into an offence. He sees that offence as no offence; other monks see that offence as an offence. If, monks, those monks know concerning that monk: ‘This venerable one has heard much, he is one to whom the tradition has been handed down ... desirous of training. If we suspend this monk for not seeing the offence we cannot carry out the Observance together with this monk, we will carry out the Observance without this monk—from this source there will be strife, dispute, contention, brawls, for the Order, there will be schism in the Order, dissension in the Order,¹ altercation in the Order, differences in the Order.’ Monks, that monk should not be suspended for not seeing an offence by monks bent on a schism.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into an offence.

¹ For further references to *saṅghabheda saṅgharāji* see **BD 2.233, n. 3.**

He sees that offence ... (as in **Kd 10.1.6**) ... ‘... if we suspend this monk for not seeing the offence we cannot invite together with this monk, we will invite without this monk; we cannot carry out a (formal) act of the Order together with this monk, we will carry out a (formal) act of the Order without this monk; we cannot sit down on a seat together with this monk, we will sit down on a seat without this monk; we cannot sit down to drink conjei together with this monk, we will sit down to drink conjei without this monk; we cannot sit down in a refectory together with this monk, we will sit down in a refectory without this monk; we cannot stay under one roof together with this monk, we will stay under one roof without this monk;¹ we cannot, according to seniority, carry out greeting together with this monk, rising up before (one another), saluting with joined palms, doing the proper duties, but we will, according to seniority, carry out greetings ... doing the proper duties without this monk—from this source there will be strife ... differences in the Order.’ Monks, that monk should not be suspended for not seeing an offence by monks bent on a schism.”

Then the Lord, having spoken on this matter with the monks who had suspended that monk, rising from his seat, approached those monks who were taking the part of the suspended (monk); having approached, he sat down on the appointed seat. As he was sitting down, the Lord spoke thus to the monks who were taking the part of the suspended (monk): “Do not you, monks, having fallen into an offence, deem that amends should not be made for the offence, thinking: ‘We have not fallen’. This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into an offence; he sees that offence as no offence; other monks see that offence as an offence. If, monks, that monk knows concerning those monks: ‘These venerable ones have heard much ... (as in **Kd 10.1.2**) ... desirous of training. It is impossible for them, because of me or because of anyone else, to follow a wrong course through desire, through hatred, through stupidity, through fear. If these monks suspend me for not seeing the offence, if they do not

¹ Cf. **Bu-Pc 69**.

carry out the Observance together with me, if they carry out the Observance without me ... if they do not invite together with me, if they invite without me ... if they, according to seniority, carry out greetings without me, rising up before (one another), saluting with joined palms, doing the proper duties—from this source there will be for the Order strife ... differences in the Order'. Monks, the offence should be confessed even out of faith¹ in others by a monk who is bent on a schism." Then the Lord, having spoken on this matter with the monks who took the part of the suspended (monk), rising from his seat, departed.

Now at that time monks taking the part of a suspended (monk) carried out the Observance just there within the boundary, and carried out a (formal) act of the Order; but the monks who had suspended (him), having gone outside the boundary, carried out the Observance and carried out a (formal) act of the Order (there). Then ascertain monk who had suspended him, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, that monk spoke thus to the Lord: "Lord, these monks who are taking the part of a suspended (monk) are carrying out the Observance just there within the boundary, they are carrying out a (formal) act of the Order; but we, the monks who have suspended him, having gone outside the boundary, are carrying out the Observance, we are carrying out a (formal) act of the Order (there)."

"Monk, if these monks who are taking the part of the suspended (monk) are carrying out the Observance just there within the boundary and are carrying out a (formal) act of the Order, these (formal) acts of theirs will be legally valid, irreversible, fit to stand because a motion and a proclamation have been laid down by me. If, monk, you monks who suspended him, carry out the Observance just there within the boundary, if you carry out a (formal) act of the Order, these (formal) acts of yours are also legally valid, irreversible, fit to

¹ Correct *sandhāya* of text to *saddhāya*, and cf. **Vin 2.289** *api cāyasmantānaṃ saddhāya desemi*.

stand, because a motion and a proclamation have been laid down by me.

“What is the reason for this? These monks belong to a different communion from yours and you belong to a different communion from theirs. Monk, there are these two grounds for belonging to a different communion: either, of oneself one makes oneself belong to a different communion,¹ or a complete Order suspends one for not seeing or for not making amends for or for not giving up. Monk, there are these two grounds for belonging to a different communion. Monk, there are these two grounds for belonging to the same communion: either, of oneself one makes oneself belong to the same communion, or a complete Order restores one who was suspended for not seeing or for not making amends for or for not giving up. Monk, there are these two grounds for belonging to the same communion.”²

Now at that time monks, causing quarrels, causing strife, falling into disputes in a refectory amidst the houses, behaved unsuitably towards one another in gesture, in speech; they came to blows.³ People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, causing quarrels ... come to blows?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can these monks ... come to blows?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks ... came to blows?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, if an Order is divided, if it is behaving not according to the rule, if there is unfriendliness, you should sit down on a seat thinking: ‘At least we will not behave unsuitably to one another in gesture, in speech; we will not come to blows.’ Monks, if an Order is divided but

¹ According to Vin-a 1149 he chooses to sit among those who speak *dhamma* and rather than among those who do not. ² End of this story given at [Kd 10.5.11ff.](#)

³ Cf. [Bu-Pc 64](#), [Bu-Pc 65](#).

if it is behaving according to the rule, if there is friendliness, you may sit down on a seat next (to one another).”

Now at that time¹ monks, making quarrels, making strife, falling into disputes in the midst of an Order, wounded one another with the weapons of the tongue;² they were not able to settle that legal question. Then a certain monk approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance, that monk spoke thus to the Lord: “This is a case, Lord, where monks, making quarrels ... are not able to settle that legal question. It would be good, Lord, if the Lord out of compassion were to approach those monks.” The Lord consented by becoming silent. The Lord approached those monks; having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. As he was sitting down, the Lord spoke thus to those monks:

“Enough, monks; no strife, no quarrels, no contention, no disputing.” When he had spoken thus, a certain monk who spoke what was not-*dhamma*³ spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord let the Lord, the *dhamma*-master⁴ wait; Lord, let the Lord, unconcerned,⁵ live intent on abiding in ease here and now;⁶ we will be (held) accountable for this strife, quarrel, contention, disputing.” And a second time the Lord spoke thus to these monks:⁷ “Enough, monks; no strife ... no disputing.” And a second time the monks who spoke what was not-*dhamma* spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, let the Lord, the *dhamma*-master wait; ... we will be (held) accountable for this ... disputing.”

¹ Kd 10.2.2 = MN iii.152f., with slight differences. ² *mukhasattihi* as at Ud 67, AN i.70, Ja i.341. ³ *adhammavādin*, or, one adhering to or professing what was not-*dhamma*. Vin-a 1150 says: one of those taking the part of the suspended (monk). Word also occurs at MN i.287 = MN iii.48 = AN ii.22 = AN v.265 = AN v.283, always in a formula with which cf. AN i.202, DN i.4. Cf. also the two assemblies, the *dhamma*- and the *adhamma*-*vādinī* at AN i.75. ⁴ *dhammassāmī*, as at SN iv.94. ⁵ *appossukka*, as at MN i.331, MN i.459, Vin 2.188 in a similar sentence. Cf. *appossukatā* above, Vin 1.5. ⁶ *diṭṭhadhammasukhavihāra*, as at AN ii.23, MN i.40, MN i.331, MN i.459, Vin 2.188, SN ii.239. ⁷ He spoke the “third time” in Kd 10.2.20, below.

THE STORY OF DĪGHĀVU

10.2.3

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Once upon a time,¹ monks, at Benares Brahmādatta was king of Kāsi; he was rich, wealthy, opulent, of great strength, with many vehicles; he had large territories, full storehouses and granaries. Dīghīti was the name of the king of Kosala. He was poor, of little wealth, of few means, of little strength, with few vehicles, he had (only) small territories, storehouses and granaries that were not full. Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, having arrayed a fourfold army,² marched against Dīghīti, the King of Kosala. Then, monks, Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, heard: ‘They say that Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, having arrayed a fourfold army, is marching against me.’ Then, monks, it occurred to Dīghīti, the King of Kosala: ‘Now Brahmādatta, King of Kāsi, is rich, wealthy, opulent ... full storehouses and granaries. I am not competent to stand against even one attack of Brahmādatta, King of Kāsi. Suppose I were to flee from the town beforehand?’ Then, monks, Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, taking his chief consort, fled from the town beforehand. Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, conquering the troops³ and vehicles and territory and storehouses and granaries of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, lived as the master. Then, monks, Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, set out for Benares with his wife. In due course he arrived at Benares. Monks, Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, dwelt there with his wife in a certain place adjoining Benares in a potter’s house, in disguise, clothed⁴ as a wanderer.

4.490

10.2.4

“Then soon, monks, the chief consort of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, became pregnant. She had a fancy of this kind: she wanted, at sunrise, to see a fourfold army arrayed, armoured, standing on level ground⁵

¹ Cf. Ja iii.211, Ja iii.487ff. ² See Vin 4.105 (BD 2.375 and notes). ³ *bala*, as above where rendered “strength”. ⁴ *channa* can also mean concealed. ⁵ *subhummiyaṃ ṭhitaṃ*. Cf. MN-a ii.97 *subhūmiyaṃ ti samabhūmiyaṃ*.

and to drink at the washing of the swords.¹ Then, monks, the chief consort of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, spoke thus to Dīghīti, the King of Kosala: ‘Sire, I am pregnant; a fancy of this kind has risen in me: I want, at sunrise, to see a fourfold army ... and to drink at the washing of the swords.’ He said: ‘Lady, whence is there for us who are in distress a fourfold army arrayed, armoured, standing on level ground and a washing of the swords?’ She said: ‘If I, sire, do not get a chance (to have my wish) I shall die.’

“Now at that time, monks, the Brahmin priest of Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, was a friend of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala. Then, monks, Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, approached the Brahmin priest of Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi; having approached, he spoke thus to the Brahmin priest of Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi: ‘A lady friend of yours, old dear,² is pregnant; a fancy of this kind has risen in her: she wants, at sunrise to see a fourfold army ... and to drink at the washing of the swords.’ He said: ‘Well then, sire, let us see the queen too.’ Then, monks, the chief consort of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, approached the Brahmin priest of Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi. Then, monks, that Brahmin priest of Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, saw the chief consort of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, coming in the distance, and seeing her, rising from his seat, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having with joined palms saluted the chief consort of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, he three times uttered this utterance: ‘Indeed, a king of Kosala is in your womb, indeed, a

¹ *khaggānaṃ dhovanaṃ pātuṃ*, to drink the water with which swords were washed. Cf. Mahāvamsa xxii.42–Mahāvamsa xxii.45 where another pregnant queen “longed to drink (the water) that had served to cleanse the sword with which the head of the first warrior among king Eḷāra’s warriors had been cut off”. (Geiger’s translation). F.L. Woodward refers me to J. ABBOTT, *Keys of Power*, O.U.P., p.168, “The sword of the Marātha Sivaji, preserved at Satāra, has power, and water in which it has been washed is a cure for obstructed delivery”. See also T.R. GLOVER, *Springs of Hellas*, C.U.P., 1945, p. 7, quoting SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones* iii.2, “‘There are waters wholesome, useful, and waters deadly and putrid ... some remove barrenness’—a belief found in other authors (ATHENAEUS, p.41f., quotes THEOPHRASTUS, *History of Plants*, to this effect).” ² *samma*.

king of Kosala is in your womb.’ And he said: ‘Do not be distressed, queen, you will get the chance at the time of sunrise to see a fourfold army arrayed, armoured, standing on level ground and to drink at the washing of the swords.’

“Then, monks, the brahmin priest of Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, approached Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi; having approached, he spoke thus to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi: ‘Sire, the signs that are visible are such that tomorrow at the time of sunrise a fourfold army arrayed, armoured, must stand on level ground and the swords must be washed.’ Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, enjoined people, saying: ‘Good sirs, do as the Brahmin priest says.’ So, monks, the chief consort of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, got the chance at the time of sunrise of seeing a fourfold army arrayed, armoured, standing on level ground, and of drinking at the washing of the swords. Then, monks, the chief consort of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, when the child in her womb had reached maturity, gave birth to a son. They gave him the name of Dīghāvu.¹ Then, monks, soon afterwards Prince Dīghāvu attained years of discretion.²

“Then, monks, it occurred to Dīghīti, the King of Kosala: ‘This Brahmādatta, King of Kāsi, has done us much mischief; our troops and vehicles and territories and storehouses and granaries have been stolen by him. If he knew about us he would have all three of us put to death. Suppose I should make Prince Dīghāvu live outside the town?’ Then, monks, Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, made Prince Dīghāvu live outside the town. Then, monks, Prince Dīghāvu, while living outside the town, soon learnt every craft.

“Now at that time, monks, the barber of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, dwelt at (the court of) Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi. The barber of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, saw Dīghīti, the King of Kosala, with

¹ Some manuscripts spell Dīghāyu. The meaning, in both spellings, is longevity, “Longeval” (*Vinaya Texts* ii.297). Dīghāvu’s story is given at Ja iii.211f., Ja iii.487ff.; at Ja iii.490 he is identified with the Bodhisatta. Dhp 109 is said to have been spoken on his account, Dhp-a ii.235. ² As at [Vin 1.269](#). In the Jātaka this age is usually reckoned to be about sixteen.

his wife in a certain place adjoining Benares, dwelling in a potter's house, in disguise, clothed as a wanderer; seeing him, he approached Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi; having approached, he spoke thus to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi: 'Sire, Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, is dwelling with his wife ... clothed as a wanderer'.

"Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, enjoined the people, saying: 'Well then, good sirs, bring along Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, with his wife.' And, monks, these people having answered, 'Yes, sire', in assent to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, brought along Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, with his wife. Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, enjoined the people, saying: "Well now, good sirs, having bound Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, and his wife with stout cord, their arms pinioned tightly behind their backs,¹ having shaved them bald,² having paraded them to a harsh-sounding kettle-drum from street to street, from cross-road to cross-road, having ejected them by the southern gate of the town, having at the south of the town³ chopped them into four pieces, discard the pieces to the four quarters." And these people, monks, having answered, 'Yes, sire', in assent to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, having bound Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, and his wife with stout cord, their arms pinioned tightly behind their backs, having shaved them bald, paraded them with a harsh-sounding kettle-drum from street to street and from cross-road to cross-road.

"Then, monks, it occurred to Prince Dīghāvu: 'It is a long time since I have seen my parents. Suppose now I should see my parents?' Then, monks, Prince Dīghāvu, having entered Benares, saw his parents bound with stout cord their arms pinioned tightly behind their backs, shaved bald, parading to a harsh-sounding kettle-drum from street to street, from cross-road to cross-road; and seeing them he approached his parents. Then, monks, Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, saw Prince Dīghāvu coming from afar, and seeing him he spoke thus to Prince Dīghāvu: 'Do not you, dear Dīghāvu, look far or close for, dear Dīghāvu, wrathful moods are not allayed by wrath: wrathful

¹ Cf. DN i.245. ² Cf. DN i.98. ³ This whole passage is stock; cf. AN ii.241, SN ii.128, SN iv.344.

moods, dear Dīghāvu, are allayed by non-wrath.’¹

“When he had spoken thus, monks, these people spoke thus to Dīghāti, the King of Kosala: ‘This Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, is mad, he is talking gibberish. Who is Dīghāvu to him that he should speak thus: “Do not you ... by non-wrath”?’ He said: ‘I am not mad, good sirs, I am not talking gibberish; what is more, whoever is learned will understand.’ And a second time, monks, ... And a third time, monks, did Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, speak thus to Prince Dīghāvu: ‘Do not you, dear Dīghāvu, look far or close ... by non-wrath.’ And a third time, monks, did these people speak thus to Dīghāti, the King of Kosala: ‘This Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, is mad ...’ And a third time, monks, did Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, speak thus to these people: ‘I am not mad ... whoever is learned will understand.’ Then, monks, these people having paraded Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, and his wife from street to street, from cross-road to cross-road, having ejected them by the southern gate, having chopped them into four pieces at the south of the town, having discarded the pieces to the four quarters, and having stationed troops² (there), departed.

“Then, monks, Prince Dīghāvu, having entered Benares, having brought back strong drink, made the troops³ drink it. When these had fallen down, intoxicated, then (Dīghāvu) having collected sticks, having made a funeral pyre, having put his parents’ bodies on to the funeral pyre, having lit it, three times circumambulated the funeral pyre, his palms joined. Now at that time Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, was on an upper terrace of his palace. He saw Prince Dīghāvu, monks, three times circumambulating the funeral pyre, his palms joined, and seeing him it occurred to him: ‘Undoubtedly this man is a relation or a kinsman of Dīghāti, the King of Kosala. Alas, this spells misfortune for me, for no one will tell me what it means.’

“Then, monks. Prince Dīghāvu, having gone to a jungle, having cried and wept, having dried his tears, having entered Benares, having gone to an elephant stable near the king’s palace, spoke thus to the elephant trainer: ‘I want to learn the craft, teacher.’⁴ He said: ‘Well

¹ Cf. Dh 5. The meaning is explained at Kd 10.2.19. ² *gumba*. ³ *gumbiye*.

⁴ *ācariya*, teacher or trainer.

then, my good youngster,¹ learn it.’ Then, monks, Prince Dīghāvu, rising in the night towards dawn, sang in a sweet voice in the elephant stable and played the lute.² And monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, rising in the night towards dawn heard the singing in the sweet voice and the lute-playing in the elephant stable; having heard, he asked the people: ‘Who, good sirs, rising in the night towards dawn, was singing in a sweet voice and playing a lute in the elephant stable?’

“Sire, a youngster, a pupil of such and such an elephant trainer, rising in the night towards dawn, was singing in a sweet voice and playing a lute in the elephant stable.’ He said: ‘Well then, good sirs, bring that youngster along.’ And, monks, these people, having answered, ‘Yes, sire’, in assent to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, brought along Prince Dīghāvu. (The king said:) “Did you, my good youngster, rising ... sing in a sweet voice and play a lute in the elephant stable?’ ‘Yes, sire,’ he said. ‘Well, then, do you, my good youngster, sing and play the lute (before me).’ And, monks, Prince Dīghāvu, having answered, ‘Yes, sire’, in assent to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, longing for success, sang in a sweet voice and played the lute. Then, monks, Brahmādatta the King of Kāsi, spoke thus to Prince Dīghāvu: ‘Do you, my good youngster, attend on me.’ Then, monks, Prince Dīghāvu answered ‘Yes, sire’, in assent to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi. Then, monks, Prince Dīghāvu became an earlier riser than Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, he lay down later, he was a willing servant, eager to please, speaking affectionately.³ Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, soon established Prince Dīghāvu in a confidential position of trust.

“Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, spoke thus to Prince Dīghāvu: ‘Well now, good youngster, harness a chariot, I will go out hunting.’ And, monks, Prince Dīghāvu having answered, ‘Yes, sire’, in assent to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, having harnessed a chariot,

¹ *bhaṇe māṇavaka*. ² He may have learnt to sing and play when he learnt “every craft” (end of **Kd 10.2.7**), or he may have learnt these accomplishments as part of the elephant craft, elephants being notoriously fond of music. ³ As at **SN iii.113**.

spoke thus to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi: 'A chariot is harnessed for you, sire; for this you may think it is now the right time.' Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, mounted the chariot, Prince Dīghāvu drove the chariot, and he drove the chariot in such a manner that the army went by one way and the chariot by another. Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, having gone far, spoke thus to Prince Dīghāvu: 'Well now, good youngster, unharness the chariot; as I am tired I will lie down.' And, monks, Prince Dīghāvu having answered 'Yes, sire', in assent to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, having unharnessed the chariot, sat down cross-legged on the ground. Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, lay down having laid his head on Prince Dīghāvu's lap, and because he was tired he fell asleep at once.

0.2.16
1.347
4.496
"Then, monks, it occurred to Prince Dīghāvu: 'This Brahmādatta, King of Kāsi, has done us much mischief, he has stolen our troops and vehicles and territory and store-houses, and granaries, and he has killed my parents. This could be a time when I could show my wrath,' and he drew his sword from its sheath. Then, monks, it occurred to Prince Dīghāvu: 'My father spoke to me thus at the time of his dying: 'Do not you, dear Dīghāvu, look far or close, for, dear Dīghāvu, wrathful moods are not allayed by wrath: wrathful moods, dear Dīghāvu, are allayed by non-wrath.'" It would not be suitable for me to transgress my father's words,' and he replaced his sword in its sheath. And a second time, monks, it occurred to Prince Dīghāvu: 'This Brahmādatta ... when I could show my wrath,' and he drew his sword from its sheath. And a second time, monks, it occurred to Prince Dīghāvu: 'My father spoke to me thus ... It would not be suitable for me to transgress my father's words,' and again he replaced his sword in its sheath. And a third time ... and again he replaced his sword in its sheath. Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, frightened, agitated, fearful, alarmed, suddenly got up. Then, monks, Prince Dīghāvu spoke thus to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi: 'Why do you, sire, frightened ... suddenly get up?' He said: 'As I was dreaming here, my good youngster, the son of Dīghīti, the King of Kosala,

attacked me with a sword. That is why I, frightened ... suddenly got up.'

"Then, monks, Prince Dīghāvu, having stroked the head of Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, with his left hand, having drawn his sword with his right hand, spoke thus to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi: 'I, sire, am Prince Dīghāvu, that son of Dīghāti, the King of Kosala. You have done us much mischief, our troops, vehicles, territory, store-houses and granaries were stolen by you, and my parents were killed by you. This could be a time when I could show my wrath.' Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, inclining his head towards Prince Dīghāvu's feet, spoke thus to Prince Dīghāvu: 'Grant me my life, dear Dīghāvu, grant me my life, dear Dīghāvu.'

"How am I able to grant life to a king? It is a king who should grant me life.'

"Well then, dear Dīghāvu, you grant me life and I will grant you life.' Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, and Prince Dīghāvu granted life to one another and they took hold of (one another's) hands and they made an oath to do (one another) no harm. Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, spoke thus to Prince Dīghāvu: 'Well then, dear Dīghāvu, harness the chariot; we will go away.' And, monks, Prince Dīghāvu, having answered, 'Yes, sire', in assent to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, having harnessed the chariot, spoke thus to Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi: 'The chariot is harnessed for you, sire; for this you may think it is now the right time.' Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, mounted the chariot. Prince Dīghāvu drove the chariot, and he drove the chariot in such a manner that soon it met the army.

"Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, having entered Benares, having had the ministers and councillors convened, spoke thus: 'If, good sirs, you should see Prince Dīghāvu, the son of Dīghāti, the King of Kosala, what would you do to him?' Some spoke thus: 'We, sire, would cut off his hands; we, sire, would cut off his feet; we, sire, would cut off his hands and feet; ... his ears, ... his nose, ... his ears and nose, ... we, sire, would cut off his head.' He said: 'This, good sirs,

Kd 10.2

Vin 1.34

BD 4.4

Kd 10.2

is Prince Dīghāvu, the son of Dīghāti, the King of Kosala; there is no occasion to do anything (against him); life was granted by him to me and life was granted by me to him.’

“Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, spoke thus to Prince Dīghāvu: ‘Concerning that, dear Dīghāvu, which your father said to you at the time of dying: “Do not you, dear Dīghāvu, look far or close, for, dear Dīghāvu, wrathful moods are not allayed by wrath: wrathful moods, dear Dīghāvu, are allayed by non-wrath”—what did your father mean?’ He said: ‘Concerning that, sire, which my father said to me at the time of dying—“not far” means: do not bear wrath long. This is what my father said to me, sire, at the time of dying when he said “not far”. Concerning that, sire, which my father said to me at the time of dying—“not close” means: do not hastily break with a friend. This is what my father said to me, sire, at the time of dying when he said “not close”. Concerning that, sire, which my father said to me at the time of dying—“for, dear Dīghāvu, wrathful moods are not allayed by wrath: wrathful moods, dear Dīghāvu, are allayed by non-wrath” means: my parents were killed by a king, but if I were to deprive the king of life those who desired the king’s welfare would deprive me of life and those who desired my welfare would deprive these of life; thus that wrath would not be settled by wrath.¹ But now that life is granted me by a king and life is granted a king by me, thus is wrath settled by non-wrath. This is what my father said to me, sire, at the time of dying when he said: ‘for, dear Dīghāvu, wrathful moods are not allayed by wrath; wrathful moods, dear Dīghāvu, are allayed by non-wrath’.

“Then, monks, Brahmādatta, the King of Kāsi, thinking: ‘Indeed, it is marvellous, indeed, it is wonderful that this Prince Dīghāvu is so clever that he understands in full the matter which was spoken by his father in brief’, gave back his father’s troops and vehicles and territory and storehouses and granaries, and he gave him his daughter.

¹ Cf. similar sentiments at SN i.85, DhP 256–Dhp 257.

“Now, monks, if such is the forbearance and gentleness of kings who wield the sceptre,¹ who wield the sword, herein, monks, let your light shine forth so that you who have gone forth in this *dhamma* and discipline which are thus well taught² may be equally forbearing and gentle.” And a third time³ the Lord spoke thus to these monks: “Enough, monks; no strife, no quarrels, no contention, no disputing.” And a third time that monk who spoke what was not *dhamma* spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, let the Lord, the *dhamma*-master, wait; Lord, let the Lord, unconcerned, live intent on abiding in ease here and now; we will be (held) accountable for this strife, quarrel, contention, disputing.” Then the Lord, thinking: “These foolish men are as though infatuate; it is not easy to persuade them,” rising up from his seat, departed.

The First Portion for Repeating: that on Dīghāvu

Then the Lord,⁴ having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Kosambī for almsfood; having walked for almsfood in Kosambī, bringing back his almsbowl after his meal, having packed away his lodging, taking his bowl and robe and standing in the midst of the Order,⁵ he spoke these verses:

“When all⁶ in chorus bawl,
none feels a fool,
nor though the Order is divided,
thinks otherwise.

“With⁷ wandering wits
the wiseacres range all the held of talk;
with mouths agape to full extent,
what leads them on they know not.

¹ *ādinna-daṇḍa*, take up a stick. *Daṇḍa* also means punishment. So the phrase may mean, instead of “scepter”, “who use violence” or “who mete out punishment”.

² Cf. *Kd 5.4.3*. ³ First and second times occur at *Kd 10.2.2*. ⁴ Cf. *MN iii.153*.

⁵ Omitted at *MN iii.153*. ⁶ All these lines occur at *MN iii.154*, *Ja iii.488*. ⁷ This couplet also at *Ud v.9*. I borrow Woodward’s translation of it.

“They who¹ (in thought) belabour this:
That man has me abused, has hurt,
has worsted me, has me despoiled:
in these wrath’s not allayed.

“They who do not belabour this:
That man has me abused, has hurt,
has worsted me, has me despoiled:
in them wrath is allayed.

“Nay, not by wrath are wrathful moods
allayed here (and) at any time,
but by not-wrath are they allayed:
this is an (ageless) endless rule.

“People do not discern
that here we straitened are (in life, in time),²
but they who herein do discern,
thereby their quarrels are allayed.

“Ruffians who maim and kill,
steal cattle, steeds and wealth, who plunder realms—
for these is concord.
Why should there not be for you?

“If one find³ friend with whom to fare
rapt in the well-abiding, apt,
surmounting dangers one and all,
with joy fare with him mindfully.

“Finding none apt⁴ with whom to fare,
None in the well-abiding rapt,
As *rājā* quits the conquered realm,
fare lonely as bull-elephant in elephant jungle.

¹ This verse and the next three also occur at Dhp 3–Dhp 6=Ja iii.212. ² This line is also at Thag 275. ³ This verse is also at Dhp 328=Snp 45. I borrow E.M. HARE’S translation. ⁴ This verse=Dhp 329=Snp 46 (except for Sutta Nipāta last line).

“Better¹ the faring of one alone,
there is no companionship with the foolish,
fare lonely, unconcerned, working no evil,
as bull-elephant in elephant-jungle.”

ON GOING TO BĀLAKALOṆAKA

Then the Lord,² having spoken these verses as he was standing in the midst of the Order, approached Bālakaloṇakāra village.³ Now at that time the venerable Bhagu was staying in Bālakaloṇakāra village. Then the venerable Bhagu⁴ saw the Lord coming from afar; seeing him, he made ready a seat, set out water for the feet, a footstool, a foot-stand, and having gone to meet him, he received his bowl and robe. Then the Lord sat down on the seat made ready; as he was sitting down he had his feet bathed. And the venerable Bhagu, having greeted the Lord, sat down at a respectful distance. As the venerable Bhagu was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord spoke thus to him: “I hope, monk, things are going well, I hope you are keeping going, I hope you are not short of almsfood.”

“Things are going well, Lord, I am keeping going, Lord, and, Lord, I am not short of almsfood.” Then the Lord, having delighted, rejoiced, roused, gladdened the venerable Bhagu with talk on *dhamma*,⁵ rising from his seat, departed for the Eastern Bamboo Grove.⁶

¹ This verse = Dhp 330. ² MN iii.154 continues in accordance with above, and cf. Ja iii.489. ³ See *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* for uncertainty of the reading (MN iii.154, Ja iii.489, MN-a iii.55, MN-a iv.206 read *-gāma*; Dhp-a i.56, SN-a ii.304, Thag-a i.380 (Siamese edition) read *-ārāma*), and for the Majjhima Commentary’s (MN-a iii.55) two interpretations of the meaning of the name. ⁴ His verses are at Thag 271–Thag 274. Mentioned at Vin 2.182, Ja i.140, Ja iii.489, Mil 107, Dhp-a i.56, Dhp-a i.133. According to *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* he is probably not the same as the Bhagu mentioned at Vin 1.300. ⁵ According to MN-a iv.206 this was on the advantages of solitariness. ⁶ Pācīnavamsa (miga) dāya. See AN-a iv.117 for interpretation of the name. Mentioned at (besides MN iii.155) Thag 155, AN iv.228, Dhp-a i.56, Thag-a 86.

ON GOING TO PĀCĪNAVAṂSADĀYA

10.4.2
4.501 Now at that time the venerable Anuruddha¹ and the venerable Nandiya² and the venerable Kimbila³ were staying in the Eastern Bamboo Grove.⁴ The keeper of the Grove saw the Lord coming from afar; seeing him he spoke thus to the Lord: “Do not, recluse, enter this Grove; there are three young men of respectable families staying here desiring self⁵; do not cause them discomfort.” The venerable Anuruddha heard the keeper of the Grove conferring with the Lord; having heard, he spoke thus to the keeper of the Grove: “Do not, good grove-keeper, impede the Lord. It is our teacher, the Lord, who is arriving.” Then the venerable Anuruddha approached the venerable Nandiya and the venerable Kimbila; having approached, he spoke thus to the venerable Nandiya and to the venerable Kimbila:” Go forward, venerable ones, go forward, venerable ones; our teacher, the Lord is arriving.”

1.351
10.4.3 Then the venerable Anuruddha and the venerable Nandiya and the venerable Kimbila, having gone out to meet the Lord, one received his bowl and robe, one made ready a seat, one set out water for the feet, a footstool, a foot-stand. Then the Lord sat down on the seat made ready; as he was sitting down he had his feet bathed. Then these venerable ones, having greeted the Lord, sat down at a respectful distance. As the venerable Anuruddha was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Lord spoke thus: “I hope that things are going well with you, Anuruddhas,⁶ I hope you are keeping going, I hope you are not short of almsfood.”

¹ Verses at Thag 892–Thag 919. He and his friends, Nandiya and Kimbila, are often mentioned together, as at MN i.205, which although set in the Gosinga Wood, is similar to the above Vinaya passage. See also the six friends (not including Nandiya) who, with Upāli, the barber, are mentioned at Vin 2.182. ² Verses at Thag 25. Thag-a 86 says that while Nandiya was in the Eastern Bamboo Grove, Māra appeared before him in a terrible form. ³ Verses at Thag 118, Thag 155. ⁴ For the following cf. MN i.205ff. (where the scene is laid in the Gosinga Sāl-Woodland Grove). ⁵ On *attakāmarūpa* see MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Buddhism* (Home University Library) 2nd edition, p. 81. ⁶ The plural, Anuruddhā, is used instead of the names of the three separate monks.

“Things are going well, Lord, we are keeping going, Lord, and, Lord, we are not short of almsfood.”

“I hope that you, Anuruddhas, are living all together on friendly terms and harmonious, as milk and water blend, regarding one another with the eye of affection?”¹

“Yes, certainly, Lord, we are living all together on friendly terms and harmonious, as milk and water blend, regarding one another with the eye of affection.”

“And how is it that you, Anuruddhas, are living ... of affection?”

“As to this, Lord, it occurred to me: ‘Indeed it is a gain for me, indeed it is well gotten by me, that I am living with such Brahmaraters.’ On account of this, Lord, for these venerable ones amity² as to bodily conduct, whether openly or in private, has risen up in me, amity as to speech, amity as to thought, whether openly or in private, has risen up.³ Because of this, Lord, it occurred to me: ‘What now, if I, having surrendered my own mind, should live only according to the mind of these venerable ones?’ So I, Lord, having surrendered my own mind, am living only according to the mind of these venerable ones. Lord, we have divers bodies,⁴ but assuredly only one mind.”

And the venerable Nandiya too, and also the venerable Kimbila spoke thus to the Lord: “And it occurred to me too, Lord: ‘Indeed it is a gain for me ... only one mind’. It is thus, Lord, that we are living all together on friendly terms and harmonious, as milk and water blend, regarding one another with the eye of affection.”

“And I hope that you, Anuruddhas, are living zealous, ardent, self-resolute?”

“Yes, certainly, Lord, we are living ... self-resolute.”

“And how is it that you, Anuruddhas, are living ... self-resolute?”

“As to this, Lord, whichever⁵ of us returns first from the village for almsfood, he makes ready a seat, puts out water for washing the

¹ Stock, as at MN i.206, MN i.398, MN iii.156, AN i.70, AN iii.67, AN iii.104, SN iv.225.

² On amity, *mettā*, see MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Outlines of Buddhism*, p. 30ff. ³ Cf.

MN i.321, which after “amity as to speech” fills in “whether openly or in private has risen up”, as does MN i.206. ⁴ We are many (or several) men, persons, *kāyā*. ⁵ Cf.

Kd 4.1.

feet, a footstool, a foot-stand; having washed a refuse-bowl he sets it out, he sets out water for drinking and water for washing. Whoever returns last from the village for almsfood, if there are the remains of a meal and if he so desires, he eats them; if he does not desire to do so he throws them out where there are no crops or drops them into water where there are no living creatures; he puts up the seat, he puts away the water for the feet, the footstool, the foot-stand, having washed the refuse-bowl, he puts it away, he puts away the water for drinking and the water for washing, he sweeps the refectory. Whoever sees a vessel for drinking water or a vessel for washing water or a vessel (for water) for rinsing after an evacuation, void and empty, he sets out (water). If it is impossible for him (to do this) by a movement of his hand, having invited a companion to help us by signalling (to him) with the hand, we set out (water); but we do not, Lord, for such a reason break into speech. And then we, Lord, once in every five nights sit down together for talk on *dhamma*. It is thus, Lord, that we are living, zealous, ardent, self-resolute.”¹

ON GOING TO PĀRILEYYAKA

Then the Lord, having delighted, rejoiced, roused, gladdened the venerable Anuruddha and the venerable Nandiya and the venerable Kimbila with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, set out on tour for Pārileyya.² Walking on tour in due course he arrived at Pārileyya. The Lord stayed there at Pārileyya in the Guarded Woodland Thicket³

¹ The versions at MN i.207, MN iii.154, break off here, and both go on from here in different ways. ² Spelt Pārileyya; a village, although SN-a ii.304 speaks of it as a *nagara*, town. Dhp-a i.51-63 takes Pārileyya to be the and describes in vivid detail the ways in which he waited upon the Lord. This elephant is identified with that in the Bhisī Jātaka (Ja iv.314). Pārileyya(ka) mentioned at SN iii.95, Ud iv.5, Ja iii.489.

³ rakkhitavanasaṇḍa. Mentioned at Ud iv.5, but not at SN iii.95. Dhp-a i.59 says that the thicket was so called because the elephant with a stick in his trunk, guarded the Lord from danger during the nights.

at the root of the lovely *sāl*-tree.¹ Then as the Lord was meditating in private a reasoning arose in his mind thus: “Formerly, beset by those monks of Kosambī, makers of strife, makers of quarrels, makers of disputes makers of brawls, makers of legal questions in the Order, I did not live in comfort; but now that I am alone with no other, I am living in comfort removed from those monks, makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in the Order.”

Now a certain large bull-elephant² was beset by elephants and cow-elephants, by elephant calves and sucklings; he ate grass already cropped by them, and they ate bundles of branches as he broke them off; and he drank muddied water and when he crossed over at a ford the cow-elephants went pushing against his body. Then it occurred to that large bull-elephant: “Now I am living beset by elephants and cow-elephants ... I eat grass already cropped by them and they eat bundles of branches as I break them off; and I drink muddied water and when I cross over at a ford the cow-elephants go pushing against my body. Suppose I were to live alone secluded from the crowd?”

Then that large bull-elephant, leaving the herd, approached Pāri-leyya, the Guarded Woodland Thicket, the lovely *sāl*-tree and the Lord; having approached, he set out by means of his trunk drinking water for the Lord and water for washing, and he kept the grass down.³ Then it occurred to that large bull-elephant: “Now formerly, beset by elephants and cow-elephants, by elephant calves and sucklings, I did not live in comfort; I ate grass already cropped by them and they ate bundles of branches as I broke them off; I drank muddied water and when I crossed over at a ford the cow-elephants went pushing against me; but now that I am alone with no other I am living in comfort removed from the elephants, the cow-elephants, the elephant calves and sucklings.”

Then the Lord, having understood his own seclusion and knowing

¹ *bhaddasāla*. It was one tree, *manāpa laṭṭhaka*, according to Ud-a 250 and SN-a ii.305, which say that the Lord stayed depending on that village (Pārileyya) in a leaf-room in the jungle thicket at the root of that tree. ² *hatthināga*. Vin-a 1152 says *mahāhatthi*, a great elephant. Ud-a 250 adds that he was the leader of a herd. This passage recurs at Ud iv.5. Cf. AN iv.435. ³ *appaharitañ ca karoti*.

by mind that bull-elephant's reasoning of mind, at that time uttered this utterance:

“Herein agreeth mind with mind,
of sage¹ and bull-elephant of plough-pole tusks,²
since each delights in forest (solitude).”³

10.5.1
4.505
Then the Lord, having stayed at Pārileyya as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Sāvattthī. Walking on tour in due course he arrived at Sāvattthī. The Lord stayed there at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Then the lay-followers of Kosambī thought: “These masters the monks of Kosambī, have done us much mischief; the Lord is departing, harassed by these; come, we should neither greet the masters, the monks of Kosambī, nor should we stand up before them, nor should we salute them with joined palms or perform the proper duties; we should not revere, respect, esteem or honour them, and neither should we give them almsfood when they come (to us); thus they, when they are neither revered, respected, esteemed nor honoured by us, will depart unrevered, or they will leave the Order, or they will reconcile themselves to the Lord’.

10.5.2
1.354
Then the lay-followers of Kosambī neither greeted the monks of Kosambī, nor stood up before them, they did not salute them with joined palms or perform the proper duties, they did not revere, respect, esteem or honour them and they did not give them almsfood when they came (to them). Then the monks of Kosambī, as they were not being revered, respected, esteemed or honoured by the lay-followers of Kosambī, spoke thus: “Come now, your reverences, let us, having gone to Sāvattthī, settle this legal question in the Lord's presence.”

¹ *nāga*. Vin-a 1152, Ud-a 251 explain by *buddhanāga*. ² Cf. *nāga isādanta* at MN i.414, Vv 20.9, Vv 43.9. ³ Version at Ud iv.5 also ends here.

ON EIGHTEEN CASES

Then the monks of Kosambī, having packed away their lodgings, taking their bowls and robes, approached Sāvattihī.

Then the venerable Sāriputta heard: “It is said that the monks of Kosambī, makers of strife, makers of quarrels, makers of disputes makers of brawls, makers of legal questions in the Order, are coming to Sāvattihī.” Then the venerable Sāriputta approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance the venerable Sāriputta spoke thus to the Lord: “It is said, Lord, that the monks of Kosambī, makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in the Order, are coming to Sāvattihī. How am I, Lord, to behave in regard to these monks?”

“Well now, Sāriputta, as *dhamma* is so must you stand.”¹

“How am I, Lord, to find out what is *dhamma* and what is non-*dhamma*?”

“Now, Sāriputta, a speaker of non-*dhamma* is to be known by eighteen points: In such a case, Sāriputta, a monk explains² non-*dhamma* as *dhamma*, he explains *dhamma* as non-*dhamma*; he explains non-discipline as discipline, he explains discipline as non-discipline; he explains what was not spoken, not uttered by the *tathāgata* as spoken, uttered by the *tathāgata*, explains what was spoken, uttered by the *tathāgata* as not spoken, not uttered by the *tathāgata*; he explains what was not practised by the *tathāgata* as practised by the *tathāgata*, he explains what was practised by the *tathāgata* as not practised by the *tathāgata*; he explains what was not laid down by the *tathāgata* as laid down by the *tathāgata*, he explains what was laid down by the *tathāgata* as not laid down by the *tathāgata*, he explains what is no offence as an offence, he explains an offence as no

¹ *yathādhammo tathā tiṭṭhāhi*. ² Cf. this passage with [Vin 2.88](#), [Vin 2.204](#). The first five pairs also occur at [AN v.77](#) as reasons why when there is strife, quarrelling, contention, dispute in an Order the monks do not live in comfort. These same five pairs are again given ([AN v.78](#)) as ten roots of disputing. They are followed by another ten roots of disputing, namely the next four pairs as given above in the Vinaya with one added pair.

offence; he explains a slight offence as a serious offence, he explains a serious offence as a slight offence; he explains an offence which can be done away with¹ as an offence which cannot be done away with, he explains an offence which cannot be done away with as an offence which can be done away with; he declares a very bad offence² as not a very bad offence, he explains not a very bad offence as a very bad offence. Sāriputta, a speaker of non-*dhamma* is to be known by these eighteen points.

And, Sāriputta, a speaker of *dhamma* is to be known by eighteen points. In such a case, Sāriputta, a monk explains non-*dhamma* as non-*dhamma*, he explains *dhamma* as *dhamma*; he explains non-discipline as non-discipline, he explains discipline as discipline; he explains what was not spoken, not uttered by the *tathāgata* as not spoken, not uttered by the *tathāgata* ... not practised ... practised ... not laid down ... laid down ... he explains an offence as an offence ... no offence as no offence ... a slight offence as a slight offence ... a serious offence as a serious offence an offence which can be done away with as an offence which can be done away with ... an offence which cannot be done away with as an offence which cannot be done away with ... a very bad offence as a very bad offence, he explains not a very bad offence as not a very bad offence. Sāriputta, a speaker of *dhamma* is to be known by these eighteen points.”

The venerable Moggallāna the Great³ heard ... the venerable Kassapa the Great⁴ heard ... the venerable Kaccāna the Great heard ... the venerable Koṭṭhita the Great heard ... the venerable Kappina the Great heard ... the venerable Cunda the Great heard ... the venerable Anuruddha heard ... the venerable Revata heard ... the venerable Upāli heard ... the venerable Ānanda heard ... the venerable Rāhula

¹ *sāvasesā āpatti, anavasesā āpatti*. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.35, n. 2, which explains that one which cannot be done away with is practically equivalent to a *Pārājika*. A *Saṅghādisesa* can be done away with by the penalties inflicted by the Order, most of the others by confession. ² *duṭṭhullā āpatti*. See **BD 2.219, n. 2**. ³ These elders, including Sāriputta but not including Kassapa, are also mentioned at **Vin 2.15–Vin.2.16, Vin 4.66**. For notes see **BD 2.295**. Cf. a list of ten at **AN iii.299**. ⁴ Verses at **Thag 1051**. At **AN i.23** called chief of those who uphold the ascetic practices.

heard: “They say that the monks of Kosambī ... (= **Kd 10.5.3**–**Kd.10.5.5**. *Read Rāhula instead of Sāriputta.*) “... Rāhula, a speaker of *dhamma* is to be known by these eighteen points.”

Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid heard: “It is said that the monks of Kosambī ... (as in **Kd 10.5.3**) ... are coming to Sāvattthī.” Then Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, she stood at a respectful distance.¹ As she was standing at a respectful distance Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid spoke thus to the Lord: “It is said, Lord, that the monks of Kosambī ... are coming to Sāvattthī. How am I, Lord, to behave in regard to these monks?”

“Well then, do you, Gotami, hear *dhamma* on both sides; having heard *dhamma* on both sides, choose the views and the approval and the persuasion and the creed² of those monks who are there speakers of *dhamma*, and whatever is to be desired by the Order of nuns from the Order of monks,³ all that should be desired only from one who speaks *dhamma*.”

Anāthapiṇḍika the householder heard: “It is said that the monks of Kosambī ... are coming to Sāvattthī.” Then Anāthapiṇḍika the householder approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Anāthapiṇḍika the householder spoke thus to the Lord: “It is said, Lord, that the monks of Kosambī ... are coming to Sāvattthī. How am I, Lord, to behave in regard to these monks?”

“Well then, do you, householder, give gifts to both sides; having given gifts to both sides, hear *dhamma* on both sides; having heard *dhamma* on both sides, choose the views and the approval and the persuasion and the creed of those monks who are there speakers of *dhamma*.”

Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, heard: “It is said that the monks of Kosambī ... are coming to Sāvattthī.” Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord,

¹ Nuns must stand in the presence of monks; see **Vin 4.52**. ² Cf. **Kd 1.38.7**. ³ See e.g. Nuns **Bi-Pc 59**.

she sat down at a respectful distance. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance Visākhā, Migāra's mother, spoke thus to the Lord: "It is said, Lord, that the monks of Kosambī ... are coming to Sāvattthī. How am I, Lord, to behave in regard to these monks?"

"Well then, do you, Visākhā, give gifts to both sides ... (as in **Kd 10.5.8**) ... choose the views ... of those monks who are there speakers of *dhamma*."

Then in due course the monks of Kosambī arrived at Sāvattthī. Then the venerable Sāriputta approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Sāriputta spoke thus to the Lord: "They say, Lord, that these monks of Kosambī, makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in the Order, have arrived at Sāvattthī. Now what line of conduct, Lord, should be followed in regard to lodgings for these monks?"

"Well now, Sāriputta, separate lodgings should be given (to them)."

"But if, Lord, there are no separate lodgings what line of conduct should be followed?"

"Well then, Sāriputta, having made (some) separate they should be given. **But I in no way say this, Sāriputta, that a senior monk's lodging should be withheld (from him). Whoever should withhold it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**"

"But what line of conduct, Lord, is to be followed in regard to material gains?"¹

"Material gains, Sāriputta, should be distributed equally amongst all."

ALLOWANCE TO RESTORE

Then while that monk who had been suspended was reflecting on *dhamma* and discipline, it occurred to him: "This is an offence, this is not no offence, I have fallen, I am not unfallen, I am suspended, I am not unsuspending, I am suspended by a (formal) act that is

¹ *āmisa*, probably meaning here food and clothing.

legally valid, irreversible, fit to stand.” Then the suspended monk approached those monks who were taking the part of the suspended (one); having approached, he spoke thus to those monks who were taking the part of the suspended (one): “This is an offence, your reverences, it is not no offence ... fit to stand. Come, venerable ones, restore me.”

Then those monks who were taking the part of the suspended (one), taking that suspended monk (with them) approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, those monks spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, this suspended monk speaks thus: ‘This is an offence, your reverences ... Come, venerable ones, restore me’. What line of conduct, Lord, is to be followed in these circumstances?”¹

“This, monks, is an offence, this is not no offence, this monk has fallen, this monk is not unfallen, this monk is suspended, this monk is not unsuspended, he was suspended by a legally valid (formal) act, irreversible, fit to stand But since, monks, that monk who has fallen and was suspended sees (his offence)—well then, monks, restore that monk.”

ON HARMONY IN THE SAṄGHA

Then these monks who were taking the part of the suspended (one), having restored that suspended monk, approached the monks who had suspended (him), having approached, they spoke thus to the monks who had suspended (him): “Concerning that case, your reverences, about which there was for the Order strife, quarrels, contention, disputes schism in the Order, dissension in the Order, altercation in the Order, differences in the Order that monk has fallen and was suspended, but he sees and is restored. Now, your reverences, let us achieve unanimity in the Order for settling this case.” Then those monks who had suspended (him) approached the Lord; having

¹ *tehi*.

approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, they spoke thus to the Lord: “These monks, Lord, who are taking the part of the suspended (monk) speak thus: ‘Concerning that case ... for settling this case.’ Now what line of conduct, Lord, is to be followed?”

“Since, monks, that monk has fallen and was suspended but sees and is restored—well then, monks, achieve unanimity in the Order for settling that case. And thus, monks, should it be achieved: One and all should gather together, both the ill and the well, leave of absence should not be declared on account of anyone. Having gathered together, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Concerning that case about which there was for the Order strife, quarrel, contention, dispute, schism in the Order ... differences in the Order—that monk has fallen and was suspended, but he sees and is restored. If it seems right to the Order the Order should achieve unanimity in the Order for settling this case. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Concerning that case ... and is restored. The Order is achieving unanimity in the Order for settling this case. If the achieving of unanimity in the Order for settling this case is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. Unanimity in the Order for settling that case is achieved by the Order. Dissension in the Order is put down, schism in the Order is put down. It is pleasing to the venerable ones; therefore they are silent. Thus do I understand this’. Observance may be carried out at once, the Pātimokkha recited.”

QUESTIONS OF UPĀLI ON HARMONY IN THE SAṄGHA

Then the venerable Upāli approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Upāli spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, in regard to a case where there is strife for an Order ... differences for an Order, if the Order not having investigated

that case, not having got to the root of it,¹ achieves unanimity in the Order, is that unanimity in the Order legally valid, Lord?”

“Upāli, in regard to a case where there is strife for an Order ... that unanimity is not legally valid, Upāli.”

“But, Lord, in regard to a case where there is strife for an Order ... differences in an Order, if the Order having investigated that case, having got to the root of it, achieves unanimity in the Order, is that unanimity in the Order legally valid, Lord?”

“Upāli, in regard to a matter where there is strife for an Order, quarrels, contention, dispute, schism in an Order, dissension in an Order, altercation in an Order, differences in an Order, if the Order, having investigated that case, having got to the root of it, achieves unanimity in the Order, that unanimity in the Order is legally valid, Upāli.”

“How many (kinds of) unanimity in an Order are there, Lord?”

“There are these two (kinds of) unanimity in an Order, Upāli. There is, Upāli, unanimity in an Order that has not arrived at the meaning but has arrived at the letter; there is, Upāli, unanimity in an Order that has both arrived at the meaning and arrived, at the letter. And what, Upāli, is unanimity in an Order that has not arrived at the meaning but has arrived at the letter? Upāli, in regard to a case where there is strife for an Order ... differences in an Order, if the Order, not having investigated that case, not having got to the root of it, achieves unanimity in the Order, this is called, Upāli, unanimity in an Order that has not arrived at the meaning but has arrived at the letter. And what, Upāli, is unanimity in an Order that has both arrived at the meaning and arrived at the letter? Upāli, in regard to a case where there is strife for an Order ... differences in an Order, if the Order, having investigated that case, having got to the root of it, achieves unanimity in the Order, this is called, Upāli, unanimity in an Order that has both arrived at the meaning and arrived at the letter. These, Upāli, are the two (kinds of) unanimity in an Order.”

Then the venerable Upāli, rising from his seat, having arranged

¹ *amulā mūlaṃ gantvā.*

his upper robe over one shoulder, having saluted the Lord with joined palms, addressed the Lord with verses:

“In the Order’s affairs and deliberations
and in matters arising for investigation,
what kind of man is here most needed?
How is a monk fit for leadership here?

“Above all, one blameless in moral habit,
of careful conduct, his faculties well controlled,
opponents do not censure him in respect of a rule,
for there could be nothing to say against him.

“Such a one, firm in purity of moral habit,
is confident, he speaks ably,¹
he is not afraid at an assembly, he does not tremble,
he does not sacrifice the meaning² to irrelevant talk.

“When asked a question in an assembly,
he neither hesitates nor is ashamed,
his timely sensible words,
fitting as explanation, delight the learned assembly.

“With esteem for senior monks
and confident in his own teachers, able to weigh,
familiar with what should be spoken,
and skilled in obstructing his opponents,

“Opponents come under his control,
and the many-folk come under his tuition,
and he does not neglect his own creed,
(skilful) at question and answer, unhurting.

“Able in doing a messenger’s duty,
and well-informed in what they tell him of the Order’s
affairs,

¹ *visayha*. ² *atthaṃ na hāpeti*, or, does not neglect the goal; cf. Snp 37, Ja i.251.

sent by a group of monks he is obedient,
but he does not therefore think, ‘I am doing this’.

“Into whatever matters one falls,
whatever is an offence and how one removes it—
both these analyses are well handed down to him.
He is skilled in the features of offences and removal,

“Being sent away and good habits—he goes by these:
he is sent away and what are the grounds,
restoration of a person who has completed this¹—
he knows this too, skilled (as he is) in analysis.

“With esteem for senior monks, for newly ordained,
for elders and for those of middle standing,
a helper of the multitude, clever herein,
monk such as this is fit for leadership here.”

The Tenth Section: that on (the monks of) Kosambī

THIS IS ITS KEY

The splendid conqueror at Kosambī,
dispute about seeing an offence, one may suspend for this or that,
whatever is an offence of his it should be seen, /
Within a boundary, just there, five, and only one, attainment,
and Pārileyya, Sāvattī, and Sāriputta, Kolita, /
Kassapa the Great, Kaccāna, Koṭṭhita, and about Kappina,
and Cunda the Great, Anuruddha, Revata, Upāli,² /
Ānanda, and Rāhula too, Gotamī, Anāthapiṇḍika, and Visākhā,
Migāra’s mother, and separate lodgings, and equal material gains also, /
Leave for absence should not be granted to anyone, Upāli inquired,
irreproachable as to moral habit, unanimity in the conqueror’s instruction.

Finished is the Great Division³

¹ *taṃvūsita*, i.e. one who has been sent away but is now fit for restoration. ² *Up-
ālivhaya* (Oldenberg and Siamese edition). Sinhalese edition reads *Upālicūbhaye*.

³ OLDENBERG’S *Vinaya Piṭakam*, Vol. I, ends here.

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

The Cullavagga, the Less or Lesser Division of the Vinaya, consists of twelve Sections. The first three of these have been translated by H. OLDENBERG and T.W. RHYS DAVIDS in Sacred Books of the East, Volume XVII, 1882, and the remaining nine in Sacred Books of the East, Volume XX, 1885. The Pali Vinaya on which their translation as well as mine is based is that edited by OLDENBERG in 1880 as Volume II of his *Vinaya Piṭakam*.

The wealth of detail increases rather than diminishes in this Lesser Division, and as an instrument for use by monks and nuns is astonishing in its variety and the minute precision it lavishes on greater and smaller points alike.

It was no doubt ever more and more necessary to put the proper ways of meeting disturbances in the Order on a firm basis. This certainly appears to be the purpose of Section I which deals in turn with seven formal acts: (1) censure for quarrels, disputes and contention which perhaps arose from an earnest endeavour to act in conformity with what had been bid down and then finding that there were other and different opinions; or which perhaps were wantonly made in the Order by monks who, unable to master the higher practices, found time hang heavy; (2) guidance for a monk who had persisted in frequenting the laity and to guide him to consort instead with *kalyāṇamittā* and so become learned and expert in the *dhamma* and discipline; (3) banishment for a monk who had indulged in the numerous "bad habits" specified here and there in the Pali canon in a stereotyped passage; (4) reconciliation for a monk who had been rude to a householder, and who, when he went to ask for his forgive-

ness, was allowed to take a companion with him to act as messenger and spokesman in case the monk himself was overcome with shame and embarrassment—an allowance which in **Kd 22** Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, asked to be extended to him when he was accused (wrongly) by the Vajjis of Vesālī of reviling and abusing lay-followers; (5, 6, 7) three acts of suspension for not seeing an offence, for not making amends for one, for not giving up a wrong view, respectively.

All these formal acts have been mentioned already in the Mahāvagga (BD.4). But only an indication is given there of the occasions for carrying them out (as summarised above). These, while tallying with the occasions given in the Cullavagga, specify neither the method to be followed in carrying out each one, nor any of the grounds held to be sufficient for its revocation. All this is however dealt with by the Cullavagga.

Some of the stories chosen to illustrate behaviour which calls for one of these formal acts to correct it appear also in other parts of the Vinaya. For example, the episode of the monk Ariṭṭha occurs both in **Bu-Pc 68** and in **Kd 11.32**. The former gives the holder of wrong views a chance to renounce them while he is being admonished up to the third time. It is only, after this, if he persists in clinging to his views that he incurs an offence of expiation. But in the Cullavagga Ariṭṭha is given no final chance to clear himself. Once it is found that he holds to his views, the Order is told that it can carry out a formal act of suspension against him. He thereupon left the Order. As the text stands, Gotama is shown as saying that the formal act of suspension may be revoked. This would not only be an uncharacteristic weakness, but it does not fit the context. In fact, as Oldenberg remarks, we should have expected a negative here, and hence just the opposite: Let the Order not revoke the formal act of suspension for not giving up the wrong view (**Kd 11.34.1**). This would moreover have been in line with the injunction not to revoke the act of banishment when those against whom it had been carried out went away and left the Order (**Kd 1.16.1**).

At Vin-a 874 Ariṭṭha is called an enemy of the Buddha's dispensa-

tion, and although as a rule monks were not lightly let go of to return to the “world”, his was a stubborn case where his absence might well have been preferred to his presence. The Order was by now well established both in the popular esteem and as an institution running efficiently by its own internal and developed organisation, and if a monk left it, this would be attributed to his own incompetence rather than to any deficiency in the teaching and training.

Apart from expulsion from the Order for having committed one of the four *Pārājika* offences, and apart from being expelled for any one of the reasons given at **Kd 1.61–Kd.1.68**, a monk left of his own choice. The formal act of banishment is not banishment from the Order, but from a particular place where a monk had, for example, either indulged in “bad habits”, been frivolous or harmful in body or speech, caused strife and contention, or spoken dispraise of the Awakened One, *dhamma* or the Order. If he conducted himself properly while the act of banishment against him was in force, he could be rehabilitated, a privilege impossible to extend to one who had been expelled.

Sections **Kd 12** and **Kd 13** of the Cullavagga deal in great detail with Probation. This is not probation preliminary to entering the Order; but probation imposed on one who is already a member of it, and consisting of “going back to the beginning” of his training and being subjected to *mānatta* discipline. Such probation falls under the four headings mentioned at Vin-a 1159: that for offences which have been concealed, that for unconcealed offences, the concurrent probation and the purifying probation. This last could be imposed on monks who did not know whether they had worked through this disciplinary period of probation or not. In view of the many references to “ignorant inexperienced monks”, such haziness in regard to the right day for the termination of a probationary period is no more surprising than is the ignorance monks manifested about the stars and the quarters (**Kd 8.6.1**) and which proved physically harmful to them.

Kd 14 is devoted to the different ways of settling legal questions.

These legal questions have already been mentioned in the Suttavi-bhaṅga. In the first place, the case must be settled in the presence of the accused monk. But this verdict “in the presence of” is necessary to all legal settlements. Secondly there is the verdict of innocence given in favour of a monk who was wrongfully accused of an offence. Dabba the Mallian is taken as the example, and his story is told in the same words as in **Bu-Ss 8**. But in the Formal Meeting the interest, at the end, is shifted to the monks who accused him and who incur an offence for doing so; while in the Cullavagga the interest is centred on Dabba who is to have a verdict of innocence accorded him. We must therefore understand that this is a case where two separate actions of the Order were called for: one dealing with the monks who brought the false accusation against Dabba, and one for acquitting him.

Then comes the “verdict of past insanity”, to be given for monks who were mad when they committed an offence. As is usual, the properties that render the act legally valid or not are enumerated. Then follows the settlement of disputes or contention by the “decision of the majority” when a reliable monk is to be agreed upon as distributor of voting-tickets, an important post (**Kd 14.14.26**) and one which Devadatta arrogated to himself and abused in his attempts to split the Order (**Kd 18.4.1**). Next, there is the “decision for specific depravity” when a monk, on being examined for an offence, prevaricates and lies. Finally there was the settlement by the “covering up as with grass”, enacted when things had been done or said in the heat of a quarrel and which, if made into a legal question, would only lead to further trouble and perhaps schism. Legal questions such as this could be covered up by each contending side confessing through a competent monk whatever were the offences that had been committed, unless they were serious offences (involving Defeat or a Formal Meeting of the Order, according to Vin-a 1194), or ones that affected the laity (**Kd 14.13.2**, **Kd 14.13.3**). And moreover, such offences could not be settled in this way for anyone who objected or who was not present. Otherwise, a legal question arising from

disputes could be settled by a committee or referendum (Kd 14.14.19) or, failing this, by the decision of the majority (Kd 14.14.24). The Venerable Revata called for a referendum of eight monks to settle the “ten points” promulgated by the Vajjis of Vesālī, and which formed the business before the Council of Vesālī (see Kd 22).

The whole subject of the legal questions and their settlement, although complicated, must be studied by anyone who wishes to grasp an important branch of the disciplinary proceedings of the Order together with the very exact machinery laid down for carrying them out. A certain pattern will be found to emerge. For the “Internal Polity of a Buddhist Saṅgha”, Chapter 6 of S. DUTT’s *Early Buddhist Monachism* may be profitably consulted.

With Sections Kd 15, Kd 16, Kd 18 and Kd 19 we remain in the heart of the monastic life as it was to be lived normally. But with Section Kd 17, on Schisms, we arrive more definitely than in the Mahāvagga at that real and increasingly present danger of dissentient voices rising to a chorus in schismatic factions. Each Section, besides its scrupulous attention to every point that arises, also contains a certain amount of narrative material.

Section Kd 15 is so loaded with detail as to make it almost impossible to pick out salient points. But mention must be made of the “group of six monks”, which really means a number of monks under three pairs of leaders. For they are constantly referred to as the malefactors from whose conduct, often unsuitable because it resembled that of householders, springs the opportunity to regularise behaviour on all pertinent points. This is, in addition, a Section well worth studying for the light it throws on contemporary manners and the things in common usage. It is a Section where the laity are made important a wonder of psychic power is not to be displayed in front of them (Kd 15.8); their “bowls could be turned upside down”, a symbolic expression meaning that if they offered food to the monks, these could, after agreeing to a motion put before the Order, turn their bowls upside down to show that they held a layman in such disgrace they would accept no food from him (Kd 15.20), thereby

depriving him of merit. There is also the allowance that monks may tread on cloths when being asked to do so by householders “for good luck’s sake” (Kd 15.21). Then there is the episode when people bring scents and garlands to a monastery. The monks are allowed to accept the scents on condition that they place the “five-finger mark” on a door. This has the appearance of a protective measure; and we know from the Buddhist charms or spells, *parittā*, one of which is to be found in this Section (Kd 15.6), that such runes or chants for self-guarding played a not negligible part in Early Buddhist life.

Section Kd 16 is a compendium of what is allowable or not in regard to dwelling-places. For narrative material, it contains the story of how Anāthapiṇḍika heard the words “Awakened One”, *buddha*, for the first time and determined to see the Lord, who addressed him by the name of Sudatta, unknown outside his family, and spoke to him on *dhamma*. The vision of *dhamma* thereupon arose in Anāthapiṇḍika, he became a lay-follower, and acquired Prince Jeta’s Grove as a gift to the Order. The story of his first meeting with the Buddha is also told, but more briefly, in the Saṃyutta. In this Section is also to be found the Tittira-jātaka which came to be known as the Partridge Brahma-faring (Kd 16.6.3), told here to encourage monks to be courteous and polite to one another. Harmony in the Order was constantly being sought, as a number of episodes and allusions in the Vinaya indicate. It is by no means only in Section Kd 16 that passages occur that have parallels in other parts of the Pali canon or the Jātaka. Throughout the Vinaya this is the case, and probably a concordance of Vinaya stories would show only few to be peculiar to it.

Section Kd 17 begins with the story of Anuruddha’s going forth from home together with Bhaddiya, a Sakyan chieftain who, within a year, realised the threefold knowledge and acclaimed his happiness. Monks, hearing him, grew suspicious that he was remembering the former joys of rulership. But Bhaddiya was able to convince Gotama, in words reminiscent of SN i.72–SN i.73, that previously, although he had had a fully appointed guard, he had been nervous and frightened

all the same; but, now, alone in a forest he is unconcerned and unruffled. An explanation of why this story is placed at the beginning of the Section on Schisms seems called for. I can only suggest that if the monks who alleged that Bhaddiya was dissatisfied with the Brahmarfaring had turned out to be right, it is not unreasonable to suppose they would next have regarded him as a potential schismatic.

This was the role for which, however, Devadatta was cast, and for far more: he was also a potential murderer, prepared to go to great lengths to get rid of the Buddha. In his overweening ambition, Devadatta thought he should no longer be the leader and coveted this position for himself. Now, although those who have progressed some distance on the Way may feel themselves safe and immune to attacks (see Bhaddiya's story and also the Bhayabherava Sutta of the Majjhima), the tradition nevertheless recognises slayers of arahants (see e.g. **BD 4.113**, etc.), while various Commentaries hold that Moggallāna, an arahant of long standing, was actually murdered (Ja v.125; Dh-p-a iii.65). At Kv 313, however, the untimely death of an arahant is a controverted point. Tathāgatas, Truth-finders, must be different, for although they may be hurt and their blood shed (**BD 4.113**, etc., and **Kd 17.3.9**), according to our Section **Kd 17** they need no protection and cannot be deprived of life by aggression (**Kd 17.3.10**). Their attainment of *nibbāna* (with no residue remaining) is in fact a matter precisely of their own volition, as is also apparent from the episode (referred to in **Kd 21.1.10**) where Ānanda fails to ask the Buddha to prolong his life to the full. He died when he was in the eighties. The assumption is probably that he might have lived to be a hundred or so as the Pali canon states that people sometimes attain this age, while Sabbakāmin was so old at the time of the Council of Vesālī that it was 120 years since his ordination (**Kd 22.2.4**). He must probably have been at least 140 years of age then, for in **Bu-Pc 65** it is said that ordination must not be conferred on any male less than twenty years old.

In Section **Kd 17** we hear of another formal act, one that is extra to the seven dealt with in **Kd 1**. This is the formal act of Informa-

tion, *pakāsaniyakamma*, which allowed it to be proclaimed that someone's nature or character had altered—for the worse (Kd 17.3.2). The causative form, *pakāseti*, “to give information” of the verb *pakāsati* (of which *pakāsaniya* is the gerundive), is used with at least a semi-technical sense by the Vajjis of Vesālī when speaking of Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, and who had been able to change the lay-followers' opinion as to who the true recluses really were (Kd 22.1.7).

Much of Section Kd 18 consists of passages of some considerable length, most of which have already occurred in the Mahāvagga, use also being made of *Sekhiya* material. But the contexts are different. For example, Kd 1.25 lays down the proper conduct for those who share cells towards their preceptors, while in Kd 18.1.2–Kd.18.1.5 this same conduct, laid down in almost identical words except for a few additions or omissions, is to be observed by a monk arriving at a monastery, and again in Kd 18.7.2–Kd.18.7.4 by monks in respect of their lodgings. These are three occasions where conduct is, rather naturally, to be the same, for all three concern monks actually in a monastery, even if only just arrived. Yet the instructions specifically for resident monks (Kd 18.2.2–Kd 18.2.3) are connected more with their behaviour to incoming monks than with any thing else. We have seen that the same story, for example that of Dabba and that of Ariṭṭha, may be told so as to introduce varying effects. So here, the same behaviour may be followed in varying circumstances. A great process of stabilisation was at work. As the mass of allowances and offences—in the *Cuḷavagga* mostly those of wrong-doing—pile up and increase, so the allusions become all the clearer. Thus, by the time we get to Kd 18.3.2 the nature of the clay goods and the wooden goods that have to be packed away by a monk who is leaving a residence, can be understood by referring to Kd 15.37. For it is here that Gotama “allows”, as recorded, all clay goods and all wooden ones with certain specified exceptions.

The ninth Section, concerned mainly with the legally valid and the legally invalid suspensions of the *Pātimokkha*, is introduced by the eight beautiful similitudes of the great ocean, a passage found

also in the Aṅguttara and the Udāna. The third of these similes showing what, ideally, the monks ought to be, is particularly to the point: the Order does not live in communion with an impure monk, but, having assembled quickly, suspends him, with the result that he is far from the Order and the Order is far from him (Kd 19.1.4). Therefore, also to the point, is the story that precedes the similes of the sea. It is a story of how the Buddha refused, in spite of a plea made three times by Ānanda, to recite the Pātimokkha to the monks. For, “the assembly is not entirely pure, Ānanda”, having in it one individual of a depravity so grave that he is described in strongly derogatory, if stereotyped, terms. The Truth-finder cannot recite the Pātimokkha to an assembly containing a monk like this (Kd 19.1.2). Instead, he delegates his powers, now as it seems out of disappointment and disgust, whereas formerly he had delegated other powers in the full tide of success (Kd 1.12.1). In both cases it is reasonable to suppose that he did so because the Order was growing beyond the capacity of one man to handle; and because he had therefore increasingly to look to the monks themselves to maintain the Order on the lines laid down by him, both while he was alive and after he was with them no longer.

At the end of Section Kd 19 we are at the end of the discipline for monks. Many and exceedingly various are the points that have been raised, and a ruling given on each. The whole method of conducting Buddhist monasticism for those who follow the Pali Vinaya is contained in this and amounts to a very complete system. All doubts as to what is allowable and what is not, or all doubts as to how to act either in conclave or as an individual may be resolved by referring to the discipline that has been laid down. All misdoings, whether serious or nor, have their appropriate penalty attached to them. Behaviour is right if it promotes one's own progress along the Way or that of others. As such it is skillful, *kusala*.

As the Bhikkhunī-Pātimokkha or Vibhaṅga follows the Bhikkhu- (called the Great, *mahā*-) Vibhaṅga, so in the Cullavagga, at the close of the legalised rules and proceedings governing the life of

monks, there follows a Section devoted to the Order of nuns. It begins with an account of the formation of this Order, and contains the important statement, attributed to Gotama, that women are capable of attaining arahantship. The eight important rules (found also in Monks' **Bu-Pc 21**) are then laid down, their adoption by Mahāpajāpatī, the instigator of the Order of nuns, constituting her ordination. The remainder of this Section is taken up with regularising for nuns the recital of the Pātimokkha, the confession of offences, the settlement of legal questions, and their exhortation, and so forth. Then come incidents told so as to establish various offences of wrong-doing and various "allowances". There follows on this the method to be followed for the second ordination of nuns, that by monks, after they have been ordained by nuns as laid down in the Nuns' *Pācittiyas*. After more offences of wrong-doing, there is a reversion to ordaining, this time through a messenger, and finally more offences of wrong-doing and more "allowances".

In this Section there is included the prohibition of forest-dwelling for nuns (**Kd 20.23**), a prohibition not, I believe, precisely repeated elsewhere. This reduces the number of their "resources" to three, instead of four, as for monks. It is said that if a nun stays in a forest there is an offence of wrong-doing. But in Nuns' Formal Meeting 3 (**Vin 4.230**), it is said that a nun incurs a grave offence if, while she is in a forest, she goes out of sight or hearing of her companion nun, and an offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order once she has got outside. The whole of this amounts to saying that nuns may pass through a forest if they go two together, but that they must not stay in one either together or separately. This was for the sake of their security.

Another interesting point is that nuns, on returning to the Order after they had joined one of the other sects, should not be ordained again. This privilege could be extended to monks, provided that they first underwent a four months' probation (**Kd 1.38.1**). Life for nuns was probably harder than it was for monks. In spite of the sympathy and justice with which their troubles were met, they were to some

extent discriminated against. I have referred to this on my Introduction at **BD 3.xxxix**; and in the notes to Volumes **BD.4** and **BD.6** have mentioned such discrepancies as occur between the penalties inflicted on monks and on nuns for similar behaviour. Possibly the only exception to the general trend of the heavier penalty being imposed on a nun is in the case of “giving a blow to a monk”. Here, if a nun does so, her offence is ranked as one of wrong-doing while, if a monk strikes another monk, his offence is one of expiation (see below, **BD 5.371**).

In the Monks’ **Bu-Pd 1**, because “women obtain things with difficulty” (**BD 3.104**) it was made an offence to be confessed if a monk accepted, with certain reservations, food from the hand of a nun who was not a relation. But in the Cullavagga a nun is to offer any food there is in her bowl to a monk (**Kd 20.13.2**). On the other hand, monks could offer nuns food that had been stored (**Kd 20.15.1**) if they had more than they wanted for themselves; and if nuns were short of lodgings the monks might give them some temporarily, again if they had more than they wanted (**Kd 20.16.1**).

A great number of women are traditionally held to have flocked to the Order of nuns. It is conceivable that they were generally regarded as of poorer quality than the monks, and that therefore there had to be a severer testing in order to weed out those who had entered without having a real vocation. It is significant that in the *Etad Aggas* of the Aṅguttara there are for monks forty-seven classes of attainments and forty-one monks said to be chief in them (for some are chief in more than one attainment), while for nuns there are only thirteen classes of attainments, as many nuns being chief in them. Among the former Nandaka is called the chief of monks who exhort nuns. I have referred to the vicissitudes attendant upon the legalisation of the exhortation for nuns at **BD 3.xli**, and can here only mention what looks like a general injunction for nuns to follow when monks fail them: *pāsādikena sampādetu*, struggle on, labour on in friendliness (see below, **BD 5.366**).

At the end of Section **Kd 21**, on the Council of Rājagaha, because

exactly five hundred monks were there, it is said that this “chanting of the discipline” *Vinayaśaṃgīti*, is in consequence called that of the Five Hundred. To speak of a “chanting of discipline” is rather a curious and limited description.¹ For it is expressly said in **Vin 5.118** that Ānanda undertook to answer questions on *dhamma*, and beginning with the *Brahmajāla* and the *Sāmaññaphala Suttantas*, did in fact answer corresponding questions about the five Nikāyas. This is no less a feat than that performed by Upāli, the great Vinaya expert, who, having answered questions about the four *Pārājika* offences, then went on to answer questions about the two disciplines, *ubhatovīnaye*, as told in **Kd 21.1.7**. All the questions on *dhamma* and discipline were put by the learned Kassapa the Great. It seems that this elder, reacting to Subhadda’s unsatisfactory attitude to Gotama’s death, with great prevision suggested to the other monks that *dhamma* and discipline should be chanted before not-*dhamma* and not-discipline should shine out and *dhamma* and discipline be withheld (**Kd 21.1.1**). The final name: “chanting of the discipline” seems therefore to sum up only half the proceedings dealt with at the first Council. This Council or Conference was held shortly, some Commentaries say three months, after Gotama had died. The record of this Council is of the utmost importance as the tradition—oral only, it is true—of a *dhamma* that was taught and a discipline that was laid down if not wholly by the Founder himself, at all events while he was still alive.

How far their recital was well based and well carried out was brought into a little doubt by the episode of the monk Purāṇa, the Old One, who told the elders he would remember *dhamma* and discipline just as he had heard and learnt them in the Lord’s presence. His words: “Well chanted by the elders”, are polite, but he was apparently not quite convinced.

According to Section **Kd 21**, discipline was recited before *dhamma*. The rather bald narrative gives no reason. The Commentaries however come forward with an explanation.² They say that Kassapa asked the monks whether *dhamma* or discipline should be chanted first,

¹ Noticed by OLDENBERG, *Vinaya Piṭakam*, vol. i, p. xxix, note. ² Vin-a i.13; DN-a i.11.

and the monks replied: “Discipline is called the *āyu*, the life or vitality, of the Buddha’s dispensation; while the discipline stands, the dispensation stands. Therefore let us chant discipline first.” The same sentiment is expressed in the verse inserted before the *uddāna*, the key, at the end of Section **Kd 1** of the *Mahāvagga*. (**BD 4.127**). The underlying notion is that discipline is primarily concerned with *sīla*, or purification of the ways of acting in body and speech, and therefore with the first of the three categories into which the whole *sāsana*, dispensation or teaching, is graded.

The remainder of Section **Kd 21** is devoted to *Ānanda*. He is the central figure. Feeling that it was not suitable in him to go to the Council while he was still a *sekha*, a learner, he made an effort to realise arahantship and, at a moment when no part of him was touching the earth, his mind was freed from the cankers. As *DN-a i.10* rightly points out, when it is said: “in this teaching when a monk attains arahantship neither lying nor sitting down, neither standing nor pacing up and down”, it is to be said of *Ānanda*. The *DN-a* goes on to say that *Ānanda*, now thinking he was fit to enter the assembly, delighted and rejoicing, went there shining like a full moon on a cloudless night, like a lotus blooming at the sun’s touch, his face pure and radiant as though he were announcing his attaining of arahantship. But the Commentary (*Vin-a i.12-13*) gives a different version, and one that at *DN-a i.11* is ascribed to the *Majjhima-bhāṇakas*, or repeaters, of how he went to the Council. According to this: “*Ānanda*, not wishing to tell of his attainment of arahantship, did not go with the monks. They asked whom an empty seat was for, and hearing it was for *Ānanda*, asked where he had gone. At this moment he thought: ‘Now is the time for me to go,’ and displaying his psychic power, plunging into the earth, he showed himself as it were in his own seat. Some say he sat down after going through the air.”

His arahantship, however, did not appear to have commanded much respect. After the Council was over, he told the elders what the Lord had said at the time of his *parinibbāna* about abolishing the “lesser and minor rules of training”. This acted like a goad on

the elders and they charged him with one offence of wrong-doing after another—all of which must have been committed before he attained arahantship, even the imputed offence of allowing women, to weep and lament beside Gotama's body. I know of no other occasion recorded in the Pali canon where an arahant is asked to confess offences said to have been committed by him before gaining liberation. This episode therefore not only puts the accusing elders in a very dubious light, it also indicates that offences of wrong-doing could be invented after Gotama's death. But as the offences with which Ānanda was charged were all concerned with the Founder himself, they are not likely to be repeated.

What must be regarded as a more dignified and correct attitude was taken, later, by Ānanda himself when he was sent to inflict the supreme or highest penalty, *brahmadanda*, on Channa (Kd 21.1.15). Channa was so much overcome by the thought of submitting to this penalty of ostracism that he took himself seriously in hand and won arahantship—the second monk recorded in this Section to do so. Ānanda then tells him that from the moment he won it the highest penalty became revoked—automatically—for him. This is the Channa who was Gotama's charioteer while he was still the Bodhisatta. It was because of his affection for Gotama, and then because of his pride in “our Buddha, our dhamma”, that he was unable to carry out the *samañadhamma*, the rule for recluses (Thag-a i.166), until he had received the emotional shock, *samvega*, of the imposition of the supreme penalty on him.

Oldenberg states (*Vinaya Piṭakam* i.xxvii) that the story of the First Council as it has come down to us in the Cullavagga, “is not history, but pure invention and, moreover, invention of no very ancient date”. He bases his argument on a comparison with the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta which, while it contains passages word for word the same as in the Cullavagga, yet makes no allusion either to Kassapa's proposal for holding a Council or to the Council itself. Oldenberg concludes that “the author” of the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta did not know anything of the First Council. Certainly his silence is

otherwise hard to account for unless we allow that “he” (the author, who should rather be spoken of as the compiler or compilers) did not want to refer to it. We are accustomed in the Pali canon to finding the same stories running parallel up to a certain point and then turning off into different endings. It is possible that we have such a case here; and that the opening part of **Kd 21** was told so as to lead up to the proposal to convene a Council, while the same story was told in the *Dīgha* (with the transposition of the Subhadda incident) so as to lead up to the account of the disposal of the relics. This affected the Buddha’s body, whereas the Council of Rājagaha was held in the attempt to get clear precisely what had been his *dhamma* and discipline. Recited by 500 elders, it could carry weight.

Nevertheless, the Pali recension of the Council may be neither wholly correct nor wholly complete. It is one of several versions stemming from different schools and whose canons may vary from sect to sect. The late Professor PRZYLUKI was of the opinion that, in respect of this Council, the *Sūtras* may contain older material than the *Vinayas*. He collected a number of versions of both and presented them, translated into French, in his valuable work: *Le Concile de Rājagrha*, Paris, 1926. The student is referred to this book; he will then be able to make any comparisons he wishes between the Pali *Vinaya* account and the others. For it is not a necessary function of this Sacred Books of the Buddhists Series to stray from the Pali texts themselves.

Section **Kd 22**, that on the Second Council, held at Vesālī a “century” after Gotama’s *parinibbāna*—a century being “no doubt a round number”¹—is more truly characterised at its end as “a chanting of discipline” than is Section **Kd 21**. For this chanting by the 700 monks is concerned with ten points of discipline only, and whether these could not be relaxed. The very fact that they were called in question shows that, in the years that had passed since Gotama’s death, a less austere attitude, a more demanding note had crept in. It was to determine which was to be followed—the less austere attitude or the

¹ *Vinaya Texts* i, Introduction, p. xxii.

more austere one—that this Council was held.

It was ultimately the monk Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, who was responsible for the “chanting of discipline” which, limited to the ten points, was the subject before the Council of Vesālī. Various Commentaries recognise this (e.g. AN-a ii.10; MN-a iv.114) by referring to this chanting as *Yasattherassa saṃgīti*, the Recital of the Elder Yasa. He got the laypeople on his side by telling them three stories where Gotama had denounced the acceptance of gold and silver by monks—the tenth point, and possibly the most important; and that he aroused much interest among the monks is clear from the records. The endless disputations that arose, the speeches made whose meanings were not clear (Kd 22.2.7), impelled the elder Revata, whose opinion on the ten points in question coincided with Yasa’s, to select a referendum of eight monks to settle the points. Their decision still holds good today in Theravādin countries. In the traditional way of the democratic Order, all the monks present were asked to agree on the eight elders proposed by Revata. They further agreed on a ninth monk, Ajita, to appoint the seats for the elders who would be listening to the proceedings.

The exact place in Vesālī where the Council was held is doubtful. The Vinaya (Kd 22.2.7) says it took place in the Vālika monastery, as does the Mahāvamsa; but the *Dīpavamsa* lays the scene in the Hall of the Gabled House. It is perhaps of no great importance, except as adding to the confusion which surrounds the legends of the Councils. What the Vinaya record of the Council of Vesālī clearly indicates is that there was enough dissatisfaction among certain monks to bring about a schism, if not checked, with the attendant danger of *dhamma* turning into not-*dhamma* and discipline into not-discipline.

It may be asked why the Cullavagga is rounded off by the Sections dealing with the first two Councils, and which make the Cullavagga longer by two Sections than the Mahāvagga. Whether they were a later addition or not, I can only suggest that they are included, reasonably and suitably as it seems to me, at the end of the enormously long compendium of discipline for monks and nuns so as to give a

culminating authority and sanction to this discipline, which at the time of the Council of Vesālī, had been tested for a “century”.

All the words spoken by the Buddha between his attainment of supreme self-awakening and his *parinibbāna* have but the one flavour, that of freedom (see **Kd 9.1.4**, etc., and *Vin-a i.16*, *DN-a i.16*). This is a characteristic of the *Buddhavacana*. Freedom is to be sought and realised by those who have entered on the Way. For their help and guidance there are two parts of the *Buddhavacana*, namely *dhamma* and discipline. It is no fault of the Pali canon if later generations have split the frequently occurring compound of *dhammavinaya* into its two component parts, and have treated each as if it functioned more or less in isolation from the other. *Dhamma* is rooted in discipline; and discipline is always bordering on *dhamma*, as *sīla* is on *samādhi* and both on *paññā*, intuitive wisdom, to give point and substance to all its rules, regulations, offences and allowances. All the time it is training disciples to attain sufficient habitual purity ultimately to enter into the goal of Wisdom, even of that “great wisdom” of which Sāriputta, “beloved” above all other disciples, was said to be the chief (*AN i.23*). The Discipline, rigid and strict, is preliminary to and usually necessary to the flowering of Wisdom. Without the control of body and speech (discipline, moral habit), without mind-control (concentration), the full expansion of wisdom may never come to be. Discipline therefore, at the beginning of the training, “is a teaching of commands, *āṇādesanā*, being taught by the Lord in respect of a multitude of commands for those meriting commands” (*Vin-a i.21*, *DN-a i.19*).

Practically every conceivable thing affecting monastic life for monks and nuns, practically every conceivable relation with other human beings, whether fellow monks or nuns or the laity, are brought under review and legislated for in minutest detail through the seven classes of offence, through the “allowances”, and through the most important and the regularly recurring events in a monk’s life: Ordination, Observance, Invitation, the rains-residence, the making up of new robe-material; through the seven official formal acts of

the Order, beginning with that of censure, and through the suspension of the Pātimokkha. It is a very complete system, a very precise organisation marked throughout by the humaneness and reasonableness of Gotama, the codifier to whom with but few exceptions every ruling is ascribed.

I.B. HORNER

London, December 1951.

11. THE FOLLOWERS OF PAṆDUKA AND LOHITAKA

Praise to the Lord, the Perfected One, the Fully Self-Awakened One

ACT OF CENSURE

At one time the Awakened One, the Lord was staying at Sāvaththī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks who were followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka¹ and who were themselves makers of strife,² makers of quarrels, makers of disputes makers of contention,³ makers of legal questions in an Order,⁴ having approached other monks who were also makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in an Order, spoke thus (to them): "Do not you, venerable ones, let this one defeat⁵ you; argue loud and long, for you are wiser and more experienced and have heard more and are cleverer than he is, do not be afraid of him, and we will be on your side." Because of this, not only did strifes arise which had not arisen

¹ These were two out of the group of six monks; cf. *Vin* 5.8ff. below. See *BD* 1.275, n. 3; *BD* 1.314, n. 2. Mentioned at *Vin*-a 614; *MN*-a iii.187 says that having taken their own company (of followers) they lived in Sāvaththī. The *Satapatta Jātaka* (Ja 279) was, so it is claimed, given in reference to these monks. ² Cf. *Vin* 4.45 and see *BD* 2.253, n. 1, for further references to these five terms. Since they all refer to disputes about legal questions, the references given at *Vinaya Texts* ii.329, n. 2, to various *Pācittiyas* hardly apply. See also *BD* 4.,224, *BD* 4.23Of., *BD* 4.488f., *BD* 4.51Of. ³ Cf. *Vin* 4.45 and see *BD* 2.253, n. 1, for further references to these five terms. Since they all refer to disputes about legal questions, the references given at *Vinaya Texts* ii.329, n. 2, to various *Pācittiyas* hardly apply. See also *BD* 4.224, *BD* 4.23Of., *BD* 4.488f., *BD* 4.51Of.

⁴ Cf. *Bu*-*Ss* 8, *Bu*-*Ss* 9, *Bu*-*Ss* 10, etc. ⁵ *mā eso ajesi*.

before, but also strifes which had arisen rolled on to increase and magnitude.

Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticized, spread it about, saying: “How can these monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka and who are themselves makers of strife, makers of quarrels, makers of disputes makers of contention, makers of legal questions in an Order, having approached other monks who are also makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in an Order, speak thus to them: ‘Do not you ... and we will be on your side.’ Because of this ... also strifes which had arisen rolled on to increase and magnitude.” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka are themselves makers of strife ... having approached other monks who are also makers of strife ... speak thus to them: ‘Do not you ... and we will be on your side’? And that because of this ... strifes which have arisen roll on to increase and magnitude?”

“It is true, Lord.” The Awakened One, the Lord, rebuked them, saying:

“It is not suitable, monks, it is not becoming in these foolish men, it is not fitting, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How, monks, can these foolish men who are themselves makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in an Order, speak thus: ‘Do not you ... and we will be on your side’? And because of this ... strifes which have arisen roll on to increase and magnitude. It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased nor for increasing the number of those who are pleased, but, monks, it is displeasing to those who are not pleased as well as to those who are pleased, and it causes wavering in some.”

Then the Lord, having rebuked these monks, having in many a figure spoken in dispraise of difficulty in supporting and maintaining oneself, of great desires, of lack of contentment, of clinging (to the obstructions), of indolence; having in many a figure spoken in

praise of ease in supporting and maintaining oneself, of desiring little, of contentment, of expunging (evil), of punctiliousness, of graciousness, of decreasing (the obstructions), of putting forth energy,¹ having given reasoned talk on what is becoming, on what is fitting for them, addressed the monks, saying:

“Well now, monks, let the Order carry out a (formal) act of censure² against the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka.

“And thus, monks, should it be carried out; First, the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka should be reproved; having reproved them, they should be made to remember; having remembered, they should be accused of an offence; having accused them of an offence, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. These monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka and who are themselves makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in an Order, having approached other monks who are also makers of strife ... makers of legal questions in an Order, spoke thus (to them): “Do not you ... and we will be on your side”. Because of this, not only did strifes arise which had not arisen before, but also strifes which had arisen rolled on to increase and magnitude. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may carry out a (formal) act of censure against the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. These monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka and who are themselves makers of strife ... rolled on to increase and magnitude. The Order is carrying out a (formal) act of censure against the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka. If the carrying out of a (formal) act of censure against the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. These monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka and who are themselves makers of strife ... he to whom

¹ Cf. Vin 3.21 (BD 1.37), Vin 1.45, Vin 1.305 for this passage. ² *tajjanīyakamma*. Cf. Kd 1.25.22 and Kd 9.7.1–Kd 9.7.5.

it is not pleasing should speak. A (formal) act of censure against the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka is being carried out by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’

TWELVE ON AN ACT NOT BY RULE

“Monks, if it is possessed of three qualities a (formal) act of censure comes to be not legally valid and not disciplinarily valid and one that is hard to settle: (that is to say) if it is carried out not in the presence of,¹ if it is carried out when there is no interrogation, if it is carried out without the acknowledgement.² Monks, if it is possessed of these three qualities a (formal) act of censure comes to be not legally valid, not disciplinarily valid and one that is hard to settle. And, monks, if it is possessed of three further qualities a (formal) act of censure comes to be one ... and one that is hard to settle: (that is to say) if it is carried out when there is no offence, if it is carried out for an offence that does not lead on to confession,³ if it is carried out for an offence that has been confessed. Monks, if it is possessed of these three qualities a (formal) act of censure ... one that is hard to settle. And, monks, if it is possessed of three further qualities a (formal) act of censure comes to be ... hard to settle: (that is to say) if it is carried out without having reproved him, if it is carried out without having made him remember, if it is carried out without having accused him of an offence. Monks, if it is possessed of these three qualities a (formal) act of censure comes to be ... hard to settle. And, monks, if it is possessed of three further qualities a (formal) act of censure comes to be ... one that is hard to settle: (that is to say) if it is carried out not in the presence of, if it is carried out not by rule, if it is carried out by an incomplete assembly. Monks, if it is possessed of these three

¹ See [Kd 14.14.16ff.](#), and [Kd 9.6.1](#). Vin-a vi.1155 says it is not carried out in the presence of the Order, *dhamma* and discipline, the individual, and is carried out without having reproved him, without having asked him (to consent) and without his having acknowledged it. ² I.e. of the accused monk. ³ *adesanāgāminiya*, i.e. a *Pārājika* or *Saṅghādisesa*, whose penalties do not include censure or confession.

qualities a (formal) act of censure comes to be ... one that is hard to settle. And, monks, if it is possessed of three further qualities a (formal) act of censure comes to be ... hard to settle: (that is to say) if it is carried out when there is no interrogation, if it is carried out not by rule, if it is carried out by an incomplete assembly. Monks, if it is possessed of these three qualities a (formal) act of censure comes to be ... hard to settle. And, monks, if it is possessed of three further qualities a (formal) act of censure ... hard to settle: (that is to say) if it is carried out without the acknowledgement, if it is carried out not by rule, if it is carried out by an incomplete assembly ... if it is carried out when there is no offence, if it is carried out not by rule, if it is carried out by an incomplete assembly ... if it is carried out for an offence that does not lead on to confession, if it is carried out not by rule, if it is carried out by an incomplete assembly ... if it is carried out for an offence that has been confessed, if it is carried out not by rule, if it is carried out by an incomplete assembly ... if it is carried out without having reproved him, if it is carried out not by rule, if it is carried out by an incomplete assembly ... if it is carried out without having made him remember, if it is carried out not by rule, if it is carried out by an incomplete assembly ... if it is carried out without having accused him of an offence, if it is carried out not by rule, if it is carried out by an incomplete assembly. If, monks, a (formal) act of censure is possessed of these three qualities it comes to be not legally valid and not disciplinarily valid and one that is hard to settle.”

Told are the Twelve Cases of (Formal) Acts that are not legally valid

TWELVE ON AN ACT BY RULE

^{11:31} “Monks, if it is possessed of three qualities a (formal) act of censure comes to be a (formal) act that is legally valid and a (formal) act that is disciplinarily valid and one that is easily settled: (that is to say) if it is carried out in the presence of, if it is carried out when there is interrogation, if it is carried out with the acknowledgement. Monks,

if it is possessed of these three qualities ... easily settled. And, monks, if it is possessed of three further qualities ... easily settled: (that is to say) if it is carried out when there is an offence, if it is carried out when there is an offence which leads on to confession, if it is carried out when an offence has not been confessed ... if it is carried out, having reproved him, if it is carried out, having made him remember, if it is carried out, having accused him of the offence ... if it is carried out in the presence of, if it is carried out by rule, if it is carried out by a complete assembly ... if it is carried out when there is interrogation, if it is carried out by rule, if it is carried out by a complete assembly ... if it is carried out with the acknowledgement, if it is carried out by rule, if it is carried out by a complete assembly ... if it is carried out when there is an offence, if it is carried out by rule, if it is carried out by a complete assembly ... if it is carried out when there is an offence that leads on to confession, if it is carried out by rule, if it is carried out by a complete assembly ... if it is carried out when an offence has not been confessed, if it is carried out by rule, if it is carried out by a complete assembly ... if it is carried out having reproved him, if it is carried out by rule, if it is carried out by a complete assembly ... if it is carried out having made him remember, if it is carried out by rule, if it is carried out by a complete assembly ... if it is carried out having accused him of an offence, if it is carried out by rule, if it is carried out by a complete assembly. If, monks, a (formal) act of censure is possessed of these three qualities it comes to be a (formal) act that is legally valid and a (formal) act that is disciplinarily valid and one that is easily settled.

Told are the Twelve Cases of (Formal) Acts that are legally valid

SIX ON DESIRES

“Monks, if a monk is possessed-of three qualities, an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of censure against him: if he is a maker of strife, a maker of quarrels, a maker of disputes a maker of contention, a maker of legal questions in an Order; if he is ignorant,

inexperienced, full of offences, not rid of them¹; if he lives in company with householders in inappropriate association with householders.² Monks, if a monk is possessed of these three qualities, an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of censure against him. And, monks, if a monk is possessed of three further qualities an Order ... against him: if, in regard to moral habit, he comes to have fallen away from moral habit³; if, in regard to good habits, he comes to have fallen away from good habits; if, in regard to (right) views, he comes to have fallen away from (right) views. Monks, if a monk is possessed ... against him. And, monks, if a monk is possessed of three further qualities, an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of censure against him: if he speaks dispraise of the Awakened One, if he speaks dispraise of *dhamma*, if he speaks dispraise of the Order. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these three qualities, an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of censure against him.

Monks, if an Order desires, it may carry out a (formal) act of censure against three (kinds of) monks: against the one who is a maker of strife ... a maker of legal questions in the Order; against the one who is ignorant, inexperienced, full of offences, not rid of them; against the one who lives in company with householders in inappropriate association with householders. Monks, if the Order desires, it may carry out a (formal) act of censure against these three (kinds of) monks. And, monks, if the Order desires, it may carry out ... against three further (kinds of) monks: against the one who, in regard to moral habit, comes to have fallen away from moral habit, against the one who, in regard to good habits, comes to have fallen away from good habits, against the one who, in regard to (right) views, comes to have fallen away from (right) views. Monks, if an Order desires ... against these three (kinds of) monks. And, monks, if an Order desires, it may carry out ... against three further (kinds of) monks: against the one who speaks dispraise of the Awakened One, against the one who speaks dispraise of *dhamma*, against the

¹ *āpattibahulo anapadāno*; cf. Vin 1.321 (BD 4.461, n. 1). ² Cf. Vin 4.321-322, and BD 3.207, n. 1. ³ Cf. Vin 1.63 (BD 4.82).

one who speaks dispraise of the Order. Monks, if an Order desires, it may carry out a (formal) act of censure against these three (kinds of) monks.

Told are the Six Cases on Being Desirous

EIGHTEEN DUTIES

“Monks, when a (formal) act of censure has been carried out against a monk, he should conduct himself properly. This is the proper conduct in this case¹: he should not ordain, he should not give guidance,² a novice should not attend him,³ the agreement for him to exhort nuns⁴ should not be consented to, and even if he is agreed upon nuns should not be exhorted (by him), he should not fall into that (same) offence for which a (formal) act of censure came to be carried out against him by an Order, nor into another that is similar, nor into one that is worse, he should not find fault with the (formal) act,⁵ he should not find fault with those who carry out the (formal) act, he should not suspend a regular monk’s Observance,⁶ he should not suspend his Invitation,⁷ he should not issue commands,⁸ he should not set up authority,⁹ he should not ask for leave,¹⁰ he should not reprove,¹¹ he should not make remember, he should not quarrel¹² with monks”.

¹ Cf. below, [Kd 12.1.2](#); [Kd 20.20](#). ² Cf. [Kd 1.36.1](#). ³ See [Kd 1.36](#), [Kd 1.37](#) for this trio.

⁴ Cf. Monks’ [Bu-Pc 21](#), and [Kd 20.9.4](#). ⁵ I.e. the act of censure, [Vin-a vi.1156](#).

⁶ From here to end of [Kd 11.5](#) recurs at [Kd 11.27.1](#) (end). Cf. also [Kd 20.20](#). ⁷ Cf.

[Kd 4.16.2](#). ⁸ *na savacaniyam katabbam*. [Vin-a 1156](#) says: “I am doing the *savacaniya*

of the venerable ones in this matter, do not go one footstep back from this residence while the legal question is not settled.” The word *savacaniya* occurs again at [Kd 2.1.2](#).

See [Vinaya Texts ii.338](#), n. 6; [Vinaya Texts ii.386](#), n. 2. ⁹ *anuvāda*. [Vin-a 1156](#) says “in a *vihāra* he should not take the chief place.”

¹⁰ I.e. to ask questions; see [Kd 2.16.1](#), [Kd 4.16.1](#), [Kd 4.16.2](#). ¹¹ Cf. [Kd 20.9.5](#). ¹² *sampayojeti*, also meaning to associate. [Vin-a 1156](#) gives both meanings, saying: “having joined one another, a quarrel should not be made.”

The sense of “to quarrel” here would be of disputing about legal questions. The foregoing prohibitions indicate that a monk undergoing “censure” is not expected to have no dealings with his fellow monks.

*Told are the Eighteen Observances connected with a (Formal) Act of
Censure*

EIGHTEEN CASES THAT SHOULD NOT BE SETTLED

11.6.1 Then the Order carried out a (formal) act of censure against the monks who were followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka. These, when the (formal) act of censure had been carried out against them by the Order, conducted themselves properly, were subdued, mended their ways, and having approached monks, they spoke thus: “We, your reverences, against whom a (formal) act of censure was carried out by the Order, are conducting ourselves properly, we are subdued, we are mending our ways. Now, what line of conduct should be followed by us?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Well then, monks, let the Order revoke the (formal) act of censure against the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka.

11.6.2 “Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities a (formal) act of censure should not be revoked: if he ordains, if he gives guidance, if a novice attends him, if he consents to the agreement for him to exhort nuns, if he exhorts nuns even although agreed upon. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities a (formal) act of censure should not be revoked. And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities a (formal) act of censure should not be revoked: if he falls into that (same) offence for which the (formal) act of censure was carried out against him by the Order, or into another that is similar, or into one that is worse, if he finds fault with the (formal) act, if he finds fault with those who carry out the (formal) act. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities a (formal) act of censure should not be revoked.

11.6.3 “Monks, if a monk is possessed of eight qualities a (formal) act of censure should not be revoked: if he suspends a regular monk’s Observance, if he suspends his Invitation, if he issues commands, if he sets up authority, if he asks for leave, if he reproves, if he makes remember, if he quarrels with monks. Monks, if a monk is possessed

of these eight qualities the (formal) act of censure should not be revoked.”

Told are the Eighteen Cases where (a Formal Act of Censure) should not be revoked

EIGHTEEN CASES THAT SHOULD BE REVOKED

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities a (formal) act of censure may be revoked: if he does not ordain, if he does not give guidance, if a novice does not attend him, if he does not consent to the agreement for exhorting nuns, if, although agreed upon, he does not exhort nuns. Monks, if a monk is possessed ... may be revoked. And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities a (formal) act of censure may be revoked: if he does not fall into that (same) offence for which the (formal) act of censure came to be carried out against him, nor into another that is similar, nor into one that is worse, if he does not find fault with the (formal) act, if he does not find fault with those who carry out the (formal) act. Monks, if a monk ... may be revoked.

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of eight qualities a (formal) act of censure may be revoked: if he does not suspend a regular monk’s Observance, if he does not suspend his Invitation, if he does not issue commands, if he does not set up authority, if he does not ask for leave, if he does not reprove, if he does not make remember, if he does not quarrel with monks. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these eight qualities the (formal) act of censure may be revoked.”

Told are the Eighteen Cases (where a Formal Act of Censure) may be revoked

“And thus, monks, should it be revoked: Those monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka, having approached the Order, having (each) arranged the upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on their haunches, having stretched forth their joined palms, should speak

Kd 11.7

Kd 11.8

BD 5.10

thus to it: 'A (formal) act of censure, honoured sirs, was carried out against us by the Order; but we are conducting ourselves properly, we are subdued, we are mending our ways; and we ask for the revocation of the (formal) act of censure'. And a second time it should be asked for ... And a third time it should be asked for ... The Order should be informed by an experienced competent monk, saying:

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. These monks, followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka, against whom a (formal) act of censure was carried out by the Order, are conducting themselves properly, they are subdued, they are mending their ways, and they ask for the revocation of the (formal) act of censure. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may revoke the (formal) act of censure for the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. These monks, followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka, against whom a (formal) act of censure was carried out by the Order, are conducting themselves properly, they are subdued, they are mending their ways, and they ask for the revocation of the (formal) act of censure. The Order is revoking the (formal) act of censure for the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka. If the revocation of the (formal) act of censure for the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... should speak. The (formal) act of censure is revoked by the Order for the monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.”

Told is the First (Formal) Act: that of Censure

ACT OF GUIDANCE

Now at that time the venerable Seyyasaka¹ was ignorant, inexperi-

¹ At Vin 3.110ff. he is represented as committing the offence for which the first Saṅghādisesa was formulated.

enced, full of offences, not rid of them; he lived in company with householders, in inappropriate association with householders.¹ So much so that the monks were done up² with granting him probation, sending him back to the beginning, imposing *mānatta*, rehabilitating him.³ Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Seyyasaka, ignorant, inexperienced ... rehabilitating him?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that the monk Seyyasaka, ignorant, inexperienced ... rehabilitating him?”

“It is true, Lord.” The Awakened One, the Lord, rebuked them, saying:

“It is not suitable, monks, it is not becoming in this foolish man, it is not fitting, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. For how, monks, can this foolish man, ignorant, inexperienced ... rehabilitating him? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, nor for increasing the number of those who are pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, let the Order carry out a (formal) act of guidance⁴ for the monk Seyyasaka, saying: ‘You should live in dependence⁵’.

“And thus, monks, should it be carried out: First, the monk Seyyasaka should be reprovved; having reprovved him, he should be made to remember; having made him remember, he should be accused of the offence; having accused him of the offence, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured

¹ Cf. above, **Kd 11.4.1**. ² *pakata*, done away with; so, exhausted, worn out, “fed up.”

³ As *Vinaya Texts* ii.343, n. 1 indicates, it is not clear why a *Saṅghādisesa* should be attributed to Seyyasaka, but it suggests that the answer may appear at *Vinaya Texts* ii.384, n. 1. The text may have in mind **Vin 3.110** (see above, **BD 5.10, n**). Certainly there is a tradition connecting Seyyasaka with the *Saṅghādisesa* type of offence. There was for monks no recognised offence incurring a penalty if they lived in association with householders. ⁴ *nissayakamma*. Cf. **Kd 1.25.22; Kd 9.7.6, Kd 9.7.14.**

⁵ *nissāya*. Cf. **BD 4.79, BD 4.100f.**

sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Seyyasaka, ignorant, inexperienced ... rehabilitating him. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order carry out a (formal) act of guidance for the monk Seyyasaka, saying: “You should live in dependence.” This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Seyyasaka, ignorant, inexperienced ... rehabilitating him. The Order is carrying out a (formal) act of guidance for the monk Seyyasaka, saying: “You should live in dependence”. If the carrying out of the (formal) act of guidance, saying: “You should live in dependence”, for the monk Seyyasaka is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. A (formal) act of guidance, saying: “You should live in dependence,” is being carried out by the Order for the monk Seyyasaka. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’

TWELVE ON AN ACT NOT BY RULE

^{11.10.1} “If a monk, monks, is possessed of three qualities ... (=Kd 11.2-Kd.11.5. *Instead of* (formal) act of censure, by carrying out a (formal) act of censure *read* (formal) act of guidance, by carrying out a (formal) act of guidance) ...

TWELVE ON AN ACT BY RULE

(Note by Sujato: This and following sections, which consist of variations on the preceding, were omitted in Horner’s translation.)

SIX ON DESIRING

(Not in Horner’s translation.)

EIGHTEEN DUTIES

... he should not quarrel with monks.”

Told are the Eighteen Observances connected with a (Formal) Act of Guidance

Then the Order carried out a (formal) act of guidance for the monk Seyyasaka, saying: “You should live in dependence.” After the (formal) act of guidance had been carried out by the Order, he, choosing, associating with, visiting friends who were lovely¹ (in deed), making them recite, interrogating them, came to be one who had heard much,² one to whom the tradition was handed down; an expert in *dhamma*, an expert in discipline, an expert in the headings; experienced, wise, modest, scrupulous, desirous of the training; he conducted himself properly, was subdued, and mended his ways; and, having approached monks, he spoke thus: “I, your reverences, for whom a (formal) act of guidance was carried out by the Order, am conducting myself properly, I am subdued and am mending my ways. What line of conduct should be followed by me? “They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order revoke the (formal) act of guidance for the monk Seyyasaka.

EIGHTEEN CASES THAT SHOULD NOT BE REVOKED

(Not in Horner’s translation.)

EIGHTEEN CASES THAT SHOULD BE REVOKED

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities ... (=Kd 11.6.2-Kd 11.7.1 *Instead of* (formal) act of censure *read* (formal) act of guidance) ... may be revoked.

Told are the Eighteen Cases (where a Formal Act of Guidance) may be revoked

¹ *kalyāṇamitta*; cf. Dh 375. Or the word may be in the technical sense of a spiritual adviser, as at SN v.3. ² As at Vin 1.119, Vin 1.337, Vin 4.158, etc.

1.12.2 “And thus, monks, should it be revoked. Monks, the monk Seyyasaka, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having saluted the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having stretched forth his joined palms, should speak thus to it: ‘I, honoured sirs, for whom a (formal) act of guidance was carried out by the Order, am conducting myself properly, I am subdued, I am mending my ways; I ask for the revocation of the (formal) act of guidance’. And a second time it should be asked for ... And a third time it should be asked for.

5.14 “The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Seyyasaka, for whom a (formal) act of guidance was carried out by the Order, is conducting himself properly, he is subdued, he is mending his ways; he asks for the revocation of the (formal) act of guidance. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may revoke the (formal) act of guidance for the monk Seyyasaka. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Seyyasaka, for whom a (formal) act of guidance was carried out by the Order, is conducting himself properly, he is subdued, he is mending his ways; he asks for the revocation of the (formal) act of guidance. If the revocation of the (formal) act of guidance for the monk Seyyasaka is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... The (formal) act of guidance for the monk Seyyasaka is revoked by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

ACT OF BANISHMENT

11.13.1 Now at that time¹ unscrupulous, depraved monks who were followers of Assaji and Punabbasu were in residence at Kiṭṭāgiri. They indulged in the following kinds of bad habits: they planted and caused to be planted small flowering trees; they watered them and had them watered; they plucked them and had them plucked; they tied them up into (garlands) and had them tied up; they made garlands and had them made with a stalk on one side; they made garlands and had them made with a stalk on both sides; they made and had a branching flower-stalk made; they made a wreath and had one made; they made a garland worn round the forehead and had one made; they made and had an ear-ornament made; they made and had a breast-plate made. These (monks) took or sent garlands having a stalk on one side to wives of reputable families, to daughters of reputable families, to girls of reputable families, to daughters-in-law of reputable families, to female slaves of reputable families. They took or sent garlands having a stalk on both sides; they took or sent a branching flower-stalk; they took or sent a wreath ... a garland worn round the forehead ... an ear-ornament ... a breastplate. These ate from one dish together with wives of reputable families, with daughters of reputable families, with girls of reputable families, with daughters-in-law of reputable families, with women slaves of reputable families; and they drank from the same beaker; they sat down on the same seat; they shared one couch; they shared one mat; they shared one coverlet; they shared one mat and coverlet. And they ate at the wrong time; and they drank intoxicants; and they wore garlands and used perfumes and cosmetics; they danced and sang and played musical instruments, and they sported. They danced when she danced; they sang when she danced; they played musical instruments when she danced; they sported when she danced; they danced when she sang ... they danced when she played musical instruments ... they danced when she sported ... they sported when she sported.

¹ The whole of 13 occurs at **Bu-Ss 13.1.1-Bu-Ss.13.1.7**. See **BD 1.314-322** where notes are given.

They played on a chequered board for gambling; they played on a draught-board: they played with imagining such boards in the air; they played a game of keeping stepping on to diagrams; they played with spillikans ... at dice ... tip-cat ... brush-hand ... with a ball ... at blowing through toy pipes made of leaves ... with a toy plough ... at turning somersaults ... with a toy windmill ... with a toy measure of leaves ... with a toy cart ... with a toy bow ... they played a game of guessing at letters ... a mind-reading game ... a game of mimicking deformities ... they trained themselves in elephant lore ... horse lore ... carriage lore ... archery ... swordsmanship ... then they ran in front of an elephant ... a horse ... a chariot; now they ran backwards, now they ran forwards; and they whistled and they snapped their fingers and they wrestled and they fought with fists; and, having spread out their upper robes as a stage, they said to a dancing-girl: "Dance here, sister", and they applauded, and they indulged in various bad habits.

1.13.3
Now at that time a certain monk, having spent the rains among the people of Kāsī, while going to Sāvattthī so as to see the Lord, arrived at Kiṭāgiri. Then this monk, dressing early and taking his bowl and robe entered Kiṭāgiri for almsfood. He was pleasing whether he was approaching or departing, whether he was looking forward or looking behind, whether he was drawing in or stretching out (his arm), his eyes were cast down, he was possessed of pleasant deportment. People, having seen this monk, spoke thus:

in 2.11
"Who can this be like an idiot of idiots, like a fool of fools, like a very supercilious person? Who will go up to him and give him alms? Our masters, the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu are polite, genial, pleasant of speech, beaming with smiles, saying: 'Come, you are welcome'. They are not supercilious, they are easily accessible, they are the first to speak. Therefore alms should be given to them."

0 5.16
A certain lay follower saw that monk walking for almsfood in Kiṭāgiri; seeing that monk, he went up to him, and having gone up to him and greeted him, he said: "Honoured sir, are alms obtainable?"

"No, sir, alms are not obtainable."

“Come, honoured sir, we will go to (my) house.”

Then that lay follower, having taken that monk to his house and made him eat, said:

“Where, honoured sir, will the master go?”

“I will go to Sāvattthī, sir, to see the Lord.”

“Then, honoured sir, in my name salute the Lord’s feet with your head and say: ‘Lord, the residence at Kiṭāgiri has been corrupted. At Kiṭāgiri are residing unscrupulous, depraved monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu. They indulge in the following bad habits ... they indulge in a variety of bad habits. Lord, those men who formerly had faith and were believing now have no faith and are not believing. Those who formerly were channels for gifts to the Order are now cut off; they neglect the well behaved monks, and the depraved monks stay on. It were good, Lord, if the Lord would send monks to Kiṭāgiri, so that this residence at Kiṭāgiri may be settled.’

“Very well, sir,” and that monk having answered the lay follower in assent, rising from his seat departed for Sāvattthī. Gradually he approached Sāvattthī, the Jeta Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery and the Lord; having approached and greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. Now it is the custom for Awakened Ones, for Lords to exchange greetings with in-coming monks. So the Lord said to this monk:

“I hope, monk, that it is going well with you, I hope that you are keeping going, I hope you have accomplished your journey with little fatigue? And where do you come from, monk?”

“Things go well, Lord, I am keeping going, Lord, and I, Lord, accomplished my journey with little fatigue. Now, I, Lord, having spent the rains among the people of Kāsī, and while coming to Sāvattthī to see the Lord, arrived at Kiṭāgiri. Then I, Lord, dressing early, and taking my bowl and robe, entered Kiṭāgiri for almsfood. Then, Lord, a certain lay follower saw me as I was walking in Kiṭāgiri for almsfood, and seeing me, he approached, and having approached, he greeted me and said: ‘Honoured sir, are alms obtainable?’ ‘No, sir, alms are not obtainable I said. ‘Come, honoured sir, we will go to (my) house

he said. Then, Lord, that lay follower, taking me to his house and feeding me, said: 'Where, honoured sir, will the master go?' I said: 'I will go to Sāvattthī, sir, to see the Lord.' Then he said: 'Then, honoured sir ... may be settled'. Therefore, Lord, do I come."

Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the monks, saying:

"Monks, is it true, as is said, that monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, residing in Kiṭṭāgiri, are unscrupulous and depraved and indulge in the following bad habits: they plant small flowering trees ... indulge in a variety of bad habits ... and those men ... and the depraved monks stay on?"

"It is true, Lord."

The Awakened One, the Lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men indulge in bad habits such as these? How can they plant and cause small flowering trees to be planted, and water them and have them watered, and pluck them and have them plucked, and how can they tie them up into (garlands) and have them tied up? How can they make and have garlands made ...? How can they take and send ...? How can they eat ... drink ... sit ... stand ... eat ... drink ... run ... dance and sing and play musical instruments and sport ... play ... train themselves ... run ... run round facing ...? How can they whistle and snap their fingers and wrestle and fight with fists, and having spread out their upper robes as a stage, say to a dancing-girl: 'Dance here, sister,' and applaud and indulge in a variety of bad habits? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...", and having rebuked them and given reasoned talk, he addressed Sāriputta and Moggallāna, saying:

"Do you go, Sāriputta and Moggallāna, and having gone to Kiṭṭāgiri, carry out a (formal) act of banishment¹ from Kiṭṭāgiri against those monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu; these are those who share your cells."

"How, Lord, do we carry out a (formal) act of banishment from Kiṭṭāgiri against those monks who are followers of Assaji and Punab-

¹ *pabbājaniyakamma*. Cf. *Kd 1.25.22*; *Kd 9.7.7*.

basu? These monks are fierce and rough.”

“Well then, Sāriputta and Moggallāna, go together with many monks.”

“Very well, Lord,” Sāriputta and Moggallāna answered the Lord in assent.

“And thus, monks, should it be carried out. First, the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu should be reprovved; having reprovved them, they should be made to remember; having made them remember, they should be accused of an offence; having accused them of the offence, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. These monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu are those who bring families into disrepute and are of evil conduct; their evil conduct is seen and also heard and respectable families corrupted by them are seen and also heard. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should carry out a (formal) act of banishment from Kiṭṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu by which the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu should not remain in Kiṭṭāgiri. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. These monks who are ... seen and also heard. The Order is carrying out a (formal) act of banishment from Kiṭṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu by which the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu should not remain in Kiṭṭāgiri. If the carrying out of the (formal) act of banishment from Kiṭṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu by which they should not remain in Kiṭṭāgiri is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter. The (formal) act of banishment from Kiṭṭāgiri against the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu by which they should not remain in Kiṭṭāgiri is carried out by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’

TWELVE ON AN ACT NOT BY RULE

^{1.14.1}
^{5.19} “Monks, if it is possessed of three qualities a (formal) act of banishment comes to be not legally valid, not disciplinarily valid and one that is hard to settle ...¹ ...”

TWELVE ON AN ACT BY RULE

(Not in Horner’s translation.)

FOURTEEN ON DESIRING

... against the one who speaks dispraise of the Order. Monks, if an Order desires, it may carry out a (formal) act of banishment against these three (kinds of) monks.

“And, monks, if a monk is possessed of three further qualities an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of banishment against him: if he is possessed of bodily frivolity,² if he is possessed of verbal frivolity, if he is possessed of bodily and verbal frivolity. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these three qualities an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of banishment against him. And, monks, if a monk is possessed of three further qualities ... against him: if he is possessed of bodily bad habits,³ if he is possessed of verbal bad habits, if he is possessed of bodily and verbal bad habits. Monks, if a monk ... a (formal) act of banishment against him. And, monks, if a monk is possessed of three further qualities ... against him: if he is possessed of harming⁴ by means of body, if he is possessed of harming by means of speech, if he is possessed of harming by means of body and speech. Monks, if a monk ... against him. And,

¹ As in **Kd 11.2-Kd.11.4**, reading “act of banishment” for “act of censure”. Chapter 14 above does not occur in **Bu-Ss 13** ² *kāyikena davena*; Vin-a 1157 says this means physical enjoyment. Perhaps he takes food for fun or amusement or in sport, cf. AN i.114, AN ii.40, AN ii.145, AN iv.167. ³ Vin-a 1157 says this means a transgression of the rules of training laid down concerning the doors of the body. ⁴ Vin-a 1157 says this is called injury through not being trained in the rules of training laid down concerning the doors of the body. It means expulsion, *nāsana*, and ruin, *vināsana*.

monks, if a monk is possessed of three further qualities, an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of banishment against him: if he is possessed of a wrong bodily mode of livelihood, if he is possessed of a wrong verbal mode of livelihood, if he is possessed of a wrong bodily and verbal mode of livelihood. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these three qualities an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of banishment against him.

“Monks, if an Order so desires, it may carry out a (formal) act of banishment against three (kinds of) monks: against the one who is a maker of strife ... (as in **Kd 11.4.2**) ... against the one who speaks dispraise of the Order. Monks, if an Order so desires, it may carry out a (formal) act of banishment against these three (kinds of) monks. And, monks, if an Order so desires it may carry out a (formal) act of banishment against three further (kinds of) monks: against the one who is possessed of bodily frivolity, against the one who is possessed of verbal frivolity, against the one who is possessed of bodily and verbal frivolity ... against the one who is possessed of wrong bodily and verbal mode of livelihood. Monks, if an Order so desires, it may carry out a (formal) act of banishment against these three (kinds of) monks.

EIGHTEEN DUTIES

“Monks, a monk against whom a (formal) act of banishment has been carried out should conduct himself properly. This is the proper conduct in this case ... (as in **Kd 11.5**) ... he should not quarrel with monks.”

Told are the Eighteen Observances connected with a (Formal) Act of Banishment

Then Sāriputta and Moggallāna at the head of an Order of monks, having arrived at Kiṭṭāgiri,¹ carried out a (formal) act of banishment from Kiṭṭāgiri against the monks who were followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, by which the monks who were followers of Assaji and

¹ From here to the words, “It is true, Lord” = **Bu-Ss 13.1.8** (**Vin 3.183-4**, translated with notes at **BD 1.322-BD.1.324**).

Punabbasu should not stay in Kiṭāgiri. When the (formal) act of banishment had been carried out by the Order, these did not conduct themselves properly, they were not subdued, they did not mend their ways, they did not ask the monks for forgiveness, they abused them, they reviled them, they offended by following a wrong course through desire, by following a wrong course through hatred, by following a wrong course through stupidity, by following a wrong course through fear; and they went away and they left the Order. Those who were modest monks looked down on, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can the monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, against whom a (formal) act of banishment has been carried out by the Order, not conduct themselves properly, not be subdued, not mend their ways? Why do they not ask for forgiveness from the monks? Why do they abuse and revile them? Why do they, following a wrong course through desire ... hatred ... stupidity ... fear, go away and leave the Order? “Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasu, against whom a (formal) act of banishment has been carried out by the Order, do not conduct themselves properly, are not subdued, ... and leave the Order?”

“It is true, Lord.”

“How, monks, can these foolish men, against whom a (formal) act of banishment has been carried out by the Order, not conduct themselves properly ... and leave the Order? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, do not let the Order revoke the (formal) act of banishment.

EIGHTEEN CASES THAT SHOULD NOT BE REVOKED

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities the (formal) act of

banishment against him should not be revoked: if he ordains ... (as in **Kd 11.6.2**) ...

EIGHTEEN CASES THAT SHOULD BE REVOKED

... if he does not quarrel with monks. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these eight qualities the (formal) act of banishment may be revoked.

Told are the Eighteen Cases where a (Formal) Act of Banishment may be revoked

“And thus, monks, should it be revoked. Monks, that monk against whom the (formal) act of banishment has been carried out, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having saluted the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having stretched forth his joined palms, should speak thus to it: ‘A (formal) act of banishment, honoured sirs, was carried out against me by the Order, but I am conducting myself properly, I am subdued, I am mending my ways. I ask for the revocation of the (formal) act of banishment’. And a second time it should be asked for, and a third time it should be asked for. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying:

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk So-and-so, against whom a (formal) act of banishment was carried out by an Order, is conducting himself properly, he is subdued, he is mending his ways, and he asks for the revocation of the (formal) act of banishment. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may revoke the (formal) act of banishment against the monk So-and-so. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk So-and-so ... and he asks for the revocation of the (formal) act of banishment. The Order is revoking the (formal) act of banishment for the monk So-and-so. If the revocation of the (formal) act of banishment for the monk So-and-so is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter.

It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

ACT OF RECONCILIATION

Now at that time the venerable Sudhamma¹ was a resident in the householder Citta’s² Macchikāsaṇḍa,³ an overseer of new buildings, a constant adviser.⁴ Whenever the householder Citta wished to invite an Order or a group or an individual⁵ he did not invite the Order or the group or the individual without having asked the venerable Sudhamma for permission. Now at that time several monks who were elders—the venerable Sāriputta and the venerable Moggallāna the Great and the venerable Kaccāna the Great and the venerable Koṭṭhita the Great and the venerable Kappina the Great and the venerable Cunda the Great, and the venerable Anuruddha and the venerable Revata and the venerable Upāli and the venerable Ānanda and the venerable Rāhula⁶—walking on tour in Kāsī arrived in Macchikāsaṇḍa. The householder Citta heard that these monks who were elders had reached Macchikāsaṇḍa. Then the householder Citta approached these monks who were elders; having approached, having greeted these monks who were elders, he sat down at a respectful distance. As the householder Citta was sitting down at a respectful distance, the Venerable Sāriputta delighted, rejoiced, roused, gladdened him with talk on *dhamma*. Then the householder Citta, delighted ... gladdened with the venerable Sāriputta’s talk on *dhamma*, spoke thus to the monks who were elders: “Honoured sirs, let the

¹ Cf. Dh-p-a ii.74ff., AN-a i.386ff. Dh-p 73 is said to have been spoken on Sudhamma’s account. ² At AN i.26 called chief of lay followers who are speakers on *dhamma*. He is fully described in the Citta-saṃyutta, SN iv.281ff. At AN i.88 = SN ii.235 he is named as a standard by which to measure disciples who are lay followers. ³ A woodland grove, *vanasaṇḍa*, according to SN-a iii.91; a town according to Dh-p-a ii.74 and AN-a i.386, the latter adding “in the realm of Magadha”. ⁴ *dhuvaḥhattika* usually means a “regular or constant diner”. But *bhattika* is given this other meaning at Thig-a 267 (cf. *Pali-English Dictionary*), and seems justified above. ⁵ *puggala*, here meaning “monk”. ⁶ This same list of great *theras* also occurs at Vin 4.66. For notes and further references, see BD 2.295.

elders consent to come to a meal with me on the morrow.” The monks who were elders consented by becoming silent.

Then the householder Citta, having understood the consent of the monks who were elders, rising from his seat, having I greeted the monks who were elders, keeping his right side towards them, approached the venerable Sudhamma; having approached, having greeted the venerable Sudhamma, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance, the householder Citta spoke thus to the venerable Sudhamma:

“Honoured sir, may master Sudhamma consent to a meal with me on the morrow together with the elders.”

Then the venerable Sudhamma thought: “Formerly, when I the householder Citta wished to invite an Order or a group or an individual, he did not invite the Order or the group or the individual without having asked me for permission; but now he invites monks who are elders without having asked me for permission. This householder Citta is now corrupted, he is indifferent to me, detached from me”, and he spoke thus to the householder Citta: “No, householder, I do not consent.” And a second time ... And a third time did the householder Citta speak thus to the venerable Sudhamma: “Honoured sir, may master Sudhamma consent to a meal with me on the morrow together with the elders.”

“No, householder, I do not consent.”

Then the householder Citta thinking: “What can master Sudhamma, either consenting or not consenting, do to me?” having greeted the venerable Sudhamma, departed keeping his right side towards him.

Then, towards the end of that night, the householder Citta had sumptuous foods, solid and soft, prepared for the monks who were elders. Then the venerable Sudhamma, thinking: “Suppose I were to see what has been prepared on behalf of the householder Citta for the elders?” having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of the householder Citta; having approached, he sat down on an appointed seat. Then the householder

Citta approached the venerable Sudhamma; having approached, having greeted the venerable Sudhamma, he sat down at a respectful distance. The venerable Sudhamma spoke thus to the householder Citta as he was sitting down at a respectful distance:

“Truly abundant, householder, is this solid and soft food prepared by you, but one thing is not here, that is to say sesamum cake.”

“Although, honoured sir, much treasure is to be found in the Awakened One’s words, just this is mentioned by master Sudhamma, that is to say sesamum cake. Formerly, honoured sir, some merchants of the Deccan¹ went to an eastern district² for trading and from there they brought back a hen. Then, honoured sir, that hen mated with a crow and produced a chick. And whenever, honoured sir, that chick wanted to utter the cry of a crow it uttered a “cockadoodle-doo” whenever it wanted to utter the cry of a cock it uttered a “caw”. In the same way, honoured sir, although much treasure is to be found in the Awakened One’s words, just this is mentioned by master Sudhamma, that is to say sesamum cake.”³

“You, householder, are reviling⁴ me, you, householder, are abusing me; this is your residence, householder, I will go away.”

“Honoured sir, I am not reviling and abusing master Sudhamma; honoured sir, let master Sudhamma remain in Macchikāsaṇḍa delightful is the Wild Mango Grove⁵; I will make an effort for master Sudhamma in respect of the requisites of robes, almsfood, lodgings and medicines for the sick.” And a second time ... And a third time did the venerable Sudhamma speak thus to the householder Citta: “You, householder, are reviling me ... I will go away.”

“Where, honoured sir, will master Sudhamma go?”

“I, householder, will go to Sāvattthī to see the Lord.”

“Well then, honoured sir, tell the Lord everything that was said

¹ *Dakkhiṇāpathakā*. On the Southern region, *Dakkhiṇāpatha*, see B.C. LAW, *India as described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism*, p. 77ff. ² *puratthima janapada*.

³ Vin-a 1158 says he speaks neither as a monk nor as a householder. ⁴ *akkosati* and *paribhāsati* are defined at Vin 4.309 (BD 3.344). ⁵ *Ambātakavana*. *Pali-English Dictionary* gives “hog-plum, *Spondias Mangifera* (a kind of mango)” for *ambāṭaka*, *Critical Pali Dictionary* adding “wild mango.” Cf. SN iv.281ff.

by you and that was said by me. But this, honoured sir, will not be surprising: that master Sudhamma should come back again to Macchikāsaṇḍa.”

Then the venerable Sudhamma, having packed away his lodgings, taking his bowl and robe, set out for Sāvattḥī. In due course he approached Sāvattḥī, the Jeta Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery, the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Sudhamma told the Lord everything that had been said by himself and that had been said by the householder Citta. The Awakened One, the Lord rebuked him, saying:

“It is not suiting, foolish man, it is not becoming, it is not fitting, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, jeer at¹ the householder Citta, who has faith and is believing, who is a benefactor, a worker, a supporter of the Order, with a low thing, and scoff at him with a low thing? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” and having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying: “Well then, monks, let the Order carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation² for the monk Sudhamma, saying: ‘The householder Citta should be asked to forgive you.’”

“And thus, monks, should it be carried out: First, the monk Sudhamma should be reprovved, having reprovved him, he should be made to remember, having made him remember, he should be accused of the offence, having accused him of the offence, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Sudhamma jeered at the householder Citta who has faith and is believing, a benefactor, a worker, a supporter of the Order, with a low thing, he scoffed at him with a low thing. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may

¹ *khumseti, vambheti*; occurring also at [Vin 4.7 \(BD 2.178\)](#). ² *paṭisāraṇiyakamma*. Cf. [Kd 1.25.22](#), and [Kd 9.7.8](#). At this latter passage the monk is said, not to jeer and scoff at the householder, but to revile and abuse him, while at [Kd 11.18.5](#) above, it is the householder who is accused, by the monk, of reviling and abusing him.

carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for the monk Sudhamma, saying: “The householder Citta should be asked to forgive you”. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Sudhamma jeered at the householder Citta ... scoffed at him with a low thing. The Order is carrying out a (formal) act of reconciliation for the monk Sudhamma, saying: “The householder Citta should be asked to forgive you”. If the carrying out of the (formal) act of reconciliation for the monk Sudhamma, saying: “The householder Citta should be asked to forgive you” is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... you should speak. A (formal) act of reconciliation for the monk Sudhamma, saying: “The householder Citta should be asked to forgive you” is carried out by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’

TWELVE ON AN ACT NOT BY RULE

^{11.19.1} “Monks, if it is possessed of three qualities, a (formal) act of reconciliation ... (=Kd 11.2, Kd 11.3) ...

TWELVE ON AN ACT BY RULE

... and is easily settled.

FOUR ON DESIRING

^{1.20.1} “Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities, the Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for him¹: if he tries for non-receiving (of gains) by householders²; if he tries for non-profiting by householders; if he tries for non-residence for householders; if he reviles and abuses householders; if he causes householders to break with householder. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities ... act of reconciliation for him. And,

^{05.27}

¹ Cf. AN iv.345. ² Cf. Vin 1.84 (BD 4.106), BD 2.125 and AN iv.345: Chapters 87 (monks), 88, 89 (householders).

monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities, the Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for him: if he speaks dispraise of the Awakened One to householders, if he speaks dispraise of *dhamma* to householders, if he speaks dispraise of the Order to householders, if he jeers at a householder with a low thing, if he scoffs at him with a low thing, if he does not fulfil, according to rule, his assent (given) to householders.¹ Monks, if a monk ... act of reconciliation for him. And, monks, an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for five (kinds of) monks: for the one who tries for non-receiving (of gains) by householders; for the one who tries for non-profiting by householders; for the one who tries for non-residence for householders; for the one who re-viles and abuses householders; for the one who causes householder to break with householder. Monks, an Order ... for these five (kinds of) monks. And monks, an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for five further (kinds of) monks: for the one who speaks dispraise of the Awakened One to householders ... of *dhamma* to householders ... of an Order to householders, for the one who jeers at a householder with a low thing, scoffs at him with a low thing, for the one who does not fulfil, according to rule, his assent (given) to householders. Monks, an Order, if it so desires, may carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for these five (kinds of) monks.

Told are the Four times Five Cases on Being Desirous

EIGHTEEN DUTIES

“Monks, a monk for whom a (formal) act of reconciliation has been carried out should conduct himself properly ... (= **Kd 11.5**, reading act

Kd 11.2

¹ On this last clause, see GS iv.228, n. 3. See especially **Vin 1.153f.**, where the monk Upananda breaks his word and also tells a conscious lie to a householder. The particular type of offence incurred by this monk for breaking his word in regard to residence is formulated as one of wrong-doing. Vin-a vi.1158 instances having accepted a rains-residence, and then not going to it.

of reconciliation for act of censure) ... he should not quarrel with monks.”

Told are the Eighteen Observances connected with a (Formal) Act of Reconciliation

Then the Order earned out a (formal) act of reconciliation for the monk Sudhamma, saying: “The householder Citta should be asked to forgive you.” He, having gone to Macchikāsaṇḍa when the (formal) act of reconciliation had been carried out by the Order, becoming ashamed, was unable to ask the householder Citta to forgive him, and he went back again to Sāvattḥī. Monks spoke thus: “Did you ask the householder Citta to forgive you?”

“Now, I, your reverences, having gone to Macchikāsaṇḍa, becoming ashamed, was unable to ask the householder Citta to forgive (me).” They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: “Well then, monks, let the Order give a companion messenger¹ to the monk Sudhamma to ask the householder Citta to forgive him. And thus, monks should he be given: First, a monk should be asked; having asked him, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may give the monk So-and-so as a companion messenger to the monk Sudhamma to ask the householder Citta to forgive him. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is giving the monk So-and-so as a companion messenger to the monk Sudhamma to ask the householder Citta to forgive him. If the giving of the monk So-and-so as a companion messenger to the monk Sudhamma to ask the householder Citta to forgive him is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The monk So-and-so is given by the Order to the monk Sudhamma as a companion messenger to ask the householder Citta to forgive him.

¹ *anudūta*, travelling companion, and one with a definite function to fulfil in case of need, as appears below. Cf. *Vin 2.295* where a monk Yasa for whom an act of reconciliation had been carried out, refers to this ruling and asks for an *anudūta bhikkhu*.

It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’

“Monks, when the monk Sudhamma, together with the companion messenger monk, has reached Macchikasanda, the householder Citta should be asked to forgive him (Sudhamma using the words), ‘Forgive me, householder, I am at peace towards you’. If, while he is being spoken to thus, he forgives him, that is good; if he does not forgive, he should be spoken to by the companion messenger monk, saying: ‘Forgive this monk, householder, he is at peace towards you.’ If, while he is being spoken to thus, he forgives him, that is good; if he does not forgive, he should be spoken to by the companion messenger monk, saying, ‘Forgive this monk, householder, for I am at peace towards you.’ If ... that is good; if he does not forgive, he should be spoken to by the companion messenger monk, saying: ‘Forgive this monk, householder, (I ask it) in the name of the Order’. If ... that is good; if he does not forgive, the companion messenger monk, not having caused the monk Sudhamma to be dismissed from reach of the sight¹ of the householder Citta, not having caused him to be dismissed from reach of the hearing, having made him arrange his upper robe over one shoulder, having made him sit down on his haunches, having made him salute with joined palms,² should cause that offence to be confessed.”

Then the monk Sudhamma, together with the companion messenger monk, having reached Macchikāsaṇḍa, asked the householder Citta to forgive him. He conducted himself properly, he was subdued, he mended his ways, and having approached monks, he spoke thus: “I, your reverences, for whom a (formal) act of reconciliation was carried out by an Order, am conducting myself properly, I am subdued, I am mending my ways. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order revoke the (formal) act of reconciliation for the monk Sudhamma.

¹ Cf. BD 2.352, n. 3. ² Cf. Kd 4.5.6.

EIGHTEEN CASES THAT SHOULD NOT BE REVOKED

1.23.2

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities, the (formal) act of reconciliation should not be revoked ... (= **Kd 11.6.2–Kd 11.7**) ...

EIGHTEEN CASES THAT SHOULD BE REVOKED

... does not quarrel with monks. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these eight qualities the (formal) act of reconciliation may be revoked.

Told are the Eighteen Cases (where a Formal Act of Censure) may be revoked

1.24.1

5.30

n 2.21

And thus, monks, should it be revoked. Monks, that monk Sudhamma, having approached the Order ... (see **Kd 11.12**) ... ‘... Thus do I understand this.’”

Told is the Fourth (Formal) Act: that of Reconciliation

AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT SEEING AN OFFENCE

1.25.1

At one time the Awakened One, the Lord was staying at Kosambī in Ghosita’s monastery. Now at that time the venerable Channa,¹ having fallen into an offence, did not want to see the offence.² Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Channa, having fallen into an offence, not want to see the offence?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that the monk Channa ... did not want to see the offence?”

“It is true, Lord.” The Awakened One, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

¹ For further references, see **BD 1.266, n. 3.** ² Cf. **Kd 9.1.3, Kd 9.1.8.**

“How, monks, can this foolish man, having fallen into an offence, not want to see the offence? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, let the Order carry out a (formal) act of suspension¹ against the monk Channa for not seeing his offence, (and there should be) no eating with an Order.²

“And thus, monks, should it be carried out. First, the monk Channa should be reprovved, having reprovved him, he should be made to remember, having made him remember, he should be accused of the offence; having accused him of the offence, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Channa, having fallen into an offence, does not want to see the offence. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may carry out a (formal) act of suspension against the monk Channa for not seeing the offence (and there should be) no eating with an Order. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Channa, having fallen into an offence, does not want to see the offence. The Order is carrying out a (formal) act of suspension against the monk Channa for not seeing the offence (and there should be) no eating with an Order. If the carrying out by the Order of a (formal) act of suspension against the monk Channa for not seeing his offence (and with) no eating with an Order, is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter: Honoured sirs, ... should speak. A (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence (and with) no eating with an Order, is carried out by the Order against the monk Channa. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent.

¹ *ukkhepaniyakamma*. Cf. **Kd 1.25.22**, and **Kd 9.7.9**. ² *asambhogam saṅghena*. Cf. **Kd 1.79.2–Kd 1.79.4**. At **Vin 4.138** it is an offence of expiation to eat with a monk who is suspended. Two kinds of *sambhoga*, eating food and eating *dhamma*, are defined at **Vin 4.137 (BD 3.29)**. The monk in the above Cullavagga passage is not deprived of “being in communion”, *saṃvāsa*, with the other monks for not seeing his offence. Cf. below, **Kd 15.20.3**.

Thus do I understand this.’ And, monks, proclaim in residence after residence: ‘A (formal) act of suspension for not seeing an offence (and with) no eating with an Order has been carried out against the monk Channa.’

TWELVE ON AN ACT NOT BY RULE

^{1.26.1} “Monks, if a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing an offence is possessed of three qualities it comes to be a (formal) act not by rule ... (see [Kd 11.2–Kd.11.4](#)) ...

TWELVE ON AN ACT BY RULE

(Not in Horner’s translation.)

SIX ON DESIRING

... Monks, if an Order so desires, it may carry out a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing an offence against these three (kinds of) monks.”

Told are the Six Cases on Being Desirous in connection with a (Formal) Act of Suspension for Not Seeing an Offence

FORTY THREE DUTIES

^{11.27.1} “Monks, a monk against whom a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence has been carried out should conduct himself properly. This is proper conduct in this case¹: he should not ordain, he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him, the agreement to exhort nuns should not be consented to (by him), even if he is agreed upon nuns should not be exhorted by him, he should not fall into that same offence for which the (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence was carried out against him by an Order,

¹ This differs from the “proper conduct” of the other formal acts ([Kd 11.5](#), [Kd 11.10](#), [Kd 11.15](#), [Kd 11.21](#)). Cf. [Kd 22.1.2](#).

nor into another that is similar, nor into one that is worse, he should not find fault with the (formal) act, he should not find fault with those who are carrying out the (formal) act, he should not consent to a regular monk's greeting him, standing up before him, saluting him with joined palms, performing the proper duties, bringing forward a seat, bringing forward a sleeping-place, water for (washing) the feet, a footstool, a foot-stand, the receiving of bowl and robe, treating his back by massaging, he should not defame a regular monk with falling away from moral habit, he should not defame him with falling away from good habits, he should not defame him with falling away from (right) views, he should not defame him with falling away from a right mode of livelihood, he should not cause monk to break with monk, he should not wear a householder's emblem, he should not wear an emblem of members of other sects,¹ he should not follow members of other sects, he should follow monks, he should train in the training for monks, he should not stay² in a residence under one roofing with a regular monk, he should not stay in what is not a residence³ under one roofing (with him), he should not stay in a residence or in what is not a residence under one roofing (with him), having seen a regular monk he should get up from his seat, he should not upbraid a regular monk either inside or outside,⁴ he should not suspend a regular monk's Observance,⁵ he should not suspend his Invitation, he should not issue commands, he should not set up authority, he should not ask for leave, he should not reprove, he should not make remember, he should not quarrel with monks.

Told are the Forty-Three Observances connected with a (Formal) act of Suspension for Not Seeing an Offence

Then the Order carried out a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence against the monk Channa (and with) no eating with an Order. He, when the (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence had been carried out against him by the Order, went

¹ Cf. Vin 1.306. ² Cf. below, Kd 12.1.4. ³ Cf. Vin 1.134, and BD 4.178, n. 3. ⁴ Inside and outside a dwelling-place, according to Vin-a 1159. ⁵ From here to the end of Kd 11.27.1 = Kd 11.5.1.

from that residence to another residence; there the monks neither greeted him, nor stood up before him, nor saluted with joined palms, nor performed the proper duties, nor revered, respected, esteemed or honoured him.¹ He, not being revered, respected, esteemed or honoured by these monks, then went unrevered from that residence to another residence; there too the monks neither greeted him ... he then went from that residence to another residence; there too the monks neither greeted him ... he, unrevered, went back again to Kosambī. He conducted himself properly, he was subdued, he mended his ways; having approached monks, he spoke thus: "I, your reverences, against whom a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing an offence was carried out by an Order, am conducting myself properly, I am subdued, I am mending my ways. What line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Well then, monks let the Order revoke the (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence against the monk Channa.

FORTY-THREE CASES THAT SHOULD NOT BE REVOKED

^{1.28.2} "If, monks, a monk is possessed of five qualities, a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence should not be revoked: if he ordains, if he gives guidance, if a novice attends him, if he consents to the agreement to exhort nuns, if, although agreed upon, he exhorts nuns. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities ... should not be revoked. And monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities ... should not be revoked: if he falls into that same offence for which a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence was carried out against him by the Order, or into another that is similar, or into one that is worse, if he finds fault with a (formal) act, if he finds fault with those who carry out a (formal) act. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities ... should not be revoked. And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities ... should not be revoked: if he consents to a regular monk's greeting him, standing up before him, saluting with joined palms, doing the proper duties,

¹ As at [Kd 10,5.1](#).

bringing forward a seat. Monks, if a monk ... should not be revoked. And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities ... should not be revoked: if he consents to a regular monk's bringing forward a sleeping-place, water for (washing) the feet, a footstool, a foot-stand, to receiving his bowl and robe, to treating his back by massaging. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these five qualities the (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence should not be revoked.

“And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities ... should not be revoked: if he defames a regular monk with falling away from moral habit, if he defames him with falling away from good habits, if he defames him with falling away from (right) views, if he defames him with falling away from a (right) way of living, if he causes monk to break with monk. Monks, if a monk ... should not be revoked. And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities ... should not be revoked: if he wears a householder's emblem, if he wears an emblem of other sects, if he follows members of other sects, if he does not follow monks, if he does not train in the training for monks. Monks, if a monk ... should not be revoked. And, monks, if a monk is possessed of five further qualities ... should not be revoked: if, in a residence, he stays under one roofing with a regular monk, if in what is not a residence he stays under one roofing with him, if in either a residence or in what is not a residence he stays under one roofing with him, if, having seen a regular monk, he does not get up from his seat, if he upbraids a regular monk either inside or outside. Monks, if a monk ... should not be revoked. Monks, if a monk is possessed of eight qualities ... should not be revoked: if he suspends a regular monk's Observance, if he suspends his Invitation, if he issues commands, if he sets up authority, if he asks for leave, if he reproves, if he makes remember, if he quarrels with monks. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these eight qualities a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence should not be revoked.

Told are the Forty-three Cases (where a Formal Act of Suspension for Not Seeing an Offence should not be revoked)

FORTY-THREE CASES THAT SHOULD BE REVOKED

1.29.1
D 5.35 “Monks, it a monk is possessed of five qualities, a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence may be revoked: if he does not ordain ... (*This Chapter is the exact opposite of Kd 11.28.2*) ... if he does not quarrel with monks. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these eight qualities a (formal) act of suspension for not seeing his offence may be revoked.

Told are the Forty-three Cases (where a Formal Act of Suspension for Not Seeing an Offence may be revoked)

1.30.1 “And thus, monks, should it be revoked: That monk Channa, having approached the Order ... (see **Kd 12**. *Instead of act of censure read act of suspension for not seeing his offence*) ... ‘... Thus do I understand this.’”

Told is the Fifth (Formal) Act: that of Suspension for Not Seeing an Offence.

n 2.25

AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT MAKING AMENDS

11.31.1 At that time the Awakened One, the Lord was staying at Kosambī in Ghosita’s monastery. Now at that time the venerable Channa, having fallen into an offence, did not want to make amends for the offence.¹ ... (= **Kd 11.25–Kd 11.30**. *Instead of see read make amends for; instead of act of suspension for not seeing his offence read act of suspension for not making amends for his offence*) ...

TWELVE ON AN ACT NOT BY RULE

(Not in Horner’s translation.)

TWELVE ON AN ACT BY RULE

(Not in Horner’s translation.)

¹ Cf. **Kd 9.5.1–Kd 9.5.9**.

SIX ON DESIRING

(Not in Horner’s translation.)

FORTY-THREE DUTIES

(Not in Horner’s translation.)

FORTY-THREE CASES THAT SHOULD NOT BE REVOKED

(Not in Horner’s translation.)

FORTY-THREE CASES THAT SHOULD BE REVOKED

... ‘... Thus do I understand this.’”

*Told is the Sixth (Formal) Act: that of Suspension for Not making Amends
for an Offence*

AN ACT OF SUSPENSION FOR NOT RELINQUISHING A WRONG VIEW

At one time the Awakened One, the Lord was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Now at that time a wrong view had arisen to a monk named Ariṭṭha who had formerly been a vulture-trainer, like this¹:

“In so far as I understand *dhamma* taught by the Lord, it is that in following those things called stumbling-blocks by the Lord, there is no stumbling-block at all.”

Several monks heard: “A wrong view has arisen to the monk named Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer, like this: ‘In so far as I understand ... there is no stumbling-block at all.’”

¹ Down to the phrase, “It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” (towards the end of **Kd 11.32.3**) = **Bu-Pc 68.1** (**Vin 4.133–Vin.4.135**) which then formulates a “rule of training.” Translated at **BD 3.21–BD.3.24**, with notes.

Then these monks approached the monk Ariṭṭha who had formerly been a vulture-trainer, and having approached, they spoke thus to the monk Ariṭṭha who had formerly been a vulture-trainer:

“Is it true, as is said, reverend Ariṭṭha, that a wrong view has arisen to you, like this: ‘In so far as I understand ... there is no stumbling-block at all?’”

“Undoubtedly, your reverences, as I understand *dhamma* taught by the Lord, it is that in following those things called stumbling-blocks by the Lord, there is no stumbling-block at all.”

“Do not speak thus, reverend Ariṭṭha, do not misrepresent the Lord; misrepresentation of the Lord is not at all seemly, and the Lord certainly would not speak thus. Reverend Ariṭṭha, in many a figure are things that are stumbling-blocks called stumbling-blocks by the Lord, and in following these there is a veritable stumbling-block. Sense-pleasures are declared by the Lord to be (things) affording little satisfaction, of much pain, of much tribulation, where in is more danger. Sense-pleasures are declared by the Lord to be like a skeleton, of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more danger. Sense-pleasures are declared by the Lord to be like a lump of meat ... to be like a fire-brand of dry grass ... to be like a pit of glowing embers ... to be like a dream ... to be like something borrowed ... to be like the fruits of a tree ... to be like a slaughter-house ... to be like an impaling stake ... Sense-pleasures are declared by the Lord to be like a snake’s head, of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more danger.”

Yet the monk Ariṭṭha who had formerly been a vulture-trainer, on being spoken to thus by these monks, expressed that wrong view as before, obstinately holding to it, adhering to it: “Undoubtedly, your reverences, as I understand *dhamma* taught by the Lord, it is that in following those things called stumbling-blocks by the Lord, there is no stumbling-block at all.”

And since those monks were unable to dissuade the monk Ariṭṭha who had formerly been a vulture-trainer from that wrong view, then those monks approached the Lord; and having approached, they

told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monk Ariṭṭha who had formerly been a vulture-trainer, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, that to you, Ariṭṭha, a wrong view like this arose: ‘In so far as I understand *dhamma* ... there is no stumbling-block at all?’”

“Undoubtedly, Lord, as I understand *dhamma* ... no stumbling-block at all.”

“To whom then do you, foolish man, understand that *dhamma* was taught thus by me? Are not, foolish man, things that are stumbling-blocks called in many a figure stumbling-blocks by me, and in following these is there not a veritable stumbling-block? Sense-pleasures are declared by me to be things affording little satisfaction, of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more danger ... Sense-pleasures are declared by me to be like a snake’s head, of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more danger. And yet you, foolish man, not only misrepresent me because of your own wrong grasp, but you also injure yourself, and give rise to much demerit which for a long time will be for you, foolish man, of woe and pain. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks saying:

“Well then, monks, let the Order carry out a (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view¹ against the monk Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer, (and with) no eating with an Order.

“And thus, monks, should it be carried out: First, the monk Ariṭṭha should be reprovved, having reprovved him he should be made to remember, having made him remember he should be accused of the offence, having accused him of the offence, the Order should be informed by an experienced competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. A wrong view has arisen to the monk Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer, like this: In so far as

¹ Cf. Kd 9,5.1–Kd 9,5.9.

I understand *dhamma* taught by the Lord ... there is no stumbling-block at all. He does not give up this view. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order carry out a (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view against the monk Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer (and with) no eating with an Order. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. A wrong view has arisen ... He does not give up this view. The Order is carrying out a (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view against the monk Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer (and with) no eating with an Order. If the carrying out of the (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view against the monk Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer (and with) no eating with an Order is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this'. And, monks, proclaim in residence after residence: 'A (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view has been carried out against the monk Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer (and with) no eating with an Order.'

TWELVE ON AN ACT NOT BY RULE

^{133.1} “Monks, if a monk is possessed of three qualities ... (= Kd 11.2–Kd 11.5. *Instead of did of censure read act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view*) ...

TWELVE ON AN ACT BY RULE

(Not in Horner's translation.)

SIX ON DESIRING

(Not in Horner's translation.)

... if he does not quarrel with monks.”

Told are the Eighteen Observances (connected with) a (Formal) Act of Suspension for Not Giving Up a Wrong View

Then the Order carried out a (formal) act of suspension for not giving up his wrong view against the monk Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer, (and with) no eating with an Order. He, when the (formal) act of suspension for not giving up his wrong view had been carried out against him by the Order, left the Order. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can this monk named Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer leave the Order when a (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view is earned out against him by the Order?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the monk Ariṭṭha who was formerly a vulture-trainer left the Order when a (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view was carried out against him by the Order?”

“It is true, Lord.” The Awakened One, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can this foolish man leave the Order when a (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view was carried out against him by the Order? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, let the Order revoke¹ the (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view.

Kd 11.3

BD 5.39

Vin 2.21

FORTY-THREE CASES THAT SHOULD NOT BE REVOKED

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of five qualities ... (= Kd 11.6.2-Kd 11.6.2)
...

FORTY-THREE CASES THAT SHOULD BE REVOKED

... the (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view may be revoked.

Told are the Eighteen Cases where a (Formal) Act of Suspension for Not Giving Up a Wrong View may be Revoked

11.35.1 “And thus, monks, should it be revoked. Monks, that monk against whom a (formal) act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view has been carried out, having approached the Order ... (see Kd 11.12 *Instead of act of censure read act of suspension for not giving up a wrong view. Instead of Seyyasaka read the monk So-and-so*) ... ‘... Thus do I understand this..’”

Told is the Seventh (Formal) Act: that of Suspension for Not Giving Up a Wrong View

Told is the First Section: that on (Formal) Acts

IN THIS SECTION ARE SEVEN ITEMS: THIS IS ITS KEY

5.40 Monks who are followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka, themselves makers of strife, approached similar ones and incited them to strife, / And strifes not arisen were born and those arisen expanded. Modest, well behaved monks looked down upon. The expounder¹, / The Awakened One, standing on what is verily *dhamma*, self-developing, foremost of men, conqueror, enjoined a (formal) act of censure at Sāvattī. / And what is carried out not in the presence of, when there is no interrogation, no acknowledgement,

¹ As Oldenberg, Vin 2.310-Vin.2.311 remarks, “we should expect” *mā* (or *na*) *paṭip-passambhetu*, let not revoke; cf. Kd 11.16.1. ¹ *padassaka* (Sanskrit *pradarśaka*). Sinhalese edition reads *parassato*; Siamese edition *parisato* (*variant readings padassako, padassato*).

and what is carried out for no offence,
 for one not (leading on to) confession, for one confessed, /
 And what is carried out not having reproved,
 not having made to remember, not having accused,
 and too what is carried out not in the presence of,
 not by rule, by an incomplete assembly, /
 Again what is carried out when there is no interrogation,
 not by rule, by an incomplete assembly,
 and too what is carried out not on the acknowledgement,
 not by rule, by an incomplete assembly, /
 And too what is carried out when there is no offence,
 not by rule, by an incomplete assembly,
 and also for (an offence) which does not lead on to confession when it is
 not by rule and the assembly is incomplete, /
 And likewise for one that is confessed, if also
 not by rule, by an incomplete assembly,
 and likewise not having reproved him, if also
 not by rule, by an incomplete assembly, /
 And likewise not having made him remember,
 not by rule, by an incomplete assembly, /
 and likewise not having accused him,
 not by rule, by an incomplete assembly. /
 The bright occasions¹ should also be inferred
 exactly according to the dark occasions.
 And the Order, so desiring, may carry out censure against this one: /
 The quarrel (-maker), the ignorant, the liver in company with.
 The Order may carry out a (formal) act of censure in regard to moral habit,
 good habits, against one who has fallen away from right views,² /
 And against whoever speaks dispraise of the Awakened One, *dhamma*, the
 Order,
 and the Order may also carry out a (formal) act of censure
 against three (kinds of) monks: /
 The one who is a maker of strife, the ignorant one,
 the one intent on living in company;
 likewise in regard to moral habit, good habits, right views, /
 And against whoever speaks dispraise of the Awakened One, *dhamma*, the
 Order.
 The one against whom a (formal) act of censure has been carried out
 conducting himself properly, thus: /
 Ordination, guidance, attendance by a novice,
 the one against whom censure has been carried out should do

¹ *sukkavāra ... kaṇhāvāra*, figuratively pure and impure, right and wrong. ² *adhisīlam ajjhācāre atiditṭhivipannassa*.

nothing in regard to exhortation, even although agreed upon. /
 He should not fall into that same offence,
 into a similar one, or into one higher¹ than it,
 and such a one would neither find fault with a (formal) act,
 nor with those who carry it out, /
 He should not suspend a regular (monk's) Observance, Invitation,
 such a one should not have to do with commands, authority, /
 Leave, reproving, making remember and quarrels.
 Ordination, guidance, attendance by a novice, /
 Exhortation and even if agreed upon: the five qualities are not the end.²
 If he falls into that same offence and into a similar one
 and one that is higher than it, /
 And finding fault both with a (formal) act
 and with those who carry it out: this is not the end.
 Observance, Invitation, commands, authority, /
 Leave, reproving too, making remember, quarrelling,
 whoever is bound by these eight qualities,
 censure is not allayed for him.³ /
 The bright occasions should also be inferred
 exactly according to the dark occasions.
 And Seyyasaka too, ignorant, full of offences, living in company: /
 The Self-Awakened One, great sage, enjoined a (formal) act of guidance.
 (Followers of) the two monks, Assaji and Punabbasu, at Kiṭāgiri /
 Indulged in a variety of bad habits and were not talked round.
 The self-Awakened One, the Conqueror (enjoined) at Sāvattthī
 (formal) act of banishment. /
 Sudhamma was a resident in Citta's Macchasanda,
 Sudhamma jeered at the lay follower Citta with talk on birth. /
 The Truth-finder enjoined a (formal) act of reconciliation.
 At Kosambī when the monk Channa, not wanting to see an offence, /
 The incomparable Conqueror enjoined (the Order)
 to suspend him for not seeing.
 Channa did not want to make amends for that same offence. /
 The leader enjoined a (formal) act of suspension
 for not making amends for.
 The wrong view of Ariṭṭha was founded on ignorance. /
 Suspension for not giving up the wrong view
 was proclaimed by the Conqueror.

¹ Here *tato param*, higher, further, as against *tato pāpiṭṭhatara* of *Kd1.5.1*. ² *na sammati*, meaning does not cease, is not appeased, and signifying here that a formal act cannot be revoked because there are more than these five qualities to consider, and which may stand in the way of the revocation. Cf. *sammanti* at *Dhp* 5. ³ *n' upasammati*.

A (formal) act of guidance, banishment, likewise reconciliation, /

A (formal) act for not seeing, for not making amends for,

and for not giving up a wrong view.

Frivolity, bad habits, harming, and also a wrong mode of livelihood: /

These are additional cases in the (formal) act of banishment.

Two fives (beginning): non-receiving, dispraise,

are two pentads particularly named¹, /

These are additional cases in the (formal) act of reconciliation.

And two among the (formal) acts are similar: censure and guidance; /

And there are the remaining cases: banishment and reconciliation.

The three (formal) acts of suspension are alike in their division.

What remains in any (formal) act is to understood as in the case of censure.

/

BD 5.4

¹ *atināmaka*; *ati-*, meaning very much, specially.

12. PROBATION (*PARIVĀSA*)

DUTIES ON ONE ON PROBATION

At one time, the Awakened One, the Lord was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks under probation¹ consented to regular monks greeting them, standing up before them, saluting with joined palms, doing the proper duties, bringing forward a seat, bringing forward a sleeping-place, water for (washing) the feet, a footstool, a foot-stand, receiving the bowl and robe, treating their backs by massaging. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can these monks who are under probation consent to regular monks greeting ... treating their backs by massaging?" Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks who are under probation consent to regular monks greeting ... treating their backs by massaging?"

"It is true, Lord." The Awakened One, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these monks who are under probation consent to regular monks ... treating their backs by massaging? It is not,

¹ Cf. *Vin* 1.143, also *Vin* 1.136, *Vin* 4.335-*Vin*.4.336. *Vin*-a 1159 notices four kinds of probation, *parivāsa*, all mentioned below: the unconcealed (as of former members of other sects, arid see *Kd* 3.1.1), the concealed (see *Kd* 3.3.1), the purifying (*Kd* 13.26.1ff.), and the concurrent (*Kd* 13.14.1ff.).

monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“A monk who is under probation, monks, should not consent to regular monks greeting him ... treating his back by massaging. Whoever should consent to (any of these actions), there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow, monks, the mutual¹ greeting, standing up before ... treating of backs by massaging between monks who are under probation according to their seniority. I allow, monks, five things for monks under probation according to their seniority: Observance, Invitation, cloths for the rains, gifts (to the Order²) rice.

“Well now, monks, I will lay down the conduct³ for monks under probation, so that monks under probation may conduct themselves⁴ according to it. A monk under probation, monks, should conduct himself properly.⁵ This is the proper conduct⁶ in this case⁷: he should not ordain, he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him, he should not consent to an agreement to exhort nuns, even if agreed upon he should not exhort nuns, he should not fall into that same offence for which he was granted probation, nor into another that is similar, nor into one that is worse, he should not find fault with the (formal) act, he should not find fault with those who carry out the (formal) act, he should not suspend a regular monk’s Observance, he should not suspend his Invitation, he should not issue commands, should not set up authority, he should not ask for leave, he should not reprove, he should not make remember, he should not quarrel with monks. Nor, monks, should a monk under probation walk in front of a regular monk, nor sit down in front of him.⁸ Whatever is the Order’s

¹ *mithu*. ² *oṇojana*. Vin-a1161 explains by *vissajjana*, bestowing. Cf. *oṇojesi* at Vin 1.39 and *oṇojetha* at Vin 4.156, both meaning “to give, to dedicate.”

³ *vatta*, custom, service, something to be done. Cf. Kd 1.27.1. ⁴ *vattitabbam*.

⁵ *sammāvattitabbam*. ⁶ *sammāvattanā*. ⁷ Cf. Vin 5.15. ⁸ These two actions are part of “intentional causing of discomfort” at Vin 4.290.

last seat, last sleeping-place, last dwelling-place¹—that should be given to him and he should consent to it. Monks, a monk under probation should not approach the families of a regular monk² either as the novice who walks in front of him or as the novice who walks behind him. He should not undertake the forest-practice, he should not undertake the almsman’s practice,³ he should not have almsfood taken back⁴ for this reason:⁵ that he thinks, ‘Do not let them find out about me’.⁶ Monks, a monk under probation should announce it⁷ when he is in-coming, he should announce it to (another who is) in-coming, he should announce it at the Observance, he should announce it at the Invitation, if he is ill he should also announce it by means of a messenger.⁸

“Monks, a monk under probation should not go from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are no monks, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger.⁹ Monks, a monk under probation should not go from, a residence where there are monks to what is not a residence where there are no monks, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger. Monks, a monk under probation should not go from a residence where there are monks to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are no monks, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger.

¹ *pariyanta*. “Last” is used in the same sense at **Bu-NP 22** See **BD 2.120, n. 5**. In reference also to these three things “the last” would mean the last available as they were being assigned or distributed to members of the Order. But see *āpattipariyanta, rattipariyanta*, at **Kd 13.26.1**, and below, **BD 5.76, n. 1**. ² I.e. the families who support him and whom he visits for almsfood. ³ He should not stay alone in the forest and he should not go to a village for alms. These two *aṅga* or practices, part of the *dhutaṅga*, ascetic practices, are explained in detail at **Vism 59ff**. See **Vin 1.253**, and **BD 4.351, n. 2**. ⁴ *nīharāpetabbo*, i.e. from a village to a monastery. Cf. *tato niharitvā* at **Vin 4.80 (BD 2.324)**. ⁵ *tappaccayā*. According to **Vin-a 1165** monks returning to the monastery would see him sitting down are eating, and if he did not tell them he was under probation his period of probation might be curtailed. ⁶ I.e. that he is under probation. **Vin-a 1165** says, “‘Do not let one monk find out about me’, and with this in mind he should not eat, having had it (i.e. the almsfood brought back) cooked in the dwelling-place by a novice. He must enter a village for almsfood.” ⁷ I.e. the fact that he is under probation. ⁸ **Vin-a 1166** says that the messenger must not be anyone who is not ordained, he must be a monk. ⁹ Cf. **Kd 2.35**.

Monks, a monk under probation should not go from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are no monks ... to what is not a residence where there are no monks ... to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are no monks, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger. Monks, a monk under probation should not go from a residence, or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are no monks ... to what is not a residence where there are no monks ... to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are no monks, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger.

BD 5.4

“Monks, a monk under probation should not go from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are monks if the monks there should belong to a different communion, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger. Monks, a monk under probation should not go from residence where there are monks to what is not a residence where there are monks ... should not go from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks if the monks there should belong to a different communion, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger.

Vin 2.3

“Monks, a monk under probation may go from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are monks if the monks there should belong to the same communion and if he knows, ‘I am able to arrive this very day.’ Monks, a monk under probation may go from a residence where there are monks to what is not a residence where there are monks ... may go from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks if the monks there should belong to the same communion and if he knows, ‘I am able to arrive this very day.’

Kd 12.1

“Monks, a monk under probation should not stay in a residence¹ under one roofing with a regular monk, he should not stay in what

¹ Vin-a 1167 here defines “residence”, *āvāsa*, as “a lodging made for staying in”.

is not a residence¹ under one roofing (with him), he should not stay in a residence or in what is not a residence under one roofing (with him).² Having seen a regular monk, he should get up from his seat. He should offer his seat to the regular monk. A monk under probation should not sit down on the same seat with a regular monk, he should not sit down on a high seat if he³ is sitting down on a low seat,⁴ he should not sit down on a seat if he is sitting on the ground, he should not pace up and down in the same place for pacing up and down in,⁵ he should not pace up and down in a high place for pacing up and down in if he is pacing up and down in a low place for pacing up and down in, he should not pace up and down in a place for pacing up and down in if he is pacing up and down on the ground.⁶

“Monks, a monk under probation should not stay in a residence under one roofing with a senior monk who is under probation ... with a monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning ... with a monk who deserves *mānatta* (discipline) ... with a monk who is undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) ... with a monk who deserves rehabilitation, he should not stay in what is not a residence under one roofing (with him) ... he should not pace up and down in a place for pacing up and down in if he is pacing up and down on the ground.

If, monks, one under probation as the fourth (member)⁷ should grant probation, should send back to the beginning, should inflict *mānatta* (discipline), if, as twentieth (member) he should rehabilitate, it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.”

Told are the Ninety-four Observances for one under Probation

¹ Vin-a 1167 here defines “not a residence” as a “shrine house (*cetiya*ghara), wisdom-house (*bodhi*ghara), a place (*aṭṭaka*) for sweepings, a place for wood, a building (*mā*ḷa, see **BD 2.16, n. 4**) for drinking-water, a privy, a granary.” ² Cf. **Kd 1.27.1; Kd 1.28.2.**

³ I.e. the regular monk. ⁴ Cf. **Bu-Sk 69.** ⁵ *caṅkama*, monks’ walk, cloister. At first, this seems not to have been prepared or leveled; then it was allowed to be made level or even, then to be roofed over. Cf. **Kd 15.14.2, Kd 15.14.3.** ⁶ Showing that “pacing up and down”, *caṅkamanta*, need not always have taken place in a *caṅkama*.

⁷ Cf. **Kd 9.4.6.** One under probation does not complete a group or an Order, *gaṇa* and *saṅgha*.

Then the venerable Upāli approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Upāli spoke thus to the Lord: “Now, Lord, how many (kinds of) interruptions¹ are there for a monk under probation?”

“There are three (kinds of) interruptions, Upāli, for a monk under probation: dwelling with²; dwelling away, separated from³; not announcing.⁴ These, Upāli, are the three (kinds of) interruptions for a monk under probation.”

Vin 2.3
BD 5.4

Now at that time a large Order of monks had gathered together at Sāvattthī; monks under probation were not able to carry through⁵ their probation. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to postpone⁶ probation. And thus, monks, should it be postponed: That monk who is under probation, having approached one monk, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to him: ‘I am postponing probation’—probation comes to be postponed; ‘I am postponing the observance’,⁷—probation comes to be postponed.”⁸

Kd 12.3

Now at that time monks went away from Sāvattthī to this place

Kd 12.3

¹ *ratticcheda*, literally “breaking of nights”, time having been reckoned by nights instead of by days. ² *sahavāsa*, which Vin-a 1168–Vin-a 1169 explains to mean any of the things given in Kd 12.1.4. ³ *vippavāsa*, as in Kd 12.1.3. Cf. *vippavāsa* in e.g. Bu-NP 2 See BD 2.13, n. 1 and BD 2.14, n. 1 for further references, and also Bu-NP 29

⁴ *anārocānā*, as in the ways specified at end of Kd 12.1.2. ⁵ *sodhetum*, to purify, cleanse, clear, so: to clear oneself of, to finish, to carry through. It was perhaps impossible for a monk to announce that he was under probation if the Order was very large or if it was dispersed. ⁶ *nikkhipitum*, the Usual word for “to lay aside, to lay down, to deposit”, but here meaning to lay aside temporarily only, until a favourable time comes for undertaking the probationary period again. ⁷ *vatta*. See the 94 *vattā* to be observed by those under probation at Kd 12.1.2–Kd 12.1.4.

⁸ This and the corresponding phrase at end of Kd 12.3.2 below, although apparently meant to have been uttered by Gotama, do not end, as would be expected, with *ti*.

and that¹; monks under probation were not able to carry through their probation. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to take up² probation. And thus, monks, should it be taken up: If that monk who is under probation, having approached one monk ... having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to him: ‘I am taking up probation’—probation comes to be taken up; ‘I am taking up the observance’—probation comes to be taken up.”

Told is the Observance for one under Probation

DUTIES OF ONE BEING SENT BACK TO THE BEGINNING

Now at that time monks who deserved to be sent back to the beginning³ consented to regular monks greeting them ... (= **Kd 12.1.1**, **Kd 12.1.2**. *Instead of* monks under probation *read* monks who deserve to be sent back to the beginning) ... ‘Do not let them find out about me’. Monks, a monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning should not go from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are monks, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger ... from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger. Monks, a monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning may go from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are monks ... from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks if the monks there should belong to the same communion and if he knows, ‘I am able to arrive this very day.’

Monks, a monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning should not stay in a residence under one roofing with a regular monk

¹ *taham-taham*, here and there. ² *samāditum*, to take up or undertake again the probation imposed on the offending monk. ³ Cf. **Kd 3.6.7**.

... (=Kd 12.1.4) ... he should not pace up and down in a place for pacing up and down in if he is pacing up and down on the ground.

Vin 2,3

Monks, a monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning should not stay in a residence under one roofing with a monk under probation ... with a senior monk¹ ... with a monk who deserves *mānatta* (discipline) ... with a monk undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) ... with a monk who deserves rehabilitation ... he should not pace up and down in a place to pace up and down in if he is pacing up and down on the ground.

If, monks, one who deserves to be sent back to the beginning as the fourth (member) should grant probation, should send back to the beginning, should inflict *mānatta* (discipline), if, as the twentieth (member), he should rehabilitate, it is not a (formal) act and ought not to be carried out.²

DUTIES OF ONE DESERVING *MĀNATTA*

Now at that time monks deserving *mānatta* (discipline)³ consented to regular monks greeting them ... (=Kd 12.1.1, Kd 12.1.2) ... “... ‘Do not let them find out about me’ Monks, a monk deserving *mānatta* (discipline) should not go from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are no monks, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger ... (=Kd 12.1.3, Kd 12.1.4) ... he should not pace up and down in a place for pacing up and down in if he is pacing up and down on the ground. Monks, a monk who deserves *mānatta* (discipline) should not stay in a residence under one roofing with a monk who is under probation ... with a monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning ... with a senior monk who deserves *mānatta* (discipline) ... with a monk undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) ... with a monk who deserves rehabilitation ... and ought not to be carried out.”

Kd 12,5
BD 5,5

¹ For following items, see Kd 12.1.4. ² Cf. Kd 9.4.6. ³ Cf. Kd 3.6.8.

DUTIES OF ONE UNDERGOING *MĀNATTA*

^{12.6.1} Now at that time monks undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) consented to regular monks greeting them ... (= **Kd 12.1.1**, **Kd 12.1.2** *Instead of under probation read undergoing mānatta (discipline)*) "... 'Do not let them find out about me'. Monks, a monk undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) should announce it when he is incoming, he should announce it to (another who is) incoming, he should announce it at the Observance, he should announce it at the Invitation, he should announce it daily,¹ if he is ill he should announce it by means of a messenger.

Monks, a monk undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) should not go from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are no monks, except with an Order,² unless there is a danger ... should not go from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are no monks, except with an Order, unless there is a danger ... should not go from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are no monks, except with an Order, unless there is a danger ... should not go from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks if the monks there should belong to a different communion, except with an Order, unless there is a danger. Monks, a monk undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) may go from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are monks ... from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks if the monks there should belong to the same communion and if he knows, 'I am able to arrive this very day.'

Monks, a monk undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) should not stay in a residence under one roofing with a regular monk ... (= **Kd 12.1.4**) ... he should not pace up and down in a place to pace up and down in if he is pacing up and down on the ground. Monks, a monk undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) should not stay in a residence under one roofing with a monk under probation ... with a monk who deserves

¹ This is an extra clause peculiar to the monk undergoing *mānatta*. ² Instead of "a regular monk", as in the other cases.

to be sent back to the beginning ...with a monk who deserves *mānatta* (discipline) ... with a senior monk who is undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) ... with a monk who deserves rehabilitation ... and ought not to be carried out.”

Then the venerable Upāli approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Upāli spoke thus to the Lord: “Now, Lord, how many (kinds of) interruptions are there for a monk who is undergoing *mānatta* (discipline)?”

“There are four (kinds of) interruptions, Upāli, for a monk who is undergoing *mānatta* (discipline): dwelling with; dwelling away, separated from; not announcing; going about with less than a group.¹ These, Upāli, are the four (kinds of) interruptions for a monk who is undergoing *mānatta* (discipline).”

Now at that time a large Order of monks had gathered together at Sāvattthī; monks undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) were unable to carry through their *mānatta* (discipline) ... (see [Kd 12.3.1](#), [Kd 12.3.2](#)) ... *mānatta* (discipline) comes to be taken up.”

DUTIES OF ONE DESERVING REHABILITATION

Now at that time monks who deserved rehabilitation consented to regular monks greeting them ... (= [Kd 12.1.1](#), [Kd 12.1.2](#)) ... “... ‘Do not let him find out about me.’ Monks, a monk who deserves rehabilitation should not go from a residence where there are monks to a residence where there are no monks ... from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are no monks, except with a regular (monk), unless there is a danger. Monks, a monk who deserves rehabilitation may go from a residence where there are monks to a residence where

¹ *ūne gaṇe caraṇaṃ*, a *gaṇa*, group usually consisting of two, three or four monks. But Vin-a 1170 says: “here a *gaṇa* means four (monks) or more. Therefore, if he is staying with three monks, that itself is an interruption.”

there are monks ... may go from a residence or from what is not a residence where there are monks to a residence or to what is not a residence where there are monks, if the monks there should belong to the same communion, and if he knows, 'I am able to arrive this very day.' Monks, a monk who deserves rehabilitation should not stay in a residence under one roofing with a regular monk ... he should I not pace up and down in a place for pacing up and down in if he is pacing up and down on the ground. Monks, a monk who deserves rehabilitation should not stay in a residence under one roofing with a monk under probation ... with a monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning ... with a monk who deserves *mānatta* (discipline) ... with a monk undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) ... with a senior monk who deserves rehabilitation ... and ought not to be carried out."

Told is the Second Section: that on Being under Probation

IN THIS SECTION ARE FIVE ITEMS. THIS IS ITS KEY

Those under probation consent to a regular monk's greeting,
 standing up before, joined palms, proper duties,¹ seat, /
 Bringing forward a sleeping-place, water for the feet,
 a footstool, a footstand,
 the bowl, treating the back by massaging,
 and well-behaved ones looked down upon.² /
 If one consents there is wrong-doing,³ mutual,
 five things according to seniority⁴:
 Observance, Invitation, (cloths for) the rains, gifts, food.⁵ /
 And proper conduct, the carriage there, in regard to a regular monk,⁶

¹ Oldenberg's edition reads: *añjali-sāmiyaṃ āsanam*; Sinhalese edition reads: *añjaliñ ca sāmīciyaṃ*; Siamese edition reads: *añjaliñ c'eva sāmīcim*. Sinhalese and Siamese begin next line with *āsanam*. ² Oldenberg's edition has a line less than Sinhalese and Siamese editions, which I follow. ³ Both Sinhalese and Siamese read *dukkaṭam*, as against Oldenberg's *dukkaṭa*. ⁴ Sinhalese and Siamese read *yathā vuḍḍham* (as *Kd 2.1.1*); Oldenberg's edition has *punāpare*; cf. *punāpare* at Snp 100.4. ⁵ Oldenberg's and Sinhalese editions read *vassik-oṇoja-bhojanam*; Siamese edition *vassikañcāvaṇojanam*, and it begins the next line with *bhattam* (omitted by Oldenberg and Sinhalese), which is the word used at end of *Kd 2.1.1*, *bhojana* not occurring there at all. ⁶ *pakatattassa gacchanam*, Oldenberg; *pakatattena gacchare*, Sinhalese and Siamese editions. This refers to not walking or sitting down in front of a regular monk (*Kd 2.1.2*).

and whatever is the last, neither as the novice in front of nor behind,¹ /
 Forest, bringing back food, when coming in, at the Observance,
 and at the Invitation, and by a messenger,²
 and he may go to where there are monks. /
 Under one roofing and getting up and likewise in regard to offering,³ /
 on a seat, in a high place for pacing up and down in,
 on the ground and not in a place for pacing up and down in, /
 With a senior—not a (formal) act, interruptions⁴ and carryings through,
 postponing, taking up should be stated (by) one under probation.⁵ /
 To the beginning, those deserving *mānatta*,
 likewise those undergoing *mānatta*,
 and also he who deserves rehabilitation—
 again the composing by the method. /
 Three⁶ for those under probation, four⁷ for one undergoing *mānatta*.
 As with the three interruptions,
 so there is ‘daily’ for those undergoing *mānatta*.⁸
 Two (formal) acts are similar,
 the remaining three (formal) acts are exactly the same.

BD 5,55

¹ Sinhalese and Siamese editions: *na pure pacchā samaṇena*; Oldenberg: *pure pacchā tath’eva ca*. ² Sinhalese and Siamese editions: *dūtena*; Oldenberg: *dūto*. ³ Sinhalese and Siamese editions read: *ekacchanne na* (Sinhalese *ca*) *vatthabbaṃ na chamāyaṃ nisajjite*. ⁴ Sinhalese and Siamese editions read: *ratticchēdā*; Oldenberg: *ratticchedo*. ⁵ Sinhalese and Siamese editions read: *nikkhipanaṃ samādānaṃ nātappaṃ pārivāsikā*; Oldenberg: *nikkhipanaṃ samādānaṃ, ratti vā pārivāsike*. ⁶ Referring to “interruptions”, as at [Kd 12.2.1](#), [Kd 12.7.1](#) ⁷ Referring to “interruptions”, as at [Kd 12.2.1](#), [Kd 12.7.1](#) ⁸ *saman tiratticchedesu mānattesu ca devasi* (Oldenberg and Sinhalese) meaning, I take it, that as there is an extra “interruption” for one undergoing *mānatta*, so he has to make an extra “announcement” (beginning of [Kd 12.6.1](#)). Siamese edition reads: *na samenti ratticchedā mānattesu ca devāsikaṃ*, “the interruptions do not agree (or, are not in accordance with) all fours) and there is ‘daily’ for those undergoing *mānatta*”.

13. ACCUMULATION (SAMUCCAYA)

EMISSION OF SEMEN

At one time the Awakened One, the Lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Udāyin¹ came to have fallen into one offence: the intentional emission of semen,² not concealed. He announced to monks: "I, your reverences, have fallen into one offence ... not concealed. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

UNCONCEALED MĀNATTA

"Well then, monks, let the Order inflict *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights³ on the monk Udāyin for the one offence ... not concealed.

"And thus, monks, should it be inflicted: Monks, that monk Udāyin, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to it: 'Honoured sirs, I fell into one offence ... not concealed. So I, honoured sirs, ask the Order for *mānatta* (discipline)

¹ A sensual monk. See Index to Names in BD.1, BD.2, BD.3. (Note: Not included in SuttaCentral edition.) ² Bu-Ss 1 (Vin 3.112, BD 1.196). Cf. also Bu-Pc 9, Bu-Pc 64, and Vin 4.194f., N.B. at BD 2.219 (Bu-Pc 9) the sentence, "He, being under probation, sat down in the refectory at the end of a seat" (*āsanapariyante*) should be corrected to "sat down ... on the last seat", in accordance with Kd 2.1.2. ³ Vin-a 1170 mentions four kinds of *mānatta*: the unconcealed, the concealed, the fortnight's duration, the concurrent.

for six nights on account of the one offence ... not concealed. I, honoured sirs, fell into one offence ... not concealed. And a second time I ask the Order ... not concealed. I, honoured sirs, fell into one offence ... not concealed. And a third time I ask the Order for *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on account of the one offence: the intentional emission of semen, not concealed.’

“The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Udāyin fell into one offence ... not concealed. He is asking the Order for *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on account of the one offence not concealed. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may inflict *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on the monk Udāyin on account of the one offence ... not concealed. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Udāyin fell into one offence ... not concealed. He is asking the Order for *mānatta* (discipline) ... not concealed. The Order is inflicting *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on the monk Udāyin on account of the one offence ... not concealed. If the infliction of *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on the monk Udāyin on account of the one offence ... not concealed is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter: Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Udāyin ... should speak. *Mānatta* (discipline) is being inflicted by the Order for six nights on the monk Udāyin for the one offence: intentional emission of semen, not concealed. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

UNCONCEALED REHABILITATION

He, having performed *mānatta* (discipline), announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into one offence: the intentional emission of semen, not concealed; so I asked the Order for *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on account of the one offence ... not concealed; thus the Order inflicted *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on me on account

Kd 13.1

BD 5.5

Vin 2.3

Kd 13.2

of the one offence ... not concealed. I have now performed *mānatta* (discipline). Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well, then, monks, let the Order rehabilitate the monk Udāyin.

“And thus, monks, should he be rehabilitated: That monk Udāyin, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to it: ‘I, honoured sirs, fell into one offence ... not concealed; so I asked the Order for *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on account of the one offence ... not concealed; thus the Order inflicted *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on me on account of the one offence ... not concealed. Now I, honoured sirs, having performed *mānatta* (discipline), ask the Order for rehabilitation. I, honoured sirs, fell into one offence ... So I, honoured sirs, having performed *mānatta* (discipline), ask the Order a second time also for rehabilitation. I, honoured sirs, fell into one offence ... So I, honoured sirs, having performed *mānatta* (discipline), ask the Order a third time also for rehabilitation.’

“The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Udāyin, fell into one offence: the intentional emission of semen, not concealed; so he asked the Order for *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on account of the one offence ... not concealed. The Order inflicted *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on the monk Udāyin on account of the one offence ... not concealed. He, having performed *mānatta* (discipline), is asking the Order for rehabilitation. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may rehabilitate the monk Udāyin. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Udāyin fell into one offence ... is asking the Order for rehabilitation. The Order is rehabilitating the monk Udāyin. If the rehabilitation of the monk Udāyin is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this

matter. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me ... should speak. The monk Udāyin is rehabilitated by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

PROBATION CONCEALED FOR ONE NIGHT

Now at that time the venerable Udāyin came to have fallen into one offence: the intentional emission of semen, concealed for one day. He announced to monks, saying: “I, your reverences, have fallen into one offence ... concealed for one day. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order impose probation for one day on the monk Udāyin on account of the offence ... concealed for one day.

“And thus, monks, should it be imposed: ... *(The matter which here follows is precisely as in Kd 13.1.2, Kd 13.1.3, with the necessary changes in the wording of (a) the offence, (b) the penalty) ...*

MĀNATTA CONCEALED FOR ONE NIGHT

He, having stayed under probation, announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... concealed for one day; so I asked the Order for probation for one day on account of the one offence ... concealed for one day; thus the Order imposed probation for one day on me on account of the one offence ... concealed for one day. I have now stayed under probation. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order inflict *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on the monk Udāyin on account of the one offence ... concealed for one day.

(Here follows precisely the same material as in Kd 13.1.2, Kd 13.1.3, reading concealed for one day instead of not concealed)

REHABILITATION CONCEALED FOR ONE NIGHT

He, having performed *mānatta* (discipline), announced to the monks: “I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... (=Kd 13.4.1) ... I, having stayed under probation, asked the Order for *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on account of the one offence ... concealed for one day. I have now performed *mānatta* (discipline). Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Well then, monks, let the Order rehabilitate the monk Udāyin.

(Here follows precisely the same material as in Kd 13.2.2, Kd 13.2.3, reading concealed for one day instead of not concealed)”

PROBATION CONCEALED FOR FIVE DAYS

Now at that time the venerable Udāyin fell into one offence: the intentional emission of semen, concealed for two days ... three days ... four days ... five days. He announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... concealed for two ... five days ... (=Kd 13.3 Instead of concealed for one day, probation for one day, read concealed for two) ... five days, probation for two ... five days ... Thus do I understand this.’”

SENDING ONE ON PROBATION BACK TO THE BEGINNING

While he was under probation he fell into one offence: the intentional emission of semen, not concealed. He announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... concealed for five days; so I asked the Order for probation for five days on account of this offence ... concealed for five days; thus the Order granted me probation for five days on account of the one offence ... concealed for five days. Now while I was under probation I fell into one offence ... not concealed. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order send the monk Udāyin back to

the beginning on account of the one offence ... not concealed, while (he was under probation).

“And thus, monks, should he be sent back to the beginning: That monk Udāyin, having approached the Order ... should speak thus to it: ‘I, honoured sirs, fell into one offence ... concealed for five days. So I asked the Order for probation for five days on account of the one offence ... concealed for five days; thus the Order granted me probation for five days ... concealed for five days. While I was doing probation I fell into one offence ... not concealed. So I am asking the Order for sending back to the beginning on account of this offence ... not concealed.’ And a second time it should be asked for ... And a third time it should be asked for ...

“The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Udāyin ... asked the Order for probation for five days ... (cf. **Kd 13.2.3**) ... The Order granted probation for five days ... While he was under probation he fell into one offence ... not concealed. He is asking the Order for sending back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... not concealed, while (he was under probation). If it seems right to the Order, the Order may send the monk Udāyin back to the beginning on account of ... not concealed, while (he was under probation). This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Udāyin ... is asking the Order for sending back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... not concealed, while (he was under probation). The Order is sending the monk Udāyin back to the beginning ... while (he was under probation). If the sending back to the beginning of the monk Udāyin ... is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... The monk Udāyin is sent back to the beginning by the Order. The sending back to the beginning for the monk Udāyin on account of the one offence ... not concealed is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

Kd 13.7

Vin 2.4

Kd 13.7

BD 5.6

13.8.1 He, having stayed under probation, while he was deserving *mānatta* (discipline), fell into an offence ... not concealed. He announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... concealed for five days; so I asked the Order ... (= **Kd 13.7.1**). Now while I was under probation I fell into one offence ... not concealed. So I asked the Order for sending back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... not concealed. The Order sent me back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... not concealed, while (I was under probation). Now I, having stayed under probation while I was deserving *mānatta* (discipline), fell into one offence ... not concealed. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well, then, monks, let the Order send the monk Udāyin back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... not concealed, while (he was under probation).”

13.8.2 “And thus, monks, should he be sent back¹: That monk Udāyin, having approached the Order ... should speak thus to it: ‘I, honoured sirs, fell into one offence ... concealed for five days ... Having stayed under probation, while I was deserving *mānatta* (discipline), I fell into one offence ... not concealed. So I, honoured sirs, ask the Order for sending back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... not concealed, having stayed under probation and while I was deserving *mānatta* (discipline).’ And a second time it should be asked for ... And a third time it should be asked for ...

13.8.3 “The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Udāyin ... asks for sending back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... not concealed, while he was deserving *mānatta* (discipline), having stayed under probation. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may send the monk Udāyin back to the beginning ... having stayed under probation. This is the motion: Honoured sirs, let the

¹ *mūlāya*, to the beginning, not in Oldenberg’s text here. Cf. **Kd 13.7.2**.

Order listen to me. This monk Udāyin asks ... The Order is sending the monk Udāyin back to the beginning ... If the sending back to the beginning for the monk Udāyin on account of ... is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... The monk Udāyin is sent back to the beginning by the Order. The sending back to the beginning ... is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

MĀNATTA FOR THREE OFFENCES

He, having stayed under probation, announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... concealed for five days ... (as in Kd 13.4.2) ... They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order inflict *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on the monk Udāyin on account of these offences.

... (as in Kd 13.4.2, Kd 13.4.3) ... ‘... Thus do I understand this.’”

SENDING ONE UNDERGOING MĀNATTA BACK TO THE BEGINNING

While he was undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) he fell into one offence ... not concealed. He announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... concealed for five days ... (as in Kd 13.8.1) ...” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order, having sent the monk Udāyin back to the beginning on account of the one offence while he was undergoing *mānatta* (discipline), not concealed, inflict *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights. And thus, monks, should he be sent back to the beginning ... And thus, monks, should *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights be inflicted ... *Mānatta* (discipline) for six nights is inflicted by the Order on the monk Udāyin for the one offence ... It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

Kd 13.9

Kd 13.9

Kd 13.9

Vin 2.4

Kd 13.1

BD 5.6

SENDING ONE DESERVING REHABILITATION BACK TO THE BEGINNING

^{3.11.1} He, having performed *mānatta* (discipline) and while he deserved rehabilitation, fell into one offence ... not concealed. He announced to monks ... They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order, having sent the monk Udāyin back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... when he had performed *mānatta* (discipline) and while he deserved rehabilitation, inflict *mānatta* (discipline) on him for six nights. And thus, monks, should he be sent back to the beginning ... And thus, monks, should (discipline) for six nights be inflicted ... ‘... Thus do I understand this.’”

REHABILITATION FOR ONE WHO HAS BEEN SENT BACK TO THE BEGINNING

^{3.12.1} He, having performed *mānatta* (discipline), announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... concealed for five days. ... (as in **Kd 13.2.1**). I have now performed *mānatta* (discipline). Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

^{3.12.2} “Well then, monks, let the Order rehabilitate the monk Udāyin.

“And thus, monks, should he be rehabilitated: That monk Udāyin, having approached the Order ... should speak thus to it: ‘I, honoured sirs, fell into one offence ... concealed for five days. So I asked the Order for probation for five days on account of the one offence ... concealed for five days. Therefore the Order granted me probation for five days on account of the one offence ... concealed for five days. While I was doing probation I fell into one offence ... not concealed. So I asked the Order for sending back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... while I was doing probation, not concealed. The Order sent me back to the beginning ... But then I, having stayed under probation and while I deserved *mānatta* (discipline), fell into one offence ... not concealed. So I asked the Order for sending back

to the beginning ... The Order sent me back to the beginning ... not concealed. So I asked the Order for *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on account of the three offences. Because of this, the Order inflicted *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on me on account of the three offences. But while I was under-going *mānatta* (discipline) I fell into one offence ... not concealed. So I asked the Order for sending back to the beginning ... Thus the Order sent me back to the beginning ... So I asked the Order for *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on account of the one offence ... while I was undergoing *mānatta* (discipline), not concealed. The Order inflicted *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on me. When I had performed *mānatta* (discipline) and while I deserved rehabilitation, I fell into one offence ... not concealed. So I asked the Order for sending back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... while I deserved rehabilitation, not concealed. Thus the Order sent me back to the beginning ... And I asked the Order for *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on account of the one offence ... while I deserved rehabilitation, not concealed. Because of this, the Order inflicted *mānatta*, (discipline) for six nights on me ... So I, honoured sirs, having performed *mānatta* (discipline) ask the Order for rehabilitation.’ And a second time should it be asked for ... And a third time should it be asked for ...

“The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, ... (as in **Kd 13.12.2**) ... He, having performed *mānatta* (discipline), asks the Order for rehabilitation. If it seems right to the Order, ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... The monk Udāyin is rehabilitated by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order ... Thus do I understand this.’”

PROBATION FOR ONE WHO HAS CONCEALED FOR A FORTNIGHT

Now at that time the venerable Udāyin fell into one offence ... concealed for half a month ... (as in **Kd 13.3** Instead of concealed for one day, probation for one day read concealed for half a month, probation for half a month) ... ‘...Thus do I understand this.’”

Kd 13.1

Vin 2.4

Kd 13.1

SENDING ONE ON PROBATION FOR A FORTNIGHT BACK TO THE BEGINNING

3:14.1
0:5.65 While he was under probation he fell into one offence ... concealed for five days. He announced to monks: "I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... concealed for half a month. So I asked the Order for probation for half a month on account of the one offence ... concealed for half a month. Because of this the Order granted me probation for half a month. Then while I was under probation, I fell into one offence ... concealed for five days. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Well then, monks, let the Order, having sent the monk Udāyin back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... concealed for five days, grant him probation concurrent¹ with the former offence.

3:14.2 "And thus, monks, should he be sent back to the beginning: ... (as in **Kd 13.7.2**, **Kd 13.7.3**. Read concealed for half a month, probation for half a month, and then concealed for five days instead of concealed for five days, probation for five days, and then not concealed) ... '... Thus do I understand this.'"

CONCURRENT PROBATION

3:14.3
12.49 "And thus, monks, should probation concurrent with the former offence be granted: That monk Udāyin, having approached the Order ... should speak thus to it: 'I, honoured sirs, asked the Order for sending back to the beginning ... (= **Kd 13.14.2**) ... Therefore the Order sent me back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... while

¹ *samodhānaparivāsa*. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.169, says, "When another offence is committed during the continuance of the Parivāsa period, a fresh period begins to run from the date of the commission of the second offence and it extends over as many days as were covered by the Parivāsa period prescribed for the first offence or the Parivāsa period prescribed for the second offence, whichever period may be longer." As *Vinaya Texts* ii.405, n. 1 points out, "the penalties for this new offence and for the old one were not accumulative but concurrent. The offender lost the advantage of the probation he had already undergone, he was thrown back to the commencement of his term of probation, and had to begin again." The *mānatta* to which he was liable for the first offence was not affected.

I was under probation for half a month, concealed for five days. So I, honoured sirs, ask the Order for concurrent probation with the former offence ... while I was under probation for half a month, concealed for five days'. And a second time ... And a third time it should be asked for. The Order should be informed ... '... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... Concurrent probation with the former offence is granted by the Order to the monk Udāyin on account of the one offence ... while he was under probation for half a month, concealed for five days. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.'”

BD 5,6

SENDING ONE DESERVING MĀNATTA BACK TO THE BEGINNING, ETC.

He, having stayed under probation, while deserving *mānatta* (discipline), fell into one offence ... concealed for five days ... They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

Kd 13,1

“Well then, monks, let the Order, having sent the monk Udāyin back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... concealed for five days, grant him probation concurrent with the former offence. And thus, monks, should he be sent back to the beginning ... (as in **Kd 13.14.2, Kd 13.14.3**) ... And thus, monks, should probation concurrent with the former offence be granted ... '... Thus do I understand this.'”

MĀNATTA FOR THREE OFFENCES

He, having stayed under probation, announced to monks: ... (as in **Kd 13.4.1** reading concealed for five days *instead of* concealed for one day) ... They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

Kd 13,1

“Well then, monks, let the Order inflict *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on the monk Udāyin on account of the three offences. And thus, monks, should it be inflicted: That monk Udāyin, having approached the Order ... '... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... *Mānatta* (discipline) is inflicted by the Order for six nights on the

Vin 2,5

monk Udāyin on account of the three offences. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.’”

SENDING ONE UNDERGOING MĀNATTA BACK TO THE BEGINNING

^{3.17.1} While he was undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) he fell into one offence, concealed for five days. He announced to monks: I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... concealed for half a month ...’ (*and he told all that had happened from Kd 13.13 onwards*) ... They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Well then, monks, let the Order, having sent the monk Udāyin back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... concealed for five days, having granted him probation concurrent with the former offence, inflict *mānatta* (discipline) on him for six nights. And thus, monks, should he be sent back to the beginning ... And thus, monks, should probation concurrent with the former offence be granted ... And thus, monks, should *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights be inflicted ... ‘*Mānatta* (discipline) for six nights is inflicted by the Order on the monk Udāyin on account of the one offence ... while he was undergoing *mānatta* (discipline), concealed for five days. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.’”

SENDING ONE DESERVING REHABILITATION BACK TO THE BEGINNING

^{3.18.1} He, having performed *mānatta* (discipline), while he deserved rehabilitation fell into one offence ... concealed for five days. He announced to monks: ‘I, your reverences, fell into one offence, concealed for half a month ... (*he repeats all that has happened from Kd 13.13 onwards*) ... When I had performed *mānatta* (discipline) and while I deserved rehabilitation, I fell into one offence ... concealed for five days. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order, having sent the monk Udāyin back to the beginning on account of the one offence ... concealed for five days, having granted him probation concurrent with the former

offence, inflict *mānatta* (discipline) for six nights on him ... (as in Kd 13.17.) ... Thus do I understand this.”

REHABILITATION FOR ONE WHO CONCEALED FOR A FORTNIGHT

He, having performed *mānatta* (discipline), announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into one offence ... concealed for half a month ... (as from Kd 13.13 onwards.) I have now performed *mānatta* (discipline). Now what line of conduct is to be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order rehabilitate the monk Udayin. And thus, monks, should he be rehabilitated: That monk Udāyin, having approached the Order, ... should speak thus to it: ‘I, honoured sirs, fell into one offence, ... concealed for half a month. So I ... But I, honoured sirs, having performed *mānatta* discipline, ask the Order for rehabilitation ...’ And a second time ... And a third time it should be asked for ... The Order should be informed ... ‘... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... The monk Udāyin is rehabilitated by the Order. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.’”

Concluded (are the proceedings connected with) Intentional Emission

PROBATION

CONCURRENT PROBATION WITH DEPENDENT DURATION

Now at that time a certain monk came to have fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order: one offence was concealed for one day, one offence was concealed for two days ... three ... four ... five ... six ... seven ... eight ... nine days, one offence was concealed for ten days. He announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; one offence was concealed for one day ... one offence was concealed for ten days. What line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

Vin 2.5

Kd 13.1

BD 5.6

Kd 13.2

“Well then, monks, let the Order grant this monk concurrent probation, its duration depending¹ on whichever was the offence among these offences that was concealed for ten days.

“And thus, monks, should it be granted: That monk, having approached the Order ... should speak thus to it: ‘I, revered sirs, have fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; ‘... one offence was concealed for ten days. So I, honoured sirs, ask the Order for concurrent probation, its duration depending on whichever was the offence among these offences that was concealed for ten days’. And a second time it should be asked for ... And a third time it should be asked for ... The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk So-and-so fell into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; one was concealed for ... ten days. He is asking the Order for concurrent probation, its duration depending on whichever was the offence among these offences that was concealed for ten days. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should grant the monk So-and-so concurrent probation ... for ten days. This is the motion ... Concurrent probation is being granted by the Order to the monk So-and-so, its duration depending on whichever was the offence among these offences that was concealed for ten days. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.’”

ALL LENGTHS CONCEALED WITH DEPENDENT DURATION

Now at that time a certain monk had fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; one offence was concealed for one day, two offences were concealed for two days, three offences were concealed for three days, four ... for four days, five ... for five days ... six for six days ... seven for seven days, eight ... for eight days,

¹ *tassā agghena*, literally according to the value or worth, i.e. of the probationary period necessitated by the number of days the offence was concealed. Here probation had to be undergone for ten days, since this was the greatest number of days for which one of the offences had been concealed. Vin-a 1182 says there are three kinds of concurrent probation: *odhāna*, *aggha*, and *missaka*, all of which it explains.

nine ... for nine days, ten offences were concealed for ten days. He announced to monks, saying: "I, your reverences, have fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; one offence was concealed for one day ... ten offences were concealed for ten days. Now, what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Well then, monks, let the Order grant this monk concurrent probation, its duration depending on whichever were the offences among these offences that were each concealed the longest.¹ And thus, monks, should it be granted: That monk, having approached the Order ... should speak thus to it: 'I, honoured sirs, have fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; one offence was concealed for one day ... ten offences were concealed for ten days. Therefore I, honoured sirs, ask the Order for concurrent probation, its duration depending on whichever were the offences among these offences that were each concealed the longest.' And a second time it should be asked for ... And a third time it should be asked for ... The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: '... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... Concurrent probation is granted by the Order to this monk, its duration depending on whichever were the offences among these offences that were each concealed the longest. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.'"

PROBATION FOR TWO MONTHS

Now at that time a certain monk fell into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; they were concealed for two months. It occurred to him: "I have fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; they were concealed for two months. Suppose I were to ask the Order for probation for two months for one offence concealed for two months?" He asked the Order for probation for two months for one offence concealed for two months. The Order

¹ *sabbacirapaṭicchannāyo*. This looks as if probation would have to last for ten times ten days.

granted him probation for two months for one offence concealed for two months. While he was under probation a feeling of shame overcame him, and he thought: "I fell into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; they were concealed for two months. It occurred to me: I have fallen into two offences ... Suppose I were to ask the Order for probation for two months for one offence concealed for two months? I asked the Order ... The Order granted me probation for two months for one offence concealed for two months. While I was under probation a feeling of shame overcame me. Suppose I were also to ask the Order for probation for two months for that other offence concealed for two months?"

3.22.2 He announced to monks: "I, your reverences, fell into two offences ... '... Suppose I were also to ask the Order for probation for two months for that other offence concealed for two months?' Now, what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said.

3.22.3 "Well then, monks, let the Order grant this monk probation for two months on account also of that other offence concealed for two months. And thus, monks, should it be granted: That monk, having approached the Order ... should speak thus to it: 'I, honoured sirs, have fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order ... (=Kd 13.22.2) ... Suppose I were also to ask the Order for probation for two months on account of that other offence concealed for two months? So I, honoured sirs, am also asking the Order for probation for two months on account of that other offence concealed for two months.' And a second time it should be asked for ... And a third time it should be asked for.

3.22.4 "The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk So-and-so has fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. It occurred to him: ... He is also asking the Order for probation for two months on account of that other offence concealed for two months. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may also grant the monk So-and-so probation

for two months on account of that other offence concealed for two months. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk So-and-so ... And a third time I speak forth this matter. Probation is also being granted the monk So-and-so by the Order for two months on account of this other offence concealed for two months. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.' Well then, monks, that monk should do probation for two months from that date.¹

“This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months ... (as above) ... The Order also granted him probation for two months on account of that other offence concealed for two months. Well then, monks, that monk should do probation for two months from that date.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. He knows that one is an offence, he does not know that the other is an offence. He asks the Order for probation for two months on account of that offence, concealed for two months, which he knows to be an offence. The Order grants him probation for two months on account of that offence concealed for two months. While he is under probation, he finds that the other is also an offence. It occurs to him: ‘I have fallen into two offences ... I knew that one was an offence, I did not know that the other was an offence. So I asked the Order for probation for two months on account of that offence which I knew to be an offence, concealed for two months. The Order granted me probation for two months on account of that offence, concealed for two months. But while I was under probation, I found that the other was also an offence. Suppose I were also to ask the Order for probation for two months on account of this other offence, concealed for two months?’ He asks the Order for probation ... The Order grants him probation for two months on account of this other offence also, concealed for two months. Well then, monks, this monk should do probation for two months from that date.

¹ *tadupādāya*.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. He remembers one offence, he does not remember the other offence. He asks the Order for probation for two months on account of that offence, concealed for two months, which he remembers ... (= Kd 13.23.2. *Read* remembers, remembered *instead of* finds, found) ... for two months from this date.

3.23.4 “This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. He is in no doubt that one is an offence, he is doubtful whether the other is an offence. He asks the Order for probation for two months on account of that offence about which he is in no doubt ... (= Kd 13.23.2. *Read* is doubtful *for* does not know) ... for two months from this date.

3.23.5 “This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. One offence is knowingly concealed, the other offence is unknowingly concealed. He asks the Order for probation for two months on account of those offences concealed for two months. The Order grants him probation for two months on account of those offences concealed for two months. While he is under probation, a certain monk arrives—one who has heard much, to whom the tradition had been handed down, expert in *dhamma*, expert in discipline, expert in the summaries, clever, experienced, wise, conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training. He speaks thus: ‘What, your reverences, has this monk fallen into? Why is this monk doing probation?’ They speak thus: ‘This monk, your reverence, has fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. One offence was knowingly concealed, the other offence was unknowingly concealed. He asked the Order for probation for two months on account of these offences concealed for two months. The Order granted him probation for two months on account of these offences, concealed for two months. This monk your reverence, has fallen into these, this monk is under probation on account of these.’ He speaks

3.23.4

3.23.5

5.73

thus: “The granting of probation, your reverences, for that offence which he knowingly concealed is legally valid¹; because it is legally valid² it is effective;³ but the granting of probation, your reverences, for that offence which he unknowingly concealed is not legally valid; because it is not legally valid it is not effective. For this offence, your reverences, the monk deserves *mānatta* (discipline).’

“This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. One offence is concealed, he remembering it, the other offence is concealed, he not remembering it ... One offence is concealed, he being not in doubt (about it), the other offence is concealed, he being in doubt (about it) ... ‘... For this offence, your reverences, this monk deserves *mānatta* (discipline).’”

Now at that time a certain monk had fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. It occurred to him: “I have fallen into two offences ... concealed for two months. Suppose that I were to ask the Order for probation for one month on account of the two offences, concealed for two months?” He asked the Order ... The Order granted him probation for one month on account of the two offences, concealed for two months. As he was under probation shame overcame him, and he thought: “I have fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. It occurred to me: ... I asked the Order for probation for one month ... The Order granted me probation for one month on account of the two offences concealed for two months. As I was under probation shame overcame me. What now, if I should also ask the Order for probation for a further month on account of the two offences concealed for two months?”

He announced to monks: “I, your reverences, have fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months ... It occurred to me: ... What now if I should also ask

¹ *dhammikaṃ*. ² *dhammattā*. ³ *rūhati*. As at [Kd 13.25,3](#), [Kd 13.27](#), etc. Cf. [Vin 2.203](#) and [Kd 6.14.5](#). *Rūhati* means something like “it counts”.

the Order for probation for a further month on account of the two offences concealed for two months? Now, what line of conduct should be followed by me?" They told this matter to the Lord.

He said: "Well then, monks, let the Order also grant this monk probation for a further month on account of these two offences concealed for two months. And thus, monks, should it be asked for: That monk, having approached the Order ... should speak thus to it: 'I, honoured sirs, have fallen into two offences ... What now if I should also ask the Order for probation for a further month on account of the two offences, concealed for two months? So I, honoured sirs, am also asking the Order for probation for a further month on account of the two offences concealed for two months.' And a second time ... And a third time it should be asked for. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk So-and-so fell into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. It occurred to him: '... Suppose I were also to ask the Order for probation for a further month on account of the two offences, concealed for two months?' He is asking ... If it seems right to the Order, the Order ... If the giving of probation to the monk So-and-so for a further month also on account of the two offences concealed for two months is pleasing to the venerable ones ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... Probation is granted by the Order to the monk So-and-so for a further month also on account of the two offences, concealed for two months. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.' Monks, that monk should do probation for two months from the earlier date.

PROCEDURE FOR ONE GIVEN PROBATION FOR TWO MONTHS

"This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. It occurs to him: 'I have fallen into two offences ... concealed for two months. Suppose I were to ask the Order for probation for one month on account of the two offences concealed for two months?' ... (= Kd 13.25.1) ... The Order also grants him probation for a further month on

account of the two offences, concealed for two months. Monks, that monk should do probation for two months from the earlier date.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. He knows the one month, he does not know the other month ... he remembers the one month, he does not remember the other month ... he is not doubtful about the one month, he is doubtful about the other month. He asks the Order for probation for that month on account of the two offences, concealed for two months, about which he is not doubtful. The Order grants him probation ... not doubtful. As he is doing probation he comes to be doubtful about the further month also. It occurs to him: ‘I have fallen into two offences ... concealed for two months. I was not doubtful about the one month, I was doubtful about the other month ... Suppose I were to ask the Order for probation for a further month also on account of the two offences concealed for two months?’ He asks the Order ... The Order grants him probation for a further month also on account of the two offences, concealed for two months. Monks, that monk should do probation for two months from the earlier date.

This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for two months. One month is knowingly concealed, the other month is unknowingly concealed ... One month is concealed, he remembering it, the other month is concealed, he not remembering it ... One month is concealed, he being not in doubt (about it), the other month is concealed, he being in doubt about it. He asks the Order for probation for two months on account of the two offences concealed for two months. The Order grants him probation for two months ... concealed for two months. As he is under probation, another monk arrives¹—one who has heard much ... desirous of training. He speaks thus: ‘Into what, your reverences, has this monk fallen? Why is this monk under probation?’ They speak thus: ‘This monk, your reverence, has fallen into two offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, concealed for

¹ As in [Kd 13.23.5](#).

two months. He concealed one month (although) he was not doubtful (about it), he concealed the other month (because) he was doubtful (about it). He asked the Order for probation ... The Order granted him probation for two months on account of the two offences, concealed for two months. This monk, your reverence, has fallen into these, this monk is doing probation on account of these.’ He speaks thus: ‘The granting of probation, your reverences, for that month which he concealed (although) he was not doubtful (about it) is legally valid; because it is legally valid, it is effective; but the granting of probation, your reverences, for that month which he concealed because he was doubtful (about it) is not legally valid; because it is not legally valid, it is not effective. For that month, your reverences, that monk deserves *mānatta* discipline.’”

PURIFYING PROBATION

3.26.1 Now at that time a certain monk came to have fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; he did not know about the expiration of the offences, he did not know about the expiration of the nights¹ ... He did not remember ... He was doubtful about the expiration of the offences, he was doubtful about the ex-

¹ *āpattipariyanta* ... *rattipariyanta*. *Pariyanta* means literally limit, end, boundary, limitation. On the use of these words here Buddhaghosa leads us to suppose that a monk might be in a state of purification in regard to various offences that he had committed because he had undergone adequate probation. This might last for a day, a half-month, a month or a year. He should then consider for how many months he still has to do probation so as to secure his purification, that is, the removal of the offence. As offences are removed, the amount of time still to be spent on probation automatically becomes less. Moreover, whoever does not know or remember or is in doubt as to the expiration of the nights should, if he has undertaken to do probation, count the nights from that day back to the day of his ordination, and then do probation for this number of nights. In this way, it appears, he would be quite certain of doing probation for all the possible nights which might be necessary for the removal of the offence. See *āpattipariyanta* and *kulapariyanta* (“limited to families”) at [Vin 4.31 \(BD 2.220\)](#), where defined; and *bhesajjapariyanta* (“limited to medicines”) and *rattipariyanta* at [Vin 4.103 \(BD 2.371\)](#). See also above, [Kd 12.1.2](#), where *pariyanta* seems used in a different sense.

piration of the nights. He announced to monks: “I, your reverences, fell into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order. I do not know about the expiration of the offences, I do not know about the expiration of the nights ... I am doubtful about the expiration of the nights. Now, what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, let the Order grant the purifying probation¹ to this monk on account of those offences.

And thus, monks, should it be granted: That monk, having approached the Order ... should speak thus to it: ‘I, honoured sirs, have fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order. I do not know about the expiration of the offences ... I am doubtful about the expiration of the nights. So I, honoured sirs, am asking the Order for the purifying probation on account of these offences’. And a second time ... And a third time it should be asked for. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk So-and-so has fallen into several offences ... he is doubtful about the expiration of the nights. He is asking the Order for the purifying probation on account of those offences. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may grant the monk So-and-so the purifying probation on account of those offences. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk So-and-so ... The Order is granting the monk So-and-so the purifying probation on account of those offences. If the granting to the monk So-and-so of the purifying probation on account of those offences is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak: And a second time ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... The purifying probation is granted by the Order to the monk So-and-so on account of those offences. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.’

“Thus, monks, should the purifying probation be granted, thus should probation be granted. And how, monks, should the purifying probation be granted? If he does not know about the expiration of the

¹ *suddhantaparivāsa.*

offences, if he does not know about the expiration of the nights, if he does not remember about the expiration of the offences, if he does not remember about the expiration of the nights, if he is doubtful about the expiration of the offences, if he is doubtful about the expiration of the nights, the purifying probation may be granted.

“If he knows about the expiration of the offences, if he does not know about the expiration of the nights, if he remembers about the expiration of the offences, if he does not remember about the expiration of nights, if he is not in doubt as to the expiration of the offences, if he is in doubt as to the expiration of the nights, the purifying probation may be granted.

“If he knows the expiration of the offences in some cases, if he does not know it in others, if he does not know the expiration of the nights, if he remembers the expiration of the offences in some cases, if he does not remember it in others, if he does not remember the expiration of the nights, if he is in doubt as to the expiration of the offences in some cases, if he is in no doubt as to it in others, if he is in doubt as to the expiration of the nights, the purifying probation may be granted.

“If he does not know the expiration of the offences, if he knows the expiration of the nights in some cases, if he does not know it in others, if he does not remember the expiration of the offences, if he remembers the expiration of the nights in some cases, if he does not remember it in others, if he is in doubt as to the expiration of the offences, if in some cases he is in doubt as to the expiration of the nights, if he is not in doubt in others, the purifying probation may be granted.

“If he knows the expiration of the offences, if he knows the expiration of the nights in some cases, if he does not know it in others, if he remembers the expiration of the offences, if he remembers the expiration of the nights in some cases, if he does not remember it in others, if he is not in doubt as to the expiration of the offences, if he is in doubt in some cases as to the expiration of the nights, if he is not in doubt in others, the purifying probation may be granted.

“If he knows the expiration of the offences in some cases, if he does not know it in others, if he knows the expiration of the nights in some cases, if he does not know it in others, if he remembers the expiration of the offences in some cases, if he does not remember it in others, if he remembers the expiration of the nights in some cases, if he does not remember it in others, if he is in doubt as to some offences, if he is not in doubt as to others, if he is in doubt as to some nights, if he is not in doubt as to others, the purifying probation may be granted.

BD 5,7

“And how, monks may probation be granted? If he knows the expiration of the offences, if he knows the expiration of the nights, if he remembers the expiration of the offences, if he remembers the expiration of the nights, if he is not in doubt as to the expiration of the offences, if he is not in doubt as to the expiration of the nights, probation may be granted.

Kd 13,2

“If he does not know the expiration of the offences, if he knows the expiration of the nights, if he does not remember the expiration of the offences, if he remembers the expiration of the nights, if he is in doubt as to the expiration of the offences, if he is not in doubt as to the expiration of the nights, probation may be granted.

“If he knows the expiration of the offences in some cases, if he does not know it in others, if he knows the expiration of the nights, if he remembers the expiration of the offences in some cases, if he does not remember it in others, if he remembers the expiration of the nights, if he is in doubt as to the expiration of the offences in some cases, if he is not in doubt in others, if he is not in doubt as to the expiration of the nights, probation may be granted. Thus, monks, may probation be granted.”

Told is Probation

FORTY CASES

Now at that time a certain monk, while doing probation, left the Order. Having come back again, he asked the monks for ordination.

Kd 13,2

They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “This is a case, monks, where a monk, doing probation, leaves the Order. Monks, the probation of one who leaves the Order is not effective. If he is ordained again, the earlier granting of probation is just as it was for him:¹ whatever probation is granted is properly granted, whoever does probation does probation thoroughly, he must do probation (for any portion of time) remaining.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, becomes a novice. Monks, the probation of a novice is not effective. If he is ordained again ... (*as in preceding paragraph*) ... remaining.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, becomes mad. Monks, the probation of one who is mad is not effective. If he becomes sane again, the earlier granting of probation is just as it was for him: whatever probation is granted is properly granted, whoever does probation does probation thoroughly, he must do probation (for any portion of time) remaining.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, becomes unhinged in mind. Monks, the probation of one who is unhinged in mind is not effective. If he becomes not unhinged in mind again ... This is a case, monks, where a monk, doing probation, becomes afflicted by pain. Monks, the probation of one afflicted by pain is not effective. If he becomes not afflicted by pain again ... he must do probation for (any portion of time) remaining.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, is suspended for not seeing an offence ... for not making amends for an offence ... for not giving up a wrong view. Monks, the probation of one who is suspended is not effective. If he is restored again, the earlier granting of probation is just as it was for him: whatever probation is granted is properly granted, whoever does probation does probation thoroughly, he must do probation for (any portion of time) remaining.

¹ I.e. on being re-ordained, he is to take up his period of probation again where he left it off, so as to complete the number of nights for which probation was originally granted him. Probation is “not broken”, another meaning of *rūhati*.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning leaves the Order. Monks, the sending back to the beginning is not effective for one who leaves the Order. If he is ordained again, the earlier granting of the probation is just as it was for him: whatever probation is granted is properly granted, that monk must be sent back to the beginning.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning becomes a novice ... becomes mad ... (as in [Kd 13.27.1](#)) ... is suspended for not giving up a wrong view. Monks, the sending back to the beginning of one who is suspended is not effective. If he is restored again, the earlier granting of the probation is just as it was for him: whatever probation is granted is properly granted, that monk must be sent back to the beginning.

BD 5,8

Kd 13,2

This is a case, monks, where a monk who deserves *mānatta* (discipline) leaves the Order. Monks, the imposing of *mānatta* (discipline) on one who leaves the Order is not effective. If he is ordained again, the earlier granting of probation is just as it was for him: whatever probation is granted is properly-granted, whoever does probation does probation thoroughly, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on that monk.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who deserves *mānatta* (discipline) becomes a novice ... becomes mad ... is suspended for not giving up a wrong view. Monks, the imposing of *mānatta* (discipline) on one who is suspended is not effective. If he is restored again, the earlier granting of probation is just as it was for him: whatever probation is granted is properly granted, whoever does probation does probation thoroughly, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on that monk.

Kd 13,2

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who is undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) leaves the Order ... is suspended for not giving up a wrong view. Monks, the undergoing of *mānatta* (discipline) for one who is suspended is not effective. If he is restored again, the earlier granting of probation is just as it was for him: whatever probation is granted is properly granted, whoever does probation does probation thor-

oughly, whatever *mānatta* (discipline) is imposed is properly imposed, whatever *mānatta* (discipline) is undergone is undergone thoroughly, it must be undergone for (any portion of time) remaining.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who deserves rehabilitation leaves the Order ... is suspended for not giving up a wrong view. Monks, rehabilitation of one who is suspended is not effective. If he is restored again, the earlier granting of probation is just as it was for him: whatever probation is granted is properly granted, whoever does probation does probation thoroughly, whatever *mānatta* (discipline) is imposed is properly imposed, whatever *mānatta* (discipline) is undergone is undergone thoroughly, that monk may be rehabilitated.

*Concluded are the Forty Cases.*¹

THIRTY-SIX CASES

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, those not concealed not being many.² That monk should be sent back to the beginning. This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, those concealed not being many. That monk should be sent back to the beginning and concurrent probation should be granted him on account of the earliest offence of the offences thus concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, those concealed as well as those not concealed not being many. That monk should be sent back to the beginning and concurrent proba-

¹ There are eight possibilities (leaving the Order down to the three reasons for being suspended) under each of the five headings (doing probation, deserving to be sent back to the beginning, deserving *mānatta*, undergoing *mānatta*, deserving rehabilitation). ² *parimāṇā*, but the meaning is not at all clear. See also below:

tion should be granted him on account of the earliest offence of the offences thus concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, those not concealed being many ... those concealed being many ... those concealed as well as those not concealed being many ... those not concealed not being many as well as being many ... those concealed not being many as well as being many ... those concealed as well as those not concealed not being many as well as being many. That monk should be sent back to the beginning and concurrent probation should be granted him on account of the earliest offence of the offences thus concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk who deserves *mānatta* (discipline) ... who is undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) ... who deserves rehabilitation meantime falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, those not concealed not being many ... those concealed as well as those not concealed not being many and being many. That monk should be sent back to the beginning and concurrent probation should be granted him on account of the earliest offence of the offences thus concealed.

Concluded are the Thirty-six Cases

ONE HUNDRED ON MĀNATTA

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, having fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, leaves the Order not having concealed them. He, being ordained again, does not conceal those offences. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed upon that monk.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, having fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, leaves the Order not having concealed them. He, on being ordained again, conceals those offences. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on

Kd 13.2

Kd 13.2

BD 5.8

Vin 2.6

that monk, having granted him probation on account of the set of offences thus later concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, having fallen ... leaves the Order having concealed them. He, on being ordained again, does not conceal those offences. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on that monk, having granted him probation on account of the set of offences thus earlier concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, having fallen ... leaves the Order, having concealed them. He, on being ordained again, conceals those offences. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on that monk, having granted him probation on account of the set of offences thus earlier and later concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order. His offences are both concealed and not concealed. He, having left the Order, on being ordained again, does not afterwards conceal those offences which formerly he concealed, afterwards he conceals those offences which formerly he did not conceal. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on that monk, having granted him probation on account of the set of offences thus earlier and later concealed.

“This is a case, monks, ... on being ordained again, does not afterwards conceal those offences which formerly he concealed, does not¹ afterwards conceal those offences which formerly he did not conceal. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on that monk, having granted him probation on account of the set of offences thus earlier and later concealed.

“This is a case, monks, ... on being ordained again, afterwards conceals those offences which formerly he concealed, afterwards conceals those offences which formerly he did not conceal. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on that monk on account of the set of offences thus earlier and later concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order. He knows some to be offences,

¹ See *Vinaya Texts* ii.423, n. 2, on the right way of making up the hundred cases mentioned at the end of [Kd 13.30](#).

he does not know others to be offences. The offences which he knows to be offences he conceals, those offences which he does not know to be offences he does not conceal. He, having left the Order, on being ordained again, conceals those offences which earlier he had known, does not conceal those offences which later he had known, does not conceal those offences which earlier he had not known, does not conceal those offences which later he had known. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on that monk, having granted him probation on account of the set of offences thus earlier concealed.

“This is a case, monks, ... on being ordained again, does not conceal those offences, (although) knowing them, which formerly, knowing them he concealed, afterwards conceals those offences, knowing them, which formerly, not knowing them, he did not conceal. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on that monk, having granted him probation on account of the set of offences thus earlier and later concealed.

“This is a case, monks, ... on being ordained again, afterwards conceals those offences, knowing them, which formerly, knowing them he concealed, afterwards does not conceal those offences, knowing them, which formerly he did not conceal, not knowing them. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on this monk, having granted him probation on account of the set of offences thus earlier and later concealed.

“This is a case, monks ... on being ordained again, afterwards conceals those offences, knowing them, which formerly, knowing them, he concealed; afterwards conceals those offences, knowing them, which formerly, not knowing them, he did not conceal. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on that monk, having granted him probation on account of the set of offences thus earlier and later concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order. He remembers some to be offences ... (= **Kd 13.29.3**. *Instead of* he knows, knowing, not knowing, *read* he remembers, remembering, not remembering) ... thus earlier

and later concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order. He is in no doubt as to some of the offences, he is in doubt as to others of the offences ... thus earlier and later concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, having fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, becomes a novice ... becomes mad ... becomes unhinged in mind ... this should be explained in detail as below.¹ He comes to be in pain. His offences are concealed as well as unconcealed. He knows that some are offences, he does not know that others are offences. He remembers that some are offences, he does not remember that others are offences. He is in no doubt that some are offences, he is in doubt as to whether others are offences. He conceals those offences about which he is in no doubt, he does not conceal those offences about which he is in doubt. He comes to be in pain. Having come to be again not in pain, those offences which formerly he concealed because he was in no doubt, he afterwards does not conceal although he is in no doubt; those offences which formerly he did not conceal, being in doubt, he afterwards does not conceal although he is in doubt, those offences which formerly he concealed, being in no doubt, he afterwards does not conceal, being in no doubt, those offences which formerly he did not conceal, being in doubt, he afterwards conceals, not being in doubt, those offences which formerly he concealed, being in no doubt, he afterwards conceals, being in no doubt, those offences which formerly he did not conceal, being in doubt, he afterwards does not conceal, being in no doubt, those offences which formerly he concealed, being in no doubt, he afterwards conceals, being in no doubt, those offences which formerly he did not conceal, being in doubt, he afterwards conceals, being in no doubt. Monks, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on this monk, having granted him probation on account of the set of offences thus earlier as well as later concealed.”

¹ I.e. in [Kd 13.27](#), “below” corresponds to our “above” in such contexts, as it refers to the palm-leaf manuscripts

FOUR HUNDRED ON CONCURRENT PROBATION AND BEGINNING

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, having fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, leaves the Order not having concealed them. On being ordained again, he does not conceal these offences. That monk should be sent back to the beginning. Kd 13.3

“This is a case, monks ... not having concealed them. On being ordained again, he conceals these offences. That monk should be sent back to the beginning and concurrent probation should be granted him on account on the earlier offences among the offences thus concealed.

“This is a case, monks ... having concealed them. On being ordained again, he does not conceal these offences. That monk should be sent back to the beginning ... thus concealed.

“This is a case, monks, ... having concealed them. On being ordained again, he conceals these offences. That monk should be sent back to the beginning ... thus concealed. Kd 13.3

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order. His offences are both concealed and not concealed. Having left the Order, he, on being ordained again, does not afterwards conceal those offences which formerly he concealed, does not afterwards conceal those offences which formerly he did not conceal. That monk should be sent back to the beginning and concurrent probation should be granted him on account of the earlier offences of the offences thus concealed. Vin 2.6

“This is a case, monks ... His offences are both concealed and not concealed. Having left the Order, he, on being ordained again, does not afterwards conceal those offences which formerly be concealed, afterwards conceals those offences which formerly he did not con-

ceal. That monk should be sent back to the beginning ... thus concealed.

“This is a case, monks, ... on being ordained again, afterwards conceals those offences which formerly he concealed, afterwards does not conceal those offences which formerly he did not conceal. That monk should be sent back to the beginning ... thus concealed.

“This is a case, monks, ... on being ordained again, afterwards conceals those offences which formerly he concealed, afterwards conceals those offences which formerly he did not conceal. That monk should be sent back to the beginning ... thus concealed.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, while doing probation, falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order. He knows some are offences, he does not know that others are offences ... (= Kd 13.29.3, Kd 13.29.4, Kd 13.30. *The penalty is always the same: that monk should be sent back to the beginning and concurrent probation granted him on account of the earlier offences of the offences thus concealed.*) ...

“This is a case, monks, where a monk deserving *mānatta* (discipline) ... undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) ... deserving rehabilitation, having meantime fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, leaves the Order, not having concealed them ... The one deserving *mānatta* (discipline) and the one undergoing *mānatta* (discipline) and the one deserving rehabilitation should be explained in detail similarly to the one doing probation.¹

“This is a case, monks, where a monk deserving rehabilitation, having meantime fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, and not having concealed them, becomes a novice ... becomes mad ... becomes unhinged in mind ... becomes afflicted by pain. His offences are both concealed and not concealed ... (= Kd 13.30) ... he afterwards conceals, being in no doubt. That monk should be sent back to the beginning and concurrent probation granted him on account of the earlier offences of the offences thus concealed.

¹ Kd 13.31.

THE PORTION WITH EIGHTEEN CASES MEASURED,

ETC.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk having fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, not having concealed not many, not having concealed many, not having concealed one kind, not having concealed different kinds, not having concealed those of a like division,¹ not having concealed those of the other division,² not having concealed separate ones,³ not having concealed connected ones,⁴ leaves the Order.⁵

Kd 13.3

BD 5.8

THE PORTION WITH ELEVEN CASES ON TWO MONKS

“Two monks come to have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. They come to be of the opinion that the offence is one entailing a formal meeting of the Order. One conceals it, the other does not conceal it. Whoever conceals it should be made to confess an offence of wrong-doing, and having granted him proba-

Kd 13.3

¹ *sabhāga ... visabhāga*, possibly referring to the two divisions of offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; that where offences are offences at once, and that where offences become so after (unsuccessful) admonition up to the third time.

² *sabhāga ... visabhāga*, possibly referring to the two divisions of offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order; that where offences are offences at once, and that where offences become so after (unsuccessful) admonition up to the third time.

³ *vavatthitā*. ⁴ *sambhinnā*. For example, there are no other Formal Meetings similar to **Bu-Ss 1**, **Bu-Ss 5**, **Bu-Ss 12**, or **Bu-Ss.13**. These, therefore, are “separate”. Formal Meetings **Bu-Ss 2**, **Bu-Ss 3**, **Bu-Ss 4** are “connected” because they deal with the same subject matter and to some extent use the same wording; the same is also true of Formal Meetings **Bu-Ss 6**, **Bu-Ss 7** and **Bu-Ss 8**; **Bu-Ss 9**, **Bu-Ss 10** and **Bu-Ss 11**. Vin-a 1191 says that *vavatthitā* and *sambhinnā* are *pariyāyavacana* of *sabhāga* and *visabhāga*.

⁵ This is the whole of this paragraph as it stands. See note at *Vinaya Texts* ii.431 which says that the conclusion should be supplied as in **Kd 13.28.1**, with the exception that the penalty in each case is “a probation corresponding in length to the period which has elapsed since the first of those offences which the re-ordained bhikkhu has concealed. The details are only worked out in **Kd 13.28.1**, of the first of the several pairs here enumerated, and are intended to be supplied here for each of the other pairs in a similar way. All the pairs recur in Chapters **Kd 13.35**, **Kd 13.36**.”

tion for as long as it was concealed, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on both.

“Two monks come to have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. They are doubtful whether the offence is one entailing a formal meeting of the Order. One conceals it ... (as above) ... should be imposed on both.

“Two monks come to have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. In regard to this offence they are of the opinion that it is a mixed offence.¹ One conceals it ... (as above) ... should be imposed on both.

“Two monks come to have fallen into a mixed offence. In regard to this mixed offence they are of the opinion that it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. One conceals it ... should be imposed on both.

“Two monks come to have fallen into a mixed offence. In regard to that mixed offence they are of the opinion that it is a mixed offence. One conceals it ... should be imposed on both.

“Two monks come to have fallen into a slighter offence.² In regard to this slighter offence they are of the opinion that it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. One conceals it, the other does not conceal it. Whoever conceals it should be made to confess an offence of wrong-doing and both should be dealt with according to the rule.³

“Two monks come to have fallen into a slighter offence. In regard to this slighter offence they are of the opinion that it is a slighter offence. One conceals it ... according to the rule.

“Two monks come to have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. In regard to this offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order they are of the opinion that it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. It occurs to one, ‘I will tell

¹ *missaka*, which Vin-a 1191 says means “mixed with a grave offence and so on.”

² *suddhaka*. Vin-a 1191 says the group of lighter offences, not those entailing a formal meeting of the Order. ³ I.e. the rule for whatever offence it was, for as it was not an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, probation and *mānatta* would not enter into the penalty.

about it,' it occurs to the other, 'I will not tell about it'. He conceals it during the first watch and he conceals it during the second watch and he conceals it during the third watch. If the offence is (still) concealed after the sun has risen, whoever conceals it should be made to confess an offence of wrong-doing, and having granted him probation for as long as it was concealed, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on both.

“Two monks come to have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. In regard to this offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order they are of the opinion that it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. They go away, thinking, ‘We will tell about it.’ On the way, backsliding arises in one and he thinks, ‘I will not tell about it.’¹ He conceals it during the first watch and ... he conceals it during the third watch. If the offence is (still) concealed after the sun has risen, ... should be imposed on both.

“Two monks ... They become mad, and later they, having become sane again, one conceals it the other does not conceal it. Whoever conceals it should be made to confess an offence of wrong-doing and, having granted him probation for as long as it was concealed, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on both.

“Two monks come to have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. As the Pātimokkha is being recited, these speak thus: ‘Only now do we understand that the rule, as is said, is handed down in a clause, contained in a clause (and) comes up for recitation every half-month.’² In regard to that offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order they are of the opinion that it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. One conceals it, the other does not conceal it. Whoever conceals it should be made to confess an offence of wrong-doing, and having granted him probation for as long as it was concealed, *mānatta* (discipline) should be imposed on both.

¹ *makkhadhamma*, hypocrisy. Perhaps it here means that he deceived the other monk. ² See the “rule” in Bu-Pc 73 (Vin 4.144).

NINE CASES ON IMPURE BEGINNING

3:35:1 “This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order: many and not many and of one kind and of different kinds and of a like division and of a different division and separate and connected.¹ He asks the Order for concurrent probation on account of these offences. The Order grants him concurrent probation on account of these offences. While he is doing probation he falls into several intervening offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, many, not concealed. On account of the intervening offences, he asks the Order for sending back to the beginning. On account of the intervening offences the Order sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is legally valid, irreversible, fit to stand, (but) it imposes *mānatta* (discipline) not by rule, it rehabilitates him not by rule. Monks, that monk is not pure in regard to those offences.

1 2:69
0 5:91 “This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order: not many and many and of one kind and of different kinds and of a like division and of a different division and separate ones and connected ones. He asks the Order for concurrent probation on account of these offences. The Order grants him concurrent probation on account of these offences. While he is under probation, he meantime falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, not many, concealed ... On account of the offences (fallen into) meantime, the Order sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is legally valid, irreversible, fit to stand. It grants concurrent probation by rule, it imposes *mānatta* (discipline) not by rule, it rehabilitates him not by rule. Monks, that monk is not pure in regard to those offences.

3:35:2 “This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order: not many ... and connected ones. He asks the Order ... While he is under probation, he meantime falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order:

¹ As in [Kd 13:33](#). The details of the first pair, not many and many, are worked out in relation to “concealed, not concealed” at [Kd 13:28](#).

many, not concealed ... many, concealed ... many, concealed and not concealed I ... not many and many, not concealed. On account of the offences (fallen into) meantime, he asks the Order for sending back to the beginning. On account of the offences (fallen into) meantime, the Order sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is legally valid, irreversible, fit to stand. It grants concurrent probation by rule, it imposes *mānatta* (discipline) not by rule, it rehabilitates him not by rule. Monks, that monk is not pure in regard to those offences.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk ... and connected ones. He asks the Order for concurrent probation on account of these offences. The Order grants him concurrent probation on account of these offences. While he is under probation, he meantime falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order: not many and many and concealed. On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime he asks the Order for sending back to the beginning. On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime the Order sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is legally valid, irreversible, fit to stand. It grants him concurrent probation by rule, it imposes *mānatta* (discipline) not by rule, it rehabilitates him not by rule. Monks, that monk is not pure in regard to those offences.

“This is a case, monks, ... and connected ones. On account of these offences, he asks the Order for concurrent probation. On account of these offences, the Order grants him concurrent probation. While he is under probation, he meantime falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order: not many and many and concealed and not concealed. On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime, he asks the Order for sending back to the beginning. On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime, the Order sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is legally valid, irreversible, fit to stand. It grants concurrent probation by rule, it imposes *mānatta* (discipline) not by rule, it rehabilitates him not by rule. Monks, that monk is not pure in regard to those offences.

Told are the Nine Cases where (a Monk on being sent back to) the

SECOND SET OF NINE CASES

3.36.1 “This is a case, monks, where a monk falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order: not many and many ... and separate ones and connected ones. On account of these offences he asks the Order for concurrent probation. On account of these offences, the Order grants him concurrent probation. While he is under probation, he meantime falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order: not many, not concealed. On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime he asks the Order for sending back to the beginning. On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime the Order sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is not legally valid, reversible, not fit to stand, it imposes *mānatta* (discipline) by rule, it rehabilitates him by rule. Monks, that monk is not pure in regard to those offences.

“This is a case, monks, ... While he is under probation he meantime falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order: not many and concealed and not concealed ... not many, concealed ... On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime the Order sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is not legally valid, reversible, not fit to stand, it grants concurrent probation not by rule, imposes *mānatta* (discipline) by rule, it rehabilitates him by rule. Monks, that monk is not pure in regard to those offences.

3.36.2 “This is a case, monks, ... While he is under probation he meantime falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order: not many, concealed. On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime he asks the Order for sending back to the beginning. On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime the Order sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is not legally valid, reversible, not fit to stand. It grants him concurrent probation not by rule. He, thinking: ‘I am under probation’, meantime falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order,

not many, concealed. He, arrived at that stage, remembers among the earlier offences offences (fallen into) meantime, he remembers among the subsequent offence's offences (fallen into) meantime. It occurs to him, 'Now, I have fallen into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, not many and many ... and separate ones and connected ones. On account of these offences I asked the Order for concurrent probation. On account of these offences the Order granted me concurrent probation. While I was under probation, I meantime fell into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, not many, concealed. So on account of these offences (fallen into) meantime, I asked the Order for sending back to the beginning. On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime, the Order sent me back to the beginning by a (formal) act that was not legally valid, reversible, not fit to stand. It granted concurrent probation not by rule. Then I, thinking 'I am under probation,' meantime fell into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, not many, concealed. Then I, arrived at this stage, remembered among the earlier offences offences fallen into meantime, I remembered among the subsequent offences offences fallen into meantime. Suppose that I, on account of those offences among the earlier offences, and on account of those offences among the subsequent offences, should ask the Order for sending back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is legally valid, irreversible, fit to stand, for concurrent probation by rule, for *mānatta* (discipline) by rule, for rehabilitation by rule?' He asks the Order ... The Order, on account of those offences among the earlier offences and on account of those offences among the subsequent offences, sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is legally valid, irreversible, fit to stand, it grants concurrent probation by rule, it imposes *mānatta* (discipline) by rule, it rehabilitates him by rule. Monks, that monk is pure in regard to those offences.

“This is a case, monks, ... (*This case is identical with the preceding, but instead of concealed read concealed and not concealed*) ...

“This is a case, monks ... While he is under probation, he meantime

n 2.72 falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, many, not concealed, many, concealed ... not many and many, not concealed. On account of the offences (fallen into) meantime he asks the Order for sending back to the beginning. On account of the offences (fallen into) meantime, the Order sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is not legally valid, reversible, not fit to stand. It imposes *mānatta* (discipline) by rule, rehabilitates by rule. Monks, that monk is not pure in regard to those offences.

THIRD SET OF NINE CASES

3.36.4 “This is a case, monks, ... While he is under probation, he meantime falls into several offences entailing a formal meeting of the Order, not many and many, and concealed ... not many and many and concealed and not concealed ... On account of these offences (fallen into) meantime, the Order sends him back to the beginning by a (formal) act that is not legally valid, reversible, not fit to stand, it grants him concurrent probation not by rule, it imposes *mānatta* (discipline) by rule, it rehabilitates him by rule. Monks, that monk is not pure in regard to those offences.

“This is a case, monks ... (*The two cases given here are identical with those specified in Kd 13.36.2; instead of not many read many*) ... Monks, that monk is pure in regard to those offences.”

Told is the Third Section: that on Accumulation (of Offences)

THIS IS ITS KEY

0 5.95 Not concealed, and one day, two days, three days, four days and five days, and for a fortnight, ten days¹: the Great Sage speaks of an offence, / And slighter ones, leaving the Order, about ‘not many’,² two monks there agree, two are doubtful, are of the opinion that it is a mixed offence, /

¹ *dasānaṃ* should perhaps read *dasāha*, or *dasannaṃ*. The reference is probably to **Kd 13.21.1**: ten offences concealed for ten days. ² Reading with Sinhalese edition *parimāṇāsa ca* instead of Oldenberg’s *parimāṇamukhaṃ*, for *-mukhaṃ* is hard to account for.

They are of the opinion that it is a heavier offence when it is a slighter one,¹
likewise of the opinion that it is a slighter one.² /
One conceals, and then about backsliding,³
and confessing for one who was mad,
(sending back) to the beginning, he is pure.⁴ /
The recitation⁵ is for the maintenance of true *dhamma*
among the teachers of the Vibhajja doctrines,⁶
and who, dwellers in the Mahāvihāra,⁷ illuminate Tambapaṇṇidīpa.⁸

¹ Reading with Sinhalese edition *suddhake garukadiṭṭhino*, and referring to the end of **Kd 13.34.1** where two monks think that they have fallen into a *Saṅghādisesa* offence when really it is a slighter one. ² Reading should probably be *sudhakadiṭṭhino* instead of *suddhadiṭṭhino* of Oldenberg's text, and *suddadiṭṭhi* of Sinhalese edition ³ As Oldenberg suggests (Vin.2.312) the *pakkhamitena ca* should perhaps read *makkhadhammena* as in **Kd 13.34.2**. The Sinhalese edition reads *pakkamitena ca*. ⁴ Reading with Sinhalese edition *mūlāya paṭivissuddhako* (for *mūlāya paṭikassati + visuddhako*) instead of Oldenberg's *mūlā, pannarasa visuddhato*. On the other hand, there seem to be fifteen cases of sending back to the beginning made up of nine to which reference is made at the end of **Kd 13.35**, with six in **Kd 13.36**. ⁵ *vācanā*. ⁶ *vibhajjapadānaṃ*, which Oldenberg suggests (Vin.2.312) should read *vibhajjavādānaṃ*. Sinhalese edition reads *vibhajjāvādānaṃ*. ⁷ The great monastery at Anurādhapura, for many centuries the chief seat of Buddhism in Ceylon. ⁸ Tambapaṇṇidīpa was a district in Ceylon, with Anurādhapura as its centre. According to SN-a ii.111, it was a hundred yojanas in extent, but Vb-a 444 says it was three hundred yojanas in extent. See also Vin-a i.102 where Mahinda tells Tissa that although the *sāsana* is established in Tambapaṇṇidīpa, it will not take root until a boy, born in Tambapaṇṇidīpa of parents belonging there, goes forth there, learns the Vinaya there, and recites it there. Tambapaṇṇidīpa also came to be a name for the whole of the Island of Ceylon. It seems strange to insert references to Anurādhapura and Ceylon here, as though this were, even if not an ending, yet referring to the time when the *sāsana* had reached this Island.

14. SETTLEMENTS (SAMATHA)

VERDICT IN THE PRESENCE OF

At one time the Awakened One, the Lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks carried out (formal) acts of censure and guidance and banishment and reconciliation and suspension against monks who were not present. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks carry out (formal) acts of censure ... and suspension against monks who are not present?" Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that these monks carried out (formal) acts of censure ... and suspension against monks who were not present?"

"It is true, Lord." The Awakened One, the Lord, rebuked them, saying:

"It is not fitting, monks, in these foolish men, it is not becoming, it is not suitable, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How, monks, can these foolish men carry out (formal) acts of censure ... and suspension against monks who are not present? It is not monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ..." Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, a (formal) act of censure or guidance or banishment or reconciliation or suspension should not be carried out against monks who are not present. Whoever should carry one out, there

is an offence of wrong-doing.

“An individual who professes non-*dhamma* makes known to an individual who professes *dhamma*, disposes him favourably, makes him consider, makes him reconsider, teaches him, teaches him again, saying: ‘This is *dhamma*, this is discipline, this is the Teacher’s instruction, choose this, approve of this.’ If this legal question is settled thus, it is settled by what is not rule, by what has the appearance of a verdict in the presence of.”¹

“An individual who professes non-*dhamma* makes known to several who profess *dhamma* ... An individual who professes non-*dhamma* makes known to an Order which professes *dhamma* ... Several who profess non-*dhamma* make known to an individual who professes *dhamma* ... Several who profess non-*dhamma* make known to several who profess *dhamma* ... Several who profess non-*dhamma* make known to an Order which professes *dhamma* ... An Order which professes non-*dhamma* makes known to an individual who professes *dhamma* ... An Order which professes non-*dhamma* makes known to several who profess *dhamma* ... An Order which professes non-*dhamma* makes known to an Order which professes *dhamma*, disposes it favourably, makes it consider, makes it reconsider, teaches it, teaches it again, saying: ‘This is *dhamma*, this is discipline, this is the Teacher’s instruction, choose this, approve of this.’ If this legal question is settled thus, it is settled by what is not rule, by what has the appearance of a verdict in the presence of.”

Told are the Nine Cases of the Dark Faction

“An individual who professes *dhamma* makes known to an individual who professes non-*dhamma* ... An Order which professes *dhamma* makes known to an Order which professes non-*dhamma* ... If this legal question is settled thus, it is settled by rule, by a verdict in the presence of.”

Told are the Nine Cases of the Bright Faction

¹ *sammukhāvinayapaṭirūpa*. On *sammukhāvinaya*., see [Vin 2.93ff.](#), and [BD 3.153, n. 2](#) for further references.

VERDICT BY MEMORY

At one time the Awakened One, the Lord, was staying at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place.¹ At that time perfection had been realised by the venerable Dabba the Mallian seven years after his birth. All that should be attained by a disciple had been fully attained by him; for him there was nothing further to be done, no increase to (be added to) that which had been done. Then this reasoning arose in the mind of the venerable Dabba the Mallian as he was meditating in solitude:² "Perfection was realised by me seven years after my birth. All that should be attained by a disciple has been fully attained by me; for me there is nothing further to be done, no increase to (be added to) that which has been done. Now, what service could I render the Order?" Then it occurred to the venerable Dabba the Mallian: "Suppose that I were to assign lodgings to the Order and issue meals?"

Then the venerable Dabba the Mallian, emerging from his meditation in the evening, approached the Lord, having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting at a respectful distance, the venerable Dabba the Mallian spoke thus to the Lord: "Now, Lord, as I was meditating in solitude, this reasoning arose in my mind: '... What service could I render the Order?' Then, Lord, it occurred to me: 'Suppose I were to assign lodgings to the Order and issue the meals?' I want, Lord, to assign lodgings to the Order and issue meals."

"It is good, it is good, Dabba. Well then, do you, Dabba, assign lodgings to the Order and issue meals."

"Very well, Lord," the venerable Dabba the Mallian answered the Lord in assent.

Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: "Well then, monks, let

¹ From here to towards the end of **Kd 14.9.1** is almost word for word the same as **Vin 3.158-Vin.3.163**; translated at **BD 1.271-BD.1.281**. I give the translation again in full here, but I have not repeated the notes, for which readers should refer to the earlier volume. ² The story is given in brief outline at **Thag-a i.44**.

the Order agree upon Dabba the Mallian as assigner of lodgings and issuer of meals. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon: First, Dabba should be asked; having asked him, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may agree upon the venerable Dabba the Mallian as assigner of lodgings and issuer of meals. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is agreeing upon the venerable Dabba the Mallian as assigner of lodgings and issuer of meals. If the agreement upon the venerable Dabba the Mallian as assigner of lodgings and issuer of meals is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The venerable Dabba the Mallian is agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings and issuer of meals. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.'"

And the venerable Dabba the Mallian, (thus) agreed upon, assigned lodgings in the same place for those monks who belonged to the same company. For those monks who knew the Suttantas he assigned lodgings in the same place, thinking: "These will be able to chant over the Suttantas to one another." For those monks who were expert in discipline he assigned lodgings in the same place, thinking: "They will decide upon discipline together." For those monks who were talkers on *dhamma* he assigned lodgings in the same place, thinking: "They will discuss *dhamma* with one another." For those monks who were musers he assigned lodgings in the same place, thinking: "They will not disturb one another." For those monks who were talkers on inferior matters and who were athletic he assigned lodgings at the same place, thinking: "These reverend ones will live according to their pleasure." For those monks who came in late at night, he, having attained the condition of heat, assigned lodgings by this light. So much so, that the monks came in late at night on purpose, thinking: "We will see a wonder of the psychic potency of the venerable Dabba the Mallian." And these, having approached the venerable Dabba the Mallian, spoke thus: "Reverend Dabba, assign

us lodgings.” The venerable Dabba the Mallian spoke thus to them; “Where do your reverences desire them? Where shall I assign them? These (monks) would quote a distant place on purpose, saying:

“Reverend Dabba, assign us lodgings on the Vultures’ Peak; your reverence, assign us lodgings on the Robber’s Cliff; your reverence, assign us lodgings on the slopes of Isigili Hill on the Black Rock; your reverence, assign us lodgings on the slopes of Vebhāra at Sattapaṇṇi Cave; your reverence, assign us lodgings in Sītā’s Wood on the slopes of the Snake Pool; your reverence, assign us lodgings at the Gomaṭa Glen; your reverence, assign us lodgings at the Tinduka Glen; your reverence, assign us lodgings at the Tapodā Glen; your reverence, assign us lodgings at the Tapodā Park; your reverence, assign us lodgings at Jīvaka’s Mango Grove; your reverence, assign us lodgings at Maddakucchi in the deer-park.”

The venerable Dabba the Mallian, having attained the condition of heat, went in front of these (monks) with his finger glowing, and they by this light went behind the venerable Dabba the Mallian. The venerable Dabba the Mallian assigned them lodgings thus: “This is the couch, this the chair, this the mattress, this the squatting mat, this a privy, that a privy, this the drinking water, this the water for washing, this the staff, this is (the form of) the Order’s agreement, this is the time it should be entered upon, this the time it should be departed from.” The venerable Dabba the Mallian, having assigned lodgings to these, went back again to the Bamboo Grove.

Now at that time monks who were the followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka were newly ordained and of little merit; they obtained whatever inferior lodgings belonged to the Order and inferior meals. At that time people in Rājagaha wanted to give the monks who were elders almsfood¹ having a specially good seasoning, and ghee and oil and dainties. But to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka they gave sufficient ordinary food, broken rice accom-

¹ Almsfood, *piṇḍapāta*, is omitted at [Vin 2.77](#) above, but occurs at [Vin 3.160](#).

panied by sour gruel.¹ These, on returning from alms-gathering after their meal, asked the monks who were elders: “What did you, your reverences, get at the refectory? What did you?”

Some elders spoke thus: “There was ghee for us, your reverences, there was oil for us, there were dainties for us.”

But the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka spoke thus: “There was nothing for us, your reverences, except sufficient ordinary food, broken rice accompanied by sour gruel.”

Now at that time a householder who had nice food gave the Order in continuous food supply meals consisting of four ingredients.² He, with his wife and children, attended and served in the refectory. They offered boiled rice to some (monks), they offered curry to others, they offered oil to others, they offered dainties to others. Now at that time a meal given by the householder who had nice food was apportioned for the following day to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka. Then the householder who had nice food went to the monastery on some business or other and approached the venerable Dabba the Mallian; having approached, having greeted the venerable Dabba the Mallian, he sat down at a respectful distance. As the householder who had nice food was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Dabba the Mallian delighted, rejoiced, roused, gladdened him with talk on *dhamma*. Then when the householder who had nice food had been delighted ... gladdened by the venerable Dabba the Mallian with talk on *dhamma*, he spoke thus to the venerable Dabba the Mallian: “For whom, honoured sir, is the meal apportioned for tomorrow in my house?”

“Householder, the meal apportioned in your house for tomorrow is for monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka.”

Then the householder who had nice food was sorry and said: “Why should these depraved monks enjoy themselves in my house?” And having gone to his house he enjoined a slave-woman, saying:

¹ At AN i.145 called food given to servants. ² “A meal for four monks” at **BD 1.276** should be corrected to the above rendering.

“Having prepared a seat in the porch for those who come to eat Tomorrow, serve them with broken rice accompanied by sour gruel.”

“Very well, master,” the woman-slave answered to the householder who had nice food, in assent.

Then the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka said to one another: “Yesterday, your reverences, a meal was apportioned to us by the householder who has nice food. Tomorrow the householder who has nice food attending with his wife and children, will serve us. They will offer boiled rice to some, they will offer curry to others, they will offer oil to others, they will offer dainties to others.” These, because of their happiness, did not sleep that night as much as expected.

Then the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, dressing in the morning and taking their bowls and robes, approached the dwelling of the householder who had nice food. That woman-slave saw the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka coming from afar; seeing them, having prepared a seat in the porch, she said to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka: “Sit down, honoured sirs.” Then it occurred to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka: “But undoubtedly the food will not be ready as we are made to sit in the porch.” Then the woman-slave came up with the broken rice accompanied by sour gruel. “Eat, honoured sirs,” she said.

“But, sister, we are those who enjoy a continuous supply of food.”

“I know that the masters enjoy a continuous supply of food. But only yesterday I was enjoined by the householder: ‘Having prepared a seat in the porch for those who come for a meal Tomorrow, serve them with broken rice accompanied by sour gruel’. Eat, honoured sirs,” she said.

Then the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka thought: “Yesterday, your reverences, the householder who has nice food went to Dabba the Mallian in the monastery. Doubtless, Dabba the Mallian has set the householder at variance with us.” These (monks), on account of their distress, did not eat as much as

expected.

Then the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, returning from alms-gathering after the meal, having arrived at the monastery, having put away their bowls and robes, sat down outside the gateway of the monastery, squatting against their outer cloaks, silent, abashed, their shoulders bent, their heads lowered, brooding, speechless.

Then the nun Mettiyā approached the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka; having approached, she spoke thus to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka: “I salute you, masters.” When she had spoken thus, the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka did not respond. A second time ... A third time the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka did not respond.

“Do I offend against the masters? Why do the masters not respond to me?” she said.

“It is because you, sister, neglected us when we were being got into difficulties by Dabba the Mallian.”

“What can I do, masters?” she said.

“If you would like, sister, this very day you could make the Lord expel Dabba the Mallian.”

“What can I do, masters? How am I able to do that?”

“You come, sister, approach the Lord; having approached, say to the Lord: ‘Now, Lord, it is not proper, it is not becoming that this quarter which should be without fear, secure, without danger, is the very quarter which is full of fear, insecure, full of danger. Where there was a calm, now there is a gale. It seems the very water is blazing. I have been assaulted by master Dabba the Mallian.’”

“Very well, masters,” and the nun Mettiyā having answered the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka in assent, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, the nun Mettiya spoke thus to the Lord: “Now, Lord, it is not proper ... I have been assaulted by master Dabba the Mallian.”

Kd 14.4

BD 5.10

Vin 2.7

Kd 14.4

Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the venerable Dabba the Mallian, saying:

“Do you, Dabba, remember doing as this nun says?”

“Lord, the Lord knows in regard to me.” And a second time ... And a third time ... “Lord, the Lord knows in regard to me.”

“Dabba, the Dabbas do not give evasive answers like that.¹ If what was done was done by you, say so; if it was not done (by you), say it was not.”

“Since I, Lord, was born, I cannot call to mind ever indulging in sexual intercourse even in a dream, much less so when I was awake.”

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Well then, monks, expel the nun Mettiyā, and take these monks to task.” Having spoken thus, the Lord, rising from his seat, entered a dwelling-place. Then these monks expelled the nun Mettiyā. Then the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka spoke thus to these monks: “Your reverences, do not expel the nun Mettiyā; in no way has she offended; she was urged on by us because we were angry, displeased and wanted him out of the way.”

“But are not you, your reverences, defaming the venerable Dabba the Mallian with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit?”²

“Yes, your reverences.” Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka defame the venerable Dabba the Mallian with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka defamed Dabba the Mallian with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned

¹ Quoted Thag-a 1.45, which explains *dabbo* as *drabyo*, *bhabbo* (with a number of variant readings). ² At **Bu-Ss 8.1.9** he is defamed with an unfounded charge involving defeat. The two versions proceed differently after the end of this paragraph.

talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, let the Order give a verdict of innocence¹ to Dabba the Mallian who has remembered fully.² And thus, monks, should it be given: Monks, Dabba the Mallian, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to it: ‘Honoured sirs, these monks, followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, defamed me with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit. But I, honoured sirs, having remembered fully, ask the Order for a verdict of innocence’. And a second time it should be asked for ... And a third time it should be asked for: ‘Honoured sirs, these monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka defamed me with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit. So I, honoured sirs, having remembered fully, for a third time ask the Order for a verdict of innocence’. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. These monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka defamed the venerable Dabba the Mallian with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit. The venerable Dabba the Mallian, having remembered fully, is asking the Order for a verdict of innocence. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may give the venerable Dabba the Mallian, who has remembered fully, a verdict of innocence. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. These monks who are followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka ... is asking the Order for a verdict of innocence. The Order is giving the venerable Dabba the Mallian, who has remembered fully, a verdict of innocence. If the giving of a verdict of innocence to the venerable Dabba the Mallian, who has remembered fully, is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ...

¹ *sativinaya*. See **BD 3.153, n. 3**. ² See *Vinaya Texts* iii.16, n. 1 on *sativepullapatta*. This means arrived at (or attained to) fullness of memory—thus one whose conscience is quite clean, as at *Vinaya Texts* iii.16. Cf. below, **Kd 14.14.27**.

And a third time I speak forth this matter ... A verdict of innocence is given by the Order to the venerable Dabba the Mallian, who has remembered fully. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this’.

“Monks, there are these five legally valid properties in giving a verdict of innocence: if the monk is pure and without offences; and if they reproach him; and if he asks; if the Order gives him a verdict of innocence; if it is by rule, the assembly being complete. These, monks, are the five legally valid properties in giving a verdict of innocence.”

VERDICT BY FORMER MADNESS

Now at that time the monk Gagga¹ was mad, out of his mind,² and while he was mad, out of his mind he perpetrated much and spoke in a way³ that was not worthy of a recluse. Monks reproved the monk Gagga because of offences done (by him) while he was mad, out of his mind, saying: “Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?” He spoke thus: “I, your reverences, was mad, out of my mind; while I was mad, out of my mind, much was perpetrated and spoken by me that was not worthy of a recluse. I do not remember that. That was done by me while I was insane.”⁴ Although being spoken to thus by him, they still reproved him, saying: “Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?” Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these monks reprove the monk Gagga because of offences done (by him) when he was mad, out of his mind, saying: ‘Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?’ and he spoke thus: ‘I, your reverences, was mad, out of my mind; while I was mad, out of my mind, much was perpetrated

¹ Typifying a mad monk, also at [Vin 1.123](#). ² *cittavipariyāsakata*; cf. *cetaso vipariyāsa* at MN ii.248; *vipariyādikata citta* at Thag 184, and *vipariyattha citta* at Ja v.372. For this whole passage cf. MN ii.248. ³ *bhāsitarikanta*. See *Pali-English Dictionary*, under *parikanta*. It says this passage is evidently faulty. ⁴ *mūlha*, astray, erring.

and spoken by me that was not worthy of a recluse. I do not remember that. That was done by me while I was insane'. And although being spoken to by him thus, they still reprovved him, saying: 'Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?'" Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: "Is it true, as is said, monks ...?"

"It is true, Lord." Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Well then, monks, let the Order give a verdict of past insanity¹ to the monk Gagga who is no longer insane.

"And thus, monks, should it be given: Monks, that monk Gagga, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having raised his joined palms in salutation, should speak thus to it: 'I, honoured sirs, was mad, out of my mind; while I was mad, out of my mind, I perpetrated much and spoke in a way that was not worthy of a recluse. Monks reprovved me because of offences done (by me) while I was mad, out of my mind, saying: "Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?" So I spoke thus: 'I, your reverences, was mad, out of my mind. While I was mad, out of my mind, much was perpetrated and spoken (by me) that was not worthy of a recluse. I do not remember that. That was done by me while I was insane'. And even although they were spoken to thus by me, they still reprovved me, saying: "Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?" So I, honoured sirs, no longer insane, am asking the Order for a verdict of past insanity,' And a second time it should be asked for ... And a third time it should be asked for, saying: 'I, honoured sirs, was mad ... even a third time am I asking the Order for a verdict of past insanity'. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Gagga was mad, out of his mind. While he was mad, out of his mind, much was perpetrated and spoken (by

¹ *amūlḥavinaya*. Cf. *Vin* 4.207 (BD 3.153, n. 4).

him) that was not worthy of a recluse. Monks reproved the monk Gagga for offences done (by him) while he was mad, out of his mind, saying: “Does the venerable one remember ...?” He spoke thus: “I, honoured sirs, do not remember ... This was done by me while I was insane.” Even on being spoken to by him thus, they still reproved him, saying: “Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like thus?” He, no longer insane, is asking the Order for a verdict of past insanity. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may give the monk Gagga, who is no longer insane, a verdict of past insanity. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Gagga ... is asking the Order for a verdict of past insanity. If the giving of a verdict of past insanity to the monk Gagga who is no longer insane is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak ... And a third time I speak forth this matter. A verdict of past insanity is given by the Order to the monk Gagga who is no longer insane. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’

“Monks, there are these three not legally valid properties in giving a verdict of past insanity, three that are legally valid. What are the three properties that are not legally valid in giving a verdict of past insanity? This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into an offence. The Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?’ If he, although remembering, speaks thus: ‘I do not, your reverences, remember having fallen into an offence like that,’ and if the Order gives him a verdict of past insanity, the giving of the verdict of past insanity is not legally valid.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into an offence ... ‘Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?’ If he, although remembering, speaks thus: ‘I, your reverences, remember it as though from a dream,’ and if the Order gives him a verdict of past insanity, the giving of the verdict of past insanity is not legally valid.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk has fallen into an offence ...

‘Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?’ If he, although not mad, pretends to be mad, saying: ‘I act thus, do you also act thus, this is allowable for me, and it is also allowable for you,’ and if the Order gives him a verdict of past insanity, the giving of the verdict of past insanity is not legally valid. These three properties in giving a verdict of past insanity are not legally valid.

Kd 14.6

“What are the three properties in giving a verdict of past insanity that are legally valid? This is a case, monks, where a monk is mad, out of his mind. While he is mad, out of his mind, he perpetrates much and speaks in a way that is not worthy of a recluse. An Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this? If he, not remembering, speaks thus: ‘I do not, your reverences, remember having fallen into an offence like that,’ and if the Order gives him a verdict of past insanity, the giving of the verdict of past insanity is legally valid.

“This is a case, monks, where a monk is mad, ... ‘Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?’ If he, not remembering, speaks thus: ‘I, your reverences, remember as though from a dream,’ and if the Order gives him a verdict of past insanity, the giving of the verdict of past insanity is legally valid.

Vin 2.8

“This is a case, monks, where a monk is mad ... ‘Does the venerable one remembers having fallen into an offence like this? If he is mad and pretends to be mad and says, ‘I act thus, do you also act thus, this is allowable for me, it is also allowable for you,’ and if the Order gives him a verdict of past insanity, the giving of the verdict of past insanity is legally valid. These three properties in giving a verdict of past insanity are legally valid.”

BD 5.10

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Now at that time the group of six monks carried out (formal) acts of censure and guidance and banishment and reconciliation and sus-

Kd 14.7

pension against monks without their acknowledgement.¹ Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks carry out (formal) acts of censure and ... suspension against monks without their acknowledgement?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true as is said, monks ...?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a (formal) act of censure or of guidance or of banishment or of reconciliation or of suspension should not be carried out against a monk without his acknowledgement. Whoever should (so) carry (one) out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

^{14.8.1} “Monks, the carrying out (of a formal act) on the acknowledgement of (a monk) is not legally valid thus, it is legally valid thus. And how, monks, is the carrying out on the acknowledgement not legally valid? A monk comes to have fallen into an offence involving defeat. The Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: ‘The venerable one has fallen into an offence involving defeat.’ If he speaks thus: ‘I have not, your reverences, fallen into an offence involving defeat, I have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order,’ and if the Order has him dealt with for an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the carrying out on the acknowledgement is not legally valid.

^{5.110} “A monk comes to have fallen into an offence involving defeat ... If he speaks thus: ‘I have not, your reverences, fallen into an offence involving defeat, I have fallen into a grave offence, into an offence involving expiation, into an offence which ought to be confessed, into an offence of wrong-doing, into an offence of wrong speech,’ and if the Order has him dealt with for an offence of wrong speech, the carrying out on the acknowledgement is not legally valid.

“A monk comes to have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order ... into a grave offence, into an offence involving expiation, into an offence which ought to be confessed, into an offence of wrong-doing, into an offence of wrong speech. The Or-

¹ I.e. of their offence: *apaṭiññāya*. Cf. *paṭiññāya kāretabbaṃ* at **Vin 4.207** (BD 3.153, n. 5).

der or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: 'The venerable one has fallen into an offence of wrong speech'. If he speaks thus: 'I have not, your reverences, fallen into an offence of wrong speech, I have fallen into an offence involving defeat,' and if the Order has him dealt with for an offence involving defeat, the carrying out on the acknowledgement is not legally valid.

Vin 2,8

"A monk comes to have fallen into an offence of wrong speech ... If he speaks thus: 'I have not, your reverences, fallen into an offence of wrong speech, I have fallen into a grave offence, into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order ... into an offence involving expiation, into an offence which ought to be confessed, into an offence of wrong-doing,' and if the Order has him dealt with for an offence of wrong-doing, the carrying out on the acknowledgement is not legally valid.

Kd 14,8

"And how, monks, is the carrying out on the acknowledgement legally valid? A monk comes to have fallen into an offence involving defeat. The Order or several (monks) or one individual reproves him for it, saying: 'The venerable one has fallen into an offence involving defeat'. If he speaks thus: 'Yes, your reverences, I have fallen into an offence involving defeat,' and if the Order has him dealt with for an offence involving defeat, the carrying out on the acknowledgement is legally valid.

"A monk comes to have fallen into an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order ... into a grave offence ... into an offence of wrong speech ... If he speaks thus: 'Yes, your reverences, I have fallen into an offence of wrong speech,' and if the Order has him dealt with for an offence of wrong speech, the carrying out on the acknowledgement is legally valid."

MAJORITY

Now at that time monks were striving, quarrelling, disputing in the midst of an Order, they were wounding one another with the weapons of the tongue; they were unable to settle that legal question.

Kd 14,9
BD 5,11

They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you monks, to settle this kind of legal question by the decision of the majority.”¹ A monk possessed of five qualities should be agreed upon as distributor of (voting) tickets²; one who would not follow a wrong course through favouritism, who would not follow a wrong course through hatred ... through stupidity ... through fear, who would know what is taken and what is not.³ And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon: First a monk should be asked. Having asked him, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon the monk So-and-so as distributor of (voting) tickets. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is agreeing upon the monk So-and-so as distributor of (voting) tickets. If the agreement upon the monk So-and-so as distributor of (voting) tickets is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The monk So-and-so is agreed upon by the Order as distributor of (voting) tickets. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’

“Monks, there are ten distributions of (voting) tickets that are not legally valid, ten that are legally valid. What are the ten distributions of (voting) tickets that are not legally valid? When the legal question is only trifling, and when it has not gone its course,⁴ and when it is not remembered or caused to be remembered,⁵ and when he knows that those who profess non-*dhamma* are more (in number), when he even thinks that those who profess non-*dhamma* may be more (in number), if he knows that the Order will be divided, if he even thinks that the Order may be divided, if they take (the tickets) not

¹ *yebhuyyasikā*. See Vin 4.207 (BD 3.153, n. 6). “As long as the majority are speakers of *dhamma*,” Vin-a 1192. ² *salākagāhāpaka*. Cf. below, Kd 14.14.24. ³ Referring to the voting tickets. ⁴ *gatigata*. See Vinaya Texts iii.26. Vin-a 1192 says, if it has not gone to two or three residences, or has not been detailed, *avinicchita*, here and there two or three times. ⁵ Vin-a 1192 says: “two or three times it is not remembered by these monks themselves, or caused to be remembered by others.”

by rule,¹ if they take them in an incomplete assembly, and if they take them not according to their views.² These ten distributions of (voting) tickets are not legally valid.

“What are the ten distributions of (voting) tickets that are legally valid? When the legal question is not merely trifling, and when it has gone its course, and when it is remembered arid caused to be remembered, and when he knows that those who profess *dhamma* are more (in number), when he even thinks that those who profess *dhamma* may be more (in number), when he knows that the Order will not be divided, when he even thinks that the Order will not be divided, when they take (the tickets) by rule, when they take them in a complete assembly, and when they take them according to their views. These ten distributions of (voting) tickets are legally valid.”

BAD CHARACTER

Now at that time the monk Uvāḷa, on being examined for offences in the midst of the Order, having denied,³ acknowledged, having acknowledged, denied, he shelved the question by (asking) another, he told a conscious lie. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this monk Uvāḷa, on being examined ... tell a conscious lie?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks ...?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, let the Order carry out a (formal) act for the decision for specific depravity⁴ against the monk Uvāḷa.

And thus, monks, should it be carried out: First, the monk Uvāḷa should be reprovved, having reprovved him, he should be made to remember, having made him remember, he should be made to confess⁵ the offence, having made him confess the offence, the Order should

¹ They each take two tickets, saying: “Thus we, speakers of what is not *dhamma*, will become the majority,” Vin-a 1193. ² Changing their views simply so as to be on the side of the majority. ³ As at Vin 4.1; see BD 2.164. ⁴ *tassapāpiyyasikā*. See BD 3.154, n. 1; MN ii.249. ⁵ *ropeti*.

5.113 be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Uvāḷa, on being examined for offences in the midst of the Order, having denied, acknowledged ... he told a conscious lie. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may carry out a (formal) act for the decision for specific depravity against the monk Uvāḷa. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk Uvāḷa ... told a conscious lie. The Order is carrying out a (formal) act for the decision for specific depravity against the monk Uvāḷa. If the carrying out of a (formal) act for the decision for specific depravity against the monk Uvāḷa is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak ... And a third time I speak forth this matter ... A (formal) act for the decision for specific depravity is carried out by the Order against the monk Uvāḷa. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’

12.86
4.12.1 “Monks, these five grounds for a (formal) act for specific depravity are legally valid: if he becomes impure, and if he is unconscientious, and if he is fault-finding,¹ if an Order carries out a (formal) act for specific depravity against him, if it is by rule and in a complete assembly. These five grounds, monks, for a (formal) act for specific depravity are legally valid.

4.12.2 “Monks, if a (formal) act for specific depravity is possessed of three qualities it comes to be a (formal) act not by rule, a (formal) act not by discipline, and one that is hard to settle: if it is carried out not in the presence of, if it is carried out without interrogation, if it is carried out not with the acknowledgement ...² if it is carried out not by rule, if it is carried out in an incomplete assembly. Monks, if a (formal) act for specific depravity is possessed of these three qualities, it comes to be a (formal) act not by rule, a (formal) act not by discipline, and one that is hard to settle.

5.114 “Monks, if a (formal) act for specific depravity is possessed of three qualities it come to be a (formal) act by rule and a (formal) act by discipline, and one that is easily settled if it is carried out in the

¹ *sānuvāda*, cf. *anuvāda* at Vin 2.5. Buddhaghosa glosses by *sa-upavāda*. ² As at Kd 11.2.1.

presence of, if it is carried out on the interrogation, if it is carried out with the acknowledgement ...¹ if it is carried out by rule, if it is carried out in a complete assembly. Monks, if a (formal) act for specific depravity is possessed of these three qualities, it comes to be a (formal) act by rule, a (formal) act by discipline, and one that is easily settled.

“Monks, if a monk is possessed of three qualities,² the Order, if it desires, may carry out a (formal) act for specific depravity against him: if he is a maker of strife, if he is a maker of quarrels, if he is a maker of disputes if he is a maker of contention, if he is a maker of legal questions in the Order; if he is ignorant, inexperienced, full of offences, not rid of them; if he lives in association with householders in inappropriate association with householders. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these three qualities, the Order, if it desires, may carry out a (formal) act for specific depravity against him.

“A monk against whom a (formal) act for specific depravity³ has been carried out should conduct himself properly. This is proper conduct in this case: he should not ordain, he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him, he should not consent to the agreement to exhort nuns, even if he is agreed upon he should not exhort nuns ... he should not quarrel with monks.”

Then the Order carried out a (formal) act for specific depravity against the monk Uvāḷa.

COVERING OVER WITH GRASS

Now at that time, while monks were striving, quarrelling, disputing, much was perpetrated and spoken that was not worthy of a recluse.⁴ Then it occurred to these monks: “While we were striving ... not worthy of a recluse. If we should deal with one another for these offences, it might even be that that legal question would conduce to harshness, to trouble, to schism. Now, what line of conduct should

¹ As at Kd 11.3.1. ² As at Kd 11.4. ³ As for an act of banishment carried out against a monk, at Kd 11.5. ⁴ As at Kd 14.5.1.

5.115 be followed by us?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“This is a case, monks, where while monks were striving ... much was perpetrated and spoken that was not worthy of a recluse. Then it occurred to these monks: ‘While we were striving ... it might even be that that legal question would conduce to harshness, to trouble, to schism.’ I allow, monks, a legal question such as this to be settled by the covering up (as) with grass.¹

4.13.2 “And thus, monks, should it be settled: One and all should gather together in the same place; having gathered together, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While we were striving ... ‘... it might even be that this legal question would conduce to harshness, to trouble, to schism.’ If it seems right to the Order, the Order may settle this legal question by the covering up (as) with grass, unless it is a heavy sin,² unless it is connected with the laity.’³ The one side⁴ should be informed by an experienced, competent monk from among the monks siding in with the one (side): ‘Let the venerable ones listen to me. While we were striving ... not worthy of a recluse ... to schism. If it is pleasing to the venerable ones, I would confess whatever is the offence of the venerable ones as well as whatever is my own offence both for the sake of the venerable ones and for my own sake, unless it is a heavy sin, unless it is connected with the laity, (so as to obtain) a covering up (as) with grass in the midst of the Order.’ Afterwards, the other side should be informed by an experienced, competent monk from among the monks siding in with the other (side): ‘Let the venerable ones listen to me. While we were striving ... a covering up (as with) grass in the midst of the Order.’

4.13.3 “The Order should be informed by an experienced competent monk siding in with the one (side): ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While we were striving ... not worthy of a recluse ...

¹ *tiṇavattthāraka*. As at [Vin 4.207](#), MN ii.250. See [BD 3.154](#). ² *thūlavajja*, Vin-a 1194, explaining as *Pārājika* and *Saṅghādisesa*. ³ Commentary says: unless it is an offence where he reviles and despises householders by means of a low thing; see under “insulting speech” at [Vin 4.6](#) ([BD 2.173ff.](#)); also above, [BD 5.25](#). ⁴ *saka pakkha*, one’s own side.

to schism. If it seems right to the Order, I would confess whatever is the offence of the venerable ones as well as whatever is my own offence, both for the sake of the venerable ones and for my own sake, unless it is a heavy sin, unless it is connected with the laity, (so as to obtain) a covering up (as) with grass in the midst of the Order. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While we were striving ... not worthy of recluse ... to schism. I am confessing whatever is the offence of these venerable ones and whatever is my own offence ... unless it is a heavy sin, unless it is connected with the laity, (so as to obtain) a covering up (as with) grass in the midst of the Order. If the confession of these offences of ours, unless they are heavy sins, unless they are connected with the laity, (so as to obtain) a covering up (as) with grass in the midst of the Order is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. These offences of ours are confessed (by me), except heavy sins, except those connected with the laity, (so as to obtain) a covering up (as) with grass in the midst of the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.'

“Afterwards the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk from among the monks siding in with the other (side): ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While we were striving ... Thus do I understand this.’

“And thus, monks, do these offences come to be removed from these monks,¹ except for a heavy sin, except for what is connected with the laity, except for (those who make) an open statement of their views,² except for those who are not there.”³

¹ *te bhikkhū tāhi āpattihi vuṭṭhitā honti*, literally “these monks are risen up (or, removed) from these offences.” ² *diṭṭhāvikkamma*. Vin-a 1194 says “those who say, ‘It is not pleasing to me’ and explain their views to one another, or, having fallen into offence together with these who have not come there, or who have come and given (someone’s) leave for being absent while sitting down in cells and so on—these have not risen from those offences. Therefore it is said: except for (those who make) an open statement of their views, except for those who are not there.” ³ *ṭhapetvā ye na tattha honti*. See previous note.

4.14.1 Now at that time monks disputed with monks and nuns disputed
 with monks and the monk Channa, intruding into the nuns' (quarters),
 5.117 disputed together with the monks and was prejudiced on the
 side of the nuns. Those who were modest monks looked down upon,
 criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can this monk Channa, intruding
 into the nuns' (quarters), dispute together with monks and
 be prejudiced on the side of the nuns?" Then these monks told this
 matter to the Lord. He said: "Is it true, as is said, monks, ...?"

"It is true, Lord." Having rebuked them, having given reasoned
 4.14.2 talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, there are these four kinds of legal questions: legal questions
 arising out of disputes legal questions arising out of censure,
 legal questions arising out of offences, legal questions arising out of
 obligations.¹

"What is here a legal question arising out of disputes This is a
 case, monks, where monks dispute, saying²: 'It is *dhamma*' or 'It
 is not *dhamma*' or 'It is discipline' or 'It is not discipline' or 'It is
 spoken, uttered by the Truth-finder', or 'It is not spoken, not uttered
 by the Truth-finder' or 'It is practised by the Truth-finder' or 'It is
 not practised by the Truth-finder' or 'It is laid down by the Truth-
 finder' or 'It is not laid down by the Truth-finder' or 'It is an offence'
 or 'It is not an offence' or 'It is a slight offence' or 'It is a serious
 offence' or 'It is an offence that can be done away with' or 'It is an
 offence that cannot be done away with' or 'It is a bad offence' or 'It
 is not a bad offence.' Whatever here is strife, quarrel, contention,
 dispute, difference of opinion, other opinion, because the common
 appellation of heatedness³ is 'quarrel',⁴, this is called a legal question
 arising from disputes

"What is here a legal question arising from censure? In this case,
 monks, monks censure a monk for falling away from moral habit or

¹ As at Vin 3.164. ² Cf. the following with Vin 1.354. ³ *vipaccatāya vohāro*. Vin-
 a 1194 says "the common appellation is due to mental uneasiness, *cittadukkha*. The
 meaning is harsh speech." ⁴ *medhaka*.

for falling away from good habits or for falling away from right view or for falling away from a right mode of livelihood. Whatever here is censure, fault-finding, talking to, scolding, bickering, inciting, instigating, this is called a legal question arising from censure.

“What is here a legal question arising from offences? Both the five classes of offences¹ (yield) legal questions arising from offences, and the seven classes of offences² (yield) legal questions arising from offences. This is called a legal question arising from offences.

“What is here a legal question arising from obligations? Whatever is an Order’s business and ought to be done (by it): a (formal) act for which leave ought to be asked,³ a (formal) act at which a motion is put, a (formal) act at which a motion is put and followed by one resolution, a (formal) act at which a motion is put and followed by a resolution made three times.⁴ This is called a legal question arising from obligations.

“What is the source of a legal question arising from disputes Six sources of dispute are the source of a legal question arising from disputes there are three unskilled sources which are the source of a legal question arising from disputes as well as three skilled sources which are the source of legal questions arising from disputes

“Which are the six sources of dispute which are the source of a legal question arising from disputes In this case, a monk becomes angry and bears ill-will.⁵ Monks, whatever monk becomes angry and bears ill-will, he lives without deference, disrespectful towards the Teacher, and he lives without deference, disrespectful towards

¹ That is to say, those of Defeat, those entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order, those of Expiation, those which ought to be confessed and those of wrong-doing.

² The above five, With grave offences and those of wrong speech added.

³ *apalokanakamma*. Vin-a 1195 says “having purified the Order living in the boundary, having brought the leave of absence of those who deserve to send leave of absence, the (formal) act should be carried out, having announced it three times for the approval of a complete Order.” Vin-a 1195 refers for all these types of formal acts to the Parivāra, i.e. to Vin 5.229ff. ⁴ These types of formal acts are also mentioned at Vin 4.152 in definition of “legitimate (formal) acts.” See BD 3.59, BD 3.60 for further references.

⁵ This recurs at AN iii.334; DN iii.246; MN i.96, MN ii.245. See Pp ii.1 where *kodha* and *upanāhi* form the subjects of questions.

5.119 *dhamma*, and he lives without deference, disrespectful towards the Order, and he does not complete the training. Monks, whatever monk lives without deference, disrespectful towards the Teacher, *dhamma*, and the Order and does not complete the training, he causes dispute in an Order, and that dispute comes to be for the harm of the many-folk, for the lack of ease of the many-folk, for the lack of the goal for the many-folk, for the harm and dissatisfaction of devas and mankind. If you, monks, should perceive a source of dispute like this among yourselves or among others, you, monks, should strive therein for the destruction of precisely that evil source of disputes. If you, monks, should perceive no source of dispute like this among yourselves or among others, you, monks, should therein follow a course (to stop) there being future effects of precisely that evil source of disputes. Thus there comes to be destruction of that evil source of disputes thus there come to be no future effects of that evil source of disputes.

“And again, monks, a monk becomes harsh¹ and unmerciful, he becomes envious and grudging, he becomes crafty and deceitful, he comes to have evil desires and wrong views, he comes to be infected with worldliness, obstinate, stubborn.² Monks, that monk who lives without deference, disrespectful towards the Teacher ... thus there come to be no future effects of that evil source of disputes. These six sources of dispute are the source of a legal question arising from disputes.

1.14.4 “Which three unskilled sources are the source of a legal question arising from disputes. In this case, monks dispute covetous in mind, they dispute corrupt in mind, they dispute erring in mind, saying: ‘It is *dhamma*’ or ‘It is not *dhamma*’ or ... ‘It is not a bad offence.’³ These three unskilled sources are the source of a legal question arising from disputes.

“Which three skilled sources are the source of a legal question

¹ The first six words occur at MN i.96 (cf. MN i.43) and they form subjects of questions at Pp ii.2–Pp ii.4. The first five occur at Ja iii.259. ² Cf. MN i.43, MN i.96, MN i.402; DN iii.247; AN iii.335, AN v.150. ³ As at Kd 14.14.2.

arising from disputes In this case, monks dispute not covetous in mind, they dispute not corrupt in mind, they dispute not erring in mind, saying: 'It is *dhamma*' or 'It is not *dhamma*' ... or 'It is not a bad offence'. These three skilled sources are the source of a legal question arising from disputes

“What is the source of a legal question arising from censure? Six sources of censure are the source of a legal question arising from censure: there are three unskilled sources which are the source of a legal question arising from censure as well as three skilled sources which are the source of a legal question arising from censure; body, too, is a source of a legal question arising from censure; speech, too, is a source of a legal question arising from censure.

“Which are the six sources of censure that are the source of a legal question arising from censure? In this case, monks, a monk becomes angry and bears ill-will ... (as in [Kd 14.14.3](#). *Instead of dispute read censure, source of censure, etc.*) ... These six sources of censure are the source of a legal question arising from censure.

“Which three unskilled sources are the source of a legal question arising from censure? In this case, monks, covetous in mind, censure a monk, corrupt in mind they censure (him), erring in mind they censure him with falling away from moral habit or with falling away from good habits or with falling away from right view or with falling away from a right mode of livelihood. These three unskilled source are the sources of a legal question arising from censure.

“Which three skilled sources are the source of a legal question arising from censure? In this case monks, not covetous in mind, censure a monk; not corrupt in mind ... not erring in mind, they censure him with falling away from moral habit ... with falling away from a right mode of living. These three skilled sources are the source of a legal question arising from censure.

“Which (kind of) a body is a source of a legal question arising from censure? In this case someone comes to be of a bad colour,¹ ugly, deformed, very ill or blind of one eye or paralysed down one side or

¹ As at AN i.107=AN ii.85=SN i.94=MN iii.169=Pp 51.

lame or a cripple, on account of which they censure him. This (kind of) body is a source of a legal question arising from censure.

“Which (kind of) speech is a source of a legal question arising from censure? In this case someone comes to be surly, stuttering, of hoarse enunciation, on account of which they censure him. This (kind of) speech is a source of a legal question arising from censure.

“What is the source of a legal question arising from offences? Six origins of offences are the source of a legal question arising from offences: there is the offence which originates from the body, not from speech, not from mind; there is the offence which originates from speech, not from body, not from mind; there is the offence which originates from body and from speech, not from mind; there is the offence which originates from body and from mind, not from speech; there is the offence which originates from speech and mind, not from body; there is the offence which originates from body and from speech and from mind. These six origins of offences are the source of a legal question arising from offences.

“What is the source of a legal question arising from obligations? The Order is the sole source of a legal question arising from obligations.

“A legal question arising from disputes is it skilled, unskilled, indeterminate? A legal question arising from disputes may be skilled, it may be unskilled, it may be indeterminate. What here is a legal question arising from disputes that is skilled? In this case monks whose thoughts are skilled dispute, saying, ‘This is *dhamma*’ or ‘This is not *dhamma*’ or ... ‘This is not a bad offence.’ Whatever therein is strife, quarrel, contention, dispute, difference of opinion, other opinion, because the common appellation of heatedness is ‘quarrel’, this is called a legal question arising from dispute? that is skilled.

“What here is a legal question arising from disputes that is unskilled? In this case, monks whose thoughts are unskilled dispute, saying: ‘This is *dhamma*’ or ‘This is not *dhamma*’ or ... ‘This is not a bad offence’ ... because the common appellation of heatedness is ‘quarrel,’ this is called a legal question arising from disputes that is

unskilled.

“What here is a legal question arising from disputes that is indeterminate? In this case, monks whose thoughts are indeterminate dispute, saying: ‘It is *dhamma*’ or ... ‘It is not a bad offence’ ... called a legal question arising from disputes that are indeterminate.

“A legal question arising from censure: is it skilled, unskilled, indeterminate? A legal question arising from censure may be skilled, it may be unskilled, it may be indeterminate. What here is a legal question arising from censure that is skilled? In this case monks whose thoughts are skilled censure a monk with falling away from moral habit or with falling away from good habits or with falling away from right views or with falling away from a right mode of livelihood. Whatever herein is censure, blaming, talking to, scolding, bickering, inciting, instigating, this is called a legal question arising from censure that is skilled.

“What here is a legal question arising from censure that is unskilled? In this case, monks whose thoughts are unskilled censure a monk ... What is here a legal question arising from censure that is indeterminate? In this case, monks whose thoughts are indeterminate censure a monk with falling away from ... a right mode of livelihood. Whatever herein is censure, blaming ... instigating, this is called a legal question arising from censure that is indeterminate.

“A legal question arising from offences: is it skilled, unskilled, indeterminate? A legal question arising from offences may be unskilled it may be indeterminate. There is no legal question arising from offences that is skilled. What is here a legal question arising from offences that is unskilled? A transgression committed knowingly, consciously, deliberately¹ is one that is called a legal question arising from offences that is unskilled.

“What is here a legal question arising from offences that is indeterminate? A transgression committed not knowingly, not consciously, not deliberately is one that is called a legal question arising from offences that is indeterminate.

¹ As at [Vin 3.73](#), [Vin 3.112](#), [Vin 4.290](#).

“A legal question arising from obligations: is it skilled, unskilled, indeterminate? A legal question arising from obligations may be skilled, it may be unskilled, it may be indeterminate. What is here a legal question arising from obligations that is skilled? Whatever (formal) act that an Order, good in mind, carries out: a (formal) act for which leave ought to be asked, a (formal) act at which a motion is put, a (formal) act at which a motion is put and followed by one resolution, a (formal) act at which a motion is put and followed by a resolution made three times¹—this is called a legal question arising from obligations that is skilled.

“What is here a legal question arising from obligations that is unskilled? Whatever (formal) act that an Order bad in mind, carries out ... What is here a legal question arising from obligations that is indeterminate? Whatever (formal) act that an Order, indeterminate in mind, carries out ... this is called a legal question arising from obligations that is indeterminate.

“(Can there be) a dispute and a legal question arising from disputes a dispute (but) no legal question, a legal question (but) no dispute, a legal question as well as a dispute? There may be a dispute and a legal question arising from disputes there may be a dispute (but) no legal question, there may be a legal question (but) no dispute, there may be a legal question as well as a dispute.

“What is here a dispute and a legal question arising from disputes In this case, monks dispute, saying: ‘This is *dhamma*’ or ... ‘This is not a bad offence’.² Whatever herein³ is strife, quarrel, contention, dispute, difference of opinion, other opinion, because the common appellation of heatedness is ‘quarrel’ this is called a dispute and a legal question arising from disputes

“What is here a dispute (but) not a legal question? Mother disputes with son and son disputes with, mother, and father disputes with son and son disputes with father, and brother disputes with brother and brother disputes with sister and sister disputes with brother, and friend disputes with friend. This is a dispute (but) not a legal

¹ As above, [Kd 14.14.2](#). ² As in [Kd 14.14.2](#). ³ As in [Kd 14.14.8](#).

question.

“What is here a legal question (but) not a dispute? A legal question arising from censure, a legal question arising from offences, a legal question arising from obligations. This is a legal question (but) not a dispute.

“What is here a legal question as well as a dispute? A legal question arising from disputes is a legal question as well as a dispute.

“(Can there be) censure and a legal question arising from censure, censure (but) no legal question, a legal question (but) no censure, a legal question as well as censure? There may be censure and a legal question arising from censure, there may be censure (but) no legal question, there may be a legal question (but) no censure, there may be a legal question as well as censure.

“What is here censure and a legal question arising from censure? In this case monks censure a monk with falling away from moral habit or ... with falling away from a right mode of living. Whatever herein is censure, blaming ... instigating, this is censure and a legal question arising from censure.

“What is here censure (but) not a legal question? Mother censures son and son censures mother ... and friend censures friend. This is censure (but) not a legal question.

“What is here a legal question (but) not censure? A legal question arising from offences, a legal question arising from obligations, a legal question arising from disputes This is a legal question but not censure.

“What is here a legal question as well as censure? A legal question arising from censure is a legal question as well as censure.

“(Can there be) an offence and a legal question arising from offences, an offence (but) no legal question, a legal question (but) no offence, a legal question as well as an offence? There may be an offence and a legal question arising from offences, there may be an offence (but) no legal question, there may be a legal question (but) no offence, there may be a legal question as well as an offence.

“What is here an offence and a legal question arising from offences?

Kd 14.1

BD 5.12

Kd 14.1

Vin 2.9

The five classes of offences (yield) a legal question arising from offences and the seven classes of offences (yield) a legal question arising from offences. This is an offence and a legal question arising from offences.

“What is here an offence (but) not a legal question? Stream-attainment and Attainment.¹ This is “falling” but not a legal question.

“What is here a legal question (but) not an offence? A legal question arising from obligations, a legal question arising from disputes a legal question arising from censure. This is a legal question (but) not an offence.

“What is here a legal question as well as an offence? A legal question arising from offences is a legal question as well as an offence.

“(Can there be) an obligation and a legal question arising from obligations, an obligation (but) no legal question, a legal question (but) no obligation, a legal question as well as an obligation? There may be an obligation and a legal question arising from obligations, there may be an obligation (but) no legal question, there may be a legal question (but) no obligation, there may be a legal question as well as an obligation.

“What is here an obligation and a legal question arising from obligations? Whatever is an Order’s business and ought to be done by it: a (formal) act for which leave ought to be asked, a (formal) act at which a motion is put, a (formal) act at which a motion is put and followed by one resolution, a (formal) act at which a motion is put and followed by a resolution made three times—this is an obligation and a legal question arising from obligations.

“What is here an obligation (but) no legal question? An obligation to a teacher, an obligation to a preceptor, an obligation to one who has the same preceptor, an obligation to one who has the same teacher. This is an obligation (but) not a legal question.

“What is here a legal question (but) not an obligation? A legal question arising from disputes ... arising from censure ... arising from offences. This is a legal question (but) not an obligation.

¹ For this play of words on *āpatti*, *sot-āpatti* and *sam-āpatti* see **BD 2.177, n. 5.**

“What is here a legal question as well as an obligation? A legal question arising from obligations is a legal question as well as an obligation.

SETTLEMENT OF ISSUES

“By how many kinds of decision is a legal question arising from disputes agreed upon? A legal question arising from disputes is (agreed upon) by two (kinds of) decisions: by a verdict in the presence of and by the decision of the majority. If one says: ‘Can it be that, in respect of a legal question arising from disputes without having recourse to one (kind of) decision—the decision of the majority—one may agree upon it by the other (kind of) decision—the verdict in the presence of?’ he should be told: ‘It can be’. It is like this: In this case monks dispute, saying: ‘It is *dhamma*’ ... or ‘It is a bad offence’. If, monks, these monks are able to settle that legal question this, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of. And what here (is needed) for a verdict in the presence of? The presence of an Order, the presence of rule, the presence of discipline, the presence of individuals.

“And what here is the presence of an Order? When as many monks as are competent for (formal) acts have arrived, when the consent of those deserving (to send their) consent has been brought, when being face to face they do not protest. This is here the presence of an Order.

“And what is here the presence of rule, the presence of discipline? If that legal question is settled by whatever is rule,¹ by whatever is discipline, by whatever is the Teacher’s instruction, that is here the presence of rule, the presence of discipline.

“And what is here the presence of individuals? Whoever quarrels and whoever he quarrels with, both, hostile about the matter,² come

¹ *dhammena*. ² Oldenberg’s text reads *attapaccatthikā*. It should probably be *attha*-. Perhaps the reference is to “the two who are litigating about the matter.” The phrase is not usually repeated in the subsequent parallel passages; but see [BD 5.129](#) below.

face to face. This is here the presence of individuals.

“Monks, if a legal question is settled thus, and if one who carries it out opens it up again, in opening up there is an offence of expiation.¹ If one who has given his consent² criticises it, in criticising there is an offence of expiation.³

“If, monk, these monks are not able to settle that legal question in that residence, then, monks, these monks should go to some residence where there are more monks. If, monks, these monks as they are going to that residence are able to settle that legal question on the way, this, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of ... (as in **Kd 14.14.16**) ... in criticising there is an offence of expiation.

“If, monks, these monks as they are going to that residence are not able to settle that legal question on the way, then, monks, these monks, having arrived at that residence, should speak thus to the resident monks: ‘This legal question, your reverences, has arisen thus, has sprung up thus. It were good if the venerable ones could settle this legal question by rule, by discipline, by the Teacher’s instruction, so that this legal question may be properly settled.’ If, monks, the resident monks are the senior and the in-coming monks the more newly ordained, then, monks, the in-coming monks should be spoken to thus by the resident monks: ‘Please do you, venerable ones, remain at a respectful distance for a moment until we have considered.’ But if, monks, the resident monks are the more newly ordained and the in-coming monks are the senior, then, monks, the in-coming monks should be spoken to thus by these resident monks: ‘Well then, do you, venerable ones, remain just here for a moment until we have considered’. If, monks, it occurs to these resident monks while they are thus considering: ‘We are not able to settle this legal question according to rule, according to discipline, according to the Teacher’s instruction,’ that legal question should not be taken up. But if, monks, it occurs to the resident monks while they are thus considering: ‘We

¹ **Bu-Pc 63.** ² *chandadāyaka*, probably meaning has given his consent for the formal act to be carried out without him as, through illness, he cannot be present for it. ³ **Bu-Pc 79.**

are able to settle this legal question according to rule, according to discipline, according to the Teacher's instruction,' monks, the incoming monks should be spoken to thus by these resident monks: 'If you, venerable ones, will tell us how this legal question has arisen, how it has sprung up, then in so far as we settle this legal question according to rule, according to discipline, according to the Teacher's instruction, so will it be settled.¹ In this way we will take up this legal question. But if you, venerable ones, will not tell us how this legal question has arisen, how it has sprung up, then in so far as we settle this legal question according to ... the Teacher's instruction, so will it be settled. But we will not take up this legal question.'" Having thus arranged it properly, monks, that legal question should be taken up by the resident monks. Monks, the resident monks should be spoken to thus by the incoming monks: 'We will tell the venerable ones how this legal question has arisen, how it has sprung up. If the venerable ones are able with or without this much² to settle this legal question according to rule, according to discipline, according to the Teacher's instruction, then will it be properly settled, and we will therefore give this legal question into the charge of the venerable ones. But if the venerable ones are not able with or without this much to settle this legal question according to ... the Teacher's instruction, then will it be not properly settled and we will not give this legal question into the charge of the venerable ones—we ourselves will become the masters³ in regard to this legal question'. Having thus arranged it properly, monks, the incoming monks should give that legal question into the charge of the resident monks. Monks, if these monks are able to settle that legal question, this, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? ... (as in **Kd 14.14.16**) ... in criticising, there is an offence of expiation.

"If, monks, while those monks are investigating that legal question both endless disputations arise,⁴ and of not one speech is the

¹ Meaning that the incoming monks must abide by the decision. ² *ettakena vā antarena*. ³ *sāmīno*, rendered as "we shall retain the custody" at *Vinaya Texts* iii.49.

⁴ *anaggāni c'eva bhassāni*. Vin-a 1197 reads *anantāni* for *amaggāni*, and glosses by *aparimāṇāni*, limitless. See **Vin 2.305**.

meaning clear, I allow you, monks, to settle a legal question like this by means of a referendum.¹ A monk possessed of ten qualities should be agreed upon for the referendum: one who is moral in habit,² who lives restrained by the restraint of the Pātimokkha, who, possessed of good conduct, sees danger in the slightest faults, who takes up and trains himself in the rules of training, who has heard much, an expert in the heard, a storehouse of the heard; those things which, lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle and lovely at the ending, declare with the spirit, with the letter the Brahma-faring utterly fulfilled, wholly purified — things like this are much heard by him, learnt by heart, repeated out loud, pondered upon, considered carefully, well penetrated by vision; both the Pātimokkhas are properly handed down to him in detail, properly sectioned, properly regulated, properly investigated clause by clause as to the linguistic form; he comes to be clever in discipline, imperturbable; he comes to be competent in convincing both of those who are hostile about the matter, in winning them over, in making them consider, in understanding, in reconciling them; he comes to be skilled in settling a legal question that has arisen; he knows what is a legal question; he knows the uprising of a legal question; he knows the stopping of a legal question; he knows the course leading to the stopping of a legal question. I allow, monks, a monk possessed of these ten qualities to be agreed upon for a referendum.

“And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon: First, a monk should be asked; having asked him, the Order should be informed by an experienced competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While we were investigating this legal question both endless disputations arose and of not one speech was the meaning clear. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may agree upon the monk So-and-so and So-and-so to settle this legal question by means of a referendum. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order

¹ *ubbāhikāya*, a committee. See **Kd 22.2.7**. The following passage = **AN v.71**. ² As at **Vin 4.51** to “linguistic form” below; and as at **AN ii.22** to “vision” below. For further references see **BD 2.265–BD.2.266**. See also **Kd 9.5.1**.

listen to me. While we were investigating this legal question ... was the meaning clear. The Order is agreeing upon the monk So-and-so and So-and-so to settle this legal question by means of a referendum. If the agreement upon the monk So-and-so and So-and-so to settle this legal question by means of a referendum is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The monk So-and-so and So-and-so is agreed upon by the Order to settle this legal question by means of a referendum. It is pleasing ... Thus do I understand this.'

"If, monks, these monks are able to settle this legal question by means of a referendum, this, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of. And what is here needed for a verdict in the presence of? The presence of rule, the presence of discipline, the presence of the individuals ... (as in **Kd 14.14.16**) ... If, monks, the legal question is settled thus, and if one who carries it out opens it up again, in opening up there is an offence of expiation.¹

"If, monks, while these monks are investigating that legal question there should be there a monk who is a speaker of *dhamma* but to whom neither the rule² comes to have been handed down nor the analysis of the rule,³ if he, not considering the meaning, holds back the meaning under the shadow of the letter, these monks should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Let the venerable ones listen to me. This monk So-and-so is a speaker of *dhamma*, but he is one to whom neither the rule nor the analysis of the rule has been handed down; not considering the meaning, he holds back the meaning under the shadow of the letter. If it seems right to the venerable ones, let the remainder, having had this monk

¹ **Bu-Pc 63**. ² *sutta*, in the singular. It cannot well mean here the "tradition", *āgama*, or the sayings in which *dhamma* was set forth. For this monk evidently knew *dhamma*, which, above, must be different from *sutta*. There is also a difference between knowing a rule or clause, *sutta* (in the sense in which it is sometimes used in Vinaya) and its analysis, which implies a wider knowledge as of the material surrounding a rule of training. On *sutta*, as used in Vinaya see **BD 1, Introduction, p. x**. Vin-a 1197 says *sutta* is *mātikā*, heading or summary. ³ Suttavibhaṅga; Vin-a 1197 says "not versed in discipline" (*vinaya*).

Kd 14.1

Kd 14.1
BD 5.13

Vin 2.9

removed,¹ settle that legal question'. If, monks, these monks, having had that monk removed, are able to settle that legal question, this, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of. And what is here needed for a verdict in the presence of? The presence of rule, the presence of discipline, the presence of individuals ... (as in **Kd 14.14.16**) ... Monks, if a legal question is settled thus, and if one who carries it out opens it up again, in opening up there is an offence of expiation.

^{14.23} "If, monks, whilst those monks are investigating the legal question there should be there a monk who is a speaker of *dhamma* and one to whom the rule has been handed down but not the analysis of the rule, if he, not considering the meaning, holds back the meaning under the shadow of the letter, these monks should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Let the venerable ones listen to me. This monk So-and-so is a speaker of *dhamma* and he is one to whom the rule has been handed down but not the analysis of the rule; not considering the meaning in opening up there is an offence of expiation.

^{14.24}
^{5.131} "If, monks, these monks are not able to settle that legal question by a referendum, monks, that legal question should be given into the charge of an Order by these monks, saying: 'We, honoured sirs, are not able to settle this legal question by a referendum. Let the Order itself settle this legal question.' I allow you, monks, to settle a legal question like this by the decision of the majority.² A monk possessed of five qualities should be agreed upon as distributor of (voting) tickets ... (as in **Kd 14.9**) ... '... Thus do I understand this.' The monk who is the distributor of (voting) tickets should make the (voting) tickets pass round. According to the way in which the greater number of monks who profess *dhamma* speak, so should this legal question be settled. This, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of and by the decision of the majority. And what is here (needed for) a verdict in the presence of? The presence of an Order, the presence of rule,

¹ *vuṭṭhāpetvā*. ² *yebhuyyasikāya*. See **Vin 5.49**

the presence of discipline, the presence of the individuals. And what is here the presence of an Order? ... (as in **Kd 14.14.16**) ... This is here the presence of the individuals.

“And what is here the decision of the majority? Whatever is the carrying out of, the performance of, the undertaking of, the assenting to, the acceptance of, the non-protesting against a (formal) act (settled) by the decision of the majority, this is here the decision of the majority. If, monks, a legal question is settled thus, and if one who carries it out opens it up again, in opening up there is an offence of expiation; if one who has given his consent criticises it, in criticising there is an offence of expiation.”¹

Now at that time at Sāvaththī a legal question had arisen thus, had sprung up thus. Then these monks were displeased with the settlement of the legal question by the Order at Sāvaththī. They heard it said: “In a certain residence several elders are staying who have heard much, to whom the tradition has been handed down, experts in *dhamma*, experts in discipline, experts in the headings, learned, experienced, clever, conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training; if these elders would settle this legal question according to rule, according to discipline, according to the Teacher’s instruction, thus would this legal question be properly settled.” Then these monks, having gone to that residence, spoke thus to those elders: “This legal question, honoured sirs, arose thus, sprang up thus. It were good, honoured sirs, if the elders were to settle this legal question according to rule, according to discipline, according to the Teacher’s instruction, so that this legal question might be properly settled.” Then these elders thought: “Because this legal question was settled by the Order at Sāvaththī, it was therefore properly settled,’ and they settled that legal question in the same way. Then these monks were displeased with the settlement of the legal question by the Order at Sāvaththī, they were displeased with the settlement of the legal question by the several elders.

¹ As at **Kd 14.14.16**, **Kd 14.14.27**.

They heard it said: “In a certain residence three elders are staying ... two elders are staying ... one elder is staying who has heard much, to whom the tradition has been handed down ... desirous of training; if this elder would settle this legal question according to ... the Teacher’s instruction, thus would this legal question be properly settled.” Then these monks, having gone to that residence, spoke thus to that elder: “This legal question, honoured sir, arose thus, sprang up thus. It were good, honoured sir, if the elder were to settle this legal question according to ... the Teacher’s instruction, so that this legal question might be properly settled.” Then that elder thought: ‘Because this legal question was settled by the Order at Sāvattḥī, because this legal question was settled by several elders, because this legal question was settled by three elders, because this legal question was settled by two elders it was therefore properly settled,’ and he settled that legal question in the same way. Then these monks, displeased with the settlement of the legal question by the Order at Sāvattḥī, displeased with the settlement of the legal question by the several elders ... by the three elders ... by the two elders, displeased with the settlement of the legal question by the one elder, approached the Lord; having approached, they told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, this legal question is done with, it is exhausted,¹ it is settled, it is properly settled.

“I allow, monks, in order to convince these monks, three methods of taking votes:² the secret, the whispering in the ear, the open. And what, monks, is the secret method of taking votes? The monk who is the distributor of voting tickets, having made the tickets different³ (from one another), having approached each monk, should speak to him thus: ‘This ticket is for one of such a view, this ticket is for one of such a view. Take whichever you like.’ When he has taken it, he should be told: ‘And do not show it to anybody’. If he finds that

¹ *santa* is both worn out, exhausted and (more commonly) appeased, tranquillised.

² *salākagāha*, more literally “distributing (or, making pass) the (voting) tickets.”

³ *vaṇṇāvaṇṇa*. Vin-a 1198 says that the tickets for those who profess *dhamma* and for those who profess non-*dhamma* should be marked by different signs, *nimitta* (not different colours, as at *Vinaya Texts* iii.56).

the majority profess what is not-*dhamma* and thinks (the voting is) wrongly taken (the result) should be rejected.¹ If he finds that the majority profess *dhamma* and thinks (the voting is) rightly taken (the result) should be announced. This, monks, is the secret (method of) taking votes.

“And what, monks, is the method of taking votes by whispering in the ear? The monk who is the distributor of voting tickets should speak into the ear of each monk, saying: ‘This ticket is for one of such a view, this ticket is for one of such a view. Take whichever you like.’ When he has taken it, he should be told: ‘And do not tell anyone about it.’ If he finds that the majority profess what is not-*dhamma* and thinks (the voting is) wrongly taken (the result) should be rejected. If he finds that the majority profess *dhamma* and thinks (the voting is) rightly taken (the result) should be announced. This, monks, is the method of taking votes by whispering in the ear.

“And what, monks, is the open method of taking votes? If he finds that those who profess *dhamma* are in the majority, because of his very confidence he should make them take openly. This, monks, is the open method of taking votes. These, monks, are the three methods of taking votes.

“By how many (kinds of) decisions is a legal question arising from censure agreed upon? A legal question arising from censure is agreed upon by four (kinds of) decisions: by a verdict in the presence of, by a verdict of innocence, by a verdict of past insanity, by a decision for specific depravity. If one says: ‘Can it be that, in respect of a legal question arising from censure, without having recourse to two (kinds of) decisions—the verdict of past insanity and the decision for specific depravity—one may agree upon it by two (kinds of) decisions—the verdict in the presence of and the verdict of innocence?’ he should be told: ‘It can be.’ It is like this: This is a case where monks defame a monk with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit. Monks, a verdict of innocence should be given to that monk

¹ *paccukkaḍḍhitabbaṃ*. Vin-a 1198 says (the distributor) “having said the tickets were wrongly taken, having distributed them again, may distribute them up to a third time.”

who has remembered fully.¹ And thus, monks, should it be given: That monk, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to it: ‘Honoured sirs, monks defamed me with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit. But I, honoured sirs, having remembered fully, ask the Order for a verdict of innocence’. And a second time it should be asked for. And a third time it should be asked for. The Order should be informed by an experienced competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. Monks defamed the monk So-and-so with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit; he, having remembered fully, is asking the Order for a verdict of innocence. If it seems right to the Order ... (as in **Kd 14.4.10**) ... Thus do I understand this.’ This, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of and by a verdict of innocence. And what is here needed for a verdict in the presence of? The presence of the Order, the presence of rule, the presence of discipline and the presence of the individuals ... (as at **Kd 14.14.16**) ... And what is here the presence of the individuals? Whoever quarrels and whoever he quarrels with, if both come face to face,² this is here the presence of the individuals.

“And what is here needed for a verdict of innocence? Whatever is the carrying out of, the performance of, the undertaking of, the assenting to, the acceptance of, the non-protesting against a formal act for a verdict of innocence, that is what is needed here for a verdict of innocence. If, monks, a legal question is settled thus, and one who carries it out opens it up again, in opening up there is an offence of expiation. If one who has given his consent criticises it, in criticising there is an offence of expiation.

“If one says: ‘Can it be that, in respect of a legal question arising from censure, without having recourse to two (kinds of) decisions—the verdict of innocence and the decision for specific deprav-

¹ Cf. above, **Kd 14.4.10**. ² As at **Kd 14.14.16**, but omitting “hostile about the matter.”

ity—one may agree upon it by two (kinds of) decisions—the verdict in the presence of and the verdict of past insanity?’ he should be told: ‘It can be.’ It is like this: This is a case where a monk becomes mad, out of his mind,¹ and while he was mad, out of his mind, he perpetrated much and spoke in a way that was not worthy of a recluse. Monks reprove him because of offences done by him while he was mad, out of his mind, saying: ‘Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like this?’ He speaks thus: ‘I, your reverences, was mad, out of my mind; while I was mad, out of my mind, much was perpetrated and spoken by me that was not worthy of a recluse. I do not remember that. That was done by me while I was insane.’ Although being spoken to thus, they still reprove him, saying: ‘Does the venerable one remember having fallen into an offence like that?’ Monks, a verdict of past insanity should be given to that monk who is no longer insane.

“And thus, monks, should it be given: Monks, that monk, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder ... should speak thus to it: ‘I, honoured sirs, was mad ... (as in **Kd 14.5.2**. *Instead of Gagga read the monk So-and-so*) ... Thus do I understand this.’ This, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of and by a verdict of past insanity. And what here (is needed) for a verdict in the presence of? The presence of the Order ... (as in **Kd 14.14.16**) ... And what is here (needed for) a verdict of past insanity? Whatever is the carrying out of, the performance of ... the non-protesting against a verdict of past insanity, that here is what (is needed for) a verdict of past insanity. If, monks, a legal question is settled thus and one who carries it out opens it up again, in opening up there is an offence of expiation. If one who has given his consent criticises it, in criticising there is an offence of expiation.

“If one says: ‘Can it be that, in respect of a legal question arising from censure, without having recourse to two (kinds of) decisions—the verdict of innocence and the verdict of past insanity—one

¹ As at **Kd 14.5.1–Kd 14.5.2**, for the monk Gagga.

may agree upon it by two (kinds of) decisions—the verdict in the presence of and the decision for specific depravity?’ he should be told: ‘It can be.’ It is like this: This is a case where a monk reproves a monk in the midst of the Order for a serious offence, saying: ‘Does the venerable one remember having fallen into a serious offence like this—one involving defeat or bordering on one involving defeat?’ He speaks thus: ‘I do not remember, your reverence, having fallen into a serious offence like this—one involving defeat or bordering on one involving defeat.’ Although denying this, he presses him, saying: ‘Please, venerable one, find out properly whether you remember having fallen into a serious offence like this—one involving defeat or bordering on one involving defeat.’ He speaks thus: ‘I, your reverence, do not remember having fallen into a serious offence like this—one involving defeat or bordering on one involving defeat. But I, your reverence, remember having fallen into a trifling offence like this.’ Although denying this, he presses him, saying: ‘Please, venerable one, find out properly whether you remember ... bordering on one involving defeat’. He speaks thus: ‘Your reverence, unasked I acknowledge having fallen into a trifling offence like this; how could I, when asked, not acknowledge having fallen into a serious offence like this—one involving defeat or bordering on one involving defeat?’ He speaks thus: ‘But, your reverence, unasked you did not acknowledge having fallen into a trifling offence, so how will you, unasked, acknowledge having fallen into a serious offence like this—one involving defeat or bordering on one involving defeat? Please, venerable one, find out properly whether you remember having fallen into a serious offence like this—one involving defeat or bordering on one involving defeat.’ He speaks thus: ‘Your reverence, I do remember having fallen into a serious offence like this—one involving defeat or bordering on one involving defeat. When I said: I do not remember having fallen into a serious offence like this—one involving defeat or bordering on one involving defeat—this was said by me in jest,¹ this was said by me in haste.’²

¹ Cf. Vin 4.4 for *davā, ravā*. ² Cf. Vin 4.4 for *davā, ravā*.

“Monks, a (formal) act for the decision of specific depravity should be carried out against this monk. And thus, monks, should it be carried out. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying ... (as in **Kd 14.11.2**. *Instead of the monk Uvāḷa read the monk So-and-so; instead of offences read serious offences*) ... Thus do I understand this.’ This, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of and by a decision for specific gravity. And what is here (needed for) a verdict in the presence of? The presence of the Order ... (as in **Kd 14.14.16**) ... And what here is (needed for) a decision for specific depravity? Whatever is the carrying out of, the performance of, the undertaking of, the assenting to, the acceptance of, the non-protesting against a decision for specific depravity, that is here what is needed for a decision for specific depravity. If, monks, a legal question is settled thus and one who carries it out opens it up again, in opening up there is an offence of expiation. If one who has given his consent criticises it, in criticising there is an offence of expiation.

“By how many (kinds of) decisions is a legal question arising from offences agreed upon? A legal question arising from offences is agreed upon by three (kinds of) decisions: by a verdict in the presence of and by the carrying out of it on his acknowledgement¹ and by the covering up (as) with grass.² If one says: ‘Can it be that, in respect of a legal question arising from offences, without having recourse to one (kind of) decision—the covering up (as) with grass—one may agree upon it by two (kinds of) decisions—the verdict in the presence of and the carrying out of it on his acknowledgement?’ he should be told: ‘It can be.’ It is like this: This is a case where a monk comes to have fallen into a slight offence. Monks, that monk, having approached one monk, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on his haunches, having stretched forth his joined palms, should speak thus to him: ‘I, your reverence, fallen into such and such an offence, confess it.’ It should be said by him: ‘Do you see it?’ ‘Yes, I see it.’ ‘You should be restrained in the future.’

¹ Cf. **Vin 4.4** for *davā, ravā*. ² See **BD 3.153, BD 3.154**.

This, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of and by the carrying out of it of his acknowledgement. And what here is (needed for) a verdict in the presence of? The presence of rule¹ and the presence of discipline and the presence of individuals. And what here is the presence of individuals? If both whoever confesses and he to whom he confesses are face to face, this here is the presence of individuals. And what here is (needed for) the carrying out on his acknowledgement? Whatever is the carrying out ... the non-protesting against his making an acknowledgement, that is here what is needed for his making an acknowledgement. If, monks, a legal question is settled thus, and the one who accepts (the confession) opens it up again, in opening up there is an offence of expiation.

“If he manages this thus, it is good. But if he does not manage it, monks, that monk, having approached several monks, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having stretched forth his joined palms, should speak thus to them: ‘I, honoured sirs, fallen into such and such an offence, confess it.’ These monks should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Let the venerable ones listen to me. This monk So-and-so remembers an offence, he discloses it, he declares it, he confesses it. If it seems right to the venerable ones, I will accept (the confession) of the monk So-and-so’s offence.’ He should say: ‘Do you see it?’ ‘Yes, I see it.’ ‘You should be restrained in the future.’ This, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of ... (as in [Kd 14.14.31](#)) ... in opening up there is an offence of expiation.

“If he manages this thus, it is good. But if he does not manage it, monks, that monk, having approached an Order ... should speak thus to it: ‘I, honoured sirs, fallen into such and such an offence, confess it.’ The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk

¹ Presence of the Order not required here, as the monk has confessed to one monk only.

So-and-so remembers an offence, he discloses it, he declares it, he confesses it. If it seems right to the Order I could accept (the confession) of the monk So-and-so's offence.' He should say: 'Do you see it?' 'Yes, I see it.' 'You should be restrained in the future.' This, monks, is called a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of and by the carrying out on his acknowledgement. And what here is (needed for) a verdict in the presence of? The presence of the Order, the presence of rule, the presence of discipline and the presence of the individuals ... **If, monks, a legal question is settled thus, and the one who accepts (the confession) opens it up again, in opening up there is an offence of expiation. If one who has given his consent criticises it, in criticising there is an offence of expiation.**

"If one says: 'Can it be that, in respect of a legal question arising from offences, without having recourse to one decision—the carrying out on his acknowledgement—one may agree upon it by two (kinds of) decisions—the verdict in the presence of and the covering up (as) with grass?' he should be told, 'It can be.' It is like this: 'This is a case, monks, where while monks were striving ... (as in **Kd 14.13.1-Kd 14.13.3**) ... Thus do I understand this.' This is called, monks, a legal question that is settled. By what is it settled? By a verdict in the presence of and by a covering up (as) with grass. And what here is (needed for) a verdict in the presence of? The presence of the Order, the presence of rule, the presence of discipline, the presence of the individuals. And what here is the presence of the Order? When as many monks as are competent for (formal) acts have arrived, when the consent of those deserving (to send their) consent has been brought, when being face to face they do not protest. This is here the presence of the Order.

"And what is here the presence of rule, the presence of discipline? If that legal question is settled by whatever is rule, by whatever is discipline, by whatever is the Teacher's instruction, that is here the presence of rule, the presence of discipline.

"And what is here the presence of individuals? If both whoever

Kd 14.1

BD 5.1a

Vin 2.1a

confesses and he to whom he confesses are face to face, this is here the presence of the individuals.

“And what here is (needed for) the covering up (as) with grass? Whatever is the carrying out of, the performance of, the undertaking of, the assenting to, the acceptance of, the non-protesting against the covering up (as) with grass, that is here what is (needed for) the covering up (as) with grass. **If, monks, a legal question is settled thus, and if the one who accepts (the confession) opens it up, in opening up there is an offence of expiation. If one who has given his consent criticises it, in criticising there is an offence of expiation.**

“By how many (kinds of) decisions is a legal question arising from obligations agreed upon? A legal question arising from obligations is agreed upon by one (kind of) decision: the verdict in the presence of.”

*Told is the Fourth Section: that on Settlements.*¹

¹ There is no *uddāna*, summary or key to this Section.

15. MINOR MATTERS (*KHUDDAKA*)

At one time the Awakened One, the Lord was staying at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. Now at that time the group of six monks, while they were bathing, rubbed their bodies against a tree and their thighs and their arms and their chests and their backs. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, while they are bathing, rub their bodies against a tree ... and their backs, like boxers and wrestlers and young villagers?"¹ Monks heard these people who were ... spreading it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying: "Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks ... and their backs?"

"It is true, Lord." The Awakened One, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

"Monks, it is not suitable in these foolish men, it is not becoming, it is not fitting, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How, monks, can these foolish men, while they are bathing, rub their bodies against a tree ... and their backs? It is not,

¹ *gāmapoddavā*. Word very uncertain, and seems to show confusion between *gāma* and *kāma*, variant reading being *kāmapudavā*. According to Vin 2.315, Buddhaghosa explains: *kāmapudavā ti chavirāgamaṇḍanānuyuttā nāgarikamanussā; gāmaṇḍapodavā ti pi pādho es'ev'attho*; the meaning of *kāmapudarā* is urban people addicted to ornamenting and dyeing the skin: *gāmaṇ* (village) -*podavā* is also a reading. TAKAKUSU and NAGAI's edition, Vin-a vi.1199, reads: *gāmapūṭavā* (variant reading *gāmamudavā*) *ti chavirāgamaṇḍanānuyuttā nāgarikamanussā, gāmapotakā* (young village men) *ti pi pādho*.

monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” and having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, while a monk is bathing he should not rub his body against a tree. Whoever should (so) rub it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”¹

15.1.2

15.1.2

Now at that time the group of six monks, while they were bathing, rubbed their bodies against a post ... (as in **Kd 15.1.1**. For tree read post) ... **“... offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time the group of six monks, while they were bathing, rubbed their bodies against a wall² ... **“... offence of wrong-doing.”**

15.1.3

2.106

Now at that time the group of six monks used to bathe on a rubbing-board.³ People spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about ... Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying: **“Monks, you should not bathe on a rubbing-board. Whoever should (so) bathe, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time the group of six monks used to bathe using a *gandhabba*-hand (device)⁴ ... **“... Monks, you should not bathe using a *gandhabba*-hand (device). Whoever should (so) bathe, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

¹ Note that it is not actually made an offence to rub the other parts of the person mentioned; but doubtless these are meant to be included. ² Three kinds of walls are mentioned at **Vin 4.266**. Vin-a 1199 says that it is one of these. ³ *aṭṭāna*. Vin-a 1199 reads *aṭṭhāna*, and explains this as a tree made like a plank of wood, cut into rows of squares and sunk into the ground at a bathing ford. People rub their bodies there, having sprinkled on chunam. ⁴ *gandhabbahatthaka*. Vin-a 1199 says “by means of a wooden hand set up at a bathing ford; having taken chunam with them, people rub their bodies.”

Now at that time the group of six monks used to bathe using a string of vermilion covered beads.¹ ... “... **Monks, you should not bathe using a string of vermilion covered beads. Whoever should (so) bathe, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time the group of six monks, having plunged into² (water), causing a rubbing to be made.³ ... “**Monks, you should not, having plunged into (water), cause a rubbing to be made. Whoever should (so) cause it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time the group of six monks used to bathe using a scrubber.⁴ ... “**Monks, you should not bathe using a scrubber. Whoever should (so) bathe, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time a certain monk came to be afflicted by a scab disease, and there came to be no comfort for him without a scrubber. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, one who is ill (to use) an unshaped scrubber.”⁵

Now at that time a certain monk, weak through age, was not able

¹ *kuruvindakasutta*. Quoted at MN-a iii.280. Vin-a 1200 says, “it is called a string of beads made by grinding vermilion chunams and stones with lac dyes. Holding this at both ends, they rub the body.” Cf. *kuruvindakacuppa* at Ja iii.282 (vermilion coloured chunam). ² *vigayha*. Pali-English Dictionary under *vigāhati* says, “At Vin 2.106 we should prefer to react *viggayha* for *vigayha*.” Vin-a 1200 has the reading *viggayha*. One of meanings of *vigrah* in the Sanskrit Dictionaries is “to lay hold of.” ³ *bhikkhū vigayha parikammaṃ kārāpentī*, explained by Vin-a 1200 as “each one rubbed up his body against the bodies of the others”—no doubt some kind of enjoyable massage or friction. ⁴ *mallaka*. Vin-a 1200 says “having cut swordfish teeth, it is called a shaped scrubber, *katamallaka*, owing to its *mallaka* form (or configuration, *mallakamūla*)”. ⁵ *akatamallaka*. See previous note; and Vin-a 1200 which says “it is made not having cut the teeth. It must be a broken piece of wood or of tortoiseshell.”

while bathing to rub his own body. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a strip of cloth.”¹

Now at that time the monks were doubtful how to give a rubbing to their backs.² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, the ordinary mode with the hand.”³

15:2.1
5:14.4
Now at that time the group of six monks wore ear ornaments, they wore chains,⁴ they wore ornamental strings of beads for the throat,⁵ they wore ornaments at the waist,⁶ they wore bangles,⁷ they wore armlets,⁸ they wore bracelets,⁹ they wore finger rings. People ... spread it about, saying ... he addressed the monks, saying: “**Monks, ear ornaments should not be worn, chains ... ornamental strings of beads for the throat ... ornaments at the waist ... bangles ... armlets ... bracelets ... finger rings should not be worn. Whoever should wear (any of these things), there is an offence of wrongdoing.**”

15:2.2
2:10.7
Now at that time the group of six monks wore their hair long. People ... spread it about ... he addressed the monks, saying: “**Monks, long hair should not be worn. Whoever should so wear it, there is**

¹ *ukkāsikā*, explained at Vin-a 1200 as *vatthavaṭṭi*. *Vattha* is cloth, clothing; *vaṭṭi*, a strip, ball, pad. Oldenberg’s version of the Commentary reads *vaṭṭa* (for *vattha*) which rendered the word “unintelligible” (see *Vinaya Texts* iii.68, n. 3) and he seems not to have had access to the full exegesis: *tasmā nahāyantassa yassa kassaci nahānasātakavaṭṭiyā piṭṭhiṃ ghaṃsiturū vaṭṭati*: therefore when anyone is bathing he may rub his back with a strip (or pad) of a cloth for bathing. ² *piṭṭhiparikamma*, as at SN-a i.296. ³ *puthupāṇiya*, explained at Vin-a 1200 by *hatthaparikamma*, hand treatment. ⁴ *pāmaṅga*. See BD 1.77, n. 9. Vin-a 1200 on word in above passage says whatever is a *pāmaṅgasutta*. ⁵ *kaṅṭhasuttaka*. As at BD 1.78. ⁶ *kaṭṭisuttaka*. See BD 1.78, n. 2. ⁷ *ovaṭṭika*, perhaps round the ankles. *Ovaṭṭika* has a different sense at Kd 7.1.5. ⁸ *kāyūra*, or bracelets for above the elbow. Cf. *keyūra* at Dh-a ii.220. But as noted at *Vinaya Texts* iii.69, n. 5. The *Jātaka Commentary* says that *kāyūra* is an ornamental decoration for the throat. ⁹ No doubt round the wrist since they are called *hatthābharāṇa*.

an offence of wrong-doing. I allow it to be of a two months' growth or two finger-breadths (in length)."

Now at that time the group of six monks smoothed their hair with a comb, they smoothed their hair with an instrument shaped like a snake's hood,¹ they smoothed their hair with their hands used as an instrument shaped like a snake's hood,² they smoothed their hair with oil of beeswax,³ they smoothed their hair with oily water. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses." They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, the hair should not be smoothed with a comb ... the hair should not be smoothed with oily water. Whoever should smooth it (in any of these ways), there is an offence of wrong-doing.**"

Now at that time the group of six monks examined a mark on the face in a mirror and in a water-bowl.⁴ People spread it about, saying: "Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses." They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, a mark on the face should not be examined in a mirror or in a water-bowl. Whoever should (so) examine it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**" Now at that time a certain monk had a sore on his face. He asked monks, saying: "What kind of sore have I, your reverences?" The monks spoke thus: "The sore is of such and such a kind, your reverence." He did not believe them. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, on account of a disease, to examine a mark on the face in a mirror or in a water-bowl."

Now at that time the group of six monks anointed their faces,⁵

¹ *phaṇaka*. Vin-a 1200 only says something made of ivory and so on. *Vinaya Texts* iii.70, n. 2 says "it was a kind of very primitive brush, but without bristles."

² *hatthaphaṇaka*. The hands would be held as a snake's hood with the fingers curving forwards and the hair would be smoothed with the fingers. Cf. *phaṇahatthaka* at Vin 1.91, and see BD 4.116, n. 2. ³ Allowed at Vin 2.152 for use in a *vihāra*. ⁴ Cf. DN i.80, SN iii.105. ⁵ Cf. Vin 2.266, Vin 4.342.

they rubbed (paste) into their faces, they powdered their faces with chunam, they smeared their faces with red arsenic, they painted their limbs, they painted their faces, they painted their limbs and faces. People spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, the face should not be anointed, the face should not be rubbed (with paste), the face should not be powdered with chunam, the face should not be smeared with red arsenic, the limbs should not be painted, the face should not be painted, limbs and faces should not be painted. Whoever should do (any of these things), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time a certain monk was afflicted by a disease of the eyes. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, on account of disease, to anoint the face.”

15.2.6
2.108
Now at that time there was a festival on a mountain-top in Rājagaha.¹ The group of six monks went to see the festival on the mountain-top. People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans come to see dancing and singing and music like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, you should not go to see dancing² or singing or music. Whoever should go, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

15.3.1
5.146
Now at that time the group of six monks sang *dhamma* with a long-drawn plain-song sound.³ People ... spread it about, saying: “Even as we sing, so do these recluses, sons of the Sakyans sing *dhamma* with a long-drawn plain-song sound.” Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks sing *dhamma* with a long-drawn plain-song

¹ Cf. Vin 4.85 (BD 2.335, and n.) and Vin 4.267 (where the group of six nuns also go to the festival, made into an offence of expiation for them). ² Even to see a peacock dancing is an offence, Vin-a 1201. ³ Cf. AN iii.251.

sound?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said ...?”

“It is true, Lord.” ... Having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying: “Monks, there are these five disadvantages to one singing *dhamma* with a long-drawn plain-song sound: he is pleased with himself in regard to that sound, and others are pleased in regard to that sound, and housepeople look down upon, and while he is himself striving after accuracy in the sound¹ there is an interruption in his concentration, and people coming after fall into the way of (wrong) views.² These, monks, are the five disadvantages to one singing *dhamma* with a long-drawn plain-song sound. **Monks, *dhamma* should not be sung with a long-drawn plain-song sound. Whoever should (so) sing it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time monks were doubtful about intoning.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, I allow intoning.”

Now at that time the group of six monks wore woollen clothes with the fleece outside. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasure of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, woollen clothes with the fleece outside should not be worn. Whoever should wear them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”⁴

Now at that time the mango trees in the park of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha were bearing fruit and it was made known by King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: “Let the masters make as much use of the mangoes as they please.” The group of six monks, having

¹ *sarakutti*. ² Vin-a 1202 says the people who come after will say “our teachers and preceptors sang it thus,” and they will sing it in the same way. Cf. AN iii.108, AN iii.256, SN ii.203. ³ *sarabhañña*. Cf. Vin 1.196, Ja ii.109, Dh-p-a i.154. Explained by Buddhaghosa as *sarena bhaṇanam*, speaking (or repeating) by means of intonation.

⁴ Vin-a 1202 here refers to the Commentary on the *bhūtagāmasikkhāpada*. This is Bu-Pc 11. (Vin 4.34; see BD 2.227, n. 1.) and the Commentary is at Vin-a 759ff.

made even young mangoes fall, made use of them. And King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha wanted a mango. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha enjoined people, saying: “Go, good sirs, having gone to the park, bring back a mango.”

“Very well, your majesty,” and these people having answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha in assent, having gone to the park, spoke thus to the park keeper: “Good sir, his majesty wants a mango, give (us) a mango.”

“There is not a mango, masters; the monks having made even young mangoes fall, have made use of them.” Then these people told this matter to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha. He said: “Good sirs, mangoes are much enjoyed by the masters, yet it is moderation that the Lord extols.” People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation, make use of the king’s mangoes?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, mangoes should not be made use of. Whoever should make use of them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”¹

Now at that time a certain guild came to have food for an Order.² Mango peels were put into the curry. Monks, being scrupulous, did not accept. (The Lord said:) “Accept it, monks, make use of it. I allow you, monks, mango peels.” Now at that time a Certain guild came to have food for an Order. They did not know how to prepare the peels; they walked into the refectory with the mangoes whole. Monks, being scrupulous, did not accept. (The Lord said:) “Accept them, monks, make use of them. I allow you, monks, to make use of fruit that in five ways is allowable for recluses:³ if it is damaged⁴ by fire, damaged by a knife, damaged by (one’s) nail, if it is seedless, and the fifth is if the seeds are discharged.⁵ I allow you, monks, to make use of fruit that in these five ways is allowable to recluses.”

¹ Cf. [BD 1.101f.](#), [BD 1.108.](#) ² As at [Kd 18.4.1.](#) ³ Quoted [Vin-a 767.](#) ⁴ These five clauses are explained in detail at [Vin-a 767](#), which rightly reads *parijita* (damaged) instead of the above *paricita*. ⁵ Cf. [Kd 6.21.1](#) for the last two items.

Now at that time a certain monk, bitten by a snake, passed away.¹ They told this matter to the lord. He said: “Monks, this monk certainly did not suffuse with loving-kindness of mind the four royal snake families. For if, monks, this monk had suffused with loving-kindness of mind the four royal snake families, then this monk, although bitten by a snake, would not have passed away. What are the four royal snake families? The royal snake family of Virūpakkha,² the royal snake family of Erāpatha, the royal snake family of Chabyāputta, the royal snake family of Kaṇhāgotamaka. Monks, this monk certainly did not suffuse with loving-kindness of mind these four royal snake families. For if, monks, this monk had suffused with loving-kindness of mind these four royal snake families, then this monk, although bitten by a snake, would not have passed away. Monks, I allow you to suffuse with loving-kindness of mind these four royal snake families, (and) to make a charm³ for the self for self-protection, for self-guarding. And thus, monks, should it be made:

“Love from me for the Virūpakkhas,⁴
Love from me for the Erāpathas,
Love from me for the Chabyāputtas,
Love from me for the Kaṇhāgotamakas.

“Love from me for the footless,
Love for the two-footed from me,
Love from me for the four-footed,
Love for the many-footed from me.

“Do not let the footless harm me,

¹ Cf. AN ii.72 (which lays the scene in Sāvattthī) and Ja ii.144–Ja ii.147. ² Cf. GS ii.82, n. 1. Virūpakkha is also the name of one of the Four Great Kings, the regent of the western quarter and lord of the Nāgas. ³ On *pariṭṭa*, charm, spell, rune, and *mettā-bhāvanā*, cf. MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Dialogues of the Buddha* iii.185f., *Sakya*, 221ff. Above reading is *attaparittam katum*; at AN ii.72 it is *attaparittāya*, “for self-warding.” ⁴ Loving-kindness or love, *mettā*, and the three other modes of the *brahmavihāras* are transferred from the mind of the suffuser to that of the being who is suffused or infused.

Do not let the two-footed harm me,
Do not let the four-footed harm me,
Do not let the many-footed harm me.

5:149

“May all beings, all breathers, all creatures every one,
See all lucky things;¹ may no evil whatever come.

“Immeasurable is the Awakened One,
immeasurable *dhamma*,
immeasurable the Order.
Limited are creeping things: snakes, scorpions,
centipedes, spinning spiders, lizards, mice.

“A protection has been made by me, a charm made by me;
Let the creatures withdraw.
I, even I, honour the Lord,
I honour the seven fully self-awakened Ones.”

“I allow you, monks, to let blood.”²

15:7.1

Now at that time a certain monk, tormented by dissatisfaction, cut off his own male organ. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “This foolish man, monks, cut off one thing when another should have been cut off. **Monks, one should not cut off one’s own male organ. Whoever should cut it off, there is a grave offence.**”

15:8.1

Now at that time a block of sandal-wood of costly choice sandal-wood had accrued to a (great) merchant of Rājagaha.³ Then it occurred to this (great) merchant of Rājagaha: “Suppose that I were to have a bowl carved out of this block of sandal-wood? The chips will be for my enjoyment, and I can also give away the bowl as a gift.” Then that (great) merchant of Rājagaha, having had a bowl carved out of that block of sandal-wood, having put a string round it,⁴ having

¹ *sabbe bhadrāni passantu. Cf. DN ii.89, sadā bhadrāni passati.* ² Allowed also at **Vin 1.205.** ³ This story is referred to at DN-a ii.388 as the *Rājagaha-seṭṭhi-vatthu.*

⁴ At **Kd 15.24.1** somewhat similar actions are ascribed to a monk.

hung it up on the top of a bamboo (-pole), having tied it to a series of bamboo (-poles); spoke thus: “Let whatever recluse or brahmin who is a perfected one as well as of psychic power get down this bowl and (to him) it is given.”¹ Then Pūraṇa Kassapa² approached the (great) merchant of Rājagaha; having approached, he spoke thus to the (great) merchant of Rājagaha:

“Now I, householder, am a perfected one as well as of psychic power; give me the bowl.”

“If, revered sir, the venerable one is a perfected one as well as of psychic power, let him fetch down the bowl and it is given (to him.)”

Then Makkhali Gosāla, Ajita Kesakambalin, Pakudha Kaccāyana, Sañjaya Belaṭṭhiputta, Nātaputta the Jain approached the (great) merchant of Rājagaha; having approached ... “... it is given (to him).”

Now at that time the venerable Moggallāna the Great and the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja,³ having dressed in the morning, taking (each) his bowl and robe, entered Rājagaha for almsfood. Then the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja spoke thus to the venerable Moggallāna the Great:

“The venerable Moggallāna the Great is a perfected one as well as of psychic power. Go along, reverend Moggallāna, fetch down this bowl; this bowl is for you.”

“The venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja a perfected one as well as of psychic power. Go along, reverend Bhāradvāja, fetch down this bowl; this bowl is for you.”

Then the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja, having risen above the ground,⁴ having taken hold of that bowl, circled three times

¹ Cf. the words of the robber chief at [Vin 3.208](#). ² He and the five others were the six great “heretical” teachers in Gotama’s times. Their views are given at [DN i.52ff](#).

³ Verses at [Thag 123](#), [Thag 124](#). At [AN i.23](#) he is called chief of the disciples who are lion-roarers. [AN-a i.196](#), which gives his story including the above episode, holds that he was called Scrap-hunter, Piṇḍola, from his greed in searching for coney and rice. Other Commentaries ([SN-a ii.393](#), [Ud-a 252](#)) ascribe his name to the large size of his bowl. For notes on the name Piṇḍola see [Psalms of the Bretheren](#), p.110, n. 4, and [Psalms of the Bretheren](#), p.415; [KS iv.68](#), n. 1. ⁴ *vehāsa*. See [BD 1.79](#), n. 6.

round Rājagaha. Now at that time, the (great) merchant of Rājagaha was standing with his wife and children in his own dwelling holding up his joined palms in salutation, paying homage, and saying: “Honoured sir, let master Bhāradvāja come to rest just here at our dwelling.” Then the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja came to rest at the dwelling of the (great) merchant of Rājagaha. Then the (great) merchant of Rājagaha, having taken the bowl from the hand of the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja, having filled it with costly solid foods, bestowed it on the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja. Then the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja, having taken hold of that bowl, went off to the monastery.

People heard: “It is said that the bowl of the (great) merchant of Rājagaha was fetched down by master Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja,” and these people (making) a loud noise, a great noise, followed close after the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja. Then the Lord heard the loud noise, the great noise, and having heard it, he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying: “What on earth, Ānanda, is this loud noise, this great noise?”

“Lord, the bowl of the (great) merchant of Rājagaha has been fetched down by the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja. Lord, people heard: ‘It is said that the bowl of the (great) merchant of Rājagaha was fetched down by the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja, and, Lord, these people (making) a loud noise, a great noise, have followed close after the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja’; this, Lord, is the loud noise, the great noise which the Lord (hears).”

Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, Bhāradvāja, that the bowl of the (great) merchant of Rājagaha was fetched down by you?”

“It is true, Lord.” The Awakened one, the Lord rebuked him, saying:

“It is not suiting, Bhāradvāja, it is not becoming, it is not fitting, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done.

How can you, Bhāradvāja, on account of a wretched wooden bowl exhibit a condition of further-men,¹ a wonder of psychic power to householders? As, Bhāradvāja, a woman exhibits her loin-cloth on account of a wretched stamped *māsaka*,² even so by you, Bhāradvāja, was a condition of further-men, a wonder of psychic power exhibited to householders on account of a wretched wooden bowl. It is not, Bhāradvāja, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a condition of further-men, a wonder of psychic power is not to be exhibited to householders.³ Whoever should exhibit them, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Break, monks, this wooden bowl; having reduced it to fragments, give them to monks as perfume to mix with ointment.⁴ **And, monks, a wooden bowl should not be used.⁵ Whoever should use one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time the group of six monks used various kinds of bowls, made of gold, made of silver. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, a bowl made of gold should not be used,⁶ a bowl made of silver should not be used, a bowl made of pearls ... made of beryl ... made of crystal ... made of bronze ... made of glass ... made of tin ... made of lead ... a bowl made of copper should not be used. Whoever should use (any of these), there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, two (kinds of) bowls: an iron bowl, a clay bowl.”⁷

¹ *uttarimanussadhamma*. See Bu-Pj 4, Bu-Pc 8, and BD 1, Introduction, p.xxiv.

² *māsakarūpa*. See BD 1.72, n. 1, and BD 1.71, n. 2. The word also occurs at Vin 2.294.

³ Vin-a 1203 says a miracle is objected to, not psychic power that is volitional in nature. ⁴ Cf. Vin 1.203, where sandal-wood was allowed among five perfumes (*añjanupapīṣana*). ⁵ Cf. BD 2.115, BD 2.415 (and n. 1), and Kd 15.37. ⁶ Cf. Kd 5.8.3.

⁷ As at Vin 3.243, Vin 4.123, Vin 4.243.

Now at that time the bases of the bowls were rubbed. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, a circular bowl-rest."

Now at that time the group of six monks used various kinds of circular bowl-rests, made of gold, made of silver. People ... spread it about, saying: "Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses." They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Monks, various kinds of circular bowl-rests should not be used. Whoever should use one, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, two (kinds of) circular bowl-rests; made of tin, made of lead." The thick circular rests could not be inserted.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to plane them." There were jags (on them).² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to cut swordfish teeth."³

Now at that time the group of six monks used carved⁴ circular bowl-rests, loaded with little figures, made with ornamentations, and they toured about showing these on carriage-roads. People ... spread it about, saying: "Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses." They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **"Monks, carved circular bowl-rests should not be used. Whoever should use one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, ordinary circular rests."⁵

¹ *acchupīyanti*. Cf. **Kd 8.14.1**, where the word is used of "inserting a batch into a robe." The meaning above may be "the circular rests were thick and they (i.e. the bowls) could not be inserted." ² *valiṃ honti*. *Pali-English Dictionary* suggests reading *valiyo*. Perhaps *vali* is here jag or scratch, the planing or adzing not having been well done. The jags could then be made the best of by converting them into crocodile teeth to hold the bowls. But this rendering is as conjectural as that given at *Vinaya Texts* iii.83. ³ See also **Kd 15.11.6**. ⁴ *Citra*, variegated or painted, but not always, and above it appears to be more likely "carved". ⁵ Buddhaghosa says "just (or, only, *eva*) the circular rests cut with swordfish teeth."

Now at that time monks (each) put away his bowl with water in it and a bowl was spoiled. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a bowl should not be put away with water in it. Whoever should (so) put it away, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to put away a bowl having dried it in the sun.”¹

Now at that time monks (each) dried his bowl in the sun with water in it and a bowl came to smell nasty. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a bowl with water in it should not be dried in the sun. Whoever should (so) dry it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to put away a bowl having emptied it of water,² having dried it in the sun.”

Now at that time monks (each) laid aside his bowl in the heat and the colour of a bowl was spoiled. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a bowl should not be laid aside in the heat. Whoever should (so) lay it aside, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to put away a bowl, having dried it for a short time in the sun’s heat.”³

Now at that time many bowls came to be laid aside in the open air without a prop. Having been blown against one another by gusts of wind, the bowls were broken. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a little prop for bowls.”

Now at that time monks (each) laid aside his bowl at the edge of a solid bench.⁴ Having fallen down, a bowl was broken. They told

¹ Cf. Vin 1.46. ² Cf. Vin 1.46. ³ Cf. Vin 1.46. ⁴ *miḍhante*. At Vin 2.143 *miḍḍhi*. Vinaya Texts iii.163 say that it is built against the wall of a room or on the veranda against the outer wall of a house or hut. Often made of hardened mud with two wooden legs in front, it is a bench used to sit or sleep on. Vin-a 1203 says *ālindaka*-(veranda) *miḍhakāḍinam ante*, and implies that some *miḍhis* are narrow. Allowed at Vin 2.149 when grass mats had been eaten by rats and so on, and where *miḍhi* appears as something hard and also as something to sleep on. The meaning is not certain.

this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, a bowl should not be laid aside at the edge of a solid bench. Whoever should (so) lay it aside, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time monks (each) laid aside his bowl at the edge of a plaster flooring.¹ Having fallen down, a bowl was broken. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, a bowl should not be laid aside at the edge of a plaster flooring. Whoever should (so) lay it aside, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time monks (each) turned his bowl upside down² on the ground. A rim was rubbed. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a grass mat.”³ The grass mat was eaten by white ants. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a piece of cloth.” The piece of cloth was eaten by white ants. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a bowl-stand.”⁴ Having fallen down from a bowl-stand, a bowl was broken. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a wicker stand for bowls.”⁵ A bowl was rubbed on the wicker stand for the bowls. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a bag for bowls.” There was no strap at the edge. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a strap at the edge, a thread for tying.”⁶

Now at that time monks (each) hung his bowl on a peg in the

¹ *paribhaṇḍa*. Meaning uncertain. Vin-a 1203-Vin-a 1204 says “on the outer side, on the edge of a treated (or, made, erected, kata) narrow *miḍhi*.” On the word at Vin 2.172 the Commentary says it is made of cow dung and of paste, *kāsava*, for colouring floors, walls, etc.; and on the word at Vin 2.220 it says *bahi jagḡati*, he lies awake (or, watches) outside. In explaining “piece of cloth,” *coḷaka*, below, Vin-a 1204 speaks of *mattika-paribhaṇḍakatā bhūmi*, which seems to mean “earth treated with clay and plaster.” ² See Kd 15.20.3. ³ Allowed at Kd 15.11.3 below; also at Vin 2.148, to save limbs and robes from being covered with dust. ⁴ *pattamāḷaka*. Vin-a 1204 says “made of brick or made of wood”. ⁵ *pattakaṇḍolika*. ⁶ Cf. Kd 6.12.4, Kd 15.11.5. See BD 4.276, n. 8.

wall¹ and on an “elephant-tusk” (peg).² Having fallen down, a bowl was broken. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a bowl should not be hung up. Whoever should hang one up, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks (each) laid aside his bowl on a couch. Sitting down heedlessly, they broke a bowl having sat down (hard) on it.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a bowl should not be laid aside on a couch. Whoever should (so) lay it aside, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”** ... (*The same repeated for laying aside a bowl on a chair*) ...

Now at that time monks (each) laid aside his bowl on his lap. They got up heedlessly and a bowl, having fallen down, was broken. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a bowl should not be laid aside on a lap. Whoever should (so) lay it aside, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks (each) laid aside his bowl in a sunshade.⁴ A sunshade was lifted up by gusts of wind⁵ and having fallen down a bowl was broken. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a bowl should not be laid aside in a sunshade. Whoever should (so) lay it aside, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks (each) opened a door⁶ when he had a bowl in his hand. As a door was blowing to and fro, a bowl was broken. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a door should not be opened when one has a bowl in one’s hand. Whoever should (so) open it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

¹ As at Vin 3.48. Allowed at Vin 2.152. ² As at Vin 3.48. Allowed at Vin 2.152. ³ Cf. Vin 3.79 (BD 1.137 and n. 4). ⁴ *chatta*. N.B. at Vin 1.152 this word appears to mean a large vessel or receptacle. ⁵ Cf. above Kd 15.9.4 and Vin 4.345. ⁶ See BD 1.199, n. 3.

Now at that time monks went about for almsfood (to be put) into a gourd.¹ People ... spread it about, saying: “Like members of other sects.”² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, you should not go about for almsfood (to be put) into a gourd. Whoever should (so) go about, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

12.115
Now at that time monks went about for almsfood (to be put) into a water-pot. People ... (as above) ... **“offence of wrong-doing.”**

5.10.2
Now at that time a certain monk came to be a wearer of nothing but rag-robcs;³ he carried a bowl made from a skull. A certain woman, terrified at having seen him, uttered a scream of horror;⁴ “How terrible for me, indeed it is a demon⁵ after me.” People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans carry a bowl made from a skull, like demon-worshippers?”⁶ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a bowl made from a skull should not be carried. Whoever should carry one, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Nor, monks, should you be a wearer of nothing but rag-robcs. Whoever should be, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

5.10.3
Now at that time monks took back in their bowls odd bits and bones and impure water.⁷ People ... spread it about, saying: “That very thing from which these recluses, sons of the Sakyans eat, that is simply their waste-tub.”⁸ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, odd bits and bones and impure water should not be taken back in a bowl. Whoever should (so) take (these things)**

¹ Cf. Vin 1.90 (BD 4.114) = BD 3.245 (BD 2.119) where they went about for almsfood to be put into their hands. ² See BD 2.119, n. 4. ³ Buddhaghosa says that in this case his robes, couch and chair were from a rag-heap. ⁴ Cf. MN i.448. ⁵ *pisāca*, as at MN i.448. MN-a iii.165 explains, “a demon (*pisāca*) has come to eat me.” ⁶ *pisācillikā*. Word occurs at Vin 1.152, Vin 2.134, Snp-a 357. ⁷ Same list found at Vin 4.266 in definition of *vighāsa*, “scraps of food.” ⁸ *paṭiggaha*, a receptacle, a receiving thing. Word occurs below Kd 15.11.5. (meaning thimble), but cf. *udakap-* at Vin 2.213.

back, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, a waste-tub.”

Now at that time monks were sewing robe-material having ripped it up with their hands. The robe-material became unsightly.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a small knife, a piece of felt² (to wrap round it).” Now at that time a small knife with a handle³ accrued to the Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a small knife with a handle.” Now at that time the group of six monks used various kinds of small knives with handles, made of gold, made of silver. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, various kinds of small knives with handles should not be used. Whoever should use (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow them, monks, to be made of bone, made of ivory, made of horn, made of reeds, made of bamboo, made of pieces of stick, made of lac, made of crystal, made of copper, made of the inside of a conch-shell.”⁴

Now at that time monks sewed robe-material with a cock’s feather and with bamboo-rind⁵ and the robe-material came to be badly sewn. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, I allow you a needle.” The needles became rusty.⁶ “I allow you, monks, a tube for (holding) the needles.”⁷ Even in the tubes they became rusty. “I allow you, monks, to fill them with yeast.”⁸ Even in the yeast they became rusty. “I allow you, monks, to fill them with barley-meal.”⁹ Even in the barley-meal they became rusty. “I allow you, monks, powdered

¹ *viloma*. ² *namataka*, allowed again at Vin 2.123, Vin 2.134. Word also found at Vin 2.267 ³ *daṇḍasatthaka*. ⁴ Cf. Kd 6.12.1, and see BD 4.276 for notes. ⁵ *velu-pesikā*. Word found at DN ii.324. ⁶ *kaṇṇakita*, spoiled in some way, probably rusty, blunt or stained. The word appears to be used in the sense of stained (of the ground and of a wall) at Kd 1.25.15–Kd 18.1.3; and in the sense of stained, soiled or spoiled (of robes) at Nuns’ Bi-Pc 24. Vin-a 1205 explains as *mallagahitā honti* (variant reading *malaggahitā*). *Mala* may mean rust. *Vinaya Texts* iii.91 translates as “blunt.” ⁷ *sūcinālika*. Bu-Pc 86 makes it an offence to have a *sūcighara* made of bone, ivory or horn. ⁸ *kiṇṇa*, explained at Vin-a 1205 as *kiṇṇacuṇṇa*. ⁹ *rattu*. Oldenberg’s text reads *satthu*. Cf. BD 2.322, n. 4.

stone.” Even in the powdered stone they became rusty. “I allow you, monks, to have it mixed with beeswax.” The powdered stone broke up. “I allow you, monks, powdered stone (mixed) with gum.”¹

Now at that time monks, having driven in posts here and there, having tied them together, sewed robe-material. The robe-material became misshapen at the corners.² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a *kaṭhina*-frame³ (and) strings for the *kaṭhina*-frame⁴ (and) to sew robe-material having tied it down here and there.” They spread out a *kaṭhina*-frame in an uneven place; the *kaṭhina*-frame was split. **“Monks, a *kaṭhina*-frame should not be spread out in an uneven place. Whoever should (so) spread one out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”** They spread out a *kaṭhina*-frame on the ground. The *kaṭhina*-frame was soiled by dust. “I allow you, monks, a grass mat.”⁵ An edge of the *kaṭhina*-frame was injured.⁶ “I allow you, monks, to put on a braiding, a binding.”⁷ The *kaṭhina*-frame was not large enough.⁸ “I allow you, monks, a stick

¹ *saritasipāṭika*; cf. *hinguṣipāṭika* at Vin 1.201 (Kd 6.7). But Vin-a 1206 explains as *madhusitthakapilotikam satthakosakam*, a little cloth for the beeswax, a little sheath for a knife. Cf. also below, BD 5.185, n. 4. ² *vikaṇṇa*, as at Vin 1.297. ³ *kaṭhina* here, as pointed out at Vinaya Texts iii.92, n. 8 “is evidently a sort of framework.” Vin-a 1206 says it “is a *nisseṇi* (ladder, frame?) and another should be spread (*attharati*) there for the mats.” Or the translation of this may be: “the *nisseṇi* should be spread out there and another for the mats.” The verb used here in connection with *kaṭhina* is *pattharati*, to spread out, to extend; whereas *attharati* is the verb used in connection with the formal making up of the *kaṭhina*-cloth; see BD 2.26, n. 3 and Kd 7. ⁴ *kaṭhinaraṭṭha* (variant reading *raṭṭha*). Vin-a 1206 says “those who are sewing robe-material double, tie the robe-material to the *kaṭhina* (-frame).” ⁵ As at Kd 15.9.4 above. ⁶ *jīrati*, or “wore out (with age).” This would begin a new idea, and perhaps this is intended. On the other hand, to say that it was hurt or damaged would imply that the grass mat was not big enough to protect the edges of the frame, and thus the same idea would be continued. ⁷ *anuvāta paribhaṇḍa*. See BD 2.409, n. 7, n. 8 (where also further references are given). These two words occur at Vin 1.254 as representing things which must have a place in the making of the *kaṭhina*-cloth into robes; and again at Vin 1.297 as representing things to be used in strengthening robes. ⁸ Vin-a 1206 says the frame was made according to the height of a tall monk, but when the robe-material was being (formally) made there, it did not suffice for (even) a short monk.

in the *kaṭhina*-frame,¹ a skewer,² a slip of wood,³ a cord for tying,⁴ a thread for tying,⁵ and having tied the robe-material, to sew it.” The spaces between the threads became unequal.⁶ “I allow you, monks, a mark⁷ (to keep the spaces between the threads equal).” The threads became crooked. “I allow you, monks, a false thread.”⁸

BD 5,15

Now at that time monks trod on a *kaṭhina*-frame with unwashed feet; the *kaṭhina*-frame was damaged. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a *kaṭhina*-frame should not be trodden upon if your feet are unwashed. Whoever should (so) tread upon (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Kd 15,1

Now at that time monks trod on a *kaṭhina*-frame with damp feet ... He said: **“Monks, a *kaṭhina*-frame should not be trodden upon if your feet are damp. Whoever should (so) tread upon (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks trod on a *kaṭhina*-frame with their sandals on.⁹ ... He said: **“Monks, a *kaṭhina*-frame should not be trodden upon if you have your sandals on. Whoever should (so) tread upon (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

¹ *daṇḍakaṭhina*. *Pali-English Dictionary* says that this is *kaṭhina*-cloth stretched on a stick (for the purpose of measuring). Vin-a 1206 says, “it means: ‘I allow you to bind another frame (*nisseṇi*) of the height of such and such a monk in the middle of that one’” (i.e. of the original *nisseṇi*, by which the Commentary has already explained *kaṭhina*). ² *pidalaka* (Vin-a 1206 *vidalaka*). Vin-a 1206 says, “it is for making double, having drawn back the ends (*pariyante*) of the mat in accordance with the measure of the stick in the *kaṭhina*-frame.” ³ *salāka*. Vin-a 1206 explains as a slip of wood going in between a double piece of robe-material. ⁴ *vinandhanarajju*. Vin-a 1206 says “a cord tying the smaller frame (*nisseṇi*) together with the large frame there.” ⁵ *vinandhanasuttaka*. Vin-a 1206, “thread for tying the robe-material to the smaller frame.” ⁶ *visamā*. Vin-a 1206 says that some were large, some small. ⁷ *kaḷimbhaka*. Vin-a 1206 says “talipot palm leaves and so on—whatever does for knowing the (right) measure.” ⁸ *moghasuttaka*. Vin-a 1206 says “for recognition by a yellow thread, as carpenters go by a black thread on a piece of wood”. See BD 4.354 and cf. Vin-a 1110 in explanation of *bandhanamattena*. In both cases the false thread is a guide. ⁹ See BD 3.144, n. 1.

Now at that time monks, sewing robes, pricked¹ their fingers; their fingers became painful. They told this matter to the Lord. He said. “Monks, I allow a thimble.”² Now at that time the group of six monks used various kinds of thimbles, made of gold, made of silver. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, various kinds of thimbles should not be used. Whoever should use them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow them, monks, to be made of bone ... made of the inside of a conch-shell.”

Now at that time needles and small knives and thimbles were lost. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a small bowl to hold (these things in).”³ (The contents of) the small bowls got in a muddle. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a bag for thimbles.” There was no strap at the edge. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a strap at the edge, a thread for tying.”⁴

Now at that time as monks were sewing robes in the open air they were bothered by cold and heat.⁵ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a hall for the *kaṭhina*-frame, a hut for the *kaṭhina*-frame.” A hall for the *kaṭhina*-frame was low to the ground,⁶ it was flooded by water. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make it high to the ground.” The piling collapsed. “I allow you, monks, to pile up three (kinds of) pilings: a piling of bricks, a piling of stones, a piling of wood.”⁷ They were inconvenienced as they were ascending. “I allow, monks, three (kinds

¹ *paṭigaṇhanti*. ² *paṭiggaha*. Cf. above, **BD 5.156**. ³ *āvesanavithaka*. *Āvesana* is dwelling, *vittha* a bowl, as in *surāvittha* at Ja v.427, Dh-p-a iii.66. Vin-a 1206 explains by *pāti*- (bowl) *caṅgoṭakādi* (box and so on). ⁴ As at **Kd 6.12.4**. ⁵ Cf. this passage with **Kd 15.14.2, Kd 15.14.3, Kd 16.3.6**. ⁶ Cf. this passage with **Kd 15.14.2**. ⁷ As at **Kd 15.16.2, Kd 15.17.2, Kd 16.3.3**.

of) staircases: a staircase of bricks, a staircase of stones, a staircase of wood.” As they were ascending they fell off. “I allow, monks, a balustrade.”¹ Powdered grass² fell into the hall for the *kaṭhina*-frame. “I allow you, monks, having lashed³ on (a roof⁴), to give a smearing inside and outside,⁵ whitewash,⁶ black colouring, red chalk, wreath-work, creeper-work, swordfish teeth, the five (pieces of) cloth design, a bamboo for hanging up robe-material,⁷ a cord for hanging up robe-material.”⁸

BD 5.16

Now at that time monks, having sewn robe-material, went away having left the *kaṭhina*-frame at that very place, and it was eaten by rats and white ants. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to fold up the *kaṭhina*-frame.” A *kaṭhina*-frame was split. “I allow you, monks, to fold up the *kaṭhina*-frame by using a wooden rod.”⁹ A *kaṭhina*-frame was twisted out of position.¹⁰ “I allow you, monks, a cord for tying it.” Now at that time monks, having lifted up the *kaṭhina*-frame on to walls and posts, went away and the *kaṭhina*-frame, having fallen down, was split. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to hang it on a peg in a wall or on an ‘elephant-tusk’ (peg).”

Kd 15.1

Then the Lord having stayed in Rājagaha for as long as he found suiting set out on tour for Vesālī. Now at that time the monks went along (each) taking his needle and small knife and medicine in his

Kd 15.1

Vin 2.11

¹ *ālambanabāha*. *Ālambana* by itself is “the plinth of a railing or balustrade,” A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Indian Architectural Terms*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 48, No. 3, p. 251. ² *tiṇacuṇṇa*, as at Vin 1.203. ³ *ogumphetvā*. Cf. *ogumphiyanti* at Vin 1.194. ⁴ So Vin-a 1207, *chadanam odhunitvā*. ⁵ *ullitāvalitta*, as in definition of “hut” and “dwelling-place” at Vin 3.149, Vin 3.156 respectively (see BD 1.267, n. 3). ⁶ This and the following terms, as far as “five (pieces of) cloth design,” mentioned again at Vin 2.121, Vin 4.47. Cf. Vin 2.172. For notes see BD 2.259. ⁷ Allowed at Vin 1.286. ⁸ Allowed at Vin 1.286. ⁹ *goghamsikā*. I do not follow the meaning as given at *Vinaya Texts* iii.98, for monks were not allowed to use cowhides (Vin 1.193). Vin-a 1207 says, “having arranged (*katvā*) a bamboo or a stick (*daṇḍaka*) from a tree inside, to fold it up (i.e. the frame) together with that.” ¹⁰ *viveṭhiyati*.

bowl. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a bag for medicine.” There was no strap at the edge. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a strap at the edge, a thread for tying.”

Now at that time a certain monk, having tied his sandals to his girdle entered a village for almsfood. A certain lay-follower, greeting that monk, knocked up against the sandals with his head. That monk became ashamed. Then that monk, having arrived at a monastery, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a bag for sandals.” There was no strap at the edge. “I allow you, monks, a strap at the edge, a thread for tying.”

Now at that time on a certain road there was water that was not allowable¹ (for) there was no strainer. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a strainer.” A little piece of cloth was not enough. “I allow, monks, a strainer on a ladle.” The little piece of cloth was not enough. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow a regulation waterpot.”²

Now at that time two monks were going along a high road in the Kosalan country. One monk indulged in bad habits.³ The other monk spoke thus to that monk: “Do not do that, your reverence, it is not allowable.” He grumbled at him. Then that monk, tormented by thirst, spoke thus to the monk who had grumbled: “Give me the strainer,⁴ your reverence, I will drink (some) water.” The monk who had grumbled did not give it. That monk passed away, tormented by thirst. Then that monk, having arrived at a monastery, told this mat-

¹ Doubtless meaning that it had “living creatures” in it—an offence to make use of water like this, **Bu-Pc 62**, and cf. **Bu-Pc 20**. ² *dhammakaraka*, as at **Vin 2.177**, **Vin 2.302**. Cf. **Dhp-a iii.290**. ³ Cf. **Vin 4.83 (BD 2.332)**. ⁴ It looks as if the strainer, at the date of this episode, was communal, one serving a number of monks. At **Vin 2.302** it is given among a “recluse’s requisites.”

ter to the monks. They said: “But did you, your reverence, (although) being asked, not give a strainer?”

“No, your reverences.” Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can this monk, when being asked for a strainer, not give it?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned this monk, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, when being asked for a strainer, did not give it?”

“It is true, Lord.” The enlightened one, the Lord rebuked him, saying:

“It is not suitable in you, foolish man, it is not becoming, it is not fitting, it is not worthy of a recluse, it is not allowable, it is not to be done. How can you, foolish man, when being asked for a strainer, not give it? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, if a monk is going along a highroad and is being asked for a strainer, he should not not give it. Whoever should not give it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Nor, monks, should you go along a highway without a strainer. Whoever should (so) go, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If there is not a strainer nor a regulation water-pot, then a corner of the outer cloak should be determined upon with the words, ‘I will drink (water) having strained it with this’.”

Then the Lord, walking on tour gradually arrived at Vesālī. The Lord stayed there in Vesālī in the Great Grove at the Hall of the Gabled Pillars. Now at that time monks were making repairs. The water-strainer did not cease (to be in use¹). They told this matter to the

¹ *na sammati*, did not rest, cease. The meaning must be that the thirsty monks made such constant demands upon it that it did not meet their needs and that therefore something larger was wanted to give more water and more quickly.

Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a double water-strainer.”¹ The double water-strainer did not cease (to be in use). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a filter.”² Now at that time monks were pestered by mosquitoes. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a mosquito-net.”³

5:14.1
5:16.4
Now at that time at Vesālī a succession of meals of sumptuous foods came to be arranged.⁴ Monks, having eaten the sumptuous foods, became very ill with their bodies full of (bad) humours.⁵ Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca went to Vesālī on some business or other. Jīvaka Komārabhacca saw the monks who were very ill with their bodies full of (bad) humours; seeing them, he approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Jīvaka Komārabhacca spoke thus to the Lord:

“At present, Lord, monks are very ill with their bodies full of (bad) humours. It were well, Lord, if the Lord allowed the monks a place for pacing up and down in and a bathroom.⁶ Thus will the monks come to have few afflictions.”⁷ Then the Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Jīvaka Komārabhacca with talk on *dhamma*. Then Jīvaka Komārabhacca, gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed

¹ *daṇḍaparissāvana*. Cf. *daṇḍasatthaka* and *daṇḍakaṭhina* at [Kd 15.11.1](#), [Kd 15.11.3](#). *Vinaya Texts* iii.102 gives “double strainer” with note that it is “apparently a long box, both ends of which strain the water which is poured into the middle by means of a pipe (*daṇḍaka*).” *Daṇḍakaṭhina* certainly has nearly the meaning of a “double *kaṭhina*-frame.” Vin-a 1207 says “like dyers’ strainers for alkaline dyes, having tied a piece of cloth to the four ends of a frame, water should be poured into a pipe (*daṇḍaka*) in the middle. Then you strain, having filled both the divisions.” ² *ottharaka*, a kind of strainer. It seems, from Buddhaghosa’s remarks, that this is a strainer which by means of four pipes filters water that monks can then take in a pitcher. ³ *makasakuṭikā*, or mosquito-curtain. Vin-a 1207 explains by *cīvarakuṭikā*. Does this mean a little hut (made of robe-material)? ⁴ As at [Vin 4.75](#); [Vin 1.57](#) (*Rājagaha*), [Vin 1.248](#) (*Kusinārā*). ⁵ As at [Vin 1.206](#). ⁶ *jantāghara*, as at [Kd 1.25.12](#); see [BD 4.62](#), and *Vinaya Texts* iii.103, n. 2. ⁷ *appābādā*. Jīvaka was probably taking a wider view of maintaining the monks’ health than the “convalescent” of *Vinaya Texts* iii.103 allows for.

keeping his right side towards him. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, a place for pacing up and down in, and a bathroom.”

Now at that time monks paced up and down in an uneven place for pacing up and down in; their feet became painful. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make it level.” A place for pacing up and down in was low to the ground; it was flooded by water. “I allow you, monks, to make it high to the ground ... (as in **Kd 15.11.6**) ... I allow you, monks, a balustrade.”

Now at that time, monks, as they were pacing up and down in the place for pacing up and down in, fell off. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a railing round the place for pacing up and down in.”¹ Now at that time monks, pacing up and down in the open air, were bothered by cold and heat. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a hall in the place for pacing up and down in.” Powdered grass fell into the hall in the place for pacing up and down in. “I allow you, monks, having lashed on (a roof) ... (as in **Kd 15.11.6**) ... a cord for hanging up robe-material.”

A bathroom was low to the ground; it was flooded by water. “I allow you, monks, to make it high to the ground ... (as in **Kd 15.11.6**) ... a balustrade.” There was no door² to a bathroom. “I allow, monks, a door, a doorpost and lintel,³ a hollow like a mortar (for the door to

¹ *caṅkamanavedikā*. As noted by A.K. COOMARASWAMY in *Indian Architectural Terms*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 48, No. 3, p.273 (q.v. for further references), DN ii.179 gives the component parts of a vedikā: the uprights, the cross-bars and the coping. Cf. *vedikāvātāpāna* at **Kd 16.2.2**. ² *kavāṭa*, the door itself, that which closes the aperture. ³ *piṭṭhasaṅghāṭa*. Allowed again with the two following items at **Kd 16.2.1**.

revolve in¹), a small upper projection,² a post for the bolt,³ a ‘monkey’s head,’⁴ a pin (to secure the bolt),⁵ a (stick used as a) bolt,⁶ a keyhole,⁷ a hole for pulling through (the cord),⁸ cord for pulling through.”⁹

The lower part of the lath and plaster wall¹⁰ of a bathroom decayed. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make a facing (round it).”¹¹ The bathroom had no pipe for the steam.¹² “I allow, monks, a pipe for the steam.”

Now at that time monks made a fireplace in the middle of a small bathroom, and there was no access.¹³ “I allow you, monks, to make a fireplace at one side of a small bathroom, in the middle of a large one.” The fire in the bathroom scorched their faces. “I allow, monks, clay for the face.”¹⁴ They moistened the clay with their hands. “I allow,

¹ *udukkhalika*. I follow translation at *Vinaya Texts* iii.105. ² *uttarapāsaka*. *Vinaya Texts* iii.105 “projections to revolve in these hollows.” ³ *aggaḷavaṭṭi*. *Vin-a* 1207 says, “the same measure as the doorpost, *dvārabāhā*, it is simply called *aggaḷathambha* (post for a bolt or bar). Having made three or four holes there, they put in pins” (*sūci*, or cross-bars). ⁴ *kapisīsaka*. *Vin-a* 1207 says, “this means, having perforated the doorpost, it is called a bolt-projection, *aggaḷapāsaka*, put in there”. *Critical Pali Dictionary* (under *aggaḷapāsaka*) notes that “according to *Vin-a* (**Vin 2.120**)=*kapisīsaka*, quadrangular end of the bolt of a door, Sacred Books of the East xx.106.” Cf. *DN* ii.143, *kapisīsam ālambitvā ṭhito*, which *DN-a* 584 explains as *kapisīsakam ti dvārabāhakoṭiyam ṭhitam aggaḷarukkham*, “a piece of wood for the bolt fixed at the top of the doorpost.” It must be a hole or cavity to receive the bolt. The word also occurs at *Ja* iii.23. ⁵ *sūcika*. *Vin-a* 1207 says, “it is put in, having made a hole in the middle there” (i.e. in the “monkey’s head”). Cf. *aggaḷasūci* at *MN* i.126, “the pin for the bolt.” ⁶ *ghaṭikā*. *Vin-a* 1207 merely says “joined above,” *upari yojitā*. Cf. *ghaṭikam ugghātetvā*, having undone the bolt, at **Vin 2.207**, and *sūciḡhaṭikā* at **Vin 2.237**, *SN* iv.290, *Ud* 52. It is explained at *Ud-a* 298: *sūciḡhaṭikā* means having fixed (*ādahitvā*, variant reading *ādim katvā*) the pin for the bolt, *aggaḷasūci*, and the upper bolt, *upariḡhaṭikā*, having closed it firmly. The *ghaṭikā* would appear to be a subsidiary bolt, the main one being the *aggaḷa*. ⁷ Cf. below, **Vin 5.207**. ⁸ *āvīñchanachidda*. This and the next allowed again at **Kd 16.2.1** because there doors could not be made to meet (the doorposts), *na phassīyanti*. ⁹ *āvīñchanarajju*. ¹⁰ *kuḍḍapāda*; also below **Kd 16.3.4** of a dwelling-place and where a different remedy was “allowed.” ¹¹ *maṇḍalikam kātum*. *Vin-a* 1207 says *nīcavatthukam cinitum*, “to pile low to the ground,” for which expression cf. **Kd 15.11.6**. ¹² *dhūmanetta*. Cf. **Kd 6.13.2**. *Vin-a* 1207 says a hole for letting out the steam. ¹³ *upacāra* as in **Kd 16.3.3**. ¹⁴ *mukhamattikā*. Cf. **Kd 1.25.12**.

monks, a tub for the clay.” The clay came to smell nasty. “I allow you, monks, to cure¹ it.” The fire in the bathroom scorched their bodies. “I allow you, monks, to take in water.” They took in water in dishes and bowls. “I allow you, monks, a receptacle for water,² a saucer³ for the water.” A bathroom with a grass roofing did not make them sweat. “I allow you, monks, having lashed on (a roof),⁴ to give it a smearing inside and outside.” The bathroom became swampy. “I allow you, monks, to spread three (kinds of) spreadings: a spreading of bricks, a spreading of stones, a spreading of wood.”⁵ Even so it became swampy. “I allow you, monks, to wash it.” Water remained. “I allow, monks, a drain for the water.”⁶ Now at that time monks sat down on the ground in a bathroom and they got pins and needles in their limbs. “I allow, monks, a chair for the bathroom.” Now at that time a bathroom was not fenced in. “I allow, monks, three (kinds of) fences to fence it in with: a fence of bricks, a fence of stones, a fence of wood.”⁷

There was no porch.⁸ “I allow, monks, a porch.” The porch was low to the ground; it was flooded by water. “I allow you, monks, to make it high to the ground ... (as in **Kd 15.11.6**) ... a balustrade.” There was no door to the porch. “I allow, monks, a door, doorposts and lintel ... (as in **Kd 15.14.3**) ... a hole for pulling through (the cord), cord for pulling through.” Powdered grass fell on to the porch. “I allow you, monks, having lashed on (a roof), to give it a smearing inside and outside, whitewash, black colouring, red chalk, garland design, creeper design, swordfish teeth, the five (pieces of) cloth design.”⁹

A cell became swampy.¹⁰ “I allow you, monks, to sprinkle gravel.”¹¹

¹ *vāsetumh*, in the sense of to prepare, to treat, as at **Kd 6.17**. Buddhaghosa says “to cure with perfumes.” ² *udakaṭṭhāna*. Buddhaghosa reads *udakanidhāna*, a receptacle for water, and explains, “a place for putting water; having put the water in a pitcher (*ghaṭa*) there, one can use it by means of a saucer” (or cup). ³ *sarāvaka*, as at **Vin 1.203**. Cf. *ācamanasarāvaka* at **Kd 15.35.4**. ⁴ See above, **Kd 15.11.6**. ⁵ As in **Kd 15.17.1**. ⁶ As at end of **Kd 15.14.5**; **Kd 15.17.2**. ⁷ As at **Kd 15.17.1**; cf. **Vin 4.266**. ⁸ *koṭṭhaka*. Vin-a 1208 says this means *dvārakoṭṭhaka*, gateway in the porch. See **Kd 15.35.4**. ⁹ As at **Kd 15.11.6**. ¹⁰ As at **Kd 15.35.4**; **Kd 16.3.8**. ¹¹ *marumbā*, as in **Bu-Pc 10** in definition of “natural ground” (see **BD 2.224 and n. 1**).

They did not succeed in doing so. “I allow you, monks, to lay down flagstones.” Water remained. “I allow, monks, a drain for the water.”¹

5:15:1 Now at that time monks, while naked,² greeted others who were naked and caused others who were naked to greet them; did a service to others who were naked and made others do a service to those who were naked; while naked they gave to others who were naked, accepted naked, ate naked, partook of naked, tasted naked, drank naked. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, one who is naked should neither greet nor be greeted by one who is naked; one who is naked should not cause another to greet nor to be greeted by one who is naked; a service for one who is naked should not be done by one who is naked, a service for one who is naked should not be caused to be done by one who is naked; one who is naked should not give to a naked one, one who is naked should not accept, one who is naked should not eat, one who is naked should not partake of, ... should not taste ... should not drink. Whoever should (so) drink, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

5:16:1 Now at that time monks laid aside their robes on the ground in a bathroom; the robes became soiled with dust.³ They told this matter
5:16:8 to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a bamboo for robes, a cord for robes.” When it rained the robes got wet. “I allow, monks, a hall in
2:122 the bathroom.” The hall in the bathroom was low to the ground. “I allow, monks, ... (as in **Kd 15.11.6**) ... a balustrade.” Powdered grass fell on to the hall in the bathroom. “I allow you, monks, having lashed on (a roof) ... (as in **Kd 15.11.6**) ... a bamboo for robes, a cord for robes.”

5:16:2 Now at that time monks were doubtful about doing a service both when in a bathroom and in the water. They told this matter to the

¹ As in **Kd 15.14.3**. ² That is, in the bathroom. ³ As at **Kd 15.11.3**.

Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, three (kinds of) coverings: a covering to the bathroom, a covering to the water, a covering by clothes.”¹

Now at that time there was no water in a bathroom. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a well.” The facing of the well fell in.² “I allow you, monks, to pile up three (kinds of) pilings: a piling of bricks, a piling of stones, a piling of wood.” The well was low to the ground ... (as in Kd 15.11.6) “... I allow, monks, a balustrade.”

Now at that time monks drew water by means of jungle rope, and by means of a waistband. “I allow you, monks, a cord for drawing water.” Their hands became painful. “I allow, monks, a well-sweep,³ a hand-wheel,⁴ a wheel and buckets.”⁵ Many vessels were broken. “I allow monks, three (kinds of) jars: a copper jar, a wooden jar, strips of animals’ hide.”⁶

Now at that time monks, drawing water in the open air, were bothered by cold and heat. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a hall for a well.” Powdered grass fell on to the hall for a well. “I allow, monks, ... (as in Kd 15.11.6) ... a bamboo for robes, a cord for robes.” The well was not covered. It was littered with powdered grass and with dust. “I allow, monks, a lid.”⁷ There

¹ Vin-a 1208 says that the two former are for doing a service, but not for greeting, etc., the last is for doing all kinds of services. ² As at Kd 15.17.2. ³ *tulā*. Vin-a 1208 says “a pole for lifting up (or pulling up, *ubbāhana*) the water like that used for vegetables, *paṇṇikānaṃ*.” A.K. COOMARASWAMY says it means here “well-sweep,” *Indian Architectural Terms*, p. 271, which also see for the two following terms. The three terms indicate different methods of pulling up water. Editors *Vinaya Texts* iii.112 had a corrupt copy of the Commentary before them. ⁴ *karakāṭaka*. *Kaṭaka* is anything circular, so a wheel. Vin-a 1208 says “either having harnessed it to bullocks or having taken it with the hands, it is an instrument with a long strap for pulling up” (a bucket of water). ⁵ *cakkavaṭṭaka*. Vin-a 1208 says “it is a contrivance for jars to be taken off the spokes of a wheel,” *arahattaḡhaṭṭiyantaṃ* (variant reading *arahattaḡhaṭṭi-*). ⁶ Vin-a 1208, “a hide vessel that can be joined to the well-sweep or the hand-wheel.” ⁷ *apidhāna*, as at Kd 6.12.2.

was no vessel for the water. “I allow, monks, a trough for water, a pot¹ for water.”

5.17.1 Now at that time monks bathed here, there and everywhere in a monastery; the monastery became swampy. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a pool.” The pool was public. “I allow, monks, three (kinds of) fences to fence it in: a fence of bricks, a fence of stones, a fence of wood.”² The pool became swampy. “I allow you, monks, to spread three (kinds of) spreadings: a spreading of bricks, a spreading of stones, a spreading of wood.”³ The water remained. “I allow, monks, a drain.”⁴ Now at that time monks’ limbs cooled down. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a wiper (with which to wipe off) the water⁵ and to sponge yourselves down with a cloth.”⁶

5.17.2
2.123 Now at that time a certain lay follower was anxious to build a tank for an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a tank.” The facing of the tank fell in.⁷ “I allow you, monks, to pile up three (kinds of) pilings: a piling of bricks, a piling of stones, a piling of wood.”⁸ They were inconvenienced as they were ascending. “I allow, monks, three (kinds of) staircases: a staircase of bricks, a staircase of stones, a staircase of wood.”⁹ As they were ascending they fell off. “I allow, monks, a balustrade.” The water in the tank became stale. “I allow, monks, a pipe for the water,¹⁰ a drain for the water.”

5.170
¹ *kaṭāha*, or receptacle. ² As at **Kd 15.14.3**. ³ As at **Kd 15.14.3**. ⁴ As at **Kd 15.14.3, Kd 15.14.5**. ⁵ *udakapuñchanī*. In view of the fact that Buddhaghosa says “made of ivory, made of horn, made of wood,” it cannot unhesitatingly be rendered “towel” (as at *Vinaya Texts* iii.114). Yet the three sorts allowed at **Vin 2.174** are those of bearskin, drapery and cloth and Buddhaghosa mentions *colakapādapuñchana* in Commentary on **Kd 16.2.2**. Cf. *pādapuñchanī* at **Vin 4.40**. The word also occurs at **Vin 4.168 (BD 3.89)**. ⁶ *colakena paccuddharitum* as at **Kd 16.3.1**. ⁷ As at **Kd 15.16.2**. ⁸ As at **Kd 15.11.6**. ⁹ As at **Kd 15.11.6**. ¹⁰ *udakāyatika*. *Vin-a 1208* (reading *udakamātikā*, a channel, course, as does Sinhalese edition of *Vinaya*) says this is a *mātikā* for bringing water in. The drain will have been to lead it away.

Now at that time a certain monk was anxious to build a bathroom with a curving roof¹ for an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a bathroom with a curving roof.”

Now at that time the group of six monks were away, separated from² their pieces of cloth to sit upon³ for four months. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not be away, separated from your pieces of cloth to sit upon for four months. Whoever should be (so) away, separated from, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time the group of six monks lay down to sleep on beds which were scattered over with flowers. People, touring the dwelling-place, having seen them ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not lie down to sleep on beds scattered over with flowers. Whoever should (so) lie down to sleep, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time people, taking scents and garlands, came to a monastery. Monks being scrupulous, did not accept them. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having taken the scents, to give the five-finger mark⁴ on the door; having taken

¹ This rendering is taken from Vin-a 1208 which says that *nillekha* is called “a projection curving at the side, *āviddhapakkhapāsaka*; having fixed the side projections in the upper round part, *uparimaṇḍale*, of the beams, this (i.e. *nillekha*) is the name of the finished covering roof.” One might compare the “curved house,” *aḍḍhayaoga*, of Vin 1.58 and other passages. See BD 4.75. ² *vippavasati*; see Bu-NP 2. ³ See Bu-NP 15, Vin 3.232 where *nisīdana* is defined, and BD 2.87, n. 2, n. 3. ⁴ *kavāṭe pañcaṅgulikaṃ dātum*. See article on *pañcaṅgulika* in *Pali-English Dictionary*. It is either a magical and protective or a decorative mark. At the present day impressions of the human hand are still made on walls in India, the hand having been first dipped in some colouring matter. See also Journal of the Pali Text Society 1884, p.84f. *Pañcaṅgulikaṃ datvā* occurs at Ja i.166 in connection with slaying a goat; at Ja i.192 (*gandhena pañc- datvā*) of an ox; at Ja ii.104, Ja iii.23 of a tree, and also as *lohitapañc-* of a tree at Ja iii.160.

the flowers, to lay them down in a dwelling-place at one side.”

5.19.1
5.171
Now at that time a piece of felt¹ accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a piece of felt.” Then it occurred to monks: “Now, should a piece of felt be allotted or should it be assigned?”² “A piece of felt, monks, should be neither allotted nor assigned.”

2.124
Now at that time the group of six monks ate (leaning against) chased cushions.³ People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not eat (leaning against) chased cushions. Whoever should (so) eat there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time a certain monk came to be ill. While he was eating he was not able to hold a bowl in his hand. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks a stand.”⁴

5.19.2
Now at that time the group of six monks ate from one dish⁵ and drank from one beaker and shared one couch⁶ and shared one cloth and shared one covering and shared one covering-cloth.⁷ People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not eat from one dish nor drink from one beaker nor share one couch nor share one cloth nor share one covering nor**

¹ *namataka*, as at [Vin 2.115](#), [Vin 2.134](#). Vin-a 1208 on its meaning above says that it is made of sheep’s wool (or goats’ hair, *eḷakaloma*). ² Not included among the articles about which the same question was asked at [Vin 1.296-7](#). ³ *āsittakūpadhāna*. Vin-a 1208 says that a synonym for this is “a *peḷā* (basket, chest?) made of copper or silver.” ⁴ *maḷorikā*. Vin-a 1208 explains as a prop (made of) sticks, *daṇḍādāhā aka*. ⁵ As lax monks did at [Vin 2.10](#), [Vin 3.180](#). ⁶ As the lax monks and as two nuns did at [Vin 4.288](#) (see [BD 3.304](#)). ⁷ As the lax monks and as the two nuns at [Vin 4.289](#) (see [BD 3.30, n](#)).

share one covering-cloth. Whoever should share (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time the Licchavi Vaḍḍha was a friend of the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka.¹ Then the Licchavi Vaḍḍha approached the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka; having approached, he spoke thus to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka: “I salute you, masters.” When he had spoken thus, the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka did not respond. And a second time ... And a third time did the Licchavi Vaḍḍha speak thus to the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka: “I salute you, masters.” And a third time the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka did not respond. He said: “Do I offend against the masters? Why do the masters not respond to me?”

“It is because you, friend Vaḍḍha, were indifferent when we were being molested by Dabba the Mallian.”

“What can I, masters, do?”

“If you, friend Vaḍḍha, were willing you could get the Lord to expel the venerable² Dabba the Mallian this very day.”

“What can I, masters, do? How am I able to do that?”

“Come you, friend Vaḍḍha, go up to the Lord; having gone up, speak thus to the Lord: ‘This, Lord, is not suitable, it is not becoming that this quarter which should be without fear, secure, without danger, is the very quarter which is full of fear, insecure, full of danger. Where there was a calm, now there is a gale. It seems as if the very water is blazing. My wife has been seduced by master Dabba the Mallian.’”

“Very well, masters,” and the Licchavi Vaḍḍha, having answered the monks who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka in assent, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a

¹ Cf. [Vin 2.78f.](#), [Vin 3.162.](#) ² He is not called *āyasmā* by the monks at the parallel passage at [Vin 3.162](#), but he is at [Vin 2.78](#).

respectful distance, the Licchavi Vaḍḍha spoke thus to the Lord: “This, Lord, is not suitable ... My wife has been seduced by master Dabba the Mallian.”

Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the venerable Dabba the Mallian, saying: “Dabba, do you remember doing as this Vaḍḍha says?”

“Lord, the Lord knows in regard to me.” And a second time the Lord ... And a third time the Lord spoke thus to the venerable Dabba the Mallian: “Dabba, do you remember doing as this Vaḍḍha says?”

“Lord, the Lord knows in regard to me,” he said.

“Dabba, the Dabbas do not give evasive answers thus. If what was done was done by you, say so: if it was not done by you, say it was not.”

“Lord, since I was born I cannot call to mind indulging in sexual intercourse even in a dream; much less so when I was awake.”

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Because of this, monks, let the Order turn the Licchavi Vaḍḍha’s bowl upside down,¹ let it impose non-eating with the Order.² Monks, if a lay-follower is possessed of eight qualities his bowl may be turned upside down:³ if he tries for non-receiving (of gains) by monks, if he tries for non-profiting by monks, if he tries for non-residence for monks, if he

¹ Not a literal turning upside down, but a symbolical one performed by a formal act of the Order for turning down, *nikkujjanā* and, a bowl, as described below in [Kd 15.20.4](#). Vin-a 1209 says “here, if a person is possessed of any one of these eight qualities, having gone within the boundaries or outside them (the Order) may turn it down. When anyone’s bowl is turned upside down thus, no alms may be taken in his house ... It is set upright (again) by a formal act consisting of a motion and a resolution, *ñattidutiya-kamma*.” AN-a iv.159 explains, “(the Order) may turn it upside down by a proclamation, *kammavācā* for turning a bowl upside down, on account of which there is no receiving of alms given—not by placing it face downwards.” The phrase *pattam nikkujjati* although used in the ordinary signification above, [Kd 15.9.4](#) (*Vinaya Texts* iii.119, n. 2) is not here. A layman certainly would have had no begging bowl that could have been, literally, turned upside down. ² *asambhogam saṅghena karotu*. See above, [Kd 11.25.1](#) where non-eating with an Order goes with and is a mark of an act of suspension. ³ This passage recurs at AN iv.345. The first five qualities are also found at [Vin 1.84](#), [Vin 2.18](#).

reviles and abuses monks, if he causes monk to break with monk,¹ if he speaks dispraise of the Awakened One, if he speaks dispraise of *dhamma*, if he speaks dispraise of the Order. I allow you, monks, to turn a lay-follower's bowl upside down if he is possessed of these eight qualities.

And thus, monks, should it be turned upside down: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Licchavi Vaḍḍha is defaming the venerable Dabba the Mallian with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit.'² If it seems right to the Order, the Order may turn the Licchavi Vaḍḍha's bowl upside down, it may impose non-eating with the Order This is the motion Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Licchavi Vaḍḍha is defaming ... of falling away from moral habit. The Order is turning the Licchavi Vaḍḍha's bowl upside down, it is imposing non-eating with an Order. If the turning upside down of the Licchavi Vaḍḍha's bowl and the imposing of non-eating with the Order is pleasing to the venerable ones they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing, should speak. The Licchavi Vaḍḍha's bowl is turned upside down by the Order (and there is to be) non-eating with the Order. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.'"³

Then the venerable Ānanda, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, went up to the Licchavi Vaḍḍha's dwelling; having gone up, he spoke thus to the Licchavi Vaḍḍha: "Your bowl, friend Vaḍḍha, is turned upside down by an Order, you are non-eating with the Order." Then the Licchavi Vaḍḍha, thinking: "It is said that my bowl is turned upside down by an Order, it is said that I am non-eating with the Order," fainted and fell on that very spot. Then the Licchavi Vaḍḍha's friends and intimates, his kith and kin³ spoke thus to the Licchavi Vaḍḍha:

¹ At [Vin 2.18](#) a formal act of reconciliation may be carried out for a monk if he has the first five of these qualities in respect of householders; and it may be too if he has spoken dispraise of the awakened one, etc., to householders. ² As at [Vin 2.79](#), where a "verdict of innocence" is given for Dabba. ³ Cf. [AN i.222](#).

“Enough, Vaḍḍha, do not grieve, do not lament, we will reconcile¹ the Lord and the Order of monks.” Then the Licchavi Vaḍḍha with his wife and children, with his friends and intimates, with his kith and kin, his clothes wet, his hair wet approached the Lord; having approached, he spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, a transgression has overcome me,² in that I, foolish, misguided, wrong that I was, defamed master Dabba the Mallian with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit. For this, Lord, let the Lord acknowledge my transgression as a transgression for the sake of restraint in the future.”

“Truly a transgression overcame you, friend Vaḍḍha, in that you, foolish, misguided, wrong that you were, defamed Dabba the Mallian with an unfounded charge of falling away from moral habit. But if you, friend Vaḍḍha, having seen the transgression as a transgression, confess according to the rule, we³ acknowledge it for you. For, friend Vaḍḍha, in the discipline of the noble, this is growth: whoever having seen a transgression as a transgression, confesses it according to the rule, he attains restraint in the future.”

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Well, now monks, let the Order set upright the Licchavi Vaḍḍha’s bowl, let it grant eating with the Order. Monks, if a lay-follower is possessed of eight qualities his bowl may be set upright: if he does not try for non-receiving (of gains) by monks, if he does not try for non-profiting by monks, if he does not try for non-residence for monks, if he does not revile and abuse monks, if he does not cause monk to break with monk, if he does not speak dispraise of the Awakened One, if he does not speak dispraise of *dhamma*, if he does not speak dispraise of the Order. I allow you, monks, to set upright a lay-follower’s bowl if he is

¹ As noted at *Vinaya Texts* iii.122, n. 1 this same verb is used in [Kd 11.22.3](#) when a monk has offended against a layman. ² As at [Vin 1.315](#), [Vin 4.18–Vin.4.19](#). See [BD 2.200](#) for notes. ³ In parallel passages the first person plural is likewise used here, perhaps to emphasise that “confession according to the rule” is to be made to monks and *they* acknowledge it and are the means by which a transgression can be removed. At the same time, since Gotama seldom, as recorded, addressed laypeople as *āvuso*, friend, it is doubtful whether he is or is intended to be speaking here at all.

possessed of these eight qualities.

“And thus, monks, should it be set upright: Monks, that Licchavi Vaḍḍha, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the monks’ feet, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted them with joined palms, should speak thus to them: ‘Honoured sirs, my bowl was turned upside down by the Order, I am not eating with the Order. But I, honoured sirs, am conducting myself properly, I am subdued, I am mending my ways, and I ask the Order for the setting upright of the bowl.’ And a second time it should be asked for. And a third time it should be asked for. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Licchavi Vaḍḍha’s bowl was turned upside down by the Order, he is not eating with the Order; but he is conducting himself properly, he is subdued, he is mending his ways; he asks the Order for the setting upright of the bowl. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may set upright the Licchavi Vaḍḍha’s bowl, it may grant eating with the Order. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Licchavi Vaḍḍha’s bowl was turned upside down ... he asks the Order for setting upright the bowl. The Order is setting upright the Licchavi Vaḍḍha’s bowl, it is granting eating with the Order. If the setting upright of the Licchavi Vaḍḍha’s bowl and the granting of eating with the Order is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The Licchavi Vaḍḍha’s bowl is set upright by the Order (and there is) eating with the Order. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

Then the Lord, having stayed in Vesālī for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for the Bhaggas.¹ In due course, walking on tour, the Lord arrived at the Bhaggas. The Lord stayed there among

¹ *yena Bhaggā*. See MN ii.91 where this story also appears, going as far as BD 5.178 below, “as he was sitting at a respectful distance,” where the Majjhima version proceeds differently. See also SN iii.1 and B.C. LAW, *Tribes in Ancient India*, 1943, p.292f.

the Bhaggas on Suṃsumāra Hill¹ in the Bhesakaḷā Grove in the deer park. Now at that time Kokanada² was the name of Prince Bodhi's³ palace; it had not long been built and was as yet uninhabited by recluse or brahmin or by any human creature. Then Prince Bodhi addressed the brahmin youth, the son of Sañjikā,⁴ saying: "Come along, good son of Sañjikā, go up to the Lord; having gone up, in my name salute the Lord's feet with your head, ask whether he is well, not indisposed, of bodily vigour, strong, abiding in comfort, and say: 'Lord, Prince Bodhi salutes the Lord's feet with his head and asks whether he is well ... abiding in comfort,' and says this: 'Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with Prince Bodhi tomorrow together with the Order of monks.'"

"Very well, good sir," and the brahmin youth, Sañjikā's son, having answered Prince Bodhi in assent, approached the Lord; having approached, having exchanged greetings with the Lord, having conversed in a courteous and friendly way, sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance the brahmin youth, the son of Sanjika, spoke thus to the Lord: "Prince Bodhi salutes the revered Gotama's feet with his head ... and says may the revered Gotama consent to a meal with Prince Bodhi tomorrow together with the Order of monks." The Lord consented by becoming silent.

Then the brahmin youth, Sañjikā's son, having understood the Lord's consent, rising from his seat approached Prince Bodhi; having approached, he spoke thus to Prince Bodhi: "I spoke, good sir, in your name to the Lord Gotama, saying: 'Prince Bodhi salutes ... together with the Order of monks.' And the recluse Gotama consented." Then Prince Bodhi towards the end of that night, having had sumptuous foods, solid and soft, prepared, and having had Kokanada palace

¹ SN-a ii.249 says that it was called Crocodile Hill because as it was being built a crocodile made a noise, the Bhesakaḷā Grove was called after a *yakkhinī* who lived there. ² Lotus. See BD 3.139, n. and MN-a iii.321. ³ Dhp 157 is said to have been uttered on his account, see Dhp-a iii.134. ⁴ *Sañjikāputta*. See Dhp-a iii.134, where he warned the architect that Bodhi contemplated killing or maiming him so that he could never build another palace like Kokanada.

strewn with white cloths as far as the last flight of stairs,¹ spoke thus to the brahmin youth, the son of Sañjikā: “Come you along, good fellow, approach the Lord; having approached, announce the time to the Lord, saying: ‘It is time, Lord, the meal is ready.’”

“Very well, good sir,” and the brahmin youth, Sañjikā’s son, having answered Prince Bodhi in assent, approached the Lord; having approached, he announced the time to the Lord, saying: “It is time, good Gotama, the meal is ready.” Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached Prince Bodhi’s dwelling. Now at the time when the Lord was coming Prince Bodhi was standing at the porch of the outside gateway. Prince Bodhi saw the Lord coming in the distance, and seeing him, having gone from there to meet him, having greeted the Lord, having honoured him, he approached Kokanada palace. Then the Lord stood still at the last flight of stairs. Then Prince Bodhi spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, let the Lord tread on² the cloths, let the well-farer tread on the cloths so that it may be for a long time for my blessing and happiness.” When he had spoken thus the Lord became silent. And a second time ... And a third time Prince Bodhi spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, let the Lord tread on ... for my blessing and happiness.” Then the Lord looked towards the venerable Ānanda. Then the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to Prince Bodhi:

“Let the cloths, prince, be packed away, the Lord will not tread upon the cloth carpeting,³ the Truth-finder has compassion⁴ for the folk who come after.”⁵

Then Prince Bodhi, having had the cloths packed away, had a seat made ready upstairs in Kokanada.⁶ Then the Lord having ascended

¹ Cf. MN ii.92, MN iii.1. ² *akkamatu*. MN ii.92 reads *abhirūhatu*. ³ *celapattikā*. For a monk to do so was apparently an auspice that the householder would have a child. ⁴ *anukampati*, MN ii.93 *apaloketi*, DhP-a iii.136 *oloketi*. The legend is that Gotama knew that Bodhi would have no children because in a former birth, while he was living on an island, he ate and cooked birds (MN-a iii.322, DhP-a iii.137). He therefore would not bring monks into contempt by walking on the cloths when he knew Bodhi would have no child (Vin-a 1209). ⁵ *pacchimā janatā*. See BD 1.66, n. 1 for further references. ⁶ MN ii.93 reads *Kokanade pāsāde*.

the Kokanada palace, sat down together with the Order of monks on the seat made ready. Then Prince Bodhi, having with his own hand served and satisfied with sumptuous foods, solid and soft, the Order of monks with the Awakened One at its head, when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from the bowl, sat down at a respectful distance.¹ Then the Lord, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Prince Bodhi as he was sitting at a respectful distance with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, departed. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “**Monks, you should not tread on a cloth carpeting.**”² **Whoever should tread on one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time a certain woman who had had a miscarriage, having invited monks, having had cloth prepared, spoke thus: “Revered sirs, tread on the cloth.” The monks, being scrupulous, did not tread on it. She said: “Revered sirs, tread on the cloth for good luck’s sake.” The monks, being scrupulous, did not tread on it. Then that woman spread it about, saying: “How can these masters (although) being asked for good luck’s sake not tread on the cloth carpeting?” Monks heard this woman who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Householders, monks, look out for lucky signs.³ I allow you, monks, when being asked by householders for good luck’s sake, to tread on a cloth carpeting.”

Now at that time monks were doubtful whether to tread on a

¹ Majjhima version goes on differently from here. ² Quoted at MN-a iii.323. Vin-a 1209 says that he laid down this rule in case a monk should tread on one not knowing whether the householder would have a child or not; and that he did it to safeguard the monks from the householders’ contempt should there not be a child after they had trodden on the cloth carpeting. ³ *gihī maṅgalikā*, as at Kd 15.33.3. See also Commentary on Kd 1.2.2. Quoted at MN-a iii.323.

sheet for use after feet had been washed.⁴ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you; monks, to tread on a sheet for use after feet have been washed.”

The Second Portion for Repeating¹

Then the Lord having stayed among the Bhaggas for as long as he found suiting set out on tour for Sāvattthī. Walking on tour in due course he arrived at Sāvattthī. The Lord stayed there at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, taking a small jar² and a (clay foot-) scrubber³ and a broom, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, she sat down at a respectful distance. As she was sitting down at a respectful distance, Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may the Lord accept my little jar and (clay foot-) scrubber and broom so that it may be for a long time for my blessing and happiness.” The Lord accepted the little jar and the broom; the Lord did not accept the (clay foot-) scrubber. Then the Lord gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, with talk on *dhamma*. Then Visākhā, Migāra’s mother gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, rising from her seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping her right side towards him. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, a little jar and a broom. **Monks, you should not make use of a (clay foot-) scrubber. Whoever should make use**

⁴ *dhotapādaka*. Vin-a 1209 says “it is a sheet spread out for treading on after the feet have been washed at the place for washing feet.” Monks were allowed to tread on this, and evidently no symbolic meaning was attached. ¹ As pointed out at *Vinaya Texts* iii.130, n. 1 “there is no mention in the text of where the first such Portion ends.” ² *ghaṭaka*. ³ *kataka*. This is one of the two things made of clay not allowed at [Kd 15.37](#). Vin-a 1209 says “it is made, having raised up protuberances, for rubbing the feet; it may be round or four-sided; it is forbidden as a thing connected with luxury, it must not be accepted nor made use of.”

of one, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow, monks, three (kinds of) foot-rubbers:⁴ a stone,⁵ a pebble,⁶ sea-scum.”⁷

Then Visākḥā, Migāra’s mother, taking a fan¹ and a palmyra-whisk,² approached the Lord ... (as in [Kd 15.22.1](#)) ... The Lord accepted the fan and the palmyra-whisk ... Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow, monks, a fan and a palmyra-whisk.”

Now at that time a mosquito-fan³ accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a mosquito-fan.” A chowry-fan⁴ accrued. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a chowry-fan should not be used. Whoever should use one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, three (kinds of) fans: made of bark, made of khus-khus,⁵ made of peacocks’ tail feathers.”

Now at that time a sunshade⁶ accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a sunshade.”

Now at that time the group of six monks toured about having put up their sunshades. Now at that time a certain lay-follower went to a pleasure grove⁷ together with several disciples of Naked Ascetics. These disciples of Naked Ascetics saw the group of six monks coming in the distance with their sunshades up; seeing them, they spoke thus

⁴ *pādaghamsanī*. ⁵ *sakkharā*. Here Vin-a 1209 says it is called a stone, *pāsāṇa*. Word also at [Vin 3.147](#)=Ja ii.284; see [BD 1.250, n. 1](#). ⁶ *kaṭhala*. Cf. *sakkharakaṭhala* at [DN i.84, AN i.9](#). ⁷ *samuddaṭṭhaka*. This may be the name of a bone; cf. *phañaka* among the “bones” at [Vism 254, Vb-a 237](#). *Vinaya Texts* iii.131, n. 2 says that the word designates “the bones of the cuttle-fish.” ¹ *vidhūpana*. See [BD 3.253, n. 3](#). ² *tālavaṇṭa*. Vin-a 1210 says this is made with palmyra palm leaves or it may be made with bamboo, ivory and bamboo chips, or with peacocks’ tail feathers or with hides. Cf. *tālavaṇṭaka* at [Kd 15.29.4](#). ³ *makasavijānī*. Vin-a 1210 says it is a little stick made of horn, made of ivory. It is difficult to know the difference intended by the two words, *vidhūpana* and *vijānī*, both here translated as “fan.” At [Vin 4.263](#) the former is defined by the latter. ⁴ *camaravijānī*. *Camara* is a yak. Its bushy tail is made into a fan or whisk to drive the flies away. ⁵ *usīra*; see [BD 2.228, n. 1](#). ⁶ Defined at [Vin 4.200, Vin 4.338](#). ⁷ Defined at [Vin 4.298](#).

to that lay-follower: “These revered sirs of yours, master, are coming along with their sunshades up like a group of chief ministers.”

“These, masters, are not monks, they are wanderers.” They made a bet as to whether they were monks or not. Then that lay-follower, having recognised them as they came up, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these revered sirs tour about with their sunshades up?” Monks heard that lay-follower who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks, ...?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a sunshade should not be used.¹ Whoever should use one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time a certain monk came to be ill²; there came to be no comfort for him without a sunshade. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a sunshade to one who is ill.” Now at that time monks, thinking: “A sunshade is allowed by the Lord to one who is ill, but not to one who is not ill,” were doubtful whether to use a sunshade in the monastery and monastery precincts. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a sunshade to be used in a monastery and monastery precincts both by one who is ill and by one who is not ill.”

Now at that time a certain monk, having tied up his bowl with string,³ having hung it on his walking staff,⁴ passed at the wrong time⁵ through a certain village gateway. People, saying: “This, masters, is a thief who is coming, his sword is gleaming,”⁶ having followed him and seized him, let him go on recognising him. Then this

¹ Nuns are not allowed to use them, [Vin 4.338](#). Cf. [DN i.7](#) where it is said that Gotama refrains from using them, but see *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.13, n. 2 which maintains, “This is not quite accurate.” [Vin-a 1210](#) says in all cases a sunshade made of one leaf is meant. ² Cf. [Vin 4.337–Vin.4.338](#) (of a nun). ³ For similar phraseology cf. [Kd 15.8.1](#). ⁴ *daṇḍa* is defined at [Vin 4.200](#). ⁵ Cf. [Vin 4.164](#) ([BD 3.82f.](#)). ⁶ Cf. [MN i.86](#).

monk, having gone back to the monastery, told this matter to the monks.

“But did you, your reverence, carry a walking staff with string on it?”

“Yes, your reverences.” Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this monk carry a walking staff with string on it?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks, ...?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a walking staff with string on it should not be carried. Whoever should carry one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time a certain monk came to be ill; he was not able to tour about without a walking staff. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to give an agreement as to a walking staff to a monk who is ill. And thus, monks, should it be given: That ill monk, having approached the Order, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak thus to it: ‘I, honoured sirs, am ill; I am not able to tour about without a walking staff, so I, honoured sirs, ask the Order for the agreement as to a walking staff.’ And a second time it should be asked for. And a third time it should be asked for. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk So-and-so is ill; he is not able to tour about without a walking staff; he asks the Order for the agreement as to a walking staff. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may give the agreement as to a walking staff to the monk So-and-so. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk ... as to a walking staff. The Order is giving the monk So-and-so the agreement as to a walking staff. If the giving to the monk So-and-so of the agreement as to a walking staff is pleasing to the

venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The agreement as to a walking staff is given by the Order to the monk So-and-so. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

Now at that time a certain monk came to be ill; he was not able to carry his bowl about without string. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to give an ill monk the agreement as to string. And thus, monks, should it be given. That ill monk ... (as in Kd 15.24.2. *Instead of* to tour about without a walking staff, etc., *read* to carry his bowl about without string, etc.) ‘... Thus do I understand this.’”

Now at that time a certain monk came to be ill; he was not able to tour about without a walking staff nor was he able to carry his bowl about without string. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to give an ill monk the agreement as to a walking staff and string. And thus, monks, should it be given: That ill monk ... (as in Kd 15.24.2. *Read*: I am not able to tour about without a walking staff nor am I able to carry my bowl about without string, etc.) ‘... Thus do I understand this.’”

Now at that time a certain monk was a ruminator;¹ he ate ruminating continually. Monks ... spread it about, saying: “This monk is partaking of a meal at the wrong time.”² Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, this monk has recently passed on from the womb of a cow. I allow, monks, rumination for a ruminator. **But, monks, one should not eat (anything), having brought it back from the mouth³ to outside of it. Whoever should (so) eat should be dealt with according to the rule⁴.**”

¹ *Romanthaka*. ² See Bu-Pc 37. ³ *mukhadvāra* as at Bu-Pc 40 and Bu-Sk 41. ⁴ I.e. according to Bu-Pc 37 or Bu-Pc 38.

Now at that time a certain guild had food for an Order; many heaps of boiled rice were allowed to fall in a refectory. People ... spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, on being given boiled rice, not accept it carefully?"⁵ Each one of these heaps of boiled rice is the result of a hundredfold labour." Monks heard these people ... who spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, if anything falls that is being given to you,¹ to make use of it having picked it up yourselves, for it is left behind (for you), monks, by benefactors."

Now at that time a certain monk walked for almsfood with long (finger-) nails.² A certain woman, having seen him, spoke thus to that monk: "Come, honoured sir, indulge in sexual intercourse."

"No, sister, that is not allowable."

"If you do not, honoured sir, I will now, having scratched my limbs with my own nails, make a row,³ saying, 'this monk has maltreated me.'"

"You, sister, understand that." Then that woman, having scratched her limbs with her own nails, made a row, saying, "This monk has maltreated me." People, having run up, took hold of that monk. But these people saw skin and blood on that woman's nails; seeing this, they said: "This is the work of this woman herself, the monk is innocent," and they let go of that monk. Then that monk, having gone back to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. They said: "But do you, your reverence, wear long nails?"

"Yes, your reverences." Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can this monk wear long nails?" Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Monks, long nails should not be worn.⁴ Whoever should wear

⁵ *sakkaccaṃ*, duly, properly, carefully, respectfully. ¹ Buddhaghosa says that this is explained in the Bhojanavagga (Vin 4.69-Vin.4.90). ² Nails are defined at Vism 250f. ³ *kuppa*, explained by Buddhaghosa as *sadda*, noise. ⁴ Vin-a 1210 points out that the cutting of the nails was allowed for reasons of self-protection.

them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time monks cut⁵ their nails with their nails and they cut their nails with their mouth and they rubbed them down on a wattle and daub wall; their fingers became painful. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, cutting of the nails.” They cut their nails down to the blood; their fingers became painful. “I allow you, monks, to cut your nails down to the height¹ of the flesh.”

Now at that time the group of six monks had their twenty (nails) polished. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not have your twenty (nails) polished. Whoever should do so, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to remove the dirt only.”

Now at that time monks’ hair² came to be long. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “But, monks, are the monks able to cut one another’s hair?”

“They are able (to do so), Lord.” Then the Lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow, monks, a razor, a whetstone, a razor-case,³ a piece of felt,⁴ and all a barber’s equipment.”⁵

Now at that time the group of six monks had their beards trimmed,⁶ they made their beards grow (long⁷), they had them shaped like

⁵ *chindati*, to cut off, to cut down, to remove, to destroy. But as Vin-a 1210 says there was no offence in cutting the nails by means of the nails and so on. I do not think we need translate *chindati* by “tore off” as at *Vinaya Texts* iii.137. ¹ *pamāṇa*, measure; often, as in “the *pamāṇa* of an average man,” meaning height. ² *kesa*, defined at Vism 249f. ³ *khurasipāṭika*, explained at Vin-a 1210 as *khurakosaka*, a little sheath for a razor. ⁴ *namataka*, as at Kd 15.11.1; Kd 15.19.1; Kd 20.10.4. ⁵ *khurabhaṇḍa*, as at Vin 1.249. See BD 4.345, n. 5. Cf. *tantabhaṇḍa* at Kd 15.28.2. ⁶ *massum kappāpentī*. Vin-a 1211 says *kattariyā massum chedāpentī*, caused their beards to be cut off with scissors (or with a knife). ⁷ Added at Vin-a 1211.

a goat's beard,⁸ they had them shaped into four corners,⁹ they had the hair on their chests shaped,¹⁰ they had the hair on their stomachs shaped,¹¹ they arranged whiskers, they had the hair on their bodies removed.¹ People ... spread it about, saying: "Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses." They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, you should not have your beards trimmed ... you should not have the hair of your bodies removed. Whoever should have it removed there is an offence of wrong-doing.**"²

Now at that time a certain monk came to have a sore on a certain part of his body;³ the medicament would not adhere. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to remove the hair on the body in the case of illness."

Now at that time the group of six monks had the hair of their heads cut off with scissors. People ... spread it about, saying: "Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses." They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, you should not have the hair of your heads cut off with scissors. Whoever should (so) have it cut off, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**"

Now at that time a certain monk came to have a sore on his head; he was not able to shave the hair of his head with a razor. They told

⁸ *golomikaṃ kārāpentī*. Vin-a 1211 says, "having made them long on the chin, they are called: arranged as a goat's beard, *ḷakamassuka*." ⁹ *caturassakan ti catukoṇaṃ*, Vin-a 1211. ¹⁰ *parimukhaṃ kārāpentī*, of which Vin-a 1211 says this was a growing, gathering, collecting (therefore a cutting), *saṃharaṇa*, into lines of the hair of the chest. ¹¹ *aḍḍharuka*. Vin-a 1211 says "an arrangement into lines of the hair on the stomach." ¹ *sambādhe lomaṃ saṃharāpentī*. See note but one above on *saṃharaṇa*. Corresponding rule for nuns at Nuns' **Bi-Pc 2** and where *sambādha* is defined. I think *saṃharāpentī* is more correctly to remove (thus cutting into a shape) than "grow" (a meaning given above), in view of the other "shapings," and also because of the objections levelled at the nuns and also, above, at the monks. ² As Vin-a 1211 notes there is a *dukkaṭa* for the shaping of the beard and everything else. ³ *sambādhe* which, as defined in Nuns' **Bi-Pc 2** means the armpits and private parts.

this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to cut off the hair of the head with scissors in the case of illness.”

Now at that time monks wore the hair in their nostrils long. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like demon-worshippers.”⁴ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, you should not wear the hair in your nostrils long. Whoever should (so) wear it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks had the hair in their nostrils taken out with pieces of crystal¹ and by means of beeswax; their nostrils became painful. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, tweezers.”²

Now at that time the group of six monks had grey hairs³ taken out. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, you should not have grey hairs taken out. Whoever should have them taken out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time a certain monk’s ears were stopped with wax. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, an instrument for removing dirt from the ears.”⁴

Now at that time the group of six monks used various kinds of instruments for removing dirt from the ears, made of gold, made of silver. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, various kinds of instruments for removing dirt from the ears should not be used. Whoever should use (these), there is an**

⁴ *pisācillika*, as at Kd 3.12.3, Kd 15.10.2. ¹ *sakkharikā*. Cf. Kd 6.14.5, *loṇa-sak-*.

² *saṅḍāsa* as at MN ii.75, Ja i.138. ³ *palita*. Cf. *palitakesi* at MN i.88. MN-a ii.60, *paṇḍarakesa*. ⁴ Allowed again below, Kd 15.28.2.

offence of wrong-doing. I allow them, monks, (to be) made of bone, made of ivory, made of horn, made of reeds, made of bamboo, made of a piece of stick, made of lac, made of crystal, made of copper, made of the centre of a conchshell.”⁵

5.28.1 Now at that time monks made a large store of copper goods, of bronze goods. People touring the dwelling-place, having seen this, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans make a large store of copper goods, of bronze goods like dealers in bronze?”¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a store of copper goods, of bronze goods should not be made. Whoever should make one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

5.28.2
5.188 Now at that time monks were (too) scrupulous to use an ointment box² and an ointment stick³ and an instrument for removing dirt from the ears⁴ and a handle.⁵ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, an ointment box ... a handle.”

Now at that time the group of six monks sat down lolling⁶ on their outer cloaks,⁷ the cotton cloth⁸ of the outer cloaks gave way.⁹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, you should not sit down lolling on outer cloaks. Whoever should (so) sit down, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

⁵ As at [Kd 6.12.1](#), [Kd 6.12.3](#); [Kd 15.11.1](#), etc. ¹ *kaṃsapattharikā*. Vin-a 1211 explains as *kaṃsabhaṇḍavānija*, merchants in bronze goods. ² *añjanī*, allowed at [Kd 6.12.1](#), [Kd 6.12.2](#), [Kd 6.12.4](#). ³ Allowed at [Kd 6.12.3](#). ⁴ Allowed at [Kd 15.27.6](#). ⁵ *bandhanamatta*. Meaning uncertain. Vin-a 1211 says a *bandhanamatta* for a *vāsikat-tarayaṭṭhikādīnaṃ*, a knife and mendicant’s staff. Or should *kattara* read *kattarī*, scissors? We should then get “a stick for knife and scissors.” Cf. *bandhanamattaṃ* at [Kd 5.11.1](#), [Kd 7.1.5](#), but in both passages it seems to have a different meaning from above. ⁶ Cf. [Bu-Sk 26](#) where “lolling” is defined as lolling on the hands, lolling on cloths. ⁷ As at [Kd 14.4.7](#) (end). ⁸ Read *paṭṭā* instead of text’s *pattā*, as noted at *Vinaya Texts* iii.141, n. 6. ⁹ As at [Kd 8.21.1](#) where a remedy is “allowed”. See [BD 4.424](#). *Lujjanti*, “gave way,” occurs also at [Kd 15.16.2](#), [Kd 15.17.2](#) and is there translated “fell in.”

Now at that time a certain monk came to be ill; there was no comfort for him without a bandage.¹⁰ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a bandage.” Then it occurred to monks: “Now how should a bandage be made?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a loom, shuttles, strings, tickets and all the equipment for a loom.”

Now at that time a certain monk entered a village for alms-food without his waistband; on a carriage road his inner robe dropped down.¹ People shouted out² and that monk became ashamed. Then that monk, having gone back to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, you should not enter a village without your waistband. Whoever should (so) enter one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, a waistband.”³

Now at that time the group of six monks wore various kinds of waistbands: those of many strands,⁴ those like the head of a water-snake,⁵ those like tambourine drums,⁶ those like chains.⁷ People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, various kinds of waistbands should not be worn: those of many strands ... those like chains. Whoever should wear one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**⁸ I allow, monks, two (kinds of) waist-

¹⁰ *āyoga*, as at [Vin 3.257](#), [Vin 4.170](#). See [BD 2.144](#), n. 2. ¹ *pabhassittha*, as at [Vin 4.159](#).

² As at [Vin 4.345](#). ³ Taken for granted at [Kd 1.25.9](#), [Kd 1.25.10](#). ⁴ *kalābuka*. [Vin-a 1211](#) explains by *bahurajjuka*. ⁵ *deḍḍubhakaṃ nāma udakasappiṣṣasadisaraṃ*, so [Vin-a 1211](#). ⁶ *muraja*. [Vin-a 1211](#) says they are made, having twisted the shape into a tambourine drum (*vaṭṭa*, circle, round). ⁷ *maddaviṇa*. [Vin-a 1211](#) (reading *-vāṇa*) says *pāmaṅgasanthānaṃ*. Cf. [Kd 15.2.1](#) where *pāmaṅga* occurs. See also [BD 1.77](#), n. 9.

⁸ [Buddhaghosa](#) says there must not be even one of these, much less many.

bands: a strip of cotton cloth,⁹ one with a well made end.”¹⁰

The borders of a waistband wore out. “I allow, monks, those like tambourine drums, those like chains.” The end of a waistband wore out. “I allow, monks, a sewing round,¹ a knotting.”² The end of a waistband where it was looped³ wore out. “I allow, monks, a buckle.”⁴

Now at that time the group of six monks wore various kinds of buckles, made of gold, made of silver. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, various kinds of buckles should not be worn. Who ever should wear one, there is a offence of wrong-doing.** I allow them, monks, (to be) made of bone ... made of the inside of a conchshell, made of thread.”⁵

Now at that time the venerable Ānanda having put on light-weight upper robes,⁶ entered a village for almsfood; his upper robes were blown up by gusts of wind.⁷ Then the venerable Ānanda, having gone back to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. The

⁹ *paṭṭikā*. Vin-a 1211 explains that here it is a *paṭṭikā* that is woven ordinarily or that is woven in the fish and thorn design (? *macchakaṅṭhakavāyimā*), and it continues, “there are to be no divisions into *kuñjaracchikādi*,” *Kuñja* is a hollow. ¹⁰ *sūkarantaka*. *Vinaya Texts* iii.143 “do not venture to translate the term,” and its meaning is extremely doubtful. Vin-a 1211 has variant reading *sūkaraṅḍaka*, and also (at Vin 2.319) *sukarantaka*, which I adopt as the most intelligible, although possibly not the most correct reading. Vin-a 1211 explains by saying it is fashioned into a well made (*sūkara*) round case for a key. ¹ *sobhaṇa*. Vin-a 1212 says “having twisted it, there is the sewing of a circular end,” *mukhavatṭhisibbana*. ² *guṇaka*. Cf. *saguṇaṃ katvā* at **Kd 1.25.9**. Vin-a 1212 says “a sewing after the style of *muddikā* (i.e. a signet ring, a bunch of grapes; or *muddika*, an accountant may be meant—one who ties coins, etc., into knots in his waistband?). ³ *pavananta*. ⁴ *vidha*, as at **Bu-Pc 86.2.2**. See **BD 3.89, n. 1**. ⁵ This last, thread, is in addition to the usual list as given above, e.g. at **Kd 15.27.6**. ⁶ *saṅghāṭiyo* as it is in the plural must refer to more than the outer cloak; and since the verb *pārupati* is used the reference is probably to this and to the upper robe. ⁷ Cf. **Vin 4.345**.

monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a block,⁸ something to tie.”⁹

Now at that time the group of six monks used various kinds of blocks, made of gold, made of silver. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, various kinds of blocks should not be used. Whoever should use them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow them, monks, (to be) made of bone ... made of thread.”

Now at that time monks inserted blocks and things to tie into their robes; the robes wore out. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a shield¹ for the blocks, a shield for the things to tie.” They inserted the shields for the blocks and the shields for the things to tie at the edge (of the robe); a corner was revealed. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to insert a shield for the blocks at the edge; to insert a shield for the things to tie having taken it back seven finger breadths or eight finger breadths.”

Now at that time the group of six monks dressed in householders’ under garments: “the elephant’s trunk,”² “the fish’s tail,”³ “the four corner arrangement,”⁴ “the palmyra whisk arrangement,”⁵ “the hun-

⁸ *gaṇṭhikā*. See [BD 3.88, n. 4](#). ⁹ *pāsaka*, perhaps a bow for the dress. Cf. [Thig.411](#) and [MORRIS, Journal of the Pali Text Society 1893, p.45](#). ¹ *phalaka*, perhaps a slip of wood or bark as in *phalakacira*, used in making an ascetic’s dress, [Vin 1.305](#), [DN i.167](#). ² *hatthisoṇḍaka*. [Vin-a 1212](#) says dressed, having made an appendage (hanging down) in the form of an elephant’s trunk. ³ *macchavālaka*. [Vin-a 1212](#) says dressed, having hung the edge of the border on one side, the edge of the tie on the other. ⁴ [Vin-a 1212](#) explains there were two above and two below, hence showing four corners when clothed thus. ⁵ *tālavaṇṭaka*. Cf. [Kd 15.22.2](#). [Vin-a 1212](#) says that when clothed one suspends the outer cloak in the manner of a palmrya whisk.

dred jungle ropes.”⁶ People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not dress in householders’ under garments: ‘the elephant’s trunk’ ... ‘the hundred jungle ropes’.** Whoever should (so) dress, there is an offence of wrongdoing.”

Now at that time the group of six monks put on¹ householders’ upper garments.² People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not put on householders’ upper garments. Whoever should put one on, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time the group of six monks dressed in loincloths.³ People ... spread it about, saying: “Like a king’s shaven bearers with coils.”⁴ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not dress in loincloths. Whoever should (so) dress, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

⁶ *satavallikā*. Cf. *vallikā* at **Kd 15.2.1** where although the word may mean ear ornaments, these may be formed like jungle ropes. See also **Kd 15.16.2**. Vin-a 1212 says dressed by making a bracelet (-like arrangement), *ovaṭṭika*, having folded over the long outer cloak a number of times; or, dressed showing continual jungle ropes at the left and right sides. If one or two jungle ropes appear from the knee it is all right. Cf. *ovaṭṭika* at **Kd 15.2.1**. ¹ On *pārupati* and *nivāseti*, put on and dress in, see **BD 2.32, n. 2, n. 3**. ² Buddhaghosa enumerates a number of upper garments which he classifies as householders’, including a Jain’s, a wanderer’s, a one-cloth ascetic’s, and a brahmin’s. ³ *saṃvelliyaṃ*. Cf. *saṃvelliyaṃ kaṭṭisuttakaṃ* at **Kd 20.16.2**. Vin-a 1212 says that they dressed having tied on long grass, *kaccha*, like wrestlers and workmen, and that it is explained in the *Sekhiyas* that a monk must be dressed having covered up the three circles all round. (See **Bu-Sk 1, Bu-Sk 2**). ⁴ *muṇḍavaṭṭi*. Vin-a 1213 (with variant reading *-veṭhi*) says “the meaning is people going anywhere for a king and carrying goods and equipment”. The coils *vaṭṭi*, would be the pads they wear on their heads to support the burden.

Now at that time the group of six monks carried a double carrying-pole.⁵ People ... spread it about, saying: “Like a king’s shaven bearers with coils.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not carry a double carrying-pole. Whoever should carry one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, a single carrying-pole, a carrying-pole for two bearers,⁶ a weight (carried) on the head, a weight (carried) on the shoulders, a weight (carried) on the hips, one hung on.”

Now at that time monks did not chew⁷ tooth-wood⁸; their mouths came to smell nasty. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, there are these five disadvantages in not chewing tooth-wood¹: it is bad for the eyes, the mouth becomes nasty smelling, the channels of taste are not purified, phelgm and mucus get on food, one’s food is not enjoyed. These, monks, are the five disadvantages of not chewing tooth-wood. Monks, there are there five advantages in chewing tooth-wood: it is good for the eyes, the mouth does not become nasty smelling, the channels of taste are purified, phelgm and mucus do not get on food, one’s food is enjoyed. These, monks, are the five advantages of chewing tooth-wood. I allow, monks, tooth-wood.”

Now at that time the group of six monks chewed long pieces of tooth-wood; they even flicked novices with these. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, a long piece of tooth-wood should not be chewed. Whoever should chew one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, a piece of tooth-wood to be eight finger breadths (in length) at the most. **And a novice should not be flicked with it. Whoever should flick him, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

⁵ I.e. with the weight at each end. Cf. *kāja* at **Kd 1.20.19**. ⁶ *antarākāja*, which Vin-a 1213 explains as one having the weight in the middle and that may be transported by two (men). ⁷ *khādanti*, eat. ⁸ *dantakaṭṭha*, used in cleaning the teeth. ¹ As at AN iii.250.

Now at that time as a certain monk was chewing a piece of tooth-wood that was too short it became lodged in his throat. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, too short a piece of tooth-wood should not be chewed. Whoever should chew one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, a piece of tooth-wood to be four finger breadths (in length) at the least.”

^{5:32.1}
^{5:193} Now at that time the group of six monks set fire to a forest.² People ... spread it about, saying: “Like forest firers.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a forest should not be set on fire. Whoever should set one on fire, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time dwelling-places were tangled over with grass.¹ As the forest fires were burning (forests and so on) they burned the dwelling-places. Monks were doubtful whether to make a counter-fire² to give protection. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, if a forest fire is burning, to make a counter-fire to give protection.”

^{5:32.2} Now at that time the group of six monks climbed a tree and jumped from tree to tree. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like monkeys.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a tree should not be climbed. Whoever should climb one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time an elephant infested the way of a certain monk who was going to Sāvattthī through the Kosalan districts. Then that monk rushed up to the foot of a certain tree (but) being scrupulous did not climb the tree; the elephant went off by another (track).

² As at Vin 3.85. ¹ As at AN i.153, AN iii.128. ² *paṭaggim dātum*. Cf. Ja i.212. Vin-a 1214 says having made the ground square, it is possible to convey grass there and dig it in carefully, and having broken off damp branches to cool down the fire.

Then that monk, having reached Sāvattḥī, told this matter to the monks. (The monks told this matter to the Lord).³ He said: “I allow you, monks, if there is a reason, to climb a tree to the height of a man, and as high as you like in cases of distress.”⁴

Now at that time Yameḷu and Tekula⁵ were the names of two monks who were brothers, brahmins by birth, with lovely voices, with lovely enunciation. They approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, these monks spoke thus to the Lord: “At present, Lord, monks of various names, various clans, various social strata have gone forth from various families; these corrupt the speech of the Awakened One in (using) his own dialect.¹ Now we, Lord, give the speech of the Awakened One in metrical form.”² The Awakened One, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“How can you, foolish men, speak thus: ‘Now we, Lord, give the speech of the Awakened One in metrical form’? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, the speech of the Awakened One should not be given in metrical form. Whoever should (so) give it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to learn the speech of the Awakened One according to his own dialect.”

³ Omitted in the text. ⁴ Such as seeing wild animals, forest fires, or approaching floods, or such as wanting to see the right direction if one is on the wrong road (so Vin-a 1214). ⁵ Yameḷutekulā. This compound should possibly be resolved into Yameḷa and Utekuḷa, but is taken as reproduced above by *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* (under Tekuḷa) and *Vinaya Texts* iii.149, q.v. note 3. These monks are mentioned nowhere but here, I think. ¹ sakāya niruttīyā. Vin-a 1214 says the current Magadhese manner of speech according to the awakened one. Cf. nirutti at MN iii.234. ² chandaso āropema. Vin-a 1214 explains, “we give (āropema) a way of speech according to the honoured dialect (or vernacular, sakkata bhāsā) like a Veda”. Sakkata, variant reading sakkata, may be Sanskrit. See four reasons for supposing so at *Vinaya Texts* iii.150, n. Cf. Sāvittḥī chandaso mukhaṃ at Snp 568, Vin 1.246, and chando nidānaṃ gāthānaṃ at SN i.38.

Now at that time the group of six monks learnt metaphysics.³ People ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Now, monks, can one who sees the essence (as being) in metaphysics attain to growth, increase, maturity in this *dhamma* and discipline?”

“This is not so, Lord.”

“Or could one who sees the essence (as being) in this *dhamma* and discipline learn metaphysics?”

“This is not so, Lord.”

“Monks, metaphysics should not be learnt. Whoever should learn them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time the group of six monks taught metaphysics. People ... “... **offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time the group of six monks learnt worldly knowledge.¹ People ... “... **offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time the group of six monks taught worldly knowledge. People ... “... **offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time the Lord, surrounded by a large assembly, sneezed while he was teaching *dhamma*. Monks, saying: “Lord, may the

³ *lokāyata*, name of a branch of brahmin learning, probably metaphysics. See *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.166–172; *Vinaya Texts* iii.151, n. 2; **BD 3.83, n. 1**. Word also occurs at AN i.163, AN i.166, AN iii.223, Snp p.105, MN ii.147. Vin-a 1214 says “it means everything is rejected, everything is unrejected; it is the lore of other sects, connected with what is utterly groundless and which says by this or that method a crow is white, a crane is black.” ¹ *tiracchānavijjā*. Learnt and then taught by the group of six nuns at **Vin 4.305–6**; a *pācittiya* for them. The Old Commentary, on these Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 49, Bi-Pc 50**, defines both *tiracchānavijjā* and *pariyāpuṇāti*, “learn.” See **BD 3.337–9** and notes there.

Lord live (long), may the wellfarer live (long),” made a loud noise, a great noise; the talk on *dhamma* was interrupted by this noise. Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Now, monks, when (the phrase) ‘Long life’ is spoken to one who has sneezed, can he for this reason live or die?”

“That is not so, Lord.”

“Monks, ‘Long life’ should not be said to one who has sneezed. Whoever should say it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time people said “May you live (long), honoured sirs” to monks who had sneezed. The monks, being scrupulous, did not respond. People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans not respond when (the phrase) ‘May you live (long), honoured sirs’ is being spoken to them?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, householders like lucky signs.¹ I allow you, monks, when (the phrase) ‘May you live (long), honoured sirs’ is being spoken to you by householders to say, ‘Long life’ (to them).”

Now at that time the Lord, surrounded by a large assembly, was teaching *dhamma* sitting down. A certain monk had eaten garlic;² he sat down to one side, thinking: “In case the monks are incommoded.” The Lord saw that monk who was sitting down at one side; seeing him, he addressed the monks, saying: “Monks, why is this monk sitting to one side?”

“Lord, this monk has eaten garlic, so he sat down at one side, thinking: ‘In case the monks are incommoded’.”

“But, monks, should that be eaten which, when eaten, can (make the eater) outside such a *dhamma*-talk as this?”

“That is not so, Lord.”

“Monks, garlic should not be eaten. Whoever should eat it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”³

¹ As at **Kd 15.21.4.** ² *lasuṇa*, defined at **Vin 4.259.** ³ A *Pācittiya* for nuns, Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 1.**

Now at that time the venerable Sāriputta had wind in his stomach. Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great approached the venerable Sāriputta; having approached, he spoke thus to the venerable Sāriputta: “When you had wind in your stomach before, reverend Sāriputta, by what means did you get comfort?”

“I had garlic, your reverence.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to eat garlic in the case of illness.”⁴

5:35-1 Now at that time monks relieved themselves here, there and everywhere in a monastery; the monastery was soiled. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you monks, to relieve yourselves at one side.” The monastery became nasty smelling. “I allow you, monks, a vessel.” Sitting down, it was painful. “I allow, monks, urinal shoes.”¹ The urinal shoes were public;² monks were ashamed to relieve themselves. “I allow, monks, three (kinds of) fences to fence them in: a fence of bricks, a fence of stones, a fence of wood.” The vessel being uncovered became nasty smelling. “I allow, monks, a lid.”

5:35-2 Now at that time monks evacuated here, there and everywhere in a monastery ... (as in **Kd 15.35.1**) ... The monastery became nasty smelling. “I allow, monks, a cesspool.” The facing of the cesspool fell in.³ “I allow you, monks, to pile up three (kinds of) pilings: a piling of bricks, a piling of stones, a piling of wood.” The cesspool was too low to the ground⁴ ... “... I allow, monks, a balustrade.” Sitting inside, they fell off. “I allow you, monks, to evacuate having spread (something) and made a hole in the middle.” Sitting down, it was painful. “I allow you, monks, privy shoes.”

5:35-3 They evacuated outside. “I allow, monks, a trough.” There was no wood for scraping. “I allow, monks, wood for scraping.” There was no receptacle⁵ for scraping. “I allow, monks, a receptacle (for the wood) for scraping.” The cesspool being uncovered became nasty

⁴ As a medicine, Vin-a 1214. ¹ Allowed at **Kd 5.8.3**. ² Cf. **Kd 15.17.1**. ³ As at **Kd 15.17.2**. ⁴ As at **Kd 15.11.6**. ⁵ *pidhara*.

smelling. “I allow, monks, a lid.” Evacuating in the open air, they were bothered by the cold and heat. “I allow, monks, a hut for the privy.” There was no door to the hut. “I allow, monks, a door ...⁶ ... swordfish teeth, the five (pieces of) cloth design, a bamboo for robes, a cord for robes.”⁷ Now at that time a certain monk, weak through age, having evacuated, fell down as he was getting up. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a chair with supports.” The hut was not fenced in. “I allow, monks, three (kinds of) fences with which to fence it in: a fence of bricks, a fence of stones, a fence of wood.”

There was no porch. “I allow, monks, a porch.” There was no door to the porch. “I allow, monks, a door ...¹ ... a cord to pull through.” Powdered grass fell on to the porch ...² “... five (pieces of) cloth design.” A cell became swampy³ ... “I allow, monks, a drain for the water.” There was no vessel for the water for rinsing. “I allow, monks, a vessel for the water for rinsing.” There was no saucer for the water for rinsing. “I allow, monks, a saucer for the water for rinsing.” They rinsed sitting down; it was painful. “I allow, monks, shoes to be worn for rinsing.”⁴ The shoes for rinsing were public; monks were ashamed to rinse. “I allow, monks, three (kinds of) fences to fence them in: a fence of bricks, a fence of stones, a fence of wood.” The vessel for the water for rinsing was uncovered; it was littered over with powdered grass and dust. “I allow, monks, a lid.”

Now at that time the group of six monks indulged in bad habits like this⁵: they planted and caused to be planted small flowering trees ... and indulged in various bad habits. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, various kinds of bad habits should not be indulged in. Whoever should indulge in them, should be dealt with according to the rule.”**⁶

⁶ As at Kd 15.14.3. ⁷ Last two items also at Kd 15.11.6. ¹ As at Kd 15.14.3. ² As at Kd 15.11.6. ³ As at Kd 15.14.5. ⁴ Allowed at Kd 5.8.3. ⁵ As at Kd 11.13.2 and Bu-Ss 13. The passage has been translated at BD 1.314–BD.1.318. ⁶ Vin-a 1214 says they should be dealt with by a *pācittiya* for a *pācittiya* matter and by a *dukkaṭa* for a *dukkaṭa* matter.

Now at the time when Kassapa of Uruvelā went forth many copper goods, wooden goods, clay goods accrued to the Order. Then it occurred to the monks: “Now, what copper goods are allowed by the Lord, what are not allowed? What wooden goods are allowed, what are not allowed? What clay goods are allowed, what are not allowed?” They told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow, monks, all copper goods except a weapon; all wooden goods except a sofa,⁷ a divan,⁸ a wooden bowl,⁹ wooden shoes;¹⁰ all clay goods except a (clay-foot-) scrubber¹ and a large earthen vessel.”²

Told is the Fifth Section: that on Minor Matters

THIS IS ITS KEY

Against a tree, and against a post, and against a wall,
on a rubbing-board (using a) *gandha* (-*bba* hand instrument), a string,
having plunged into, a scrubber, scab,
and age, ordinary mode with the hand.

And also ear-ornaments, chains,
ornamental strings of beads for the throat³ should not be worn,
ornamental girdles, bangles, armlets, bracelets, finger rings,
Long, with a comb, with a snake’s hood instrument,
with the hands, with beeswax, with oily water,
sores in a mirror and bowl of water, ointment, with paste and chunan,
They smeared,⁴ and painting the limbs, painting the faces, both these,
disease of the eyes, and the mountain top, long-drawn, intoning,⁵ outside,⁶

⁷ *āsandī*. See [BD 3.326, n. 1](#), and [BD 4.256, n. 5](#). ⁸ *pallaṅka*. See [BD 3.271, n. 3](#). ⁹ See definition of bowl at [BD 2.115](#), [BD 2.415](#), [BD 3.213](#). At [Kd 15.8.2](#) it is made a *dukkāṭa* to use a wooden bowl. ¹⁰ Cf. [Kd 5.6.4](#) (*kaṭṭhapāduka*), above *dārupāduka*. ¹ *kataka*. See [Kd 15.22.1](#). ² *kumbhakārikā*. Vin-a 1215 says “this is a hut made entirely of clay like Dhaniya’s”. Dhaniya’s story is told at the beginning of [Bu-Pj 2](#). ³ Reading above is *kaṇṇasuttaṃ*, an ornamental string hanging from the ear Oldenberg at Vin 2.320 queries whether it should not be *kaṇṭhasuttaṃ* (see [Kd 15.2.1](#)) which is the reading in the Sinhalese and Siamese editions. ⁴ Text here *lañcanti*; at [Kd 15.2.5](#), as also in Sinhalese edition *lañcenti*. Siamese edition *lañcenti*. ⁵ These two words, run together as *sara-bāhiraṃ*, stand for *sarabhañña* and *bāhiralomi* ([Kd 15.3.2](#) and [Kd 15.4](#)). ⁶ These two words, run together as *sara-bāhiraṃ*, stand for *sarabhañña* and *bāhiralomi* ([Kd 15.3.2](#) and [Kd 15.4](#)).

Mango peels, with whole (mangoes), a snake, and he cut off, sandal wood,
various kinds, bases of bowls, gold, thick, jags,
Carved, was spoiled,⁷ nasty smelling,
in the heat, were broken, by a solid bench,
plaster flooring, grass (mat), piece of cloth, a stand, and on a wicker stand,
A bag, and a strap at the edge, thread made for tying,
a peg, and on a couch, and on a chair, on a lap, in a sunshade, opened,
A gourd, a water-pot, a skull, odd bits, waste-tub,
split open,⁸ handle, gold, feathers and rind, a tube,
And yeast, barley-meal, powdered stone, beeswax, gum,
misshapen at the corners, tying, uneven place,
on the ground, old¹ and was (not) enough,²
A mark, and a false thread, unwashed, damp, sandals,
fingers, and a thimble, a small bowl, a bag, tyings,
In the open air, low to the ground, and also a piling, they were inconvenienced,
they fell off, powdered grass, a smearing inside and out,
Whitewash and treatment with black colouring and red chalk,
wreathwork, creeperwork, swordfish teeth, strips (of cloth)³
And a bamboo and cord for robes—the Leader allowed (these).
And they went away having left, a *kaṭhina* frame was split,
Was twisted out of position,⁴ and on to a wall, they went along taking in a
bowl,
a bag, and a thread for tying, having tied, sandals,⁵
On a road water that was not allowable, strainer, little piece of cloth,
regulation water-pot, two monks, the Sage reached Vesālī,
Double (water-strainer), filter, he allowed a strainer.
By mosquitoes, very ill through sumptuous (foods) and Jīvaka,
Place for pacing up and down in, bathroom, in an uneven place, low to the
ground,

⁷ Reading should be *dussati* as at **Kd 15.9.3** and Sinhalese and Siamese editions, not as with Oldenberg *dussanti*. ⁸ *vippāri*. Sinhalese edition *vippāli* and Siamese edition *viphāli*. At **Kd 15.11.1** it is *vipāṭetvā*. ¹ *vippāri*. Sinhalese edition *vippāli* and Siamese edition *viphāli*. At **Kd 15.11.1** it is *vipāṭetvā*. ² Text reads *jira-patoti ca*; Sinhalese edition *jiṇṇaṃ pahoti ca*; Siamese edition *jirappahoti ca*. ³ Text reads *paṭikā*; Siamese edition *pātikāṃ*; Sinhalese edition *paṭṭikā*; **Kd 15.11.6** and similar passages *pañcapaṭṭhikāṃ*. *Pali-English Dictionary* takes *paṭṭikā* = *paṭṭaka* “made of or forming a strip of cloth; a bandage, a strip (of cloth).” Thus *pañcapaṭṭhika* may be a design: the five strips (of cloth) design. ⁴ *viniveṭhiya*; Siamese edition *viniveṭhiyati*. ⁵ Sinhalese edition here inserts *upāhanatthavikaṇ ca aṃsabandhanasuttakaṃ*, bag for sandals and thread or tying at the edge; and Siamese edition *upāhanatthavikaṇ ca aṃsavaddhaṇ ca suttakaṃ*, bag for sandals and a strap at the edge and thread.

three pilings, they were inconvenienced, stairs, balustrade, railing,
In the open air, powdered grass, a smearing inside and out
whitewash and treatment with black colouring and red chalk
Wreathwork creeperwork swordfish teeth strips (of cloth)⁶
bamboo and cord for robes, and it may be built high to the ground,
A piling, staircase and balustrade,⁷ a door, doorpost and lintel,
a hollow like a mortar, a small upper projection, and a post, a “monkey’s
head,”

A pin, a (stick used as a) bolt, a keyhole, and pulling through, a cord,
a facing, and a pipe for steam, and in the middle, clay for the face,
And nasty smelling,¹ it scorched, a receptacle for water,² a saucer,
and it did not make them sweat, swampy, to wash, one may make a drain,
And a chair,³ about a porch, work,⁴ gravel, stones, a drain,
naked, on the ground, when it rained, three coverings there,
A well, and it fell in,⁵ by means of a creeper,⁶ by means of a waistband,
a well-sweep, hand-wheel, a wheel, many vessels were broken,
Copper, wooden, strips of animals’ hides, a hall, grass, a lid,
a trough, a pool, a fence, swampy, and about a drain,
Cooled down, a tank, and stale, with a curving roof,
for four months, and lay down to sleep,
and a piece of felt, and it should not be allotted,
Chased (cushions), a stand,⁷ eating they would share one,⁸
Vaḍḍha, and Bodhi, tread on it, little jar, (clay foot-) scrubber, broom,
Stone pebble and scum as a foot-rubber,
fan, palmyra-whisk, and also a mosquito fan, a chowry,
Sunshade, and⁹ without, in a monastery—the three¹⁰—with string, agree-

⁶ Text here reads *makarantakapaṭṭikam*, but Sinhalese edition *makaradantaka-
paṭṭikam* and Siamese *makaradantapātīkam*. ⁷ *bāha* here stands for *ālambanabāha*.

¹ In Siamese edition this word is preceded by *doṇi*, a tub or a trough, and in Sinhalese edition by *mattikādoṇi*, a tub for clay, as at **Kd 15.14.3**. ² Text reads *udakātara*, Siamese edition *udakhānam*, and Sinhalese edition *udakādhanaṃ*, with which cf. Buddhaghosa’s *udakanidhāna* on **Kd 15.14.3**, **BD 5.166** above (*udakaṭṭhāna*), and also cf. *udakādhāna* at MN i.414. ³ Reading *pītham* with Sinhalese edition instead of text’s *pīṭhe*.

⁴ This must refer to the wreath work and creeperwork mentioned in **Kd 15.14.4**. ⁵ Reading *lujjati* with Sinhalese and Siamese editions, instead of text’s *lujja-tīṇi*. ⁶ *valliyā*; at **Kd 15.16.2** *vallikāya*. ⁷ **Kd 15.19.1** and Siamese edition *maḷorīkam*; above *maḷorakam*; Sinhalese edition *malojīkam*.

⁸ Text reads *bhuñjanto ka tuvaṭṭayyum*; Sinhalese edition *bhuñjant’eka tuvaṭṭīkam*; Siamese edition *bhuñjant’ekam tuvaṭṭayum*. ⁹ Read *ca* with Sinhalese and Siamese editions, instead of text’s *va*. ¹⁰ This refers to three (of the four) rulings laid down at **Kd 15.23.2**, **Kd 15.23.3** for the use of sunshades: (1) allowed, (2) not allowed, (3) allowed (only) to an invalid, (4) allowed to be used by a monk whether ill or well in a monastery and monastery precincts.

ment,

ruminator, lumps of boiled rice, long nails, they cut, painful fingers,

Down to the blood, and to the height, the twenty, long-haired,

razor, whetstone, razor-case, piece of felt, a barber's equipment,

They trimmed beards, they let them grow,

goat's beard, four cornered arrangement,

on their chests and on their stomachs, whiskers, removed the hair on their bodies,

Illness, scissors, a sore, long, and with a piece of crystal,

grey hair, stopped, and various kinds of copper goods, a store,¹

And lolling, a bandage, strings,² tickets, (waist-)band,

those of many strands, like the head of a water-snake,

like tambourine drums, those like chains,³

Palmyra whisk, hundred jungle-ropes,⁴

having put on householders' upper garments,

loin cloths, double carrying-pole, toothwood, on flicking,

Lodged in the throat, and a forest, counterfire, a tree, and by an elephant,

Yamelu (and Tekula),⁵ they learnt metaphysics, they taught it,

Worldly knowledge,⁶ he sneezed, good luck, and he ate,

affliction of wind, and it was soiled, nasty smelling, painful, shoes,

They were ashamed, nasty smelling (un-) covered,⁷ and they did it here and there,

nasty smelling, cesspool, it fell in,⁸ high to the ground, and about a piling,

¹ *nīcayā*. Sinhalese edition *nīcayā*, text *nisaha*. Siamese edition *lohabhaṇḍaṅkhanīsaha*. Sinhalese edition inserts between this word and “lolling” *bandhanamattaṃ kukkucā*, (too) scrupulous (to use) a handle, see note at [Kd 15.28.2](#) above. ² Text *paṭaṃ*; Sinhalese edition and [Kd 15.28.2](#) *vaṭaṃ*. ³ Sinhalese and Siamese editions here have the following: *paṭṭikaṃ* (Siamese *paṭṭikā*) *sūkarantaṅ ca / dasā muraja-veṇikā* (Siamese *murajja-*) *pavananto pi jirati / gaṇṭhikaṃ uccāvacaṅ ca phalakante pi ogahe gihīvatthaṃ hatthisoṇḍaṃ macchakaṃ catukaṇṇakaṃ /* (Siamese *gihivatthaṃ soṇḍaṃ macchavāḷakaṃ catukkaṇṇakaṃ*)—a strip of cotton cloth and one with a well made end/borders, like tambourine drums, a twisting (*veṇikā*, probably for *sobhaṇa* at [Kd 15.29.2](#)), an end, and knotting the rest, also where it was looped, / it wore out, a block, and various kinds, also shields and edges, taking back, / householders' undergarments: the elephant's trunk, the fish arrangement, the four cornered arrangement. This covers [Kd 15.29.2–Kd 15.29.4](#) (beginning), and clearly should be inserted. ⁴ Reading with Sinhalese edition *satavallim*, instead of *satavali* above. ⁵ Text reads *Yameḷe*, which I take to be a plural of “*Yameḷa* and *Tekula*”. But Sinhalese edition reads *Yameḷa*. Siamese *Sakaṭe*, with variant reading *Yameḷe*. See note above to [Kd 15.33.1](#). ⁶ Text and Siamese edition *tiračchānakathā*. I follow Sinhalese *tiračchānagatā vijjā* since there is no mention of “talk” in [Kd 15.33.2](#). ⁷ *pāru*. ⁸ Should read *lujjati* as in Sinhalese and Siamese editions, not *lujjanti* as in text.

Staircase, balustrade, inside, painful and shoes,
outside, a tub and wood, and a stick,⁹ uncovered,
A hut for the privy, both a door as well as a doorpost and lintel,
a hollow like a mortar, an upper projection, a post, and a “monkey’s head,”
A pin, a bolt, a keyhole, and a hole for pulling (cord) through as well as
a cord, a smearing inside and out, whitewash and black colouring
Wreathwork creeperwork swordfish five strips of cloth (design)
a bamboo and a cord for robes, weak through age, a fence,
And about a porch, as before, and gravel, flagstones,
(water) remained, a drain, and also a vessel, a saucer,
Painful, shame, a lid, and they indulged in bad habits.
He allowed copper goods a weapon being excepted.
A sofa and divan, a wooden bowl and shoes being excepted—
the Great Sage allowed all (other) goods made of wood.
And the Truth-finder, a (clay foot-) scrubber
and an earthen vessel having been excepted,
compassionate, allowed also all (other) goods made of clay.
The character of whatever matter, if equal to the preceding,
even if it is brief, is known from the context in the key.
Thus the hundred and ten matters in the Minor Matters in the discipline
are based on what is *dhamma* indeed—also there is help for the well be-
haved.
The expert in discipline is well trained, friendly in mind, very well behaved,
bringing light, steadfast, worthy of honour, one who has heard much.

⁹ Kd 15.35.3 *pidharo*; above *pidhāro*; Sinhalese edition *Pidharo*; Siamese edition *pīṭharo*.

16. LODGINGS (SAYANĀSANA)

FIRST RECITATION SECTION

ALLOWANCE FOR DWELLINGS

At one time the Awakened One, the Lord was staying at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding place. Now at that time lodgings had not been permitted to monks by the Lord. So these monks stayed here and there: in a forest, at the root of a tree, on a hillside, in a glen, in a mountain cave, in a cemetery, in a forest glade, in the open air, on a heap of straw.¹ Early in the mornings these went out from this and that place: from the forest ... from the heap of straw, pleasing when approaching and when receding, when looking before, when looking back, when bending back (their arms), when stretching them out, their eyes cast down and possessed of pleasant behaviour.²

Kd 16.1
BD 5.2

Now at that time a (great) merchant of Rājagaha went early one morning to a pleasure grove.³ The (great) merchant of Rājagaha saw these monks going out from this and that place: from a forest ... from a heap of straw, and seeing them he made up his mind.⁴ Then the (great) merchant of Rājagaha approached those monks; having

Kd 16.1

¹ Cf. same list at DN i.71, MN iii.3, AN ii.210, and a shorter one at AN i.241 The terms are defined at DN-a 209-DN-a 210, Vb-a 366-Vb-a 367. ² More or less stock; cf. Vin 3.181, DN i.70, MN iii.35, MN iii.90, AN ii.104, AN ii.106, AN ii.210. ³ Defined at Vin 4.298. ⁴ *assa cittam padīdi*, his mind became clear or bright.

approached, he spoke thus to those monks: “If I, revered sirs, were to have dwelling-places built, would you stay in my dwelling-places?”

“Householder, dwelling-places have not been allowed by the Lord.”

“Well then, revered sirs, having inquired of the Lord, tell me (what he says).”

“Very well, householder,” and these monks, having answered the (great) merchant of Rājagaha in assent, approached the Lord; having approached the Lord, having greeted him, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, these monks spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the (great) merchant of Rājagaha is anxious to have dwelling-places built. What line of conduct should be followed by us, Lord?” Then the Lord on this occasion having given reasoned talk addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, five (kinds of) abodes:¹ a dwelling-place, a curved house, a long house,² a mansion,³ a cave.”⁴

Then these monks approached the (great) merchant of Rājagaha; having approached, they spoke thus to the (great) merchant of Rājagaha: “Householder, dwelling-places have been allowed by the Lord. Do now what seems right.” Then the (great) merchant of Rājagaha had sixty dwelling-places established on one day alone. When the (great) merchant of Rājagaha had had these sixty dwelling-places finished he approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the (great) merchant of Rājagaha spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with me on the morrow together with the Order of monks.” The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then the (great) merchant of Rājagaha, having understood the Lord’s consent, rising from his seat departed keeping his right side towards him.

¹ Cf. Kd 1.30.4, and also BD 2.16, n. 6 (on BD 5.17). ² See BD 2.16, n. 5. Pāsāda is again called *ḍiḥapāsāda* at Vin-a 1215, on above passage. ³ *hammiya*. See BD 2.16, n. 6. Vin-a 1215 says “a *hammiya* is like a *pāsāda* with a chamber placed on the top-most open-air floor.” ⁴ Vin-a 1215 says a cave, *guhā*, in bricks, in stones, in wood, in laterite, *paṃsu*. On *paṃsu* as meaning “laterite” in this connection see A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Indian Architectural Terms*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 48, no. 3, p. 266.

Then the (great) merchant of Rājagaha, having had sumptuous foods, solid and soft, prepared towards the end of that night, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: “It is time, Lord, the meal is ready.” Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of the (great) merchant of Rājagaha; having approached, he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks. Then the (great) merchant of Rājagaha, having with his own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the Awakened One at its head with sumptuous foods, solid and soft, sat down at a respectful distance when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance the (great) merchant of Rājagaha spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, I had these sixty dwelling-places built because I need merit, because I need heaven. What line of conduct am I, Lord, to follow in regard to these dwelling-places?”

BD 5.2

“Well now, do you, householder, establish these sixty dwelling-places for (the use of) the Order of the four quarters,¹ present and to come.”

“Very well, Lord,” and the (great) merchant of Rājagaha, having answered the Lord in assent, had those sixty dwelling-places established for (the use of) the Order of the four quarters, present and to come.

Kd 16.1

Then the Lord thanked the (great) merchant of Rājagaha in these verses:²

“They ward off cold and heat and beasts of prey from there
And creeping things and gnats and rains in the wet season.

When the dreaded hot wind arises, that is warded off.
To meditate and obtain insight in a refuge and at ease:—

“A dwelling-place is praised by the Awakened One as chief
gift to an Order.

Therefore a wise man, looking to his own weal,

¹ See S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p. 83ff., p. 131, p. 143. ² As at **Kd 16.9.2** below, and Ja i.93, DN-a i.304.

Should have charming dwelling-places built
so that those who have heard much can stay therein.¹

“To these² food and drink, raiment and lodgings
He should give, to the upright, with mind purified.
(Then) these³ teach him *dhamma* dispelling every ill;
He, knowing that *dhamma*, here attains *nibbāna*, canker-
less.”⁴

Then the Lord, having given thanks to the (great) merchant of Rājagaha in these verses, rising from his seat, departed.

People heard: “It is said that dwelling-places are allowed by the Lord,” and they zealously had dwelling-places built. These dwelling-places did not have doors, and snakes, scorpions and centipedes got in. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a door.” Having made a hole in the wall, they tied on the door with jungle creeper and with cord, but these were eaten by rats and white ants and when the tyings were eaten the doors fell down. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a doorpost and lintel, a hollow like a mortar (for the door to revolve in) a small upper projection.”⁵ The doors did not meet. “I allow, monks, a hole for pulling through (the cord), cord for pulling through.”⁶ The doors could not be closed. “I allow, monks, a post for the bolt, a ‘monkey’s head,’ a pin (to secure the bolt), a stick (used as a bolt).”⁷

Now at that time monks were not able to open a door. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a keyhole and three (kinds of) keys: a copper key, a wooden key, a horn key.” But the dwelling-places were unguarded⁸ when those who, having unfas-

¹ Cf. Mil 211. ² For this line and next, cf. SN 1.100. ³ This line and next at AN iii.41, AN iii.43. ⁴ Cf. this line with Snp 765. ⁵ On these items see Kd 15.14.3. ⁶ On these items see Kd 15.14.3. ⁷ On these items see Kd 15.14.3. ⁸ *agutta*, as were the lodgings at Kd 18.3.1.

tened¹ (the doors), entered. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a bolt and a pin (to secure the bolt).”²

Now at that time dwelling-places were roofed with grass; they were cold in the cold weather, hot in the hot weather. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having lashed on (a roofing), to give it a smearing inside and out.”³ Now at that time dwelling-places had no windows.⁴ They were bad for the eyes and nasty smelling. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, three (kinds of) windows: a railing window,⁵ a lattice window,⁶ a stick window.”⁷ Squirrels and bats got through the spaces in the windows. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, drapery⁸ across the windows.” Squirrels and bats got in even through the drapery. “I allow, monks, shutters⁹ across the windows, little bolsters¹⁰ across the windows.”

Now at that time monks lay down to sleep on the ground and their limbs and robes were soiled with dust. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a grass matting.” The grass matting was eaten by rats and white ants. “I allow, monks, a solid

¹ *ugghātetvā*, as at [Kd 18.1.1](#) of the *ghaṭikā*, stick used as a bolt. ² *yantakaṃ sūcikaṃ*. Vin-a 1216 says “Whatever one sees that is a *yantaka*, and one can make a pin to open it”. Cf. *yantakaṃ deti*, to secure the bolt, to lock up, at Dh-p-a i.220. ³ As at [Kd 15.11.6](#): [Kd 15.14.3](#), etc. ⁴ Probably window holes, because the above word, *vātapāna*, is used at [Vin 4.47](#) to explain *ālokasandhi*, the holes for light and air. *Vātapāna* mentioned at [Kd 1.25.18](#). ⁵ *vedikāvātapāna*. Vin-a 1216 says like the railing of a shrine. So, a grille in a railing pattern. See A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Indian Architectural Terms*, Journal of the American Oriental Society Vol. 48, no. 3, p.273 for short discussion of these three types of windows. ⁶ *jālavātapāna*. Vin-a 1216 says something tied net wise, so a lattice. ⁷ *salākavātapāna*. Vin-a 1216 says a little post or pillar window. These words will be more readily understood if it is remembered that *vātapāna* is an aperture and not what closes it. ⁸ *cakkalikā*. Vin-a 1216 says “I allow you to tie on cloth used for wiping the feet” ⁹ *kavāṭaka*. ¹⁰ *bhisikā*. Cf. [BD 2.47, n. 1](#) on *bhisi*.

bench.”¹ Because of the solid bench their limbs became painful. “I allow, monks, a little couch of split bamboo.”²

ALLOWANCE FOR COUCHES AND CHAIRS

Now at that time a bierlike long couch³ accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a long couch.” A long chair accrued. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a long chair.” Now at that time a bierlike couch with slats⁴ accrued to an Order ... a chair with slats ... a bierlike couch with curved legs⁵ ... a chair with curved legs ... a bierlike couch with removeable legs⁶ ... a chair with removeable legs accrued. “I allow, monks, a chair with removeable legs.”

Now at that time a rectangular chair⁷ accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a rectangular chair.” A tall rectangular chair⁸ accrued. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, even⁹ a tall rectangular chair.”¹⁰ A three-sided (couch)¹¹ accrued. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a three-sided (couch).” A tall three-sided (couch) accrued. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow,

¹ *miḍhi*. See **Kd 15.9.4**. Vin-a 1216 here explains by *pīṭhaphalaka*. ² *bidalamañ-caka*. Cf. Ja i.9, Dh-p-a i.135 where mentioned as a feature in the life of one who has gone forth. Vin-a 1216 says a twig couch or one woven with bamboo chips.

³ *masāraka* defined in **Bu-Pc 14**. For notes on these four kinds of couches and chairs see **BD 2.240**. ⁴ *bundikābaddha*, defined in **Bu-Pc 14**, as are also the next two terms.

⁵ *kulīrapādaka*. ⁶ *āhaccapādaka*. ⁷ *āsandika*. Vin-a 1216, reading *āsandhika*, says it is called a four-cornered (or square, *caturassa*) chair. Cf. Kh-a 44. ⁸ *uccako āsandiko*. ⁹ *pi*, also meaning “too, also,” but in view of the efforts made to prevent monks from using chairs, couches and beds that were too high, “even” seems a permissible translation. ¹⁰ Vin-a 1216 says a long chair is on a support eight fingerbreadths (high), but if it exceeds that measure it should be called a rectangular chair. ¹¹ *sattaṅga*, literally seven limbs, parts, members or constituents. Vin-a 1216 says that “it is a couch that is finished, a support having been made towards three (of the) quarters.” It therefore occupied three sides of a square, and had four ends (two outer and two inner), making a total of seven parts.

monks, even a tall three-sided (couch).” A plaited chair¹ accrued ... a cloth chair² ... a sheep-footed³ chair ... a “stalks of the emblic myrobalan” chair⁴ ... a wooden (chair)⁵ ... a stool⁶ ... a straw chair accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a straw chair.”

Now at that time the group of six monks lay down to sleep on high couches. People touring the lodgings, having seen them ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not lie down to sleep on high couches. Whoever should (so) lie down to sleep, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time a certain monk, lying down to sleep on a low couch, was bitten by a snake. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, supports for the couches.”⁷

Now at that time the group of six monks used tall supports for the couches; they rocked to and fro together with the tall supports for the couches. “**Monks, tall supports for couches should not be used. Whoever should use them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, a support for a couch to be eight finger-breadths at the most.”⁸

¹ *baddhapīṭha*. Vin-a 1216 says a chair made entirely of twigs. ² *pīṭhikā*. Vin-a 1216 says just a chair plaited in cloth. ³ *eḷakapādaka*. Vin-a 1216 says “having placed the upper parts of the legs in white woollen cloth round the wood, it is a finished chair like a slab for food, *bhojanaphalaka*”. Cf. *kulīrapādaka*, literally “crab-footer,” for which see **BD 2.240, n. 4**. ⁴ *āmālakavaṇṭhika pīṭha*. Vin-a 1217 says this is a chair of many legs plaited in the manner (or on the pattern) of emblic myrobalan. ⁵ *phalaka*. See *phalakapīṭha* at **Vin 4.40** and **BD 2.242, n. 5**. Cf. *apassenaphalaka* at **Kd 1.25.15, Kd 16.20.2**. ⁶ *koccha*. See **BD 2.239, n. 1**, and Old Commentary’s definition at **BD 2.240**. On above passage Vin-a 1217, omitting “made of bark,” says made of khus-khus, made of *muñja*-grass (which at Vin-a 1217 reads *puñjamaya*), made of reeds. ⁷ *mañcapaṭipādaka*, as at **Kd 1.25.16, Kd 18.1.3**. See **BD 4.64, n. 4**. ⁸ Cf. **Bu-Pc 87**.

Now at that time thread accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to weave a couch.” The ends used up much thread. “I allow you, monks, having pierced the ends,¹ to weave small squares.”² A piece of cotton cloth accrued. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make a carpet.”³ A cotton quilt⁴ accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having unravelled it, to make a squatting mat⁵ of three (kinds of) cotton:⁶ cotton from trees, cotton from creepers, cotton from grass.”

Now at that time the group of six monks used squatting mats half (the size of a man’s) body. People, touring the dwelling-places, having seen them ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, squatting mats half (the size of a man’s) body should not be used. Who-ever should use one, there is an offence of wrongdoing.** I allow you, monks, to make a squatting mat the size of a head.”⁷

Now at that time there came to be a festival on a mountain top near Rājagaha.⁸ People arranged mattresses⁹ for the great ministers: mattresses of wool, mattresses of cotton cloth, mattresses of bark, mattresses of *tiṇa*-grass, mattresses of leaves.¹⁰ When the fes-

¹ *aṅge vijjhitvā*. On this expression see **BD 2.240, n. 5**. “Legs” is I think a better translation than “sides” (*Vinaya Texts* iii.166). ² *aṭṭhapadaka* as at **Kd 8.21.1**. Perhaps meaning “in the chequered board fashion,” *aṭṭhapada*, on which see **BD 1.316, n. 2**.

³ *cilimikā*. See **BD 2.241, n. 8**. Vin-a 1217 on above says “when the earth is treated with plaster, a *cilimikā* is called a covering, *attharaṇa*, for protecting the surface, *chavi*.” ⁴ *tūlikā*, as at **Kd 5.10.4**. ⁵ *bimbohana*. Similar allowance made at **Kd 6.14**.

⁶ *tūla*. See similar definition at **Vin 4.170 (BD 3.93, q.v. n. 2)**. Vin-a 1217 says cotton from any vegetable growth can be used for squatting mats, but apart from trees, creepers and grasses there is no other vegetable growth. ⁷ Cf. Vb-a 365 which elaborates saying that in width it can be four standard finger breadths, in length the measure of the width of the couch. ⁸ See **BD 2.335, n. 1**. Phrase also occurs at **Kd 15.2.6**. ⁹ *bhisi*. See **BD 2.47, n. 1**. ¹⁰ Same five kinds given at **Vin 4.40**. See **BD 2.240, n. 7**.

tival was over they conveyed them away having taken off the covers. Monks saw much wool and cotton cloth and bark and *tiṇa*-grass and leaves thrown away at the festival place; and seeing it they told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, five (kinds of) mattresses: a mattress of wool ... of cotton cloth ... of bark ... of *tiṇa*-grass, a mattress of leaves.”

Now at that time woven cloth¹ as a requisite for lodgings accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to cover a mattress (with it).” Now at that time monks packed away a couch-mattress on a chair, they packed away a chair-mattress on a couch; the mattresses fell to bits.² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a covered couch, a covered chair.”³ They packed them away without having put a cobweb cloth (beneath⁴ and the stuffing) came out from below. “I allow you, monks, having put a cobweb cloth (beneath the mattress), having spread it, to cover a mattress.” Having removed the covers, they carried them away. “I allow you, monks, to sprinkle⁵ them.” They still carried them away. “I allow, monks, line decoration.”⁶ They still carried them away. “I allow you, monks, the outline of the hand.”⁷

¹ *dussa*. ² As at **Kd 15.11.2**. ³ *onaddhamañca onaddhapīṭha*. This must mean covered with mattresses to fit them. Cf. **Vin 1.194**, **Vin 2.270**. ⁴ *ullokaṃ akaritvā*, which Vin-a 1218 explains by *hetthā cimilikāṃ adatvā*. On *cimilikā* see above, **BD 5.210**, n. 4. *Ullokā* occurs at **Vin 1.48 = Vin 2.209**. ⁵ *posituṃ*, which should read *phosituṃ* as does **Vin 1.205** and Vin-a 1218. This latter says “to give sprinklings (or touches, *phusitāni*) on top with dyes or with turmeric.” ⁶ *bhattikamma*. Vin-a 1219 reads *bhittikamma*, wall-work, and says it is a *bhittikamma* on top of the mattress cover. Whatever the exact meaning of the term, it is no doubt a different process from the “sprinkling” which, as perhaps a forerunner to the tie-and-dye industry, would probably result in spots. Cf. *bhatikamma* at **Kd 15.9.2**. ⁷ *hatthabhitti*. *Bhitti* is of course a wall. Vin-a 1219 says *pañcaṅgulabhitti*, the wall of the five fingers. All these marks were probably applied so as to disfigure the mattresses and thus dissuade monks from carrying them off; cf. **Bu-Pc 58**. Or they may have been identification marks. But all the readings, and therefore the meanings, are uncertain. Reading in the “key,” **Vin 2.178**, is *hatthabhatti*, line of the hand. On *pañcangulikāṃ dātuṃ* cf. above, **BD 5.170**.

ALLOWANCE FOR WHITEWASH, ETC.

16,3:1
5,212

Now at that time the sleeping places¹ of members of other sects were whitewashed, the ground was coloured black, the walls were treated with red chalk.² Many people went to see the sleeping places. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, whitewash, black colouring, red chalk (to be used) in a dwelling-place.” Now at that time the whitewash did not adhere to the rough walls. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having applied lumps of grain-husks, having kept some back with a spoon,³ to put on the whitewash.” The whitewash would not stick on. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having applied soft clay, having kept some back with a spoon, to put on the whitewash.” The whitewash would not stick on. “I allow, monks, what exudes from trees⁴ and flour-paste.”

Now at that time the red chalk did not adhere to the rough walls ... (as above) ... The red chalk would not stick on. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having applied the red powder of rice husks (mixed with) clay, having kept some back with a spoon, to put on the red chalk.” The red chalk would not stick on. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, mustard-powder,⁵ oil of beeswax.” It was too thick.⁶ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to sponge it over⁷ with a piece of cloth.”

Now at that time the black colouring did not adhere to the rough walls ... (as above) ... The black colouring would not stick on. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having applied

¹ *seyyā*, defined at Vin 4.17 = Vin 4.20, Vin 4.41. ² See Kd 15.11.6 for these words.

³ *pāṇikā*, Buddhaghosa says nothing. Cf. *pāṇiyā* at Kd 15.1.5. ⁴ *ikkāsa*. Vin-a 1219 says *rukkhaniy(y)āsaṃ vā silesaṃ vā*. Gum, resin, and juice all exude from trees. Cf. *niyyāsakhādaniya* at Vin-a 832, Vin-a 837 and *niyyāsarukkha* at Vism 74. ⁵ *-kuḍḍa* of text should read *-kuṭṭa*.

⁶ Vin-a 1219 says it stayed there in drop upon drop.

⁷ *paccuddharitum* (as at Kd 15.17.1) explained at Vin-a 1219 as *puñchitum*, to wipe.

clay (mixed with the excrement of) earthworms,¹ having kept some back with a spoon, to put on the black colouring.” The black colouring would not stick on. They told this matter to the Lord He said: “I allow, monks, what exudes from trees, an astringent decoction.”²

REJECTION OF A BOLD DESIGN

Now at that time the group of six monks had a bold design³ made with figures of women, figures of men, in a dwelling-place. People touring the dwelling-places, having seen this, ... spread it about, saying: “Like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not have a bold design made with figures of women, figures of men. Whoever should have one made, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, wreath-work, creeper-work, swordfish teeth, the five strips (of cloth design).”⁴

ALLOWANCE FOR A BALUSTRADE

Now at that time dwelling-places were low to the ground ...⁵ “... I allow monks, a balustrade.”

Now at that time dwelling-places were thronged with people.⁶ Monks were (too) modest to lie down. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a curtain.”⁷ They looked in, having lifted up the curtain. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a small half-wall.” They looked in over the top of the small half-wall. “I allow, monks, three (kinds of) inner rooms: a

¹ *gaṇḍamattikā*. Vin-a 1219, reading *taṇḍa-* with variant reading *gaṇḍu-*, explains as above. ² *kasāva*. Cf. Kd 4.4, where certain specified ones are allowed as medicines.

³ *paṭibhānacitta*, as at Vin 4.61 (see BD 2.285, n. 5) and BD 4.298. Vin-a 1219 says “not only the figures of women and men, but also figures of animals, even of an earthworm.” ⁴ As at Kd 15.11.6. ⁵ As at Kd 15.11.6. ⁶ *ālakamandā*. At DN ii.147, DN ii.170 said to be the capital of the *devas*, with many people and crowded with *yakkhas*. Spelt in both passages as *Ālaka-*. Vin-a 1219 says each open space was crowded with people. ⁷ *tirokaraṇī* as at Vin 1.276.

palanquin-like inner room,¹ a tube-like inner room,² an inner room on the roof.”³ Now at that time monks made an inner room in the middle of a small dwelling-place; there was no access.⁴ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make an inner room at one side of a small dwelling-place, in the middle of a large one.”

Now at that time the base of a wall of a dwelling-place disintegrated. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a timber buttress.”⁵ A wall of a dwelling-place let in the rain.⁶ “I allow, monks, a protecting screen⁷ (and) paste and water.”⁸

Now at that time a snake fell from a grass roofing on to a certain monk’s shoulder. Terrified, he uttered a cry of distress. Monks, having run up, spoke thus to this monk: “Why did you, your reverence, utter a cry of distress?” Then this monk told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a canopy.”⁹

Now at that time monks hung their bags at the feet of couches, and at the feet of chairs: they were eaten by rats and white ants. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a peg in the wall, an ‘elephant-tusk’ (peg).”¹⁰ Now at that time monks laid aside their robes on a couch and on a chair. The robes fell to pieces. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a bamboo for robes, a cord for robes.”¹¹

¹ *sivikāgabbha*. Vin-a 1219 calls it a quadrangular (or four-sided) inner room.

² *nāḷikāgabbha*. Vin-a 1219 says it is a long room whose length is two or three times its width. ³ *hammiyagabbha*. See BD 2.16, n. 6 on HAMMIYA. Vin-a 1219 calls it a room in the gable on the open air floor or a room on the bare roof. ⁴ As at Kd 15.14.3

⁵ *kulaṅkapādaka*. See MORRIS, Journal of the Pali Text Society 1884, p. 78. ⁶ *ovasati* also at Kd 15.16.1. ⁷ *parittānakiṭṭika*. Cf. *saṃsaraṇakiṭṭika ughātanakiṭṭika* in

Kd 16.3.5 below. ⁸ *uddhasudha*. Vin-a 1219 reading *uddhā-* with variant reading *uda-*, says clay pounded together with ashes and cowdung. Sinhalese edition reads *udda-*. ⁹ *vitāna*, an item in some of the “no offence” clauses in the Suttavibhaṅga, e.g. at Vin 3.225, Vin 3.227, Vin 3.229, Vin 3.233, Vin 4.171, Vin 4.279. ¹⁰ Cf. Kd 15.9.5 where monks hung their bags on these pegs.

Now at that time dwelling-places had no verandahs¹ and were without shelter.² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a verandah, a covered terrace,³ an inner court,⁴ a verandah roofing.”⁵ The verandahs were public. Monks were (too) modest to lie down. “I allow, monks, a moveable screen,⁶ a screen that can be drawn.”

ALLOWANCE FOR AN ASSEMBLY HALL

Now at that time monks participating in a meal in the open air were bothered by cold and heat. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, an assembly hall.” The assembly hall was low to the ground ...⁷ “... a cord for robes.” Now at that time monks spread out their robes in the open air on the ground. The robes were soiled by dust. “I allow, monks, a bamboo for robes and a cord for robes in the open air.”

The drinking water became tepid.⁸ “I allow, monks, a hall for the drinking water, a shed for the drinking water.” The hall for the drinking water was low to the ground ...⁹ “... a cord for robes.” There was no vessel for the drinking water. “I allow, monks, a conchshell for drinking water, a saucer for drinking water.”

¹¹ Also allowed at [Kd 15.11.6](#); [Kd 15.14.3](#). ¹ *ālinda*. Vin-a 1219 explains as *pamukha*. See [Kd 6.36.4](#), and [BD 4.342, n. 3](#). ² *apaṭissaraṇa*. Sinhalese edition *appatissaraṇā*. ³ *paghana*. Vin-a 1220, reading *palighana* but saying it is also called *paghana*, speaks of it as a *katapadesa*, a shaped (artificial) place or locality. It was at the door of the dwelling-places. ⁴ *pakuṭa*. Sinhalese edition *pakuḍḍa*-. Vin-a 1220 reading *pakudda* and saying *pakuṭṭa* is also a reading, explains as “the whole of the inner room in the middle is called *pariyāgāro*: *pakuddan ti majjhe gabbhassa samantā pariyāgāro vuccati*. With this phrase cf. [Vin 3.119](#). *Pariyāgāra* means “surrounded by a house.” ⁵ *osarika*. Vin-a 1220 reads, *osārika*, with variant reading *osaraka* and says “having put a bamboo in a dwelling-place without a verandah, having had small sticks taken from that, *tato osāretvā*, a verandah-covering, *chadanapamukha*, is made. ⁶ *saṃsaraṇak-iṭṭika*. Vin-a 1220 says *cakkalayutta*. Cf. *cakkalikā* at [Kd 16.2.2](#) and *cakkkalī* at [Kd 16.19](#) ⁷ As at [Kd 15.11.6](#). ⁸ *otappati*, perhaps “evaporated, dried up.” Cf. *otāpeti*, to dry in the sun. ⁹ As at [Kd 15.11.6](#).

ALLOWANCE FOR A PORCH

16.3.8 Now at that time dwelling-places were not fenced in. "I allow, monks, three (kinds of) fences to fence them in: a fence of bricks, a fence of stones, a fence of wood." There was no porch. "I allow, monks, a porch." The porch was low to the ground. It was flooded with water. "I allow you, monks, to build it high to the ground." There was no door to the porch. "I allow, monks, a door, a door-post and lintel ... a cord to pull through."¹ Powdered grass fell from the porch.² "I allow, monks, ... the five (pieces of) cloth design."³

2.15.4 Now at that time a cell came to be swampy.⁴ They told this matter to the Lord He said: "I allow you, monks, to sprinkle gravel." They did not succeed in doing so. "I allow you, monks, to lay down flagstones." Water remained. "I allow, monks, a drain for the water."

16.3.9 Now at that time monks made a fireplace here and there in a cell; the cell became soiled.⁵ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to make at one side a hall for the fire." The hall for the fire was low to the ground ...⁶ "I allow, monks, a balustrade." 5.21.6 The nail for the fire had no door. "I allow, monks, a door, a doorpost and lintel ...⁷ a cord for pulling through." Powdered grass fell into the hall for the fire. "I allow you, monks, ... a cord for robes."

ALLOWANCE FOR A FENCED MONASTERY

6.3.10 A monastery was not fenced in: goats and cattle⁸ injured the little plants.⁹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow, monks, three (kinds of) hedges to fence it in: a hedge of bamboo, a hedge of thorns, a ditch." There was no porch. As before, goats and cattle injured the little plants. "I allow, monks, a porch, an interlacing of

¹ As at Kd 15.14.4. ² *koṭṭhakā* above; *koṭṭhake* at Kd 15.14.4. ³ As at Kd 15.14.4.

⁴ As at Kd 15.14.5; Kd 15.35.4. ⁵ *uklāpa*, as at Vin 1.46. ⁶ As at Kd 15.11.6. ⁷ As at Kd 15.14.3. ⁸ *pasuka*. ⁹ *uparopa*. Cf. *uparopaha* at Ja ii.345, Ja iv.359.

stakes and thorns,¹ a hedge of swallow-wort,² a gateway, a door-bar.”³ Powdered grass fell from the porch. “I allow you, monks, ...⁴ the five (pieces of) cloth design.” The monastery became swampy⁵ “... a drain for the water.”

Now at that time King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha wanted to have a long house with a smearing of plaster and clay built for an Order. Then it occurred to monks: “Now what kind of roofing is allowed by the Lord, what is not allowed?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, five (kinds of) roofings: a roofing of tiles, a roofing of stones, a roofing of plaster, a roofing of *tiṇa*-grass, a roofing of leaves.”⁶

Told is the First Portion for Repeating

SECOND RECITATION SECTION

THE STORY OF ANĀTHAPIṆḌIKA

Now at that time the householder Anāthapiṇḍika was the husband of a sister of a (great) merchant of Rājagaha. Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika went to Rājagaha on some business or other. At that time the Order with the Awakened One at its head had been invited for the morrow by the (great) merchant of Rājagaha. Then the (great) merchant of Rājagaha enjoined slaves and servants, saying: “Well now, good people, getting up early in the morning, cook conjeys, cook rice,⁷ prepare⁸ curries, prepare vegetables.”⁹ Then it occurred

¹ *apesiyam*. Sinhalese edition *apesim*. Vin-a 1220 reading *apesi*, says “having inserted stakes with long pieces of wood, having covered with thorny branches, it is made for closing up the doorway.” ² *akkavāṭa*. Sinhalese edition reads *yamakakavāṭa*, a pair of doors. ³ *paligha*. Vin-a 1220 says “as in village gateways, it is for closing a door that is joined to a wheel.” ⁴ As at [Kd 15.14.4](#). ⁵ As at [Kd 15.14.5](#); [Kd 15.35.4](#). ⁶ These five kinds of roofings mentioned at [Vin 4.48](#). ⁷ *bhattāni*. Cf. [BD 2.149](#), [BD 3.11](#) These four words are, above, all in the plural suggesting that separate portions should be got ready for each monk. ⁸ *sampādeti*, as at [Vin 3.208](#). ⁹ *uttaribhaṅga*, or tit-bits, dainties. See [BD 1.275](#), n. 5.

to the householder Anāthapiṇḍika: “Now, on my arrival formerly this householder, having put aside all duties, did nothing except exchange greetings with me, but now he seems excited and enjoins slaves and servants, saying: ‘Well now, good people ... prepare vegetables.’ Now can there be for this householder a leading to¹ (a bride’s home) or can there be a leading away from² (a bride’s home) or is a great oblation arranged or is King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha invited for the morrow together with his troops?”

Then the (great) merchant of Rājagaha, having enjoined the slaves and servants, approached the householder Anāthapiṇḍika; having approached, having exchanged greetings with the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, he sat down at a respectful distance. The householder Anāthapiṇḍika spoke thus to the (great) merchant of Rājagaha as he was sitting down at a respectful distance: “Formerly you, householder, on my arrival, having put aside all duties, did nothing except exchange greetings with me, but now you seem excited and enjoin slaves and servants, saying: ‘Well now, good people ... prepare vegetables.’ Now can there be for you, householder, a leading to ... or is King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha invited for the morrow together with his troops?”

“There is to be for me, householder, neither a leading to (a bride’s home), nor is there to be a leading away from (a bride’s home), nor is King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha invited for the morrow together with his troops. But a great oblation is arranged by me: the Order is invited for the morrow with the Awakened One at its head.”

“Did you, householder, say ‘Awakened One?’”

“‘Awakened One’ I did say, householder.”

“Did you, householder, say ‘Awakened One?’”

“‘Awakened One’ I did say, householder.”

“Did you, householder, say ‘Awakened One?’”

“‘Awakened One’ I did say, householder.”

“Even this sound, householder, is hard to come by in the world, that is to say ‘Awakened One, Awakened One.’ Now would it be possi-

¹ As at Vin 3.135. See BD 1.229, n. 2. ² As at Vin 3.135. See BD 1.230, n. 1.

ble, householder, at this time¹ to go up and see this Lord, a perfected one, a fully Self-awakened One?”

“This time is not a right time, householder, to go up and see this Lord, a perfected one, a fully Self-awakened One. But now, early Tomorrow you shall go up to see this Lord, a perfected one, a fully Self-awakened One.”

Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, thinking: “Early Tomorrow I will go up to see this Lord ... fully Self-Awakened One,” lay down with mindfulness (so much) directed to the Awakened One,² that he got up three times during the night thinking it was daybreak.

Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika approached the gateway to the Cool Grove,³ and non-human beings opened the gateway. Then as the householder Anāthapiṇḍika was going out from the town, light vanished, darkness appeared; fear, consternation, hair standing on end⁴ arose so that he was desirous of turning back from there. Then the *yakkha* Sīvaka, invisible, made this sound heard:

“A hundred elephants,⁵ a hundred horses, a hundred chariots with she-mules,⁶

A hundred thousand maidens adorned with jewelled earrings—

These are not worth the sixteenth part of one length of stride.

“Advance, householder, advance, householder.

Advance is better for you, not retreat.”

Then darkness vanished for the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, light appeared, so that his fear, consternation, hair standing on end subsided. And a second time ... And a third time did the *yakkha* Sīvaka make this sound heard: “... Advance is better for you, not retreat.”

¹ For this episode to the end of **Kd 16.4.4** cf. *SN* i.210. ² *buddhagatāya satiyā*. ³ Sītavana. *SN* i.211 reads Sīvathika, from the name of Sīvathika (variant reading Sivaka) of the *yakkha* who lived in the Sitavana. ⁴ As at e.g. **Vin 3.69**. ⁵ Cf. the first three of these lines with *Vv* 20.8; *Vv* 43.8. ⁶ *assatarī*. Cf. *vaccharī* at **Kd 5.9.1**, **Kd 5.9.3**.

And a third time darkness vanished for the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, light appeared, so that his fear, consternation, hair standing on end subsided.

Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika approached the Cool Grove. Now at that time the Lord was pacing up and down in the open air, having got up in the night towards dawn. Then the Lord saw the householder Anāthapiṇḍika coming in the distance; seeing him, having stepped down from the place for pacing up and down in, he sat down on an appointed seat, and sitting down the Lord spoke thus to the householder Anāthapiṇḍika: “Come, Sudatta.”¹ Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, thinking: “The Lord addressed me by name,” joyful, elated, approached the Lord; having approached, having inclined his head to the Lord’s feet, he spoke thus to the Lord: “I hope, Lord, that the Lord is living at ease.” He said:

“Yes, always at ease he lives, the brahmin, attained to
nibbāna,

Who is not stained by lusts,² cooled, without attachments.³

Having rent all clingings, having averted heart’s care,
Tranquil he lives at ease, having won to peace of mind.”⁴

Then the Lord talked a progressive talk⁵ to the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, that is to say talk on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven, he explained the peril, the vanity, the depravity of pleasures of the senses, the advantage in renouncing (them). When the Lord knew that the mind of the householder Anāthapiṇḍika was ready,

¹ SN-a i.315 says that Anāthapiṇḍika thinks that there are many other sects, those of Pūraṇa Kassapa and so on, who say they are awakened ones; but if this teacher is the awakened one he will address him by his *kuladattika* name, i.e. by the name given him in his family, because no one but Anāthapiṇḍika himself knows this. See also KS i.273, n. 1. ² *yo na lippati kāmesu*, as at Snp 625. Cf. Kaṭha Upaniṣad 5.11 where the Sun is not defiled or contaminated, *na lipyate*, by what he sees outside himself. See A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *A Note on the Stickfast Motif*, Journal American Folklore, Vol. 57, No. 224, April–June, 1944, p.128. ³ Cf. Snp 642. ⁴ Besides SN i.212, where the Saṃyutta version of this episode ends, this verse occurs at AN i.138. ⁵ As at Kd 1.7.5, Kd 1.7.10; Kd 5.1.9, Kd 5.1.10; Kd 6.26.8, Kd 6.26.9.

malleable, devoid of the hindrances, uplifted, pleased, then he explained to him that teaching on *dhamma* which the awakened ones have themselves discovered: ill, uprising, stopping, the Way. And as a clean cloth without black specks will easily take dye, even so as he was (sitting) on that very seat, *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arose to the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, that “whatever is liable to uprising, all that is liable to stopping.” Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having seen *dhamma*, attained *dhamma*, known *dhamma*, plunged into *dhamma*, having crossed over doubt, having put away uncertainty, having attained without another’s help to full confidence in the Teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Excellent, Lord! Excellent, Lord! Even, Lord, as one might set upright what has been upset, or might uncover what was concealed, or might show the way to one who is astray, or might bring an oil lamp into the darkness, thinking, ‘Those with eyes to see may see shapes,’ even so is *dhamma* explained in many a figure by the Lord. I myself, Lord, go to the Lord for refuge, to *dhamma*, and to the Order of monks. May the Lord accept me as a lay-disciple going for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts. And, Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with me on the morrow together with the Order of monks.” The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having understood the Lord’s consent, rising from his seat, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him.

The (great) merchant of Rājagaha heard: “It is said that the Order with the Awakened One at its head is invited for the morrow by the householder Anāthapiṇḍika.” Then the (great) merchant of Rājagaha spoke thus to the householder Anāthapiṇḍika: “It is said, that the Order with the Awakened One at its head is invited by you, householder, for the morrow. But you are incoming.¹ I can give you, householder, the means by which you can make a meal for the Order with the Awakened One at its head.”

“Thank you, householder, but I have the means by which I can

¹ As opposed to resident.

5.221 make a meal for the Order with the Awakened One at, its head.”

The urban council of Rajagana heard: “The Order with the Awakened One at its head is invited for the morrow by the householder Anāthapiṇḍika.” Then the urban council of Rājagaha spoke thus to the householder Anāthapiṇḍika: “It is said that the Order ... We can give you, householder, the means by which you can make a meal for the Order with the Awakened One at its head.”

“Thank you, masters, but I have the means ... at its head.”

King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha heard: “The Order ...” ...

16.4.7 “Thank you, sire, but I have the means by which I can make a meal for the Order with the Awakened One at its head.”

2.158 Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having had sumptuous foods, solid and soft, prepared towards the end of that night in the dwelling of the (great) merchant of Rājagaha, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: “It is time, Lord, the meal is ready.” Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of the (great) merchant of Rājagaha; having approached, he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks. Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having with his own hand served and satisfied with sumptuous foods, solid and soft, the Order of monks with the Awakened One at its head, when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from the bowl, sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the householder Anāthapiṇḍika spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may the Lord consent to a rains-residence¹ from me at Sāvattthī together with the Order of monks.”

“But, householder, Truth-finders delight in empty places.”

“It is understood, Lord, it is understood, Well-farer.” Then the Lord, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted the householder Anāthapiṇḍika with talk on *dhamma*, rising from his seat, departed.

16.4.8 At that time the householder Anāthapiṇḍika had many friends,

¹ *vassāvāsa*, as in *Kd 3.1.1*, and cf. *Kd 3.14*.

many companions, his word carried weight.¹ Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having concluded that business at Rājagaha, set out for Sāvattihī. Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika enjoined people on the way, saying: “Masters, build monasteries, prepare dwelling-places, furnish gifts; an Awakened One has arisen in the world, and this Lord, invited by me, will come along by this road.”

Then these people, urged on by the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, built monasteries, prepared dwelling-places, furnished gifts. Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having arrived at Sāvattihī, looked all round Sāvattihī, thinking:² “Now where could the Lord stay that would be neither too far from a village, nor too near, suitable for coming and going, accessible to people whenever they want, not crowded by day, having little noise at night, little sound, without folks’ breath, secluded from people, fitting for meditation?”

Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika saw Prince Jeta’s pleasure grove, neither too far from a village ... fitting for meditation, and seeing it, he approached Prince Jeta; having approached he spoke thus to Prince Jeta: “Give me, young master, the pleasure grove to make a monastery.”

“The pleasure grove is not to be given away, householder, even for the price of a hundred thousand.”³

“Young master, the monastery is taken.”

“The monastery is not taken, householder.” They asked the chief ministers of justice,⁴ saying: “Is it taken or is it not taken?” The chief ministers spoke thus: “The monastery is taken at the price fixed by you, young master.” Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having had gold coins⁵ brought out by means of wagons, had the Jeta Grove

¹ *ādeyyavāca*. Vin-a 1220 says “his speech would be taken up by the many folk thinking, ‘It seems he should be heard’.” ² As at Kd 1.22.16, Kd 1.22.17 where Bimbisāra is giving the Bamboo Grove. ³ As at Ja i.94. ⁴ Cf. similar passage at Vin 4.223 (BD 3.178). ⁵ *hirañña*; see note at BD 1.28.

spread with the price of a hundred thousand.¹

The gold coins that were taken out the first time were not enough for a small open space near to the porch. Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika enjoined the people, saying: “Go back, good people, bring (more) gold coins, I will spread this open space.” Then it occurred to Prince Jeta: “Now this can be no ordinary matter² inasmuch as this householder bestows so many gold coins,” and he spoke thus to the householder Anāthapiṇḍika:

“Enough, householder; let me spread this open space, give this open space to me, it will be my gift.”

Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, thinking: “This Prince Jeta is a distinguished, well-known man; surely the faith in this *dhamma* and discipline of well-known men like this is very efficacious,”³ made over that open space to Prince Jeta. Then Prince Jeta built a porch⁴ on that open space. The householder Anāthapiṇḍika had dwelling-places made, he had cells⁵ made ... porches ... attendance halls ... fire halls ... huts for what is allowable ... privies ... places for pacing up and down in ... halls in the places for pacing up and down in ... wells ... halls at the wells ... bathrooms ... halls in the bathrooms ... lotus ponds ... he had sheds made.

GIVING BUILDING WORK

Then the Lord, having stayed at Rājagaha for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Vesālī. In due course, walking on tour, he arrived at Vesālī. The Lord stayed there at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the Hall of the Gabled Pillars. Now at that time people were making repairs carefully and they were also attending carefully,

¹ *koṭisantharam santharāpesi*. Vin-a 1220 says “having given a hundred thousand *kaḥāpaṇas*, having had them spread out (on the ground), having taken the measure of the circumference of trees and ponds there, he gave having had them (i.e. the *kaḥāpaṇas*) spread out in a certain place”. Most likely the gold coins were not round but square, see *Vinaya Texts* iii.188, n. 1. ² *na orakam bhavassiti*. Cf. **Kd 1.9.1**, and below **Kd 16.5.1**. ³ As at **Kd 6.36.3**. ⁴ *koṭṭhaka* is a word of unsettled meaning. Vin-a 1221 says that he built a seven storeyed long house with a porch (or storehouse) at the gateway (*dvārakoṭṭhakapāsāda*). ⁵ Cf. this list with that at **Kd 3.5.6**, **Kd 3.5.9**.

with the requisites of robes, almsfood, lodgings and medicines for the sick, to those monks who were looking after the repairs. Then it occurred to a certain poor tailor: “Now this can be no ordinary matter inasmuch as these people are making repairs carefully. What now if I too should make repairs?” Then that poor tailor, having himself kneaded mud, having piled up bricks, had wattle and daub walls erected. But because he was not skilful the piling was crooked and a wall fell down. And a second time ... And a third time ... a wall fell down.

Then that poor tailor ... spread it about, saying: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, exhort, instruct those who give them the requisites of robes, almsfood, lodgings, medicines for the sick, and these look after their repairs. But I am poor. No one exhorts or instructs me or looks after my repairs.” Monks heard this poor tailor as he was ... spreading it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow you, monks, to put repairs in charge (of a monk).¹ Monks, the monk who is in charge of repairs should make an effort,² thinking, ‘How can the dwelling-place be brought to a rapid termination?’ and he should restore broken and dilapidated parts.³

“And thus, monks, should they be given in charge: First, a monk should be asked; having asked him, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order give the repairs to the dwelling-place of the householder So-and-so in charge of the monk So-and-so. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is giving the repairs ... in charge of the monk So-and-so. If the giving in charge of the monk So-and-so, of the repairs to the dwelling-place of the householder So-and-so, is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom

¹ *navakammaṃ dātuṃ*. For various rules for making repairs see [Kd 16.17](#). ² *ussukkaṃ āpajjissati*. Cf. *ussukkaṃ karoti* at [Vin 4.280](#), [Vin 4.291](#), [Vin 4.300](#). ³ At [AN iii.263](#) this is one of five things said to make a resident monk very useful to his residence.

it is not pleasing should speak. Repairs to the dwelling-place of the householder So-and-so are given in charge of the monk So-and-so. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this’.”

ALLOWANCE FOR THE FIRST SEAT, ETC.

16.6.1 Then the Lord, having stayed at Vesālī for as long as he found suit-
ing,¹ set out on tour for Sāvattthī. Now at that time monks who were
5.225 pupils of the group of six monks, having gone along in front of the
Order of monks with the Awakened One at its head, took possession
of dwelling-places, they took possession of sleeping places, saying:
“This will be for our preceptors, this will be for our teachers, this will
be for us.” Then the venerable Sāriputta, having gone along close
behind the Order of monks with the Awakened One at its head, not
being able to get a sleeping place—the dwelling-places being taken
possession of, the sleeping places being taken possession of—sat
down at the root of a certain tree. Then the Lord, getting up during
the night towards morning, coughed. The venerable Sāriputta also
coughed.

“Who is there?”

“It is I, Lord, Sāriputta.”

16.6.2 “Why are you, Sāriputta, sitting here?” Then the venerable Sāri-
putta told this matter to the Lord.²

12.161 Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had
the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying: “Is it
true, as is said, monks, that monks who are pupils ... ‘... this will be
for us?’”

“It is true, Lord.” The Awakened One, the Lord rebuked them,
saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men, having gone along in front
of ... saying ‘... this will be for us’? It is not, monks, for pleasing those

¹ For the incident related here, cf. Ja no.37. ² Cf. a similar passage at Vin 4.16.

who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Who, monks, is worthy of the best seat, the best water¹ (for washing), the best alms?” Some monks spoke thus: “Whoever, Lord, has gone forth from a noble family, he is worthy of the best ... alms.” Some monks spoke thus: “Whoever, Lord, has gone forth from a brahmin family ... from a householder’s family ... Whoever, Lord, knows the *suttantas*² ... is an expert on discipline ... is a teacher of *dhamma* ... is possessed of the first meditation³ ... is possessed of the second meditation ... is possessed of the third meditation ... is possessed of the fourth meditation ... is a stream winner ... a once-returner ... a non-returner ... one perfected ... a threefold wisdom man ... a sixfold superknowledge man, he is worthy of the best seat, the best water (for washing), the best alms.”

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Formerly,⁴ monks, there used to be a large banyan on a slope of the Himalayas. Three friends lived near it: a partridge, a monkey and a bull-elephant. These lived courteous, deferential, polite⁵ to one another. Then, monks, it occurred to these friends: ‘Now let us find out which of us is the eldest by birth. We should respect, revere, reverence, honour him, and we should abide by his advice.’ Then, monks, the partridge and the monkey asked the bull-elephant: ‘You, friend, what long-ago thing do you remember?’

“When I, friends, was young I used to pass over this banyan keeping it between my thighs, and the topmost shoots brushed against my belly. This, friends, is a long-ago thing that I remember.’

“Then, monks, the partridge and the bull-elephant asked the monkey: ‘You, friend, what long-ago thing do you remember?’

“When I, friends, was young, having sat down on the ground, I used to eat the topmost shoots of this banyan. This, friends, is a long-ago thing that I remember.’

¹ *aggodakam*, explained by *dakkhiṇodaka* at Vin-a 1221=MN-a i.145. Cf. MN i.28, MN ii.204. ² With this and the next two items compare a similar list at Vin 3.159.

³ With this list to the end, cf. Vin 4.24. ⁴ This episode forms the Tittirajāta, Ja no.37. ⁵ As at Kd 1.25.6, Kd 5.4.3.

“Then, monks, the monkey and the bull-elephant asked the partridge: ‘You, friend, what long-ago thing do you remember?’

“‘Friends, in a certain open space there was a great banyan. I, having eaten one of its fruits, relieved myself in that open space, and this banyan has grown from that. So I, friends, am the eldest by birth’.

“Then, monks, the monkey and the bull-elephant spoke thus to the partridge: ‘You, friend, are the eldest of us by birth. We will respect, revere, reverence, honour you and we will abide by your advice.’

“Then, monks, the partridge caused the monkey and the bull-elephant to undertake the five moral habits and himself followed the observance of the five moral habits. They, having lived courteous, deferential, polite to one another, at the breaking up of the body after dying arose in a happy bourn, a heaven world. This, monks, came to be known as the ‘Partridge Brahma-faring.’¹

“Those who reverence the old—
those men are skilled in *dhamma*,
Worthy of praise here and now
and a happy bourn here-after.

“Well then, monks, if animals, breathers, can live courteous, deferential, polite to one another, so do you, monks, let your light shine forth here so that you, gone forth in this *dhamma* and discipline which are well taught, live likewise courteous, deferential, polite to one another. It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” Having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, greeting, rising up for, joining the palms in salutation, proper homage, the best seat, the best water (for washing), the best alms according to seniority. But, monks, what belongs to an Order should not be reserved according to seniority. Whoever should (so) reserve it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

PERSONS NOT TO BE BOWED TO

16.6.5

“Monks, there are these ten who are not to be greeted: one ordained later is not to be greeted by one ordained earlier; one not ordained is not to be greeted; one belonging to a different communion (even) if he is more senior (yet) speaks what is not-*dhamma* is not to be greeted; a woman is not to be greeted; a eunuch ... one under probation¹ ... one who deserves to be sent back to the beginning² ... one who deserves *mānatta* ... one undergoing *mānatta* ... one deserving rehabilitation is not to be greeted. These, ten, monks, are not to be greeted. These three, monks, are to be greeted: one ordained earlier is to be greeted by one ordained later; one belonging to a different communion if he is more senior and speaks what is *dhamma* is to be greeted; and, monks, a Truth-finder, a perfected one, a fully Self-awakened one³ is to be greeted in the world with its *devas*, with its Māras, with its Brahmās, by creatures with recluses and brahmins, with *devas* and mankind. These three, monks, are to be greeted.”

BD 5.2

REJECTION OF RESERVED SEATING

Now at that time people prepared sheds for an Order, they prepared rugs, they prepared open spaces. Monks who were pupils of the group of six monks,⁴ saying: “Only what belongs to an Order is not allowed according to seniority by the Lord, not what is made on purpose for it,” having gone along in front of the Order of monks with the Awakened One at its head, took possession of the sheds, took possession of the rugs, took possession of the open spaces, thinking: “This will be for our preceptors, this will be for our teachers, this will be for us.” Then the venerable Sāriputta, having gone along close behind the Order of monks with the Awakened One at its head, not having a chance to get an open space—the sheds being taken possession of, the rugs being taken possession of, the open spaces being taken possession of—sat down at the root of a certain tree. Then

Kd 16.7

Vin 2.10

¹ This sentence is quoted at DN-a.i.178. ² See Kd 12.1.2. ³ Cf. AN ii.34, Iti p. 87f. ⁴ As in Kd 16.6.1.

the Lord, getting up during the night towards morning, coughed. The venerable Sāriputta also coughed.

“Who is there?”

“It is I, Lord, Sāriputta.”

“Why are you, Sāriputta, sitting here?” Then the venerable Sāriputta told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the monks, saying: “Is it true, as is said, monks, ...?” ... Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, even what is made on purpose for an Order should not be reserved according to seniority. Whoever should (so) reserve it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

ALLOWANCE FOR WHAT IS DISPLAYED BY HOUSEHOLDERS

16.8.1 Now at that time in a refectory inside a house people appointed high and broad things to recline upon, that is to say:¹ a sofa,² a divan, a long-haired coverlet, a many-coloured coverlet, a white coverlet, a wool coverlet besprent with flowers, a cotton quilt, a wool coverlet decorated with animals forms, a wool covering with hair on the upper side, a wool covering with hair at one side, a silken sheet studded with jewels, a sheet made with silk thread and studded with jewels, a dancer’s carpet, an elephant rug, a horse rug, a chariot rug, rugs of black antelope skins, a splendid sheeting of the hide of the *kadali*-deer, a sheet with an awning above, a couch with a red cushion at either end. Monks, being scrupulous, did not sit down on them.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, except for the three: a sofa, a divan, a cotton quilt, to sit down on what is displayed by householders, but not to lie down on it.”⁴

¹ List as at [Kd 5.10.4](#). See [BD 4.256](#) for notes ² Definition of *āsandi* at [Thag-a i.137](#) is that it is a long-legged four-cornered chair upon which it is possible to sit but not to lie. ³ Made an offence of wrong-doing at [Kd 5.10.5](#) to use any of these things.

⁴ Cf. [Vin 1.194](#) ([BD 4.259](#)).

Now at that time in a refectory inside a house people appointed a couch and a chair, both covered up with cotton.¹ Monks, being scrupulous, did not sit down on them. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to sit down on what is displayed by householders, but not to lie down on it.”

APPRECIATION FOR THE JETAVANA MONASTERY

Then the Lord, walking on tour, in due course arrived at Sāvattthī. The Lord stayed there at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance the householder Anāthapiṇḍika spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, may the Lord consent to a meal with me on the morrow together with the Order of monks.” The Lord consented by becoming silent. Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having understood the Lord’s consent, rising from his seat departed keeping his right side towards him. Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having had sumptuous foods, solid and soft, prepared towards the end of that night, had the time announced to the Lord, saying: “It is time, Lord, the meal is ready.” Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, approached the dwelling of the householder Anāthapiṇḍika; having approached, he sat down on the appointed seat together with the Order of monks. Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having with his own hand served and satisfied the Order of monks with the Awakened One at its head with sumptuous foods, solid and soft, when the Lord had eaten and had withdrawn his hand from his bowl, sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance the householder Anāthapiṇḍika spoke thus to the Lord: “What line of conduct am I, Lord, to follow in regard to the Jeta Grove?”

¹ *tūlonaddha*. Cf. *onaddhamañca onaddhapīṭha* at **Kd 16.2.7**, and **Vin 2.270**. Cf. also **Vin 1.194**.

“Well now, do you, householder, have the Jeta Grove prepared for (the use of) the Order of the four quarters,¹ present and to come.”

“Very well, Lord,” and the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, having answered the Lord in assent, had the Jeta Grove prepared for (the use of) the Order of the four quarters, present and to come.

Then the Lord thanked the householder Anāthapiṇḍika in these verses:²

“They ward off cold and heat and beasts of prey from there

...

He, knowing that *dhamma* here, attains *nibbāna*, cankerless.”

Then the Lord, having given thanks to the householder Anāthapiṇḍika in these verses, rising from his seat departed.

RESERVATION OF A SEAT, ETC.

Now at that time a certain chief minister who was a disciple of the Naked Ascetics had a meal for an Order. The venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having arrived after (the others) while the meal was yet unfinished, turned away the monk who was next to him,³ and there was an uproar in the refectory. Then that chief minister ... spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, having arrived after (the others) turn away monks while a meal is yet unfinished so that there is an uproar in the refectory? Now, is it not possible, even sitting somewhere else, to eat as much as one pleases?” Monks heard this chief minister as he ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having arrived after (the others), turn away the monk who is next to him while the meal is yet unfinished so that there is an uproar in the refectory?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ See **Kd 8.275**; **Kd 16.1.4**. ² As at **Kd 16.1.5** above and **Jai i.93**. ³ I.e. in the procession for alms. Text reads here and at **Vin 4.234** *anantavika* which *Vinaya Texts* iii.198, n. 4 says “is a misprint” for *ānantarika*. Cf. **Vin 1.321**.

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, having arrived ... in the refectory?”

“It is true, Lord.” The Awakened One, the Lord rebuked him, saying:

How can you, foolish man, having arrived ... in a refectory? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a monk should not turn (another) away while a meal is yet unfinished. Whoever should turn (another) away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he turns (another) away who is invited (to the meal), he should be told, ‘Go and fetch water.’ If this is thus accomplished, that is good; if it is not accomplished, having swallowed lumps of boiled rice properly, his seat should be given to a senior monk. **But this I say, monks: that not by any method should a seat be reserved for a senior monk. Whoever should reserve one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time the group of six monks turned ill monks away. The ill ones spoke thus: “We, your reverences, are not able to get up, we are ill.” Saying, “We will turn the venerable ones away,” having taken hold of them, having turned them away, they let go (of them) while they were standing. The ill ones, on being let go of, fell down. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, one who is ill should not be turned away. Whoever should turn him away, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time the group of six monks, saying: “We are ill, we are not to be turned away,” kept to the best sleeping places. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to give a suitable sleeping place to one who is ill.”

Now at that time the group of six monks reserved lodgings on

(some slight) pretext.¹ They told this matter to the Lord He said: **“Monks, a lodging should not be reserved on (some slight) pretext. Whoever should (so) reserve it, there is an offence of wrongdoing.”**

Now at that time the group of seventeen monks² were repairing³ a large dwelling-place in the neighbourhood, thinking: ‘We will spend the rains here.’ The group of six monks saw the group of seventeen monks as they were repairing the dwelling-place, and seeing them, they spoke thus:

“Your reverences, the group of seventeen monks are repairing a dwelling-place. Come, we will turn them away.”

Some spoke thus: “Wait, your reverences, until they have repaired it; when it is repaired, we will turn them away.” Then the group of six monks spoke thus to the group of seventeen monks: “Go away, your reverences, the dwelling-place was obtained⁴ by us.”

“Your reverences, should not this have been explained before, and we would have repaired another?”

“Your reverences, does not a dwelling-place belong to the Order?”

“Yes, your reverences, a dwelling-place belongs to the Order.”

“Go away, your reverences, the dwelling-place was obtained by us.”

“Your reverences, the dwelling-place is big; you stay, and we too will stay.”

“Go away, your reverences, the dwelling-place was obtained by us,” and angry, displeased, having taken them by the throat, they threw them out. These being thrown out, wept. Monks spoke thus:

“Why do you, your reverences, weep?”

“Your reverences, this group of six monks, angry, displeased, threw us out of a dwelling-place belonging to the Order.” Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about,

¹ *lesakappa*. Vin-a 1222 says for a small thing, nothing more than a headache. ² As at Bu-Pc 17. Translated at BD 2.250-BD.2.251, q.v. for notes. ³ *paṭisaṃkharoti*, restore, repair, mend. ⁴ *pāpuṇāti*.

saying: “How can this group of six monks, angry, displeased, throw out monks from a dwelling-place belonging to an Order?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks, angry, displeased, threw out monks from a dwelling-place belonging to an Order?”

“It is true, Lord.”¹ Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, a monk should not be thrown out of a dwelling-place belonging to an Order by one who is angry, displeased. Whoever (such) should throw him out should be dealt with according to the rule.”² I allow you, monks, to assign³ lodgings.”

AGREEMENT FOR AN ASSIGNER OF LODGINGS

Then it occurred to the monks: “Now by whom should lodgings be assigned?”

They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to agree upon a monk endowed with five qualities as assigner of lodgings:⁴ one who would not follow a wrong course⁵ 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 taken and what is not taken. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon: First, a monk should be asked. Having asked him, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon the monk So-and-so as assigner of lodgings. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is agreeing upon the monk So-and-so as assigner of lodgings. If the agreement upon the monk So-and-so as

¹ *Cūlavagga* and *Pācittiya* versions proceed differently from here. ² *Bu-Pc 17.*

³ *gāheturī*. ⁴ *Senāsanagāhāpaka*; cf. *pattagāhāpaka* and see *BD 2.122, n. 1*. To the end of *Kd 16.11.2* is the same as the passage at *Vin 3.246-7 (BD 2.122)* dealing with the assigner of bowls. ⁵ See *BD 2.122, n. 2*.

assigner of lodgings is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The monk So-and-so is agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this’.”

Then it occurred to the monks who were the assigners of lodgings: “Now, how should the lodgings be assigned?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, first to count the monks; having counted the monks, to count the sleeping places;¹ having counted the sleeping places, to assign according to the accommodation for sleeping places.”² Assigning according to the accommodation for sleeping places (some) sleeping places were left over.³ “I allow you, monks, to assign according to the accommodation in dwelling-places.” Assigning according to the accommodation in dwelling-places (some) dwelling-places were left over. “I allow you, monks, to assign according to the accommodation in cells.”⁴ Assigning according to the accommodation in cells (some) cells were left over. “I allow you, monks, to give an additional share⁵ also.”

When an additional share had been occupied another monk arrived. “It need not be given (to him if the occupier) is not willing.”⁶

Now at that time monks assigned lodgings to one who was standing outside a boundary. They told this matter to the Lord. He said; **“Monks, a lodging should not be assigned to one standing outside a boundary. Whoever should (so) assign it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

¹ Vin-a 1223 calls these the places for couches. ² *seyyaggena*. Vin-a 1223 explains by *seyyaparicchadena*, by the space, range, and speaks of each monk having a place for a couch. Cf. *bhikkhaggena*, at Kd 12.1.1, apparently meaning the number of monks.

³ *ussādiyimsu*. Cf. Vin 4.99 and BD 2.364, n. 1. ⁴ *pariveṇa*. As pointed out at Vinaya Texts iii.203, n. 1 a “cell” here appears to be a unit larger than a dwelling-place. But I do not think that this is necessarily the case. Probably not more than one monk slept in a cell, but a dwelling-place might have been used by two at least. Vin-a 1223 in explaining *anubhāga*, says that if there are too few monks (for the available space) two or three cells should be given to each monk. ⁵ *anubhāga*. ⁶ *na akāmā* as at Kd 8.24.4.

Now at that time monks, having occupied lodgings, reserved them for all time. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, having occupied a lodging, it should not be reserved for all time. Whoever should reserve it (thus), there is an offence of wrongdoing.** I allow you, monks, to reserve it for the three months of the rains but not to reserve it for the dry season.”¹

BD 5.23

Kd 16.1

Then it occurred to the monks: “Now, how many (times for) the assignment of lodgings are there?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, there are these three (times for) the assignment of lodgings: the earlier,² the later, the intervening.³ The earlier on which they are to be assigned is the day following the full moon of Āsālha; the later on which they are to be assigned is the month following the full moon of Āsālha; the intervening on which they are to be assigned is the day following the Invitation, with reference to the next rains-residence. These, monks, are the three (times for) the assignment of lodgings.”

The Second Portion for Repeating.

Vin 2.1

THIRD RECITATION SECTION

Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having occupied a lodging in Sāvattḥī, went away to some village residence and occupied a lodging there too. Then it occurred to these monks: “Now your reverences, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, is a maker of strife, a maker of quarrels, a maker of contention, a maker of disputes a maker of legal questions in the Order. If he will spend the rains here, not one of us can live in comfort. Come, let us ask him.” Then these monks spoke thus to the

¹ Cf. Kd 16.17.2, below. ² See Kd 3.2.2. These two dates are the same as the earlier and the later periods for entering on the rains-residence. ³ The “intervening,” *antarāmuttaka*, does not refer to a date between these earlier and later times, but to the time between the rains-residence of one year and the next. Lodgings would become vacant at the end of the rains (see above Kd 16.11.3) and then assignment for the next rains could take place. It seems that the first two are compulsory, the third optional, see Vin-a 1223.

venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans: “Have you not, reverend Upananda, occupied a lodging in Sāvattthī?”

“Yes, your reverences.”

“But do you, reverend Upananda, (although) alone reserve two (lodgings)?”

“I, your reverences, am giving up the one here and occupying the one there.” Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

5.236 “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, (although) alone reserve two (lodgings)?” They told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, in this connection, having had the Order of monks convened, questioned the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, saying:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda ... (lodgings)?”

“It is true, Lord.” The Awakened One, the Lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, (although) alone reserve two (lodgings)? The one occupied by you there, foolish man, is lost here,¹ the one occupied by you here is lost there. Thus are you, foolish man, excluded from both. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” ... having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, two (lodgings) should not be reserved by one (monk). Whoever should reserve (them), there is an offence of wrong doing.

6.13.1 Now at that time the Lord² in many a figure talked a talk on discipline to the monks, he spoke in praise of discipline, he spoke in praise of accomplishment in discipline, he spoke in praise of the venerable Upāli, referring (to him) again and again. Monks spoke thus: “The Lord in many a figure talked a talk on discipline ... he spoke in praise of the venerable Upāli, referring (to him) again and again. Come, your reverences, let us master discipline under the venerable

¹ The one taken in each place is automatically lost just because a monk has taken them both. ² The two introductory sentences occur also at [Vin 4.142 \(BD 3.40\)](#).

Upāli,” and they, many monks—elders and newly ordained and those of middle standing—mastered discipline under the venerable Upāli. The venerable Upāli, out of respect for the monks who were elders, recited standing, and also the monks who were elders, out of respect for *dhamma*,¹ had it recited standing, so that the monks who were elders were tired as well as the venerable Upāli. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, when a newly ordained monk is reciting to sit down on a seat that is the same (height) or on a higher one out of respect for *dhamma*; when a monk who is an elder is having it recited to sit down on a seat that is the same (height) or on a lower one out of respect for *dhamma*.”

Vin 2.1

BD 5,2

Now at that time many monks standing near the venerable Upāli grew tired waiting for the recitation. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to sit down with those entitled to seats of an equal (height).” Then it occurred to monks: “Now, in respect of what is one entitled to seats of an equal (height)?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to sit down together with those who are within three years (of your) standing.”²

Kd 16.1

Now at that time several monks entitled to seats of an equal (height), having sat down on a couch, broke the couch; having sat down on a chair, they broke the chair. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a couch for a group of three (persons),³ a chair for a group of three (persons).” But a group of three (people), having sat down on a couch, broke the couch; having sat down on a chair, they broke the chair. “I allow, monks, a couch for a group of two (persons), a chair for a group of two (persons).”

Now at that time monks were (too) scrupulous to sit down on a long seat with those not entitled to a seat of an equal (height). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, except with

¹ Cf. **Bu-Sk 57–Bu-Sk 72** and especially **Bu-Sk 69**. ² I.e. since the time of ordination.

³ *tivagga*, threefold.

a eunuch, a woman, a hermaphrodite, to sit down on a long seat with those not entitled to a seat of an equal (height).” Then it occurred to the monks: “Now, what is the maximum (length) of a ‘long seat’?”

“I allow, monks, the maximum (length) of a ‘long seat’ (to be) whatever is the maximum (length) that suffices (to seat) three (persons).”

Now at that time Visākhā, Migāra’s mother, wanted to have a long house with a verandah of the “elephant-nail” type¹ built for an Order. Then it occurred to the monks: “What appurtenances of a long house are allowed by the Lord, what are not allowed?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, all the appurtenances of a long house.”

Now at that time the grandmother of King Pasenadi of Kosala passed away.² On her passing many unallowable goods accrued to an Order, that is to say³ a sofa, a divan ... a cotton quilt ... a couch with a red cushion at either end. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, having broken off⁴ the legs of a sofa, to make use of it; having destroyed the horse-hair (stuffing) of a divan, to make use of it; having unravelled the cotton quilt, to make a squatting mat;⁵ to make a ground covering with what is over.”

THINGS NOT TO BE DISPOSED OF

Now at that time in a certain village residence not far from Sāvattthī the resident monks were worried at preparing lodgings for the in-

¹ *hatthinakhaka*. See A.K. COOMARASWAMY, *Indian Architectural Terms*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 48, No. 3, p.258. ² Cf. SN i.97. ³ List as at Kd 5.10.4; Kd 16.8. ⁴ Cf. Nuns’ Bi-Pc 42, where a nun may use a sofa and a divan if she cuts down, *chinditvā*, the legs of the former and cuts out, *chinditvā*, the stuffing from the latter. Above *bhinditvā* occurs in both places instead of *chinditvā*. See BD 3.326, n. 1; BD 3.327, n. 3. DN-a 88, quoting above passage, uses both words: *āsandiya pāde chinditvā ... pallāṅkassa vāḷe bhinditvā*. At Kd 5.10.5 it is a *dukkaṭa* for a monk to use a sofa, divan or cotton quilt. At Kd 16.8 they form the three exceptions to the things displayed by a householder that a monk may sit down on. Above they are allowed if certain conditions are fulfilled. ⁵ Similar allowance at Kd 16.2.6.

coming monks who arrived. Then it occurred to these monks: “At present we, your reverences, are worried at preparing lodgings for incoming monks who arrive. Come, your reverences, let us make over all the lodgings belonging to the Order to one (monk) and we will make use of them as belonging to him.” So these made over to one (monk) all the lodgings belonging to the Order. Incoming monks spoke thus to these monks: “Make ready lodgings, your reverences, for us.”

“Your reverences, there are no lodgings belonging to the Order, we have made them all over to one (monk).”

“But have you, your reverences, disposed of lodgings belonging to an Order?”

“Yes, your reverences.” Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can these monks dispose of what belongs to an Order?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks disposed of lodgings belonging to an Order?”

“It is true, Lord.” The Awakened One, the Lord, rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can these foolish men dispose of lodgings belonging to an Order? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, these five things not to be disposed of¹ should not be disposed of by an Order or by a group or by an individual—even if disposed of they are not (really) disposed of. Whoever should dispose of them, there is a grave offence. What are the five?

1. **A monastery, a site for a monastery. This is the first thing not to be disposed of that should not be disposed of by an Order or by a group or by an individual—even if disposed of it is not (really) disposed of. Whoever should dispose of it, there is a grave offence.**

¹ *avissajjiyāni*. Cf. *avissajjikam* at **Kd 8.275**; and *appamattakavissajjaka* at **Vin 2.177**, **Vin 4.38**.

2. **A dwelling-place, a site for a dwelling-place. This is the second thing ...**
3. **A couch, a chair, a mattress, a squatting mat. This is the third thing ...**
4. **A copper pot, a copper box, a copper jar, a copper vessel, an adze, a hatchet, an axe, a hoe, a spade. This is the fourth thing ...**
5. **Jungle-rope, bamboo, coarse grass, reeds, *tiṇa*-grass, clay, wooden goods, clay goods. This is the fifth thing not to be disposed of that should not be disposed of by an Order or by a group or by an individual—even if disposed of it is not (really) disposed of. Whoever should dispose of it, there is a grave offence.**

Monks, these five things not to be disposed of should not be disposed of by an Order or by a group or by an individual—even if disposed of they are not (really) disposed of. Whoever should dispose of them, there is a grave offence.”

THINGS NOT TO BE DISTRIBUTED

6.16.1 Then the Lord, having stayed at Sāvattihī for as long as he found
 12.171 suiting, set out on tour for Kiṭṭāgiri with a large Order of monks, with
 5.240 at least five hundred monks and with Sāriputta and Moggallāna. Then
 the monks who were followers of Assaji and Punabbasuka heard:
 “They say that the Lord has arrived at Kiṭṭāgiri with a large Order of
 monks ... and with Sāriputta and Moggallāna. Come, your reverences,
 let us distribute all the lodgings belonging to the Order. Sāriputta
 and Moggallāna are of depraved desires, they are under the influence
 of depraved desires; we will not make ready lodgings for them.” They
 distributed all the lodgings belonging to the Order. Then the Lord,
 walking on tour, gradually reached Kiṭṭāgiri. Then the Lord addressed
 several monks, saying:

“Do you go, monks, and having gone up to the monks who are
 followers of Assaji and Punabbasuka, speak thus: ‘The Lord, your

reverences, has come together with a large Order of monks ... and with Sāriputta and Moggallāna; so, your reverences, make ready lodgings for the Lord and for the Order of monks and for Sāriputta and Moggallāna.’”

“Very well, Lord,” and these monks, having answered the Lord in assent, went up to the monks who were followers of Assaji and Punabbasuka; having gone up to the monks who were followers of Assaji and Punabbasuka, they spoke thus: “The Lord, your reverences, has come ... make ready lodgings for the Lord and for the Order of monks and for Sāriputta and Moggallāna.”

“There are no lodgings, your reverences, belonging to the Order; all were distributed by us. The Lord, your reverences, is welcome, the Lord can stay in whatever dwelling-place he likes. Sāriputta and Moggallāna are of depraved desires, they are under the influence of depraved desires; we will not make ready lodgings for them.”

“But did you, your reverences, distribute lodgings belonging to the Order?”

“Yes, your reverences.” Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can these monks who are followers of Assaji and Punabbasuka distribute lodgings belonging to an Order?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks distributed ... to an Order?”

“It is true, Lord.”

“How, monks, can these foolish men distribute lodgings belonging to an Order? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ...” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, these five things not to be divided up¹ should not be divided up by an Order or by a group or by an individual—even if divided up they are not (really) divided up. Whoever should divide them up, there is a grave offence. What are the five?²

¹ *avebhaṅgiyāni*. Cf. *avebhaṅgikam* at **Kd 8.275**. ² As at **Kd 16.15.2**.

1. A monastery, a site for a monastery. This is the first thing not to be divided up that should not be divided up by an Order or by a group or by an individual—even if divided up it is not (really) divided up. Whoever should divide it up, there is a grave offence.
2. A dwelling-place, a site for a dwelling-place. This is the second thing ...
3. A couch, a chair, a mattress, a squatting mat. This is the third thing ...
4. A copper pot, a copper box, a copper jar, a copper vessel, an adze, a hatchet, an axe, a hoe, a spade. This is the fourth thing ...
5. Jungle-rope, bamboo, coarse grass, reeds, *tiṇa*-grass, clay, wooden goods, clay goods. This is the fifth thing not to be divided up that should not be divided up by an Order or by a group or by an individual—even if divided up it is not (really) divided up. Whoever should divide it up, there is a grave offence.

ON THE GIFT OF BUILDING WORK

Then the Lord, having stayed at Kiṭāgiri for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Āḷavī. Gradually, walking on tour, he arrived at Āḷavī. The Lord stayed there at Āḷavī at the chief shrine of Āḷavī.¹ Now at that time the monks of Āḷavī gave repairs such as these into the charge (of a monk):² they gave repairs in charge when there was merely putting aside in heaps³ ... when there was merely smearing a wall ... when there was merely placing a door ... when there was merely making a socket for a bolt ... when there was merely making a window-hole ... when there was merely treating with whitewash ... when there was merely treating with black colouring ... when there was merely treating with red chalk ... when there was merely roofing ... when there was merely joining ... when there was merely

¹ See **BD 1.247, n. 2.** ² Cf. the giving in charge of repairs in a general way at **Kd 16.5.**

³ *Vinaya Texts* iii.213 takes this to refer to “clay or earth.”

putting on a bar (to a doorpost)¹ ... when there was merely restoring broken and dilapidated parts² ... when there was merely plastering the floors;³ and they gave repairs in charge for twenty years, and they gave repairs in charge for thirty years, and they gave repairs in charge for life, and they gave the repairs to a completed dwelling-place into the charge (of a monk until) the time of his cremation.⁴

BD 5.2

Those who were modest monks spread it about, saying: “How can the monks of Ālavī give repairs such as these into the charge (of a monk) ... (until) the time of his cremation?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the monks of Ālavī ... the time of his cremation?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, repairs when there is merely putting aside in heaps should not be given into the charge (of a monk) ... nor should repairs to a completed dwelling-place be given into the charge (of a monk) until the time of his cremation. Whoever should (so) give in charge, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to give repairs to a dwelling-place into the charge (of a monk) if it is not (yet) built or if it is not (yet) finished;⁵ in reference to work on a small dwelling-place, repairs may be given in charge for six or five years; in reference to work on a curved house repairs may be given in charge for seven or eight years; in reference to work on a large dwelling-place or a long house, repairs may be given in charge for ten or twelve years.”

Now at that time monks gave the whole of a dwelling-place into

Kd 16.1

¹ Oldenberg's text reads *gaṇḍikādhānamattena*; Vin-a 1245 reads *bhaṇḍika-*. At Ja iii.41 *bhaṇḍikā* is variant reading for *gaṇḍikā*. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.213, n. 4 ² As at Kd 16.5.2. ³ *paribhaṇḍa*. Vin-a 1245 says doing up a “floor” with cowdung, with an astringent decoction. Cf. Kd 15.9.4. ⁴ *dhūmakālika*, smoke-time, i.e. when the smoke arises from his funeral pyre. Cf. Ja iii.422. Word occurs at Kd 21.1.9. ⁵ According to Vin-a 1245-6, if the rafters have not been put up, for when they are up much has been built.

charge for repairs. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, the whole of a dwelling-place should not be given in charge for repairs. Whoever should give one in charge, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

“Now at that time monks gave two (dwelling-places) into the charge of one (monk). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, two (dwelling-places) should not be given into the charge of one (monk). Whoever should (so) give in charge, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks, having taken on repairs, made another live (there). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, having taken on repairs, you should not make another live (there). Whoever should make (another) live (there), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks, having taken on repairs, reserved (for their own use) what belonged to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, having taken on repairs, you should not reserve (for your own use) what belongs to an Order. Whoever should (so) reserve it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to occupy one good sleeping place.”**

Now at that time monks gave repairs into the charge of one outside a boundary. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, repairs should not be given into the charge of one outside a boundary. Whoever should (so) give them in charge, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks, having taken on repairs (to a building), reserved it for all time. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, having taken on repairs (to a building), you should not**

reserve it for all time. Whoever should (so) reserve it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to reserve it for the three months of the rains, but not to reserve it for the dry season.”¹

Now at that time monks, having taken on repairs, went away² and left the Order and passed away, and they pretended to be novices and they pretended to be disavowers of the training ... to be committers of extreme offences ... to be mad ... to be unhinged ... to have bodily pains ... to be suspended for not seeing an offence ... to be suspended for not making amends for an offence ... to be suspended for not giving up a wrong view and they pretended to be eunuchs ... to be living in communion as it were by theft ... to have gone over to a sect ... to be animals ... to be matricides ... to be parricides ... to be slayers of one perfected ... to be seducers of nuns ... to be schismatics ... to be shedders of a (Truth-finder's) blood and they pretended to be hermaphrodites. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“This is a case, monks, where a monk, having taken on repairs, goes away. Thinking, ‘Do not let the Order suffer,’ (the repairs) should be given into the charge of another. This is a case, monks, where a monk, having taken on repairs, leaves the Order, passes away, pretends to be ... a hermaphrodite. Thinking, ‘Do not let the Order suffer,’ (the repairs) should be given into the charge of another. This is a case, monks, where a monk, having taken on repairs, goes away while they are yet unfinished ... pretends to be a hermaphrodite. Thinking, ‘Do not let the Order suffer,’ (the repairs) should be given into the charge of another. This is a case, monks, where a monk, having taken on repairs, on their completion goes away; they are still in his (charge).³ This is a case, monks, where a monk, having taken on repairs, on their completion leaves the Order ... pretends to have committed an extreme offence: the Order is the owner. This is a case, monks, where a monk, having taken on repairs, on their completion pretends to be mad ... pretends to be suspended for not giving up a wrong view:

¹ Cf. Kd 16.11.3 above. ² See Kd 2.22.3; Kd 2.36.1-Kd 2.36.3; Kd 9.4.2, Kd 9.4.7. ³ *tass'eva tam*. Vin-a 1248 elaborates “for the rains.”

they are still in his (charge). This is a case, monks, where a monk, having taken on repairs, on their completion pretends to be a eunuch ... pretends to be a hermaphrodite: the Order is the owner.”

REJECTION OF USING ELSEWHERE, ETC.

^{6.18.1} Now at that time monks made use elsewhere¹ of lodgings—appurtenances of a dwelling-place—belonging to a lay-follower. Then that lay-follower ... spread it about, saying: “How can these revered sirs make use elsewhere of appurtenances belonging somewhere else?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not make use elsewhere of appurtenances belonging somewhere else. Whoever should (so) make use of them, there is an offence of wrong doing.**”

Now at that time monks,² being (too) scrupulous to convey to the Observance house and to the meeting place (things to sit on), sat down on the ground. Their limbs and robes were covered with dust. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to convey (things) temporarily.”

^{5.245} Now at that time a great dwelling-place belonging to an Order fell into decay. Monks, being scrupulous, did not take out the lodgings.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to convey (things) for the sake of protecting (them).”

^{6.19.1} Now at that time a costly woollen blanket—an accessory to a lodging—accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to barter⁴ it for (something) advantageous.”

¹ As at Vin 3.65–Vin 3.66. Cf. Vin 4.76, Vin 4.81 (both “eating elsewhere”). ² As at Vin 3.66. ³ Vin-a 1248 explains that having conveyed them elsewhere they do not make use of them. ⁴ *parivatteti*. Cf. BD 2.55, n. 8. Vin-a 1248 says that the meaning is to get a lodging, couch or chair of equal or greater value.

Now at that time a costly woven cloth ... “to barter it for (something) advantageous.”

Now at that time a bear’s hide¹ accrued to an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make a towel for the feet.” Drapery² accrued. “I allow you, monks, to make a towel for the feet.” Cloth³ accrued. “I allow you, monks, to make a towel for the feet.”

Now at that time monks trod upon a lodging while their feet were unwashed;⁴ the lodging was soiled. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a lodging should not be trodden upon while your feet are unwashed. Whoever should (so) tread upon one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”** Now at that time monks trod upon a lodging while their feet were damp with their sandals on ... **“... offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks spat on ground that had been treated;⁵ the colour was spoiled. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, you should not spit upon ground that has been treated. Whoever should (so) spit, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, a spittoon.”** Now at that time the legs of couches and the legs of chairs scratched ground that had been treated. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to wrap them round with a piece of cloth.”

Now at that time monks leant against a wall that had been treated; the colour was spoiled. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ At [Vin 1.192](#) this is not included among the large hides which were not allowed.

² *cakkali*. Cf. [Kd 16.2.2](#). ³ *colaka*. Cf. [Kd 8.18](#). ⁴ Cf. [Kd 5.6.1](#) where monks are allowed to wear sandals so as not to soil couches and chairs when they get up on to them. ⁵ Either with whitewash, black colouring or red chalk; cf. [Kd 15.11.6](#);

[Kd 16.8.1](#); [Kd 16.17.1](#). [Kd 1.25.15](#) makes it appear as if black were for the ground and red for the walls.

“Monks, you should not lean against a wall that has been treated. Whoever should lean against one, there is an offence of wrongdoing. I allow you, monks, a reclining board.”¹ The reclining board scratched the ground underneath, it destroyed the wall above. “I allow you, monks, to wrap it round with a piece of cloth at the lower and the upper (ends).”

Now at that time monks² were (too) scrupulous to lie down on a place for treading on with washed feet.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to lie down (in such a place), having spread a sheet.”⁴

ALLOWANCE FOR MEALS FOR THE ORDER, ETC.

^{6.21.1} Then the Lord, having stayed at Ālavī for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Rājagaha. Gradually, walking on tour, he arrived at Rājagaha. The Lord stayed there at Rājagaha in the Great Grove at the squirrels’ feeding place. Now at that time Rājagaha was short of food. People were not able to make a meal for the Order (but) they wanted to make a meal for special (monks),⁵ an invitation (-meal),⁶ food (allowed by) ticket,⁷ (food given) on a day of the waxing or waning of the moon, (given) on an Observance day, (given) on the day after an Observance day. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, a meal for an Order, a meal for a special (monk), an invitation (meal) ... (food given) on the day after an Observance day.”⁸

¹ Mentioned at [Kd 1.25.15](#), [Kd 1.25.16](#). ² Omitted in Oldenberg’s text. ³ *dhotapādakā*. Vin-a 1249 gives the above meaning, and says that *dhotapādake* is also a reading. ⁴ *paccattharivā*. On “sheet,” *paccattharaṇa*, see [BD 2.34, n. 1](#); [BD 2.46, n. 3](#). ⁵ Cf. [Kd 6.19.1](#) and [Bu-Pc 46](#). ⁶ Defined at [Vin 4.100](#). ⁷ For this and the next three see notes at [BD 2.313–314](#). ⁸ Vin-a 1250 says that this allowance was made by the Lord for times of plenty when people can again give food to a whole Order.

AGREEMENT FOR AN ISSUER OF MEALS

Now at that time the group of six monks, having chosen the sweet foods for themselves, gave poor foods to (other) monks. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow you, monks, to agree upon a monk possessed of five qualities as issuer of meals:¹ one who would not follow a wrong course from desire ... from hatred ... from stupidity ... from fear, and one who would know what is issued and what is not issued. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon: First, a monk should be asked ...² ‘... Thus do I understand this’.”

Then it occurred to the monks who were issuers of meals: “Now, how should a meal be issued?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to issue (the food) after having put it into heaps and having tied on a ticket or a leaf.”³

AGREEMENT FOR AN ASSIGNER OF LODGINGS

Now at that time there was no assigner of lodgings⁴ for an Order.⁵ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to agree upon a monk endowed with five qualities as assigner of lodgings ... and one who would know what is assigned and what is not assigned. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon ...⁶ ‘... Thus do I understand this’.”

Now at that time there was no keeper of the storeroom⁷ for an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, ... and one who would, know what is guarded and what is not guarded. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon ... ‘... Thus do I understand this’.”

¹ Dabba was agreed upon for this office at [Kd 14.4](#) above, and at [Bu-Ss 8](#) ([Vin 3.158](#) = [Vin 2.75](#)). See also [AN iii.275](#). ² As in [Kd 14.9](#) ³ *paṭṭikā*. Buddhaghosa, reading *pattikā*, says it is a leaf (*paṇṇa*) of a bamboo, reed or palm. ⁴ This office was also given to Dabba. ⁵ The following list of offices also occurs at [AN iii.274](#)–[AN iii.275](#). ⁶ As in [Kd 14.4.3](#). ⁷ *bhaṇḍāgārika*, as at [Vin 1.284](#).

Now at that time there was no acceptor of robes¹ for an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow ... and one who would know what is taken and what is not taken ... ‘... Thus do I understand this’.”

Now at that time there was no distributor of robe material² ... no distributor of conje³ ... no distributor of fruit for an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks ... and one who would know what is distributed and what is not distributed ... ‘... Thus do I understand this’.”

Now at that time there was no distributor of solid food⁴ for an Order. The solid food, not being distributed, was lost. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you ... and one who would know what is distributed and what is not distributed ... ‘... Thus do I understand this’.”

AGREEMENT ON ONE TO DISPOSE OF TRIFLES

Now at that time trifling accessories had accrued in the storeroom of an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to agree upon a monk endowed with five qualities as disposer of trifles:⁵ ... one who would know what is disposed of and what is not disposed of ... ‘... Thus do I understand this.’ Each needle is to be given by the monk who is the disposer of trifles, pairs of scissors are to be given, sandals are to be given, waistbands ... shoulder straps ... strainers ... regulation water pots⁶ ... cross-seams⁷ ... short cross-seams ... circular seams ... short circular seams ... braiding⁸ ... binding is to be given. If there comes to be ghee or oil or honey

¹ *cīvarapaṭiggāhaka*, as at Vin 1.283. ² *cīvarabhājaka*, as at Vin 1.285. ³ Mentioned at Vin 4.38, Vin 4.155. ⁴ Mentioned at Vin 4.38, Vin 4.155. ⁵ Mentioned at Kd 15.13.1. ⁶ Mentioned at Kd 15.13.1. ⁷ See Kd 8.12.2. ⁸ See BD 2.409, n. 7, BD 2.409, n. 8; BD 4.354, n. 7, BD 4.354, n. 8; and Kd 15.11.3.

or molasses for an Order, it may be given to be partaken of at once;¹ if there is need for it yet again, it may be given yet again; if there is need for it yet again, it may be given yet again.”

AGREEMENT ON AN ACCEPTER OF OUTER CLOAKS

Now at that time there was no accepter of outer cloaks² ... accepter of bowls³ for an Order. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to agree upon ... one who would know what is taken and what is not taken. And thus, monks, ... ‘... Thus do I understand this..”

Now at that time an Order had no superintendent of monastery attendants. The monastery attendants, not being superintended, did not do the work (properly). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to agree upon a superintendent of monastery attendants ... and one who knows what is superintended and what is not superintended ... ‘... Thus do I understand this..”

BD 5.2

Now at that time an Order had no superintendent for the novices. The novices, not being superintended, did not do the work (properly) ... ‘... Thus do I understand this..”

The Sixth Section: that on Lodgings

THIS IS ITS KEY

At that time a dwelling-place had not been permitted by the best of Awakened Ones; these, disciples of the Conqueror went out from this and that place—(their) habitation.⁴ /

A merchant householder, having seen them, said this to the monks: “If I were to have (dwelling-places) built,

¹ Cf. Bu-NP 23 and Kd 6.15.10, when these things—medicines—may not be stored for more than seven days. ² *sāṭiyagāhāpaka*. ³ See Bu-NP 22 (Vin 3.246–Vin 3.247).

⁴ Text reads *āvāsā tamhā te*; Sinhalese and Siamese editions. *vāsā te*. Oldenberg, Vin 2.323 says “the meter is quite correct if we expunge *tamhā te*.”

would you stay (in them)?” They asked the Leader. /
 Dwelling-place, curved house, and long house, mansion, cave,
 he allowed five (kinds of) abodes. The merchant had dwelling-places built.
 People had a dwelling-place built doorless, unclosed,
 door, doorpost and lintel, hollow like a mortar and so on, /
 Hole and cord for pulling through, post for a bolt, and “monkey’s head,”
 a pin, a stick, a key of copper, wood, horn, /
 And just a bolt and a pin, roofing smeared inside and out,
 railing, lattice and stick, cloth and about matting, /
 Solid bench, and couch of split bamboo, bierlike long couch,
 with slats, and curved legs, removeable, rectangular, tall ones, /
 And three-sided, plaited chair, cloth chair, sheep-footed,
 emblic myrobalan,¹ wooden,² stool, and just a straw chair, /
 One a high one,³ and a snake,⁴ supports,⁵ and supports of eight finger-
 breadths,
 thread, squares, cotton cloth, cotton quilt, half (the size of a man’s) body, /
 Festival and also mattresses, woven cloth, and also lodgings,
 covered, it fell from below, and having removed they carried away, /
 And line, and the Truth-finder⁶ allowed the outline of the hand,
 and also other sects in a dwelling-place,⁷ grain-husk, and soft clay, /
 What exudes from trees, a spoon, a wall, mustard powder (and) oil of
 beeswax,
 to sponge over the thick (places), rough, clay
 (and the excrement of) earthworms,⁸ /
 What exudes from trees, and a bold design, low, and a piling, they ascended,
 they fell off, thronged, half-wall, again three, /
 In a small (one), and a buttress,⁹ let in the rain, cry of distress,¹⁰ peg,
 and bamboo and cord for robes, verandah, and about a screen, /

¹ Siamese edition, which I follow, reads *āmalakā phalakā*. Vin.2.323 suggests *āmalaka-phalakā*. Text reads *āmaṭāmalaka*; Sinhalese edition *āmalāmalakā*.

² Siamese edition, which I follow, reads *āmalakā phalakā*. Vin.2.323 suggests *āmalaka-phalakā*. Text reads *āmaṭāmalaka*; Sinhalese edition *āmalāmalakā*.

³ Reading *ucce ca ahi* with Sinhalese and Siamese editions, instead of Text’s *uccā hi*.

⁴ Reading *ucce ca ahi* with Sinhalese and Siamese editions, instead of Text’s *uccā hi*. ⁵ I suggest *pādakā*, instead of Text’s *atipādakā* and Sinhalese and Siamese editions. *pādāni*, legs.

⁶ Siamese edition omits *tathāgata* and reads instead *titthiyā setakālavihāre cāpi*. Sinhalese edition has *tathāgato* but not *titthiyā*, reading *tathāgato setakālavihāre pi*.

⁷ Siamese edition omits *tathāgata* and reads instead *titthiyā setakālavihāre cāpi*. Sinhalese edition has *tathāgato* but not *titthiyā*, reading *tathāgato setakālavihāre pi*. ⁸ Siamese edition reads *laṇḍumattikam*, Sinhalese *laṇḍa-*. ⁹ Here *kuḍḍapāda*. ¹⁰ Reading *vissaraṃ* with Siamese edition instead of *saraṃ*.

Balustrade, powdered grass—the method should be done in the way below,¹
in the open air, became tepid, hall, and as below, vessel, /
Dwelling-place, and just a porch, little hall for a fire in a cell,
monasteries, porches again, the method should be done just (as) below. /
Plaster,² and faithful Anāthapaṇḍika went to the Cool Grove,
things seen, he invited the Leader with the Order. /
He enjoined on the way, a group built a monastery,
repairs at Vesālī, in front of and taking possession of, /
Who is worthy of the best food? and the partridge, not to be greeted,
taken possession of, inside a house, cotton, he visited Sāvattthī, /
He prepared a monastery, and an uproar in a refectory,
ill, and a good sleeping place, pretexts, the seventeen there, /
“Now, by whom?” “Now, how?” he distributed
according to the accommodation in the dwelling-places,
and in cells, an additional share, shares need not be given if one is not
willing, /
Outside a boundary, and for all time, three (times for) assignment of lodg-
ings,
and Upananda, he praised, standing, equal seats, /
Those entitled to seats of an equal (height) broke them,
groups of three (and) for a group of two,³
a long (seat) for those not entitled to seats of an equal (height),
to make use of a verandah,⁴ /
Grandmother,⁵ and not far, and distributed, Kiṭṭāgiri,
Ālavī: in heaps, on walls, door, socket, /
And window-hole, whitewash, black colouring, red chalk, roofing, joining,
bar, broken (parts), doing up, twenty, thirty and for life, /
Completed, not built, incomplete,⁶ for six or five years if it is a small one,
and seven or eight if it is a curved house, ten and twelve for a large one, /
A whole dwelling-place, of one, they made another live (there),
what belongs to an Order,
outside a boundary, and for all time,
he goes away, and they leave the Order, /
And passed away, and (pretended to be) a novice,

¹ See e.g. “key” to **Kd 15** (towards end of **Vin 2.143** and again towards top of **BD 5.144**).

² This should read *sudha* as in **Kd 16.3.11** above, and as in Siamese edition, and as suggested at **Vin 2.323**, and not *suddha*. ³ Reading with Sinhalese edition *ca duvaggikaṃ*, as surmised would be right at **Vin 2.323**, instead of text’s *catuvaggikaṃ*. Siamese reads *ca duvaggikā*. ⁴ Sinhalese and Siamese editions. *ālindam paribhuñjituṃ*, as for **Kd 16.14**, instead of text’s *taṃ dvinnam, paribhuñjisu*. ⁵ Sinhalese *ayyakā ca*, as surmised would be right at **Vin 2.323**. Siamese *ayyikā ca*; text *ayyā ca*. ⁶ There is no *sabbaṃ*, whole, in the context to which this refers (i.e. **Kd 16.17.1**). Should read *vippaṃ* as does Siamese (for *vippakatam*).

disavowers of the training, extreme,
 mad, and unhinged, pains, not seeing an offence, /
 Not making amends for, wrong view, eunuchs, as it were by theft, other
 sects,
 animals, (slayers) of mother, of father, and of one perfected, seducers, /
 Schismatics, shedders of (a Truth-finder's) blood, and then hermaphrodites,
 "Do not let the Order suffer"—the work should be given to another, /
 And when (yet) unfinished to another;
 if he goes away when it is built it is still in his (charge);
 if he leaves the Order, passes away, and pretends to be a novice, /
 And disavows the training,
 (pretends to have committed an) extreme (offence and to be) a eunuch,
 the Order itself becomes the owner; if he is mad, unhinged, in pain, /
 (Suspended for) not seeing, for not making amends for, (for not giving up)
 a wrong view—they are still in his (charge);
 Eunuch, and as it were by theft, member of another sect,
 animal, matricide, parricide,
 Slayer of one perfected, and then a seducer, schismatic,
 shedder of (a Truth-finder's) blood, hermaphrodite—
 if he pretends thus, the Order itself becomes the owner. /
 They conveyed, elsewhere, scrupulous, and fell into decay, woollen blanket,
 and woven cloths, hide, drapery, a cloth, and they trod upon, /
 Damp, sandals, should not spit, they scratched,¹ and they leant against,
 reclining board, even then it scratched,² about spreading where washed,³ /
 They were unable to in Rājagaha, poor, issuer of meals,
 "Now, how?" assigner, agreement upon a storeroom keeper, /
 And then accepter, distributor, and conje, distributor of fruit,
 and even a distributor of solid food, disposer of trifles, /
 And even an accepter of outer cloaks, likewise an accepter of bowls,
 and agreement upon a superintendent of monastery attendants and of
 novices. /
 The Leader who has overcome all, knower of the worlds, his mind benevo-
 lent,
 (is one) to meditate upon and have insight into the need for abodes and
 ease.

¹ Sinhalese and Siamese *Likhanti*; text *khilanti*; **Kd 16.20.2 vilikhanti**. ² Siamese *likhat'eva*; Sinhalese *likhaṇ evā*; text *khalite vā*; **Kd 16.20.2 vilikhati**. ³ Referring to the *dhotapādaka* at **Kd 16.20.2**.

17. SCHISM IN AN ORDER (SAṄGHABHEDA)

FIRST RECITATION SECTION

ON THE GOING FORTH OF THE SIX SAKYANS

At one time the Awakened One, the Lord, was staying at Anupiyā. Anupiyā¹ is a little town² of the Mallas.³ Now at that time many distinguished Sakyan young men had gone forth in imitation of the Lord who had gone forth. Now at that time Mahānāma the Sakyan and Anuruddha the Sakyan were two brothers. Anuruddha the Sakyan was delicately nurtured. He had three palaces,⁴ one for the cold weather, one for the hot, one for the rains. Being waited on for four months in the palace for the rains by female musicians, he did not come down from that palace. Then it occurred to Mahānāma the Sakyan:⁵ “At present many distinguished Sakyan young men have gone forth in imitation of the Lord who has gone forth, but no one from our family has gone forth from home into homelessness. Suppose I should go forth, or Anuruddha?” Then Mahānāma the Sakyan approached Anuruddha the Sakyan; having approached, he spoke thus to Anuruddha the Sakyan: “At present, dear Anuruddha, many distinguished Sakyan young men ... but no one from our family has

¹ Neuter form used here, although the locative is formed as though the word were feminine. Cf. Ja i.65–Ja i.66, Bv-a 284 which say the Bodhisatta spent the first week after he had gone forth in the mango grove at Anupiyā. ² See **BD 2.63, n. 2.** ³ It is more usual to name the exact locality in the place where the Lord was staying.

⁴ Cf. **Kd 1.71** where the same is said of Yasa. ⁵ At **AN i.26** he is called chief of those who give sumptuous alms.

gone forth from home into homelessness. Well now, either you go forth or I will go forth.”¹

“But I have been delicately nurtured, I am not able to go forth from home into homelessness.² You go forth.”

“Come along, dear Anuruddha, I will instruct you in what belongs to the household life. First the fields have to be ploughed;³ having had them ploughed they must be sown; having had them sown water must be led in to them; having had water led in to them the water must be led away; having led the water away you must have the weeds dug up; having had the weeds dug up you must get the crop reaped; having had the crop reaped you must have it harvested; having had it harvested you must have it made into stooks; having had it made into stooks you must have it threshed; having had it threshed you must have the straw winnowed; having had the straw winnowed you must have the chaff winnowed; having had the chaff winnowed you must have it sifted; having had it sifted you must have it⁴ brought in;⁵ having had it brought in it is to be done just the same the next year, and it is to be done just the same the next year.”

“The operations do not stop,⁶ no end to the operations is to be seen. When will the operations stop? When will an end to the operations be seen? When will we, possessed of and provided with the fivefold strand of sense pleasures, amuse ourselves unconcernedly?”

“But, dear Anuruddha, the operations do not stop, no end to the operations is to be seen. Even when our fathers and grandfathers passed away the operations were not stopped.”

“Well now, you understand⁷ just what belongs to the household life. I will go forth from home into homelessness.”

Then Anuruddha the Sakyan approached his mother; having approached, he spoke thus to his mother: “I, mother, want to go forth from home into homelessness. Consent to my going forth from

¹ Quoted Dh-p-a i.133; AN-a i.191. ² Quoted Dh-p-a i.135-Dh-p-a i.136. ³ Quoted Dh-p-a i.136. Cf. similar list of operations at Ja i.215 and an other at AN i.241. ⁴ I.e. the grain, or the good grass. ⁵ *atiharati*, as at Nuns’ Bi-Pc 7 (also of grain). ⁶ *na khiyanti*, do not wear away, become exhausted or used up. ⁷ Text reads *upajāna*; Vin-a 1274 *upajānāhi*.

home into homelessness.”¹ When he had spoken thus, the mother of Anuruddha the Sakyan spoke thus to Anuruddha the Sakyan:

“You two boys, dear Anuruddha, are dear to me,² beloved, agreeable. In the case of your death I would be unwillingly separated from you. So how can I, while you are still living, allow a going forth from home into homelessness?” And a second time ... And a third time Anuruddha the Sakyan spoke thus to his mother: ... the mother of Anuruddha the Sakyan spoke thus to Anuruddha the Sakyan: “... how can I, while you are still living, allow a going forth from home into homelessness?”

Now at that time Bhaddiya³ the Sakyan chieftain was ruling over the Sakyans and was a friend of Anuruddha the Sakyan. Then the mother of Anuruddha the Sakyan thinking: “Now this Bhaddiya ... is a friend of Anuruddha; he will not be able to go forth from home into homelessness,” spoke thus to Anuruddha the Sakyan: “If, dear Anuruddha, Bhaddiya the Sakyan chieftain goes forth from home into homelessness you can go forth likewise.”⁴

Then Anuruddha the Sakyan approached Bhaddiya the Sakyan chieftain; having approached, he spoke thus to Bhaddiya the Sakyan chieftain: “My going forth, friend, is dependent on yours.”

“If your going forth, friend, is dependent on mine, let it be independent. I, with you ...⁵ Go forth according to your wish.”

“Come, friend, we will both go forth from home into homelessness.”

“I, friend, am not able to go forth from home into homelessness. Whatever else I am able to do for you, that will I do. You go forth.”

“My mother, friend, spoke thus to me: ‘If, dear Anuruddha, Bhad-

¹ Cf. Dhp-a i.137. Boys under fifteen had to obtain their parents’ consent for going forth, Vin 1.79, Vin 1.83. ² Cf. Vin 3.13; MN ii.58. ³ He was, as said at Ud ii.10, AN-a i.192, the son of Kālī of the Godhas, see *Psalms of the Bretheren* p. 315, n. 2. Bhaddiya’s verses are at Thag 842–Thag 865. At AN i.23 he is called chief among the disciples of high family. AN-a i.192 says he went forth with Anuruddha. ⁴ Cf. Dhp-a i.137. ⁵ Vin-a 1274 says that out of affection for his friend he wanted to say, “I, with you, will go forth,” but he was not able to finish the sentence as the greed for ruling overcame his heart.

diya the Sakyan chieftain goes forth from home into homelessness, you can go forth likewise.’ But, friend, these words were spoken by you: ‘If your going forth is dependent on mine, let it be independent. I, with you ... Go forth according to your wish.’ Come, friend, we will both go forth from home into homelessness.”

Now at that time people were speakers of truth, pledged to the truth. Then Bhaddiya the Sakyan chieftain spoke thus to Anuruddha the Sakyan: “Wait, friend, for seven years. After seven years we will both go forth from home into homelessness.”

“Seven years are too long, friend, I am not able to wait for seven years.”

“Wait, friend, for six years ... live ... four ... three ... two years ... for one year.”

“One year is too long, friend, I am not able to wait one year.”

“Wait, friend, for seven months. After seven months we will both go forth from home into homelessness.”

“Seven months are too long, friend, I am not able to wait seven months.”

“Wait, friend, for six ... five ... four ... three ... two months ... one month ... for half a month, after half a month we will both go forth from home into homelessness.”

“Half a month is too long, friend, I am not able to wait half a month.”

“Wait, friend, for seven days until I hand over the kingdom to my sons and brothers.”

“Seven days are not too long, friend, I will wait.”

Then¹ Bhaddiya the Sakyan chieftain and Anuruddha² and Ānanda and Bhagu³ and Kimbila⁴ and Devadatta with Upāli the barber⁵ as the seventh, as they had often previously gone out to a ground in a pleasure grove with a fourfold army,⁶ so did they (now) go out with a fourfold army. Having gone far, having sent back the army, having

¹ For the following incident cf. Dh-p-a i.137f. ² See BD 4.501. ³ See BD 4.428, BD 4.500. ⁴ See BD 4.501. ⁵ See Vin 4.308 and BD 3.344, n. 2. ⁶ See definition of “army” at Vin 4.105.

passed into other territory, having taken off their ornaments, having tied them up into a bundle with their upper robes,¹ they spoke thus to Upāli the barber: “Come, good Upāli, return, this will be enough for your livelihood.” Then it occurred to Upāli the barber as he was going back: “The Sakyans are fierce. Thinking: ‘This one has made the young men come forth,’ they may even kill me. But if these young Sakyans will go forth from home into homelessness, why should not I?”

Having loosened the bundle, having hung the goods up on a tree, and having said: “Whoever sees it, it is given (to him), let him take it,”² he approached the young Sakyans. These young Sakyans men saw Upāli the barber coming in the distance; having seen him, then spoke thus to Upāli the barber: “Why have you, good Upāli, returned?”

“Now, it occurred to me, young gentlemen, as I was going back, ‘The Sakyans are fierce ... they may even kill me. But if these young Sakyans men will go forth from home into homelessness, why should not I?’ So I, young gentlemen, having loosened the bundle ... ‘... let him take it,’ returned again from there.”

“You did well, good Upāli, in that you did not go back. The Sakyans are fierce ... they might even have killed you.” Then these young Sakyans men, taking Upāli the barber, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, these young Sakyans men spoke thus to the Lord:

“We, Lord, are Sakyans, we are proud. Lord, this barber, Upāli, has been our attendant for a long time. May the Lord let him go forth first. We will greet him, rise up before him, salute him with joined palms, and do the proper duties. Thus will the Sakyans pride be humbled in us Sakyans.” Then the Lord let Upāli the barber go forth first, and afterwards these young Sakyans men. Then the venerable Bhaddiya within one year realised the threefold knowledge,³ the venerable

¹ As at Vin 3.208, Vin 4.162. ² As at Vin 3.208. ³ AN-a.i.191 says Bhaddiya attained arahantship in the same year (as he went forth).

Anuruddha obtained *deva*-sight,¹ the venerable Ānanda realised the fruit of stream attainment, Devadatta acquired ordinary psychic power.²

17.1.5 Now at that time³ the venerable Bhaddiya, dwelling in a forest and at the root of a tree and in an empty place, constantly uttered this utterance: “Ah, what happiness! Ah, what happiness!” Then several monks approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, these monks spoke thus to the Lord:

5.258 “Lord, the venerable Bhaddiya, dwelling in a forest utters this utterance: ‘Ah, what happiness! Ah, what happiness!’ Doubtless, Lord, the venerable Bhaddiya fares the Brahma-faring dissatisfied,⁴ and (although) dwelling in a forest and at the root of a tree and in an empty place, he utters this utterance, ‘Ah, what happiness! Ah, what happiness!’ while he is recalling the former joys of kingship.”

2.184 Then the Lord addressed a certain monk, saying: “Come you, monk, in my name address the monk Bhaddiya saying: ‘The Teacher, reverend Bhaddiya, is summoning you.’”

“Very well, Lord,” and that monk, having answered the Lord in assent, approached the venerable Bhaddiya; having approached, he spoke thus to the venerable Bhaddiya: “The Teacher, reverend Bhaddiya, is summoning you.”

17.1.6 “Very well, your reverence,” and the venerable Bhaddiya, having answered that monk in assent, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. The Lord spoke thus to the venerable Bhaddiya as he was sitting down at a respectful distance: “Is it true, as is said, that you, Bhaddiya, dwelling in a forest and at the root of a tree and in an empty

¹ At AN i.23 called chief of monks of *deva*-sight. ² AN-a i.191 says Devadatta won the eight attainments; and adds that Bhagu and Kimbila attained arahantship later.

³ As at Ud ii.10. The following incident, with a summary of the preceding sections, also forms the introductory story to the 10th Jātaka. ⁴ Quoted Ud-a 161.

place, are constantly uttering this utterance, ‘Ah, what happiness! Ah, what happiness!’?”

“Yes, Lord.”

“What circumstances were you, Bhaddiya, taking into account when, dwelling in a forest and at the root of a tree and in an empty place, you constantly uttered this utterance, ‘Ah, what happiness! Ah, what happiness!’?”

“Formerly, Lord, when I was a ruler there was a fully appointed guard both within my private quarters and outside my private quarters, there was a fully appointed guard both within the town and outside the town, and there was a fully appointed guard within the country districts. But I, Lord, although being guarded and warded thus, dwelt afraid, anxious fearful, alarmed.¹ But now I, Lord, dwelling in a forest and at the root of a tree and in an empty place, am unafraid, not anxious, not fearful, not alarmed. I am unconcerned, unruffled,² dependent on others,³ with a mind become as a wild creature’s.⁴ This, Lord, was the circumstance I was taking into account when, dwelling in a forest and at the root of a tree and in an empty place, I constantly uttered this utterance, ‘Ah, what happiness! Ah, what happiness!’”

BD 5, 25

Then the Lord, having understood this matter, at that time uttered this utterance:

“In whom there inly lurk no spites.

¹ Same quartet of words below, [Kd 17.2.1](#); [Kd 17.3.4](#), [Kd 17.3.7](#). ² *pannaloma*. Cf. *lomariṇ pāṭeti* as at [Kd 11.6.1](#). ³ *paradattavutta*. Vin-a 1275, MN i.450, Ud 19 read *paradavutto*, with variant readings Ud-a 163 says “living on the gifts of others in respect of robes and so on.” MN-a iii.167 explains by *parehi dinnavuttino parato laddhena yāpentā*, whose livelihood is given by others, subsisting on what is obtained from another. WOODWARD, *Verses of Uplift*, p. 24, n. 3 says that “such meanings are hardly applicable in the context.” He translates as “lightsome,” following *Pali-English Dictionary*’s suggestion that *parada* is “fond of” with *vutta* “being prepared,” active, alert. I choose “dependent on others,” following the Commentaries, and as balancing his former dependence on those others who guarded him. ⁴ Same quartet of words as at MN i.450, MN ii.121. MN-a iii.167 seems to explain the last word, *migabhūtena cetasā*, as not expecting or hoping for anything.

Who has overcome becoming and not becoming thus or
thus,¹
Him, gone past fear, blissful, sorrowless,
The *devas* do not win to see.”

THE STORY OF DEVADATTA

17.2.1 Then the Lord, having stayed at Anupiyā for as long as he found
suiting, set out on almstour for Kosambī. Gradually, walking on tour,
he arrived at Kosambī. The Lord stayed there at Kosambī in Ghosita’s
monastery. Then as Devadatta was meditating in private a reasoning
arose in his mind thus: “Whom² now could I please, so that because
he is pleased with me, much gain and honour would accrue (to me)?”³
2.185 Then it occurred to Devadatta: “This Prince Ajātasattu is young and
also has an auspicious future. What now if I were to make Prince
Ajātasattu pleased, so that because he is pleased with me, much gain
and honour would accrue (to me)?”
5.260

Then Devadatta, having packed away his lodging, taking his bowl
and robe, set out for Rājagaha; in due course he arrived at Rājagaha.⁴
Then Devadatta, having thrown off his own form, having assumed
the form⁵ of a young boy clad in a girdle of snakes,⁶ became manifest
in Prince Ajātasattu’s lap. Then Prince Ajātasattu was afraid, anxious,
fearful, alarmed.⁷ Then Devadatta spoke thus to Prince Ajātasattu:
“Are you, prince, afraid of me?”

¹ *itibhavābhavataṃ*. Here Vin-a 1275 and Ud-a 164 explain *bhava* and *vibhava* much
as do Snp-a 20, SN-a iii.295, MN-a iii.223, and say that one is freed from this state
of becoming this or that by means of the four ways. Cf. also fuller explanation at
Ud-a 164, the rather different explanation at MN-a ii.74, and note that Vin-a 1275
says that *vibhava* and *abhava* are identical in meaning. This line occurs at Ud ii.10
and Snp 6. Cf. *itibhavābhavakathā* at Vin 4.164 and parallel passages mentioned at
BD 2.82, n. 3. ² Read *kaṃ* for text’s *kiṃ*. ³ Cf. Ja i.185–Ja i.186. ⁴ This episode,
as far as where Devadatta stands before Ajātasattu, is also told at Dh-p-a i.139. ⁵ Cf.
Vin 1.3, where Mucalinda assumed the form of a brahmin youth. ⁶ Vin-a 1275 says
having bound a snake round the hips. Dh-p-a i.139 elaborates that there were four
poisonous snakes, i.e. one on each hand and foot; also one hung round the neck,
one was made into a coil on the head, and one arranged over one shoulder. ⁷ As
above, Kd 17.1.6.

“Yes, I am afraid. Who are you?”

“I am Devadatta.”

“If you, honoured sir, are really master Devadatta, please become manifest in your own form.” Then Devadatta, having thrown off the young boy’s form, stood, wearing his outer cloak and (other) robes and carrying his bowl, before Prince Ajātasattu. Then Prince Ajātasattu, greatly pleased with this wonder of psychic power on Devadatta’s part, morning and evening¹ went to wait on him with five hundred chariots, and five hundred offerings of rice cooked in milk were brought as a gift of food.² Then there arose to Devadatta, overcome by gains, honours and fame,³ his mind obsessed by them, some such longing as this: “It is I who will lead the Order of monks.”⁴ But at the very occurrence of this thought Devadatta declined in his psychic power.⁵

Now at that time⁶ Kakudha⁷ the Koliyan,⁸ the venerable Moggallāna the Great’s attendant, had just died and had arisen in a certain mind-made⁹ body, and such was the reinstatement of his individuality¹⁰ that it was like two or three Magadhan village fields,¹¹ yet even with that reinstatement of individuality he injured neither himself nor another. Then Kakudha the young *deva* approached the venerable Moggallāna the Great; having approached, having greeted the venerable Moggallāna the Great, he stood at a respectful distance. As he was standing at a respectful distance, the young *deva* Kakudha spoke thus to the venerable Moggallāna the Great:

“To Devadatta, honoured sir, overcome by gains, honours and fame, his mind obsessed by them, some such longing as this arose: ‘It is I who will lead the Order of monks’. But, honoured sir, at the very

¹ As at SN ii.242. ² Cf. Vin 3.15. ³ As at SN ii.228f. Cf. *Lābhasakkāra Saṃyutta*, SN ii.225–SN ii.244. ⁴ Cf. Dh-p-a i.139. At DN ii.100 Gotama tells Ānanda that this thought does not occur to the Truth-finder. ⁵ See E.J. THOMAS, *Life of Buddha*, p.132ff.

⁶ This incident to the end of Kd 17.2.4 is also told at AN iii.122–AN iii.126. ⁷ See note at GS iii.95. ⁸ Spelt Koliya above. On this tribe see C.H.I. i.177 and B.C. LAW, *Tribes in Ancient India*, p.290ff. ⁹ *manomaya*, as again at AN iii.192.

¹⁰ *attabhāvapaṭilābha*. AN-a iii.277 explains *attabhāva* by *sarīra*, body. ¹¹ Sizes of these given at AN-a iii.277.

occurrence of this thought Devadatta declined in his psychic power.” Thus spoke Kakudha the young *deva*. Having spoken thus, having greeted the venerable Moggallāna the Great, keeping his right side towards him he vanished then and there. Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Moggallāna the Great spoke thus to the Lord:

“Kakudha the Koliyan, Lord, my attendant, has just died and has arisen in a certain mind-made body ... Then Kakudha the young *deva* approached me ... keeping his right side towards me, he vanished then and there.”

“But, Moggallāna, does Kakudha the young *deva* so compass your mind with his mind for you to know that whatever Kakudha the young *deva* says, all that is so and not otherwise?”

“Lord, Kakudha the young *deva* so compasses my mind with his mind for me to know that whatever Kakudha the young *deva* says, all that is so and not otherwise.”

“Mind what you say, Moggallāna, mind what you say,¹ Moggallāna. This foolish man² will now betray himself, by himself.

ON THE FIVE TEACHERS

“Moggallāna, these five teachers are found in the world.³ What five?

“This is a case, Moggallāna, when some teacher, not pure in moral habit, pretends ‘I am pure in moral habit,’ and he says, ‘My moral habit is pure, clean, untarnished.’ Disciples know this about him: ‘This worthy teacher, not pure in moral habit pretends ... untarnished.’ But they think: ‘If we should tell this to householders, he would not like it, and how could we carry out⁴ what he would not like? Moreover he consents to (accept)⁵ the requisites of robes, alms-

¹ As at MN i.502. ² I.e. Devadatta. ³ Sections Kd 17.2.3, Kd 17.2.4 repeated below Kd 17.3.10. ⁴ *samudācareyyāma*, explained at AN-a iii.278 as *katheyāma*, say, speak.

⁵ *sammannati*, Vin-a 1275 explaining as *sammāneti*, and AN-a iii.278 as *sammānaṃ karoti*, he makes or produces honour, i.e. by accepting these gifts.

food, lodgings and medicines for the sick. Whatever anyone¹ shall do, even by that shall he be known.’ Moggallāna, disciples protect such a teacher in regard to moral habit and such a teacher expects protection from disciples in regard to moral habit.

“And again, Moggallāna, this is a case when some teacher, not pure in mode of livelihood, pretends ... not pure in teaching of *dhamma*, pretends ... not pure in exposition ... not pure in knowledge and vision, pretends ... Moggallāna, disciples protect such a teacher in regard to knowledge and vision, and such a teacher expects protection from disciples in regard to knowledge and vision. These, Moggallāna, are the five teachers found in the world.

“But I, Moggallāna, am pure in moral habit, I acknowledge that I am pure in moral habit, that my moral habit is pure, clean, untarnished. And disciples do not protect me in regard to moral habit and I do not expect protection from disciples in regard to moral habit. I am pure in mode of livelihood ... I am pure in *dhamma* teaching ... I am pure in exposition ... I am pure in knowledge and vision. I acknowledge that I am pure in knowledge and vision, that my knowledge and vision are pure, clean, untarnished. And disciples do not protect me in regard to knowledge and vision, and I do not expect protection from disciples in regard to knowledge and vision.”

Then the Lord, having stayed at Kosambī for as long as he found suiting, set out on a tour for Rājagaha. Gradually, walking on tour, he arrived at Rājagaha. The Lord stayed there at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels’ feeding place.² Then several monks approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, these monks spoke thus to the Lord:

“Prince Ajātasattu, Lord, goes morning and evening to wait on

¹ *tumo*, explained by Vin-a 1275 as *so*, he, and by AN-a iii.278 as *esa ... eso* (variant reading *so*), this one. Cf. *tumo* at Snp 890, Snp 908. ² Cf. SN ii.242 for this episode down to the end of the simile of the fierce dog.

Devadatta with five hundred chariots, and five hundred offerings of rice cooked in milk are brought as a gift of food.”

“Do not, monks, envy Devadatta’s gains and honours and fame. For as long, monks, as Prince Ajātasattu goes morning and evening to wait on Devadatta with five hundred chariots and (as long as) five hundred offerings of rice cooked in milk are brought as a gift of food, there may be expected for Devadatta decline in skilled mental states, not growth. It is as if, monks, they were to throw¹ a bladder² at a fierce dog’s nose—as that dog, monks, would become much fiercer, even so, monks, for as long as Prince Ajātasattu goes morning and evening ... there may be expected for Devadatta decline in skilled mental states, not growth. Devadatta’s gains, honours and fame³ bring about his own hurt, Devadatta’s gains, honour and fame bring about his destruction. As, monks, a plantain bears fruit to its own hurt, bears fruit to its destruction, even so, monks, do Devadatta’s gains, honours and fame bring about his own hurt, do Devadatta’s gains, honours and fame bring about his destruction. As, monks, a bamboo ... a reed bears fruit to its own hurt ... even so, monks, do Devadatta’s gains, honours and fame bring about ... his destruction. As, monks, a she-mule conceives to her own hurt, conceives to her destruction, even so, monks, do Devadatta’s gains, honours and fame bring about ... his destruction.

“Truly its fruit the plantain does destroy,
Its fruit the bamboo, its fruit the reed;
So honour does destroy the fool,
Just as its embryo the mule.”⁴

Told is the First Portion for Repeating

¹ *bhindeyyum* is explained at SN-a ii.212 by *pakkhipeyyum*. ² *pitta*. See MORRIS, JOURNAL OF THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY 1893, p. 4 and Ud-a 65. SN-a ii.212 explains *pitta* as that of a bear or a fish. ³ Cf. SN ii.241, AN ii.73 to the end of the verse. ⁴ Quoted SN i.154, Mil 166, Ne 130.

SECOND RECITATION SECTION

ACT OF INFORMING

Now at that time the Lord was sitting down teaching *dhamma* surrounded by a large company, by a company which included the king.¹ Then Devadatta, rising from his seat, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having saluted the Lord with joined palms, spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the Lord is now old, worn, stricken in years, he has lived his span and is at the close of his life;² Lord, let the Lord now be content to live devoted to abiding in ease here and now,³ let him hand over the Order of monks to me. It is I who will lead the Order of monks.”

“Enough, Devadatta, please do not lead the Order of monks.” And a second time ... And a third time Devadatta spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the Lord is now old, worn, stricken in years ... It is I who will lead the Order of monks.”

“I, Devadatta, would not hand over the Order of monks even to Sāriputta and Moggallāna. How then could I to you, a wretched one to be vomited like spittle?”⁴

Then Devadatta, thinking: “The Lord in an assembly which included a king disparaged me by (using) the term, ‘one to be vomited like spittle,’ while he extolled Sāriputta and Moggallāna,” angry, displeased, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him.

And this was the first time that Devadatta felt malice towards the Lord.

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Well then, monks,

¹ Cf. another version of this episode, as far as “the act of information” at Dhpa i.139–Dhp-a i.140. ² Stock, as at Vin 3.2, MN i.82, Snp p.50, Snp p.92. ³ *diṭṭhadhammasukhavihāra*, as at Vin 1.341. ⁴ Text reads *kheḷāpakassa*, Vin-a 1275 *kheḷāsaka*. Vin-a 1275 explains: requisites accruing by means of an evil mode of livelihood should be ejected like spittle by the noble ones. That is why the Lord said “to be vomited like spittle,” *kheḷāsaka*, (to explain) that he (Devadatta) eats requisites of this nature.

let the Order carry out a (formal) act of Information¹ against Devadatta in Rājagaha to the effect that whereas Devadatta's nature was formerly of one kind, now it is of another kind; and that whatever Devadatta should do by gesture and by voice, in that neither the Awakened One nor *dhamma* nor the Order should be seen but in that only Devadatta should be seen. And thus, monks, should it be carried out: The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order carry out an act of Information against Devadatta in Rājagaha, to the effect that whereas Devadatta's nature was formerly of one kind, now it is of another kind, and that whatever Devadatta should do ... in that only Devadatta should be seen. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order is carrying out the (formal) act of Information against Devadatta in Rājagaha, to the effect that ... in that only Devadatta should be seen. If the carrying out of the (formal) act of Information against Devadatta in Rājagaha to the effect that ... in that only Devadatta should be seen is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The (formal) act of Information against Devadatta in Rājagaha to the effect that ... in that only Devadatta should be seen is carried out by the Order. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this'."

Then the Lord addressed the venerable Sāriputta, saying: "Well then, do you, Sāriputta, inform against Devadatta in Rājagaha."

"Formerly, Lord, I spoke praise of Devadatta in Rājagaha saying: 'Godhi's son is of great psychic power, Godhi's son is of great majesty.' How can I, Lord, inform against Devadatta in Rājagaha?"

"Was not the truth spoken by you, Sāriputta, when you spoke praise of Devadatta in Rājagaha saying: 'Godhi's son is of ... great majesty'?"

¹ *pakāsaniyakamma*. *Vinaya Texts* iii.239, n. 2 rightly says "This is not among the regular official acts of the Order as described in **Kd 11**," but it is wrong to say "it is not referred to by the Dhammapada Commentator" for it is mentioned at Dh-p-a i.140.

“Yes, Lord.”

“Even so, Sāriputta, when you inform against Devadatta in Rājagaha it will be just as true.”

“Very well, Lord,” the venerable Sāriputta answered the Lord in assent.

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Well then, monks, let the Order agree for Sāriputta to inform against Devadatta in Rājagaha saying: ‘Formerly Devadatta’s nature was of such a kind, now it is of another kind, and that whatever Devadatta should do by gesture and by voice, in that neither the Awakened One nor *dhamma* nor the Order should be seen, but in that only Devadatta should be seen.’ And thus, monks, should Sāriputta be agreed upon: First, Sāriputta should be asked; having been asked, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may agree for the venerable Sāriputta to inform against Devadatta in Rājagaha saying: ‘Formerly Devadatta’s nature was of one kind ... in that only Devadatta should be seen.’ This is the motion. If the agreement upon Sāriputta to inform against Devadatta in Rājagaha, saying: ‘Formerly Devadatta’s nature was of one kind ... in that only Devadatta should be seen’ is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The venerable Sāriputta is agreed upon by the Order to inform against Devadatta in Rājagaha, saying: ‘Formerly Devadatta’s nature was of one kind ... in that only Devadatta should be seen.’ ... It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this’.”

The venerable Sāriputta, (thus) agreed upon, having entered Rājagaha together with several monks, informed against Devadatta in Rājagaha to the effect that: “Formerly Devadatta’s nature was of one kind, now it is of another kind, and that whatever Devadatta should do by gesture and by voice, in that neither the Awakened One nor *dhamma* nor the Order should be seen, but in that only Devadatta should be seen.” Those people who were of little faith, not believing, who were of poor intelligence, spoke thus: “These recluses, sons of

Kd 17,3

BD 5,20

Vin 2,19

the Sakyans are jealous, they are jealous of Devadatta's gains and honours." But those people who had faith and were believing, who were wise, intelligent, spoke thus: "This can be no ordinary matter in that the Lord has Devadatta informed against in Rājagaha."

THE STORY OF PRINCE AJĀTASATTU

^{173.4} Then Devadatta approached Prince Ajātasattu; having approached, he spoke thus to Prince Ajātasattu: "Formerly,¹ prince, people were long-lived, nowadays they are short-lived, and it is possible that you, while still a prince, might pass away. Well now, do you prince, having slain your father, become king. I, having slain the Lord, will become the Awakened One." And Prince Ajātasattu, thinking: "Now, master Devadatta is of great psychic power, of great majesty; master Devadatta must know (what is right)," having fastened a dagger² against his thigh, at an early hour (although) afraid, anxious, fearful, alarmed, entered the (king's) private quarters forcibly. But the chief ministers in attendance in the private quarters saw Prince Ajātasattu at an early hour (although) afraid, anxious, fearful, alarmed, entering the (king's) private quarters forcibly. Seeing him, they laid hold of him. These examining him, and having seen the dagger bound against his thigh, spoke thus to Prince Ajātasattu: "What is it that you, prince, want to do?"

"I want to slay my father."

"By whom are you being incited?"

"By master Devadatta." Some chief ministers gave this opinion: "The Prince should be slain and Devadatta and all the monks should be slain."³ Some chief ministers gave this opinion: "The monks should not be slain for the monks are not giving offence,⁴ but the Prince should be slain and Devadatta." Some chief ministers gave this opinion: "The Prince should not be slain, nor Devadatta, the monks should

¹ Quoted DhP-a i.140, DN-a 135. ² *potthanikam*. As at Vin 1.217, where translated "butcher's knife." ³ Quoted at DN-a 135. ⁴ *aparajjhanti*, as at Vin 3.162.

not be slain. The king should be told and we will do whatever the king says.”

“Then these chief ministers, taking Prince Ajātasattu, approached King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha; having approached, they told this matter to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha. He said: “What opinion, my good men, have the chief ministers formed?”

“Some chief ministers, Sire, gave this opinion ... Some chief ministers gave this opinion ... Some chief ministers gave this opinion: ‘The Prince should not be slain, nor Devadatta, the monks should not be slain. The king should be told and we will do whatever the king says’.”

“What, my good men, can the Awakened One or *dhamma* or the Order have to do (with this)? Has not the Lord already had Devadatta informed against in Rājagaha to the effect that formerly Devadatta’s nature was of one kind, now it is of another kind, and that whatever Devadatta may do by gesture or by speech, in that neither the Awakened One nor *dhamma* nor the Order is to be seen, but in that only Devadatta should be seen?”

Those chief ministers who had given their opinion thus: “The Prince should be slain and Devadatta and all the monks should be slain,” these he discharged.¹ Those chief ministers who had given their opinion thus: “The monks should not be slain, for the monks do not give any offence, but the prince should be slain and Devadatta,” these he set in lowly positions. Those chief ministers who had given their opinion thus: “The prince should not be slain, nor Devadatta, nor should the monks be slain. The king should be told and we will do whatever the king says,” these he set in high positions. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to Prince Ajātasattu:

“Why do you, prince, want to slay me?”

“Sire, I have need of a kingdom.”

“If it be that you, prince, have need of a kingdom, this kingdom is yours,” and he handed over the kingdom to Prince Ajātasattu.

¹ *te abhabbe akāsi*, he rendered them incapable (of holding an official position).

17.3.6 Then Devadatta approached Prince Ajātasattu¹; having approached, he spoke thus to Prince Ajātasattu:

“Your Majesty, command your men so that they deprive the recluse Gotama of life.” Then Prince Ajātasattu commanded his men, saying: “My good men, do whatever master Devadatta says.” Then Devadatta enjoined the men, saying: “Go along, friends, the recluse Gotama is staying at a certain place. Having deprived him of life, come back by a certain road,” and he set two men on that road, saying: “Whatever man comes alone along this road, having deprived him of life, come back by this road,” and having set four men on that road, saying: 5.269 “Whatever couple of men come along by this road, having deprived them of life, come back by this road,” and having set eight men on that road, saying: 2.192 “Whatever four men come along by this road, ... come back by this road,” and having set sixteen men on that road, he said: “Whatever eight men come along by this road, having deprived them of life, come back.”

17.3.7 Then that man who was alone, having grasped a sword and shield, having bound on a bow and quiver,² approached the Lord; having approached, when he was quite near the Lord he stood still, his body quite rigid³ afraid, anxious, fearful, alarmed.⁴ The Lord saw that man standing still, his body quite rigid, afraid ... alarmed and seeing him, he spoke thus to that man: “Come, friend, do not be afraid.” Then that man, having put his sword and shield to one side, having laid down his bow and quiver, approached the Lord; having approached, having inclined his head to the Lord’s feet, he spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, a transgression has overcome me, foolish, misguided, wrong that I was, in that I was coming here with my mind malignant,⁵ my

¹ *Vinaya Texts* iii.243, n. 2 points out that Ajātasattu is not called “king” here, and that therefore the events described in this paragraph took place before he actually became king, and that the paragraph probably stood originally in some other connection. On the other hand, it should be noticed that Devadatta addresses him as *mahārāja*. ² Stock, as at e.g. AN iii.93–AN iii.94, MN i.86, MN ii.99. ³ *patthaddha*, as at Thag 1074. Vin-a 1275, says “with his body motionless like a figure modelled in clay.” ⁴ As at Kd 17.1.6. ⁵ *duṭṭhacitta*, as at MN iii.65.

mind on murder.¹ Lord, may the Lord acknowledge for me the transgression as a transgression for the sake of restraint in the future.”

“Truly, friend, a transgression overcame you, foolish, misguided, wrong that you were, in that you were coming here, with your mind malignant, your mind on murder. But if you, friend, having seen the transgression as a transgression, confess according to the rule, we acknowledge it for you; for friend in the discipline of the noble, this is growth: whoever having seen a transgression as a transgression, confesses according to the rule, he attains restraint in the future.”²

Then the Lord talked a progressive talk³ to this man, that is to say talk on giving, talk on moral habit, talk on heaven ... sorrow, its uprising, stopping, the Way. Just as a clean cloth without black specks will take a dye easily, even so (as he was sitting) on that very seat did *dhamma*-vision, dustless, stainless, arise to that man, that “whatever is of a nature to arise, all that is of a nature to stop.” Then that man⁴ as one who has seen *dhamma*, attained *dhamma*, known *dhamma*, plunged into *dhamma*, having crossed over doubt, having put away uncertainty, having attained without another’s help to full confidence in the Teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Excellent, Lord: Lord, it is excellent. It is as if one were to set upright what has been upset ... thus is *dhamma* explained in many a figure by the Lord. So I, Lord, am going to the Lord for refuge and to *dhamma* and to the Order of monks. May the Lord accept me as a lay-follower going for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts.”

Then the Lord spoke thus to that man: “Do not you, friend, go by that road. Go by this road,” and he sent him off by another road.

Then those two men, thinking: ‘Why is that man who is alone so slow in coming?’ going along to meet him saw the Lord sitting at the root of a tree. Seeing him, they approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. The Lord talked a progressive talk to these ... to full confidence in the Teacher’s instruction, spoke thus to the Lord: “Excellent,

¹ *vadhakacitta*, as at DN iii.72. ² Cf. Vin 4.18–Vin 4.19, etc. ³ As at Vin 1.15. ⁴ As at Vin 1.12.

BD 5.27

Vin 2.19

Kd 17.3

Lord ... May the Lord accept us as lay-followers going for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts.”

Then the Lord spoke thus to these men: “Do not you, friends, go by that road. Go by this road,” and he sent them off by another road. Then those four men, thinking: ‘Why are these two men so slow in coming?’ ... and he sent them off by another road. Then those eight men, thinking: ‘Why are these four men so slow in coming?’ ... and he sent them off by another road. Then those sixteen men, thinking: ‘Why are these eight men so slow in coming?’ ... “May the Lord receive us as lay-followers going for refuge from this day forth for as long as life lasts.”¹

Then that one man approached Devadatta²; having approached, he spoke thus to Devadatta: “Honoured sir, I am not able to deprive that Lord of life, that Lord is of great psychic power, of great might.”

“All right, friend, do not you deprive the recluse Gotama of life. I myself will deprive the recluse Gotama of life.”

SHEDDING BLOOD

Now at that time the Lord was pacing up and down in the shade³ of Mount Vulture Peak. Then Devadatta, having climbed Mount Vulture Peak, hurled down a great stone, thinking: “With this I will deprive the recluse Gotama of life.” But two mountain peaks, having met, crushed that stone, and (only) a fragment of it, having fallen down, drew blood on the Lord’s foot.⁴ Then the Lord, having looked upwards, spoke thus to Devadatta: “You have produced great demerit, foolish man, in that you, with your mind malignant, your mind on murder, drew the Truth-finder’s blood.” Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “This, monks, is the first deed whose fruit comes with no delay⁵ accumulated by Devadatta since he, with his mind malignant, his mind on murder, drew the Truth-finder’s blood.”

¹ A version noticed by Oldenberg (Vin.2.324) adds that “the Lord spoke thus to those men ... sent them off by another road.” ² From here, cf. Ja v.333ff. ³ Cf. Vin 1.180. ⁴ An echo of widespread folk-tradition, where the Hero, on his quest,

passes with all speed through clashing rocks, sometimes sustaining an injury.

⁵ *ānantarikamma*. Cf. Vism 177.

Monks heard: “It is said that Devadatta schemed to murder the Lord,” and so these monks paced up and down on every side of the Lord’s dwelling-place doing their studies together with a loud noise, with a great noise for the protection, defence and warding of the Lord. The Lord heard the loud noise, the great noise, the noise of studying, and hearing it, he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying:

“What on earth, Ānanda, is this loud noise, this great noise, this noise of studying?”

“Lord, the monks heard that Devadatta schemed to murder the Lord, and so, Lord, these monks are pacing up and down ... for the protection, defence and warding of the Lord. This, Lord, is the loud noise, the great noise, the noise of studying.”

“Well now, Ānanda, address these monks in my name, saying: “The Teacher is summoning the venerable ones.””

“Very well, Lord,” and the venerable Ānanda, having answered the Lord in assent, approached those monks; having approached, he spoke thus to those monks: “The Teacher is summoning the venerable ones.”

“Very well, your reverence,” and these monks, having answered the venerable Ānanda in assent, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. The Lord spoke thus to these monks as they were sitting down at a respectful distance:

“This is impossible, monks, it cannot come to pass that anyone could deprive a Truth-finder of life by aggression; monks, Truth-finders attain *nibbāna* not because of an attack.¹ Monks, there are these five teachers found in the world. What five? ...² and I do not expect protection from disciples in respect of knowledge and vision. This is impossible, monks, it cannot come to pass that anyone could deprive a Truth-finder of life by aggression; monks, Truth-finders attain *nibbāna* not because of an attack. Go, monks, to your own dwelling-places³; Truth-finders, monks, do not need to be protected.”

¹ *anupakkama*, “not by attack (from external enemies),” as at *Critical Pali Dictionary*.

² As at *Kd 17.2.3*, *Kd 17.2.4* (to end). Read above “monks” instead of “Moggallāna.”

³ *yathāvihāraṃ*, as at *Vin 4.15*.

SENDING OUT NĀLĀGIRI

73.11 Now at that time there was a fierce elephant in Rājagaha, a man-slayer, called Nālāgiri. Then Devadatta, having entered Rājagaha, having gone to the elephant stable, spoke thus to the mahouts: “We, my good fellows, are relations of the king. We are competent to put in a high position one occupying a lowly position and to bring about an increase in food and wages. Well now, good fellows, when the recluse Gotama is coming along this carriage road,¹ then, having let loose this elephant, Nālāgiri, bring him down this carriage road.”

“Very well, honoured sir,” these mahouts answered Devadatta in assent.

5-273
2.195 Then the Lord, having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Rājagaha for almsfood together with several monks. Then the Lord went along that carriage road. Then those mahouts saw the Lord coming along that carriage-road; seeing him, having let loose the elephant Nālāgiri, they brought him down that carriage-road. The elephant Nālāgiri saw the Lord coming from afar; seeing him, having lifted up his trunk, he rushed towards the Lord, his ears and tail erect. Those monks saw the elephant Nālāgiri coming in the distance; seeing him, they spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, this elephant Nālāgiri, coming along this carriage-road, is a fierce man-slayer; Lord, let the Lord turn back, let the well-farer turn back.”

“Wait, monks, do not be afraid; this is impossible, monks, it cannot come to pass that anyone should deprive a Truth-finder of life by aggression; monks, Truth-finders attain *nibbāna* not because of an attack.” And a second time ... And a third time these monks spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, this elephant Nālāgiri, ... let the well-farer turn back.”

“Wait, monks, ... Truth-finders attain *nibbāna* not because of an attack.”

73.12
¹ *racchā*. See BD 3.268, n. 1.

Now at that time people, having mounted up on to the long houses and the curved houses and the roofs, waited there. Those people who were of little faith, not believing, who were of poor intelligence,¹ these spoke thus: “This great recluse is indeed lovely; he will be hurt by the bull elephant.”² But those people who had faith and were believing, who were wise and intelligent, these spoke thus: “Soon, good sirs, the bull-elephant will come into conflict with the elephant (among men).”

Then the Lord suffused the elephant Nālāgiri with loving-kindness of mind. Then the elephant Nālāgiri, suffused by the Lord with loving-kindness of mind, having put down his trunk, approached the Lord; having approached, he stood in front of the Lord. Then the Lord, stroking the elephant Nālāgiri’s forehead with his right hand, addressed the elephant Nālāgiri with verses:

“Do not, elephant,³ strike the elephant (among men),
for painful, elephant, is the striking of the elephant (among
men),
For there is no good bourn, elephant,⁴
for a slayer of the elephant (among men) when he is
hence beyond.

“Be not proud,⁵ be not wanton,⁶
for the wanton reach not a good bourn;
Only that should you do by which
you will go to a good bourn.”

Then the elephant Nālāgiri, having taken the dust of the Lord’s feet with his trunk, having scattered it over his head, moved back bowing while he gazed upon the Lord. Then the elephant Nālāgiri, having returned to the elephant stable, stood in his own place; and it was in this way that the elephant Nālāgiri became tamed. Now at that time people sang this verse:

¹ As at Kd 173.3. ² *nāga*. Cf. the matted hair ascetics’ speech at Kd 1.15.4. ³ *kuñjara*. Verses also at Ja v.336. ⁴ *kuñjara*. Verses also at Ja v.336. ⁵ *mada ... pamāda*, also at Snp 218. ⁶ *mada ... pamāda*, also at Snp 218.

“Some are tamed by stick, by goads and whips.
The elephant was tamed by the great seer
without a stick, without a weapon.”¹

^{73,13} People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:
“How evil is this Devadatta, how inauspicious,² in that he tried to
murder the recluse Gotama who is of such great psychic power, of
such great might,” and Devadatta’s gains and honours declined; the
Lord’s gains and honours increased.

ON THE REQUEST FOR THE FIVE POINTS

Now at that time Devadatta, gains and honours lost,³ ate with his
friends, having asked and asked among households. People looked
down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans eat, having asked
and asked among households? Who is not fond of well-cooked things?
Who does not like sweet things?”

^{5,275} Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who
were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can Devadatta
eat with his friends, having asked and asked among households?”
They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Devadatta, ate with your friends,
having asked and asked among households?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked him, having given reasoned talk,
he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well now, monks, I will lay down for monks the eating by a triad

¹ Cf. MN ii.105, Thag 878. ² *alakkhika*. Vin-a 1275-6 says “here it means he does not discriminate, he does not know. He does not know ‘I am doing an evil deed’.” Cf. version of Vin-a given at *Vinaya Texts* iii.250, n. 1. In interpreting the word like the corresponding Sanskrit *alakaṃika*, as does *Vinaya Texts* iii, I prefer “inauspicious, unlucky,” to their “wretched,” with the sense of its being unlucky for donors to give alms to Devadatta. ³ Down to “It is true, Lord” = Bu-Pc 32 where this episode is used to lead up to the framing of a rule against a group-meal, see BD 2.306f. for notes.

(of monks)¹ among households—founded on three reasons:² for the restraint of evil-minded³ individuals; for the living in comfort⁴ of well behaved monks⁵ lest those of evil desires should split the Order by means of a faction;⁶ out of compassion for families.⁷ In eating a group meal, one should be dealt with according to the rule.”⁸

Then Devadatta⁹ approached Kokālika,⁹ Kaṭamorakatissaka, the son of the lady Khaṇḍā, and Samuddadatta, having approached, he spoke thus to Kokālika, Kaṭamorakatissaka, the son of the lady Khaṇḍā, and Samuddadatta: “Come, we, your reverences, will make a schism in the recluse Gotama’s Order, a breaking of the concord.” When he had spoken thus, Kokālika spoke thus to Devadatta:

“But, your reverence, the recluse Gotama is of great psychic power,

¹ *tikabhajana*, a meal to be eaten by three people, so Vin-a 1276. See also SN-a ii.178. Just as *gaṇabhajana* is a group-meal, so *tikabhajana* is a three-party meal. It is apparently meant that a “group” is larger than three monks, since at the end of [Kd 173.13](#) it is specially said that one who eats a group-meal must be treated according to the rule. On *gaṇabhajana* see [BD 2.307, n. 1](#). ² The subject of a question put by Kassapa to Ānanda at SN ii.218. ³ SN-a ii.178, AN-a ii.163 explain *dummaṅkūnaṃ* by *dussīla*, bad moral habit. ⁴ *phāsuvihāra*, cf. [Vin 1.92](#), etc. ⁵ This and the first reason are among the ten reasons sometimes ascribed to the Lord for laying down a rule of training, as at [Vin 3.21](#) and other Vinaya passages. Cf. also AN i.99. ⁶ SN-a ii.178 explains that as Devadatta and his friends split the Order by means of their evil desires, so too others of evil desires, on account of their bond as a group, having begged among families, were eating having made the group increase; so it was said “Lest they split the Order by means of that faction.” ⁷ AN i.100 has *gihīnaṃ anukampāya pāpicchānaṃ pakkhupachedāya*, translated at GS i.84 “out of compassion for householders and to uproot the factions of the evilly disposed.” If “the idea is here, of course, lest any particular layman should be burdened by providing for many *bhikkhus*,” as stated at *Vinaya Texts* iii.251, n. 3, it is the exact opposite of the opinion given at SN-a ii.178 for allowing three monks to eat together among families. For this is that “having carried out the Observance and the Invitation in the Order of monks, and (the monks) being all together, people having given (them) meals by ticket and so on become bound for heaven”. So the compassion for families is in allowing them scope to give and thereby to acquire merit. AN-a ii.164 less cogently says: “A rule of training laid down when householders complain is called “laid down out of compassion for householders.” ⁸ I.e. to the rule laid down in [Bu-Pc 32](#). ⁹ Almost word for word the same as [Bu-Ss 10.1.1](#), [Bu-Ss 10.1.2](#) and part of [Bu-Ss 10.1.3](#). See [BD 1.296–299](#) for footnotes.

of great might. How can we make a schism in the recluse Gotama's Order, a breaking of the concord?"

"Come, we, your reverence, having approached the recluse Gotama, will ask for five items, saying: 'Lord, the Lord in many a figure speaks in praise of desiring little, of being contented, of expunging (evil), of being punctilious, of what is gracious, of decrease (in the obstructions), of putting forth energy. Lord, these five items are in many a way conducive to desiring little, to contentment, to expunging (evil), to being punctilious, to what is gracious, to decrease (in the obstructions), to putting forth energy.

1. It were good, Lord, if the monks, for as long as life lasted, might be forest-dwellers; whoever should betake himself to the neighbourhood of a village, sin would besmirch him.
2. For as long as life lasts, let them be beggars for alms; whoever should accept an invitation, sin would besmirch him.
3. For as long as life lasts, let them be rag-robe wearers; whoever should accept a robe given by a householder, sin would besmirch him.
4. For as long as life lasts, let them live at the root of a tree; whoever should go under cover, sin would besmirch him.
5. For as long as life lasts, let them not eat fish and flesh; whoever should eat fish and flesh, sin would besmirch him.'

The recluse Gotama will not allow these. Then we will win over the people by means of these five items."

"It is possible, your reverence, with these five items, to make a schism in the recluse Gotama's Order, a breaking of the concord. For, your reverence, people esteem austerity."

Then Devadatta together with his friends approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Devadatta spoke thus to the Lord:

"Lord, the Lord in many a figure speaks in praise of desiring little ... whoever should eat fish and flesh, sin would besmirch him."

“Enough, Devadatta,” he said. “Whoever wishes, let him be a forest-dweller; whoever wishes, let him stay in the neighbourhood of a village; whoever wishes, let him be a beggar for alms; whoever wishes, let him accept an invitation; whoever wishes, let him be a rag-robe wearer; whoever wishes, let him accept a householder’s robes. For eight months, Devadatta, lodging at the root of a tree is permitted by me. Fish and flesh are pure in respect of three points: if they are not seen, heard or suspected (to have been killed on purpose for him).”¹

Then Devadatta, thinking: ‘The Lord does not permit these five items,’ joyful, elated, rising from his seat with his friends, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then Devadatta, having entered Rājagaha with his friends, taught the people by means of the five items, saying: “We, friends, having approached the recluse Gotama, asked for five items, saying: ‘Lord, the Lord in many a figure speaks in praise of desiring little ... whoever should eat fish and flesh, sin would besmirch him’. The recluse Gotama does not allow these five items, but we live undertaking these five items.”

Those people who were there of little faith, not believing, who were of poor intelligence, these spoke thus: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans are punctilious, are expungers (of evil), but the recluse Gotama is for abundance and strives after abundance.” But those people who had faith and were believing, who were wise and intelligent, these looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can this Devadatta go forward with a schism in the Lord’s Order, with a breaking of the concord?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying:

“How can this Devadatta go forward with a schism in the Order, a breaking of the concord?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said that you, Devadatta, went forward with a schism in the Order, a breaking of the concord?”

¹ Cf. Vin 1.238 (BD 4.325).

“It is true, Lord.”

“Enough, Devadatta, do not let there be a schism in the Order, for a schism in the Order is a serious matter,¹ Devadatta. Whoever, Devadatta, splits an Order that is united, he sets up demerit that endures for an aeon;² he is boiled in hell for an aeon; but whoever, Devadatta, unites an Order that is split, he sets up sublime³ merit, he rejoices in heaven for an aeon. Enough, Devadatta, do not let there be a schism in the Order, for a schism in the Order is a serious matter, Devadatta.”

Then the venerable Ānanda,⁴ having dressed in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Rājagaha for almsfood. Devadatta saw the venerable Ānanda walking in Rājagaha for almsfood; seeing him, he approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached, he spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda: “Now from this day forth will I, reverend Ānanda, carry out Observance both in contradistinction to⁵ the Lord and in contradistinction to the Order of monks and will (so) carry out (formal) acts of the Order.”⁶ Then the venerable Ānanda, having walked in Rājagaha for almsfood, on returning from the almshouse, after his meal, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the Lord:

“Just now, Lord, I, having dressed in the morning, taking my bowl and robe, entered Rājagaha for almsfood. Devadatta, Lord, saw me walking in Rājagaha for almsfood; seeing me, he came up; having come up, he spoke thus to me: ‘Now from this day forth will I ... (so) carry out (formal) acts of the Order.’ Today, Lord, Devadatta will split the Order.”⁷

Then the Lord, having understood this matter, at that time uttered this utterance:

¹ Quoted at Vin 1.150. ² *kappaṭṭhika*. But Vin-a 1276 says that *kappa* is *āyukappa*, “for the duration of life.” ³ *brahma=seṭṭha*, Vin-a 1276. ⁴ This episode also appears at Ud v.8 and Dh-p-a iii.154. ⁵ *aññatr’eva*. ⁶ *saṅghakammaṇi*. Ud v.8 reads *-kammāni*. ⁷ Udāna adding “and will carry out Observance and (formal) acts of the Order.”

“Easy is good for the good, good for the evil is hard,
Evil for the evil is easy, evil for the noble ones is hard.”¹

Told is the Second Portion for Repeating

THIRD RECITATION SECTION

ON SCHISM IN THE ORDER

Then Devadatta on that Observance day rising from his seat gave out voting tickets,² saying: “We, your reverences, having approached the recluse Gotama, asked for five items.³ ... The recluse Gotama does not allow these, but we live undertaking these five items. If these five items are pleasing to the venerable ones, let each one take a voting ticket.”

Now at that time as many as five hundred monks, Vajjis of Vesālī, were newly ordained and were not properly versed,⁴ and these, thinking: “This is the rule, this is discipline, this is the Teacher’s instruction,” took voting tickets. Then Devadatta, having split the Order, set out for Gayā Head taking as many as the five hundred monks. Then Sāriputta and Moggallāna⁵ approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Sāriputta spoke thus to the Lord: “Devadatta, Lord, having split the Order, is setting out for Gayā Head with as many as five hundred monks.”

“Can there not be for you, Sāriputta and Moggallāna,⁶ compassion for these newly ordained monks? Go you along, Sāriputta and Moggallāna, before these monks fall into trouble and distress.”

¹ Cf. Dhṛp 163, ascribed by Dhṛp-a iii.154 to this occasion. ² *salāka*. Method of appointing distributor of voting tickets laid down at [Kd 14.9–Kd 14.10](#). On process to be followed when voting by ticket see [Kd 14.14.26](#). This incident is briefly recounted at Dhṛp-a i.142–Dhṛp-a i.143. ³ As at [Kd 17.3.14](#), [Kd 17.3.15](#). ⁴ *apakataññuno*, or, did not know what had been appointed; cf. [Vin 4.112](#), [Vin 4.143](#). ⁵ Sāriputtamoggallānā. “The venerable” is not used in such cases. ⁶ Sāriputtā.

5.280 “Very well, Lord,” and Sāriputta and Moggallāna having answered the Lord in assent, rising from their seats, having greeted the Lord, keeping their right sides towards him, approached Gayā Head. Now at that time a certain monk was standing weeping not far from the Lord. Then the Lord spoke thus to that monk: “Why are you, monk, weeping?”

“Even those, Lord, who are the Lord’s chief disciples—Sāriputta and Moggallāna—even these are going to Devadatta approving of Devadatta’s *dhamma*.”

“This is not possible, monk, it cannot come to pass that Sāriputta and Moggallāna should approve Devadatta’s *dhamma*. They have merely gone so as to convince the monks.”¹

17.4.2
2.200 Now at that time Devadatta, surrounded by the large company, was teaching *dhamma* sitting down. Then Devadatta saw Sāriputta and Moggallāna coming in the distance; seeing them, he addressed the monks, saying: “You see, monks, how well taught is *dhamma* by me that even these who are the recluse Gotama’s chief disciples—Sāriputta and Moggallāna—that even these are coming to me approving of my *dhamma*.” When he had spoken thus Kokālika spoke thus to Devadatta: “Reverend Devadatta, do not put your trust in Sāriputta and Moggallāna, Sāriputta and Moggallāna have evil desires and are under the influence of evil desires.”²

“Enough, your reverence, let us give a welcome to these since they approve of my *dhamma*.” The Devadatta invited the venerable Sāriputta to half his seat, saying: “Come, reverend Sāriputta, sit here.”

“No, your reverence,” and the venerable Sāriputta, having taken another seat, sat down at a respectful distance; and the venerable Moggallāna too, having taken another seat, sat down at a respectful distance. Then Devadatta, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, de-

¹ *bhikkhusaññatiyā*. Cf. same expression at Kd 22.2.8. Cf. *gihisañatti* at SN i.199, translated at KS i.254 “imparting matters to the laity”; and explanation at SN-a i.292, KS i.254, n. 1. Also cf. AN i.75. ² Quoted at Dhpa-a i.143.

lighted the monks far into the night with talk on *dhamma*, asked¹ the venerable Sāriputta, saying:

“The Order of monks, reverend Sāriputta, is without sloth or drowsiness; may a talk on *dhamma* occur to² you, reverend Sāriputta, for the monks. My back aches and I will stretch it.”³

“Very well, your reverence,” the venerable Sāriputta answered Devadatta in assent. Then Devadatta, having laid down his outer cloak folded in four, lay down to sleep on his right side,⁴ and as he was tired, forgetful and inattentive, he fell asleep that very moment.

Then the venerable Sāriputta exhorted, instructed the monks with *dhamma*-talk by means of an instruction on the wonders of thought-reading;⁵ the venerable Moggallāna exhorted, instructed the monks with *dhamma*-talk by means of an instruction on the wonders of psychic power. Then as the monks were being exhorted, instructed by the venerable Sāriputta with *dhamma*-talk by means of an instruction on the wonders of thought-reading; were being exhorted, instructed by the venerable Moggallāna with *dhamma*-talk by means of an instruction on the wonders of psychic power, *dhamma* vision, dustless, stainless, arose to them, that ‘whatever is of the nature to uprise all that is of the nature to stop.’ Then the venerable Sāriputta addressed the monks, saying: “We are going, your reverences, to the Lord. Whoever approves of this Lord’s *dhamma*, let him come along.” Then Sāriputta and Moggallāna, taking those five hundred monks, approached the Bamboo Grove. Then Kokālika wakened Devadatta, saying: “Wake up,⁶ reverend Devadatta, those monks have been led away by Sāriputta and Moggallāna. Now, did I not say to you, reverend Devadatta, ‘Reverend Devadatta, do not put your trust in Sāriputta and Moggallāna, Sāriputta and Moggallāna have evil desires and are under the influence of evil desires’?” Then at that

¹ *ajjhesi*, as at **Kd 5.13.9**. ² *paṭibhātu*, as at **Kd 5.13.9** and see note at **BD 4.264, n. 1**.

³ Cf. MN i.354, where these same words are ascribed to Gotama. ⁴ Cf. MN i.354. But here Gotama lies down mindful and circumspect. ⁵ Among the three “wonders” mentioned at AN i.170–AN i.171, DN i.212–DN i.214 and explained at both passages. Cf. AN v.327. ⁶ Quoted at Dhp-a i.143.

very place hot blood issued from Devadatta's mouth.¹

Then Sāriputta and Moggallāna approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they sat down at a respectful distance. As they were sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Sāriputta spoke thus to the Lord: "It were well, Lord, if the monks who were partisans of the schismatics could be ordained again."

"Be careful, Sāriputta, about any reordination of monks who were partisans of the schismatics. But do you, Sāriputta, make the monks who were partisans of the schismatics confess a grave offence. But what line of conduct, Sāriputta, did Devadatta follow in regard to you?"

"Even, Lord, as the Lord, having gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted monks with *dhamma*-talk far into the night, he asked me: 'The Order of monks, Sāriputta, is without sloth or drowsiness, may a talk on *dhamma* occur to you, Sāriputta, for the monks. My back aches and I will stretch it.' Just this, Lord, was the line of conduct which Devadatta followed."

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: "Formerly,² monks, there was a great pond in a stretch of forest; bull elephants lived near it and these, having plunged into that pond,³ having tugged out the lotus fibres and stalks with their trunks, having washed them well, and having chewed them free of mud, swallowed them. Thus there came to be for them both beauty and strength, and not for this reason did they incur death or suffering like unto death. But, monks, among these great bull elephants were young elephant calves and these, imitating them, having plunged into that pond, having tugged out the lotus fibres and stalks with their trunks, but not having washed them well, having chewed them with the mud, swallowed them. Thus there came to be for them neither beauty nor strength, and for this reason they incurred death or suffering like unto death. Likewise, monks, Devadatta will die, a wretched creature, copying me.

¹ The same is recorded of Sañjaya at [Kd 1.24.3](#). ² As at [SN ii.269](#). ³ Cf. [Vin 1.214-Vin 1.215](#).

“While the great beast¹ is shaking the earth,
grazing on lotus stalks, keeping alert among the waters—

Copying me, the wretched creature will die,
like a calf having eaten mire.

“Monks, a monk who is possessed of eight qualities is fit to go a message.² What are the eight? Herein, monks, a monk is a hearer and one who makes others hear and a learner and an instructor and a knower and an expounder and one skilled in (recognising) conformity and non-conformity³ and not a maker of quarrels. Monks, if a monk is possessed of these eight qualities he is fit to go a message. Monks, because he is possessed of these eight qualities, Sāriputta is fit to go a message. What are the eight? Herein, monks, Sāriputta is a learner ... and not a maker of quarrels. Monks, because Sāriputta is possessed of these eight qualities he is fit to go a message.

“Who, to some high assembled council come,
Wavers not, nor in discourse fails, nor hides
The teaching, nor speaks⁴ in doubtfulness,⁵
And who, being questioned, is not agitated—
A monk like this is fit to go a message.

“Monks, Devadatta,⁶ overcome and his mind controlled by eight

¹ *mahāvarāha*, which as pointed out at *Vinaya Texts* iii.261, n. 1 can also mean a boar.

² *dūteyyaṃ gantum arahati*. This paragraph recurs at AN iv.196. Cf. the qualities of a messenger, *dūta*, at Manu 7.63ff. Also see DN i.5, DN i.8 where it is held by some ordinary people that Gotama abstains from sending messages and going on them.

³ I copy the note at GS iv.135: *sahitāsahita*; cf. DN i.8, AN ii.138; *Dialogues of the Buddha* i.14, n. 6. Some of these terms recur at DN i.56. Cf. *S.B.E.* xxi, p. 352f. for what may be the Mahāyāna version of this sutta. ⁴ *akkhāti*. AN iv.196 reads *bhaṇāti*. ⁵ *asandiddho*. AN iv.196 reads *asandiṭṭhan*, but AN-a iv.106 has *asandiddham* which it glosses as *vigatasamsayam*, without doubts. Vin-a 1276 reads *asandiṭṭho ca akkhāti ti nissandeho hutvā akkhātā anusandhivasena yojetvā*. At Mil 295 *sandeha* occurs, meaning “doubt.” At DN-a 282 *sandiddha* occurs with variant reading *sandiṭṭha*. See GS iv.135, n. 4.

⁶ Down to “thus it is that you, monks, should train” = AN iv.160–AN iv.161.

wrong conditions,¹ is doomed to the Downfall,² to Niraya Hell,³ staying there for an aeon, incurable.⁴ What eight?

1. Devadatta, monks, overcome and his mind controlled by gain⁵ is doomed to the Downfall ... incurable.
2. Devadatta, monks, overcome and his mind controlled by lack of gain ...
3. ... by fame ...
4. ... by lack of fame ...
5. ... by honours ...
6. ... by lack-of honours ...
7. ... by evil desire ...
8. ... by evil friendship is doomed to the Downfall ... incurable.

Monks, Devadatta, overcome and his mind controlled by these eight wrong conditions is doomed to the Downfall, to Niraya Hell, staying there for an aeon, incurable.

“Monks, it is well that a monk should live constantly overcoming gain⁶ that has arisen, lack of gain that has arisen, fame that has arisen, lack of fame that has arisen, honours that have arisen, lack of honours that has arisen, evil desire that has arisen, evil friendship that has arisen. And why, monks, for what good purpose should a monk live constantly overcoming gain ... evil friendship that has arisen? Monks, if a monk live not constantly overcoming gain that has arisen, the cankers, that are destructive and consuming,⁷ may arise, but if he lives constantly overcoming gain that has arisen, then it follows that the cankers, that are destructive and consuming, will not be in him ... if he lives constantly overcoming evil friendship that has arisen, then it follows that the cankers, destructive and

¹ *asaddhammehi*. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.262, n. 2. ² *āpāyika nerayika*. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.262, n. 3. ³ *āpāyika nerayika*. See *Vinaya Texts* iii.262, n. 3. ⁴ This quartet of words occurs at AN iii.402, AN iv.160, MN i.393 also in connection with Devadatta. Vin-a 1276 says “now it is not possible to cure him even with a thousand Buddhas.”

⁵ Gain, lack of gain, fame, lack of fame are four of the eight worldly conditions mentioned at DN iii.260, AN ii.188, AN iv.157. ⁶ Also see DN i.8 where an ordinary man would say that Gotama abstains from avariciously adding gain to gain, or benefit to benefit. ⁷ As at AN ii.197; MN i.9.

consuming, will not be in him.

“It is for this good purpose, monks, that a monk should live constantly overcoming gain that has arisen ... evil friendship that has arisen. Wherefore, monks, saying, ‘We will live constantly overcoming gain that has arisen ... evil friendship that has arisen’—thus it is that you, monks, should train.¹

“Monks, Devadatta,² overcome and his mind controlled by three wrong conditions, is doomed to the Downfall, to Niraya Hell, staying there for an aeon, incurable. What three? Evil desire, evil friendship, the coming to a halt midway in his career because his special attainments are of trifling value.³ Monks, a monk who is overcome ... by these three wrong conditions is ... incurable.

“Never⁴ let anyone of evil desires arise in the world;
And know it by this: as the bourn of those of evil desires.
Known as ‘sage,’⁵ held as ‘one who made the self become,’

Devadatta stood shining as with fame—I heard tell.

“He, falling into recklessness,⁶ assailing the Truth-finder,⁷
Attained Avīci Hell,⁸ four-doored, frightful.
For he who would injure one without hatred, not doing
an evil deed—
That evil touches only him of mind of hate, contemptuous.⁹

¹ Version at AN iv.160–1 stops here. ² Rest of this paragraph and the whole of the next (the verses) given also at It BD 5.85ff. ³ Cf. AN v.157, AN v.164, DN ii.78.

⁴ These verses occur also at It p.85–It p.86. See Woodward’s translation and notes at Minor Anthologies ii.p.177–178. ⁵ Cf. SN i.65. ⁶ so *pamādaṃ anuciṇṇo*. Iti-a ii.100–Iti-a ii.101 says “Devadatta, saying ‘I am the awakened one,’ and so on, not knowing his own measure (*attano pamāṇaṃ ajānitvā*)” falling into recklessness (or perhaps ‘error,’ *pamādaṃ āpajjanto*) as to himself as an awakened one, said, “Now I will become an awakened one, I will lead the Order of monks.” ⁷ *āsajja taṃ* (or *naṃ*) *tathāgataṃ*. Text reads *āsajjanaṃ*, but Sinhalese and Siamese editions have *āsajja taṃ*. Iti-a ii.101 explains as *āsādetvā viheṭhetvā*, having assailed (insulted, offended), having annoyed. ⁸ Described at AN i.141. ⁹ This resembles Dhp 125.

“Who should think to pollute the sea with pot of poison—
He would not pollute it with that, for sublime¹ is the great
ocean.

So he who with abuse² afflicts the Truth-finder
Who has rightly gone, his mind tranquil—on him the
abuse has no effect.

“A wise man should make a friend of such a one and follow
him,
A monk following the way of him³ should achieve de-
struction of ill.”

QUESTIONS OF UPĀLI

^{175.1} Then the venerable Upāli approached the Lord, having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Upāli spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, as to the words: Dissension in an Order,⁴ dissension in an Order—to what extent, Lord, is there dissension in an Order but not schism in an Order? And then to what extent is there dissension in an Order as well as schism in an Order?”

^{5,286}

“If, Upāli, there is one on one side⁵ and two on another⁶ and if a fourth⁷ speaks out⁸ and offers a voting ticket, saying: ‘This is the rule, this is discipline, this is the Teacher’s instruction, take this (voting

¹ Reading *bhesmā* with Sinhalese and Siamese editions, Vin-a 1277 and Iti-a ii.101, instead of text’s *bhasmā* and It *tasmā*. *Bhesmā* means awful, terrible, and hence may be taken as sublime. ² *vādena*. Iti-a ii.101 explains by *dosena*, anger, hatred. ³ *yassa maggānugo bhikkhu*. ⁴ *saṅgharāji*. Cf. Vin 4.37, Vin 4.128, Vin 4.153, Vin 4.217, Vb-a 428, and DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monachism*, p.193ff. Other expressions for differences in the Order occur at e.g. Vin 1.339. There is also *cakkabheda*, “breaking of the concord,” as at Vin 3.171, and above Kd 17.3.14. ⁵ Vin-a 1277, “if there is one on the side (or in the faction or party) of *dhamma*-speakers.” ⁶ Vin-a 1277, “on the side of non-*dhamma* speakers.” ⁷ Vin-a 1277, “if there is a fourth, a non-*dhamma* speaker, who thinks ‘I will split the Order’.” ⁸ *anussāveti*, not here I think in the technical sense of making a proclamation. Vin-a 1277 says, “fawning, he announces, *sāveti*.”

ticket), approve of this'—this, Upāli, is dissension in an Order but not schism in an Order.

“If, Upāli, there are two on one side and two on another and if a fifth speaks out ... two on one side and three on another and if a sixth speaks out ... three on one side and three on another and if a seventh speaks out ... three on one side and four on another and if an eighth speaks out and offers a voting ticket, saying: ‘This is the rule, this is discipline, this is the Teacher’s instruction, take this (voting ticket), approve of this’—this, Upāli, is dissension in an Order but not schism in an Order.

“If, Upāli, there are four on one side and four on another and a ninth speaks out ... this, Upāli, is dissension in an Order as well as schism in an Order. Dissension in an Order, Upāli, as well as schism in an Order is (due to there being) nine or more than nine.¹ Upāli, a nun does not split an Order even if she goes forward with a schism² ... a probationer ... a novice ... a woman novice ... a lay-follower ... a woman lay-follower does not split an Order even if she goes forward with a schism. Only a regular monk, Upāli, belonging to the same communion, staying within the same boundary, splits an Order.”

“Lord, as to the words:³ Schism in an Order, schism in an Order—to what extent, Lord, can an Order become split?”

“As to this, Upāli, monks explain non-*dhamma* as *dhamma*, they explain *dhamma* as non-*dhamma*, they explain non-discipline as discipline, they explain discipline as non-discipline, they explain what was not spoken, not uttered by the Truth-finder as spoken, uttered by the Truth-finder, they explain what was spoken, uttered by the Truth-finder as not spoken, not uttered by the Truth-finder, they explain what was not practised by the Truth-finder as practised by the Truth-finder, they explain what was practised by the Truth-finder as not practised by the Truth-finder, they explain what was not laid down by the Truth-finder as laid down by the Truth-finder, they explain what was laid down by the Truth-finder as not laid down

¹ Thus for a schism to occur at least nine monks must break off from the main body of the Order. ² Cf. Vin 1.151. ³ Cf. AN v.73, AN v.75.

by the Truth-finder, they explain what is no offence as an offence, they explain an offence as no offence, they explain a slight offence as a serious offence, they explain a serious offence as a slight offence, they explain an offence that can be done away with as an offence that cannot be done away with, they explain an offence that cannot be done away with as an offence that can be done away with, they explain a bad offence as not a bad offence, they explain not a bad offence as a bad offence.¹ These, in regard to these eighteen points draw away and separate (a company),² they carry out a separate³ Observance, they carry out a separate Invitation, they carry out a separate (formal) act of the Order. To this extent, Upāli, does an Order become split.”

“Lord, as to the words:⁴ Harmony in an Order, harmony in an Order—to what extent, Lord, does an Order come to be harmonious?”

“As to this, Upāli, monks explain non-*dhamma* as non-*dhamma*, they explain *dhamma* as *dhamma* ... they explain not a bad offence as not a bad offence. These, in regard to these eighteen points, do not draw away, do not separate (a company), they do not carry out a separate Observance, they do not carry out a separate Invitation, they do not carry out a separate (formal) act of the Order. To this extent, Upāli, an Order comes to be harmonious.”

“But, Lord,⁵ having split⁶ an Order that was harmonious, what does he set up?”

“Now, Upāli, having split an Order that was harmonious, he sets up demerit that endures for an aeon and he is boiled in hell for an aeon.”⁷

“A schismatic in the Order,
doomed to the Downfall,

¹ As at Kd 10.5.4, Kd 10.5.5; Kd 14.14.2, Cf. AN i.19–AN i.20. ² Oldenberg’s text reads *apakāsanti avapakāsanti*, which Vin-a 1280 interprets: they draw over a company, extract it (*vijaṭenti*) and set it up (*ussādentī*) on one side. They make it widely known that they are separated. AN v.74, AN v.75 reads *avakassanti vavakassanti* (with variant reading). Cf. AN iii.145. ³ *āveṇi*. Vin-a 1280 gives *visuṇi*. ⁴ Cf. AN v.74, AN v.76. ⁵ Cf. AN v.75. ⁶ *bhinditvā*. AN v.75 reads *bhetvā* with variant readings *chetvā*, *bhinditvā*. ⁷ Cf. Kd 17.3.16 for many of these expressions.

to Niraya Hell for an aeon,
To disharmony prone,
standing on non-*dhamma*,
falls away from peace from bondage.
Having split an harmonious Order,
he boils for an aeon in hell.”¹

“But, Lord,² having united an Order that was split, what does he set up?”

“Now, Upāli, having united an Order that was split,
he sets up sublime merit
and he rejoices in heaven for an aeon.
Blessed is harmony for an Order,
and the friend of those who are harmonious,

“To harmony prone,
standing on *dhamma*,
falls not away from peace from bondage.
Making an Order harmonious,
he rejoices for an aeon in heaven.”³

“Now, could it not be, Lord, that a schismatic in the Order is doomed to the Downfall, to Niraya Hell, remaining there for an aeon, incurable?”

“It could be, Upāli, that a schismatic in the Order is doomed to the Downfall ... incurable.”

“But could it be, Lord, that a schismatic in the Order is not doomed to the Downfall, not to Niraya Hell, not remaining there for an aeon, not incurable?”

“It could be, Upāli, that a schismatic in the Order is not doomed to the Downfall ... not incurable.”

“But which (kind of) schismatic in an Order, Lord is doomed to the Downfall, to Niraya Hell, remaining there for an aeon, incurable?”

¹ Cf. AN v.76. ² Cf. AN v.76. ³ Cf. AN v.76.

“This is a case, Upāli, where a monk explains non-*dhamma* as *dhamma*; if he has the view that in this (explanation) there is non-*dhamma*, if he has the view that in schism there is non-*dhamma*, misrepresenting opinion, misrepresenting approval, misrepresenting pleasure, misrepresenting intention,¹ and if he speaks out and offers a voting ticket, saying: ‘This is rule, this is discipline, this is the Teacher’s instruction; take this (voting ticket), approve of this’—this schismatic in the Order, Upāli, is doomed to the Downfall, to Niraya Hell, remaining there for an aeon, incurable.

“And again, Upāli, if a monk explains non-*dhamma* as *dhamma*, if he has the view that in this (explanation) there is non-*dhamma*, if he has the view that in schism there is *dhamma*, misrepresenting opinion ... incurable.

“And again, Upāli, if he explains non-*dhamma* as *dhamma*, if he has the view that in this (explanation) there is non-*dhamma*, if he is doubtful as to a schism ... if he has the view that in this (explanation) there is *dhamma*, if he has the view that in schism there is non-*dhamma* ... if he has the view that in this (explanation) there is *dhamma*, if he is doubtful as to a schism ... if he is doubtful as to this (explanation), if he has the view that in schism there is non-*dhamma* ... if he is doubtful as to this (explanation), if he has the view that in schism there is *dhamma* ... if he is doubtful as to this (explanation), if he is doubtful as to a schism, misrepresenting opinion ... incurable.”

“But which (kind of) schismatic in the Order, Lord, is not doomed to the Downfall, nor to Niraya Hell, not remaining there for an aeon, not incurable?”

“This is a case, Upāli, where a monk explains non-*dhamma* as *dhamma*; if he has the view that in this (explanation) there is *dhamma*, if he has the view that in schism there is *dhamma*, yet not misrepresenting opinion, not misrepresenting approval, not misrepresenting pleasure, not misrepresenting intention, he speaks out and offers a voting ticket, saying, ‘This is rule, this is discipline, this is the Teacher’s instruction; take this (voting ticket), approve of this’—even

¹ On these four psychological modalities, see **BD 1.163, n.**

this schismatic in the Order, Upāli, is not doomed to the Downfall, not doomed to Niraya Hell, not remaining there for an aeon, not incurable.

“And again, Upāli, a monk explains *dhamma* as non-*dhamma* ... explains a not bad offence as a bad offence, but (although) he has the view that in this (explanation) there is *dhamma* the view that in schism there is *dhamma*, yet not misrepresenting opinion ... not incurable.”

Told is the Third Portion for Repeating

Told is the Seventh Section: that on Schism in an Order

THIS IS ITS KEY

In Anupiyā, distinguished, the delicately nurtured one did not want to, ploughing, sowing, leading in, led away, digging up and reaping, Harvesting, making into stooks, threshing and winnowing, sifting, bringing in,

the next and they do not stop, fathers and grandfathers.

Bhaddiya, Anuruddha and Ānanda, Bhagu, Kimbila,

and the Sakyan pride, at Kosambī, he declined, and about Kakudha.

He informed against, and a father's, by a man, Nālāgiri,

a triad, five, a serious matter, he splits, and about a grave offence,

three, eight, three again, dissension, schism, “Could it not be?”

18. DUTIES (VATTA)

ON THE DUTIES OF VISITORS

18.1.1 At one time the Awakened One, the Lord, was staying at Sāvattthī
5.291 in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time incoming monks entered the monastery with their sandals on,¹ and they entered the monastery with sunshades up,² and they entered the monastery with their heads muffled up,³ and they entered the monastery having put their robes on their heads, and they washed their feet in the drinking water, and they did not greet the resident monks who were senior nor ask about lodgings. And a certain incoming monk, having unfastened the bolt⁴ of an unoccupied dwelling-place, having opened the door,⁵ entered hastily. A snake fell on to his shoulder from a lintel above; terrified, he uttered a cry of distress. Monks, having run up, spoke thus to that monk: "Why did you, your reverence, utter a cry of distress?" Then this monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "How can these incoming monks enter a monastery with their sandals on ... nor ask about lodgings?" Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that incoming monks entered a monastery with their sandals on ... and did not ask about lodgings?"

"It is true, Lord." The Awakened One, the Lord, rebuked them, saying:

¹ A sign of disrespect, see [Kd 5.12](#) and [Bu-Sk 61](#), [Bu-Sk 62](#). ² See [Kd 15.23.2](#). ³ See [Bu-Sk 23](#), [Bu-Sk 67](#) at the latter of which "head muffled up" is defined. ⁴ *ghaṭikā*, as at [Kd 15.14.3](#), [Kd 16.2.1](#). See also [Vin 3.119](#). ⁵ See [BD 1.199, n. 3](#).

“How, monks, can incoming monks enter a monastery with their sandals on ... nor ask about lodgings? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased ... Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance¹ for incoming monks which should be observed by incoming monks.

“Monks, an incoming monk, thinking, ‘I will now enter a monastery,’ having taken off his sandals, having put them down,² having beaten them, having taken them up (again), having lowered his sunshade, having uncovered his head, having put his robe over his shoulder, should enter the monastery carefully and unhurriedly.³ While he is entering the monastery, he should notice where the resident monks have withdrawn to.⁴ Wherever resident monks have withdrawn to—whether to an assembly hall or to a hut or to the root of a tree—having gone there, he should put down his bowl at one side, he should put down his robe at one side, and having taken a suitable seat he should sit down. He should ask about the drinking water, he should ask about the washing water—which the drinking water is, which the washing water. If he wants drinking water, having taken drinking water he should drink; if he wants washing water, having taken washing water he should wash his feet. When he is washing his feet he should sprinkle water (over them) with one hand and wash his feet with the other; but he should not sprinkle water and wash his feet with one and the same hand. Having asked for a piece of cloth to wipe his sandals, he should wipe the sandals. While he is wiping his sandals he should first wipe them with a dry piece of cloth, afterwards with a damp one; having washed the pieces of cloth for wiping the sandals he should spread⁵ them on one side. If a resident monk is senior he should greet him; if he is newly ordained he should make him greet (him). He should ask about lodgings, saying: ‘Which lodging pertains to⁶ me?’ He should ask whether it is occu-

¹ *vatta*, custom, duty, habit. ² *nīcam katvā* occurs also at [Kd 1.25.11](#), [Kd 1.25.15](#); [Kd 18.4.4](#); [Kd 18.6.2](#). ³ *ataramānena* as at [Vin 1.248](#). ⁴ Vin-a 1281, “have assembled.” ⁵ *vissajjetabbam*. Vin-a 1281, *attharitabbam*. ⁶ *pāpuṇāti*. Cf. [Kd 16.11.3](#); [Kd 16.21.2](#) for rules for apportioning lodgings.

5.293
18.1.3
pied or unoccupied. He should ask about resorts for alms,¹ he should ask about non-resorts for alms,² he should ask about the families which are agreed upon as learners,³ he should ask about the privies, he should ask about the drinking water,⁴ he should ask about the water for washing,⁵ he should ask about a staff, he should ask about (the form of) the Order's agreement, saying: 'What time should it be entered upon, what time should it be departed from?'⁶

2.209
"If the dwelling-place is unoccupied, having knocked at the door, having waited a moment, having unfastened the bolt, having opened the door, he should watch out while standing outside.⁷ If the dwelling-place is soiled or if couch is piled on couch or if chair is piled on chair and lodgings heaped on top of them, he should clear (the dwelling-place) if he is able to do so. While clearing⁸ the dwelling place, having first taken out the ground covering he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the supports for the beds ... having taken out the mattress and the squatting-mat ... the piece of cloth to sit upon and the sheet, he should lay them to one side. Having lowered the couch, having taken it out carefully without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts he should lay it to one side. Having lowered the chair, having taken it out carefully without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts, he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the spittoon, he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the reclining board, he should lay it to one side. If there are cobwebs in the dwelling-place, he should first remove

¹ *gocara*. Vin-a 1281 says "he should ask about walking for alms thus: Is the village which gives alms, *gocaraḡama*, near or far? May one walk for alms early, or during the day?" ² *agocara*. Vin-a 1281 says this is a village of people of wrong views or a village with a limited supply of alms. And he should ask if it is where alms are given to one or two (monks only). ³ See Bu-Pd 3. ⁴ These questions do not this time refer to finding out which is which but, according to Vin-a 1281, what pond's drinking water it is that they drink, and what washing water it is that they use for bathing and so on. ⁵ These questions do not this time refer to finding out which is which but, according to Vin-a 1281, what pond's drinking water it is that they drink, and what washing water it is that they use for bathing and so on. ⁶ Cf. Vin 3.160 = Vin 2.76. ⁷ For, according to Vin-a 1281, he may have seen the path of a snake or a non-human creature. ⁸ Rest of this section also at Kd 1.25.15. Kd 18.7.2.

them from the (floor-) covering. He should wipe the corners of the window-holes. If a wall that was coloured red becomes stained, he should wipe it having moistened a rag, having wrung it out. If ground that was blacked becomes stained, he should wipe it having moistened a rag, having wrung it out. If the ground has not been treated, he should sweep it having sprinkled it all over with water, thinking: ‘Take care lest the dwelling-place is sullied with dust.’ Having looked for (any) rubbish, he should remove it to one side.

BD 5.29

Kd 18.1

“Having dried the ground-covering in the sun, having cleaned it, having shaken it, having brought it back, he should lay it down as it was before.¹ Having dried the supports for the couch in the sun, having wiped them, having brought them back, he should place them as they were before. Having dried the couch in the sun ... the chair in the sun, having cleaned it, having shaken it, having lowered it, having brought it back carefully without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts, it should be laid down as it was before. Having dried the mattress and the squatting mat in the sun, having cleaned them, having shaken them, having brought them back, they should be laid down as they were before. Having dried the piece of cloth to sit upon and the sheet in the sun, having cleaned them, having shaken them, having brought them back, they should be laid down as they were before. Having dried the spittoon in the sun, having wiped it, having brought it back, it should be placed where it was before. Having dried the reclining-board in the sun, having wiped it, having brought it back, it should be placed where it was before.

Kd 18.1

“He should² lay aside the bowl and robes. When laying aside the bowl, having taken the bowl in one hand, having felt with the other under the couch or under the chair, the bowl should be laid aside, but the bowl should not be laid aside on the bare ground. When laying aside the robe, having taken the robe in one hand, having stroked the other hand along the bamboo for robes or along the cord for robes, having got the edges away from him and the fold towards him, the

¹ *yathābhāgaṃ*. ² See also [Kd 1.25.11](#); [Kd 18.73](#).

robe should be laid aside.

“If dusty winds blow from the east, he should close the eastern windows. If dusty winds blow from the west, he should close the western windows. If dusty winds blow from the north, he should close the northern windows. If dusty winds blow from the south, he should close the southern windows. If the weather is cool, he should open the windows by day, he should close them by night. If the weather is warm, he should close the windows by day, he should open them by night.

“If a cell is soiled, the cell should be swept. If a porch is soiled, the porch should be swept. If an attendance-hall ... if a fire-hall ... if a privy is soiled, the privy should be swept. If there is no drinking water, drinking water should be provided. If there is no water for washing, water for washing should be provided. If there is no water in the pitcher of water for rinsing, water should be tipped into the pitcher of water for rinsing. This, monks, is the observance for incoming monks that is to be observed by incoming monks.”

ON THE DUTIES OF RESIDENTS

Now at that time resident monks, having seen incoming monks, neither appointed a seat nor brought forward water for the feet, a footstool, a footstand, nor, having gone to meet them, did they receive their bowls and robes, they did not offer drinking water, they did not greet the senior incoming monks, nor appoint lodgings. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these resident monks, having seen incoming monks, neither appoint a seat ... nor appoint lodgings?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks ...?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well now, monks, I will lay down an observance for resident monks that should be observed by resident monks.

“Monks, when a resident monk has seen an incoming monk who is senior, he should appoint a seat, he should bring forward water for the feet, a footstool, a footstand, having gone to meet him he should receive his bowl and robe, he should offer him drinking water, and if he is able he should wipe his sandals. When he is wiping his sandals, he should first wipe them with a dry piece of cloth, afterwards with a damp one; having washed the pieces of cloth for wiping the sandals he should spread them on one side. An incoming monk should be greeted and a lodging appointed with the words, ‘This lodging pertains to you.’ He should explain whether it is occupied or unoccupied, the alms resorts should be explained, the non-alms resorts ... the families agreed upon as learners ... the privies ... the drinking water ... the washing water ... the staff ... the form of the Order’s agreement should be explained with the words, ‘This is the time to enter upon it, this is the time to depart from it.’

BD 5.29

“If it is a newly ordained monk (who is incoming) then (the resident one) sitting down should explain: ‘Put aside your bowl in this place, put aside your robe in this place, sit on this seat.’ The drinking water should be explained (to him), the water for washing should be explained, the pieces of cloth for wiping the sandals should be explained. And incoming monks should be made to greet (him). The lodgings should be explained to him with the words, ‘This lodging pertains to you.’ He should explain whether it is occupied or unoccupied, alms resorts should be explained ... (the form of) the Order’s agreement should be explained with the words, ‘This is the time to enter upon it, this is the time to depart from it.’ This, monks, is the observance for resident monks that should be observed by resident monks.”

Vin 2.21

Kd 18.2

ON THE DUTIES OF TRAVELLERS

Now at that time monks who were going away set out without having packed away their wooden goods and clay goods, having opened the doors and windows, and without having asked (for permission) as

Kd 18.3

to their lodgings.¹ The wooden goods and the clay goods were lost and the lodgings came to be unguarded.² Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can these monks who are going away set out ... lodgings came to be unguarded?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance for monks who are going away and which should be observed by monks who are going away.

“Monks, when a monk is going away, having packed away his wooden goods, his clay goods, having closed the doors and windows, he may set out having asked (for permission) as to his lodgings. If there is no monk, he should ask a novice (for permission).³ If there is no novice, he should ask a monastery attendant (for permission). If there is no monk or novice or monastery attendant, having laid a couch down on four stones,⁴ having piled couch on couch, having piled chair on chair, having made the lodgings into a heap on top⁵ (of them), he may set out having packed away the wooden goods the clay goods, having closed the doors and windows.

“If the dwelling-place is leaking he should roof it if he is able to do so, or he should make an effort, thinking, ‘How then can this dwelling-place be roofed?’ If he thus succeeds in this, that is good, but if he does not succeed, having laid down a couch on four stones in a place where it is not leaking, having piled couch on couch, having piled chair on chair, having made the lodgings into a heap on top (of them), he may set out, having packed away his wooden goods, his clay goods, having closed the doors and windows. If the whole dwelling-place is leaking, if he is able he should convey the lodgings to a village, or he should make an effort, thinking, ‘How then can this lodging be conveyed to a village?’ If he thus succeeds in this, that is good. If he does not succeed, having laid a couch down on four stones in the open air, having piled couch on couch, having piled chair on

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 14, Bu-Pc 15, and see BD 2.238, n. 4. ² *agutta*, as were dwelling-places at Kd 16.2.1. ³ Cf. Bu-Pc 14.2.1; Bu-Pc 15.2.1. ⁴ As a protection from white ants.

⁵ *uparipuñjaṃ karitvā*; above, in corresponding passage Kd 18.1.3 *uparipuñjakita*.

chair, having made the lodgings into a heap on top (of them), having packed away his wooden goods, his clay goods, having covered them with grass or leaves, he may set out, thinking, ‘So can the different things surely remain.’¹ This, monks, is the observance for monks who are going away and which should be observed by monks who are going away.”

ON THE DUTIES OF EXPRESSING APPRECIATION

Now at that time monks did not give thanks in a refectory. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not give thanks in a refectory?” Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow you, monks, to give thanks in a refectory.” Then it occurred to the monks: “Now, by whom should thanks be given in a refectory?” They told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow you, monks, to give thanks in a refectory through a monk who is an elder.”

Kd 18.4

BD 5.2

Now at that time a certain guild had food for an Order;² the venerable Sāriputta was the elder in the Order. Monks, thinking, ‘The Lord has allowed thanks to be given in a refectory through a monk who is an elder,’ departed, leaving the venerable Sāriputta alone. Then the venerable Sāriputta, having returned thanks to these people, later went away alone. The Lord saw the venerable Sāriputta coming in the distance; seeing him, he spoke thus to the venerable Sāriputta: “I hope, Sāriputta, that the meal was successful?”³

¹ *app’eva nāma añgāni pi seseyyurū.* Vin-a 1282 reads *seyyurū*, with variant reading *seseyyurū*, and says that the advantage of leaving things in the open air is that the parts of beds and chairs are not destroyed by grass and lumps of clay falling on them from above as happens in a leaking house. ² Cf. Kd 15.5.2. ³ *iddha*, as in Nuns’ Bi-Pc 56, there rendered “effective.”

“The meal, Lord, was successful, even though the monks departed leaving me alone.” Then the Lord on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, four or five monks who are elders or next (in age) to the elders¹ to wait in a refectory.”

Now at that time a certain elder waited in a refectory although he wanted to relieve himself, and through restraining himself he fell down fainting. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, if there is a reason, to go away, having asked (permission from) the monk immediately next² (to you).”

ON DUTIES IN THE REFECTORY

Now at that time the group of six monks, wrongly dressed, wrongly clothed, improperly attired,³ went into a refectory and turning aside went in close in front of monks who were elders, and sat down encroaching on⁴ (the space intended for) the elders and kept newly ordained monks from a seat and sat down amid the houses having spread out their outer cloaks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the group of six monks, wrongly dressed, wrongly clothed, improperly attired, go into a refectory ... sit down encroaching on ... and sit down amid the houses having spread out their outer cloaks?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks, wrongly dressed ... having spread out their outer cloaks?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

¹ *therānuthera*. At Vin-a 1283, Dh-p-a ii.211 *anuthera* appears to be in opposition to *mahāthera* and *saṅghathera*, and at Dh-p-a iii.412 to *mahāthera*. ² *ānantarika bhikkhu*, as at Kd 9.4.8; Kd 16.10.1; Kd 17.3.9 and Vin 4.234. ³ As at Vin 1.44. ⁴ *anupakhajja*, as at Bu-Pc 16, Bu-Pc 43. See BD 2.247, n. 3. This expression and the next also occur at Kd 1.25.13.

“Well then, monks, I will lay down a refectory observance for monks and which should be observed by monks in a refectory.

“If the time is announced in a monastery, (a monk), having dressed with the inner robe all round him for covering the three circles,¹ having tied on his waistband, having made one bundle,² having clothed himself in his upper robes, having fastened the block,³ having washed, having taken a bowl, he may enter a village carefully and unhurriedly. He should not, turning aside, go in close in front of monks who are elders, he should go (sit down) amid the houses properly clad,⁴ well controlled should he go (sit down) amid the houses, with eyes cast down should he go (sit down) amid the houses, not lifting up the robes ... not with loud laughter ... with little noise ... not swaying the body ... not swaying the arms ... not swaying the head ... not with the arms akimbo ... not muffled up should he go (sit down) amid the houses, he should not go amid the houses crouching down on his heels, he should not go amid the houses lolling, he should not sit down amid the houses encroaching (on the space intended) for monks who are elders, newly ordained monks should not be kept from a seat, he should not sit down amid the houses having spread out his outer cloak.

“When water is being given out, having grasped the bowl with both hands,⁵ the water should be received I having put it down carefully⁶ the bowl should be washed without rubbing it. If there is a receiver of (used) water, having put the bowl down, the water should be sprinkled into a waste-tub⁷ thinking, ‘Be careful not to splash the receiver of (used) water with the water, not to splash the neighbouring monks with the water, not to splash the outer cloak with water.’ If there is no receiver of (used) water, having put down the bowl, the

¹ Bu-Sk 1. Many of Sekhiyas Bu-Sk 1–Bu-Sk 26 recur here. For notes, see BD 3.120ff.

² *saguṇaṃ katvā*. Cf. Kd 1.25.9. ³ *gaṇṭhikā*, as at Kd 15.29.3. ⁴ The items from here to “lolling” are the same as those occurring at Bu-Sk 1–Bu-Sk 26. ⁵ According to Vin-a 1284, the water is being given for washing the bowl, as is clear from the context. More water is apparently given after the meal for again washing the bowl, see Kd 18.4.6 below. ⁶ Vin-a 1284 says without making the sound of water.

⁷ *paṭiggaha*, as at Kd 15.10.3.

water should be sprinkled on to the ground, thinking, 'Be careful not to splash the neighbouring monks with water nor to splash the outer cloak with water.' If cooked rice is being given, having grasped the bowl with both hands, the cooked rice should be received. Room should be left for the curry. If there is ghee or oil or tit-bits an elder should say: 'Obtain the same for all.' Almsfood should be received attentively¹ ... thinking of the bowl ... with equal curry, almsfood should be received at an equal level. The elder should not eat until the cooked rice has been served to all.

"Almsfood should be eaten attentively². For notes see **BD 3.128ff.** ... thinking of the bowl ... on continuous almsround ... with equal curry ... not having chosen from the top; neither the curry nor the condiment should be covered up with cooked rice, (the monk) desiring something more; neither the curry nor the cooked rice should be eaten by one who is not ill having asked for it for himself; others' bowls should not be looked at captious-mindedly; too large a mouthful should not be made up; pieces (of food) should be made up into a round; the door of the face should not be opened if the mouthful is not brought close; while eating, the whole hand should not be put into the mouth; one should not talk with a mouthful in the mouth; one should not eat tossing up balls (of food); one should not eat breaking up the mouthfuls ... stuffing the cheeks ... shaking the hands about ... scattering lumps of boiled rice ... putting out the tongue ... smacking the lips ... making a hissing sound ... licking the fingers ... licking the bowl ... licking the lips, one should not accept a drinking cup with a hand (soiled) with food.

"An elder should not accept water³ until everyone has eaten. When the water is being given, having grasped the bowl in both hands ...⁴ '... nor to splash the outer cloak with water.' One should not throw out amidst the houses rinsings of the bowl with lumps of boiled rice.⁵ When they are returning,⁶ newly ordained monks should return first,

¹ Cf. **Bu-Sk 27–Bu-Sk 30.** ² The items in this paragraph occur at **Bu-Sk 31–Bu-Sk 55.**

³ Vin-a 1284 says water for washing the hands is meant here. ⁴ As in **Kd 18.4.4**

above. ⁵ **Bu-Sk 56.** ⁶ I.e. leaving the refectory, rising from it, so Vin-a 1284.

afterwards the elders. One should go properly clad amid the houses, well controlled should one go amid the houses ...¹ ... one should not go amid the houses crouching down on the heels. This, monks, is the refectory observance for monks and which monks should observe in a refectory.”

The First Portion for Repeating

ON DUTIES FOR THOSE GOING ON ALMSROUND

Now at that time monks who walked for almsfood walked for almsfood wrongly dressed, wrongly clothed, improperly attired, and they entered a dwelling without deliberation and they left without deliberation, and they entered very hastily and they left very hastily, and they stood too far away and they stood too close, and they stood too long and they turned away too soon. And a certain monk who was walking for almsfood entered a dwelling without deliberation; taking (a doorway) for the house-door, he entered an inner chamber. In that inner chamber a woman was lying naked on her back. That monk saw that woman lying naked on her back; seeing her, he thought: “This is not the house-door, this is an inner chamber,” and he went away from that inner chamber. That woman’s husband saw that woman lying naked on her back: seeing her, he thought: “My wife has been seduced by that monk,” and having seized that monk, he thrashed him. Then that woman, waking up at the noise, spoke thus to that man: “Why are you, master, thrashing this monk?”

Kd 18.5

“You were seduced by this monk.”

BD 5.30

“I was not, master, seduced by this monk. This monk is innocent,”² and she made him let go of that monk. Then that monk, having gone back to the monastery, told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these monks who walk for almsfood walk for almsfood wrongly dressed ... enter ... depart ... stand ... and turn away too

¹ As in [Kd 18.4.3](#). ² Cf. the incident related in [Bu-Pc 67](#).

soon?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks ...?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance for monks when they are walking for almsfood and which should be observed by monks when they are walking for almsfood.

“Monks, if a monk when he is walking for almsfood thinks: ‘I will enter this village,’ having dressed himself¹ with his inner robe all round him so as to cover the three circles, having fastened his waistband, having made one bundle, having clothed himself in his upper robes, having fastened the block, having washed, having taken a bowl, he may enter the village carefully and unhurriedly. He should go amid the houses properly clad ... he should not go amid the houses crouching down on his heels. When he is going amid the houses he should consider: ‘I will enter in this (fashion), I will leave in this.’ He should not enter too hastily, he should not leave too hastily, he should not stand too far away, he should not stand too close, he should not stand too long, he should not turn away too soon. While he is standing, he should consider: ‘Are they willing to give alms or are they not willing?’ If she puts aside her work² or rises from her seat or wipes a spoon or wipes a dish or sets it out, he should stand still, thinking: ‘It is as though she is willing to give.’ When alms are being given, having raised the outer cloak with the left hand, having uncovered the bowl with the right hand, having grasped the bowl with both hands, the alms should be received, but one should not look at the face of the donor of the alms.³ He should consider: ‘Are they willing to give curry or are they not willing?’ If she wipes a spoon or wipes a dish or sets it out, he should stand still, thinking: ‘It is as though she

¹ As at **Kd 18.4.3**. ² Vin-a 1285 says “whether she is standing or sitting at her work—cotton or winnowing or grinding—she puts aside whatever it may be that she has chosen.” Vin-a 1285 reads *nikkhipanti*, they put aside, with variant reading *nikkhipati*. The work mentioned seems to suggest women’s work; but below, the donor of the almsfood may be a woman or a man. ³ Vin-a 1285 says that the donor may be a woman or a man. One is not to look at his face at the time when the alms are being given.

is willing to give'. When the alms have been given, having covered the bowl with the outer cloak, one should turn away carefully and unhurriedly. One should go amid the houses properly clad ... one should not go amid the houses crouching down on one's heels.

“Whoever returns first from the village for almsfood should make ready a seat, he should bring forward water for (washing) the feet, a footstool, a footstand, he should set out a refuse bowl, having washed it, he should set out drinking water and water for washing. Whoever should return last from the village for almsfood,¹ if there should be the remains of a meal and if he should so desire, he may eat them; but if he should not so desire, he may throw them away where there is but little green grass or he may drop them into water where there are no living creatures. He should put up the seat, he should put away the water for (washing) the feet, the footstool, the footstand, he should put away the refuse-bowl, having washed it, he should put away the drinking water and the water for washing, he should sweep the refectory. Whoever should see a vessel for drinking water or a vessel for washing water or a vessel (for water) for rinsing after evacuation, void and empty, should set out (water). If it is impossible for him (to do this) he should set out (water) by signalling with his hand, having invited a companion (to help him) by a movement of his hand; but he should not for such a reason break into speech. This, monks, is the observance for monks when they are walking for almsfood and which should be observed by monks when they are walking for almsfood.”

ON DUTIES FOR FOREST DWELLERS

Now at that time several monks were living in a forest. They neither set out drinking water, nor did they set out water for washing, nor did they set out a fire,² nor did they set out kindling wood,³ they did not know the positions of the lunar mansions, they did not know the

¹ As at [Vin 1.157](#), etc. ² Cf. [Bu-Pc 56](#) where it is an offence for a monk to kindle a fire to warm himself. ³ *araṇisahita*. See [BD 3.88, n. 5](#), and *Vinaya Texts* iii.292, n. 2.

divisions of the quarters. Thieves, having gone there, spoke thus to these monks: “Is there drinking water, honoured sirs?”

“There is not, friends.”

“Is there water for washing ... Is there a fire ... Is there kindling wood, honoured sirs?”

“There is not, friends.”

“What is there a conjunction with today, honoured sirs?”

“Indeed, we do not know, friends.”

“Which quarter is this, honoured sirs?”

“Indeed, we do not know, friends.” Then these thieves thought: ‘These have no drinking water nor water for washing, there is no fire, there is no kindling wood, they do not know the positions of the lunar mansions, they do not know the divisions of the quarters. These are thieves, these are not monks,’ and having thrashed them, they departed. Then these monks told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. Then the Lord on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance for monks who are forest-dwellers and which should be observed by monks who are forest-dwellers.

“Monks, a monk who is a forest-dweller, getting up early, having placed his bowl in a bag, having hung it on his shoulder, having arranged his robe¹ over his shoulder, having put on his sandals, having packed away the wooden goods, the clay goods, having closed the doors and windows, may leave² his lodgings. If he thinks: ‘Now I will enter a village,’ having taken off his sandals, having put them down, having beaten them, having placed them in a bag, having hung it on his shoulder, having dressed himself all round covering the three circles, having fastened his waistband ... (as in [Kd 18.5.2](#)) ... he should turn away carefully and unhurriedly. He should go amid the houses properly clad ... he should not go amid the houses crouching down on his heels.

¹ *cīvara*, not specified here as “outer cloak”. ² *senāsanā otaritabbaṃ*. Vin-a 1285 says *vasanaṭṭhānato nikkhamitabbaṃ*, should depart from the place where he was staying.

“Having set out from the village, having placed his bowl in the bag, having hung it on his shoulder, having rolled up his robe, having placed it on his head,¹ having put on his sandals, he should go along. Monks, a monk who is a forest-dweller should set out drinking water, he should set out water for washing, he should set out a fire, he should set out kindling wood, he should set out a walking staff,² he should learn the positions of the lunar mansions, either the whole or one part, he should become skilled in the quarters. This, monks, is the observance for monks who are forest-dwellers and which should be observed by monks who are forest-dwellers.”

ON DUTIES REGARDING LODGINGS

Now at that time several monks were making robes in the open air. The group of six monks beat their lodgings to windward (of them) and in the open space;³ the monks were covered with dust. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks beat their lodgings ... so that monks are covered with dust?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks beat their lodgings ... covered with dust?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance for monks in respect of lodgings that should be observed by monks in respect of lodgings.

“In whatever dwelling-place he is staying, if that dwelling-place is soiled, he should, if he is able, clean it.⁴ When he is cleaning the dwelling-place, having first taken out the bowl and robes, he should lay them to one side. Having taken out the piece of cloth for to sit

¹ See [Kd 8.13.1](#). ² *kattaraḍaṇḍa*. See [Kd 5.6.2](#) and [Vin 2.76](#), [Vin 2.208](#). ³ *ariṅgaṇa*. *Vinaya Texts* iii.295, n. 1 say that this is “a part of the *ārāma* immediately in front of the hut or *vihāra*, which is kept as an open space, and daily swept ... The term is a common one, and its meaning is not doubtful.” ⁴ Cf. this passage with [Kd 1.25.14](#), [Kd 1.25.15](#), [Kd 18.1.3](#). See [BD 4.63](#), [BD 4.64](#) for notes.

upon and the sheet ... the mattress and squatting mat, he should lay them to one side. Having lowered the couch, having taken it out carefully without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts, he should lay it to one side. Having lowered the chair, having taken it out carefully without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the supports for the couch, he should lay them to one side. Having taken out the spittoon, he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the reclining board, he should lay it to one side. Having observed how the ground covering was laid down, having taken it out, he should lay it to one side. If there are cobwebs in the dwelling-place, he should first remove them from the (floor-) covering. He should wipe the corners of the window-holes. If a wall that was coloured red becomes stained, he should wipe it having moistened a rag, having wrung it out. If ground that was blacked becomes stained, he should wipe it having moistened a rag, having wrung it out. If the ground was not treated, he should sweep it; having sprinkled it all over with water, thinking: 'Take care lest the dwelling-place is sullied with dust.' Having looked for (any) rubbish, he should remove it to one side. He should not beat the lodgings near monks ... near dwelling-places ... near drinking-water ... near water for washing, he should not beat the lodgings to windward in the open space, he should beat the lodgings to leeward.

18:7,3
2:219
5:307
“Having dried the ground-covering to one side in the sun,¹ having cleaned it, having shaken it, having brought it back, he should lay it down as it was laid down (before). Having dried the supports for the couch to one side in the sun, having wiped them, having brought them back, he should place them where they were (before). Having dried the couch to one side in the sun, having cleaned it, having beaten it, having lowered it, having brought it back carefully without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts, he should lay it down as it was laid down (before). Having dried the chair to one side in the sun, having cleaned it, having shaken it,

¹ Cf. Kd 1.25.16; Kd 18.1.4.

having lowered it, having brought it back carefully without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts, he should lay it down as it was laid down (before). Having dried the mattress and the squatting mat to one side in the sun, having cleaned them, having shaken them, having brought them back, he should lay them down as they were laid down (before). Having dried the piece of cloth to sit upon and the sheet to one side in the sun, having cleaned them, having shaken them, having brought them back, he should lay them down as they were laid down (before). Having dried the spittoon to one side in the sun, having wiped it, having brought it back, he should place it where it was (before). Having dried the reclining board to one side in the sun, having wiped it, having brought it back, he should place it where it was (before). The bowl and robe should be laid aside.¹ When he is laying aside the bowl, having taken the bowl in one hand, having felt with the other hand under the couch or under the chair, the bowl should be laid aside; but the bowl should not be laid aside on the bare ground. When he is laying aside the robe, having taken the robe in one hand, having stroked the other along the bamboo for robes or the cord for robes, having got the edges away from him and the fold towards him, the robe should be laid aside.

Kd 18.7

“If dusty winds² blow from the east, the eastern windows should be closed. If dusty winds blow from the west ... from the north ... from the south, the south windows should be closed. If the weather is cool, the windows should be opened during the day, closed at night. If the weather is warm, the windows should be closed during the day, opened at night. If a cell is soiled, the cell should be swept. If a porch is soiled, the porch should be swept. If an attendance-hall ... a fire-hall ... a privy is soiled, the privy should be swept. If there is no drinking water, drinking water should be provided. If there is no water for washing, water for washing should be provided. If there is no water in the pitcher of water for rinsing, water should be poured into the pitcher of water for rinsing. If he is staying in a dwelling-place together with a senior, he should not give a recitation³

BD 5.30

¹ Cf. Kd 1.25.11. ² Cf. Kd 1.25.18, Kd 1.25.19, etc. ³ Cf. Kd 1.26.1; Kd 1.32.1; Kd 1.37.6, and Vin 4.15.

without asking the senior (for permission), he should not give the interrogation, he should not study, he should not speak *dhamma*,¹ he should not light a lamp, he should not extinguish a lamp, he should not open windows, he should not close windows. If he is pacing up and down in the same place for pacing up and down in with a senior, he should turn when the senior turns, but he should not touch the senior (even) with a corner of his outer cloak. This, monks, is the observance for monks in respect of lodgings that should be observed by monks in respect of lodgings.”

ON DUTIES IN THE SAUNA

Now at that time the group of six monks, being hindered in (their use of a) bathroom by monks who were elders, having brought, out of disrespect, a quantity of sticks, having made a fire, having closed the doorway, sat down in the doorway. The monks, overcome by the heat, not being able to get through the doorway, fell down fainting. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks, being hindered (in their use of a) bathroom by monks who are elders ... sit down in the doorway, so that monks ... fell down fainting?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks, being hindered in (their use of a) bathroom by monks who are elders ... sat down in the doorway so that monks ... fell down fainting?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, on being hindered in (your use of) a bathroom by monks who are elders, having out of disrespect brought a quantity of sticks, a fire should not be made. Whoever should make one, there is an offence of wrong-doing. And nor, monks, having closed a doorway, should you sit down in the doorway. Whoever should (so) sit down, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

“On account of this, monks, I will lay down an observance for

¹ As above; and see definition of *dhamma* at [Vin 4.15](#) = [Vin 4.22](#) = [Vin 4.200](#).

BD 530

monks as to a bathroom and which should be observed by monks in a bathroom. Whoever goes first to a bathroom, if ashes have accumulated, should throw out the ashes. If the bathroom is soiled, the bathroom should be swept. If the flooring¹ ... cell ... the porch ... the hall in the bathroom is soiled, the hall in the bathroom should be swept. Chunam should be kneaded, clay should be moistened, water should be poured into the water-jar. On entering the bathroom, having smeared the face with clay, having covered oneself front and back, one may enter the bathroom. One should not sit down so as to encroach on (the space intended for) monks who are elders, nor should newly ordained monks be turned away from a seat.² If one is able, a treatment should be done in the bathroom for monks who are elders. On leaving the bathroom, having taken the chair for the bathroom and having covered oneself front and back, one may leave the bathroom. If one is able, a treatment should also be done in the water for the monks who are elders. One should not bathe before the monks who are elders, nor should one bathe above them. Way should be made by one who has bathed and is getting out (of the water) for those who are getting into it. Whoever leaves the bathroom last, if the bathroom is swampy, he should wash it. Having washed the tub for the clay, having put away the chair for the bathroom, having extinguished the fire, having closed the door, he may depart. This, monks, is the observance for monks as to a bathroom and which should be observed by monks in a bathroom.”

Vin 2.2

ON DUTIES IN THE TOILET

Now at that time a certain monk who had been born a brahmin, having relieved himself, did not want to rinse, thinking: “Who would touch this foul evil smell?” A worm remained in his rectum. Then this monk told this matter to the monks. They said: “But did you, your reverence, not rinse after relieving yourself?” “No, your rev-

Kd 18.9

¹ *paribhaṇḍa*. It is doubtful whether Buddhaghosa has understood this term: he explains it by *bahi jaggati*, he lies awake outside, Vin-a 1286. ² Cf. Kd 1.25.12, Kd 1.25.13.

erences.” Those who were modest monks ... spread it about ... Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, did not rinse after relieving yourself?” “It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, if there is water you should not not rinse after relieving yourselves. Whoever should not rinse, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time monks relieved themselves in the privy according to seniority. Newly ordained monks, having arrived first, waited and through restraining themselves, they fell down fainting.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks?” “It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, you should not relieve yourselves in a privy according to seniority. Whoever does (this), there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow, you monks, to relieve yourselves according to the order of arrival.”

Now at that time the group of six monks entered a privy very hastily and they entered forcibly² and they relieved themselves while groaning³ and while chewing toothwood and outside the proper vessels and they spat into a vessel and they scraped themselves with a rough piece of wood and they dropped a piece of wood for scraping into a cesspool; and they left very hastily and they left forcibly and they rinsed smacking their lips and they left water in the saucer for rinsing (-water). Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks enter a privy very hastily ... and leave water in the saucer for rinsing (-water)?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is

¹ Cf. **Kd 18.4.1**. ² *ubbhujitvā*, as at **Vin 3.40**. ³ *nitthunantā*. Or is this “spitting”?

said, monks?" "It is true, Lord." Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance in respect of privies and which is to be observed by monks in privies.

"Whoever goes to a privy, standing outside should cough, and the one sitting inside should cough too. Having laid aside the robe on a bamboo for robes or on a cord for robes, one should enter the privy carefully and unhurriedly. One should not enter too hastily, one should not enter forcibly, one should stand firmly on the privy shoes. One should not relieve oneself while groaning ... you should not drop a piece of wood for scraping into a cesspool. You should get rid of it while standing on the privy shoes. You should not depart too quickly, nor forcibly. You should stand firmly on the rinsing shoes. You should not rinse smacking your lips, you should not leave water in the saucer for rinsing (-water). You should get rid of it while standing on the rinsing shoes. If the privy is dirty it should be washed. If the receptacle for (wood for) scraping is full, the pieces of wood for scraping should be thrown away. If the privy is soiled, it should be swept. If the plaster flooring ... if the cell ... if the porch is soiled the porch should be swept. If there is no water in the vessel for rinsing-water, water should be tipped into it. This, monks, is the observance for monks in respect of privies and which should be observed by monks in respect of privies."

ON DUTIES TO THE PRECEPTOR

Now at that time those who shared cells did not conduct themselves properly towards their preceptors. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: "How can these who share cells not conduct themselves properly towards their preceptors?" Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: "Is it true, as is said, monks, that those who share cells do not conduct themselves properly towards their preceptors?" "It is true, Lord." The Awakened One, the Lord rebuked them, saying:

“How, monks, can those who share cells not conduct themselves properly towards their preceptors? It is not, monks ...” And having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance for those who share cells towards their preceptors and which should be observed by those who share cells towards their preceptors:

“The one who shares a cell,¹ monks, should conduct himself properly towards the preceptor. This is the proper conduct in this respect: having got up early, having taken off his sandals, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, he should give toothwood, he should give water for rinsing the mouth, he should make ready a seat. If there is conjei, having washed a bowl, the conjei should be placed near (the preceptor). When he has drunk the conjei, having given him water, having received the bowl, having lowered it, having washed it properly without rubbing it, it should be put away. When the preceptor has got up, the seat should be removed. If that place is soiled, that place should be swept.

“If the preceptor wishes to enter a village, his inner clothing should be given (to him), the inner clothing (that he is wearing) should be received (from him) in return, the waistband should be given (to him); having folded them (into two or four folds), the outer robes are to be given (to him); having washed it, a bowl with water is to be given (to him). If the preceptor desires an attendant, (the latter) having put on his inner robe all round so as to cover the three circles, having bound on the waistband, having folded them, and having dressed in the outer robes, having fastened the ties, having washed, having taken a bowl, should be the preceptor’s attendant. He should not walk too far away (from him), he should not walk too close. He should receive the bowl and its contents.

“He should not interrupt the preceptor when he is speaking. (But) if the preceptor is bordering on an offence, then, speaking himself, he should warn him. When he is returning, he should make ready a

¹ From here to the end of [Kd 18.11.2](#) see [Kd 1.25.8–Kd 1.25.24](#), and for notes see [BD 4.59ff.](#)

seat, having come back first; he should set out water for washing the feet, a foot-stool, a foot-stand; having gone to meet him, he should receive his bowl and robe, he should give back the inner clothing (given) in return, he should receive his inner clothing. If a robe is damp with perspiration, he should dry it for a short time in the sun's warmth, but a robe should not be laid aside in the warmth. He should fold up the robe. When folding up the robe, having made the corners turn back four finger-breadths, he should fold up the robe, thinking 'Mind there is no crease in the middle.' The waistband should be placed in a fold (of the robe). If there is almsfood and the preceptor wishes to eat, having given him water, almsfood should be placed near (him).

"He should offer the preceptor drinking-water. When he has eaten, having given him water, having received the bowl, having lowered it, having washed it properly without rubbing it, having emptied out the water, he should dry it for a short time in the sun's warmth, but a bowl should not be laid aside in the warmth. He should lay aside the bowl and robes. When laying aside the bowl, having taken the bowl in one hand, having felt with the other hand under the couch or under the chair, the bowl should be laid aside, but the bowl should not be laid aside on the bare ground. When laying aside a robe, having taken the robe in one hand, having stroked the other hand along the bamboo for robes or along the cord for robes, having got the edges away from him and the fold towards him, the robe should be laid aside. When the preceptor has got up, the seat should be removed, the water for washing the feet, the foot-stool, the foot-stand should be put away. If that place comes to be soiled that place should be swept.

"If the preceptor wishes to bathe, he should prepare a bath. If he wants a cold (bath), he should prepare a cold one; if he wants a hot (bath), he should prepare a hot one. If the preceptor wishes to enter a bathroom, he should knead chunam, should moisten clay; taking a chair for the bathroom, having gone close behind the preceptor, having given him the chair for the bathroom, having received his

robe he should lay it to one side. He should give him the chunam, he should give him the clay. If he is able to do so, he should enter the bathroom. When he is entering the bathroom, having smeared his face with clay, having covered himself front and back, he should enter the bathroom.

8.11.7 “He should not sit down so as to encroach upon (the space intended for) monks who are elders. He should not keep newly ordained monks from a seat. He should make preparation for the preceptor in a bathroom. When he is leaving the bathroom, taking the chair for the bathroom, having covered himself front and back, he should leave the bathroom. He should also make preparation for the preceptor in the water. When he is bathing, having come out of the water (first), having dried his own body, having put on his inner robe, he should wipe off the water from the preceptor’s limbs, he should give him his inner clothing, he should give him his outer cloak; taking the chair for the bathroom, having come back first, he should make ready a seat, he should put out water for washing the feet, a foot-stool, a foot-stand. He should offer the preceptor drinking-water.

5.314 8.11.8 “If he wishes to make him recite, he should make him recite. If he wishes to interrogate, he should be interrogated. In whatever dwelling-place the preceptor is staying, if that dwelling-place is soiled, it should be cleaned if he is able (to do so). When he is cleaning the dwelling-place, having first taken out the bowl and robes, he should lay them to one side. Having taken out the piece of cloth to sit upon and the sheet, he should lay them to one side. Having taken out the mattress and the squatting-mat, he should lay them to one side.

8.11.9 2.225 “Having lowered the couch, having taken it out carefully without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts, he should lay it to one side. Having lowered the chair, having taken it out carefully without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts, he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the supports for the couch, he should lay them to one side. Having taken out the spittoon, he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the

reclining-board, he should lay it to one side. Having taken out the ground-covering, having observed how it was laid down, he should lay it to one side. If there come to be cobwebs in the dwelling-place, he should first remove them from the (floor-) covering; he should wipe the corners of the window-holes. If a wall that was coloured red comes to be stained, he should wipe it, having moistened a rag, having wrung it out. If ground that was blacked becomes stained, he should wipe it, having moistened a rag, having wrung it out. If the ground did not come to be treated, he should sweep it, having sprinkled it all over with water, thinking: 'Take care lest the dwelling-place is sullied with dust'. Having looked for (any) rubbish, he should remove it to one side.

“Having dried the ground-covering in the sun, having cleaned it, having shaken it, having brought it back, he should lay it down as it was laid down before. Having dried the supports for the couch in the sun, having wiped them, having brought them back, he should place them where they were before. Having dried the couch in the sun, ... the chair in the sun, having cleaned it, having shaken it, having lowered it, having brought it back carefully without rubbing it, without knocking it against the door or the posts, he should lay it down as it was laid down before. Having dried the mattress and the squatting mat in the sun ... having dried the piece of cloth to sit upon and the sheet in the sun, having cleaned them, having shaken them, having brought them back, he should lay them down as they were laid down before. Having dried the spittoon in the sun, having wiped it, having brought it back, he should place it where it was before. Having dried the reclining-board in the sun, having wiped it, having brought it back, he should place it where it was before.

“He should lay aside the bowl and robes. When laying aside the bowl ... (as in [Kd 18.11.5](#)) ... When laying aside a robe ... the fold towards him, the robe should be laid aside.

“If dusty winds blow from the east, he should close the eastern windows. If dusty winds blow from the west ... the north ... from the south, he should close the southern windows. If the weather is

Kd 18.1

BD 5.31

Kd 18.1

Kd 18.1

Vin 2.21

cool, he should open the windows by day, he should close them at night. If the weather is warm, he should close the windows by day, he should open them at night.

“If a cell is soiled, the cell should be swept. If a porch ... an attendance hall ... a fire-hall ... a privy is soiled, the privy should be swept. If there is no drinking-water, drinking-water should be provided. If there is no water for washing, water for washing should be provided. If there is no water in the pitcher of water for rinsing, water should be tipped into the pitcher of water for rinsing.

“If dissatisfaction has arisen in the preceptor, the one who shares his cell should allay it or get another to allay it, or he should give him a talk on *dhamma*. If remorse has arisen in the preceptor, the one who shares the cell should dispel it or get another to dispel it, or he should give him a talk on *dhamma*. If wrong views have arisen in the preceptor, the one who shares his cell should dissuade him (from them) or get another to dissuade him (from them), or he should give him a talk on *dhamma*.

“If the preceptor has committed an offence against an important rule and deserves probation, the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order grant the preceptor probation?’ If the preceptor deserves to be sent back to the beginning, the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order send the preceptor back to the beginning?’ If the preceptor deserves *mānatta* (discipline), the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order inflict *mānatta* (discipline) on the preceptor?’ If the preceptor deserves rehabilitation, the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order rehabilitate the preceptor?’

“If the Order desires to carry out a (formal) act against the preceptor—one of censure or one of guidance or one of banishment or one of reconciliation or one of suspension—the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order not carry out a (formal) act against the preceptor, or change it to a lighter one?’ Yet if a (formal) act—one of censure ... one of suspension—is carried

out by the Order against him, the one who shares his cell should make an effort, thinking: 'How then could the preceptor conduct himself properly, be subdued, mend his ways, (so that) the Order could revoke that (formal) act?'

"If the preceptor's robe should be washed, the one who shares his cell should wash it or he should make an effort, thinking: 'How then could the preceptor's robe be washed?' If the preceptor's robe-material should be made up, the one who shares his cell should make it up or he should make an effort, thinking: 'How then could the preceptor's robe-material be made up?' If dye should be boiled for the preceptor, the one who shares the cell should boil it or he should make an effort, thinking: 'How then can the dye be boiled?' If the preceptor's robe should be dyed, the one who shares his cell should dye it or should make an effort, thinking: 'How then can the preceptor's robe be dyed?' When he is dyeing the robe, he should dye it properly, turning it again and again, nor should he go away if the drips have not ceased.

"Without asking the preceptor (for permission), he should not give an almsbowl to anyone nor should he receive an alms bowl from anyone; he should not give a robe to anyone nor should he receive a robe from anyone; he should not give a requisite to anyone nor should he receive a requisite from anyone; he should not cut off anyone's hair, nor should he have his hair cut off by anyone; he should not render a service to anyone nor should he cause a service to be rendered by anyone; he should not execute a commission for anyone nor should he cause a commission to be executed by anyone; he should not become an attendant on anyone nor should he take anyone as an attendant; he should not bring back almsfood for anyone nor should he have almsfood brought back by anyone. Without asking the preceptor (for permission), he should not enter a village, he should not go to a cemetery, he should not leave the district. If the preceptor becomes ill, he should tend him for as long as life lasts; he should wait (with him) until he recovers. This, monks, is the observance for those who share cells towards preceptors and which should be

Kd 18.1

Vin 2.2

Kd 18.1

BD 5.3

observed by those who share cells towards preceptors.”

ON DUTIES TO ONE WHO SHARES HIS CELL

8.12.1 Now at that time preceptors did not conduct themselves properly towards those who shared their cells. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can these preceptors not conduct themselves properly towards those who share their cells?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that preceptors do not conduct themselves properly towards those who share their cells?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying: “Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance for preceptors towards those who share their cells and which should be observed by preceptors towards those who share their cells.

8.12.2 “The preceptor,¹ monks, should conduct himself properly towards the one who shares his cell. This is the proper conduct in this respect: the one who shares the cell should be furthered, he should be helped by the preceptor in regard to recitation, interrogation, exhortation, instruction. If there is a bowl for the preceptor but no bowl for the one who shares his cell, a bowl should be given by the preceptor to the one who shares his cell, or he should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could a bowl be procured for the one who shares my cell?’ If there is a robe for the preceptor ... if there is (another) requisite for the preceptor ... ‘How then could (another) requisite be procured for the one who shares my cell?’

8.12.3 “If the one who shares a cell becomes ill, having got up early he should give tooth-wood, he should give water for rinsing the mouth, he should make ready a seat. If there is conjei, having washed a vessel, conjei should be placed near him. When he has drunk the conjei, having given him water, having received the vessel, having lowered it, having washed it properly without rubbing it, it should

¹ From here to the end of **Kd 18.12** is the same as **Kd 1.26**.

be put away. When the one who shares a cell has got up, the seat should be removed. If that place is soiled that place should be swept.

“If the one who shares a cell wishes to enter a village, his inner clothing should be given (to him), the inner clothing (that he is wearing) should be received from him, in return, the outer robes should be given (to him), having folded them (into two or four folds); having washed it, a bowl with water is to be given to him. Thinking: ‘He will be returning about now,’ he should make ready a seat, he should set out water for washing the feet, a foot-stool, a foot-stand; having gone to meet him, he should receive his bowl and robe, he should give back the inner clothing (given) in return, he should receive his inner clothing. If a robe is damp with perspiration, he should dry it for a short time in the sun’s warmth, but a robe should not be laid aside in the warmth. He should fold up the robe. When folding up the robe, having made the corners turn back four finger-breadths, he should fold up the robe, thinking: ‘Mind there is no crease in the middle’. The waistband should be placed in a fold (of the robe). If there is almsfood and the one who shares a cell wishes to eat, having given him water, almsfood should be placed near (him).

“He should offer the one who shares his cell drinking water. When he has eaten, having given him water, having received the bowl, having lowered it, having washed it properly without rubbing it, having emptied out the water he should dry it for a short time in the sun’s warmth, but a bowl should not be laid aside in the warmth. He should lay aside the bowl and robes. When laying aside the bowl, having taken the bowl in one hand, having felt with the other under the couch or under the chair, the bowl should be laid aside, but the bowl should not be laid aside on the bare ground. When laying aside a robe, having taken the robe in one hand, having stroked the other hand along the bamboo for robes or the cord for robes, having got the edges away from him and the fold towards him, the robe should be laid aside. When the one who shares a cell has got up, the seat should be removed, the water for washing the feet, the foot-stool, the foot-stand should be put away. If that place comes to be soiled,

Kd 18.1

Kd 18.1

BD 5.31

Vin 2.2

that place should be swept.

“If the one who shares a cell wishes to bathe, he should prepare a bath. If he wants a cold (bath), he should prepare a cold one; if he wants a hot (bath), he should prepare a hot one. If the one who shares a cell wishes to enter a bathroom, he should knead chunam, he should moisten clay; taking a chair for the bathroom, having gone (close behind the one who shares a cell), having given him the chair for the bathroom, having received his robe, he should lay it to one side. He should give him the chunam, he should give him the clay. If he is able to do so he should enter the bathroom. When he is entering the bathroom, having smeared his face with clay, having covered himself front and back he should enter the bathroom.

“He should not sit down so as to encroach upon (the space intended for) monks who are elders. He should not keep newly ordained monks from a seat. He should make preparation for the one who shares a cell in the bathroom. When he is leaving the bathroom, taking the chair for the bathroom, having covered himself front and back, he should leave the bathroom. And he should make preparation in the water for the one who shares his cell. When he is bathing, having come out of the water first, having dried his own body, having put on his inner robe, he should wipe off the water from the limbs of the one who shares the cell, he should give him his inner clothing, he should give him his outer cloak; taking the chair for the bathroom, having come back first, he should make ready a seat, he should put out water for washing the feet, a foot-stool, a foot-stand. He should offer the one who shares a cell drinking-water.

“If the dwelling-place in which the one who shares a cell is staying is dirty, if he is able (to do so) he should clean it. When he is cleaning it, having first taken out the bowl and robes, he should lay them to one side ... If there is no water in the pitcher of water for rinsing, water should be tipped into the pitcher of water for rinsing. If dissatisfaction has arisen in the one who shares a cell, the preceptor should allay it or get another to allay it, or he should give him a talk on *dhamma*. If remorse ... the preceptor should dispel it or

get another to dispel it, or he should give him a talk on *dhamma*. If wrong views have arisen in the one who shares a cell, the preceptor should dissuade him (from them) or get another to dissuade him (from them) or he should give him a talk on *dhamma*.

“If the one who shares a cell has committed an offence against an important rule ... the preceptor should make an effort, thinking: ‘How then could the Order rehabilitate the one who shares the cell?’

“If the Order desires to carry out a (formal) act against one who shares a cell ... thinking: ‘How then could the one who shares a cell conduct himself properly, be subdued, mend his ways, (so that) the Order could revoke that (formal) act?’

“If the robe of one who shares a cell should be washed ... When he is dyeing the robe, he should dye it properly, turning it again and again, nor should he go away if the drips have not ceased. If the one who shares a cell becomes ill, he should tend him for as long as life lasts; he should wait (with him) until he recovers. This, monks, is the observance for preceptors towards those who share their cells and which should be observed by preceptors towards those who share their cells.”

The Second Portion for Repeating

ON DUTIES TO THE TEACHER

Now at that time pupils did not conduct themselves properly towards their teachers ... (as in **Kd 18.11.1**. *Instead of preceptor read teacher; instead of one who shares a cell read pupil*) ...

ON DUTIES TO THE STUDENT

Now at that time teachers did not conduct themselves properly towards their pupils ... (as in **Kd 18.12.1** *Instead of preceptor, one who shares his cell read teacher, pupil*) ...

Told is the Eighth Section: that on Observances

IN THIS SECTION ARE FIFTY-FIVE ITEMS, FOURTEEN OBSERVANCES. THIS IS ITS KEY

With sandals and sunshades, heads muffled up, drinking water, did not greet, they did not ask, snake, the well behaved looked down upon,
/

He took off, sunshade, and over his shoulder, and unhurriedly, withdrawal, laying aside bowl and robe, and suitable, asked,¹ /

Should sprinkle,² and about washing, sandals with a dry and a damp³ (cloth),

a senior, a newly ordained one should ask, and whether occupied, resorts, / Learners, privies, drinking water, washing,⁴ staff, agreement, thereupon⁵

the time, a moment, soiled, the ground-covering should be taken out, / Supports, mattress and squatting mat, and couch and chair, spittoon,⁶

reclining board, cobwebs, corners, coloured red, black, not treated,⁷ / And rubbish, ground covering, supports, couch and chair,

mattress,⁸ piece of cloth to sit upon, spittoon,⁹ and reclining board, / Bowl and robe, and the ground, the edges away, the folds towards,

from East, and from West, from the North, then from the South, / And cool, warm, by day, at night, and a cell, a porch,

attendance- and fire-hall, and the custom in privies, / Water for drinking, for washing, and into pitchers of water for rinsing—

For the rhythm: an observance laid down for those incoming. / Neither a seat, nor water, nor meeting, nor drinking water either,

they did not greet, they did not appoint,¹⁰ and the well behaved spread it about. /

And a seat for a senior, water, and having gone to meet, drinking water, sandals, on one side, and he should be greeted, should be appointed, /

Occupied, resorts and a learner, privy, drinking- and washing-water,¹¹ staff,¹² agreement, the time, if he is sitting down before one newly ordained,

/ He should greet, he should explain, the method is as below.

The observance for these resident ones was pointed out by the Leader of the Caravan. /

Those going away and wood, clay,¹³ having opened, not asking (for permission),

¹ *pucchitā*. ² Oldenberg's text: *asiñceyya*; Siamese: *āsiñci*. ³ Oldenberg's text: *all'*; Siamese *allen'*. ⁴ *paribhojaniya* here abbreviated to *pari*. ⁵ Oldenberg's text: *katikan tato*; Siamese *katikaṭṭhitam*. ⁶ *kheḷamallaka* here abbreviated to *mallaka*. ⁷ Oldenberg: *gerukā-kāla, akatā*; Siamese: *gerukā kālakākata*. ⁸ Oldenberg: *paṭipādakaṃ mañca-piṭham, / bhisi*; Siamese: *patipādakā mañcakaṃ / pitham bhisi*. ⁹ *kheḷamallaka* here abbreviated to *mallaka*. ¹⁰ Oldenberg: *paññape*; Siamese: *paññāpe*. ¹¹ Oldenberg: *bhojani*; Siamese: *bhojanam*. ¹² Oldenberg: *kattarā*; Siamese: *kattaram*. ¹³ Oldenberg: *matti ca*; Siamese: *mattikā*.

and they were lost, and unguarded, and the well behaved ones looked down upon. /

Having packed away, having closed, having asked (for permission), so may he set out,

monk or novice or park-attendant or lay follower, /

On stones, a heap, he should pack away, and he should close,

if he is able,¹ or an effort, and just where it does not leak, /

If the whole² leaks—to a village, and just there in the open air,

“So the different things surely remain”: the observance for monks who are going away. /

They did not give thanks, through an elder, leaving alone, about four or five,

wanting to relieve himself, he was fainting: these are the observances for those giving thanks. /

The group of six monks wrongly dressed and further wrongly clothed, and improperly, turning aside, encroaching on³ (the space intended for) elders, /

And newly ordained monks, outer cloaks, and the well behaved looked down upon,

having dressed with the inner robe all round one for covering the three circles, waistband, one bundle, block, /

Not turning aside, properly clad, well-controlled, eyes cast down,⁴

lifting up the robes, with loud laughter, noise, and so the three swayings,⁵ /

Arms akimbo, muffled up, crouching, properly clad, well controlled,

lifting up the robes, loud laughter,⁶ little noise, the three swayings,⁷ /

Arms akimbo, muffled up, and lolling, encroaching, not on a seat,

having spared (he should) not, when water,⁸ having lowered, he should not splash, /

Receiver, neighbouring, outer cloak, and if cooked rice it should be received,

curry, tit-bits, for all, and an equal level,⁹ /

Attentively, and thinking of the bowl,¹⁰ and on continuous almsround, equal curry,

not from the top, coverings up, asking, captious-mindedly, /

Large, a round, door, whole hand, one should not talk,¹¹ ball, breaking up,

¹ Oldenberg: *ussahati*; Siamese: *sace ussahati*. ² Oldenberg: *sabbe*; Siamese: *sace*.

³ Oldenberg: *anupakhajjane*; Siamese: *jjanam*. ⁴ Oldenberg: *-cakkhu*; Siamese: *cakkhunā*.

⁵ *pacālanā ... calā*. ⁶ Oldenberg: *ukkhittacittā, ujjhaggi*; Siamese: *okkhittukkhittā ujjhagghi*. ⁷ *pacālanā ... calā*. ⁸ Oldenberg: *na udake*; Siamese: *ca udake*.

⁹ Oldenberg: *samatitti*; Siamese: *samakanti*. ¹⁰ Siamese here adds: *samasūpañca titthikā / na tāva thero bhuñjeyya asampatte ca odane / sakkacāṃ pattasaññī ca sapadā-*

nam ca sūpakāṃ. ¹¹ Oldenberg: *na byāhare*; Siamese: *na vohare*.

cheeks, shaking, scattering lumps of boiled rice, /
 And then putting out the tongue, smacking the lips, making a hissing sound,
 licking the fingers, the bowl, the lips, accepting with what is soiled, /
 Until everyone,¹ when water,² having lowered, he should not splash,
 receiver, neighbouring, outer cloak, and having lowered on the ground, /
 With lumps of boiled rice, when returning, properly clad, crouching;
 this refectory-observance was laid down by the *dhamma*-king. /
 Wrongly dressed, improperly, and without deliberation,³ hastily,
 far, close, long, soon, here just those who walk for alms. /
 He may go properly clad,⁴ well controlled,⁵ his eyes cast down,⁶
 lifting up the robes, with loud laughter, noise, and so the three swayings, /
 Arms akimbo, muffled up, crouching, and having considered, hastily,
 far, close, long, soon, a little seat, a spoon, /
 Or a dish and if she sets it out, having raised (and) having uncovered,⁷
 (the alms) may be received, he should not look at, and that is about curries
 as before, /
 A monk should cover with the outer cloak, he should go properly clad,⁸
 well controlled, and the eyes cast down, lifting up the robes, and with loud
 laughter, /
 Little noise, the three swayings, arms akimbo, muffled up, crouching,
 the first the seat, the refuse (tub), drinking water, washing water,
 the last if he so desires may eat, it may be thrown into, he should remove, /
 He should put away, he should sweep, if empty (and) depleted he should
 attend (to them)
 by a sign with the hand, he should not break into:⁹ and the observance for
 those who walk for alms. /
 Drinking water, washing water, fire, kindling wood and lunar mansions
 (and) quarters (and) thieves,
 thinking, “there is nothing” having thrashed (them), a bowl, on the shoul-
 der, then the robe, /
 “Now,” having hung on the shoulder, the three circles, all round,
 as is the observance for those who walk for alms so are the meanings in
 that for forest-dwellers. /
 A bowl, on the shoulder, robe, on the head, and having put on, drinking
 water,
 washing water, fire, and also kindling wood, a staff, /

¹ Oldenberg: *yāva na sabbe, udake*; Siamese: *na tāva yāva na sabbe*. ² Oldenberg:
yāva na sabbe, udake; Siamese: *na tāva yāva na sabbe*. ³ Oldenberg: *asallakkhe ca sa-*
hasā; Siamese: *asallakkhetvā sāhasā*. ⁴ Oldenberg: *paṭicchannena*; Siamese *paṭiccha-*
nno va. ⁵ Oldenberg: *susamvut’okkhittacakkhu*; Siamese: *saṃvut’okkhittacakkhunā*.
⁶ Oldenberg: *susamvut’okkhittacakkhu*; Siamese: *saṃvut’okkhittacakkhunā*. ⁷ Old-
 enberg: *paṇāmetvā*; Siamese: *paṇāmakā*. ⁸ *paṭicchanneva*. ⁹ Oldenberg:
hatthivikāre, bhindeyya; Siamese: *hatthakāre na bhindeyya*.

Lunar mansions, or their positions, he should become skilled in the quarters:

the observance was laid down for these forest-dwellers by the Best of Teachers. /

In the open air, they were covered, and the well behaved looked down upon.

If a dwelling-place is soiled, first the bowl and robe, /

Mattress and squatting-mat, couch, and chair, spittoon,

reclining board (and) window corners, red colouring, black, not treated, /

Rubbish, near monks, lodgings, dwelling-place, drinking water,

near washing water, and to windward in the open space, /

To leeward, covering, supports and couch,¹

chair, mattress, piece of cloth to sit upon, spittoon, and reclining board, /

And bowl and robe on the ground, the edges away from, the fold towards,

and the East, the West, the North, then the South, /

And cool and warm, by day (and) at night, and a cell, a porch,

attendance- and fire-hall, a privy, drinking water, /

Pitcher of rinsing water, seniors, recitation (and) interrogation, study,²

dhamma, and a light, he should (not) extinguish, he should not open, nor

should he close, /

When the senior turns, he should not touch him even with a corner;

the Great Sage laid down this observance for lodgings. /

If they are being hindered, doorway, fainting, the well behaved look down

upon,

he should throw out the ashes, bathroom, and flooring as before, /

Cell (and) porch, hall, chunam (and) clay (and) jar,

face, in front, not (encroaching on) elders, nor³ newly ordained, if he is able, /

In front, above, a way, swampy, clay, a little chair,

and having extinguished, he may depart:⁴ the observance for those in bathrooms. /

He did not rinse, according to seniority and in order, and he fell down, hastily,

forcibly,⁵ groaning, toothwood, they relieved themselves, spitting, /

Rough, cesspool, hastily, forcibly, smacking, they left,⁶

outside and inside one should cough, a cord, and unhurriedly, /

¹ Oldenberg: *mañce ca*; Siamese: *mañcakaṃ*. ² Oldenberg: *-paripucchanā, sajjhā, / dhammo, padīpaṇ ca vijjhāpe na vivare, na pi thake*; Siamese: *paripucchanā / sajjhā dhammo padīpaṇ ca na vivare na ca thake*. / ³ Siamese omits *na*. ⁴ Oldenberg: *vijjhāpetvā ca, pakkame*; Siamese: *vijjhāpetvā thaketvā ca*. ⁵ Oldenberg reads *uppajji* for *ubbhujitvā*, and in the line below *ubbhajji*; Siamese *ubbhujī* in both places. ⁶ Oldenberg: *sethena*. At **Kd 18.10.2** the corresponding word is *sesenti*. Siamese: *sesakaṃ*.

Hastily, forcibly, groaning,¹ toothwood, and relieving oneself,
spitting, rough, and cesspool, privy shoes, /
Not too hastily, forcibly, shoes, smacking the lips,
one should not leave, one should not² get rid of, dirty,³ and about the recep-
tacle,⁴ /

Privy, plaster flooring, and cell, porch,
and water in the pitcher for rinsing water: the observance in the privies
are these. /

Sandals, toothwood, and water for rinsing the mouth, a seat,
conje, water, having washed, he should remove, soiled, and village, /

Inner clothing, waistband, fold, a bowl with water,
attendant, and precisely the three circles, all round, waistband, /
Fold, having washed, attendant, not too far away, he should receive,
while he is speaking, offence, going first, a seat, /

Water, (foot-) stool and stand, having gone to meet, inner clothing,
in the sun, he laid aside, crease, in a fold, let him eat, he may place,⁵
Drinking water, water, lowered, for a moment, but he should not lay aside,
bowl on the ground and robes, edges away, fold towards, /

He should remove, he should put away, and soiled, to bathe,
cold, hot, bathroom, chunam, clay, behind, /

And chair, robe, chunam, clay, if he is able, face,
front, elders, neither, and preparation, when leaving, /

Front, in the water, when bathing, having dressed, the preceptor,
and the inner clothing, outer cloak, chair, and about a seat, /

Footstool and stand, drinking water, recitation, interrogation,
if soiled he should clean it,⁶ first the bowl and robes /

Piece of cloth to sit upon and sheet, and the mattress and squatting mat,
couch, chair, supports, spittoon, and the reclining board, /

Ground- (covering), cobwebs, windows, red, black, not treated,
ground-covering, supports, couch, chair, mattress, /

Piece of cloth to sit upon and sheet, spittoon and reclining board, bowl and
robe,

from the East, and from the West, from the North, and then from the South,
/

And cool and warm, by day and night, and a cell, porch,
attendance- and fire-hall, privy, drinking water, water for washing, /

Pitcher of water for rinsing, dissatisfaction remorse, and wrong view, im-

¹ Oldenberg: *sahasā ubbhajitvāna*; Siamese: *sahasā ubbhuji ṭhite*. ² Siamese omits *na*. ³ Oldenberg: *uhana*, presumably for *ūhatā* of Kd 18.10.3; Siamese: *ūhanā*.

⁴ Oldenberg: *pidharena ca*; Siamese: *piṭharena ca*. ⁵ *name*, for *upanāmetabbo* at the end of Kd 18.11.4. ⁶ Oldenberg *uklāpaṃ su sodheyya*; Siamese: *uklāp'ussahaṃ sodheyya*.

portant (rule),¹

the beginning, *mānatta*, rehabilitation, censure, guidance,² /

Banishment, reconciliation, and suspension, if it is carried out,
he should wash, and he should make up, the dye, he should dye, turning it,
/

And bowl, and also robe, and a requisite, cutting off,
service, commission, attendant, almsfood, entering, /

Nor to a cemetery, and also from a district, he should attend him for as long
as life lasts;

this is the observance for one who shares a cell. These are for a preceptor: /
Exhortation, instruction, recitation, interrogation, and bowl, robe,
and requisite, ill, he should not be an attendant.³ /

These observances for preceptors are also so for teachers;

as are the observances for those who share a cell, so they are for pupils. /
Those observances for incoming ones, and again for resident ones,
those going away, those giving thanks, in a refectory, those walking for
almsfood, /

That observance for forest-dwellers, and also that for lodgings,
In a bathroom, a privy, and those for preceptors and those who share their
cells, /

(As is) that observance for teachers, so is it for pupils.

Nineteen matters are spoken of in sixteen sections. /

Being imperfect in observance one does not perfect morality,
Impure in morality, of poor wisdom, one knows not one-pointedness of
mind, /

The mind wavering, not one-pointed, sees not *dhamma* rightly,
not seeing true *dhamma*, one is not freed from ill. /

Being perfect in observance, one perfects morality too,
pure in morality, with wisdom, one knows too one-pointedness of mind, /
The mind unwavering, one-pointed, rightly sees *dhamma* too,
beholding true *dhamma*, one is freed from ill. /

Wherefore the watchful son of the Conqueror should fulfil the observance,
the exhortation of the best of Buddhas—hence he will come to *nibbāna*. /

¹ Oldenberg *ācamanaṃ anabhirati kukkucam diṭṭhi ca garu*; Siamese: *ācamana-*
anabhirati kukkucam diṭṭhikā garu. ² Oldenberg has *niyasaka* above, for *nissaya*.
Siamese *niyassakam*. Cf. also AN i.99 where *niyassakamma* should read *nissayak-*

³ Oldenberg reads *na pacchāsamaṇo sāve*; Siamese *bhave*.

19. SUSPENDING THE OBSERVANCE (UPOSATHAṬṬHĀPANA)

REQUESTING THE RECITATION OF THE PĀTIMOKKHA

19.1.1
5.330
At one time¹ the Awakened One, the Lord was staying at Sāvattthī in the Eastern Monastery in the long house of Migāra’s mother. Now at that time the Lord was sitting down surrounded by an Order of monks on an Observance day. Then, when the night was far spent, as the first watch was waning, the venerable Ānanda, rising from his seat, having arranged his upper robe over one shoulder, having saluted the Lord with joined palms, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, the night is far spent, the first watch is waning; the Order of monks has been sitting down for a long time; Lord, let the Lord recite the Pātimokkha to the monks.”² When he had spoken thus the Lord became silent. And when the night was far spent, as the middle watch was waning, the venerable Ānanda a second time rising from his seat, having arranged ... spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, the night is far spent, the middle watch is waning; ... recite the Pātimokkha to the monks.” And a second time the Lord became silent. And when the night was far spent, as the last watch was waning, when the sun had risen and the night had a face of gladness,³ a third time did the venerable Ānanda, rising from his seat, having arranged ... speak thus to the Lord:

¹ The whole of this episode occurs also at AN iv.204ff., Ud 5.5. ² Quoted at Kh-a 114; and at DN-a 227-DN-a 228, and Vv-a 52, to “for a long time,” as an example of *khaya*, waning. ³ Cf. Kd 8.13.2; Ud 3.3.

“Lord, the night is far spent, the last watch is waning; the sun has risen, the night has a face of gladness; the Order of monks has been sitting down for a long time; Lord, let the Lord recite the Pātimokkha to the monks.”

“Ānanda, the assembly is not entirely pure.”¹

Then it occurred to the venerable Moggallāna the Great:

“Now, on account of which individual did the Lord speak thus: ‘Ānanda, the assembly is not entirely pure?’” Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great with his mind compassed the minds of the entire Order of monks. Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great saw that individual sitting in the midst of the Order of monks—of bad moral habit,² depraved in character, of impure and suspicious behaviour,³ of concealed actions,⁴ not a (true) recluse (although) pretending to be a (true) recluse, not a farer of the Brahma-faring (although) pretending to be a farer of the Brahma-faring, rotten within, filled with desire,⁵ filthy by nature; seeing him, he approached that individual, having approached, he spoke thus to that individual:

“Get up, your reverence, the Lord has seen you; for you there is no communion⁶ together with the monks.” When he had spoken thus that individual became silent. And a second time ... And a third time the venerable Moggallāna the Great spoke thus to that individual: “Get up, your reverence ... for you there is no communion together with the monks.” And a third time that individual became silent. Then the venerable Moggallāna the Great, having taken that individual by the arm, having thrust him out through the porch of the gateway, having shot the bolt,⁷ approached the Lord; having approached, he spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord I have thrust that individual out; the company is entirely

¹ I.e. there is some monk in it who has not confessed an offence which he has committed. ² For this set of epithets cf. AN i.108, AN i.126, AN ii.239, AN iv.201, AN i.205, Pp 27, Pp 36; Ud 52; SN iv.180–SN iv.181. ³ SN i.66, Thag 277; cf. Dh-p-a iii.485.

⁴ Snp 127. ⁵ Defined at Vin 4.214, Vin 4.221, Vin 4.233 (BD 3.161, BD 3.174, BD 3.196).

⁶ *samvāsa*. Cf. definition at Vin 4.315, and definition of “to be in communion” at Vin 4.138, Vin 4.214. Also see Bu-Pc 69. ⁷ *sūciḡhaṭṭikam datvā*, cf. Kd 15.14.3. This episode is referred to at Snp-a 312.

pure; Lord, let the Lord recite the Pātimokkha to the monks.”

“How strange, Moggallāna, how wonderful, Moggallāna, that that foolish man should have waited even until he was taken hold of by the arm.”

Then the Lord addressed the monks,¹ saying:

EIGHT WONDERFUL THINGS ABOUT THE GREAT OCEAN

“Monks, there are these eight strange and wonderful things about the great ocean,² from constantly having seen which *asuras*³ delight in the great ocean. What are the eight? The great ocean, monks, deepens gradually, slopes gradually, shelves gradually, with no abruptness like a precipice. And monks, that the great ocean deepens gradually, slopes gradually, shelves gradually with no abruptness like a precipice—this, monks, is the first strange and wonderful thing about the great ocean from constantly having seen which *asuras* delight in the great ocean.

“And again, monks, the great ocean is stable, it does not overflow its margins.⁴ And, monks, that the great ocean is stable, that it does not overflow its margins—this, monks, is the second strange and wonderful thing ...

“And again, monks, the great ocean does not associate with a dead body, a corpse. Whatever dead body, corpse there may be in the great ocean, that it just quickly forces ashore and pushes on to the dry land.⁵ That the great ocean, monks, does not associate with a dead body, a corpse ... this, monks, is the third strange and wonderful thing ...

“And again, monks, all the great rivers, that is to say the Ganges,

¹ At AN iv.198 this description of the ocean is ascribed to the *asura* chief, *Pahārāda*.

² As at AN iv.198–AN iv.204, AN iv.206–AN iv.208; Ud 53–Ud 56. ³ A class of mythical beings—not apparently here, as sometimes, shown as the enemies of the *devas*.

⁴ In ebbing and flowing, Vin-a 1287 says. ⁵ Cf. Mil 187, Mil 250.

the Jumna, the Aciravatī, the Sarabhū, the Mahī¹—these, on reaching the great ocean lose their former names and identities² and are reckoned simply as the great ocean. That all the great rivers ... this, monks, is the fourth strange and wonderful thing ...

“And again, monks, those streams which in the world flow into the great ocean, and those showers from the sky which fall into it, yet is neither the emptiness nor the fullness of the great ocean affected by that. That those streams which in the world ... this, monks, is the fifth strange and wonderful thing ...

“And again, monks, the great ocean has one taste, the taste of salt. That the great ocean, monks, has one taste ... this, monks, is the sixth strange and wonderful thing ...

“And again, monks, the great ocean has many treasures,³ divers treasures; these treasures are there, that is to say: pearl,⁴ crystal, lapis lazuli, shell, quartz, coral, silver, gold, ruby, cat’s-eye. That the great ocean, monks, has many treasures ... this, monks, is the seventh strange and wonderful thing ...

“And again, monks, the great ocean is the abode of great beings; these beings are there: the *timis*, the *timīṅgalas*, the *timitimīṅgalas*, *asuras*,⁵ *nāgas*, *gandhabbas*. There are in the great ocean individualities⁶ a hundred *yojanas*⁷ (long),⁸ individualities two hundred ... three hundred ... four hundred ... five hundred *yojanas* (long). That the great ocean, monks, is the abode of great beings; that these beings are there: the *timis* ... individualities five hundred *yojanas* (long)—this, monks, is the eighth strange and wonderful thing about the great ocean from constantly having seen which *asuras* delight in the great ocean. These, monks, are the eight strange and wonderful things about the great ocean from constantly having seen which *asuras* delight in the great ocean.

¹ This list recurs at AN iv.101, AN v.22; SN ii.135, SN v.38; Mil 70, Mil 87, Mil 380; Vism 10. ² *gotta*, clan. Cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.10.1,2; Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 3.2.8, Praśna Upaniṣad 6.5. ³ *ratana*. ⁴ See GS iv.137, notes. ⁵ See GS iv.137, n.11. ⁶ *attabhāva*. ⁷ See BD 2.90, n. 8. ⁸ Quoted Atthasālini 299.

EIGHT WONDERFUL THINGS ABOUT THIS DHAMMA AND VINAYA

19.1.4 “In exactly the same way, monks, in this *dhamma* and discipline there are eight strange and wonderful things from constantly having seen which monks delight in this *dhamma* and discipline. What are the eight?

5.334 “Even,¹ monks, as the great ocean deepens gradually, slopes gradually, shelves gradually with no abruptness like a precipice, even so, monks, in this *dhamma* and discipline there is a gradual training,² a gradual doing,³ a gradual course,⁴ with no abruptness such as penetration of profound knowledge. And, monks, that in this *dhamma* and discipline there is a ... gradual course with no abruptness such as penetration of profound knowledge, this, monks, is the first strange and wonderful thing from constantly having seen which monks delight in this *dhamma* and discipline.

2.239 “And even, monks, as the great ocean is stable and does not overflow its margins, even so, monks, whatever rule of training has been laid down by me for disciples, my disciples will not transgress it even for life’s sake. And that, monks, my disciples will not transgress even for life’s sake a rule of training laid down by me for disciples, this, monks, is the second strange and wonderful thing ...

“And even, monks, as the great ocean does not associate with a dead body, a corpse, but whatever dead body, corpse there may be in the great ocean, that it just quickly forces ashore and pushes on to the dry land, even so, monks, whatever individual is of bad moral habit, of depraved character, of impure and suspicious behaviour, of concealed actions, not a (true) recluse (although) pretending to

¹ Quoted Kv 219. ² AN-a iv.111 says this is the “three trainings,” i.e. either in the higher moral habit, the higher mentality, the higher wisdom (as at AN i.234), or in moral habit, concentration, wisdom. For these three words, cf. MN i.479. MN iii.1; AN iv.201; Ud 54. ³ *kiriya*. AN-a iv.111 calls this the thirteen *dhutaṅgas*, ascetic practices (explained at Vism 59ff.). ⁴ AN-a iv.111 calls this: the seven (ways of) contemplating, the eighteen great (ways of) insight (Vism 628ff.), the thirty-eight categories of dependence, the thirty-seven things helpful to enlightenment.

be a (true) recluse, not a farer of the Brahma-faring (although) pretending to be a farer of the Brahma-faring, rotten within, filled with desire, filthy by nature—the Order does not live in communion¹ with him, but having assembled quickly, suspends him; and although he is sitting in the midst of an Order of monks, yet he is far from the Order and the Order is far from him² ... this, monks, is the third strange and wonderful thing ...

“And even, monks, as those great rivers, that is to say the Ganges, the Jumna, the Aciravatī, the Sarabhū, the Mahī which, on reaching the great ocean, lose their former names and identities and are reckoned simply as the great ocean, even so, monks, (members of) these four castes: noble, brahmin, merchant and low, having gone forth from home into homelessness in this *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder, lose their former names and clans and are reckoned simply as recluses, sons of the Sakyans³ ... this, monks, is the fourth strange and wonderful thing ...

“And even, monks, as those streams which in the world flow into the great ocean and those showers which fall into it from the sky, yet not by that is either the emptiness or the fullness of the great ocean affected—even so, monks, even if many monks attain *nibbāna* in the *nibbāna*-condition in which no more groups are remaining,⁴ not by that is either the emptiness or the fullness of the *nibbāna*-condition affected ... this, monks, is the fifth strange and wonderful thing ...

“And even, monks, as the great ocean has one taste, the taste of salt, even so, monks, does this *dhamma* and discipline have one taste, the taste of freedom ... this, monks, is the sixth strange and wonderful thing ...

“And even, monks, as the great ocean has many treasures, divers treasures—these treasures are there, that is to say: pearl, crystal, lapis lazuli, shell, quartz, coral, silver, gold, ruby, cat’s-eye—even so,

¹ *Sarivasati*; a technical term when used of the Order; see note above, **BD 5.331**.

² Cf. It p.91. ³ On this term see **BD 2, Introduction, p.xliv**. ⁴ See GS iv.139, n. 4 and GS iv.320; also DN iii.135, It p.38 where the meaning of *anupādisesanibbānadhātu* is explained. See also *Compendium of Buddhist Philosophy* p.154: “That which bears its own intrinsic nature.” The groups are those of grasping.

monks, does this *dhamma* and discipline have many treasures, divers treasures—these treasures are there, that is to say: the four arousings of mindfulness, the four right efforts, the four bases of psychic power, the five faculties, the seven links in awakening, the noble eightfold Way¹ ... this, monks, is the seventh strange and wonderful thing ...

“And even, monks, as the great ocean is the abode of great beings—these beings are there: *timis, timingalas, timitimingalas, asuras, nāgas, gandhabbas*, individualities a hundred *yojanas* (long) ... two hundred ... three hundred ... four hundred ... five hundred *yojanas* (long)—even so, monks, this *dhamma* and discipline is the abode of great beings—these beings are there: the stream-attainer, the one going along to the realisation of the fruit of stream-attainment, the once-returner, the one going along to the realisation of the fruit of once-returning, the non-returner, the one going along to the realisation of the fruit of non-returning, the perfected one, the one going along to perfection. And that, monks, this *dhamma* and discipline is the abode of great beings—these beings are there: the stream-attainer ... the one going along to perfection, this, monks, is the eighth strange and wonderful thing in this *dhamma* and discipline from constantly having seen which monks delight in this *dhamma* and discipline. These, monks, are the eight strange and wonderful things in this *dhamma* and discipline from constantly having seen which monks delight in this *dhamma* and discipline.”

Then the Lord, having known this matter, at that time uttered this utterance:

“It rains hard on a covered thing,
It rains not hard on an open thing;
So open up the covered thing,

¹ MRS. RHYS DAVIDS, *Sakya*, p. 395, points out that the order of these terms sometimes varies.

Thus will it not rain hard on that.”¹

THOSE DESERVING TO HEAR THE PĀTIMOKKHA

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Now, I, monks, henceforth will not carry out the Observance, I will not recite the Pātimokkha; now you yourselves, monks, must henceforth carry out the Observance, must recite the Pātimokkha. It is not possible, monks, it cannot come to pass that the Truth-finder should carry out the Observance, should recite the Pātimokkha with an assembly that is not entirely pure. Nor, monks, should the Pātimokkha be heard by one who has an offence.² Whoever (such) should hear it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, to suspend the Pātimokkha for him who, having an offence, hears the Pātimokkha.³ And thus, monks, should it be suspended:⁴ On an Observance day, whether it be the fourteenth or the fifteenth, when that individual is present this should be uttered in the midst of the Order: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The individual So-and-so has an offence; I am suspending the Pātimokkha for him, the Pātimokkha should not be recited when he is present’ — (thus) does the Pātimokkha become suspended.”

Now at that time the group of six monks,⁵ thinking: “No one knows about us,” listened to the Pātimokkha although they had offences. Monks who were elders, knowing the minds of others, told the monks: “So-and-so and So-and-so, your reverences, (belonging to) the group of six monks, thinking, ‘No one knows about us,’ listened to the Pātimokkha although they had offences.” The group of

¹ This verse occurs at Ud v.5, but not at AN iv.204 or AN iv.208. It is among the verses ascribed to Sirimaṇḍa, Thag 447. Vin-a 1287 observes (as is clear from the context) that the covered thing means “having fallen into an offence and concealing it one falls into another and a fresh offence; but disclosing it, one does not fall into another offence.” Cf. Ud-a 306, and also Thag-a ii.188. ² Cf. Kd 2.27.1. ³ Kd 11.5.1 says that it may not be suspended (*thapeti*) for a regular monk. ⁴ Cf. suspending the Invitation, Kd 4.16.2 which follows a similar course. ⁵ Cf. Kd 4.16.3.

six monks heard it said that the monks who were elders, knowing the minds of others, had told the monks: “So-and-so and So-and-so ... listened to the Pātimokkha although they had offences.” These, thinking: “In case the well behaved monks suspend the Pātimokkha for us,” suspended first, without ground, without reason, the Pātimokkha for the pure monks who had no offences. These who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this group of six monks suspend, without ground, without reason, the Pātimokkha for pure monks who have no offences?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Is it true, as is said, monks, that the group of six monks suspended, without ground, without reason, the Pātimokkha for pure monks who have no offences?”

“It is true, Lord.” Having rebuked them, having given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, you should not, without ground, without reason, suspend the Pātimokkha for pure monks who have no offences. Whoever should (so) suspend it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

SETTING ASIDE THE PĀTIMOKKHA BY RULE AND NOT BY RULE

19.3.2

“Monks, one suspension of the Pātimokkha is not legally valid, one is legally valid; two suspensions of the Pātimokkha are not legally valid, two are legally valid; three... four ... five ... six ... seven ... eight ... nine ... ten suspensions of the Pātimokkha are not legally valid, ten are legally valid.

19.3.3

“What is the one suspension of the Pātimokkha that is not legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from moral habit, this one suspension of the Pātimokkha is not legally valid.

5.338

“What is the one suspension of the Pātimokkha that is legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) falling away from moral habit, this one suspension of the Pātimokkha is legally valid.

“What are the two suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are not legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from moral habit, if one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from good habits, these two suspensions of the Pātimokkha are not legally valid.

“What are the two suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) falling away from moral habit, if one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) falling away from good habits, these two suspensions of the Pātimokkha are legally valid.

“What are the three suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are not legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from moral habit, if one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from good habits, if one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from right views, these three suspensions ... are not legally valid.

“What are the three suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) falling away from moral habit ... from good habits ... from right views, these three suspensions ... are legally valid.

“What are the four suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are not legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from moral habit ... from good habits ... from right views, if one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from a right mode of livelihood, these four suspensions of the Pātimokkha are not legally valid.

“What are the four suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) falling away from moral habit, ... from good habits ... from right views, if one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) falling away from a right mode of livelihood, these four suspensions ... are legally valid.

“What are the five suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are not

legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) an offence involving defeat ... on an unfounded (charge of) an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order ... on an unfounded (charge of) an offence of expiation ... on an unfounded (charge of) an offence which ought to be confessed ... on an unfounded (charge of) an offence of wrong-doing, these five suspensions ... are not legally valid.

“What are the five suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) an offence involving defeat ... on a founded (charge of) an offence of wrong-doing, these five suspensions ... are legally valid.

“What are the six suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are not legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from moral habit which has not been done,¹ if one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from moral habit which has been done² ... on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from good habits which has not been done ... which has been done, if one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from right views which has not been done ... which has been done, these six suspensions ... are not legally valid.

“What are the six suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) falling away from moral habit which has not been done ... which has been done ... on a founded (charge of) falling away from good habits which has not been done ... which has been done, if one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) falling away from right views which has not been done ... which has been done, these six suspensions ... are legally valid.

“What are the seven suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are not legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) an offence involving defeat ... of an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order ... of a grave offence ... of an offence of

¹ *akata*. Vin-a 1288 says the falling away may or may not have been done by that individual. ² *kata*.

expiation ... of an offence which ought to be confessed ... of an offence of wrong-doing, if one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) an offence of wrong speech, these seven suspensions ... are not legally valid.

“What are the seven suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) an offence involving defeat ... on a founded (charge of) an offence of wrong speech, these seven suspensions ... are legally valid.

“What are the eight suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are not legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from moral habit which has not been done ... which has been done ... of falling away from good habits which has not been done ... which has been done ... of falling away from right views which has not been done ... which has been done, if one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from a right mode of livelihood which has not been done ... which has been done, these eight suspensions ... are not legally valid.

“What are the eight suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) falling away from moral habit which has not been done ... which has been done ... of falling away from a right mode of livelihood which has not been done ... which has been done, these eight suspensions ... are legally valid.

“What are the nine suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are not legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from moral habit which has not been done ... which has been done ... which has been done and not done¹ ... on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from good habits which has not been done ... which has been done ... which has been done and not done ... on an unfounded (charge of) falling away from right views which has not been done ... which has been done ... which has been

¹ *katākatāya*. Vin-a 1288 says “it is so called because (the one who is suspending) has chosen, *gahetvā*, both: done and not done” (presumably as his grounds for suspending, since falling away may have been done both by the individual whom he is suspending, and by another).

done and not done, these nine suspensions ... not legally valid.

“What are the nine suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are legally valid? If one suspends the Pātimokkha on a founded (charge of) falling away from moral habit which has not been done ... which has been done ... which has been done and not done ... on a founded (charge of) falling from good habits ... on a founded (charge of) falling away from right views which has not been done ... which has been done ... which has been done and not done, these nine suspensions ... are legally valid.

“What are the ten suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are not legally valid? If one who is defeated is not sitting in that assembly,¹ if talk on an offence involving defeat is still going forward,² if one who has disavowed the training is not sitting in that assembly, if talk on disavowing the training is still going forward, if he submits himself to a legally valid complete assembly,³ if he does not withdraw his acceptance⁴ (of a formal act settled) in a legally valid complete assembly, if talk on withdrawing acceptance (of a formal act settled) in a legally valid complete assembly is still going forward, if he is not seen, heard or suspected of falling away from moral habit, if he is not seen, heard or suspected of falling away from good habits, if he is not seen, heard or suspected of falling away from right views, these ten suspensions of the Pātimokkha are not legally valid.

“What are the ten suspensions of the Pātimokkha that are legally valid? If one who is defeated is sitting in that assembly, if talk on an offence involving defeat is not still going forward ... (as in above paragraph, but the opposite in each case) ... if he is seen, heard or suspected of falling away from right views, these ten suspensions of the

¹ These clauses are explained in **Kd 19.3.4** below. ² A monk cannot be legally suspended while talk on his case is still in progress. ³ *dhammikarū sāmaggiṃ upeti*. See **Kd 10.5.13**; **Kd 10.6.2** (*atthupeta*, *vyañjanupeta*). ⁴ *na paccādiyati*. Vin-a 1288 says of *paccādiyati* (in the “legally valid” clause) it means that if he says the formal act should be earned out again, he withdraws his acceptance. But he who opens it up again falls into an offence of expiation. If he desires to find fault with a formal act while it is being carried out, and neither comes nor gives his consent, and protests if he has come, for this reason he falls into an offence of wrong-doing. (Cf. **Bu-Pc 80.**)

Pātimokkha are legally valid.

SETTING ASIDE THE PĀTIMOKKHA BY RULE

“How (can it be said that) one who is defeated is sitting in that assembly? This is a case, monks, where by reason of those properties,¹ by reason of those features, by reason of those signs by which there comes to be commission of an offence involving defeat a monk sees (another) monk committing an offence involving defeat; or it may be that that monk does not himself see a monk committing an offence involving defeat, but that another monk tells that monk: ‘The monk So-and-so, your reverence, is committing an offence involving defeat’; or it may be that that monk does not himself see a monk committing an offence involving defeat and that no other monk tells that monk: ‘The monk So-and-so, your reverence, is committing an offence involving defeat,’ but that he himself tells the monk: ‘I, your reverence, have committed an offence involving defeat.’ Monks, that monk if he so desires, on account of what he has seen, or has heard, or has suspected may, on an Observance day, whether it is the fourteenth or the fifteenth, utter in the midst of the Order when that individual is present: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This individual So-and-so is committing an offence involving defeat. I am suspending the Pātimokkha for him. The Pātimokkha should not be recited in his presence.’ This suspension of the Pātimokkha is legally valid. When the Pātimokkha has been suspended for that monk, if the assembly removes itself on account of any one of the ten dangers²—the danger from kings or ... thieves or ... fire or ... water or ... human beings or ... non-human beings or ... beasts of prey or ... creeping things or because of danger to life or because of danger to the Brahma-faring—monks, that monk, if he so desires, may either in that residence or in another residence, utter in the midst of the Order in the presence of that individual: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The talk on the individual So-and-so’s offence involving

¹ As at Vin 3.27. ² See rule at Kd 2.15.4.

5.343 defeat was still going forward; that matter is not decided. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may decide this matter.’ If he succeeds thus, that is good. If he does not succeed, he should, on an Observance day, whether the fourteenth or the fifteenth, utter in the midst of the Order and in the presence of that individual: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The talk on the individual So-and-so’s offence involving defeat was still going forward; that matter is not decided. I am suspending the Pātimokkha for him, the Pātimokkha should not be recited in his presence.’ This suspension of the Pātimokkha is legally valid.

19.3.5 “How (can it be said that) one who has disavowed the training is sitting in that assembly? This is a case, monks ... (*the same as Kd 19.3.4, reading disavowed the training instead of offence involving defeat*) ... This suspension of the Pātimokkha is legally valid.

2.245 ... This suspension of the Pātimokkha is legally valid.

19.3.6 “How (can it be said that) he does not submit himself to a legally valid complete assembly? This is a case, monks ... (*the same as Kd 19.3.4, reading does not submit himself to a legally valid complete assembly instead of offence involving defeat*) ... This suspension of the Pātimokkha is legally valid.

2.246 ... This suspension of the Pātimokkha is legally valid.

19.3.7 “How (can it be said that) he withdraws his acceptance (of a formal act settled) in a legally valid complete assembly? This is a case, monks, ... (*the same as Kd 19.3.4 reading withdraws his acceptance of a formal act settled in a legally valid complete assembly instead of offence involving defeat*) ... This suspension of the Pātimokkha is legally valid.

19.3.8 “How (can it be said that) he is seen, heard or suspected of falling away from moral habit? This is a case, monks, ... (*the same as Kd 19.3.4 reading seen, heard or suspected of falling away from moral habit instead of offence involving defeat*) ... This suspension of the Pātimokkha is legally valid.

19.3.9 “How (can it be said that) he is seen, heard or suspected of falling away from good habits? This is a case, monks, ... (*see Kd 19.3.8*) ...

2.247 “How (can it be said that) he is seen, heard or suspected of falling away from right views? This is a case, monks, ... (*see Kd 19.3.8*) ... This

suspension of the Pātimokkha is legally valid. These ten suspensions of the Pātimokkha are legally valid.”

The First Portion for Recital

FACTORS FOR UNDERTAKING ON ONE'S OWN BEHALF

Then the venerable Upāli approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Upāli spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, if a monk wishes to undertake an undertaking on his own behalf,¹ endowed with how many qualities is the undertaking that he may undertake on his own behalf?”

“Upāli, if a monk wishes to undertake an undertaking on his own behalf, the undertaking that he may undertake on his own behalf is endowed with five qualities. Upāli, if a monk wishes to undertake an undertaking on his own behalf, he should consider this: ‘That undertaking which I wish to undertake on my own behalf, is it the right time to undertake this undertaking on my own behalf, or not?’ If, Upāli, while that monk is considering, he knows thus: ‘It is a wrong time² to undertake this undertaking on my own behalf, not a right time,’ Upāli, that undertaking on his own behalf should not be undertaken. But if, Upāli, while that monk is considering, he knows thus: ‘It is a right time to undertake this undertaking on my own behalf, not a wrong time,’ Upāli, it should be further considered by that monk: ‘That undertaking which I wish to undertake on my own behalf, is this undertaking on my own behalf about a true thing, or not?’ If, Upāli, while that monk is considering, he knows thus: ‘That under-taking on my own behalf is about an untrue thing, not a true

¹ *attādānaṃ ādātukāmena*. Vin-a 1288 says “here a monk wishing to search (or purify, *sodhetu*) the teaching—whatever legal question he undertakes on his own behalf (or, appropriates to himself, *attanā ādiyati*), that is called *attādāna*.” ² Vin-a 1288 says a wrong time means when there is fear of kings, of thieves, of a scarcity of food, or if it is the rains-season.

thing,' Upāli, that undertaking on his own behalf should not be undertaken. But if, Upāli, while that monk is considering he knows thus: 'That undertaking on my own behalf is about a true thing, not an untrue thing,' Upāli, it should be further considered by that monk: 'That undertaking which I wish to undertake on my own behalf, is that undertaking connected with the goal, or not?' If, Upāli, while that monk is considering, he knows thus: 'This undertaking on my own behalf is unconnected with the goal,¹ not connected with it,' Upāli, that undertaking on his own behalf should not be undertaken. 5.345 But if, Upāli, while that monk is considering, he knows thus: 'This undertaking on my own behalf is connected with the goal, not unconnected with it.' Upāli, it should be further considered by that monk: 'Will I, undertaking this undertaking on my own behalf, attract² monks who are comrades and associates to my side in accordance with *dhamma*, in accordance with discipline, or not?' If, Upāli, while that monk is considering, he knows thus: 'I, undertaking this undertaking on my own behalf, will not attract monks who are comrades and associates to my side in accordance with *dhamma*, in accordance with discipline,' Upāli, that undertaking on his own behalf should not be undertaken. But, if, Upāli, while that monk is considering, he knows thus: 'I, undertaking this undertaking on my own behalf, will attract monks who are comrades and associates to my side in accordance with *dhamma*, in accordance with discipline,' Upāli, it should be further considered by that monk: 'From my having undertaken this undertaking on my own behalf, will there be for the Order from that source strife, quarrel, dispute, contention, schism in the Order, dissension in the Order, altercation in the Order, differences in the Order,³ or not?' If, Upāli, while this monk is considering, he knows thus: 'From my having undertaken this undertaking on my own behalf, there will be for the Order from that source strife ... differences in the Order,' Upāli, that undertaking should not be undertaken on his own behalf. But if, Upāli, while that monk is considering, he

¹ Vin-a 1288: it leads to danger to life, danger to the Brahma-faring. ² *labhissāmi*.

³ List as at [Kd 10.1.6](#), [Kd 10.5.13](#); [Kd 17.5.1](#).

knows thus: ‘From my having undertaken this undertaking on my own behalf, there will not be for the Order from that source strife ... differences in the Order,’ Upāli, that undertaking on his own behalf may be undertaken. Thus, Upāli, if an undertaking on one’s own behalf is undertaken when it is endowed with these five qualities, later it will be no cause for remorse.”

THINGS TO BE REVIEWED BY A REPROVER

“Lord, if a monk is reproving,¹ willing to reprove another, when he has considered how many states within himself may he reprove the other?”

“Upāli, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, when he has considered five states within himself may he reprove the other. Upāli, when a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, he should consider thus: ‘Now, am I quite pure in bodily conduct,² am I possessed of pure bodily conduct, flawless, faultless? Is this state found in me, or not? ‘If, Upāli, this monk is not quite pure in bodily conduct, is not possessed of bodily conduct that is quite pure, flawless, faultless, there will be those who will say to him: ‘Please do you, venerable one, train yourself as to body’—thus will those say to him.

“And again, Upāli, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, he should consider thus: ‘Now, am I quite pure in the conduct of speech, am I possessed of conduct in speech that is quite pure, flawless, faultless? Is this state found in me, or not?’ If, Upāli, that monk is not quite pure in the conduct of speech ... ‘Please do you, venerable one, train yourself as to speech’—thus will those say to him.

“And again, Upāli, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, he should consider thus: ‘Now is a mind of loving-kindness, without malice towards my fellow Brahma-farers, established in me? Is this state found in me, or not?’ If, Upāli, a mind of loving-kindness,

¹ Cf. AN v.79ff., addressed to “monks.” ² Cf. MN ii.113.

without malice towards his fellow Brahma-farers, is not established in the monk, there will be those who will say to him: ‘Please do you, venerable one, establish a mind of loving-kindness towards your fellow Brahma-farers’ — thus those will say to him.

“And again, Upāli, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, he should consider thus: ‘Now, am I one who has heard much, an expert in the heard, a storehouse of the heard? Those things which are lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the ending, and which, with the spirit, with the letter, declare the Brahma-faring utterly fulfilled, wholly purified — are such things much heard by me, learnt by heart, repeated out loud, pondered upon, carefully attended to, well penetrated by vision?’¹ Now, is this state found in me, or not?’ If, Upāli, the monk has not heard much ... if such things have not been ... well penetrated by vision, there will be those who will say to him: ‘Please do you, venerable one, master the tradition’² — there will be those who speak thus to him.

“And again, Upāli, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, he should consider thus: ‘Now,³ are both the Pātimokkhas properly handed down⁴ to me in detail, properly sectioned, properly regulated, properly investigated clause by clause, as to the linguistic form? Is this state found in me, or not?’ If, Upāli, the two Pātimokkhas are not properly handed down to the monk in detail ... as to the linguistic form, and if they say: ‘Now where, your reverence, was this spoken by the Lord?’⁵ and if questioned thus he is not able to explain, there will be those who will say to him: ‘Please do you, venerable one, master discipline’ — there will be those who speak thus to him. Upāli, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, when he has considered these five states within himself, he may reprove the other.

¹ Cf. *Kd 14.14.19*. ² *āgama*; here in opposition to *vinaya*, see next clause. On *āgatāgama*, one to whom the tradition has been handed down, see *BD 3.71, n. 1*.

³ As at *Vin 4.51* (*BD 2.266*, where see notes), and above *Kd 14.14.19*. ⁴ *āgatāni*; cf. *āgatāgama* and *suttāgata* at e.g. *Vin 4.144* (*BD 3.43, n. 5*). ⁵ *Vin-a 1289* explains, “in which town was this rule of training spoken by the Lord?” — thus making “where” refer to locality and not to context.

THINGS TO BE ESTABLISHED BY A REPROVER

“Lord, if a monk is reproving,¹ willing to reprove another, having caused how many states to be set up within himself, may he reprove the other?”

“Upāli, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, having caused five states to be set up within himself, may he reprove the other. If he thinks, ‘I will speak at a right time, not at a wrong time;² I will speak about fact³ not about what is not fact; I will speak with gentleness, not with harshness; I will speak about what is connected with the goal, not about what is unconnected with the goal I will speak with a mind of loving-kindness, not with inner hatred.’ Upāli, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, having made these five states to be set up within himself, he may reprove the other.”

ON CONNECTED WITH THE REPROVER AND THE REPROVED

“Lord, in how many ways may remorse be caused in a monk who reproves according to what is not the rule?”

“Upāli, in five ways⁴ may remorse be caused in a monk who reproves according to what is not the rule. One says: ‘The venerable one reproved at a wrong time, not at a right time—you have need for remorse.⁵ The venerable one reproved about what is not fact, not about what is fact—you have need for remorse. The venerable one reproved with harshness, not with gentleness ... with what is

¹ Cf. AN iii.196, where this passage is put into the mouth of Sāriputta, AN v.81 (addressed to monks). The five recur at DN iii.236. Cf. also MN i.95-. ² Cf. MN I.126, AN iii.243. Vin-a 1289 explains “one monk having obtained leave from another (to reprove him), when he is reproving him speaks at a right time. But reproving him in the midst of an Order or a group, in a hut where tickets and conjeys are distributed, in a quadrangular building, when he is walking for alms, on a road, on a seat or in a hall, when he is among his supporters, or at the moment of the Invitation—this is called at a wrong time.” ³ *bhūtena*, about what has happened. Vin-a 1290 explains by *taccha*, what is true, real, justified. ⁴ Cf. AN iii.197. ⁵ Here presumably the reprover is being spoken to.

unconnected with the goal, not with what is connected with the goal ... with inner hatred, not with a mind of loving-kindness—you have need for remorse.’ Upāli, in these five ways may remorse be caused in a monk who reprovves according to what is not the rule. What is the reason for this? To the end that no other monk might think that one might be reprovved about what is not fact.”

19.5.4 “But, Lord, in how many ways may no remorse be caused in a monk who has been reprovved according to what is not the rule?”

19.5.5 “Upāli, in five ways may no remorse be caused in a monk who has been reprovved according to what is not the rule. One says: ‘The venerable one reprovved at a wrong time, not at a right time—you have no need for remorse.’¹ The venerable one reprovved ... with inner hatred, not with a mind of loving-kindness—you have no need for remorse.’ Upāli, in these five ways may no remorse be caused in a monk who has been reprovved according to what is not the rule.”

19.5.5 “Lord, in how many ways may no remorse be caused in a monk who reprovves according to rule?”

5.349 “In five ways,² Upāli, may no remorse be caused in a monk who reprovves according to rule. One says: ‘The venerable one reprovved at a right time, not at a wrong time—you have no need for remorse. The venerable one reprovved ... not with inner hatred, but with a mind of loving-kindness—you have no need for remorse’. In these five ways, Upāli, may no remorse be caused in a monk who reprovves according to rule. What is the reason? To the end that another monk should think that one should be reprovved about what is fact.”

19.5.6 “But, Lord, in how many ways may remorse be caused in a monk who has been reprovved according to rule?”

“In five ways, Upāli, may remorse be caused in a monk who has been reprovved according to rule. One says: ‘The venerable one reprovved at a right time, not at a wrong time—you have need for remorse. The venerable one reprovved ... not with inner hatred, but with a mind of loving-kindness—you have need for remorse’. Upāli, in these five ways may remorse be caused in a monk who has been

¹ Here the one reprovved is being spoken to. ² Cf. AN iii.198.

reproved according to the rule.”

“Lord, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, having attended to how many states within himself may he reprove the other?”

“Upāli, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, having attended to five states within himself, he may reprove the other: compassion, seeking welfare, sympathy, removal of offences, aiming at discipline. Upāli, if a monk is reproving, willing to reprove another, having attended to these five states within himself, he may reprove the other.”

“But, Lord, in how many mental objects should there be support for a monk who has been reproved?”

“Upāli, there should be support in two mental objects for a monk who has been reproved: in truth and in being imperturbable.”¹

Told is the Ninth Section: that on suspending the Pātimokkha

IN THIS SECTION THERE ARE THIRTY ITEMS. THIS IS ITS KEY

On an Observance so long as a depraved monk does not depart,
Urged off² by Moggallāna, a wonder, in the conqueror’s instruction, /
Deepens and gradual training, fixed (and) do not transgress,
(with) a corpse (and) the Order suspends, streams (and) they lose, /
Streams (and) they attain *nibbāna*, and the one taste is freedom,
many (and) *dhamma* and discipline too,
(great) beings and the eight *ariyan* men:³ /

Having made it like the ocean, he tells of excellence⁴ in the teaching.

Pātimokkha on an Observance day, “no one knows about us,” /

“In case,” they looked down upon.

One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, and nine and ten. /

(One of) moral habit, good habits, right views and mode of livelihood—the
four disciples,

defeat and entailing a Formal Meeting, of expiation,

¹ *akuppa*, being free from anger, immovable. Cf. AN iii.198, which slightly elaborates the thoughts a reproved monk might have. ² *niccuddo*. Should this be *nicchuddho* (from *nicchubhati*) as in Sinhalese reading? Oldenberg suggests *nicchuddo* = *nicchudito*. Siamese edition reads *nicuttho* with variant reading *nicchuddo*.

³ The *ariyan* men are those who follow Gotama’s teachings, his disciples. The “eight” are the classes of those who attain stream-winning, once-returning, no return and arahantship and the fruits of these four ways. ⁴ *guṇaṃ*. Sinhalese reads *guṇā*.

that ought to be confessed, /
 Wrong-doing among the fivefold divisions as they are,
 and falling away from moral habit and good habits,
 and with what has not been done and has been done¹
 in the six divisions as they are, /
 And about defeat and entailing a Formal Meeting,
 a grave offence and one of expiation
 and likewise one that ought to be confessed
 and one of wrong-doing and one of wrong speech, /
 Falling away from moral habit and good habits
 and falling away from right views and mode of livelihood,
 and those eight dones and not dones with one as to moral habit,
 good habits, right views, /
 Also not dones and dones and likewise the done and not done
 are likewise spoken of as ninefold by the system² in accordance with fact, /
 Defeated, still going forward and likewise one who has disavowed,
 he submits, he withdraws acceptance, talk on withdrawing acceptance and
 whoever /
 falls away from moral habit and good habits,
 and likewise as to falling away from right views,
 seen, heard, suspected, the tenfold, this he should know. /
 A monk sees a monk, and another tells what he has seen,³
 a pure one tells him of it himself:⁴ he suspends the Pātimokkha. /
 If it removes itself on account of a danger—kings, thieves, fire, water and
 human beings and non-human beings
 and beasts of prey and creeping things,
 to life, to the Brahma (faring)—/
 Because of a certain one of the ten, or as to one among the others,
 and he should know just what is legally valid,
 what is not legally valid as it accords with the way. /
 The right time (and) according to fact (and) connected with the goal,
 “I will attract,” “There will be,”
 Conduct of body and speech, loving-kindness, great learning,⁵ both. /
 He should reprove at the right time, about fact, with gentleness,

¹ Sinhalese and Siamese read, more correctly, *akatāya katāya ca* for Oldenberg’s text’s *akatā katāya ca*. ² *ñāyato*, Sinhalese edition reading *jānatā*. ³ Text: *vipass’ añño cārocati*; Sinhalese edition: *añño cārocayā taṃ*; Siamese edition: *añño cārocayāti taṃ*. ⁴ Text: *taṃ suddheva tassa akkhāti*. Oldenberg suggests at Vin 2.326 *taṃ sv’ eva tassa akkhāti*. Sinhalese and Siamese editions read *suddho va tassa akkhāti*. ⁵ *bāhusaccam*. Oldenberg suggests at Vin 2.326 *bāhusuccam*. But *bāhusacca* = *bahussuta* at e.g. Kd 19.5.1. The word also occurs at MN i.45; AN i.38 (*bahu-* should here read *bāhu-*), AN ii.218; Vin 3.10; Kp p.3. It is explained at MN-a iii.156 = Khu-a 134 as *bahussutabhāva*, the condition of having heard much.

about the goal,¹ with loving-kindness.²

As a speech should dispel remorse caused by what is not the rule /

It dispels the remorse of one who reproves

or who is reprovved according to rule.

Compassion, seeking welfare, sympathy, removal, aiming at—/

The conduct for one reproving is explained³ by the Self-awakened One.

And the proper course for the reprovved one

is in the truth as well as in being imperturbable.

Vin 2.2

¹ Sinhalese edition reads *attamettana* for Oldenberg's and Siamese edition's *atthamettana*. ² Sinhalese edition reads *attamettana* for Oldenberg's and Siamese edition's *atthamettana*. ³ *pakāsītā* in Sinhalese and Siamese editions, and as suggested by Oldenberg, Vin 2.326, instead of text's *pakāsitaṃ*.

20. NUNS (*BHIKKHUNĪ*)

FIRST RECITATION SECTION

THE STORY OF MAHĀPAJĀPATĪ GOTAMĪ

At one time the Awakened One, the Lord, was staying among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery.¹ Then the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, it were well that women should obtain the going forth from home into homelessness in this *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”

“Be careful, Gotami, of the going forth of women from home into homelessness in this *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.” And a second time ... And a third time did the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great speak thus to the Lord: “Lord, it were well ...”

“Be careful, Gotami, of the going forth of women from home into homelessness in this *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”

Then the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, thinking: “The Lord does not allow women to go forth from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder,” afflicted, grieved, with a tearful face and crying, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping her right side towards him.

¹ Down to end of *Kd 20.1* occurs also at AN iv.274–AN iv.279.

Then the Lord having stayed at Kapilavatthu for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Vesālī. Gradually, walking on tour, he arrived at Vesālī. The Lord stayed there in Vesālī in the Great Grove in the Gabled Hall. Then the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, having had her hair cut off, having donned saffron robes, set out for Vesālī with several Sakyan women, and in due course approached Vesālī, the Great Grove, the Gabled Hall. Then the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, her feet swollen, her limbs covered with dust, with tearful face, and crying, stood outside the porch of the gateway. The venerable Ānanda saw the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, standing outside the porch of the gateway, her feet swollen, her limbs covered with dust, with tearful face and crying; seeing her, he spoke thus to the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great:

“Why are you, Gotami, standing ... and crying?”

“It is because, honoured Ānanda, the Lord does not allow the going forth of women from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”

“Well now, Gotami, stay¹ here a moment,² until I have asked the Lord for the going forth of women from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”

Then the venerable Ānanda approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, this Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, is standing outside the porch of the gateway, her feet swollen, her limbs covered with dust, with tearful face and crying, and saying that the Lord does not allow the going forth of women from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder. It were well, Lord, if women might obtain the going forth from home ... by the Truth-finder.”

“Be careful, Ānanda, of the going forth of women from home ... by the Truth-finder.” And a second time ... And a third time the

¹ *hohi*. ² Not in Aṅguttara version.

venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the Lord: “It were well, Lord, if women might obtain the going forth ... proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”¹

“Be careful, Ānanda, of the going forth of women from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.” Then the venerable Ānanda, thinking: “The Lord does not allow the going forth of women from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder. Suppose now that I, by some other method, should ask the Lord for the going forth of women from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.” Then the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the Lord:

“Now, Lord, are women, having gone forth from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder, able to realise the fruit of stream-attainment or the fruit of once-returning or the fruit of non-returning or perfection?”

“Women, Ānanda, having gone forth ... are able to realise ... perfection.”

“If, Lord, women, having gone forth ... are able to realise ... perfection—and, Lord, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, was of great service: she was the Lord’s aunt, foster-mother, nurse, giver of milk, for when the Lord’s mother passed away she suckled him²—it were well, Lord, that women should obtain the going forth from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”

EIGHT IMPORTANT RULES

20.1.4

“If, Ānanda, the Gotamid, Pajāpati the Great, accepts eight important rules,¹ that may be ordination² for her:

1. “A nun who has been ordained (even) for a century must greet respectfully, rise up from her seat, salute with joined palms, do proper homage to a monk ordained but that day. And this rule is to be honoured, respected, revered, venerated, never to be transgressed during her life.
2. “A nun must not spend the rains in a residence where there is no monk. This rule too is to be honoured ... during her life.
3. “Every half month a nun should desire two things from the Order of monks: the asking (as to the date) of the Observance day, and the coming for the exhortation. This rule too is to be honoured ... during her life.
4. “After the rains a nun must ‘invite’ before both Orders in respect of three matters: what was seen, what was heard, what was suspected. This rule too is to be honoured ... during her life.
5. “A nun, offending against an important rule, must undergo *mānatta* (discipline) for half a month before both Orders. This rule too must be honoured ... during her life.
6. “When, as a probationer, she has trained in the six rules for two years, she should seek ordination from both Orders. This rule too is to be honoured ... during her life.
7. “A monk must not be abused or reviled in any way by a nun. This rule too is to be honoured ... during her life.

BD 53

¹ See Vin 2.289 where Ānanda was charged at the Council of Rājagaha with having persuaded Gotama to admit women to the Order, thus causing its decay. ² See MN iii.253. ¹ *garudhammā*. See BD 2.266, n.11. Besides at AN iv.276, these rules are given at Vin 4.51 (see BD 2.268–BD 2.269 for notes). ² AN-a iv.134 says “that may be her going forth as well as (her) ordination.” She would not therefore have to pass two years as a probationer, and this practice will no doubt have been introduced later, after an Order of nuns had been in being for some time.

8. “From today admonition of monks by nuns is forbidden, admonition of nuns by monks is not forbidden. This rule too is to be honoured, respected, revered, venerated, never to be transgressed during her life.

“If, Ānanda, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, accepts these eight important rules, that may be ordination for her.”

Then the venerable Ānanda, having learnt the eight important rules from the Lord, approached the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great; having approached, he spoke thus to the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great:

“If you, Gotami, will accept eight important rules, that will be the ordination for you: a nun who has been ordained (even) for a century ... From today admonition of monks by nuns is forbidden ... never to be transgressed during your life. If you, Gotami, will accept these eight important rules, that will be the ordination for you.”

“Even,¹ honoured Ānanda, as a woman or a man when young, of tender years, and fond of ornaments, having washed (himself and his) head, having obtained a garland of lotus flowers or a garland of jasmine flowers or a garland of some sweet-scented creeper, having taken it with both hands, should place it on top of his head—even so do I, honoured Ānanda, accept these eight important rules never to be transgressed during my life.”

Then the venerable Ānanda approached the Lord: having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the eight important rules were accepted by the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great.”

“If, Ānanda, women had not obtained the going forth from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder, the Brahma-faring, Ānanda, would have lasted long, true *dhamma* would have endured for a thousand years. But since, Ānanda, women have gone forth ... in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder, now, Ānanda, the Brahma-faring

¹ Besides at AN iv.278 this simile occurs at MN i.32, and the first part at Vin 3.68 (see BD 1.117, n. for notes).

will not last long, true *dhamma* will endure only for five hundred years.

“Even, Ānanda, as those households which have many women and few men easily fall a prey to robbers, to pot-thieves,¹ even so, Ānanda in whatever *dhamma* and discipline women obtain the going forth from home into homelessness, that Brahma-faring will not last long.

“Even, Ānanda, as when the disease known as mildew² attacks a whole field of rice that field of rice does not last long, even so, Ānanda, in whatever *dhamma* and discipline women obtain the going forth ... that Brahma-faring will not last long.

“Even, Ānanda, as when the disease known as red rust³ attacks a whole field of sugar-cane, that field of sugar-cane does not last long, even so, Ānanda, in whatever *dhamma* and discipline ... that Brahma-faring will not last long.

“Even, Ānanda, as a man,⁴ looking forward, may build a dyke to a great reservoir so that the water may not overflow, even so, Ānanda, were the eight important rules for nuns laid down by me, looking forward, not to be transgressed during their life.”

Told are the Eight Important Rules for Nuns

ALLOWANCE FOR THE ORDINATION OF NUNS

Then the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great spoke thus to the Lord:

“Now, what line of conduct, Lord, should I follow in regard to these Sakyan women?” Then the Lord, gladdened, rejoiced, roused,

¹ *kumbhatthenaka*. Vin-a 1291 says “having lit a light in a pot, by its light they search others’ houses for booty.” AN-a iv.136 is the same, and SN-a ii.223 very similar. The simile occurs also at SN-a ii.264. ² *setaṭṭhika*, “white-as-bones.” See BD 1.11, n. 4. GS iv.185, n. 2 gives explanation of AN-a iv.136 (= Vin-a 1291) on above: some insect bores the stem, so that the head of the paddy is unable to get the sap. ³ *mañjeṭṭhika*. Vin-a 1291 explains that the ends of the sugar canes become red; also AN-a iv.136.

⁴ Cf. like similes at MN iii.96, AN iii.28.

delighted the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, with talk on *dhamma*. Then the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, gladdened ... delighted by the Lord with talk on *dhamma*, having greeted the Lord, departed keeping her right side towards him. Then the Lord on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“I allow, monks, nuns to be ordained by monks.”¹

Then these nuns spoke thus to the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great: “The lady is not-ordained, neither are we ordained, for it was thus laid down by the Lord: nuns should be ordained by monks.”

Then the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached, having greeted the venerable Ānanda, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda: “Honoured Ānanda, these nuns spoke to me thus: ‘The lady is not ordained, neither are we ordained, for it was thus laid down by the Lord: nuns should be ordained by monks’.”

Then the venerable Ānanda approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great spoke thus: ‘Honoured Ānanda, these nuns spoke to me thus ... nuns should be ordained by monks’.”

“At the time, Ānanda, when the eight important rules were accepted by the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, that was her ordination.”

Then the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached, having greeted the venerable Ānanda, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda: “I, honoured Ānanda, am asking one boon from the Lord: It were well, Lord, if the Lord would allow greeting, standing up for salutation and the proper duties between monks and nuns according to seniority.”

¹ Cf. the sixth important rule above. Also see **BD 3, Introduction, p. xlviff.**

Then the venerable Ānanda approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great spoke thus: ‘I, honoured Ānanda, am asking one boon ... according to seniority’.”

“This is impossible, Ānanda, it cannot come to pass, that the Truth-finder should allow greeting, standing up for, salutation and the proper duties between monks and nuns according to seniority. Ānanda, these followers of other sects, although liable to poor guardianship, will not carry out greeting, standing up for, salutation and proper duties towards women, so how should the Truth-finder allow greeting ... and proper duties towards women?” Then the Lord, on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

“Monks, one should not carry out greeting, rising up for salutation and proper duties towards women.¹ Whoever should carry out (one of these), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Then the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, those rules of training for nuns which are in common with those for monks,² what line of conduct should we, Lord, follow in regard to these rules of training?”

“Those rules of training for nuns, Gotami, which are in common with those for monks, as the monks train themselves, so should you train yourselves in these rules of training.”

“Those rules of training for nuns, Lord, which are not in common with those for monks, what line of conduct should we, Lord, follow in regard to these rules of training?”

¹ At Kd 16.6.5 women are among those not to be greeted. ² See BD 3 Introduction, p. xxxiif., BD 3 Introduction, p. xxxviiif.

“Those rules of training for nuns, Gotami, which are not in common with those for monks, train yourselves in the rules of training according as they are laid down.”

20.5.1 Then the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great spoke thus to the Lord:¹ “Lord, it were well if the Lord would teach me *dhamma* in brief so that I, having heard the Lord’s *dhamma*, might live alone, aloof, zealous, ardent, self-resolute.”

2.259 “Whatever are the states,² of which you, Gotami, may know: these states lead to passion, not to passionlessness, they lead to bondage, not to the absence of bondage, they lead to the piling up (of rebirth), not to the absence of piling up, they lead to wanting much, not to wanting little, they lead to discontent, not to contentment, they lead to sociability, not to solitude, they lead to indolence, not to the putting forth of energy, they lead to difficulty in supporting oneself, not to ease in supporting oneself—you should know definitely, Gotami: this is not *dhamma*, this is not discipline, this is not the Teacher’s instruction. But whatever are the states of which you, Gotami, may know: these states lead to passionlessness, not to passion ... (*the opposite of the preceding*) ... they lead to ease in supporting oneself, not to difficulty in supporting oneself—you should know definitely, Gotami: this is *dhamma*, this is discipline, this is the Teacher’s instruction.”³

20.6.1 Now at that time the Pātimokkha was not recited to nuns. They told this matter to the Lord.⁴ He said: “I allow you, monks, to recite the Pātimokkha to the nuns.” Then it occurred to the nuns: “Now,

¹ As at AN iv.280. ² So AN-a iv.137 (on AN iv.280). ³ Vin-a 1292 and AN-a iv.137 say that on account of this exhortation, Pajāpatī attained arahantship. ⁴ Usually the nuns approach the Lord only through the mediation of the monks. Here it would appear as if the monks had themselves observed that the nuns were not hearing the Pātimokkha and reported the matter to the Lord on their own initiative.

by whom should the Pātimokkha be recited to nuns?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow monks, the Pātimokkha to be recited to nuns by monks."

BD 530

Now at that time monks, having approached a nunnery, recited the Pātimokkha to nuns.¹ People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "These are their wives, these are their mistresses; now they will take their pleasure together." Monks heard these people who ... spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Monks, the Pātimokkha should not be recited to nuns by monks. Whoever should recite it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow, monks, the Pātimokkha to be recited to nuns by nuns."

The nuns did not know how to recite the Pātimokkha. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to explain to the nuns through monks, saying: 'The Pātimokkha should be recited thus'."

Now at that time nuns did not confess² offences. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **"Monks, an offence should not be not confessed by a nun. Whoever should not confess it, there is an offence of wrong-doing."** The nuns did not know how to confess offences. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks, to explain to the nuns through monks, saying: 'An offence should be confessed thus'."

Kd 20.6

Then it occurred to monks: "Now, by whom should nuns' offences be acknowledged?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow you, monks to acknowledge nuns' offences through monks."

Vin 2.2

Now at that time nuns, having (each) seen a monk on a carriage-road and in a cul-de-sac and at cross-roads,³ having (each) laid down

¹ Cf. Bu-Pc 23 where the modest monks complain that monks go to the nuns' quarters to exhort them. ² *paṭikaronti*. ³ Cf. Nuns' Bi-Pc 14. These three words are defined at Vin 4.271 (BD 3.268); see also Vin 4.176 in definition of "among the houses."

her bowl on the ground, having arranged her upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on her haunches, having saluted with joined palms, confessed an offence. People ... spread it about, saying: “These are their wives, these are their mistresses; having treated them contemptuously during the night now they are asking for forgiveness.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nuns’ offences should not be acknowledged by monks. Whoever should acknowledge (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, nuns’ offences to be acknowledged by nuns.” The nuns did not know how to acknowledge offences. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to explain to the nuns through monks, saying: ‘An offence should be acknowledged thus’.”

Now at that time (formal) acts¹ were not carried out for nuns. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a (formal) act to be carried out for nuns.” Then it occurred to monks: ‘Now, by whom should (formal) acts for nuns be carried out?’ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, (formal) acts for nuns to be carried out by monks.”

Now at that time nuns on whose behalf (formal) acts had been carried out,² having (each) seen a monk on a carriage-road and in a cul-de-sac and at cross-roads, having (each) laid down her bowl on the ground, having arranged her upper robe over one shoulder, having sat down on her haunches, having saluted with joined palms, asked forgiveness³ thinking, “Surely it should be done thus.” As before⁴ people ... spread it about, saying: “These are their wives, these are their mistresses; having treated them contemptuously during the night now they are asking for forgiveness.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, a (formal) act on behalf of nuns should**

¹ Vin-a 1292 says “acts of censure and so on, and also the sevenfold formal acts.” The former number five, as at [Vin 1.49](#). The legal questions amount to seven, as at [Vin 4.207](#), and probably these are meant. ² *katakammā*. ³ Vin-a 1292 says, “saying, ‘we will not act in such a way again’.” ⁴ Above in [Kd 20.6.2](#)

not be carried out by monks. Whoever should (so) carry one out, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow, monks, nuns to carry out (formal) acts on behalf of the nuns.” Nuns did not know how (formal) acts should be carried out. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to explain to the nuns through monks, saying: ‘A (formal) act should be carried out thus’.”

Now at that time nuns, in the midst of an Order,¹ striving, quarrelling, falling into disputes wounding one another with the weapons of the tongue,² were not able to settle that legal question. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to settle nuns’ legal questions by monks.”

Now at that time monks were settling a legal question for nuns, but as that legal question was being investigated there were to be seen both nuns who were entitled to take part in a (formal) act³ and those who had committed an offence.⁴ The nuns spoke thus: “It were well, honoured sirs, if the ladies themselves⁵ could carry out (formal) acts for nuns, if the ladies themselves could acknowledge an offence of nuns, but it was thus laid down by the Lord: ‘Nuns’ legal questions should be settled by monks’.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ Cf. [Vin 1.341](#), MN iii.152. ² *mukhasattihi vitudantā*, not “got to blows” as at *Vinaya Texts* iii.333, but “inflicting wounds with the mouth.” ³ *kammappattāya* as at [Kd 9.3.5](#), but perhaps here, as nuns were not yet entitled to take part in formal acts, meaning “had fallen into the need for having a formal act carried out on their account”. There are two variant readings, see [Vin 2.327](#). ⁴ *āpattigāminiyo*. ⁵ *ayyā va*. The nuns are not asking the monks to do these things, as made out at *Vinaya Texts* iii.333, but are hoping to get the Lord’s decree altered.

“I allow you, monks, having cancelled¹ the carrying out by monks of nuns’ (formal) acts, to give it into the charge of nuns to carry out nuns’ (formal) acts by nuns; having cancelled (the acknowledgement) by monks of nuns’ offences, to give it into the charge of nuns to acknowledge nuns’ offences by nuns.”

20.8.1
5.363
Now at that time the nun who was the pupil of the nun Upalavaṇṇā had followed after the Lord for seven years mastering discipline, but because she was of confused mindfulness, what she had learnt she forgot. That nun heard it said that the Lord wished to come to Sāvaththī. Then it occurred to that nun: “For seven years I have followed the Lord mastering discipline, but because I am of confused mindfulness, what I have learnt is forgotten. Hard it is for a woman to follow after a teacher for as long as her life lasts. What line of conduct should be followed by me?” Then that nun told this matter to the nuns. The nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, discipline to be taught to nuns by monks.”

The First Portion for Repeating

SECOND RECITATION SECTION

20.9.1
Then the Lord, having stayed in Vesālī for as long as he found suiting, set out on tour for Sāvaththī. Gradually, walking on tour, he arrived at Sāvaththī. The Lord stayed there at Sāvaththī in the Jeta

¹ *ropetvā*. *Ropeti* can mean to direct towards, also to cancel, and to pass off. *Pali-English Dictionary* favours the latter. *Vinaya Texts* iii.334 has “set on foot.” Commentary reads *āropetvā* (with variant reading *ropetvā*), which means: to bring about, to get ready; to tell, to show, etc. Vin-a 1292 says “saying, ‘this formal act among those of censure and so on, against whom is it to be carried out?’ having explained (*aropetva*) it thus, he says ‘Now you carry it out yourselves’—it should be given into the charge of. But if a certain one was explained and they carry out another, (monks) saying: ‘They are carrying out a formal act of guidance (*niyasakamma for nissayak-*), against one deserving a formal act of censure,’ here, according to what is said, they show what should be carried out.”

Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks sprinkled nuns with muddy water, thinking: "Perhaps they may be attracted¹ to us." They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **"Monks, nuns should not be sprinkled with muddy water by monks. Whoever should (so) sprinkle them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to inflict a penalty² on that monk." Then it occurred to monks: "Now, how is the penalty to be inflicted?" They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"Monks, that monk is to be made one who is not to be greeted by the Order of nuns."

Now at that time the group of six monks, having uncovered their bodies ... thighs ... private parts, showed them to nuns; they offended³ nuns, they associated with⁴ nuns, thinking: "Perhaps they may be attracted to us." They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **"Monks, a monk, having uncovered his body ... thighs ... private parts should not show them to nuns, he should not offend nuns, he should not associate together with nuns. Whoever should (so) associate, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to inflict a penalty on that monk." Then it occurred to monks: ... (as in above paragraph) ... "Monks, that monk is to be made one who is not to be greeted by the Order of nuns."

BD 5.3

Now at that time the group of six nuns sprinkled monks with muddy water ... (repeat **Kd 20.9.1** down to "I allow you, monks, to inflict a penalty on that nun.") Then it occurred to the monks: "Now how should the penalty be inflicted?" They told this matter to the

Kd 20.9

¹ *sārajjeyyūm*. Cf. *sārajjati* at **Kd 15.3.1**. ² *daṇḍakamma*, as at **Vin 1.75**, **Vin 1.76**, **Vin 1.84**. ³ *obhāsanti*, explained at Vin-a 1292 as *asaddhammena obhāsenti*. See also **Vin 3.128**, and Buddhaghosa's remarks, given at **BD 1.216, n. 2**. ⁴ *sampayojenti*. Vin-a 1292 says men "associated with" nuns according to what is not true *dhamma* (or in a wrong way, *asaddhammena*). Cf. **Kd 11.5** (at the end).

Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make a prohibition.”¹ When the prohibition was made they did not comply with it. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to suspend exhortation (for her²).”

Now at that time the group of six nuns, having uncovered their bodies ... their breasts ... their thighs ... their private parts, showed them to monks ... “I allow you, monks, to make a prohibition.” When the prohibition was made they did not comply with it. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to suspend exhortation (for her).”

Then it occurred to monks: “Now, is it allowable to carry out Observance together with a nun whose exhortation has been suspended, or is it not allowable?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, Observance should not be carried out together with a nun whose exhortation has been suspended so long as that legal question is not settled.”

Now at that time the venerable Upāli, having suspended exhortation, set out on tour. Nuns looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can the master Upāli, having suspended exhortation, set out on tour?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, having suspended exhortation, one should not set out on tour. Whoever should (thus) set out, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

¹ *āvāraṇa*. Vin-a 1292 says this is hindering them from entering a dwelling-place. Cf. the word at Vin 1.84, where it is the *daṇḍakamma*, the penalty imposed on novices and preventing them from entering a monastery. ² Vin-a 1293 says “here it means that not having gone to a nunnery (the exhortation) may be suspended, but the nuns who have come for exhortation should be told, ‘This nun is impure, she has an offence; I am suspending exhortation for her, do not carry out Observance with her’.”

Now at that time ignorant, inexperienced (monks) suspended exhortation. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, exhortation should not be suspended by an ignorant, inexperienced (monk). Whoever (such) should suspend it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time monks suspended exhortation without ground, without reason. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, exhortation should not be suspended without ground, without reason. Whoever should (so) suspend it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time, monks, having suspended exhortation, did not give a decision.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, having suspended exhortation, you should not not give a decision. Whoever should not give (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time nuns did not go for exhortation. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, nuns should not not go for exhortation. Whoever should not go, should be dealt with according to the rule.”**²

Now at that time the entire Order of nuns went for exhortation. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “These are their wives, these are their mistresses, now they will take their pleasure together.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, the entire Order of nuns should not go for exhortation. If it should go thus, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow, monks, four or five nuns to go for exhortation.”**

¹ I.e. on the matter for which exhortation was suspended. ² Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 58**.

Now at that time four or five nuns went for exhortation. As before, people ... spread it about, saying: "These are their wives ... now they will take their pleasure together." They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, four or five nuns should not go (together) for exhortation. If they should go thus, there is an offence of wrongdoing.** I allow, monks, two or three nuns to go (together) for exhortation: having approached one monk, having (each one) arranged her upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured his feet, having sat down on her haunches, having saluted with joined palms, they should speak to him thus: 'Master, the Order of nuns honours the feet of the Order of monks, and asks about (the right time for) coming for exhortation; may the Order of nuns, master, hear what is (the right time for) coming for exhortation.' It should be said by the one who recites the Pātimokkha: 'Is there any monk agreed upon as exhorter of the nuns?' If there is some monk agreed upon as exhorter of the nuns, it should be said by the one who recites the Pātimokkha: 'The monk So-and-so is agreed upon as exhorter of the nuns; let the Order of nuns approach him.' If there is not some monk agreed upon as exhorter of the nuns, the one who recites the Pātimokkha should say: 'Which venerable one is able to exhort the nuns?' If some one is able to exhort the nuns and if he is endowed with the eight qualities,¹ having gathered together, they should be told: 'The monk So-and-so is agreed upon as the exhorter of the nuns; let the Order of nuns approach him.' If no one is able to exhort the nuns, the one who recites the Pātimokkha should say: 'There is no monk agreed upon as exhorter of the nuns. Let the Order of nuns strive on with friendliness'."²

Now at that time monks did not undertake the exhortation. They

¹ See Vin 4.51 (BD 2.265ff.). ² *pāsādikena sampādetu*; Vinaya Texts iii.339 has "may the Bhikkhuni-saṅgha obtain its desire in peace," thus deriving "in peace," *pāsādikena*, from *pasādeti*. But their desire was to hear the exhortation. As this was impossible, they were advised to do the best they could without it. Cf. *appamādena sampādettha*. Here the notion is probably that the nuns, even without the exhortation, should labour on, strive themselves, peacefully and in friendliness with one another.

told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, the exhortation should not not be undertaken. Whoever should not undertake it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time a certain monk was ignorant; nuns, having approached him, spoke thus: “Master, undertake the exhortation.” He said: “But I, sisters, am ignorant. How can I undertake the exhortation?” “Master, undertake the exhortation, for it was thus laid down by the Lord: ‘The exhortation of nuns should be undertaken by monks’.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, excepting an ignorant one, to undertake the exhortation through the others.”

Now at that time a certain monk was ill; nuns, having approached him, spoke thus: “Master, undertake the exhortation.” He said: “But I, sisters, am ill. How can I undertake the exhortation?” “Master, undertake the exhortation, for it was thus laid down by the Lord: ‘Except for an ignorant one, the exhortation should be undertaken through the others’.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, excepting an ignorant one, excepting an ill one, to undertake the exhortation through the others.”

Now at that time a certain monk was setting out on a journey; nuns, having approached him, spoke thus: “Master, undertake the exhortation.” He said: “But I, sisters, am setting out on a journey. How can I undertake the exhortation?” “Master, undertake the exhortation, for it was laid down by the Lord: ‘Except for an ignorant one, except for an ill one, the exhortation should be undertaken through the others’.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, excepting an ignorant one, excepting an ill one, excepting one setting out on a journey, to undertake the exhortation through others.”

Now at that time a certain monk was staying in a forest; nuns, having approached him, spoke thus: “Master, undertake the exhortation.” He said: “But I, sisters, am staying in the forest. How can I undertake the exhortation?” They said: “Master, undertake the exhortation, for it was thus laid down by the Lord: ‘Except for an ignorant one, except for an ill one, except for one setting out on a journey, the exhortation should be undertaken through the others’.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, I allow you to undertake the exhortation through a monk who is a forest-dweller and (for him) to make a rendezvous,¹ saying, ‘I will perform² it here’.”

Now at that time monks, having undertaken the exhortation, did not announce it.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, the exhortation should not not be announced. Who-ever should not announce it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

5.368
Now at that time monks, having undertaken the exhortation did not come.⁴ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, one should not not come for the exhortation. Whoever should not come for it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

2.266
Now at that time nuns did not go to the rendezvous. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nuns should not not go to the rendezvous. Whoever should not go, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

0.10.1
Now at that time nuns wore long waistbands out of which they

¹ *saṅketa*. See **BD 1.88**, **BD 1.135** where “the making of a rendezvous,” *saṅketakamma* is defined. ² *paṭiharissāmi*. ³ These remaining clauses refer, I think, only to monks who are forest-dwellers. ⁴ *na paccāharati*. Table of contents: *na paccāgacchanti*.

arranged flounces.¹ People ... spread it about, saying: “Like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nuns should not wear long waistbands. Whoever should wear one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, a nun (to have) a waistband going once round (the waist). **And a flounce should not be arranged out of this. Whoever should arrange one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time the nuns arranged flounces out of strips of bamboo ... of strips of leather ... of strips of woven cloth² ... out of plaited woven cloth ... of fringed woven cloth ... of strips of cloth³ ... of plaited cloth ... of fringed cloth ... of plaited thread ... of fringed thread. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, flounces of strips of bamboo should not be arranged by nuns, nor flounces of strips of leather ... nor should flounces of fringed thread be arranged. Whoever should arrange (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time nuns had their loins rubbed with a cow’s leg bone,⁴ they had their loins massaged with a cow’s jaw-bone,⁵ they had their forearms⁶ massaged, they had the backs of their hands

¹ *teh’eva pāsuke namenti. P(h)āsukā* is a rib; *nameti*, to wield, to bend; Vin-a 1293 says “like householders’ daughters, they fasten them so as to arrange a flounce out of the solid cloth (*thanapaṭakena*, variant reading *ghanapaṭakena*) of the waistband.” On wrong waistbands worn by monks see **Kd 15.29.2.** ² *dussapaṭṭena*. Vin-a 1293 explains *dussa* by *setavaththa*, white cloth. ³ *coḷa*. Vin-a 1293 says that this is the *coḷa* (cotton cloth) of the *kāsāva*, the saffron robes. He thus apparently seeks to discriminate between *dussa*, as the material out of which householders’ cloths are made, and *coḷa*, as that out of which monks’ robes are made. ⁴ *aṭṭhilla*. *Pali-English Dictionary* says this is more likely to be Sanskrit *aṣṭhīla*, a round pebble or stone. Vin-a 1293 calls it *gojaṅghaṭṭika*, which would seem to fit in with the *gohanuka* of the next item. ⁵ *gohanuka*. ⁶ On *hattha* see **BD 2, Introduction, p.li**. Vin-a 1293 says, “having had their arms massaged, at the tip, *aggabāham kottāpetvā*, they make designs with peacocks’ feathers and so on.” This would not necessarily mean “tattoo marks” as at *Vinaya Texts* iii.341, n. 7.

massaged, they had their calves¹ massaged ... the tops of their feet ... their thighs ... their faces massaged, they had their gums massaged. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nuns should not have their loins rubbed with a cow’s leg-bone, they should not have their loins massaged with a cow’s jaw-bone, they should not have their forearms massaged ... they should not have their gums massaged. Whoever should (so) have herself massaged, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

0.10.3
2.267
Now at that time the group of six nuns² smeared their faces, rubbed their faces (with ointment³), painted their faces with chunam, marked their faces with red arsenic, painted their bodies, painted their faces, painted their bodies and faces. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nuns should not smear their faces ... should not paint their bodies and faces. Whoever should do (any of these things), there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

0.10.4
5.370
Now at that time the group of six nuns made (ointment marks) at the corners of their eyes,⁴ they made distinguishing marks (on their foreheads),⁵ they looked out from a window,⁶ they stood in the light,⁷ they had dancing performed,⁸ they supported courtesans,⁹

¹ *pāda*. Vin-a 1293 says *jaṅgha*. ² Cf. Kd 15.2.5, of the group of six monks.
³ Cf. Nuns’ Bi-Pc 90, Bi-Pc 91. ⁴ *avaṅgaṃ karonti*, so explained at Vin-a 1293.
⁵ *visesakam karonti*. Vin-a 1293 explains *gaṇḍappadesa vicitrasaṅṭhānam visesakam karonti*. ⁶ *olokanakena oloketi*. Vin-a 1293 says they looked out at the road (*vīthi*), having opened the window, *vātapāna* (on which see BD 2.259, n. 1). ⁷ Vin-a 1293 says, having opened the door, they stand showing half the body. ⁸ *sanaccam kārapenti*. Nuns should not go to see dancing, Nuns’ Bi-Pc 10. Vin-a 1293 says they had a dancing festival held, *naṭasamajjam kārenti*. ⁹ *vesim vuttḥāpentī*. *Vesī* may be a courtesan or a low-class woman. Vin-a 1293 explains by *gaṇikā*, a prostitute. *Vuttḥāpeti* can also mean to cause to raise, to remove; and it is the regular word used, especially in the Nuns’ *Pācittiyas*, for nuns ordaining nuns. Vin-a does not comment on it here.

they set up a tavern,¹ they set up a slaughter-house,² they offered (things) for sale in a shop,³ they engaged in usury,⁴ they engaged in trade, they kept slaves,⁵ they kept slave women, they kept servants, they kept servant women, they kept animals, they dealt in greens and leaves,⁶ they carried a piece of felt⁷ (for a razor). People ... spread it about, saying: “Like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, nuns should not make (ointment marks) at the corners of their eyes ... nor should they carry a piece of felt (for a razor). Whoever should carry (one), there is an offence of wrongdoing.”

Now at that time the group of six nuns wore robes that were all dark green,⁸ they wore robes that were all yellow, they wore robes that were all red, they wore robes that were all crimson, they wore robes that were all black, they wore robes that were dyed all brownish-yellow, they wore robes that were dyed all reddish-yellow, they wore robes with borders that were not cut up, they wore robes with long borders, they wore robes with borders of flowers, they wore robes with borders of snakes’ hoods,⁹ they wore jackets, they wore (garments made of) the Tirīṭṭa tree. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “Like women householders who

¹ Vin-a 1293 says that they sold strong drink. Cf. AN iii.208, where five trades not to be carried on by lay followers are enumerated. ² Vin-a 1293 says that they sold meat. ³ Vin-a 1293 says that they offered for sale (*pasārenti*, as at Vin 2.291) various and divers goods in a shop. ⁴ *vaḍḍhi*, profit, interest (on money, especially on loans); cf. DN-a 212; and Ja v.436. It was a *Nissaggiya* for monks (and nuns) to have money, Bu-NP 18. ⁵ *dāsaṃ upaṭṭhāpenti*. Vin-a 1293 says, “having chosen (or taken, *gahetvā*) a slave, they had a service done to themselves by him. And it is the same with women slaves and the rest.” ⁶ *haritakapaṇṇikāṃ pakiṇanti*. Vin-a 1293 reading *haritakapattiyāṃ*, with variant reading *haritakapattikāṃ*, says that they deal in greens, *haritaka*, as well as in ripe things, *pakka* (variant reading *pakkika*) and that they offered various things for sale in a shop. ⁷ *namataka*. See Kd 15.11.1, Kd 15.27.3. ⁸ As at Kd 8.29 for the group of six monks, except that for monks *veṭhana*, turbans, is added at the end. For notes see BD 4.438. ⁹ *phaṇa*. Siamese edition reads *phala*, fruits.

enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, robes that are all dark green should not be worn by nuns ... (garments made of) the Tirīṭa tree should not be worn. Whoever should wear (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

Now at that time a certain nun as she was passing away, spoke thus: “After I am gone, let my requisites be for the Order.” Monks and nuns who were there disputed, saying: “They are for us,” “They are for us.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, if a nun as she is passing away, should speak thus, ‘After I am gone, let my requisites be for the Order,’ in that case the Order of monks is not the owner, but they are for the Order of nuns. Monks, if a probationer ... if a woman novice, passing away ... the Order of monks is not the owner, but they are for the Order of nuns. Monks, if a monk as he is passing away, should speak thus ... the Order of nuns is not the owner, but they are for the Order of monks. Monks, if a novice ... if a lay-follower ... if a woman lay-follower ... if anyone else as he is passing away should speak thus, ‘After I am gone, let my requisites be for the Order,’ in that case the Order of nuns is not the owner, but they are for the Order of monks.”¹

Now at that time a certain woman who had formerly been a Mallian had gone forth among the nuns. She, having seen a feeble monk on a carriage road, having given him a blow with the edge of her shoulder, toppled him over. Monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can a nun give a monk a blow?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, a blow should not be given to a monk by a nun. Whoever should give (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**² I allow, monks, that a nun, having seen a monk, should make

¹ Vin-a 1294 explains that the five kinds of co-religionists (monks, nuns, probationers, male and female novices) cannot make a bequest as they like, for their things are the Order's and so their gifts at the time of death take no effect. Householders' bequests, on the other hand, do take effect. ² Cf. Bu-Pc 74 where it is an offence of expiation for a monk to give another a blow.

way for him having stepped aside while (still) at a distance.”

Now at that time a certain woman whose husband had gone away from home became with child by a lover.¹ She, having caused abortion, spoke thus to a nun dependent for alms on (her) family: “Come, lady, take away this foetus in a bowl.” Then that nun, having placed that foetus in a bowl, having covered it with her outer cloak, went away. Now at that time an undertaking had been made by a certain monk who walked for almsfood: “I will not partake of the first almsfood I receive without having given (of it) to a monk or a nun.” Then that monk, having seen that nun, spoke thus: “Come, sister, accept almsfood.”

“No, master,” she said. And a second time ... And a third time ... “No, master,” she said.

“I made an undertaking, sister, that I will not partake of the first almsfood that I receive without having given (of it) to a monk or a nun. Come, sister, accept almsfood.” Then that nun, being pressed by that monk, having pulled out her bowl, showed him, saying: “You see, master, a foetus in the bowl, but do not tell anyone.” Then that monk looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can this nun take away a foetus in a bowl?” Then this monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can this nun take away a foetus in a bowl?” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, a foetus should not be taken away in a bowl by a nun. Whoever should take one away, there is an offence of wrong doing. I allow, monks, when a nun has seen a monk, having pulled out her bowl, to show it to him.”

Now at that time the group of six nuns, having seen a monk, having turned (their bowls) upside down,² showed the bases of the bowls. Monks ... spread it about, saying: “How can the group of six nuns, having seen a monk, having turned (their bowls) upside down, show

¹ Cf. Vin 3.83. ² parivattetvā.

the bases of the bowls?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, nuns having seen a monk, should not show (him) the base of a bowl, having turned it upside down. I allow, monks, a nun who has seen a monk to show (him) her bowl, having set it upright, and whatever food there is in the bowl should be offered to the monk.”

0.14.1 Now at that time a membrum virile came to be thrown away on a carriage road in Sāvattihī,¹ and nuns were looking at it.² People made an uproar and those nuns were ashamed. Then these nuns, having returned to the nunnery, told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns ... spread it about, saying: “How can these nuns look at a membrum virile?” Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nuns should not look at a membrum virile. Whoever should look at one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

0.15.1
2.270 Now at that time people gave food to monks, the monks gave it to nuns. People ... spread it about, saying: “How can these revered sirs give to others what was given them for their own enjoyment? It is as though we do not know how to make a gift.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not give to others what was given you for your own enjoyment. Whoever should (so) give, there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time food for the monks was (too) abundant. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to give it to an Order.” There was an even greater abundance. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, also to give away what belongs to an individual.”³

Now at that time the food for monks that was stored⁴ was (too)

¹ Cf. Mil 124. ² *sakkaccaṃ upanijjhāyati*, as at Vin 1.193. ³ I.e. probably food specially given to different monks. Cf. *puggalika* at Kd 6.39, Kd 20.24. ⁴ *sannidhikataṃ āmisarī*. Cf. Bu-Pc 38, and see BD 2.339 for notes.

abundant. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to make use of a store of food for monks, the monks having offered it to nuns.”¹

(*The same repeated but reading nun for monk and vice versa*).

Now at that time lodgings for monks were (too) abundant; the nuns had none.² The nuns sent a messenger to the monks, saying: “It were good, honoured sirs, if the masters would give us lodgings temporarily.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to give lodgings to nuns temporarily.”

Now at that time menstruating nuns sat down and lay down on stuffed couches and stuffed chairs;³ the lodgings were soiled with blood. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nuns should not sit down or lie down on stuffed couches and stuffed chairs. Whoever should (so) sit lie down, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, a household robe.”⁴ The household robe was soiled with blood. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a pin and a little cloth.”⁵ The little cloth fell down.⁶ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow them, monks, having tied it with a thread, to tie it round the thighs.” The thread broke. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow them, monks, a loin-cloth, a hip-string.”⁷

¹ *bhikkhunihi bhikkhūhi paṭiggahāpetvā*. Vin-a 1294 says, having accepted yesterday, the food that was set aside having been offered today by monks may be made use of by nuns. ² Or perhaps, not enough, *na hoti*. ³ Cf. **Kd 16.2.7**. ⁴ *āvasathacivara*. See Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 47**. ⁵ *āṇicolaka*. *Vinaya Texts* iii.348, n. 1 says “*āṇi* must here be ‘that part of the leg immediately above the knee, the front of the thigh,’ cf. Böhlingk-Roth, s.v. No. 2.” I think, however, two things must be meant, *āṇi* and *colaka*, or the next sentence would have repeated both, instead of only *colaka*. The point is that a “pin” was too insecure, and so “thread” was tried. *Āṇi* is a usual word for peg or pin. ⁶ *nipphaṭati*. Cf. the word at **Vin 2.151** where it appears to mean to fall out or to fall in. Here it may imply to fall away from the pin. ⁷ *saṁvelliyaṁ kaṭisuttakaṁ*. *Saṁvelliya* forbidden to monks at **Kd 15.29.5**; *kaṭisuttaka* at **Kd 15.2.1**.

5.375 Now at that time the group of six nuns wore a hip-string the whole time. People ... spread it about, saying: "Like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses." They told this matter to the Lord He said: "**Monks, nuns are not to wear a hip-string the whole time. Whoever should (so) wear one, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, monks, a hip-string when they are menstruating."

The Second Portion for Repeating

THIRD RECITATION SECTION

0.17.1 Now at that time ordained women were to be seen without sexual characteristics and who were defective in sex and bloodless and with stagnant blood and who were always dressed and dripping and deformed and female eunuchs and man-like women and those whose sexuality was indistinct and those who were hermaphrodites.¹ They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

"I allow you, monks, to question a woman who is being ordained about twenty-four things that are stumbling-blocks. And thus, monks, should she be questioned: 'You are not without sexual characteristics? ... You are not a hermaphrodite? Have you diseases like this:² leprosy, boils, eczema, consumption, epilepsy? Are you a human being? Are you a woman? Are you a free woman? Are you without debts? You are not in royal service? Are you allowed by your mother and father, by your husband?³ Have you completed twenty years of age?⁴ Are you complete as to bowl and robe? What is your name? What is the name of your woman proposer?'"⁵

0.17.2 Now at that time monks asked nuns about the things which are

¹ Same list occurs at **Vin 3.129** in definition of "he abuses". Cf. the examination of male candidates for ordination at **Kd 1.76**. ² Cf. **Kd 1.76-Kd 1.77** as far as to end of 17 below. ³ See Nuns' **Bi-Pc 80**. ⁴ See Nuns' **Bi-Pc 71-Bi-Pc 73**. ⁵ *pavattinī*. See Nuns' **Bi-Pc 69**, and **BD 3.377** where *pavattinī* is defined as *upajjhā*, woman preceptor.

stumbling-blocks. Those wishing for ordination were at a loss, they were abashed, they were unable to answer. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, ordination in the Order of monks after she has been ordained on the one side, and has cleared herself (in regard to the stumbling-blocks) in the Order of nuns.”

Now¹ at that time nuns asked those wishing for ordination, but who were not instructed, about the things which are stumbling-blocks. Those wishing for ordination were at a loss, they were abashed, they were unable to answer. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow them, monks, having instructed first, afterwards to ask about the things which are stumbling-blocks.”

They instructed just there in the midst of the Order. As before, those wishing for ordination were at a loss, they were abashed, they were unable to answer. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow them, monks, having instructed aside, to ask about the things which are stumbling-blocks in the midst of the Order. And thus, monks, should she be instructed: First, she should be invited to choose a woman preceptor;² having invited her to choose a woman preceptor, a bowl and robes should be pointed out to her (with the words): ‘This is a bowl for you, this is an outer cloak, this is an upper robe, this is an inner robe, this is a vest,³ this is a bathing-cloth;⁴ go and stand in such and such a place’.”

Ignorant, inexperienced (nuns) instructed them. Those wishing for ordination, but who were not instructed, were at a loss, they were abashed, they were unable to answer. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“Monks, they should not be instructed by ignorant, inexperienced (nuns). Whoever (such) should instruct them, there is an

¹ Cf. Vin 1.93f. for the questions put to monks on their ordination. ² *upajjhā*.

³ *samkacchikā*, cf. Vin 4.345. This and the bathing cloak make up the “five robes” for nuns, mentioned, e.g. at Vin 4.282 (Nuns’ Bi-Pc 24, Bi-Pc 25). ⁴ *udakasāṭikā*. One of the boons which Visākhā asked for at Vin 1.293 was that of bestowing bathing cloths on the Order of nuns; allowed at Vin 1.294. Their proper measurements are laid down at Vin 4.279.

offence of wrong-doing. I allow them, monks, to instruct by means of an experienced, competent (nun).”

Those who were not agreed upon instructed. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“**Monks, they should not be instructed by one who is not agreed upon. Whoever (such) should instruct them, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow them, monks, to instruct by means of one who is agreed upon. And thus, monks, should she be agreed upon: oneself may be agreed upon by oneself, or another may be agreed upon by another. And how is oneself to be agreed upon by oneself? The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: ‘Ladies, let the Order listen to me. So-and-so wishes for ordination through the lady So-and-so. If it seems right to the Order, I could instruct So-and-so.’ Thus may oneself be agreed upon by oneself. And how is another to be agreed upon by another? The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: ‘Ladies, let the Order listen to me. So-and-so wishes for ordination through the lady So-and-so. If it seems right to the Order, So-and-so could instruct So-and-so.’ Thus may another be agreed upon by another.

“The nun who is agreed upon, having approached the one who wishes for ordination, should speak thus to her: ‘Listen, So-and-so. This is for you a time for truth (-speaking), a time for fact (-speaking). When I am asking you in the midst of the Order about what is, you should say: “It is,” if it is so; you should say: “It is not,” if it is not so. Do not be at a loss, do not be abashed. I will ask you thus: “You are not without sexual characteristics? ... What is the name of your woman proposer?”’

“They arrived together. They should not arrive together. The instructor having arrived first, the Order should be informed (by her): ‘Ladies, let the Order listen to me. So-and-so wishes for ordination through the lady So-and-so. She has been instructed by me. If it seems right to the Order, let So-and-so come.’ She should be told: ‘Come.’ Having made her arrange her upper robe over one shoulder,

having made her honour the nuns' feet, having made her sit down on her haunches, having made her salute with joined palms, she should be made to ask for ordination, saying: 'Ladies, I am asking the Order for ordination. Ladies, may the Order raise me up out of compassion. And a second time, ladies ... And a third time, ladies, I am asking the Order for ordination. Ladies, may the Order raise me up out of compassion.'

"The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: 'Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This one, So-and-so, wishes for ordination through the lady So-and-so. If it seems right to the Order, I could ask So-and-so about the things that are stumbling-blocks. Listen, So-and-so, this is for you a time for truth (-speaking), a time for fact (-speaking). I am asking you about what is. You should say, "It is," if it is so; you should say, "It is not," if it is not so. You are not without sexual characteristics? ... What is the name of your woman proposer?'

"The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: 'Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This one, So-and-so, wishes for ordination through the lady So-and-so. She is quite pure in regard to the things which are stumbling-blocks, she is complete as to bowl and robes. So-and-so is asking the Order for ordination through the woman proposer, the lady So-and-so. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may ordain So-and-so through the woman proposer, the lady So-and-so. This is the motion. Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This one, So-and-so, is asking the Order for ordination through the woman proposer, the lady So-and-so. The Order is ordaining So-and-so through the woman proposer, the lady So-and-so. If the ordination of So-and-so through the woman proposer, the lady So-and-so, is pleasing to the ladies, they should be silent: she to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter. Ladies, let the Order listen to me. This one, So-and-so, ... should speak. So-and-so is ordained by the Order through the woman proposer, the lady So-and-so. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand

Kd 20.1

BD 5,3

Kd 20.1

0.17.8
this.’”

2.274
5.379
“Taking her at once, having approached the Order of monks, having made her arrange her upper robe over one shoulder, having made her honour the monks’ feet, having made her sit down on her haunches, having made her salute with joined palms, she should be made to ask for ordination, saying: ‘I, the lady So-and-so, wish for ordination through the lady So-and-so, I am ordained on the one side in the Order of nuns. I am pure (in regard to the stumbling-blocks). Ladies, I am asking the Order for ordination. Ladies, may the Order raise me up out of compassion. I, the lady So-and-so ... am pure (in regard to the stumbling-blocks). And a second time ... I, the lady So-and-so ... am pure (in regard to the stumbling-blocks.) And a third time, ladies, I am asking the Order for ordination Ladies, may the Order raise me up out of compassion.’ The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: ‘Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This one, So-and-so, wishes for ordination through So-and-so. She is ordained on the one side in the Order of nuns, she is pure (in regard to the stumbling-blocks). So-and-so is asking the Order for ordination through the woman proposer So-and-so. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may ordain So-and-so through the woman proposer So-and-so. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This one, So-and-so, wishes for ordination ... through the woman proposer So-and-so. The Order is ordaining So-and-so through the woman proposer So-and-so. If the ordination of So-and-so through the woman proposer So-and-so is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter: Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me ... should speak. So-and-so is ordained by the Order through the woman proposer So-and-so. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this’.”

The shadow should be measured at once, the length of the season should be explained, the portion of the day should be explained, the formula should be explained, the nuns should be told: “Explain

the three resources¹ to her and the eight things which are not to be done.”²

Now at that time nuns being uncertain as to seats in a refectory let the time go by.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, eight nuns (to be seated) according to seniority, the rest as they come in.” Now at that time nuns, thinking: ‘It is allowed by the Lord that eight nuns (may be seated) according to seniority, the rest as they come in,’ everywhere reserved⁴ (seats) just for eight nuns according to seniority, for the rest as they come in. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, (seats) in a refectory for eight nuns according to seniority, for the rest as they come in. **Nowhere else should (a seat) be reserved according to seniority. Whoever should reserve (one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time nuns did not invite.⁵ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nuns should not not invite. Whoever should not invite should be dealt with according to the rule.**”⁶ Now at that time nuns, having invited among themselves, did not invite in an Order of monks. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nuns, having invited among themselves, should not not invite in an Order of monks. Whoever should not invite should be dealt with according to the rule.**”⁷

Now at that time nuns, inviting (only) on the one side (of the Order) together with monks, made an uproar. They told this matter

¹ Four resources for monks, see **Kd 1.77**. But the third, forest-dwelling, is forbidden to nuns at **Kd 20.23**. ² At **Kd 1.78** there are four *akaraniyaṇi* for monks which correspond to their four *Pārājikas*. The nuns, however, have eight *Pārājikas* (see **BD 3, Introduction, p. xxxff.**) and there is no doubt that reference is here being made to these. ³ Vin-a 1294 says “making one get up, making another sit down, they let the right time for eating go by.” The right time for this is before midday, see **Vin 4.86. Vin 4.166** (the wrong time). ⁴ *paṭibāhati*, as at **Kd 16.6.4, Kd 16.7**. ⁵ See Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 57**, and **BD 3.354** for further references. ⁶ Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 57**. ⁷ Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 57**.

to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, nuns should not invite (only) on the one side together with monks. Whoever should (so) invite, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time nuns, inviting before the meal, let the (right) time¹ go by. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow them, monks, to invite after a meal.” Inviting after a meal, they came to be at a wrong time.² They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow them, monks, having invited (among themselves) one day, to invite the Order of monks the following day.”

Now at that time the entire Order of nuns, while inviting, created a disturbance. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow them, monks, to agree upon one experienced, competent nun to invite the Order of monks on behalf of the Order of nuns. And thus, monks, should she be agreed upon: First, a nun should be asked; having asked her, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: ‘Ladies, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may agree upon the nun So-and-so to invite the Order of monks on behalf of the Order of nuns. This is the motion. Ladies, let the Order listen to me. The Order is agreeing upon the nun So-and-so to invite the Order of monks on behalf of the Order of nuns. If the agreement upon the nun So-and-so to invite the Order of monks on behalf of the Order of nuns is pleasing to the ladies, they should be silent; she to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The nun So-and-so is agreed upon by the Order to invite the Order of monks on behalf of the Order of nuns. It is pleasing to the Order. Therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

“That nun who has been agreed upon, taking the Order of nuns (with her), having approached the Order of monks, having arranged her upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the monks’ feet, having sat down on her haunches, having saluted with joined palms,

¹ See above, **BD 5,379, n. 3.** ² I.e. for inviting in the Order of monks, as the context shows.

should speak thus to it: ‘The Order of nuns, masters, is inviting the Order of monks in respect of what has been seen, heard, or suspected. Masters, let the Order of monks speak to the Order of nuns out of compassion and they, seeing (the offence), will make amends. And a second time, masters ... And a third time, masters, the Order of nuns is inviting the Order of monks ... will make amends’.¹

Now at that time nuns suspended the Observance for monks, they suspended the Invitation, they issued commands, they set up authority,² they asked for leave, they reprovved, they made to remember.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, a monk’s Observance is not to be suspended by a nun: even if it is suspended, it is not (really) suspended, and for her who suspends it there is an offence of wrong-doing. The Invitation should not be suspended: even if it is suspended it is not (really) suspended, and for her who suspends it there is an offence of wrong-doing. Commands should not be issued: even if issued they are not (really) issued, and for her who issues them there is an offence of wrong-doing. Authority should not be set up: even if set up it is not (really) set up, and for her who sets it up there is an offence of wrong-doing. Leave should not be asked for: even if asked for it is not (really) asked for, and for her who asks there is an offence of wrong-doing. She should not reprove: the one reprovved is not (really) reprovved and for her who reprovves there is an offence of wrong-doing. She should not make to remember: the one made to remember is not (really) made to remember, and for her who makes to remember there is an offence of wrong-doing.**”

Now at that time monks suspended the Observance for nuns ... (as above) ... they made to remember. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, I allow you to suspend through a monk a nun’s Observance: and if it is suspended it is properly suspended,

¹ Cf. Kd 4.1.14 ² It would be preferable to read *anuvādam paṭṭhapenti* instead of *anuvādam ṭhapenti*; cf. Kd 11.5. ³ Cf. Kd 11.5.

and there is no offence for the one who suspends it ... to make to remember: and if she is made to remember she is properly made to remember, and there is no offence for the one who makes her remember.”

0.21.1 Now at that time the group of six nuns went in a vehicle,¹ both in one that had a bull in the middle yoked with cows, and in one that had a cow in the middle yoked with bulls. People ... spread it about, saying: “As at the festival of the Ganges and the Mahī.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, a nun should not go in a vehicle. Whoever should go in one should be dealt with according to the rule.**”²

Now at that time a certain nun came to be ill; she was not able to go on foot. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a vehicle for (a nun) who is ill.” Then it occurred to nuns: “Now, (should the vehicle be) yoked with cows or yoked with bulls?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a handcart yoked with a cow, yoked with a bull.”

2.277
5:383 Now at that time a certain nun became exceedingly uncomfortable owing to the jolting of a vehicle. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a palanquin, a sedan-chair.”³

0.22.1 Now at that time the courtesan Aḍḍhakāsī⁴ had gone forth among the nuns. She was anxious to go to Sāvattthī, thinking, ‘I will be ordained in the Lord’s presence.’ Men of abandoned life heard it said that the courtesan Aḍḍhakāsī was anxious to go to Sāvattthī and they beset the way. But the courtesan Aḍḍhakāsī heard it said that the men of abandoned life were besetting the way and she sent a messenger

¹ Cf. Kd 5.9.4–Kd 5.10.3, and also Nuns’ Bi-Pc 85. ² Nuns’ Bi-Pc 85. ³ *pāṭaṅkim*. Vin-a 1295 says *paṭapoṭalikam*, variant reading *patapoṭṭalikam*, cf. Vin-a 1085. ⁴ Her verses at Thig.25, Thig.26. Cf. *aḍḍhakāsika* at Kd 8.2.

to the Lord saying: “Even¹ I am anxious for ordination. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?” Then the Lord on this occasion, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: “I allow you, monks, to ordain even through a messenger.”²

They ordained through a messenger who was a monk. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, you should not ordain through a messenger who is a monk. Whoever should (so) ordain there is an offence of wrong-doing.**” They ordained through a messenger who was a probationer ... a novice ... a woman novice ... through a messenger who was an ignorant, inexperienced (woman). “**Monks, you should not ordain through a messenger who is an ignorant, inexperienced (woman). Whoever should (so) ordain there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow you, monks, to ordain through a messenger who is an experienced, competent nun.

“That nun who is the messenger, having approached the Order, having arranged her upper robe over one shoulder, having honoured the monks’ feet, having sat down on her haunches, having saluted with joined palms, should speak to it thus: ‘The lady So-and-so wishes for ordination through the lady So-and-so. She is ordained on the one side, in the Order of nuns, and is pure;³ she is not coming only on account of some danger. The lady So-and-so is asking the Order for ordination; may the Order out of compassion⁴ raise up that lady. The lady So-and-so ... is not coming on account of some danger. And a second time the lady So-and-so is asking the Order ... raise up that lady. The lady So-and-so wishes for ordination through the lady So-and-so. She is ordained on the one side in the Order of nuns, and is pure; she is not coming only on account of some danger. And a third time the lady So-and-so is asking the Order for ordination; may the Order out of compassion raise up that lady.’

The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent

¹ Oldenberg has *hi*, Thig-a 31 pi. ² It was probably usual for a nun to be ordained through an Order of not less than ten persons, as it was for monks, Kd 1.31.2; Kd 9.4.1. Vin-a 1295 says “ordination through a messenger existed on account of any one of the ten dangers.” Here, danger from human beings. ³ As to the stumbling-blocks. Cf. use of *visuddhā* at Kd 20.17.2. ⁴ Cf. Kd 1.76.8.

monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. So-and-so wishes for ordination through So-and-so. She is ordained on the one side in the Order of nuns and is pure; she is not coming only on account of some danger. So-and-so is asking the Order for ordination through the woman proposer So-and-so. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may ordain So-and-so through the woman proposer So-and-so. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. So-and-so wishes for ordination through So-and-so ... So-and-so is asking the Order for ordination through the woman proposer So-and-so. The Order is ordaining So-and-so through the woman proposer So-and-so. If the ordination of So-and-so through the woman proposer So-and-so is pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. And a second time I speak forth this matter ... And a third time I speak forth this matter: Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me ... he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.' The shadow should be measured at once,¹ the length of the season should be explained, the portion of the day should be explained, the formula should be explained, the nuns should be told: 'Explain the three resources to her and the eight things which are not to be done'."

Now at that time nuns were staying in a forest; men of abandoned life seduced them. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "**Monks, nuns should not stay in a forest. Whoever should stay (in one) there is an offence of wrong-doing.**"²

Now at that time a storeroom³ came to be given to an Order of nuns by a lay-follower. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow, monks, a storeroom." The storeroom was not enough.⁴ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: "I allow, monks, a dwelling."⁵

¹ As at Kd 20.17.8. ² Cf. Kd 20.17.8, n.. ³ *uddosita*. See BD 3.177, n. 2; also BD 2.16, n. 2. Vin-a 1295 here again explains by *bhaṇḍasālā*, a hall for goods. ⁴ *na sammati*, as at Kd 15.13.3. Vin-a 1295 explains by *nappahoti*, did not suffice. ⁵ *upassaya*; here Vin-a 1295 says *ghara*, a house.

The dwelling was not enough. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, building operations.”¹ The building operations were not enough. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to build even what belongs to an individual.”²

Now at that time a certain woman had gone forth among the nuns when she was already pregnant, and after she had gone forth she was delivered of a child.³ Then it occurred to that nun: “Now what line of conduct should be followed by me in regard to this boy?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow her, monks, to look after him until he attains to years of discretion.”⁴ Then it occurred to that nun: ‘It is not possible for me to live alone,⁵ nor is it possible for another nun to live with a boy. Now, what line of conduct should be followed by me?’ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow them, monks, having agreed upon one nun, to give her to that nun as a companion.⁶ And thus, monks, should she be agreed upon: First, that nun should be asked; having asked her, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent nun, saying: ‘Ladies, let the Order listen to me. If it is pleasing to the Order, the Order may agree upon the nun So-and-so as companion to the nun So-and-so. This is the motion. Ladies, let the Order listen to me. The Order is agreeing upon the nun So-and-so as companion to the nun So-and-so. If the agreement upon the nun So-and-so as companion to the nun So-and-so is pleasing to the ladies, they should be silent; she to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The nun So-and-so is agreed upon by the Order as companion to the nun So-and-so. It is pleasing to the Order; therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.’”

Then it occurred to that nun who was the companion: ‘Now what

¹ *navakamma*, here probably more than “repairs.” Vin-a 1295 says “I allow you to carry out building operations for nuns for the sake of the Order.” ² *puggalikaṃ kāturaṃ*, or, even for individuals. Buddhaghosa has no note. Cf. the word at **Kd 20.15.1**.

³ At Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 61** it is an offence to ordain a pregnant woman, but it is not an offence for the one who ordains her if she thinks that she is not pregnant. ⁴ Vin-a 1295 says until he is able to eat and wash himself properly. ⁵ Cf. Nuns’ **Bi-Ss 3**, Nuns’ **Bi-Pc 14**. ⁶ Cf. **BD 3.190**, **BD 3.267**, **BD 3.323**, **BD 3.357**, **BD 3.360**.

line of conduct should be followed by me in regard to this boy?’ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow them, monks, to behave in regard to that boy exactly as they would behave to another man, except for sleeping under the same roof.”¹

0.25.3
Now at that time a certain nun who had fallen into an offence against an important rule, was undergoing *mānatta*.² Then it occurred to that nun: “It is neither possible for me to live alone, nor is it possible for another nun to live with me. Now, what line of conduct should be followed by me?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow them, monks having agreed upon one nun, to give her to that nun as a companion. And thus, monks, should she be agreed upon: ... (as in **Kd 20.26.1**) ‘... Thus do I understand this..’”

0.26.1
Now at that time a certain nun, having disavowed the training,³ left the Order;⁴ having come back again she asked the nuns for ordination. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, there is no disavowal of the training by a nun, but in so far as she is one who leaves the Order,⁵ she is in consequence not a nun.”

0.26.2
5:38
Now at that time a certain nun, wearing the saffron robes, went over to the fold of a sect;⁶ having come back again she asked the nuns for ordination. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, whatever nun, wearing the saffron robes, goes over to the fold of a sect, on coming back should not be ordained.”⁷

¹ Vin-a 1295 says excepting only a sleeping place in the same house, *sahāgāraseyya-mattarū*. But, it adds, the mother is able to lie down and having put the child on her breast to wash it, make it drink, feed it and adorn it. ² Cf. the 5th and 8th important rules at **Kd 20.1.4**. Also on *mānatta* see **Kd 12.6.1**. ³ On this state of dissatisfaction see **Vin 3.24–Vin 3.28**. ⁴ *vibbhami*. This, and disavowing the training, occur at e.g. **Kd 2.22.3**. ⁵ *vibbhantā*. Vin-a 1295 says if, leaving the Order at her own pleasure and approval, having clothed herself in white clothes, she is thus not a nun, but this is not through disavowing the training. ⁶ *tittihāyatanarū samkama*, as at **Vin 1.69**, where there is a similar rule for monks. ⁷ Vin-a 1295 says not only should she not be ordained, but she cannot even obtain the “going forth.”

Now at that time nuns being scrupulous, did not consent to greeting by men, to their cutting (their) hair, to their cutting (their) nails, to their dressing a sore. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow them, monks, to consent to (these actions).”¹

Now at that time nuns were sitting down cross-legged,² consenting to the touch of heels.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, nuns should not sit down cross-legged. Whoever should (so) sit down, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time a certain nun was ill. There was no comfort for her if she was not cross-legged. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, the half cross-legged (posture)⁴ for nuns.”

Now at that time nuns relieved themselves in a privy; the group of six nuns caused abortion there. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, nuns should not relieve themselves in a privy. Whoever should do so there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow them, monks, to relieve themselves where it is open underneath, covered on top.”⁵

¹ See Nuns’ **Bi-Pj 8** It would seem as if these things were permissible if neither party were filled with desire. ² *pallaṅkena nisīdanti*. Vin-a 1296 says *pallaṅkaṅ ābhujjitva nisīdanti*. So probably *pallaṅka* does not mean “divan” here as it does at **Vin 4.299**, see **BD 3.271, n. 3**. ³ *pañhisamphassa*. Not at all clear whose heels were touching, but probably the nuns’ next on either side. *Pallaṅkena* may have double meaning of sitting down cross-legged and sitting down “divan-wise,” i.e. sitting down cross-legged and in a row. It was probably disturbing to meditation if heels touched, hence the prohibition. ⁴ *aḍḍhapallaṅka*. Vin-a 1296 says the *pallaṅka* is made having drawn in one foot (only and leaving the other straight out). Of course, if *pallaṅka* is taken as divan, *aḍḍhapallaṅka* must be half a divan—*Vinaya Texts* iii.367, n. 2 says “probably a cushion.” ⁵ The idea is that there should be no privacy. Cf. **Kd 18.9**, **Kd 18.10**.

Now at that time nuns bathed with chunam. People looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “Like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, nuns should not bathe with chunam. Whoever should (so) bathe, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow them, monks, the red powder of rice husks and clay.”¹

Now at that time nuns bathed with scented clay. People ... spread it about, saying: “Like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, nuns should not bathe with scented clay.² Whoever should (so) bathe, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow, them, monks, ordinary clay.”

Now at that time nuns, bathing in a bathroom, created a disturbance. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, nuns should not bathe in a bathroom. Whoever should bathe (in one), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time nuns bathed against the stream consenting to the touch of the current.³ They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, nuns should not bathe against the stream. Whoever should (so) bathe, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

Now at that time nuns bathed not at a ford; men of abandoned life seduced them. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: **“Monks, nuns should not bathe not at a ford. Whoever should (so) bathe, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”**

¹ *kukkusaṃ mattikaṃ*. Vin-a 1296 explains by saying, *kuṇḍakaṅ c’eva mattikaṅ ca*, the red powder of rice husks as well as clay. Both these were allowed to monks for building operations. Kd 16.3.1. ² Cf. Nuns’ Bi-Pc 88, Bi-Pc 89. ³ *dhārāsamphassa*.

Now at that time nuns bathed at a ford for men. People ... spread it about, saying, “Like women householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses.” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “**Monks, nuns should not bathe at a ford for men. Whoever should (so) bathe, there is an offence of wrong-doing.** I allow them monks, to bathe at a ford for women.”¹

The Third Portion for Repeating

Told is the Tenth Section: that on Nuns

IN THIS SECTION ARE A HUNDRED AND SIX ITEMS. THIS IS ITS KEY

The Gotamid asked for the going forth, the Truthfinder did not allow it, from Kapilavatthu the Leader went to Vesālī. /

Covered with dust² she made it known to Ānanda in the porch.

Saying: “Is she able?” he asked about the method; saying,

“(She was your) mother” and “(your) nurse.” /

A century and that day, no monk, desiring,

Invitation, important rules, two years, not abusing, /

Complying with these eight rules for exhortation³ during her life.

Acceptance of the important rules—that is the ordination for her. /

A thousand years to only five (hundred) by the similes of the pot-thieves, mildew, red-rust:⁴ thus an injury to what is true *dhamma*. /

May, looking forward,⁵ build a dyke; again it is the stability of what is true *dhamma*.

To be ordained, the lady, greeting according to seniority, /

Will not carry out like this, in common and not in common,

about exhortation, and about the Pātimokkha, “now, by whom?”, to a nun-
nery, /

If they do not know he explains, and they do not confess,⁶ through a monk,
to acknowledge through a monk, acknowledgement through a nun, /

He explained, (formal) act, by a monk, they looked down on, or by a nun,
to explain, and to quarrel, having cancelled, and about Uppala-(vaṇṇā), /

¹ *mahilātitthe*. On nuns bathing see also [Vin 1.293](#), [Vin 4.259](#). [Vin 4.278](#). ² Siamese edition reads *rajokiṇṇā*, as suggested at [Vin 2.328](#); Sinhalese edition *rajokiṇṇena*.

³ Oldenberg’s text and Sinhalese read *ovāden’ aṭṭha te dhammā*; Siamese edition *ovaṭo ca aṭṭha dhammā* (with variant reading as text). ⁴ Sinhalese and Siamese editions read *mañjēṭṭhikā* (Sinhalese reading *-ka*) for Oldenberg’s *mañcaṭṭhika-*.

⁵ Oldenberg: *pā eva*, probably for *paṭigacc’ eva* of [Kd 20.1.6](#). But Sinhalese edition reads *ālim bandheyy’ upamāhi*, and Siamese *pālim bandheyy’ upamāhi*, with variant readings as in Oldenberg. ⁶ Here *karonti*, for *paṭikaronti*.

In Sāvattḥī, muddy water, did not greet, bodies and thighs
and private parts and the group offended and associated with, /
Not to be greeted is the penalty, for nuns likewise again,
and the prohibition, exhortation, is it allowable? he went away, /
Ignorant, without ground, decision, exhortation, an Order of five,
two or three, they did not undertake, ignorant ones, ill, setting out on a
journey, /

Forest-dwellers, they did not announce, and they did not come back,
long, bamboo and leather, and woven cloth, plaited, and fringed,
And plaited cloth, and fringed, and plaited thread, (and) fringed, /
Cow's leg-bone, cow's jaw-bone, backs of the hands, likewise the feet,¹
thighs (and) faces, gums, smearing, rubbing (and) with chunam, /
They marked,² and painting the body, painting the face, likewise the two,
ointment marks (and) distinguishing marks, from a window, in the light,
and about dancing, /

2.282 Courtesan, tavern, slaughter-house, a shop, usury, trade,
they kept slaves, women slaves, servants, servant women, /
Animals, and greens, they carried pieces of felt,
robes that were dark green, yellow, red, crimson, that were black, /
Brownish-yellow, reddish-yellow, not cut up, and long,
and if they should wear (robes) with (borders) of flowers, snakes' hoods,³
jackets,
as well as (garments made of the) Tirīṭa tree. /

5.391 If a nun, after she has gone, on a probationer, on a woman novice
bestows her requisites, it is the (Order of) nuns that is the owner. /
If a woman lay-follower on a monk, on a novice, on a lay-follower,
and on others is bestowing her requisites, the (Order of) monks is the
owner. /

About a Mallian (woman), foetus, base of the bowl, membrum and concern-
ing food,
and abundant, even greater, food that was stored, /
As for monks below, do likewise for nuns,
lodgings, menstruating, was soiled, and cloth and pin,⁴ /
They broke, and all the time, there were to be seen:
beginning with women without sexual characteristics,
those defective in sex, bloodless, just the same for those with stagnant

¹ Sinhalese, *pādam*; Oldenberg: *pari*; Siamese *padam* as suggested at Vin 2.328.

² Oldenberg: *lañchenti*; Sinhalese: *lañchanti*; Siamese: *lañcenti*. ³ *pala* here, instead of *phaṇa* of Kd 20.10.5. Sinhalese and Siamese read *phala*. ⁴ Oldenberg: *paṭāni ca*. Vin 2.329 suggests *patati ca*, "and it fell down," evidently to replace *nip-phaṭati* of Kd 20.16.2. But I prefer to take it as a substitute for *ānicolaka* (on which see note, BD 5.374 above). For *paṭa* is also a word for "cloth"; thus the compound *paṭāni* supports my view that *āni* and *colaka* are words for two separate items.

blood, /

Always dressed, dripping, deformed, women eunuchs,
man-like women, and those of indistinct sexuality, and those who were
hermaphrodites, /

Beginning with those defective in sexual characteristics and going as far as
hermaphrodites.

This is from the abbreviation below: leprosy, boils, eczema and /

Consumption, epilepsy, are you a human woman? and a free woman?
without debts (and) not in the royal service and allowed (and) twenty, /
Complete, and what name and that of your woman proposer?:

having asked about twenty-four stumbling-blocks, there is ordination. /
They were at a loss, instructed, and likewise in the midst of the Order,
a woman preceptor should be chosen,¹ outer cloak, inner and upper robes,
And vest (and) bathing cloth having explained them they may be used,²
ignorant ones, not agreed on, on one side, if she asks, questioned about the
stumbling-blocks, /

Ordained on one side, likewise again in the Order of monks,
the shadow, the season, the day and formula, the three resources, /
The eight things not to be done, the right time, or everywhere eight,
nuns did not invite, and the Order of monks likewise, /

Disturbance, before the meal, and at the wrong time, disturbance,
Observance, Invitation, commands, authority, /

Leave, reproved, made to remember: objected to by the great Sage.

Just as monks, so nuns: allowed by the great Sage (was) /

A vehicle, and ill (and) yoked, jolting vehicle, Aḍḍhakāsika,
monk, probationer, novice, woman novice and ignorant (woman), /

In a forest, a store-room by a lay-follower, a dwelling,
the building operations were not enough, pregnant, alone, /

And sleeping under the same roof, against an important rule,
and having disavowed, went over to the fold of,

greeting and hair and nails and treating a sore,³ /

Cross-legged, and ill, privy, with chunam, scented clay,
in a bathroom, against the stream, not at a ford, and at one for men, /

The Great Gotamid asked and also judiciously did Ānanda.

There were four assemblies for going forth in the dispensation of the Con-
queror. /

For the sake of arousing emotion

for what is true *dhamma* and for awakening

it was taught thus by the Awakened One, as medicine for a disease. /

Other women also, recognised thus in what is true *dhamma*,

¹ *upajjhā gāha*. ² *pesaye*. ³ *vakakammannā* should probably read *vaṇa (paṭi) kammanāṃ* as at [Kd 20.27.1](#), Sinhalese and Siamese editions.

nurture the everlasting state¹ where, having gone, they grieve not.

¹ *accuta ṭhāna*, the place not deceased from, not passed away from, not fallen from.

21. (RECITATION WITH) FIVE HUNDRED (PAÑCASATA)

ORIGIN OF THE COUNCIL

Then¹ the venerable Kassapa the Great addressed the monks, saying: “Once upon a time, your reverences, I was going along the high-road from Pāvā to Kusināra together with a large Order of monks, with at least five hundred monks.² Then I, your reverences, stepping aside from the way, sat down at the root of a certain tree. Now at that time a certain Naked Ascetic, having picked up a flower of the Coral Tree³ at Kusināra, was going along the high-road to Pāvā. Then I, your reverences, saw that Naked Ascetic coming in the distance, and seeing him I spoke thus to him: ‘Do you, your reverence not know about our Teacher?’ He said: ‘Yes, I know, your reverence, the recluse Gotama attained *nibbāna* a week ago. Because of that I picked up this flower of the Coral Tree.’

“Your reverences, of those monks who were not passionless, some, stretching forth their arms, wailed, they fell down hurting themselves, they reeled backwards and forwards, saying: ‘Too soon has the Lord attained *nibbāna*, too soon has the Well-farer attained *nibbāna*, too soon has the Eye in the World disappeared.’ But those monks who were passionless, these, mindful, circumspect, bore it, saying: ‘Im-

¹ Cf. DN ii.962 ² Quoted at Kh-a 91, Vin-a 5. ³ *mandārava*. Cf. DN ii.137; *Erythrina fulgens*. A tree growing only in heaven. If its flowers were found on the earth something special must have happened. Not the same as the Pāricchattaka, also a celestial coral-tree, of which there were five.

permanent are compounded things—what is here possible because of this?

“Then I, your reverences, spoke thus to these monks: ‘Enough, your reverences, do not grieve, do not lament, for has it not already been explained by the Lord: ‘Of every single thing that is dear and beloved there is variation, separation, becoming otherwise. What is here possible, your reverences, because of this: that whatever is born, has become, is composite, is liable to dissolution? Indeed, thinking: ‘Let not that be dissolved’—such a situation does not exist”¹

“Then at that time, your reverences,² one named Subhadda, who had gone forth when old, was sitting in that assembly. Then your reverences, Subhadda who had gone forth when old spoke thus to these monks: ‘Enough, your reverences, do not grieve, do not lament, we are well rid of this great recluse. We were worried when he said: “This is allowable to you, this is not allowable to you.” But now we will be able to do as we like and we won’t do what we don’t like’.

“Come, let us, your reverences, chant *dhamma* and discipline before what is not *dhamma* shines out and *dhamma* is withheld, before what is not discipline shines out and discipline is withheld, before those who speak what is not-*dhamma* become strong and those who speak *dhamma* become feeble, before those who speak what is not discipline become strong and those who speak discipline become feeble.”³

“Well then, honoured sir, let the elder select monks.” Then the venerable Kassapa the Great selected five hundred perfected ones, less one. Monks spoke thus to the venerable Kassapa the Great:⁴

“Honoured sir, this Ānanda, although he is still a learner, could not be one to follow a wrong course through desire, anger, delusion, fear; and he has mastered much *dhamma* and discipline under the Lord. Well, now, honoured sir, let the elder select the venerable Ānanda as

¹ Also at DN ii.118. ² At DN ii.162 the Subhadda incident is placed before the speech which here precedes it. At DN-a 599 he is identified with the barber of Ātuma who went forth when old, and who, as told at Vin 1.249, was angry when Gotama refused to accept the meal he had prepared. The above incident was his revenge. ³ As at Kd 22.1.7. Quoted at DN-a 3,602, Vin-a 6. ⁴ Quoted at DN-a 5, Kh-a 92, Vin-a 7.

well.” Then the venerable Kassapa the Great selected the venerable Ānanda as well.

Then it occurred to the monks who were elders:¹ “Now, where should we chant *dhamma* and discipline?” Then it occurred to the monks who were elders: “There is great resort for alms at Rājagaha and lodgings are abundant. Suppose that we, spending the rains at Rājagaha, should chant *dhamma* and discipline (there), and that no other monks were to come up to Rājagaha for the rains.”²

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great informed the Order, saying: “Your reverences, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may agree upon these five hundred monks to chant *dhamma* and discipline while they are spending the rains in Rājagaha, and that the rains should not be spent in Rājagaha by any other monks. This is the motion. Your reverences, let the Order listen to me. The Order is agreeing upon these five hundred monks to chant *dhamma* and discipline while they are spending the rains in Rājagaha, and that the rains should not be spent in Rājagaha by any other monks. If the agreement upon these five hundred monks to chant *dhamma* and discipline while they are spending the rains in Rājagaha, and that the rains should not be spent in Rājagaha by any other monks, is pleasing to the venerable ones you should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. These five hundred monks are agreed upon by the Order to chant *dhamma* and discipline while they are spending the rains in Rājagaha, and (it is agreed) that the rains should not be spent in Rājagaha by any other monks. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus, do I understand this.”

Then the monks who were elders went to Rājagaha to chant *dhamma* and discipline.³ Then it occurred to the monks who were elders: “Now, repairs to broken and dilapidated parts were praised

¹ Quoted at DN-a 5, Vin-a 7. ² The elders did not want others to take part in the Council; but if they came they would have to so as to render valid the proceedings. For had only part of an assembly or Order present there taken part in them, the proceedings would have been invalid for they would have been carried out by an incomplete assembly, *vagga*. ³ Some of this paragraph quoted at DN-a 8.

by the Lord. Come, let us during the first month, make repairs to the broken and dilapidated parts; having assembled in the middle month, we will chant *dhamma* and discipline.” Then the monks who were elders made repairs to the broken and dilapidated parts during the first month.

21.1.6

5.396

Then the venerable Ānanda, thinking:¹ “Tomorrow is the assembly. Now it is not suitable in me that I, being (only) a learner, should go to the assembly,” and having passed much of that night in mindfulness as to body, when the night was nearly spent thinking: “I will lie down,” he inclined his body, but (before) his head had touched the mattress and while his feet were free from the ground—in that interval his mind was freed from the cankers with no residuum (for rebirth) remaining. Then the venerable Ānanda, being a perfected one, went to the assembly.²

21.1.7

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great informed the Order, saying:³ “Your reverences, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order I could question Upāli on discipline.” Then the venerable Upāli informed the Order, saying: “Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, I, questioned on discipline by the venerable Kassapa the Great, could answer.” Then the venerable Kassapa the Great spoke thus to the venerable Upāli: “Where,⁴ reverend Upāli, was the first offence involving defeat laid down?”

“At Vesālī, honoured sir.”

“Regarding whom?”

“Regarding Sudinna the Kalandaka.”

“On what subject?”

“On sexual intercourse.”

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great questioned the venerable Upāli as to the subject of the first offence involving defeat and he questioned him as to its provenance and he questioned him as to the

¹ Cf. DN-a 9–10, which differs somewhat. ² Quoted at DN-a 10. ³ Quoted DN-a 11.

⁴ Quoted at DN-a 12, Vin-a 30.

individual¹ and he questioned him as to what was laid down and he questioned him as to what was further laid down² and he questioned him as to what was an offence and he questioned him as to what was no offence.³

“Then, reverend Upāli, where was the second offence involving defeat laid down?”

“In Rājagaha, honoured sir.”

“Regarding whom?”

“Regarding Dhaniya, the potter’s son.”

“On what subject?”

“On taking what is not given.”

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great questioned the venerable Upāli as to the subject of the second offence involving defeat and he questioned him as to its provenance and he questioned him ... as to what was no offence.

“Then, reverend Upāli, where was the third offence involving defeat laid down?”

“At Vesālī, honoured sir.”

“Regarding whom?”

“Regarding several monks.”

“On what subject?”

“On human beings.”⁴

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great questioned the venerable Upāli as to the subject of the third offence involving defeat and he questioned him as to its provenance and he questioned him ... as to what was no offence.

“Then, reverend Upāli, where was the fourth offence involving defeat laid down?”

“At Vesālī, honoured sir.”

“Regarding whom?”

¹ These first three questions are quoted at Vin-a 30. ² *anupaññatti*; the additions made to the rule that was laid down, the *paññatti*, after it had been first laid down. Cf. Vin 5.2. ³ These are the cases mentioned after the Old Commentary’s explanations of the words of the rules. ⁴ *manussaviggaha*. “Depriving of life” is to be understood.

“Regarding the monks on the banks of the Vaggumudā.”

“On what subject?”

“On conditions of further-men.”

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great questioned the venerable Upāli as to the subject of the fourth offence involving defeat and he questioned him as to its provenance and he questioned him as to ... what was no offence. In this same way he questioned him about both the disciplines.¹ Constantly questioned, the venerable Upāli answered.²

21.1.8

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great informed the Order, saying: “Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me.³ If it seems right to the Order, I could question Ānanda about *dhamma*.” Then the venerable Ānanda informed the Order, saying: “Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, I, questioned on *dhamma* by the venerable Kassapa the Great, could answer.” Then the venerable Kassapa the Great spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda:⁴

5.398

“Where, reverend Ānanda, was the Brahmajāla⁵ spoken?”

“Honoured sir, between Rājagaha and Nālandā in the royal rest-house at Ambalaṭṭhikā.”

“With whom?”

“Suppiya the wanderer and Brahmadata the brahmin youth.”⁶ Then the venerable Kassapa the Great questioned the venerable Ānanda as to the provenance of the Brahmajāla and he questioned him as to the individual(s).

“But where, reverend Ānanda, was the Sāmaññaphala⁷ spoken?”⁸

“In Rājagaha, honoured sir, in Jīvaka’s mango grove.”

“With whom?”

“With Ajātasattu, the son of the Videhan (lady).”

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great questioned the venerable

¹ I.e. that for monks and that for nuns. ² Quoted at DN-a 12. ³ Quoted at DN-a 13. ⁴ Quoted at DN-a 14. ⁵ The first Suttanta in the Dīgha. ⁶ Here both Vin-a 16 and DN-a 14 add: “On what subject?” “On praise and not praise.” ⁷ The second Suttanta in the Dīgha. ⁸ Quoted at Vin-a 16. After this sentence DN-a 14 proceeds differently.

Ānanda as to the provenance of the Sāmaññaphala and he questioned him as to the individual. In this same way he questioned him about the five Nikāyas. Constantly questioned, the venerable Ānanda answered.

ON THE LESSER AND MINOR TRAINING RULES

Then the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the monks who were elders: “The Lord, honoured sirs, spoke thus to me at the time of his attaining *nibbāna*: ‘If the Order, Ānanda, after my death is willing, the lesser and minor rules of training¹ may be abolished’.”²

“But did you, reverend Ānanda, ask the Lord, saying: ‘But which, Lord, are the lesser and minor rules of training?’”

“No, I, honoured sirs, did not ask the Lord, saying: ‘But which, Lord, are the lesser and minor rules of training?’”

Some elders spoke thus: “Except for the rules for the four offences involving defeat, the rest are lesser and minor rules of training.” Some elders spoke thus: “Except for the rules for the four offences involving defeat, except for the rules for the thirteen offences entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order, the rest are lesser and minor rules of training.” Some elders spoke thus: “Except for the rules for the four offences involving defeat ... except for the rules for the two undetermined offences, the rest are lesser and minor rules of training.” Some elders spoke thus: “Except for the rules for the four offences involving defeat ... except for the rules for the thirty offences of expiation involving forfeiture, the rest are lesser and minor rules of training.” Some elders spoke thus: “Except for the rules for the four offences involving defeat ... except for the rules for the ninety-two offences of expiation, the rest are lesser and minor rules of training.” Some elders spoke thus: “Except for the rules for the four offences involving defeat ... except for the rules for the four offences which ought to be confessed, the rest are lesser and minor rules of training.”

¹ See **BD 3, Introduction, p. x** and **Bu-Pc 72**, especially **BD 3.41** where see n. 1 for further references; also see *Questions of King Milinda* i.202f. ² DN ii.154.

Then the venerable Kassapa the Great informed the Order, saying: “Your reverences, let the Order listen to me. There are rules of training for us which affect householders, and householders know concerning us: ‘This is certainly allowable for the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, this is certainly not allowable.’ If we were to abolish the lesser and minor rules of training there would be those who would say: ‘At the time of his cremation¹ a rule of training had been laid down by the recluse Gotama for disciples; while the Teacher was amongst them these trained themselves in the rules of training, but since the Teacher has attained *nibbāna* among them, they do not now train themselves in the rules of training.’ If it seems right to the Order, the Order should not lay down what has not been laid down, nor should it abolish what has been laid down. It should proceed in conformity with and according to the rules of training that have been laid down.² This is the motion.³ Your reverences, let the Order listen to me. There are rules of training for us ... ‘... these do not now train themselves in the rules of training.’ The Order is not laying down what has not been laid down, nor is it abolishing what has been laid down. It is proceeding in conformity with and according to the rules of training that have been laid down. If the not laying down of what has not been laid down, if the not abolishing of what has been laid down, if the proceeding in conformity with and according to the rules of training that have been laid down are pleasing to the venerable ones, they should be silent; he to whom they are not pleasing should speak. The Order is not laying down what has not been laid down, it is not abolishing what has been laid down, it is proceeding in conformity with and according to the rules of training that have been laid down. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.”

Then the monks who were elders spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda: “This, reverend Ānanda, is an offence of wrong-doing for

¹ *dhūmakālikam*, as at [Kd 16.17.1](#). ² Cf. [Vin 3.231 \(Bu-NP 15.1.2\)](#). ³ This speech of Kassapa’s, as far as here, is quoted at [DN-a 592](#).

you, in that you did not ask the Lord, saying: ‘But which, Lord, are the lesser and minor rules of training?’ Confess that offence of wrong-doing.”

“I, honoured sirs, out of unmindfulness, did not ask the Lord, saying: ‘But which, Lord, are the lesser and minor rules of training?’ I do not see that as an offence of wrong-doing,¹ yet even out of faith in the venerable ones I confess that as an offence of wrong-doing.”

“This too is an offence of wrong-doing for you, reverend Ānanda, in that you sewed the Lord’s cloth for the rains² after having stepped on it. Confess that offence of wrong-doing.”

“But I, honoured sirs, not out of disrespect, sewed the Lord’s cloth for the rains after having stepped on it. I do not see ... but even out of faith in the venerable ones I confess that as an offence of wrong-doing.”

“This too is an offence of wrong-doing for you, reverend Ānanda, in that you had the Lord’s body first of all honoured by women; because these were weeping, the Lord’s body was defiled by tears. Confess that offence of wrong-doing.”

“But I, honoured sirs, thinking: ‘Do not let these be (here) at a wrong time,³ had the Lord’s body honoured first of all by women. I do not see that as an offence of wrong-doing ... but even out of faith ...”

“This too is an offence of wrong-doing for you, reverend Ānanda, in that you,⁴ (although) a broad hint was being given, a palpable sign was being made, did not ask the Lord, saying: ‘Let the Lord remain for a (full) lifespan,⁵ let the well-farer remain for a (full) lifespan for the welfare of the many-folk, for the happiness of the many-folk, out of compassion for the world, for the good, the welfare, the happiness of *devas* and mankind.’ Confess that offence of wrong-doing.”

¹ Cf. **Kd 10.1.8** ² *vassikasāṭhikā*, see **BD 2.134, n. 1**. Defined at **Vin 4.173 (BD 3.99)**.

³ *mā yimā vikāle ahesum̐*. Vin-a 1297 explains by *mā imāsaṃ vikāle gamanāni ahesum̐*, do not let there be comings of these at a wrong time. ⁴ Cf.

AN iv.309–AN iv.310, DN ii.103, DN ii.115, SN v.259, Ud 62. ⁵ *kappa*. See GS iv.206, n. AN-a iv.149 = SN-a iii.251 = Ud-a 323 calls it *āyukappa*, and say whatever is the length of men’s life at this and that time, bringing that to the full, let him remain.

“But I, honoured sirs, because my mind was obsessed¹ with Māra, did not ask the Lord, saying: ‘Let the Lord remain ... the happiness of *devas* and mankind.’ I do not see ... out of faith ...”

“This too is an offence of wrong-doing for you, reverend Ānanda, in that you made an effort for the going forth of women in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.² Confess this offence of wrong-doing.”

“But I, honoured sirs, made an effort for the going forth of women in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder, thinking: ‘This Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great,³ is the Lord’s aunt, foster-mother, nurse, giver of milk, for when the Lord’s mother passed away, she suckled him.’ I do not see that as an offence of wrong-doing, but even out of faith in the venerable ones I confess that as an offence of wrong-doing.”

21.1.11
Now at that time the venerable Purāṇa was walking on almstour in the Southern Hills together with a large Order of monks, with at least five hundred monks. Then the venerable Purāṇa, having stayed in the Southern Hills for as long as he found suiting, after the monks who were elders had chanted *dhamma* and discipline, 2.290
, approached Rājagaha, the Bamboo Grove, the squirrels’ feeding place, and the monks who were elders; having approached, having exchanged friendly greetings with the monks who were elders, he 5.402
sat down at a respectful distance. The monks who were elders spoke thus to the venerable Purāṇa as he was sitting down at a respectful distance:

“Reverend Purāṇa, *dhamma* and discipline have been chanted by monks who are elders. Submit yourself⁴ to this chanting.”

“Your reverences, well chanted by the elders are *dhamma* and discipline, but in that way that I heard it in the Lord’s presence, that I received it in his presence, in that same way will I bear it in mind.”

¹ As at Vin 4.94, Vin 4.229. ² Above, Kd 20.1. ³ As at Kd 20.13; MN iii.253. ⁴ *up-ehi*, as at Kd 19.3.3 (towards the end).

ON THE HIGHER PENALTY

Then the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the monks who were elders: “Honoured sirs, the Lord, at the time of attaining *nibbāna*, spoke thus to me: ‘Well now, Ānanda, after I am gone, let the Order enjoin the higher penalty¹ for the monk Channa.’”²

“But did you, reverend Ānanda, ask the Lord: ‘But what, Lord, is the higher penalty?’”

“I, honoured sirs, did ask the Lord: ‘But what, Lord, is the higher penalty?’ He said, ‘Ānanda, Channa may say whatever he likes to monks, but the monk Channa must neither be spoken to, nor exhorted nor instructed by monks.’”³

“Well then, reverend Ānanda, do you yourself enjoin the higher penalty on the monk Channa.”

“But how can I, honoured sirs, enjoin the higher penalty on the monk Channa? That monk is fierce and rough.”

“Well then, reverend Ānanda, go along together with many monks.”

“Very well, honoured sirs,” and the venerable Ānanda, having answered these monks in assent, having, together with a large Order of monks, with at least five hundred monks, disembarked at Kosambī from a boat going upstream,⁴ sat down at the root of a certain tree not far from King Udena’s⁵ pleasure grove.

Now at that time King Udena was amusing himself in his pleasure grove together with his concubines. Then King Udena’s concubines heard:⁶ “It is said that our teacher, master Ānanda, is sitting at the

¹ *brahmadāṇḍa*. ² As at DN ii.154. See BD 2.230, BD 2.257, BD 2.393, BD 3.36 for further references to Channa’s misdoings. It is not clear whether this penalty was imposed because he had taken the nun’s part in a dispute with monks, or because he had repeatedly reviled Sāriputta and Moggallāna, as appears from Dhpa ii.110–Dhp-a ii.112, where also other details are to be found. Cf. also Thag-a i.166.

³ Cf. AN ii.113 where it is said that this is destruction, *vaḍḍha*, in the *ariya*n discipline: when a monk is to be neither spoken to, exhorted nor instructed by the Truthfinder or by his fellow Brahma-farers. ⁴ *ujjavanikāya*, cf. Vin 4.65. ⁵ King of Kosambī. ⁶ Cf. Kd 21.1.13–Kd 21.1.14 with Ja ii.23–Ja ii.24 where Ānanda receives another thousand robes.

root of a certain tree not far from the pleasure grove.” Then King Udena’s concubines spoke thus to King Udena: “Sire, they say that our teacher ... not far from the pleasure grove. We, sire, want to see master Ānanda.”

“Well then, do you see the recluse Ānanda.” Then King Udena’s concubines approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached, having greeted the venerable Ānanda, they sat down at a respectful distance. The venerable Ānanda gladdened, rejoiced, roused, delighted King Udena’s concubines with talk on *dhamma* as they were sitting down at a respectful distance. Then King Udena’s concubines, gladdened ... delighted by the venerable Ānanda with talk on *dhamma*, bestowed five hundred inner robes on the venerable Ānanda. Then King Udena’s concubines, pleased with the venerable Ānanda’s words, having thanked him, rising from their seats, having greeted the venerable Ānanda, having kept their right sides towards him, approached King Udena.

King Udena saw the concubines coming in the distance; seeing them he spoke thus to the concubines: “Did you see the recluse Ānanda?”

“We, sire, did see master Ānanda.”

“But did not you give anything to the recluse Ānanda?”

“We gave, sire, five hundred inner robes to master Ānanda.”

King Udena looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can this recluse Ānanda accept so many robes? Will the recluse Ānanda set up trade in woven cloth or will he offer (them) for sale in a shop?”¹ Then King Udena approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached, he exchanged greetings with the venerable Ānanda; having exchanged greetings of friendliness and courtesy, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King Udena spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda:

“Did not our concubines come here, good² Ānanda?”

“Your concubines did come here, your majesty.”

“Did they not give anything to the honourable³ Ānanda?”

¹ *paṅṅāhikasālaṃ pasāressati. Cf. Kd 20.10.4, āpaṇaṃ pasārenti.* ² *bho.* ³ *bhoto.*

“They gave me five hundred inner robes, your majesty.”

“But what can you, honourable¹ Ānanda, do with so many robes?”

“I will share them, your majesty, with those monks whose robes are worn thin.”

“But what will you do, good Ānanda, with those old robes that are worn thin?”

“We will make them into upper coverings,² your majesty.”

“But what will you do, good Ānanda, with those upper coverings that are old?”

“We will make these into mattress coverings, your majesty.”

“But what will you do, good Ānanda, with those mattress coverings that are old?”

“We will make them into ground coverings, your majesty.”

“But what will you do, good Ānanda, with those ground coverings that are old?”

“We will make them into foot-wipers, your majesty.”

“But what will you do, good Ānanda, with those foot-wipers that are old?”

“We will make them into dusters, your majesty.”

“But what will you do, good Ānanda, with those dusters that are old?”

“Having torn them into shreds, your majesty, having kneaded them with mud, we will smear a plaster-flooring.”

Then King Udena, thinking: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, use everything in an orderly way and do not let things go to waste,”³ bestowed even another five hundred woven cloths on the venerable Ānanda. Therefore this was the first time that a thousand robes had accrued to the venerable Ānanda as an alms of robes.

Then the venerable Ānanda approached Ghosita’s monastery; having approached, he sat down on an appointed seat. Then the venerable Channa approached the venerable Ānanda; having ap-

¹ *bhavaṃ*. ² *uttaratharaṇa*. ³ *sabbeva yoniso upanenti na kulāvaṃ gamenti*. Vin-a 1297 says the meaning of *na kulāvaṃ gamenti* is *na koṭṭhake gopenti*, they do not keep them in a storeroom.

proached, having greeted the venerable Ānanda, he sat down at a respectful distance. The venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the venerable Channa as he was sitting down at a respectful distance: “The higher penalty has been enjoined on you, reverend Channa, by the Order.”

“But what, honoured Ānanda, is the higher penalty?”

“You, reverend Channa, may say what you please to the monks, but you must neither be spoken to nor exhorted nor instructed by the monks.”

Saying: “Am I not, honoured Ānanda, destroyed because I may be neither spoken to nor exhorted nor instructed by the monks?” he fell down fainting at that very place. Then the venerable Channa, being troubled about the higher penalty, being ashamed of it, loathing it,¹ dwelling alone, aloof, zealous, ardent, self-resolute, having soon realised here and now by his own super-knowledge that supreme goal of the Brahma-faring for the sake of which young men of family rightly go forth from home into homelessness, entering on it, abided in it and he understood: “Destroyed is (individual) birth, lived is the Brahma-faring, done is what was to be done, now there is no more of being this or that.” And so the venerable Channa became another of the perfected ones. Then the venerable Channa, having attained perfection, approached the venerable Ānanda; having approached he spoke thus to the venerable Ānanda: “Honoured Ānanda, now revoke the higher penalty for me.”

“From the moment that you, reverend Channa, realised perfection, from that moment the higher penalty was revoked for you.”

Now because five hundred monks—not one more, not one less—were at this chanting of the discipline, this chanting of the discipline is in consequence called ‘that of the Five Hundred’.²

Told is the Eleventh Section: that on the Five Hundred

IN THIS SECTION ARE TWENTY-THREE ITEMS. THIS IS ITS KEY

¹ As at Vin 1.86f. ² Cf. Kd 22.2.9.

When the Self-enlightened One had attained *nibbāna* the elder called Kassapa addressed a group of monks on preserving what is true *dhamma*, /
On the high-road from Pāvā, what was declared by Subhadda,
we will chant true *dhamma*, before what is not-*dhamma* shines forth, /
And he selected Ānanda also for the one in the five hundred less one
spending the rains¹ in chanting *dhamma* and discipline in the best of re-
sorts. /
He asked Upāli about discipline, the wise Ānanda about the Suttantas:
disciples of the Conqueror chanted the three Piṭakas. /
The lesser and minor, various, in conformity with and according to what
was laid down,
he did not ask, having stepped on, he caused to honour, and he did not
request, /
the going forth of women: out of faith they are offences of wrong-doing for
me.
Purāṇa, and the higher penalty, the concubines with Udena, /
So many, and worn thin, upper coverings, mattresses,
ground coverings, foot-wipers, dusters, kneading with mud,
a thousand robes accrued for the first time to the one called Ānanda. /
Threatened with the higher penalty he attained the fourfold truth.
The five hundred having mastered:
therefore it is called (the Chanting) of the Five Hundred.

Vin 2.2

Vin 2.2

¹ Text: *vassanto*, Sinhalese and Siamese: *vasanto*.

22. (RECITATION WITH) SEVEN HUNDRED (SATTASATA)

FIRST RECITATION SECTION

Now at that time, a century after the Lord had attained *nibbāna*, monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī¹ promulgated ten points at Vesālī, saying:

1. “The practice concerning a horn for salt² is allowable;
2. the practice as to two finger-breadths is allowable;
3. the practice concerning ‘among the villages’ is allowable;
4. the practice concerning residences is allowable;
5. the practice concerning assent is allowable;
6. the practice concerning what is customary is allowable;
7. the practice concerning unchurned butter-milk is allowable;
8. it is allowable to drink unfermented toddy;
9. a piece of cloth to sit upon that has no border is allowable;
10. gold and silver are allowable.”

Now at that time the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā,³ walking on tour among the Vajjis, arrived at Vesālī.⁴ Then the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, stayed there at Vesālī in the Great Grove in the Hall of the Gabled Roof. Now at that time the monks who were

¹ As at Kd 17.4.1. ² The terms of the ten points are explained below, Kd 22.1.10; Kd 22.2.8. ³ I take this parent to be his mother. This Yasa is mentioned at DN-a 525; Mbvs.96; Mbvs.iv.57. ⁴ This passage is quoted at Vin-a i.34.

Vajjis of Vesālī, having on that Observance day filled a bronze pot with water, having set it in the midst of the Order of monks, spoke thus to lay-followers of Vesālī who came: “Give, sirs, a *kahāpaṇa*¹ for the Order and half a *pāda*² and a stamped *māsaka*;³ there will be something to be done for the Order in respect of requisites.”

When they had spoken thus, the venerable Yasa,⁴ the son of Kākaṇḍakā, spoke thus to the lay-followers of Vesālī: “Do not, sirs, give *kahāpaṇas* and stamped *māsakas* to the Order: gold and silver are not allowable to recluses, sons of the Sakyans.⁵ The recluses, sons of the Sakyans do not consent (to accept) gold and silver, the recluses, sons of the Sakyans do not receive gold and silver, the recluses, sons of the Sakyans do not use jewels and refined gold,⁶ they have done with gold and silver.”⁷ Then the lay-followers of Vesālī, being spoken to thus by the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, nevertheless gave *kahāpaṇas* ... and stamped *māsakas* to the Order. Then the monks who were Vajjis or Vesālī, having towards the end of that night arranged those gold coins,⁸ distributed portions according to the number of monks.⁹ Then the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī spoke thus to the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā:

“This portion of gold coins is for you, reverend Yasa.”

“I have no need of a portion of gold coins, sirs, I do not consent (to accept) gold coins.”

Then the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī, saying: “This reverend Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, is reviling and abusing¹⁰ lay-followers

¹ See [BD 1.29, n.](#), and [BD 1.71, n. 2.](#) ² On *pāda*, see [BD 1.71, n. 2.](#) Although the reading above is *aḍḍham pi pādam pi*, as though *aḍḍha* and *pāda* were separate mediums of exchange, in taking the phrase as meaning “half a *pāda*” I am following Vv-a 77=Dhp-a iii.108 which gives the descending line: *kahāpaṇa, aḍḍhapāda, māsaka*. *Vinaya Texts* iii.387 takes *aḍḍha* as half a *kahāpaṇa*, but the justification for its being half a *pāda* is greater. ³ See [BD 1.72, n. 1,](#) and Vin-a 689 where it is said that some *māsakas* have figures stamped on them. ⁴ For the ten points and the Yasa episode see also Mahāvamsa iv.9ff., Dīpavamsa iv.45ff., Dīpavamsa v.23; Vin-a i.33ff. ⁵ [Bu-NP 18.](#) ⁶ *suvaṇṇa*. On this and *hirañña* see [BD 1.28, n.](#) ⁷ All these phrases occur at SN iv.325 as above; the last two are also used at MN ii.51 in respect of the potter. ⁸ *hirañña*. ⁹ *bhikkhaggena*. Cf. *seyyaggena, vihāraggena* and *parivenaggena* at [Kd 16.11.3.](#) ¹⁰ Both these terms are defined at [Vin 4.309.](#) They occur also at [Vin 4.52.](#)

who are faithful and believing; come, let us carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation¹ for him,” carried out a (formal) act of reconciliation for him. Then the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā spoke thus to the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī:

“It was laid down by the Lord, your reverences, that a companion messenger should be given to a monk for whom a (formal) act of reconciliation has been carried out.² Your reverences, give me a monk as companion messenger.”

Then the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī, having agreed upon one monk, gave him to the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, as a companion messenger. Then the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, having entered Vesālī together with the monk who was his companion messenger, spoke thus to the lay-followers of Vesālī:

“It is said that I revile and abuse the venerable lay-followers³ who are faithful and believing, and that I afford little satisfaction in that I speak of not-*dhamma* as not-*dhamma*; in that I speak of *dhamma* as *dhamma*, in that I speak of not-discipline as not-discipline, in that I speak of discipline as discipline.

“Friends, the Lord was once staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. There, friends, the Lord addressed the monks, saying: ‘Monks,⁴ there are these four stains of the moon and the sun, stained by which stains the moon and the sun burn not, shine not, blaze not. What are the four? Dense cloud, monks, is a stain of the moon and the sun, stained by which stain the moon and the sun ... blaze not. A snow-cloud⁵ ... Smoke and dust ... Rāhu,⁶ monks, is a stain of the moon and the sun, stained by which stain the moon and the sun burn not, shine not, blaze not. These, monks, are the four stains of the moon and the sun, stained by which stains the moon and the sun burn not, shine not, blaze not.

“Even so, monks, there are four stains of recluses and brahmins,

¹ *paṭisāraṇīyakamma*. See **Kd 11.18.5**. ² **Kd 11.22.2**. ³ *āyasmante upāsake*. ⁴ As at AN ii.53. Cf. Mil 273. ⁵ *mahikā*; at AN ii.53, *mahiyā*. Vin-a 1297 says it is a snow-cloud (*himavatāhākā*) at the time of snow-fall. ⁶ He figures in the Indian myth of eclipses. See SN i.50, SN i.51 where the Moon and Sun *devas* were seized by Rāhu; they both invoked Gotama’s aid, and he told Rāhu to set the *devas* free.

stained by which stains some recluses and brahmins burn not, shine not, blaze not. What are the four? There are, monks, some recluses and brahmins who drink fermented liquor, who drink spirits,¹ abstaining not from drinking fermented liquor and spirits. This, monks, is the first stain of recluses and brahmins, stained by which stain some recluses and brahmins burn not, shine not, blaze not. And again, monks, some recluses and brahmins indulge in sexual intercourse,² abstaining not from sexual intercourse. This, monks, is the second stain ... And again, monks, some recluses and brahmins consent (to accept) gold and silver abstaining not from accepting gold and silver.³ This, monks, is the third stain ... And again, monks, some recluses and brahmins earn a living by a wrong mode of livelihood, abstaining not from a wrong mode of livelihood.⁴ This, monks, is the fourth stain, stained by which stain some recluses and brahmins ... blaze not. These, monks, are the four stains of recluses and brahmins, stained by which stains some recluses and brahmins burn not, shine not, blaze not.' Friends, the Lord said this; the Well-farer having said this, the Teacher further spoke thus:

“Some recluses⁵ and brahmins are stained
By lust and ill-will. Clothed in ignorance,
Beings delight in pleasure-giving shapes;
Liquor fermented and distilled they drink;
They follow sexual lust; by folly blinded
Some recluses and brahmins take gifts
Of gold and silver and live wrongfully.

“These are called “stains” by the Awakened One,
The kinsman of the Sun. Tainted by these
Some recluses and brahmins burn not,
They shine not, tarnished, dust-soiled, utter fools,

¹ See Bu-Pc 51. ² See Bu-Pj 1. ³ See Bu-NP 18, and DN i.5 ⁴ At DN i.9–DN i.12 many wrong modes of livelihood are enumerated. ⁵ I follow translation at GS ii.62–63, except that in the first line I have “stained” (Vinaya: *parikkiliṭṭhā*) instead of “snared” (Aṅguttara: *paṭikkīṭṭhā*), and in the last line I have “take on again-becoming” instead of “reap rebirth.”

Shrouded in darkness; slaves of craving they,
Led by the cord of craving, and they swell
The dreadful charnel-field¹ and take on again-becoming.’

“It is for speaking thus that it is said that I am reviling and abusing the venerable lay followers who are faithful and believing, and that I afford little satisfaction in that I speak of not-*dhamma* as not-*dhamma*, in that I speak of *dhamma* as *dhamma*, in that I speak of not-discipline as not-discipline, and in that I speak of discipline as discipline.

“Friends, the Lord was once staying at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels’ feeding place. Now at that time,² friends, in the king’s private quarters this conversation arose among the king’s assembly as they were gathered together and sitting down: ‘Gold and silver are allowable for the recluses, sons of the Sakyans; the recluses, sons of the Sakyans consent (to accept) gold and silver; the recluses, sons of the Sakyans receive gold and silver.’ Now at that time, friends, a village headman, Maṇicūḷaka, was sitting down in that assembly. Then, friends, Maṇicūḷaka, the village headman, spoke thus to that assembly: ‘Do not, masters, speak thus. Gold and silver are not allowable to recluses, sons of the Sakyans; the recluses, sons of the Sakyans do not consent (to accept) gold and silver; the recluses, sons of the Sakyans do not receive gold and silver; the recluses, sons of the Sakyans do not use gold and silver, they have done with gold and silver.’ And, friends, Maṇicūḷaka, the village headman, was able to convince that assembly. Then, friends, Maṇicūḷaka the village headman, having convinced that assembly approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, Maṇicūḷaka the village headman, spoke thus to the Lord: ‘Now, Lord, in the king’s private quarters ...³ I was able, Lord, to convince that assembly. I

¹ *vaḍḍhenti kaṭasim̐*. Cf. Ud 6.8 *icc’ ete ubho antā kaṭasivaḍḍhanā kaṭasiyo ditṭhī vaḍḍhenti*; also Thig.502 *kaṭasim̐ vaḍḍhente*; and the line above, from “they swell” to the end, with Thag 456 which however for our *ādiyanti* (take on) reads *ācinanti* (accumulate). ² As at SN iv.325. ³ The whole is repeated in the text.

hope¹ that I, Lord, maintaining thus, am one who asserts (fairly) what has been affirmed, and am not misrepresenting the Lord by what is not fact, but am maintaining a doctrine which conforms to his doctrine, and that no one who is a fellow *dhamma*-man, a holder of (his) views, comes to a position incurring blame.’

“Certainly you, village headman, maintaining thus, are one who asserts (fairly) what I have affirmed, and are not misrepresenting me by what is not fact, but are maintaining a doctrine which conforms to my doctrine, and no one who is a fellow *dhamma*-man, a holder of (my) views, comes to a position incurring blame. For, village headman, gold and silver are not allowable to recluses, sons of the Sakyans; the recluses, sons of the Sakyans do not consent (to accept) gold and silver; the recluses, sons of the Sakyans do not receive gold and silver; the recluses, sons of the Sakyans do not use gold and silver, they have done with gold and silver. To whoever, village headman, gold and silver are allowable to him also are allowable the five strands of sense-pleasures; to whoever the five strands of sense-pleasures are allowable, certainly you may understand, village headman, (this to be) not the *dhamma* of recluses,² not the *dhamma* of sons of the Sakyans. Although I, village headman, spoke thus: Grass may be looked about for by one who needs grass; wood may be looked about for by one who needs wood; a wagon may be looked about for by one who needs a wagon; a man may be looked about for by one who needs a man³—yet I, village headman, have never said in any way that gold and silver may be consented to or looked about for.’ It is for speaking thus that it is said that I am reviling and abusing venerable lay-followers who are faithful and believing, and that I afford little satisfaction in that I speak of not-*dhamma* as not-*dhamma*, in that I speak of *dhamma* as *dhamma*, in that I speak of not-discipline as not-discipline, in that I speak of discipline as discipline.

“Once, friends, when the Lord was in Rājagaha, as before, he ob-

¹ This speech occurs in almost identical terms at [Kd 6.31.4](#); see also [SN iii.6](#), [SN iv.51](#), [SN iv.340](#), [SN iv.381](#); [AN i.161](#); *cf.* [AN ii.31](#), [AN iii.4](#), [DN i.161](#). ² *samañadhamma*, recluses’ *dhamma*, mentioned also at [AN iii.371](#). ³ The *Mañicūla-sutta* of [SN iv.325](#)–[SN iv.327](#) stops here.

jected in connection with Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to gold and silver and laid down a rule of training.¹ It is for speaking thus that it is said that I am reviling and abusing venerable lay-followers who are faithful and believing, and that I afford little satisfaction in that I speak of not-*dhamma* as not-*dhamma*, in that I speak of *dhamma* as *dhamma*, in that I speak of not-discipline as not-discipline, in that I speak of discipline as discipline.”

When he had spoken thus the lay-followers of Vesālī spoke thus to Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā: “Honoured sir, master Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, is alone a recluse, a son of the Sakyans; these, one and all, are not recluses, not sons of the Sakyans. Honoured sir, let master Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, stay in Vesālī and we will make an effort in regard to the requisites of robes, almsfood, lodgings, medicines for the sick.”

Then the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, having convinced the lay-followers of Vesālī, went to a monastery together with the monk who was his companion messenger.

Then the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī asked the monk who was the companion messenger, saying: “Your reverence, have the lay-followers of Vesālī been asked for forgiveness by Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā?”

“Your reverences, evil has been done to us; Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, is alone regarded as² a recluse, a son of the Sakyans; we, one and all, are regarded as not recluses, not sons of the Sakyans.”

Then the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī, saying: “Your reverences, this Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, not agreed upon by us, has given information³ to householders. Come, let us carry out a (formal) act of suspension⁴ against him.” And these gathered together desirous of carrying out a (formal) act of suspension against him. Then the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, having risen above the ground, reappeared at Kosambī. Then the venerable Yasa, the

¹ See Bu-NP 18. ² *kata*, literally made. ³ *pakāseti*. Cf. Kd 17.3.2ff. ⁴ *ukkhepaniyakamma*. See Kd 11.25.

son of Kākaṇḍakā, sent a messenger to the monks of Pāvā¹ and (to those) of the southern region of Avanti,² saying:

“Let the venerable ones come, we must attend to this legal question before what is not *dhamma* shines forth and *dhamma* is withheld, (before) what is not discipline shines forth and discipline is withheld, before those who speak what is not *dhamma* become strong and those who speak *dhamma* become feeble, (before) those who speak what is not discipline become strong and those who speak discipline become feeble.”³

Now at that time the venerable Sambhūta,⁴ a wearer of coarse hempen cloth,⁵ was staying on Ahogaṅgā mountain slope. Then the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, approached Ahogaṅgā mountain slope and the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth; having approached, having greeted the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, spoke thus to the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth:

“Honoured sir, these monks, Vajjis of Vesālī, are promulgating ten points:⁶ the practice concerning a horn for salt is allowable; the practice as to two finger-breadths is allowable; the practice concerning ‘among the villages’ is allowable; the practice concerning residences is allowable; the practice concerning assent is allowable; the practice concerning what is customary is allowable; the practice concerning unchurned buttermilk is allowable; it is allowable to drink unfermented toddy; a piece of cloth to sit upon that has no border is allowable; gold and silver are allowable. Come, honoured sir, we must attend to this legal question before what is not *dhamma* shines

¹ Mentioned at [Vin 1.253](#), and called there and above Pāṭheyyakā. See [BD 4.351, n.](#) Vin-a 1105 calls Pāṭheyyam (variant reading Pāveyyam) a kingdom to the west of Kosala, which will no doubt account for the “western country” of *Vinaya Texts* iii.394. ² See [Vin 1.195ff.](#) ³ As at [Kd 11.1.1.](#) ⁴ Verses at [Thag 291–Thag 294.](#) See [Thag-a ii.122ff.](#) Mentioned with Sālha, Revata, and Yasa as Ānanda’s pupils, [Vin-a 34f.](#) ⁵ *sāṇavāsīn*. On *sāṇa* see [BD 2.143, n. 3.](#) ⁶ As at [Kd 22.1.1.](#)

forth and *dhamma* is withheld, (before) what is not discipline shines forth and discipline is withheld, before those who speak what is not *dhamma* become strong and those who speak *dhamma* become feeble, (before) those who speak what is not discipline become strong and those who speak discipline become feeble.”

“Very well, your reverence,” the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth, answered the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā in assent. Then as many as sixty monks of Pāvā, all forest-dwellers, all almsmen, all rag-robe wearers, all wearers of the three robes,¹ one and all men perfected,² gathered together on Ahogaṅgā mountain slope; and as many as eighty-eight monks of the southern region of Avantī, mostly forest-dwellers, mostly almsmen, mostly rag-robe wearers, mostly wearers of the three robes, and one and all men perfected, gathered together on Ahogaṅgā mountain slope.

Then as these monks who were elders were considering, it occurred to them: “Now, this legal question is hard and troublesome. How can we acquire a faction through which we could be stronger in regard to this legal question?” Now at that time the venerable Revata³ was staying in Soreyya. He had heard much, he was one to whom the tradition had been handed down, he was an expert in *dhamma*, expert in discipline, expert in the headings; wise, experienced, clever; conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training.⁴ Then it occurred to the monks who were elders:

“This venerable Revata is staying in Soreyya. He has heard much ... desirous of training. If we could acquire the venerable Revata for the faction, thus could we be stronger in regard to this legal question.”

Then the venerable Revata, through the condition of deva-like hearing which was purified, surpassing that of men, heard these monks who were elders as they were considering. And having heard them, it occurred to him: “This legal question is hard and troublesome, yet it is not suitable for me to hold back from a legal question like

¹ For references to these four ascetic practices see notes at **BD 4.351**. ² They are not called this at **Vin 1.253**. ³ See Mahāvamsa iv.57, Mahāvamsa iv.60; cf. Dīpavamsa iv.49, Vin-a i.33f. ⁴ Stock, as at **Vin 1.127, Vin 2.8**; cf. AN i.117, AN ii.147, AN iii.179.

this. But these monks are coming now. I will get no comfort crowded up by them. Suppose that I should go away beforehand?’

Then the venerable Revata went from Soreyya to Saṃkassa. Then the monks who were elders, having arrived at Soreyya, asked: “Where is the venerable Revata?” They spoke thus: “The venerable Revata has gone to Saṃkassa.” Then the venerable Revata went from Saṃkasato Kaṇṇakujja. Then the monks who were elders, having arrived at Saṃkassa, asked: “Where is the venerable Revata?” They spoke thus: “This venerable Revata has gone to Kaṇṇakujja.” Then the venerable Revata went from Kaṇṇakujja to Udumbara. Then the monks who were elders, having arrived at Kaṇṇakujja, asked: “Where is the venerable Revata?” They spoke thus: “This venerable Revata has gone to Udumbara.” Then the venerable Revata went from Udumbara to Aggaḷapura. Then the monks who were elders, having arrived at Udumbara, asked: “Where is the venerable Revata?” They spoke thus: “This venerable Revata has gone to Aggaḷapura.” Then the venerable Revata went from Aggaḷapura to Sahajāti. Then the monks who were elders, having arrived at Aggaḷapura, asked: “Where is the venerable Revata?” They spoke thus: “This venerable Revata has gone to Sahajāti.” Then the monks who were elders met the venerable Revata at Sahajāti.

Then the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth, spoke thus to the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā: “Your reverence, this venerable Revata has heard much, he is one to whom the tradition has been handed down, he is an expert in *dhamma*, expert in discipline, expert in the headings; wise, experienced, clever; conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training. If we were to ask the venerable Revata a question, the venerable Revata would be capable of spending a whole night over just the one question. But now the venerable Revata will call upon a monk who is a pupil and a plain-song repeater.¹ Do you, when that monk has completed the plain-song intonation, having approached the venerable Revata, ask him about these ten points.”

¹ *sarabhāṇaka*. See note above, **BD 5.146**.

“Very well, honoured sir,” the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, answered the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth, in assent. Then the venerable Revata called upon the monk who was a pupil and a plain-song repeater. Then when that monk had completed the plain-song intonation, the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, approached the venerable Revata; having approached, having greeted the venerable Revata, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, spoke thus to the venerable Revata:

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning a horn for salt allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning a horn for salt?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable to carry about salt in a horn, thinking, ‘I will enjoy whatever may be unsalted?’”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning two finger-breadths allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning two finger-breadths?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable to eat a meal at the wrong time when the shadow has passed beyond two finger-breadths?”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning ‘among the villages’ allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning ‘among the villages?’”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable, thinking, ‘I will go now among the villages,’ having eaten, being satisfied, to eat a meal that is not left over?”¹

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning residences allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning residences?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable for several residences belonging to

¹ See Bu-Pc 35, and BD 2.328.

the same boundary to carry out various Observances?”

“Your reverences, it is not allowable.”

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning assent allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning assent?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable for an incomplete Order to carry out a (formal) act, thinking, ‘We will advise monks who arrive?’”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning what is customary¹ allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning what is customary?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable, thinking, ‘This is habitually done² by my preceptor, this is habitually done by my teacher,’ to conduct oneself according to that?”

“Your reverence, the practice concerning what is customary is sometimes allowable, sometimes not allowable.”

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning unchurned buttermilk allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning unchurned buttermilk?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable, having eaten, being satisfied, to drink whatever is milk that is not left over but which has passed the stage of being milk (although) it has not arrived at the stage of being curds?”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable to drink unfermented toddy?”

“What, your reverence, is this toddy?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable to drink whatever is fermented liquor³ (but) which has not fermented and has not arrived at the stage of being strong drink?”⁴

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

¹ *āciṇṇakappa*. Cf. Vin 1.79 (Kd 1.51.1). Dīpavaṃsa 4.47, Dīpavaṃsa 5.18. ² *ajjhāciṇṇa*, as at Kd 14.5.1. ³ *surā*. Cf. Bu-Pc 51. ⁴ *majja*. See BD 2.385, n. 1.

“Honoured sir, is a piece of cloth to sit upon that has no border¹ allowable?”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Honoured sir, are gold and silver allowable?”

“Your reverence, they are not allowable.”

“Honoured sir, these monks who are Vajjis of Vesālī are promulgating these ten points in Vesālī. Come, honoured sir, we must attend to this legal question before what is not *dhamma* shines forth and *dhamma* is withheld, (before) what is not discipline shines forth and discipline is withheld, before those who speak what is not *dhamma* become strong and those who speak *dhamma* become feeble (before) those who speak what is not discipline become strong and those who speak discipline become feeble.”

“Very well, your reverence,” the venerable Revata answered the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā in assent.

The First Portion for Repeating

SECOND RECITATION SECTION

The monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī heard: “They say that Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, is willing to attend to this legal question, is looking about for a faction, and they say that he is acquiring a faction.” Then it occurred to the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī: “This legal question is hard and troublesome. How could we acquire a faction through which we could be stronger in regard to this legal question?” Then it occurred to the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī: “This venerable Revata is one who has heard much, one to whom the tradition has been handed down, he is expert in *dhamma*, expert in discipline, expert in the headings; he is wise, experienced, clever; conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training. If we could acquire the venerable Revata for the faction, thus could we be stronger in regard to this legal question.”

¹ Cf. definition at [Vin 3.232](#), [Vin 4.123](#), [Vin 4.171](#). See [BD 2.87](#), n. 5.

Then the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī prepared abundant requisites for recluses—bowls and robes and pieces of cloth to sit upon and needle-cases and waistbands and strainers and regulation water-pots. Then the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī, taking these requisites of recluses, went in a boat upstream¹ to Sahājati; having disembarked from the boat, they participated in a meal at the root of a certain tree.

Then as the venerable Sālha² was meditating in private a reasoning arose in his mind thus: “Which now are the speakers of *dhamma*—the monks from the East or those from Pāvā?” Then as the venerable Sālha was considering *dhamma* and discipline it occurred to him: “The monks from the East are not speakers of *dhamma*; the monks of Pāvā are speakers of *dhamma*.” Then a certain *devatā* of the Pure Abodes, knowing by mind the reasoning in the mind of the venerable Sālha, as a strong man might stretch out his bent back arm or might bend back his outstretched arm, even so, vanishing from the devas of the Pure Abodes, did she appear before the venerable Sālha. Then that *devatā* spoke thus to the venerable Sālha: “It is right, honoured Sālha, the monks from the East are not speakers of *dhamma*, the monks of Pāvā are speakers of *dhamma*. Well then, revered Sālha, stand firm according to *dhamma*.”³

“Both formerly and now I, *devatā*, have stood firm according to *dhamma*. Nevertheless I am not making known my views until I may be agreed upon in regard to this legal question.”

Then those monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī, taking those requisites for recluses, approached the venerable Revata; having approached, they spoke thus to the venerable Revata: “Honoured sir, let the Order accept these requisites for recluses—bowls and robes and pieces of cloth to sit upon and needle-cases and waistbands and strainers and regulation water-pots.”

He said: “No, your reverences, I am complete as to the three robes” (for) he did not want to accept. Now at that time a monk named Ut-

¹ *ujjavimsu*. ² Ānanda’s pupil, Vin-a 34–Vin-a 35. ³ Or, according to the rule, *yathādharmo tathā tiṭṭhāhi*. Cf. Mahāvamsa iv.29 *dhamme tiṭṭha*, stand firm in *dhamma*.

tara, of twenty years' standing was the venerable Revata's attendant. Then the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī approached the venerable Uttara; having approached, they spoke thus to the venerable Uttara: "Let the venerable Uttara accept these requisites for recluses—bowls and ... regulation water-pots."

He said: "No, your reverences, I am complete as to the three robes," (for) he did not want to accept. They said: "Reverend Uttara, people used to bring requisites for recluses to the Lord. If the Lord accepted them, they were glad; but if the Lord did not accept them, they brought them to the venerable Ānanda, saying: 'Honoured sir, let the elder accept these requisites for recluses, thus will this (gift) be as though accepted by the Lord.' Let the venerable Uttara accept these requisites of recluses, thus will this (gift) be as though accepted by the elder."

Then the venerable Uttara, being pressed by the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī, took one robe, saying: "Let the reverend ones tell me what they have need of."

"Let the venerable Uttara say this much to the elder: 'Honoured sir, let the elder say this much in the midst of the Order: Awakened Ones, Lords, arise in the Eastern districts, the monks from the East are speakers of *dhamma*, the monks of Pāvā are speakers of what is not *dhamma*'."

"Very well, your reverences," and the venerable Uttara, having answered the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī in assent, approached the venerable Revata; having approached, he spoke thus to the venerable Revata: "Honoured sir, let the elder say this much in the midst of the Order: Awakened Ones, Lords, arise in the Eastern districts, the monks from the East are speakers of *dhamma*, the monks of Pāvā are speakers of what is not *dhamma*."

Saying: "You, monk, are inciting me to what is not *dhamma*," the elder dismissed¹ the venerable Uttara. Then the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī spoke thus to the venerable Uttara: "What, reverend

¹ *paṇāmesi*. Cf. **Kd 1.27.2** where this word is used of the formal dismissal by a preceptor of the one who shares his cell. See also *Mahāvamsa* iv.30.

Uttara, did the elder say?”

“Evil has been done to us, your reverences. Saying, ‘You, monk, are inciting me to what is not *dhamma*,’ the elder dismissed me.”

“Are not you, your reverence, a senior of twenty years’ standing?”

“Yes, your reverences.”

“Then we shall take up guidance under (you as) teacher.”¹

Then the Order assembled wishing to investigate that legal question. The venerable Revata informed the Order, saying: “Your reverences, let the Order listen to me. If we were to settle that legal question here, it might be that the monks who had taken it up originally might open it up for a further (formal) act.² If it seems right to the Order, let the Order settle this legal question wherever this legal question arose.”

Then the monks who were elders went to Vesālī willing to investigate that legal question. Now at that time Sabbakāmin³ was the name of an elder of the Order, (the oldest) on earth;⁴ it was a hundred and twenty years since his ordination; he had shared the cell of the venerable Ānanda, and he was staying at Vesālī. Then the venerable Revata spoke thus to the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth: “I, your reverence, am going up to the dwelling-place where the venerable Sabbākamin is staying. Do you, having gone up early to the venerable Sabbākamin, ask him about these ten points.”

“Very well, honoured sir,” the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth, answered the venerable Revata in assent. Then the venerable Revata went up to that dwelling place where the venerable Sabbakāmin was staying. A lodging was made ready for the venerable Sabbakāmin in an inner room, and one for the venerable

¹ *garunissaya*. *Garu* no doubt = *guru*. On *nissaya* see [Kd 1.73](#). ² See [Bu-Pc 63](#).

³ *Psalms of the Bretheren* p.226, n. 1 suggests that the Sabbakāma of the Theragāthā is the same as the Sabbakāmin of *Vinaya Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* identifies the two. Called Sabbakāmin at *Vin-a* i.34. He took a vow to purify the teaching of some Buddha in a birth during the time of Padumuttara Buddha. ⁴ *pathavyā saṅghathero*.

Revata on the veranda of the inner room. Then the venerable Revata, thinking: “I This elder is old, but he is not lying down,” did not lie down to sleep. The venerable Sabbakāmin, thinking: “This incoming monk is tired, but he is not lying down,” did not lie down to sleep.

Then at the end of the night towards dawn, the venerable Sabbakāmin spoke thus to the venerable Revata: “Because of what abiding do you, dear,¹ abide now in the fullness thereof?”

“Because of abiding in loving-kindness, do I, honoured sir, abide now in the fullness thereof.”

“They say that you, dear, because of abiding in friendship² now abide in the fullness thereof. This abiding in friendship, beloved, this is loving-kindness.”

“Formerly, honoured sir, when I was a householder loving-kindness was practised by me, and because of that abiding in loving-kindness I now abide in the fullness thereof, and moreover perfection was attained by me long ago. Honoured sir, because of what abiding does the elder now abide in the fullness thereof?”

“Because of abiding in (the concept of) emptiness³ do I, beloved, now abide in the fullness thereof.”

“They say that the elder, honoured sir, because of the abiding of great men⁴ now abides in the fullness thereof. This abiding of great men, honoured sir, this is (the concept of) emptiness.”⁵

¹ *bhummi*, a term of affection, says Vin-a 1298. ² *kullaka*. Vin-a 1298 explains by *uttāna*, stretched; clear. *Kullaka* is probably derived from *kaulya* = Pali *kulla*, belonging to the family, and possibly meaning that loving-kindness has been extended to others and that they have been suffused with his loving-kindness of mind.

³ *suññatāvihāra*. Cf. MN iii.104, MN iii.294. MN-a v.105 explains as abiding in the attainment of the fruit of emptiness—or *phala-samāpatti* may mean “sustained fruition”; therefore “as abiding in the sustained fruition of emptiness.” On *suññatā* see especially *Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, p. 91, n. 2; Atthasālinī 221–Atthasālinī 225; Kv iii.2. At Atthasālinī 221 it is said that *suññatā* is applied to the purification formula, that it is a name of the transcendental Way, and that when one sees the *sankhāras* as “void” of self this insight is called *suññatā*. “Voidness” or “Emptiness” is the usual translation of *suññatā*, and must remain until something better is found.

⁴ *mahāpurisavihāra*. Cf. MN iii.294. MN-a v.106 explains as the abiding of great men: buddhas, individual buddhas, *tathāgatas* and great disciples. ⁵ This phrase occurs at MN iii.294.

“Formerly, beloved, when I was a householder emptiness was practised by me, and because of that abiding in emptiness I now abide in the fullness thereof, and moreover perfection was attained by me long ago.”

Then¹ this chance talk of the monks who were elders was interrupted, because the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth, arrived there. Then the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth, approached the venerable Sabbakāmin; having approached, having greeted the venerable Sabbakāmin, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth, spoke thus to the venerable Sabbakāmin:

“Honoured sir, these monks who are Vajjis of Vesālī are promulgating ten points: the practice concerning a horn for salt is allowable ... gold and silver are allowable. Honoured sir, much *dhamma*, and discipline has been mastered² by the elder at the feet³ of a preceptor. As, honoured sir, the elder was considering *dhamma* and discipline, what occurred to him? Who are the speakers of *dhamma*—the monks from the East or those of Pāvā?”

“By you too, your reverence, has much *dhamma* and discipline been mastered at the feet of a preceptor. As you, your reverence, were considering *dhamma* and discipline, what occurred to you? Who are the speakers of *dhamma*—the monks from the East or those of Pāvā?”

“As I, honoured sir, was considering *dhamma* and discipline, this occurred to me: ‘the monks from the East are speakers of what is not *dhamma*, the monks of Pāvā are speakers of *dhamma*.’ Nevertheless I am not making known my views until I am agreed upon in regard to this legal question.”

“As I too, your reverence, was considering *dhamma* and discipline, this occurred to me: the monks from the East are speakers of what is not *dhamma*, the monks of Pāvā are speakers of *dhamma*. Nevertheless I am not making known my views until I am agreed upon in

¹ *carahi*, as at Vin 2.292. ² As at Kd 21.1.2. ³ *mūle*.

regard to this legal question.”

22.2.7

Then the Order assembled, willing to investigate that legal question. But while they were investigating that legal question both endless disputations arose and of not one speech was the meaning clear. Then the venerable Revata informed the Order, saying: “Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While we were investigating this legal question both endless disputations arose and of not one speech was the meaning clear. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may settle this legal question by means of a referendum.”¹ He selected four monks from the East, four monks from Pāvā—of the Eastern monks the venerable Sabbakāmin and the venerable Sālha and the venerable Khujjasobhita² and the venerable Vāsabhagāmika; of the monks from Pāvā the venerable Revata and the venerable Sambhūta, the wearer of coarse hempen cloth, and the venerable Yasa, the son of Kākaṇḍakā, and the venerable Sumana.³ Then the venerable Revata informed the Order, saying:

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While we were investigating this legal question both endless disputations arose and of not one speech was the meaning clear. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may agree upon the four monks from the East and the four monks from Pāvā to settle this legal question by means of a referendum. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While we were investigating this legal question ... was the meaning clear. The Order is agreeing upon the four monks from the East and the four monks from Pāvā to settle this legal question by means of a referendum. If the agreement upon the four monks from the East and the four monks from Pāvā to settle this legal question by means of a referendum is pleasing to the venerable ones, they

¹ Cf. *Kd 14.14.19* where the proceeding to be used in such an emergency as arose and is recorded in subsequent sentence above, is laid down. ² Probably not to be identified with the *thera* of the same name at *Thag 234*, as perhaps suggested at *Mahāvamsa iv.57*. ³ Names given at *Vin-a i.34–Vin-a i.35*; but there classified by reason of their being cell-sharers of Ānanda or Anuruddha. Cf. *Mahāvamsa iv.47–Mahāvamsa iv.49*.

should be silent; he to whom it is not pleasing should speak. The four monks from the East and the four monks from Pāvā are agreed upon by the Order to settle this legal question by means of a referendum. It is pleasing to the Order, therefore it is silent. Thus do I understand this.”

BD 5.4

Now at that time Ajita was the name of a monk of ten years' standing; he was a reciter of the Pātimokkha for the Order. Then the Order further agreed upon the venerable Ajita as appointer of seats for the monks who were elders.¹ Then it occurred to the monks who were elders: “Now where should we settle this legal question?” Then it occurred to the monks who were elders: “This Vālika monastery² is pleasing, with little noise, with little disturbance. Suppose that we should settle this legal question in Vālika monastery?” Then the monks who were elders went to Vālika monastery, willing to investigate that legal question.

Vin 2.3

Then the venerable Revata informed the Order, saying: “Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, I can ask the venerable Sabbakāmin about discipline.” Then the venerable Sabbakāmin informed the Order, saying: “Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, I, questioned about discipline by the venerable Revata, can answer.” Then the venerable Revata spoke thus to the venerable Sabbakāmin:

Kd 22.2

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning a horn for salt allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning a horn for salt?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable to carry about salt in a horn, thinking: ‘I will enjoy whatever may be unsalted?’”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Where was it objected to?”

“In Sāvattihī, in the Suttavibhaṅga.”³

¹ Elders were allowed to sit down while the Pātimokkha was being recited. ² See also Mahāvamsa iv.50; but Dīpavamsa v.29 says the Ten Points were settled at the Gabled Hall (Vesāli). ³ Bu-Pc 38.

“What offence does one fall into?”

“An offence of expiation for eating what has been stored.”

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This first point, investigated by the Order, this is a point that is against *dhamma*, against discipline, not of the Teacher’s instruction. This is the first (voting-) ticket that I cast.

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning two finger-breadths allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning two finger-breadths?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable to eat a meal at the wrong time if the shadow has passed beyond two finger-breadths?”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Where was it objected to?”

“At Rājagaha, in the Suttavibhaṅga.”¹

“What offence does one fall into?”

“An offence of expiation for eating at the wrong time.”

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This second point ... This is the second (voting-) ticket that I cast.

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning ‘among the villages’ allowable?”

What, your reverence, is this practice concerning ‘among the villages’?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable, thinking: ‘I will go now among the villages,’ having eaten, being satisfied, to eat a meal that is not left over?”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Where was it objected to?”

“At Sāvattihī, in the Suttavibhaṅga.”²

“What offence does one fall into?”

“An offence of expiation for eating what is not left over.”

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This third point ... This is the third (voting-) ticket that I cast.

¹ Bu-Pc 37. ² Bu-Pc 35.

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning residences allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning residences?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable for several residences belonging to the same boundary to carry out various Observances?”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Where was it objected to?”

“In Rājagaha, in what is connected with the Observance.”¹

“What offence does one fall into?”

An offence of wrong-doing for going beyond discipline.”

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This fourth point ... This is the fourth (voting-) ticket that I cast.”

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning assent allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is the practice concerning assent?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable for an incomplete Order to carry out a (formal) act, thinking: ‘We will advise monks who arrive?’”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Where was it objected to?”

“In a matter of discipline on things pertaining to (the monks of) Campā.”²

“What offence does one fall into?”

“An offence of wrong-doing for going beyond discipline.”

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This fifth point ... This is the fifth (voting-) ticket that I cast.

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning what is customary allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is this practice concerning what is customary?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable, thinking: ‘This is what is habitually done by my preceptor, this is what is habitually done by my teacher,’ to conduct oneself according to that?”

“Your reverence, the practice concerning what is customary is

¹ Kd 2.8.3. *Uposathasamīyutta*; *samīyutta* here being used, as noted at *Vinaya Texts* iii.410, n. 2 for *khandhaka*, section. ² Kd 9.3.5. *Campeyyake vinayavatthusmiri*. Vin-a 1299 here explains that this matter of discipline is handed down in the *Campeyyakkhandhaka*.

sometimes allowable, sometimes not allowable.”

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This sixth point ... This is the sixth (voting-) ticket that I cast.

“Honoured sir, is the practice concerning unchurned buttermilk allowable?”

“What, your reverence, is the practice concerning unchurned buttermilk?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable having eaten, being satisfied, to drink whatever is milk that is not left over but which has passed the stage of being milk (although) it has not arrived at the stage of being curds?”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Where was it objected to?”

“At Sāvattthī, in the Suttavibhaṅga.”¹

“What offence does one fall into?”

“An offence of expiation for eating what was not left over.”

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This seventh point ... This is the seventh (voting-) ticket that I cast.

“Honoured sir, is it allowable to drink unfermented toddy?”

“What, your reverence, is this unfermented toddy?”

“Honoured sir, is it allowable to drink whatever is fermented liquor, but which has not fermented and has not arrived at the stage of being strong drink?”

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Where was it objected to?”

“At Kosambī, in the Suttavibhaṅga.”²

“What offence does one fall into?”

“An offence of expiation for drinking fermented liquor and spirits.”

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This eighth point ... This is the eighth (voting-) ticket that I cast.

“Honoured sir, is a piece of cloth to sit upon that has no border allowable?”

¹ Bu-Pc 35. ² Bu-Pc 51.

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

“Where was it objected to?”

“At Sāvattḥī, in the Suttavibhaṅga.”¹

“What offence does one fall into?”

“An offence of expiation involving cutting down.”

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This ninth point ... This is the ninth (voting-) ticket that I cast.

“Honoured sir, are gold and silver allowable?”

“Your reverence, they are not allowable.”

“Where were they objected to?”

“At Rājagaha, in the Suttavibhaṅga.”²

“What offence does one fall into?”

“An offence of expiation for accepting gold and silver.”

“Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This tenth point, investigated by the Order, this is a matter that is against *dhamma*, against discipline, not of the Teacher’s instruction. This is the tenth (voting-) ticket that I cast. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. These ten points, investigated by the Order, these are matters that are against *dhamma*, against discipline, not of the Teacher’s instruction.”

“This legal question, your reverence, is concluded, and being settled is well settled. Nevertheless you, your reverence, may also question me in the midst of the Order³ on these ten points in order to convince these monks.”⁴

So the venerable Revata also questioned the venerable Sabbakāmin in the midst of the Order on these ten points, and the venerable Sabbakāmin, being questioned, answered.

Now because⁵ seven hundred monks—not one less and not one more—were at this chanting of the discipline, this chanting of the discipline is called “that of the Seven Hundred.”⁶

Told is the Twelfth Section: that on the Seven Hundred.

¹ Bu-Pc 89. ² Bu-NP 18 ³ Not only, that is, before the special committee.

⁴ *bhikkhūnaṃ saññattiyā*; cf. Kd 14.14.26, Kd 17.4.1; also Kd 17.3.14. ⁵ Quoted at Vin-a i.34.

⁶ Cf. Kd 21.1.16, the Five Hundred. This second recital, that of the Seven Hundred, is also called the Recital of Yasatthera at AN-a ii.10 = MN-a iv.114.

IN THIS SECTION ARE TWENTY-FIVE ITEMS. THIS IS ITS KEY

Ten points, having filled, formal act, entered with a messenger,
the four, and on gold (and silver) again¹
and Kosambī, the monks of Pāvā, /
The way to Soreyya, Saṃkāsa, Kaṇṇakujja, Udumbara,
and Sahamjāti,² he called upon, he heard, “How could we?” /
Bowl (and) they went in a boat upstream,³
he was in private,⁴ they used to bring this
teacher (and) the Order and Vesālī,
loving-kindness, the Order, referendum.

Told is the Lesser Division.⁵

¹ Oldenberg’s text and Siamese and Sinhalese editions read *puna rūpañ ca*. Oldenberg suggests (Vin.2.330) *antepurañ ca* (see Kd 22.1.4), but I think it may be an abbreviation for *jātarūparajata*, the subject of Kd 22.1.4, Kd 22.1.5. ² Oldenberg’s text: *Sahamjāti ca, majjhesi, assosi*; Sinhalese edition: *Aggaḷaṃ Sahajātāṃ ca assosi*; Siamese edition: as Oldenberg’s text but reading *Sahajātīm*. Oldenberg suggests (Vin.2.330) *ajjhesi* (in place of *majjhesi*). The verb in Kd 22.1.10 is *ajjhesissati*. ³ Oldenberg’s text: *sa ujjī*. Sinhalese edition *ujjavī*. ⁴ Oldenberg’s text: *dūraho pi udā-massa / dārukaṃ, saṅgho*; Sinhalese and Siamese editions: *raho’ si upanām’ āyam garusaṅgho*. ⁵ Here ends Oldenberg’s Vol. II.