

VINAYA STUDIES:
PROBLEMS IN TRANSLATION and INTERPRETATION
RELATED TO THE *VINAYAPIṬAKAPĀḲI*

**Dissertation submitted to the Postgraduate Institute of
Pali and Buddhist studies of the University of Kelaniya
in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.**

by

DUNG DINH TRUONG

(Bhikkhu Indacanda)

Under the Supervision of

Professor Asanga Tilakaratne

Professor Kapila Abhayavamsa

Colombo

April 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to pay my utmost gratitude to the late Professor I. B. Horner whose works has inspired in me the courage to devote all of my times and energy in learning the *Pāli* language and approaching its literature. I am greatly indebted to her for the *Pāli* knowledge that I have acquired from her translation following a literal style, if I may say so, that helps me to strengthen my knowledge in recognizing simple patterns of *Pāli* sentences, and to gain my comprehensive skill towards complicated ones. My dissertation here is, in its simplest way, the questions of a student to his instructor in case of having doubt or ignorance about the ancient texts; so that my work presented here in no way or by any means should be seen as a gesture of disrespect towards her knowledge or her works.

Secondly, I would like to express my enthusiastic appreciation that I have the great honor of working under the guidance of two eminent scholars in the field of *Pāli* and Buddhist studies namely Professor Asanga Tilakaratne and Professor Kapila Abhayavamsa as my supervisors. I would like to pay my thanks and gratitude for their scholarly guidance and encouragement not only in this research but in my studies about the *Pāli* language as well.

I wish to record here my gratitude to Professor Director G. D. Sumanapala, other professors and lecturers, the administrative personnel and the library staff at the Post Graduate Institute of Pali & Buddhist Studies for their kind and helpful assistance in the course of this work.

Last but not least, I should also mention all my co-religionists, devotees, and friends who have continually encouraged and lent me spiritual and material support in order to continue my study in Sri Lanka and complete this dissertation; but their names are numerous so that not being able to be listed here.

Dung Dinh Truong
(Bhikkhu Indacanda)

THE DECLARATION OF CANDIDATE

I certify that this dissertation “Vinaya Studies: Problems in Translation and Interpretation Related to the *Vinayapiṭakapāḷi*” is my own work based on my original research and my own investigations, I have clearly indicated the footnotes wherever necessary and I do hereby assert that this was not submitted to any other university.

.....
Date

.....
Candidate’s signature

THE DECLARATION OF THE SUPERVISORS

We know that this dissertation “Vinaya Studies: Problems in Translation and Interpretation Related to the *Vinayapiṭakapāḷi*” by Ph.D. candidate Dung Dinh Truong (Bhikkhu Indacanda) is his own work and that he has successfully completed it under our supervision. We therefore recommend the submission of this dissertation for Ph.D. Degree Examination.

Professor Asanga Tilakaratne

Professor Kapila Abhayavamsa

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| CONTENTS | iv |
| ABSTRACT | v |
| ABBREVIATIONS | vi |
| I. INTRODUCTION | |
| 1. <i>Vinaya</i> and <i>Vinayapiṭaka</i> | 01 |
| 2. Other <i>Pāli</i> Texts about <i>Vinaya</i> | 03 |
| 3. Contemporary Texts about <i>Vinaya</i> - A Quick Survey | 04 |
| 4. What Problems in Translation and Interpretation Related to the <i>Vinayapiṭaka</i> ? | |
| a. Lack of ancient language competency of book writers | 06 |
| b. What information found in the <i>Vinayapiṭaka</i> ? | 07 |
| c. Wrong interpretation about the language and <i>Vinaya</i> concepts: | 09 |
| 5. Methodology | 09 |
| II. CATALOGUE | |
| 1. The Book of the Discipline Volume I: 33 items | 13 |
| 2. The Book of the Discipline Volume II: 34 items | 68 |
| 3. The Book of the Discipline Volume III: 45 items | 119 |
| 4. The Book of the Discipline Volume IV: 58 items | 184 |
| 5. The Book of the Discipline Volume V: 78 items | 263 |
| 6. The Book of the Discipline Volume VI: 25 items | 362 |
| III. CONCLUSION | 395 |
| APPENDIX: SELECTED BOOK REVIEW | 398 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 411 |
| INDEXES | |
| 1. Index of Contents | 416 |
| 2. Index of Words | 417 |

ABSTRACT

This study is mainly based on critical reading the *Vinayapiṭakapāli* and its English translations pointing out as many as possible problematic items encountered in the six-volume series “*The Book of the Discipline*” translated by I. B. Horner, finally proposing new translations or interpretations for each of them.

There are 274 single items; each one is presented in the following order:

- I. B. Horner’s translation with problematic word(s) underlined
- *Pāli* text from PTS. Editions
- Translation proposed with replaced word(s) underlined
- Discussion based on the supportive facts or logical reasoning.

In order to make the proposal of the new ones to be accepted, relevant evidence from the *Pāli* literature and materials about Buddhism including logical reasoning will be provided, so that this study discusses not only the *Pāli* language but also Buddhist knowledge especially monastic tradition as well.

Besides this work also tries to point out a general misconception about the content of the *Vinayapiṭaka* that it is just materials about the monastic discipline of Buddhist monks and nuns, ignoring the fact that rich information about historical events, psychological aspects, cultural incidents, and even medical treatments of people in India in the past of more than 2500 years that are hidden underneath the main theme of monastic rules. Such view pushes general readers away from the *Vinayapiṭaka* and consequently, comparing to the *Suttantapiṭaka* counterpart, there are not many written documents about *Vinaya* studies, not many scholars trying to dig deeper in the *Vinaya* literature, or further no efforts have been made in order to produce new English translation for the *Vinayapiṭaka* after half a century.

To sum up, I think that this study could be used as an extra handout while reading *Vinaya* texts, as a grammar notebook for *Pāli* learners, or further as a useful tool for the becoming *Vinaya* translator.

--ooOoo--

ABBREVIATIONS:

1. GENERAL AND GRAMMATICAL:

| | |
|--------|--------------------------------------|
| Cf. | : compare |
| ff. | : and following (pages) |
| Ibid. | : Previously mentioned book or books |
| pp. | : past participle |
| ppp. | : past passive participle |
| Skt. | : Sanskrit |
| Trans. | : Translation |

2. TITLES OF BOOKS, PUBLISHERS, etc.

| | |
|--------|--|
| A. | : Aṅguttarara Nikāya |
| AA. | : Aṅguttarara Nikāya-Aṭṭhakathā (Manorathapūranī) |
| BD. | : Book of the Discipline |
| Be. | : Burmese Tipiṭaka. |
| BJTS. | : Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series |
| D. | : Dīghanikāya |
| DA. | : Dīghanikāya-Aṭṭhakathā (Sumaṅgalavilāsini) |
| DṬ. | : Dīghanikāya-Ṭīkā |
| Dhs. | : Dhammasaṅgaṇī |
| KanA. | : Kaṅkhāvitaranī-Aṭṭhakathā |
| MidLD. | : Majjhima Nikāya translation, by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi |
| Miln. | : Milindapaṇhā |
| Nidd. | : Mahāniddeśa |
| NiddA. | : Niddesa-Aṭṭhakathā (Saddhammapajjotikā) |
| Pts. | : Paṭisambhidāmagga |
| PTS. | : Pali Text Society |
| Syā. | : Thai Tripiṭaka |
| TheA. | : Theragāthā-Aṭṭhakathā (Paramatthadīpanī) |
| VA | : Vinaya-Aṭṭhakathā (Samantapāsādikā) |

| | |
|-------|---|
| VbhA. | : Vibhaᅅga At□t□hakathā (Sammohavinodanī) |
| Vin. | : Vinayapiᅇaka |
| VRI. | : Vipassana Research Institute |
| Vᅇ. | : Vinaya-ᅇkā (Sāratthadīpanī) |

3. DICTIONARIES:

| | |
|-------|---|
| CPED. | : Concise Pāli-English Dictionary (A. P. Buddhadatta) |
| DOP. | : A Dictionary of Pāli (Cone) |
| DOPL. | : A Dictionary of the Pali Language (Childers) |
| DPI. | : Dictionary of Pāli Idioms (Anuruddha Thera) |
| PED. | : Pali-English Dictionary of PTS. |
| SED. | : Sanskrit English Dictionary |

4. AUTHORS' NAMES:

| | |
|------------|-------------------------------|
| A. P. Bud. | : Venerable A. P. Buddhadatta |
| Tha. | : Venerable Thanissaro |
| Vaj. | : Venerable Vajiraᅅᅇavarorasa |
| Wij. | : Wijesekera |
| Wija. | : Mohan Wijayaratna |

--ooOoo--

I. INTRODUCTION:

1. *Vinaya* and *Vinayaṭṭaka*:

Vinaya is one part of the Buddha's teachings according to evidences found in ancient scriptures. The *Pāli* text *Mahāparinibbānasutta* states that the Buddha, on the bed of leaving for *Nibbāna*, told his attendant Ānanda that he and others should have considered *Dhamma* and *Vinaya* as their teacher after the Buddha was gone: “*Yo vo Ānanda mayā Dhammo ca Vinayo ca desito paññatto, so vo mam' accayena Satthā.*”¹ Another evidence comes from the saying of Venerable Mahākassapa to the monks about the necessity of preserving the Buddha's words before they would be forgotten or altered: “*handa mayaṃ āvuso dhammañ ca vinayañ ca saṃgāyāma.*”² The incident happened about a week after the demise of the Buddha. And later in the raining retreat season of the same year, five hundred monks presided by Venerable Mahākassapa rehearsed the authentic teachings that came from the Buddha's mouth.

Whereas the term *Vinayaṭṭaka* seems to have been used later on, the word *ṭṭaka* is found in the summarizing verse of the chapter XI of *Cullavagga*, *Pañcasatikakkhandhakaṃ*, which tells the story of the first rehearsing council:

*Upāliṃ vinayaṃ pucchi, suttant' Ānandaṇḍitaṃ:
ṭṭakaṃ tīṇi saṃgītiṃ, akaṃsu jinasāvaka* (Vin. II, 293).

And I. B. Horner translates as:

*He asked Upāli about discipline, the wise Ānanda about the Suttantas:
disciples of the Conqueror chanted the three Ṭṭakas* (BD. V, 406).

¹ D. II, 154.

² Vin. II, 285.

Since then, the Buddha's Teachings have been known as the *Tipiṭaka* (Three Baskets); *Vinayapiṭaka* is one of the three. There are five books that belong to the *Vinayapiṭaka*, which are: *Suttavibhaṅga First Part*, *Suttavibhaṅga Second Part*, *Mahāvagga*, *Cullavagga*, and *Parivāra*. These books are the main document for the field of *Vinaya Studies*.

It is essential to have few words about the meaning of the word *Vinaya*:

- Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains in a verse:

*vividhavisesanayattā vinayanato c'eva kāyavācānaṃ,
vinayatthavidūhi ayaṃ vinayo vinayo ti akkhāto ti.*¹

It has the meaning as “the ones who are skilled in the purpose of training called this discipline ‘*vinaya*’ because it is the method of training bodily and verbal acts with various and distinguished efforts.”

- Similarly, I. B. Horner defines *vinaya* as “the discipline governing and regulation the outward life of the monks and nuns who had entered the Monastic Orders, the foundation of which is attributed to Gotama.”²

- John C. Holt seems to be more liberal by taking its meaning etymologically:

The term *vinaya* usually has been loosely translated as “discipline.” There really is no reason to call that translation into question as discipline, in fact, is the root concept at work in our text. However, we gain a deeper appreciation for the type of discipline characterized within the *Vinaya* if we pay attention to the literal meaning of the term. The prefix *vi* connotes “difference,” “distinction,” “apart,” “away from,” etc. When combined with the verb root \sqrt{ni} which basically means “to lead,” we end up with $vi+\sqrt{ni}$ meaning “to lead away from.” *Vinaya*, the reified noun form of the verb $vi+\sqrt{ni}$ therefore leads us to the general meaning of “that which separates,” or “that which removes.” (3)

¹ VA. I, 19.

² BD. I, Intro. vii.

- PED. gives more comprehensible explanations that covers John C. Holt's idea in the first entry. I am showing the fourth entry that is related to our concerns:

— 4. code of ethics, monastic discipline, rule, rules of morality of canon law. In this sense applied to the large collection of rules which grew up in the monastic life and habits of the bhikkhus and which form the ecclesiastical introduction to the "Dhamma," the "doctrine," or theoretical, philosophical part of the Buddhist Canon. The history & importance of the Vinaya Piṭaka will be dealt with under the title "Vinaya" in the Dictionary of Names. Only a few refs. must suffice here to give a general idea. (623)

So, the contents of the *Vinayapiṭaka* must be heavily relied on the rules, on the regulations given by the Buddha to his followers, which are the *bhikkhus* and *bhikkhunis* in the Order. There is no doubt about that. Such impression is an interesting point that I will come back again later.

2. Other Pāli Texts about Vinaya:

Besides the *Tipiṭaka* texts, in the *Pāli* literature there are also three other kinds of literature that are related to the Buddha's Teachings:

- The first one is called *Aṭṭhakathā* (Commentaries). *Aṭṭhakathā* was written down with the purpose of explaining the authentic words preserved in the *Tipiṭaka*. Ven. Buddhaghosa composed the Commentaries on the *Vinayapiṭaka* (*Vinaya-Aṭṭhakathā*) and gave it the name *Samantapāsādikā*. He also wrote the Commentary on the *Pātimokkha* namely *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*. Even though *Aṭṭhakathā* texts were composed mainly by Ven. Buddhaghosa in the 5th century AD and some by others in later time, but it is believed that the *Aṭṭhakathā* could have started from the time of the Buddha.¹

¹ Hinüber 101.

- The second is called *Tīkā* (Sub-Commentaries). The books in this category perform the function of clarifying the meaning of *Aṭṭhakathā* texts and some parts in the *Tipiṭaka* untouched by the *Aṭṭhakathā* in order to make the Buddha's teachings clear and more comprehensible. According to Hinüber, *Vajirabuddhiṭkā*, *Sāratthadīpanī*, *Samantapāsādikā-atthayojanā* are Sub-Commentaries for *Samantapāsādikā*;¹ and *Kaṅkhāvitāraṇīporāṇaṭīkā*, *Vinayatthamañjūsā*, *Kaṅkhāvitāraṇī-atthayojanā-mahāṭīkā* are Sub-Commentaries for *Kaṅkhāvitāraṇī*.²

- And the last one is Handbooks. According to Hinüber, *Parivāra*, the last book of the *Tipiṭaka*, *Peṭakopadesa* and *Nettipakaraṇa*, the last two books of *Khuddakanikāya*, are considered as Handbooks. He further explains that “the *Parivāra* tries to convey the basic knowledge necessary to handle the *Vinaya*, *Peṭ* and *Nett* are guides to the interpretation of *Suttanta* texts.”³ He also gives the names of handbooks in the field of *Vinaya* studies such as: *Vinayavinicchaya*, *Uttaravinicchaya*, *Vinayatthasārasandīpanī*, *Uttaralīnatthapakāsini*, *Khuddakasikkhā*, *Mūlasikkhā*, *Pāḷimuttakavinayavinicchayasāṅgha*, *Vinayasāṅghaporāṇaṭīkā*, *Vinayālaṅkāraṭīkā*, *Vimativinodanī*, *Sīmāvivādavinicchayakathā*, *Sīmālaṅkāra*, *Sīmālaṅkārasāṅgha*.⁴

More information about the *Pāli* textbooks listed above is mentioned in the work of Hinüber. There is no need to repeat here.

3. Contemporary Texts about *Vinaya* - A Quick Survey:

As Buddhism spread into other countries, there have been more and more works about Buddhism written by native scholars in their own mother tongues. Especially a large number

¹ Hinüber 103.

² *Ibid.* 109.

³ *Ibid.* 154.

⁴ *Ibid.* 154-160.

of books in English have been published due to the popularity of the language. Juo-Hsüeh Shih Bhikkhunī, in the General Introduction of her book *Controversies over Buddhist Nuns*, presents an overview of the progress in the field of *Vinaya* studies taking evidences from the works of others. I will show here some interesting facts from her research:

- In 1691, De la Loubère published the translation of the *Pātimokkha*, although his translation was incomplete and inaccurate.

- In Europe, the field of *Vinaya* studies started as early as 1791 but until the 1950s and 1960s it still was not flourished.

- *Vinaya* studies are still a “comparatively neglected corner of Buddhology” and *Vinaya* studies have been a minority pursuit in Buddhology.

I have no opposition to her observation but approval instead. However, an important notice should be made that by the end of 1952 the complete translation of the *Vinayapiṭaka* by I. B. Horner had been published. Such revealed information is necessary for researchers in the field of *Vinaya* studies and it has been quoted by many authors in the contemporary period.

In order to perform this research, I have been trying to read the books related to the *Vinaya* field as many as I can. But the truth is that I have had not much difficulty to carry out the task of reading them; there are very few of them. And I divide those books into three categories:

1. Translations of *Pāli* texts: For the *Vinayapiṭaka*, there are two translations: An incomplete one named *Vinaya Texts* translated by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg and a complete translation in six volumes named *The Book of the Discipline* by I. B. Horner. There are also some translations of the *Pātimokkha* for *bhikkhus* and *bhikkhunīs* by different translators whose names will be mentioned in my work in case in need.

2. Exegetic books: *The Entrance to the Vinaya*, which is an English translation for the book *Vinayamukha* written in Thai language by Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa and *The Buddhist Monastic Code I & II* by Ven. Thanissaro.

3. And general books about Buddhism that provide some basic *Vinaya* knowledge.

4. What Problems in Translation and Interpretation Related to the *Vinayapiṭaka*?

a. Lack of ancient language competency of book writers:

In order to support this statement, I present the comment of Dr. Dhirasekera mentioning about this phenomenon in his book, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: A study of its origin and development in relation to the Sutta and Vinaya Pitakas*. He states, in chapter one, that his study is undertaken “after careful consideration” and that his work would make a contribution to the elimination of some imprecise conclusions “with regard to monastic discipline and *Vinaya* literature” from the works of others (17). And he summarizes such failings into three categories:

- (i) Inadequate examination of all original source material,
- (ii) Misinterpretations resulting from ignorance of the language, i.e. Pali, and lack of familiarity with the subject,
- (iii) Misinterpretations resulting from a desire to force available evidence to fit into a preconceived pattern.” (17)

After taking a quick look on the books written on *Vinaya*, I totally agree with him. Due to the unfamiliarity with the *Pāli* Scripture, it is safe for those writers to quote the translation of others; in this case the translation of I. B. Horner, I mean the six volumes of *The Book of the Discipline*. Unfortunately, some quotes that they took are problematic and consequently their works have flaws and the responsibility is of them for not having critical choices.

b. What information found in the *Vinayapiṭaka*?

My hypothesis for the inflorescence in the *Vinaya* study is that readers often have a general impression that *Vinaya* books are law books intended for monks and nuns, not for them as lay people. While performing a survey on printed materials for the field of *Vinaya* study, I have the feeling that my hypothesis becomes strengthened more and more; in fact I have found only one article, *A Propos the Pāli Vinaya as a Historical Document: A Reply to Gregory Schopen*,¹ that might shed a light on something else hidden behind the contents of the *Vinayapiṭaka*, not merely rules and rules for monks and nuns.

Even though the theme of the *Vinayapiṭaka* is rules for the clergy, my rough estimate is that more than fifty percent content of the *Vinayapiṭaka* mentions of information about cultural, historical, medical, psychological, doctrinal, etc. perspectives. In fact, the *Vinayapiṭaka* not only presents the rules but also gives us other information about them:

- The *Suttavibhaṅga*, which is a collective title used for the two books, *Pārājikapāḷi* and *Pācittiyapāḷi*, or *Mahāvibhaṅga (Bhikkhuvibhaṅga)* and *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* in some other tradition, consists of 227 rules for monks and extra rules for nuns. Each rule has its original cause, the regulation of Buddha, its amendments if necessary, and the analysis of legal terms and appliance. The material mentioned in each rule is short or long depending on the importance of them.

- The *Mahāvagga* begins with the history of Buddhism from the enlightenment of the Buddha to the arriving of his two chief disciples (*aggasāvaka*) Sārīputta and Moggallāna. The story takes 38 pages of the PTS. Edition to lead to the acceptance the grove Veḷuvana offered by the King Bimbisāra then a regulation given by the Buddha: “*anujānāmi bhikkhave ārāman ti*” (39). That was the beginning of monastic life and activities.

¹ Journal of the Pali Text Society, XV, 197-208.

- The *Cullavagga* gives full chapter 7 mentioning about the first schism in Buddhism and chapter 10 about the establishment of the *bhikkhunī* Order with Mahāpajāpati Gotamī as the first ordained nun and five hundred Sakyan women later.

To conclude, I would like to say that from the *Vinayapiṭaka* one can draw a lot of materials for his/her interest about:

- Activities of the past through many stories about the Indian people not only inside monastic campuses but outside in the societies as well.

- Explanations of some *Pāli* terms for the benefits of linguistic.

- Or how medical care worked at the time of the Buddha. From listening to a patient, I realize that some treatments at the Sri Lankan Ayurvedic Hospital for Rheumatism and Arthritis seem similar to the methods given by the Buddha to ill monks a long time ago. There is also a stunning story about the physician Jīvaka in chapter 8 of *Mahāvagga*. At that time, Jīvaka already performed major surgeries on the abdomen or at the head. The story of Jīvaka takes 13 pages in PTS. Edition in order to show just one short rule regulating that monks from now on can receive robes made by laypeople: “*anujānāmi bhikkhave gahapaticīvaraṃ, yo icchati paṃsukūliko hotu, yo icchati gahapaticīvaraṃ sādīyatu. itarītarena p’ahaṃ bhikkhave santuṭṭhiṃ vaṇṇemīti.*”¹

- Buddhist doctrine is also found scattered in *Vinayapiṭaka*, e. g. the *Dhammacakkapavattanasutta*² and the *Anattalakkhaṇasutta*³ to the first five monks Aññaṅkaṇḍañña, Vappa, Bhaddiya, Mahānāma, and Assaji, the *Ādittapariyāyasutta*⁴ to a thousand matted hair ascetics of Uruvelakassapa, the *Mahāsamudde-aṭṭhacchariyasutta*⁵ to Venerable Ānanda etc.

¹ Vin. I, 268-280.

² *Ibid.* 10-12.

³ *Ibid.* 13-14.

⁴ *Ibid.* 34-35.

⁵ Vin. II, 237-240.

There are and more information waiting for diligent readers to grasp indirectly. For instance the Buddha gave different rules to monks and nuns even though both were based on similar grounds. Instead of seeing such phenomenon reveals the unfairness of the Buddha against women but taking it as a hint about the psychological differences between the two sexes.

c. Wrong interpretation about the language and *Vinaya* concepts:

Following my reasoning above that readers interested in Buddhism should approach the *Vinayapiṭaka*, either merely reading or further digging and reveal treasures in it. As I have mentioned above, many authors writing about *Vinaya* topic quote from the translation of I. B. Horner, and as commenting upon it the nuns Juo-Hsüeh Shih in her book, *Controversies over Buddhist Nuns*, published lately 2000, says that in the English translation for the *Vinayapiṭaka* by I. B. Horner, “mistakes are almost inevitable.”¹ My observation is not far different from hers.

So, for the benefit of my own and others, I start to pick out the items that I am not agree with her translation or interpretation one by one, thinking about them, making up a hypothesis for my solution, finding evidence to support my side, then proposing my translation in this work.

5. Methodology:

My research is a process of learning: learning the language used in the *Tipiṭaka* texts, which is so-called *Pāli*, and learning *Vinaya* concepts conveyed through the language of the Scriptures.

¹ Shih 3.

My first step for this research is to read the *Vinayapiṭakapāli* with the help from the English translation of I. B. Horner. Through this, I have picked out *Pāli* passages or terms that are awkwardly, imprecisely interpreted, or misunderstood by I. B. Horner; I call each finding is item. To perform such task, critical reading skill is required and essential.

The second step is to find new interpretation for the items detected. Depending on the nature of the items, the research become involved to further reading *Pāli* Commentaries and Sub-Commentaries of the *Vinaya*, *Vinaya* Textbooks, dictionaries, grammar books, and other materials in order have a propositional solution for each of them. In a conservative point of view also my interest about *Theravāda* Buddhism, I am going to confine my research to the *Pāli* literature only; information from others sources whether they are ancient such as Sanskrit, Chinese texts, or contemporary such as Sri Lankan, Thai, Burmese translations and general books about *Vinaya* will be used as hints or clues for my research. For the *Pāli* passages quoted in order to prove my point, I will refer to the sources if I used the translation of others mainly of I. B. Horner, otherwise I translate them myself; in some cases, they are left not translated if their meanings are not needed. For a practical purpose, I am trying to look for a reasonable solution for the problem detected; once the goal is reached I will conclude my research with my proposal of new translation or interpretation. Then in the discussion that follows, supporting evidence and logical reasoning will be presented in order to defend my stand.

The third step is to organize the research into an acceptable format and convenient for readers' consultation. In fact, the load of my work involves a couple of hundred individual items. For each single item, I am going to present firstly the translation of I. B. Horner and its *Pāli* correspondence next, then my proposed translation, finally a discussion explaining the

need of a replacement and defending it as well. When putting all items together, however a problem arises is that which way they should be listed.

One method is to arrange them according to linguistic matters such as grammatical, semantic, syntactic, i.e. all items involving grammar should be put together - grammatical, others that are related to Vinaya concepts should be separated - semantic, some others that their meanings depend on particular sentence structures can be formed a different heading - syntactic, etc. Such practice seems reasonable but not feasible due to the reason that the natures of all the problems discussed more or less have mixed characters.

For instance, the Genitive vs. Dative cases at the items § 24, 50a, 52, 78, 79a, these seem to be grammatical matters, but going into specific cases the natures of these items are more complicated. Taking the example of “*tāsaṃ itthīnaṃ vaccamaggaṃ passāvamaggaṃ ādissa*” at § 24 into consideration: I. B. Horner takes “*tāsaṃ itthīnaṃ*” as dative case and I the other. In order to defend my stand, I have to perform a research on the gerund *ādissa*, and I come to know that *ādissa* has double accusatives, so that it has no relationship with the phrase *tāsaṃ itthīnaṃ* - semantic; I also look further into other similar examples in order to confirm my choice - textual; finally some logical reasoning based on Vinaya contexts must be done before jumping to a final conclusion, which is genitive case - contextual.

Another example is the personal pronoun *me* at the items § 116a, 117a, 120a, 175a. According to grammar books, *me* could be taken as one among the four cases, accusative, instrumental, dative, or genitive. The pronoun *me* at § 116a is decided as dative by considering the meaning of the whole passage - contextual, its position in the sentence - syntactic, and by consulting the Sub-Commentary; and the one at § 117a as genitive by the meaning of the text - contextual, and its parallel structure to others - syntax, etc.

As a consequence of this kind of mixed characters, it is not easy to classify the detected items according to some general themes, so that one method that is simple but consistent,

direct, and could be the most practical one is to list them as they occur in the books. To be more specific, I am going to present them listed one by one according to their orderly page numbers occurring in the six-volume translation of I. B. Horner.

So that there are six parts, each part contains the items found in each volume of *The Book of the Discipline* from I to VI; I place these six parts under one heading named “Catalogue.”

Also at the end of my dissertation, there are two indexes named “Index of Contents” and “Index of Words” in order to help readers easily to find the information they need.

--ooOoo--

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE

VOLUME I

(*Pārājika* 01–04 & *Saṅghādisesa* 01-13 & *Aniyata* 01-02)



The Book of the Discipline Volume One is the English translation of the volume III of *The Vinaya Pitakam* edited by Hermann Oldenberg, consisting of 4 *pārājika(s)*, 13 *saṅghādisesa(s)*, and 2 *aniyata(s)*. The *Pāli* excerpts are quoted from the PTS. edition.

Each item will be presented in the order of:

- English translation by I. B. Horner
- *Pāli* quotation
- Translation proposed
- Discussion.

01. Syntactic - sentence structure, *sacchikatvā, sayam abhiññā* (BD. I, 2):
(*Verañjakaṇḍam*)

Having brought to fulfillment his own powers of realization, he makes known this world, together with devas including the Māras, and the Brahmās; creatures, together with recluses and Brahmins, together with devas and men. He teaches dhamma, lovely at the beginning, lovely at the middle and lovely at the ending. He explains with the spirit and the letter the Brahma-life completely fulfilled and wholly pure. Good indeed it were to see perfected men like that.

PĀLI TEXT:

so imaṃ lokaṃ sadevakaṃ samārakaṃ sabrahmakāṃ sassamaṇabrāhmaṇiṃ pajam
sadevamanussaṃ sayam abhiññā sacchikatvā pavedeti, so dhammaṃ deseti
ādikalyāṇaṃ majjhe kalyāṇaṃ pariyosānakalyāṇaṃ sātthaṃ savyañjanaṃ
kevalaparipuṇṇaṃ parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ pakāseti. sādhu kho pana
tathārūpaṇaṃ arahataṃ dassanaṃ hotīti. (Vin. III, 1)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Having realized by means of his own higher knowledge, he makes known this world, together with devas including the Māras, and the Brahmās; creatures, together with recluses and Brahmins, together with devas and men. He teaches dhamma, lovely at the beginning, lovely at the middle, and lovely at the ending. He explains with the spirit and the letter the Brahma-life completely fulfilled and wholly pure. Good indeed it were to see perfected men like that.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Syntactic - sentence structure:** We should simplify the first sentence by taking out all attributes in accusative cases of the noun “*lokaṃ*,” i.e. *sadevakaṃ samāraṃ ... sadevamanussaṃ*, so that it would be easier to see the structure of the sentence “*so imaṃ lokaṃ ... sayam abhiññā sacchikatvā pavedeti*.” There are two verbals in this sentence, the gerund *sacchikatvā* from *sacchikaroti* and the finite verb *pavedeti*. They share the same direct object, which is “*imaṃ lokaṃ*” and its attributes *sadevakaṃ ... sadevamanussaṃ*.” The basic meaning of the sentence is “*He realizes this world ... then makes known this world ...*”

b/ ***sacchikatvā*:** Taking the clause “Having brought to fulfillment his own powers of realization” into consideration, it is clear that I. B. Horner translates the gerund *sacchikatvā* as “having brought to fulfillment” having its direct object *abhiññā* translated as “powers of realization.” I. B. Horner must take the meaning of the verb *sacchikaroti* from somewhere not from the PED. “(Cf. Sk. *sākṣāt kṛ*) ... to see with one’s eyes, to realize, to experience for oneself;”¹ for the context here I choose the meaning of *sacchikatvā* as “having realized.”

c/ ***sayam abhiññā*:** It seems to me that I. B. Horner takes *abhiññā* (power of realization) as accusative plural. In fact, it is the truncated form of “*abhiññāya*,” which is in instrumental case as explained by Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa:

¹ PED. 668.

sayam abhiññā sacchikatvā pavedetī ti ettha pana *sayan* ti sāmam aparaneyyo hutvā, *abhiññā* ti abhiññāya adhikena ñāṇena ñatvā ti attho, *sacchikatvā* ti paccakkham katvā etena anumānādipaṭikkhepo kato hoti, *pavedetī* ti bodheti ñāpeti pakāseti.¹

This case is also noticed by Geiger in his grammar book.² Later, I found that in her translation for *Mahāvagga* I. B. Horner already made corrections conforming to the explanation of the Commentary, e.g. “by your own super-knowledge,”³ “by his own super-knowledge,”⁴ etc. The Commentary also explains that *sayam* means *sāmam*, which is contracted from *sayamaṃ* and has the meaning as “self, of one self.”⁵ It suggests that *sayam* modifies the noun *abhiññā*, so that the English equivalence for “*sayam abhiññā sacchikatvā*” should be “having realized by means of higher knowledge of his own.”

--ooOoo--

02. *anekapariyāyena, saṃgaṇikāya, apacayassa* (BD. I, 37):
(Pārājika 01)

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, having given reasoned talk on what is becoming, on what is fitting for them, addressed the monks, saying:

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho bhagavā te bhikkhū anekapariyāyena vigarahitvā dubbharatāya dupposatāya mahicchātāya asantuṭṭhitāya saṃgaṇikāya kosajjassa avaṇṇaṃ bhāsivā anekapariyāyena subharatāya suposatāya appicchassa santuṭṭhassa sallekhassa

¹ VA. I, 126.

² Geiger 19, § 27.2.

³ BD. IV, 13.

⁴ *Ibid.* 241.

⁵ PED. 704.

dhutassa pāsādikassa apacayassa viriyārambhassa vaṇṇaṃ bhāsitvā bhikkhūnaṃ
tadanucchavikaṃ tadanulomikaṃ dhammiṃ kathaṃ katvā bhikkhū āmantesi. (Vin.
III, 21)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the Lord, in many ways having rebuked these monks, having spoken in dispraise of difficulty in supporting and maintaining oneself, of great desires, of lack of contentment, of sociability, of indolence; in many ways having spoken in praise of ease in supporting and maintaining oneself, of desiring little, of contentment, of expunging (evil), of punctiliousness, of graciousness, of the absence of piling (up rebirth), of putting forth energy, having given reasoned talk on what is becoming, on what is fitting for them, addressed the monks, saying:

DISCUSSION:

a/ *anekapariyāyena*: We should take a closer look at the sentence structure. In this sentence, there are five clauses governed by four gerunds: *vigarahitvā*, (*avaṇṇaṃ*) *bhāsitvā*, (*vaṇṇaṃ*) *bhāsitvā*, *kathaṃ katvā*, and the finite verb *āmantesi*; so we should translate it accordingly. The point to be noticed here is the adverbial *anekapariyāyena*; it appears twice in this sentence. I. B. Horner interprets it as “in many a figure,” but I prefer a simpler form, “in many ways.” For the verbs it modifies, I. B. Horner lets it modify the two gerunds (*avaṇṇaṃ*) *bhāsitvā* and (*vaṇṇaṃ*) *bhāsitvā*, perhaps she prefers a parallel structure. On the other hand, I analyze the sentence according to the word orders: the first adverbial *anekapariyāyena* standing in front of the two gerunds should modify not only (*avaṇṇaṃ*) *bhāsitvā* but also *vigarahitvā*; the second one standing at the beginning of the clause and modifies the one and only gerund (*vaṇṇaṃ*) *bhāsitvā*.

b/ *saṃgaṇīkāya*: The next two issues will be related to the awkward in word choice of I. B. Horner that two distant words have close interpretation: *saṃgaṇīkāya* = of clinging (to the obstructions); *apacayassa* = of decreasing (the obstructions). Perhaps, I. B. Horner missed the

first part “*gaṇasaṅgaṇikāya ceva*” in her quotation from the Commentary *Samantapāsādikā* that mentions two kinds of *saṅgaṇikā*:

*gaṇasaṅgaṇikāya ceva kilesasaṅgaṇikāya ca saṃvattati.*¹

Considering the context of the Vinaya, we should take the interpretation that relates to the outward discipline, i.e. bodily and verbally, so I prefer the explanation *gaṇasaṅgaṇikāya* that is more concrete instead of the other *kilesasaṅgaṇikāya* as I. B. Horner did.

In fact, the meaning of *saṅgaṇikāya* can be drawn from the Buddha’s words when He taught the nun Mahāpajāpati Gotamī:

*saṃgaṇikāya saṃvattanti no pavivekāya = they lead to sociability, not to solitude.*²

Furthermore, the PED. approves my choice: “**sanganikā** (f.) [saṅ + gaṇa + ikā ...] communication, association, society ... -vihāra (saṅganika⁰) living in society A III. 104; IV. 342.”³ So, I translates *saṃgaṇikāya* as “of sociability.”

c/ apacayassa: is translated by I. B. Horner as “of decreasing (the obstructions),” For this, she gives a quotation from the Commentary, “*sabbakilesāpacayabhūtāya.*”⁴

However, I. B. Horner translates the word differently in another case found in the teachings of the Buddha to the nun Mahāpajāpati Gotamī in the same occasion that is just mentioned above:

*apacayāya saṃvattanti no ācayāya = they lead to the absence of piling (up rebirth), not to the piling up.*⁵

Dictionaries also approve her latter choice.⁶ Moreover, the Sub-Commentary of *Dīghanikāya* states clearly that *apacaya* refers to *nibbāna*: “*apacayāyāti sabbassāpi vaṭṭassa*

¹ VA. I, 222.

² Vin. II, 258; BD. V, 359.

³ PED. 666.

⁴ VA. I, 222.

⁵ Vin. II, 259; BD. V, 359.

⁶ CPED. 21; PED. 50.

apacayanāya, nibbānāyāti attho.”¹ So, I restore I. B. Horner’s transtion for *apacayassa* as “to the absence of piling (up rebirth)” in my proposed translation.

--ooOoo--

03. ārāmika (BD. I, 43):

(Pārājika 01)

... longing to be a householder, longing to be a lay-follower, longing to be a park-attendant, longing to be a novice ...

PĀLI TEXT:

... gīhibhāvaṃ patthayamāno upāsakabhāvaṃ patthayamāno ārāmikabhāvaṃ patthayamāno sāmaṇerabhāvaṃ patthayamāno ... (Vin. III, 24)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

... longing to be a householder, longing to be a lay-follower, longing to be a monastery-attendant, longing to be a novice ...

DISCUSSION:

ārāmika: is an adjective originated from the noun *ārāma* (*ā* + *√ram*). The PED. gives the meaning of *ārāma* as:

1. pleasure, fondness of (—^o), delight, always as adj. (—^o) delighting in, enjoying, finding pleasure in (usually combined with *rata*, e.g. *dhammārāma dhammārata* finding delight in the dhamma.) ... – 2. a pleasure-ground, park, garden (literally sport sporting); classified at Vin III. 49 as *pupphārāma* and *phalārāma* a park with flowers or with fruit (i. e. orchard), defined at DhA III. 246 as *Veḷuvana-Jīvaka’ ambavan’ ādayo*, i. e. the park of *Veḷuvana*, or the park belonging to *Jīvaka* or mango-groves in general. Therefore: (a) (in general) a park, resort for pastime etc. ... – (b) (in special) a private park, given to the Buddha or the Sangha for the benefit of the bhikkhus, where they meet & hold discussions about sacred & secular matters; a place of recreation and meditation, a meeting place for religious gatherings. Amongst the

¹ DṬ. II, 215.

many ārāmas given to the bhikkhus the most renowned is that of Anāthapiṇḍika (Jetavana; see ...); others more frequently mentioned are e.g. the park of Ambapāli (Vin I.233), of Mallikā (D I.178), etc. ...¹

For the entry (b), the revolutionary usage of the word *ārāma* could be originated from the Buddha's permission in case of lodging for monks. When the King Bimbisāra offered the Bamboo Grove (*Veḷuvana*) to the Order having the Buddha as the leader, the Buddha accepted the gift and later said to the monks:

anujānāmi bhikkhave ārāman ti = Monks, I allow a park.²

However, once an *ārāma* has offered to the Order and became the lodging for the monks, the interpretation for such context should not be “a park” but “a monastery.” One model of *ārāma* mentioning in the *Vinayapiṭaka* is the monastery of Anāthapiṇḍika (*anāthapiṇḍikassa ārāma*) with more constructions such as storehouses, toilets, walking paths, wells, bathrooms, pools, etc.³

So, in the context relating to the residency of monks, *ārāmika* has the meaning as: “belonging to an Ārāma, one who shares the congregation, an attendant of the Ārāma ... – f. ārāmakiṇī a female attendant or visitor of an Ārāma Vin I.208.”⁴

I choose the English translation for *ārāmika* as “monastery-attendant.” Such meaning is to apply to other cases as well. Here is an example:

I. B. HORNER'S TRANSLATION:

... he speaks, he declares: ‘What now if I were a householder ... he says, he declares: ‘What now if I were a lay-follower ... what now if I were a park-attendant ... what now if I were a novice ...’⁵

¹ PED. 108.

² Vin I, 39; BD. IV, 52.

³ Vin. II, 154.

⁴ PED. 108.

⁵ BD. I, 43-44.

PĀLI TEXT:

—pa— yaṃ nūnāhaṃ gihī assan ti vadati viññāpeti —pa— yaṃ nūnāhaṃ upāsako
assan ti —pa— yaṃ nūnāhaṃ ārāmiko assan ti —pa— yaṃ nūnāhaṃ sāmaṇero assan
ti —pa—. (Vin. III, 25)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

... he speaks, he declares: ‘What now if I were a householder ... he says, he declares:
‘What now if I were a lay-follower ... what now if I were a monastery-attendant ... what now
if I were a novice ...

--ooOoo--

04. *ariyaka & milakkhuka* (BD. I, 47):

(Pārājika 01)

If an ariyan disavows the training in the presence of a non-ariyan and he does not
recognise it, the training is not disavowed. If a non-ariyan in the presence of an ariyan ... if an
ariyan in the presence of an ariyan ... if a non-ariyan disavows the training in the presence of
a non-ariyan and he does not recognise it, the training is not disavowed.

PĀLI TEXT:

ariyakena milakkhukassa santike sikkhaṃ paccakkhāti so ca na paṭivijānāti:
apaccakkhātā hoti sikkhā. milakkhukena ariyakassa santike ... ariyakena ariyassa
santike ... milakkhukena milakkhukassa santike sikkhaṃ paccakkhāti so ca na
paṭivijānāti: apaccakkhātā hoti sikkhā. (Vin. III, 27-28)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

If he disavows the training by an ariyan language in the presence of a non-ariyan and that
person does not recognise it, the training is not disavowed. If he disavows the training by a
non-ariyan language in the presence of an ariyan ... by an ariyan language in the presence of
an ariyan ... by a non-ariyan language in the presence of a non-ariyan and that person does
not recognise it, the training is not disavowed.

And a translation in freestyle:

If he disavows the training by a native language in the presence of a foreigner and that person does not recognise it, the training is not disavowed. ... by a foreign language in the presence of a native ... by a native language in the presence of a native ... if he disavows the training by a foreign language in the presence of a foreigner and that person does not recognize it, the training is not disavowed.

DISCUSSION:

ariyaka & milakkhuka: First of all, we need to take a look at the structure of the two clauses “*ariyakena milakkhukassa santike sikkham paccakkhāti so ca na paṭivijānāti.*” There are two finite verbs: *paccakkhāti* and *paṭivijānāti*, and I don’t agree with I. B. Horner as she takes *ariyakena* in instrumental case as the agent of the former verb due to the reason that *paccakkhāti* is not a causative verb. In fact, this verb has an understood subject that is the monk who is disavowing the training, and *ariyakena* should be as an adjectival modifying an understood noun, I assume “a language” in this case.

What is the meaning of *ariyaka*? We are going to discuss *ariyaka* and *milakkhuka* at the same time. These two terms must have opposite meanings. I. B. Horner reminds us in her footnotes quoting from the Commentary: “*tattha ariyakam nāma ariyavohāro, māgadhabhāsā. Milakkhukam nāma yo koci anariyako andhadamiḷādi,*”¹ and her explanation as followed: “*ariyaka* means the proper mode of speech, the language of Magadha,” and *milakkhuka* implies “the people of Andha (*i.e.* the Telugus) and the Tamils.”²

In addition to that, the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* clarifies that *milakkhuka* is a language other than the Magadha language (*anariyakoti māgadhavohārato añño*).³ So this is a case of language barrier, in which the latter is not able to understand what the former says,

¹ VA. I, 255.

² Footnotes 2 & 3 (BD. I, 47).

³ VṬ. II, 71.

then he fails to be a witness for the disavowal. As a consequence, the former happens to still be a *bhikkhu* for whatever status he might think he is.

A minor point about English usage is that the pronoun “he” in I. B. Horner’s translation may cause confusion: Which one the word “he” stands for, the one who is disavowing or the witness? As I understand from the context, the subject of the former verb is the disavowing monk and the latter is the witness. In this case, I prefer to translate “so” as “that one” or more clearly “that person.”

--ooOoo--

05. *davāya & ravāya, asāvetukāma/sāvetukāma (BD. I, 47):*
(Pārājika 01)

If he disavows the training for a joke ... he disavows the training for fun ... if he announces what he does not wish to announce ... if he does not announce what he wishes to announce ... if he announces to those not knowing ... if he does not announce to those knowing ... or if he does not announce the whole thing, the training is not disavowed. This, monks, is the training which is not disavowed.

PĀLI TEXT:

davāya sikkhaṃ paccakkhāti ... ravāya sikkhaṃ paccakkhāti ... asāvetukāmo sāveti ... sāvetukāmo na sāveti ... aviññussa sāveti ... viññussa na sāveti ... sabbaso vā pana na sāveti: apaccakkhātā hoti sikkhā. evaṃ kho bhikkhave, apaccakkhātā hoti sikkhā.
(Vin. III, 28)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

If he disavows the training due to a slip of the tongue ... he disavows the training due to speaking by mistake ... if he announces without intention to announce ... if he having intention to announce does not announce ... if he announces to those not knowing ... if he does not announce to those knowing ... or if he does not announce the whole thing, the training is not disavowed. This, monks, is the training which is not disavowed.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *davāya & ravāya*: For the translation of “*davāya sikkhaṃ paccakkhāti ... ravāya sikkhaṃ paccakkhāti*,” if we go through dictionaries to find the meanings of *dava* and *rava*, we would have the same results or similar, joke and fun, as those translated by I. B. Horner.

However, I expect something different. We should consult Ven. Buddhaghosa’s explanations in the Commentary:

davāyā ’ti sahasā aññaṃ bhaṇitukāmo sahasā buddhaṃ paccakkhāmī ti bhaṇati, *ravāyā* ’ti ravā bhaṇṇena, aññaṃ bhaṇissāmīti aññaṃ bhaṇanto, purimena ko visesoti ce. purimaṃ paṇḍitassāpi sahasāvasena aññaṃ bhaṇanaṃ, idaṃ pana mandattā momūhattā apakataññuttā pakkhalantassa aññaṃ bhaṇissāmīti aññaṃ bhaṇanaṃ¹ = *Davāya* means by force (forcibly), intending to say different thing he forcibly says ‘*Buddhaṃ paccakkhāmi*.’ *Ravāya* means being broken due to mistake. (Thinking) ‘I will say a different thing’ he is saying different thing. If so what is different to the first? The first case is the unexpected speaking by means of quickness of a smart one, whereas this case is the unexpected speaking of a stumbling person due to his dull, ignorant, unintelligent character (even though he thinks): ‘I will say a different thing.’

Ven. Thanissaro mentions two cases that the act of disrobing does not count: (i) “If, without actually intending to disrobe, he makes any of the sattuements usually used for disrobing,” and (ii) “if he says one thing and means something else-e.g., if he makes a slip of the tongue;”² I presume the former case is *ravāya* and the latter *davāya*. So I propose the interpretation for *davāya* as “due to a slip of the tongue” and *ravāya* as “by mistake.”

b/ *asāvetukāma/sāvetukāma*: The way I. B. Horner translates *asāvetukāma* and *sāvetukāma* as two clauses “what he does not wish to announce” and “what he wishes to announce” respectively being the direct objects of the verb “announce” in affirmative and negative cases is problematic. Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta explains that the compound *sāvetukāma* is formed with an infinitive (*sāvetuṃ*) and the noun *kāma* is considered to be in

¹ VA. I, 255-256.

² Tha. I, 43.

the Dative-Tappurisa (*catutthī-tappurisa*) and treated it as an adjectival;¹ A. K. Warder says that such a “compound is used as an adjective expressing the desire to do the action of the infinitive;”² so that I translate *sāvetukāma* as “having intention to announce” and *asāvetukāma* as “without intention to announce.”

--ooOoo--

06. *itthiliṅga, taṃ yeva* (BD. I, 54):
(Pārājika 01)

Now at one time the sign of a woman appeared to a monk. They told this matter to the lord. He said: “Monks, I allow a teacher to meet with the nuns during the rains, as for the upasampadā ordination, so as in the presence of nuns to turn the nuns away from those offences which they have in common with monks; but in those offences of monks which are offences not in common with nuns, there is no offence (for the nuns).”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno itthiliṅgaṃ pātubhūtaṃ hoti. bhagavato etamatthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave taṃ yeva upajjhaṃ tam eva upasampadaṃ tāni vassāni bhikkhunīhi saṃkamituṃ, yā āpattiyo bhikkhūnaṃ bhikkhunīhi sādharmaṇā tā āpattiyo bhikkhunīnaṃ santike vuṭṭhātuṃ, yā āpattiyo bhikkhūnaṃ bhikkhunīhi asādharmaṇā tāhi āpattīhi anāpattīti. (Vin. III, 35)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at one time the female characteristic appeared to a monk. They told this matter to the lord. He said: “Monks, I allow (a) to transfer to live with nuns having the same preceptor, the same upasampadā ordination, and those years of seniority, (b) to turn away from those offences which they have in common with monks in the presence of nuns, (c) but there is no offence in those offences of monks that are not in common with nuns.

¹ A. P. Bud. part II, 49.

² Warder 231-232.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *itthilinga*: *Linga* has a specific meaning in Indian languages and literature, i.e. “mark of sex, sexual characteristic;”¹ “the sign of gender or sex, organ of generation”² The translation “the sign of a woman” of I. B. Horner is vague, so that I replace by “the female characteristic.” This is just a matter of word choice.

b/ *taṃ yeva*: At footnote # 3, I. B. Horner writes: “*Taṃ yeva upajjhaṃ taṃ eva upasampadaṃ*, explained at VA. 273 as *pubbe gahitaupajjhāyaṃ eva pubbe kataupasampadaṃ eva anujānāmi*, which seems to mean: I allow the teacher who was taken before, the *upasampadā* that was conferred before ...”³ She got the right meaning here but gave wrong and meaningless translation in the text. So I just restore her finding in my proposed translation.

This rule can be explained like this: When a monk underwent a sex transformation, he (now she) would be transferred to the *bhikkhunī* order, would still keep the same preceptor, the same *upasampadā* ordination, those years of seniority, then would follow the disciplinary codes of nuns. In case that he (now she) had committed some offences while having been being as a monk, only the offences that were applied to both Order would continue to be effective to her and she would get rid of them in the presence of nuns; others that were not shared by nuns would be nullified.

The same rules were applied in the case of a nun becoming a monk due to the sex transformation.

--ooOoo--

07. Textual discrepancy, *mocessāmi*, *upakkamivā* (BD. I, 61): (Pārājika 01)

¹ PED. 584.

² SED. 901.

³ BD. I, 54.

Come, honoured sir, (only) touch region of the breasts, thus there will be no offence for you ... Come honoured sir, (only) touch the navel ... the stomach ... the waist ... the throat ... the ear ... the coil of hair ... the spaces between the fingers ... Come, honoured sir, approaching (me only) with (your) hands, I will make you function, thus there will be no offence for you.”

PĀLI TEXT:

ehi bhante uruntarikāya ghaṭṭehi, evan te anāpatti bhavissatīti —pa— ehi bhante nābhiyā ghaṭṭehi —pa— udaravaṭṭiyā ... upakacchake ... gīvāya ... kaṇṇacchidde ... kesavaṭṭiyā ... aṅgulantarikāya —pa— ehi bhante hatthena upakkamivā mocessāmi, evan te anāpatti bhavissatīti. (Vin. III, 39)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Come, honoured sir, (only) touch the region between the thighs, thus there will be no offence for you ... Come honoured sir, (only) touch the navel ... the stomach ... the waist ... the throat ... the ear ... the coil of hair ... the spaces between the fingers ... Come, honoured sir, I will strive with (my) hand and (will) make you emit semen, thus there will be no offence for you.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Textual discrepancy:** For the compound *uruntarikāya*, there is a discrepancy among the *Pāli* texts from different sources: *uruntarikāya* (PTS.), *ūrantarikāya* (Sri Lankan), *ūruntarikāya* (Thai, Burmese) so that the meanings for it are supposed to be different.¹

I. B. Horner follows the text of the PTS. and analyses the compound “*uruntarikāya* = *ura+antarikāya*,” then approaches the translation as “region of the breasts;” literally it should be “region between the breasts.” Considering the compounds of the Sri Lankan text and the rest, whether it is *ūrantarikāya* or *ūruntarikāya* it would be analyzed as “*ūru+antarikāya*.” The meaning of “*ūru*” is “the thigh,” and come up with the meaning “region between the

¹ Be. Vol. 1, 49; BJTS. Vol. 1, 92; Syā. Vol. 1, 72.

thighs.” The reason for me to prefer the latter expression due to the reason that in *Pāli* literature, compilers while indicating spatial relations often describe things following orders: from left to right, from lower to upper parts, or vice versa. So in this case, other parts of the body, which are the navel, the stomach, the waist, the throat, the ear, the coil of hair, indicate a description moving upwards; that convinces me to take “region between the thighs” as the starting point instead of “region of the breasts” by I. B. Horner.

b/ *mocessāmi*: I. B. Horner gave an asterisk at the word “function” indicating that she avoids using “ugly” word, but later I found “emit semen” in her translation for another passage, i.e. “then emit semen using your hand;”¹ so that I restore it here for the meaning of the causative verb *mocessāmi*, literally should be “I will make you release.”

c/ *upakkamitvā*: I. B. Horner assumes that the monk is the agent of the gerund *upakkamitvā* (approach) and the hand belongs to him. On the contrary, I believe that the hand is of the woman and that she is the agent of the two actions occurring consequently expressed by the two verbals *upakkamitvā* and *mocessāmi*.² We need to take a closer look at the structure of this sentence “*ehi bhante hatthena upakkamitvā mocessāmi*.” The key point here is the meaning of the gerund *upakkamitvā*. Besides the meaning “approach” given in I. B. Horner’s translation, the verb *upakkamati* (= *upa* + \sqrt{kam} + *a* + *ti*) also has the meaning: “to strive, to undertake, to apply oneself, to exert oneself (esp. sexually), to masturbate.”³ So, in this case, the story should be understood like this: The woman told the monk that he was invited to come closer to her so that she could excite him with her hand then make him release semen. The correction should be applied to the same passage found in the following story of the female lay-follower named Saddhā.

¹ BD. I, 192.

² Warder 48; Wij. 23.

³ CPED. 57; DOP. 438; PED. 139.

I found one passage having similar vocabulary but different context: “*tadā hatthena upakkamivā asuciṃ mocehī ti* = then emit semen using your hand.”¹ In this case, I. B. Horner’s translation is fine while taking the two verbals *upakkamivā* and *mocehi* having the same agent “you.” And a literal translation should be, “then you strive with (your) hand and make (you) release semen.”

--ooOoo--

08. *vuḍḍhapabbajita* (BD. I, 62):

(Pārājika 01)

Now at that time a certain monk who had long gone forth, went to see his former wife.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro vuḍḍhapabbajito bhikkhu purānadutiyikāya dassanaṃ agamāsi. (Vin. III, 40)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time a certain monk, who was ordained in his old age, went to see his former wife.

DISCUSSION:

vuḍḍhapabbajita: The compound *vuḍḍhapabbajito* is a *kammadhāraya* having two parts *vuḍḍho+pabbajito*:² *vuḍḍha* (pp. of *vaḍḍhati*) = old and *pabbajito* (pp. of *pabbajati*) = ordained, gone forth. It should be understood like this: The monk in this story, before becoming a monk of the Order, was a layman and already had a family (house, wife, children, etc.). Later in life, he left home, went forth, and was ordained according to the Buddhist monastic tradition.

Furthermore, the mistaken interpretation is corrected by I. B. Horner in later translation:

¹ Vin III, 110; BD. I, 192.

² A.P. Bud. II, 40.

Tena kho panāvuso, samayena subhaddo nāma vuḍḍhapabbajito tassam parisāyam nisinno hoti. = Then at that time, your reverences, one named Subhadda, who had gone forth when old, was sitting in that assembly.¹

--ooOoo--

09. *dinnaṃ, harāpetha* (BD. I, 67-68):
(Pārājika 02)

Then the overseer of the wood-yard thought: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are followers of dhamma, followers of tranquility, followers of the Brahma-life, speakers of truth, virtuous, of good conduct. Now the king has faith in these. It is not right for what is said to be given not to be given.” Then the overseer of the wood-yard spoke thus to the venerable Dhaniya, the potter’s son: “You may take (some), honoured sir.”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho dāruḡahe gaṇakassa etad ahoṣi : ime kho samaṇā Sakyaputtiyā dhammacārino samacārino brahmacārino saccavādino sīlavanto kalyāṇadhammā, rājāp’ imesaṃ abhippasanno, na arahati adinnaṃ dinnan ti vattun ti. atha kho dāruḡahe gaṇako āyasmantaṃ Dhaniyaṃ kumbhakāraputtaṃ etad avoca : harāpetha bhante ’ti. (Vin. III, 43)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the overseer of the wood-yard thought: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are followers of dhamma, followers of tranquility, followers of the Brahma-life, speakers of truth, virtuous, of good conduct. The king also has faith in these. It is not right (for the king) to say ‘given’ about what is not given.” Then the overseer of the wood-yard spoke thus to the venerable Dhaniya, the potter’s son: “You make take away (some), honoured sir.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *dinnaṃ*: We have a special usage of infinitive in the sentence “*rājāp’ imesaṃ abhippasanno, na arahati adinnaṃ dinnan ti vattun ti*.” Here, *arahati* (= to be worthy of, to

¹ Vin. II, 284; BD. V, 394.

deserve, to merit) “exhibits a passive sense and consequently agrees with the nominative of the noun which in the original active form would have been expressed by the accusative.”¹ So, my understanding of the whole sentence quoted here is the words of the wood-yard mentioning about the king’s characters; whereas it seems to me that I. B. Horner broke it into two parts: the first mentions about the king and the other speaks to empty benches.

b/ *harāpetha*: is the second person, plural, imperative mood of the causative verb *harāpeti* (√*har* + *āpe* + *ti*) having the meaning as “to cause someone to carry something;” and it is difficult to find an equivalent for it in English so that perhaps I. B. Horner was forced to translate it in optative form. I just want to stress the point that it is a causative verb in imperative mood, not optative.

--ooOoo--

10. *haññati* (BD. I, 68-69):

(Pārājika 02)

The venerable Dhaniya, the potter’s son, saw the overseer of the wood-yard being brought along, bound, and said to him: “Why are you brought bound, your reverence?”

“Because of this business with the pieces of wood, honoured sir,” he said.

“Go, your reverence, for I come,” he said.

“You should come with me, honoured sir, before I am done for,” he said.

PĀLI TEXT:

addasa kho āyasmā Dhaniyo kumbhakāraputto dārugehe gaṇakaṃ baddhaṃ niyyamānaṃ, disvāna dārugehe gaṇakaṃ etad avoca : kissa tvaṃ āvuso baddho niyyasīti. tesaṃ bhante dārūnaṃ kiccā ’ti. gacchāvuso ahaṃ pi āgacchāmīti. eyyāsi bhante pur’ āhaṃ haññāmīti. (Vin. III, 43)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

¹ Wij. § 19c, 25-26.

Venerable Dhaniya, the potter's son, saw the overseer of the wood-yard being bound and brought away. Having seen (that), he said to the overseer of the wood-yard thus:

“Why are you bound and brought away, your reverence?”

“Because of the business (done) with those sticks of wood, honoured sir,” he said.

“Go, your reverence. I will come also,” he said.

“You should come, honoured sir, before I get killed,” he said.

DISCUSSION:

haññati: The sentence structure in this passage seems to be obvious to see that the overseer of the wood-yard was asking the venerable Dhaniya to go to see the king right away in order to clear out the unjust accusation fallen on him, not to go along with him.

Under the light of linguistic science, the phonological transformation in the process of making the passive form *haññati* from the root \sqrt{han} = kill is explained as below:

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| <i>han + ya + ti</i> | (adding <i>ya</i> after the root to have passive base) |
| <i>hañ + ya + ti</i> | (progressive assimilation: <i>y</i> affects the antecedent <i>n</i> into <i>ñ</i>) |
| <i>hañ + ña + ti</i> | (regressive assimilation: <i>ñ</i> in turn affects <i>y</i> into <i>ñ</i>) |
| <i>haññati</i> | (= to be killed, to get killed, etc.) ¹ |

--ooOoo--

11. *majjhimassa purisassa* (BD. I, 74):

(Pārājika 02)

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 a village not fenced in, the outward stone-throw of a man of average height standing at the precincts of a house.

PĀLI TEXT:

gāmupacāro nāma parikkhattassa gāmassa indakhīle ñhitassa majjhimassa purisassa
leḍḍupāto, aparikkhattassa gāmassa gharupacāre ñhitassa majjhimassa purisassa
leḍḍupāto. (Vin. III, 46)

¹ A.P. Bud. part II, 115-116.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The precincts of the village means: of a fenced-in village, the outward stone-throw of a man of average strength standing at the threshold; of a village not fenced in, the outward stone-throw of a man of average strength standing at the precincts of a house.

DISCUSSION:

majjhimassa purisassa: Ven. Thanissaro translates “*majjhimassa purisassa*” as “a man of average size.”¹ Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa in his book *Vinayamukha (The Entrance to the Vinaya)* just mentions “an average man” and has no further explanation.² According to Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa, the man who is throwing the stone has average strength (*thāma*) not average height, not average size:

majjhimassā ’ti thāmamajjhimassa, no pamāṇamajjhimassa, n’ eva appathāmassa na mahāthāmassa majjhimathāmassā ’ti vuttaṃ hoti.³ = *Of an average* means average strength not average height; ‘of average strength’ is explained as neither too weak nor too strong.

See also § 54, 133b.

--ooOoo--

12. *olambako, khandhaṃ oropeti* (BD. I, 81-82):

(Pārājika 02)

A burden means: a burden carried on the head, a burden carried on the back (or shoulder), a burden carried on the hip and hanging down. Intending to steal, he touches the burden on the head, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence. If he robs the back (of its burden), there is an offence involving defeat.

PĀLI TEXT:

bhāro nāma sīsabhāro khandhabhāro kaṭibhāro olambako. sīse bhāraṃ theyyacitto āmasati, āpatti dukkaṭassa; phandāpeti, āpatti thullaccayassa; khandhaṃ oropeti, āpatti pārājikassa. (Vin. III, 49)

¹ Tha. II, 193.

² Vaj. III, 44.

³ VA. II, 299.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

A *burden* means: a burden carried on the head, a burden carried on the back (or shoulder), a burden carried on the hip, and something hanging. Intending to steal, if he touches the burden on the head, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if he makes it quiver, there is a grave offence; if he takes down (the burden from the head) to the shoulder, there is an offence involving defeat.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *olambako*: Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa takes *olambako* as a separate item from the others and explains thus:

kapparato paṭṭhāya pana hetṭhā yāva hatthanakhasikhā, ayaṃ olambakaparichedo etthantare ṭhitabhāro olambako nāma.¹ = From the elbow downwards to the tops of fingernails, this is the periphery of *olambaka*, the burden stays in the middle of this area is called *olambaka*.

I reluctantly translate *olambaka* as “something hanging,” e.g. travel bag, shoulder bag.

b/ *khandhaṃ oropeti*: The meaning of “*khandhaṃ oropeti*” should be understood in the context like this: A monk is carrying a burden that belongs to another. Having the intention of stealing if he moved it down from the head to the shoulder, he would transgress the second offence involving defeat (the value of the burden is a understood factor). Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa gives more information about such case:

khandhaṃ pana anoropetvāpi sīsato kesaggamattaṃ mocentassa pārājikaṃ.² = even if he (intending to steal) moves the burden away from the head just a distance equal to the tip of one’s hair, there is an offence involving defeat.

For a more comprehensive understanding, one can check out the explanations about “moveable items” of the second *pārājika* (offence involving defeat) in the two exegetic books of Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa and Ven. Thanissaro.³

¹ VA. II, 336.

² *Ibid.* 337.

³ Vaj. I, 32-34; Tha. I, 52-54.

13. *tāvakālikam, chah' ākārehi* (BD. I, 91):
(Pārājika 02)

There is an offence involving defeat through appropriating in six ways what is not given: he does not know it is his own, he does not take a confidant, it is not for the time being, it is important, it is a requisite to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, and there is present the intention to steal. If he touches it ... involving defeat.

PĀLI TEXT:

Chah' ākārehi adinnaṃ ādiyantassa āpatti pārājikassa : na ca sakasaññī, na ca viśāsaggāhī, na ca tāvakālikam, garuko ca hoti parikkhāro pañcamāsako vā atirekapañcamāsako vā, theyyacittaṃ ca paccupaṭṭhitam hoti : āmasati . . . āpatti pārājikassa. (Vin. III, 54)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

There is an offence involving defeat for the one who has appropriated what is not given with six factors: (1) he does not take it with the idea that it is his own, (2) he does not take by means of confidence, (3) it is not (taken) for a while, (4) it is an important requisite to the value of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, (5) and there is present the intention to steal, (6) if he touches it ... there is an offence involving defeat.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *tāvakālikam*: Here, I. B. Horner translates “*na ca tāvakālikam*” as “not for the time being,” and I am not able to figure out what she means by that. But at the summary of non-offence in the next page, she gives the meaning of *tāvakālike* as “temporality”:

anāpatti sakasaññissa viśāsaggāhe tāvakālike petapariggahe tiracchānagatapariggahe paṃsukūlasaññissa ummattakassa khittacittassa vedanāṭṭassa ādikammikassā 'ti. = There is no offence if he knows it is his own, if he is taken as a confidant, if it is taken temporarily, if he is in the realm of the departed, if he is in the animal-world, if he thinks them to be rags taken from the dust-heap, if he is mad, if his mind is unhinged, if he is afflicted by pain, if he is a beginner.¹

¹ Vin. III, 55; BD. I, 92-93.

Ven Commentator has explanation about this term:

tāvakāliketi paṭidassāmi paṭikarissāmīti evaṃ gaṇhantassa tāvakālike pi gahaṇe anāpatti. gahitaṃ pana sace bhaṇḍasāmiko puggalo vā gaṇo vā tuyh' ev' etaṃ hotū 'ti anujānāti, iccetaṃ kusalaṃ. no ce anujānāti, āharāpente dātabbaṃ, saṅghasantakaṃ pana paṭidātum eva vaṭṭati.¹ = *tāvakālike* means: there is no offence to the one who, while taking temporarily, is thinking thus: 'I will return, I will make amends for it' then takes. Moreover, if the owner of the utensil whether an individual or a group allows: 'Let this be yours,' this is good; if does not allow, the things taken away should be given back. Also it is proper to return things belong to the Order.

The PED. also says:

Tāvakālika (adj.) 'as long as the time lasts,' i. e. for the time being, temporary, pro tempore Vin. II. 174; . . . , PvA. 87 (= *na sassata* [not eternal]).²

From the three pieces of evidence above, it is safe to choose the meaning of *tāvakālika* in this context as "temporary, for a while, etc." So the phrase "*na ca tāvakālikaṃ*" can be interpreted as "not temporarily, not for a while." One thing should be noticed here is that *tāvakālikaṃ* is in accusative case singular used as an adverb.³

b/ ***chah' ākārehi***: Here there is a misconception about the syntax: The question is how the six factors is enumerated? And whether the phrase "*garuko ca hoti parikkhāro pañcamāsako vā atirekapañcamāsako vā*" is one or two factors? I. B. Horner breaks it into two factors, also does the Burmese Scriptures implied by the punctuation. On the other hand, I prefer it as only one factor considering that there are only four conjunctives *ca* (= and) determining five factors and leaves the sixth for the three actions taken: *āmasati*, *phandāpeti*, *thānā cāveti*; there would be no offence committed as long as there is no action performed. I found the approval from the Sri Lankan and Thai Scriptures also from the PTS.⁴

¹ VA. II, 372.

² PED. 300.

³ Wij. 58ff.

⁴ BJTS. Vol. 1, 122; Syā. Vol. 1, 102.

--ooOoo--

14. *niruttipatho* (BD. I, 95-96):

(Pārājika 02)

At one time a certain monk having spread out his robe in the open air, entered the vihāra. A certain monk, saying: “Do not let this robe be lost,” put it aside. Having come out (of the vihāra), he asked the monks: “Your reverences, who has stolen my robe?” He said: “I have stolen it.” He seized him and said: “You are not a (true) recluse.” Thereupon he was remorseful. He told this matter to the lord. He said: “Of what were you thinking, monk?”

“I lord? It was a way of speaking,” he said.

(The lord) said: “There is no offence, monk, in the way of speaking.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu ajjhokāse cīvaram pattharivā vihāram pāvīsi. aññataro bhikkhu mā yidaṃ cīvaram nassīti paṭisāmesi. so nikkhamitvā bhikkhū pucchi: āvuso mayhaṃ cīvaram kena avahaṭan ti. so evam āha: mayā avahaṭan ti. so taṃ ādiyi asamaṇo’si tvaṃ ti. tassa kukkucam ahoṣi. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesi. kiṃcitto tvaṃ bhikkhū ’ti. niruttipatho ahaṃ bhagavā ’ti. anāpatti bhikkhu niruttipathe ’ti. (Vin. III, 57)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

At one time a certain monk spread out his robe in the open air and then entered the dwelling place. A certain second monk, thinking: “Do not let this robe be lost,” put it aside. Having come out, the first one asked the monks: “Your reverences, who has stolen my robe?” The second said: “I have stolen it.” The first one seized him and said: “You are not a recluse anymore.” Thereupon the second was remorseful. He told this matter to the Lord. The Lord said: “Of what were you thinking, monk?”

“O Lord, I am just having a way of speaking,” he said.

(The Lord) said: “There is no offence, monk, in the way of speaking.”

DISCUSSION:

In this passage I. B. Horner uses the pronoun *he* for three different persons: the two monks and the Lord; I render them into the first monk, the second, and the Lord in order to avoid confusion.

niruttipatho: This is a grammatical issue. For the sentence “*niruttipatho ahaṃ bhagavā,*” I take *niruttipatho* as a *bahubbīhi* compound¹ modifying *ahaṃ*, so that it has the meaning as: “O lord, I of whom there is a way of speaking” or “O lord, I am just having a way of speaking.” In order to understand more about the idiom “*niruttipatho,*” we need to take a look at the explanation of Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa:

itaro pana kena avahaṭan ti vutte mayā avahaṭan ti pucchāsabhāgena paṭiññaṃ adāsi. yadi hi itarena kena gahitaṃ kena apanītaṃ kena ṭhapitaṃ ti vuttaṃ abhaviṣṣa addhā ayam pi mayā gahitaṃ apanītaṃ ṭhapitaṃ ti vā vadeyya. mukhaṃ nāma bhuñjanatthāya ca kathanatthāya ca kataṃ, theyyacittaṃ pana vinā avahāro n’ atthi. tenāha bhagavā anāpatti bhikkhu niruttipatheti. vohāravacanamatte anāpattīti attho.² = Now when being said: “Being stolen by whom?” the other gave his assertion sharing similar part with the question: “Being stolen by me.” Even if he were said: “Being taken by whom, being led away by whom, being kept by whom?” Surely, this one also might answer: “Being taken by me, being led away by me, being kept by me.” The mouth is used for the purpose of eating and for the purpose of speaking, then without the intention of stealing there is no thievery. Therefore, the Buddha said: “O monk, there is no offence in the way of speaking.” Thus is the meaning of “there is no offence in the case of common speaking.”

The Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* gives further explanation about this point: “*pucchāsabhāgenāti pucchānurūpena*³ = sharing similar parts with the question” means “conforming to the question.”

--ooOoo--

¹ A.P. Bud. part II, 59 ff.; Warder, 137.

² VA. II, 374.

³ VṬ. II, 142.

15. Vegetarianism in Buddhism (BD. I, 98):

DISCUSSION:

When reading footnote #2 on this page, I was surprised of I. B. Horner's thinking about the vegetarianism in Theravāda Buddhism; she writes: "This shows that vegetarianism was not (at this time) enjoined; *cf.* below, pp. 297, 298." Again on page 139, she states more clearly about her perception of vegetarianism in Buddhism in the present time at footnote for the word "meat": "*maṃsa*; again showing that the monks were not vegetarians. *Cf.* above, p. 98." Then on page 297, also at footnote, she writes: "*Cf.* pp. 98, 99 above, where there seems to be no offence in eating meat." There is no doubt that I. B. Horner falls into the rumor that Buddhists are vegetarians. This topic has consumed a lot of energy and paperwork of many scholars. So, I did a little research just in the Vinaya Piṭaka volume III, and I am going to present here some authentic excerpts along with the translation of I. B. Horner with the hope of stating the stand that Buddha took in this matter:

a/- tena kho pana samayena sambahulā bhikkhū gijjhakūṭā pabbatā orohantā sīhavighāsaṃ ... byagghavighāsaṃ ... dīpivighāsaṃ ... taracchavighāsaṃ ... kokavighāsaṃ passitvā pacāpetvā paribhuñjimsu = At one time a company of monks, descending from the slopes of the Vulture's Peak, seeing the remains of a lion's kill ... of a tiger's kill ... of a panther's kill ... of a wolf's kill, had it cooked and ate it.¹

b/- tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu dubbhikkhe sūnagharaṃ pavisitvā pattapūraṃ maṃsaṃ theyyacitto avahari = At one time a certain monk, entering a slaughter house during a shortage of alms-food, intending to steal, stole a bowlful of meat.²

c/- tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu kulalena ukkhittaṃ maṃsapesiṃ sāmikānaṃ dassāmīti aggahesi = At one time a certain monk intending to steal a piece of flesh taken up by a hawk "before the owners see it," took hold of it.³

¹ Vin. III, 58; BD. I, 98.

² *Ibid.* 59; *Ibid.* 99.

³ *Ibid.* 63; *Ibid.* 106.

d/- tena kho pana samayena Sāvattīyaṃ Andhavana corakā gāviṃ ... sūkaraṃ hantvā maṃsaṃ khāditvā sesakaṃ paṭisāmetvā agamaṃsu. bhikkhū paṃsukūlasañño paṭiggahāpetvā paribhuñjimsu = At one time thieves in the Dark Wood at Sāvattī having killed a cow, eaten the flesh and tidied up the remains, went away. The monks, thinking that these were rags taken from the dust-heap, took them up and ate them.¹

e/- tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno bhuñjantassa maṃsaṃ kaṅṭhe vilaggaṃ hoti = At one time while a certain monk was eating, some meat stuck in his throat.²

f/- alaṃ Devadatta, yo icchati āraññaṃ hotu, yo icchati gāmate viharatu, yo icchati piṇḍapātiko hotu, yo icchati nimantaṃ sādīyatu, yo icchati paṃsukūliko hotu, yo icchati gahapaticīvaraṃ sādīyatu. aṭṭhamāse kho mayā Devadatta rukkhamaṃsānaṃ anuññātaṃ. tikoṭiparisuddhaṃ macchamaṃsaṃ aditṭhaṃ asutaṃ aparisaṅkitaṃ ti = “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 wished, 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. Fish and flesh are pure in respect of three points: if they are not seen, heard of suspected (to have been killed for him)”³

g/- Also, at the end of page 298, I. B. Horner gives a translation summarizing the explanation of Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa about those three points:

VA. 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

¹ Vin. III, 64; BD. I, 108.

² *Ibid.* 80; *Ibid.* 139.

³ *Ibid.* 171-172; *Ibid.* 298.

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.

My opinion is that eating vegetarian or non-vegetarian food should not be a relevant factor in discussing or practicing Buddhism because it is just a waste of time and energy.

--ooOoo--

16. *senāsanam, ujjhāyati khīyati vipāceti, bhaddantū* (BD. I, 110):
(Pārājika 02)

At one time monks enjoyed elsewhere the lodging and food of a vihāra belonging to a certain lay-follower. Then this lay-follower was vexed, annoyed and angry. He said:

“How can the revered sirs, enjoy elsewhere appurtenances belonging somewhere else?” They told this matter to the lord. “Monks, one should not enjoy elsewhere appurtenances belonging somewhere else. Who enjoys himself (in this way)—there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū aññatarassa upāsakassa vihāraparibhogam senāsanam aññatra paribhuñjanti. atha kho so upāsako ujjhāyati khīyati vipāceti : katham hi nāma bhaddantā aññatraparibhogam aññatra paribhuñjissantīti. bhagavato etam attham ārocesum. na bhikkhave aññatraparibhogo aññatra paribhuñjitabbo. yo paribhuñjeyya āpatti dukkaṭassā ’ti. (Vin. III, 65-66)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

At one time monks used elsewhere the bedding and carpeting that was appurtenances of a dwelling place belonging to a certain lay-follower. Then this lay-follower looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can the reverends use elsewhere appurtenances belonging somewhere else?” They told this matter to the lord. “Monks, one should not use elsewhere appurtenances belonging somewhere else. Who uses himself (in this way)—there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *senāsanam*: In the phrase “*vihāraparibhogam senāsanam*,” *vihāraparibhogam* is a *tappurisa* compound¹ having the meaning “appurtenances of a dwelling place,” not “food of a *vihāra*,” and *senāsanam* is the apposition of the compound, not co-ordination due to the lack of conjunction *ca* (= and). Few words to explain further about the term *senāsanam* seem to be necessary:

- The Pali-English Dictionary defines *senāsana* as “*senāsana* (nt.) [sayana+āsana] sleeping and sitting, bed & chair, dwelling, lodging”² and referred to the meaning found in the *Vibhaṅga Atthakathā* as “*seti ceva āsati ca etthāti senāsanam*.”³

- Robert Cæsar Childers in his dictionary gives a similar explanation and definition for *senāsanam*.⁴

- The Abhidhamma text *Vibhaṅga* gives us a list of *senāsanam*: a bed (*mañco*), a chair (*pīttham*), a mattress (*bhisi*), a pillow (*bimbohanam*), a dwelling-place (*vihāro*), a curved house (*adḍhayogo*), a long house (*pāsādo*), a watch tower (*attho*), a pavillion (*mālo*), a shelter (*lenam*), a cave (*guhā*), the foot of a tree (*rukkhamūlam*), a bush of bamboo trees (*velugumbo*), and concludes that *senāsanam* is where the bhikkhus are going to return (*yattha vā pana bhikkhū patikamanti*).⁵

- The *Dīghanikāya Atthakathā* has the list above divided into four categories:

(i) *Vihārasenāsanam*: a dwelling-place (*vihāro*), a curved house (*adḍhayogo*), a long house (*pāsādo*), a mansion (*hammiyam*), a cave (*guhā*)

(ii) *Mañcapītthasenāsanam*: a bed (*mañco*), a chair (*pīttham*), a mattress (*bhisi*), a pillow (*bimbohanam*)

¹ A. P. Bud., part II, 49-50, §50.5; A. K. Warder, 77-78.

² PED. 723.

³ VbhA. 365.

⁴ DOPL. 471.

⁵ VbhA. 251.

(iii) *Santhataśenāśanam*: a carpet (*cilimikā*), an animal skin rug (*cammakhan*), a mat made of grass (*tin*), a mat made of leaves (*pan*)

(iv) *Okāśasenāśanam*: where the bhikkhus are going to return.¹

So the meaning of *senāśanam* applied in this context should be the items in categories (ii) and (iii). Later, I. B. Horner also revised her translation seen in the BD. V for *Cullavagga*:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū aññatarassa upāsakassa vihāraparibhogam senāśanam aññatra paribhuñjanti = Now at that time monks make use elsewhere of lodgings—appurtenances of a dwelling-place—belonging to a lay follower.²

b/ *ujjhāyati khīyati vipāceti*: Here I. B. Horner translates the group of three verbs “*ujjhāyati khīyati vipāceti*” as adjectives, i.e. “vexed, annoyed and angry,” but later in other books she changed to “looked down upon, criticised, spread it about” that reflect the essence of those words as explained by Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa; so that I has no compellation to translate the *Pāli* text but just show the evidence found in the Commentary:

manussā ujjhāyantīti rañño parisatiṃ bhāsamānassa sammukhā ca parammukhā ca sutvā tattha tattha manussā ujjhāyanti avajjhāyanti, avajānantā taṃ jhāyanti olokenti, lāmakato vā cintenti attho. *khīyantīti* tassa avaṇṇam kathenti pakāśenti. *vipācentīti* vitthārikam karonti sabbattha pattharanti, ayañ ca attho saddasatthānusārena veditabbo. ayaṃ pan’ ettha yojanā alajjino ime samaṇasakyauputtīyā ti ādīni cintentā ujjhāyanti, n’ atthi imesaṃ sāmāññaṃ ti ādīni bhaṇantā khīyanti, apagatā ime sāmāññaṃ ti ādīni tattha tattha vitthārento vipācentīti, etena nayena imesaṃ padānam ito param pi tattha tattha āgatapadānurūpena yojanā veditabbā.³

And in another place, the Ven. Commentator also has some words about the verb *ujjhāyanti* confirming I. B. Horner’s latter choice:

Tatīyasikkhāpade *Dabbaṃ Mallaputtaṃ bhikkhū ujjhāyantī* ’ti “*chandāya Dabbo Mallaputto*”ti ādīni vadantā taṃ āyasmantaṃ tehi bhikkhūhi avajānāpentī avaññāya

¹ DA. I, 209.

² Vin. II, 174; BD. V, 244.

³ VA. II, 296.

olokāpentī lāmakato vā cintāpentī ’ti attho.¹ = In the rule number three, (which is the *pācittiya* 13th of the Section on Plants - *Bhūtagāma*), the phrase ‘*Dabbaṃ Mallaputtaṃ bhikkhū ujjhāyanti*’ means ‘the monks (who were followers of Mettiya and Bhummajaka) while disparaging “Dabba the Mallian assigns lodgings through favouritism,’ etc. make those monks despise, look with contempt, or think badly about that venerable.”

However, for the verb *khīyanti*, he explains differently, and such explanation is already given to the verb *vipācenti* previously:

khīyanti ’ti chandāya Dabbo Mallaputto ti ādīni vadantā pakāsentī.² = ‘*Khīyanti*’ means (those monks) while saying: ‘Dabba the Mallian assigns lodgings through favouritism,’ etc. make known publicly.

Ven. Thanissaro also has some words about *ujjhāyati* and *khīyati*: “To malign means to speak critically of a person in the presence of one or more other people so as to make them form a low opinion of him/her. To complain means simply to give vent to one’s criticisms of the person within earshot of someone else.”³

Whereas Margaret Cone gives the meaning of *ujjhāyati* as “complains (about, acc. or gen.); is indignant (at or against, acc. or gen.),” and *khīyati* as “expresses anger, complains; criticises publicly, denounces.”⁴

Evidently, the meanings given to the three *Pāli* words are different from one to another, but all show that these three terms “*ujjhāyati khīyati vipāceti*” describe mental and verbal gestures in a negative way upon someone. So that I keep the revised ones given by I. B. Horner in my proposed translation.

c/ *bhaddantā*: I. B. Horner translates *bhaddantā* as “the revered sirs” (with a comma after *sirs*); I am not sure about her usage of *sirs* in this sentence. Without a comma after it, the phrase *the revered sirs* could be equivalent to the *Pāli* term *bhaddantā*; that could make

¹ *Ibid.* 770.

² VA. II, 771.

³ Tha. I, 304.

⁴ DOP. 403, 768.

sense. But with a comma after it, I assume *sirs* as vocative plural; in such case the word *sirs* is superfluous. Anyway I take *bhaddantā* as nominative plural and render it as “reverends.”

--ooOoo--

17. Textual - misreading (BD. I, 140):

(Pārājika 03)

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were making a site for a vihāra. A certain monk being below, lifted up his head, and a stone badly held by a monk who was above, hit the monk who was below on the head, and that monk died. He was remorseful ... “There is no offence, monk, as it was unintentional,” he said.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana समयena Āḷavakā bhikkhū vihāravatthum karonti. aññataro bhikkhu heṭṭhā hutvā silam uccāresi, uparimena bhikkhunā duggahitā silā heṭṭhimassa bhikkhuno matthake avatthāsi, so bhikkhu kālam akāsi. tassa kukkucam ahoṣi —pa—. anāpatti bhikkhu asaṅciccā ’ti. (Vin. III, 80-81)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

At one time the monks of Āḷavī were making a site for a dwelling place. A certain monk being below, lifted up a stone, and the stone carelessly held by a monk who was above, hit the monk who was below on the head; and that monk died. He was remorseful ... “There is no offence, monk, as it was unintentional,” he said.

DISCUSSION:

Textual - misreading (*silam* vs. *sīsam*): There is no need to explain, the context is clear. Perhaps I. B. Horner read “*sīsam uccāresi*” then translated it accordingly.

--ooOoo--

18. *iti/ti, samāpajjim, jhānaṃ* (BD. I, 162):

(Pārājika 04)

There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, “In three ways may I enter upon the first musing”: before he has lied he knows, “I am going to lie”; while lying he knows, “I am lying”; having lied he knows; “I lied.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tīh’ ākārehi paṭhamam jhānam samāpajjin ti sampajānamusā bhaṇantassa āpatti pārājikassa: pubbev’ assa hoti musā bhaṇissan ti, bhaṇantassa hoti musā bhaṇāmīti, bhaṇitassa hoti musā mayā bhaṇitan ti. (Vin. III, 93)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

For deliberately telling the lie that “I did enter upon the first trance,” there is an offence involving defeat by three stages: before he has lied he knows, “I am going to lie”; while lying he knows, “I am lying”; having lied he knows; “I has lied.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *iti/ti*: PED. defines it as an “emphatic particle pointing out or marking off a statement either as not one’s own (reported) or as the definite contents of (one’s own or other’s) thoughts.”¹ There is no signal at the beginning of such statement or thought; the task is left to the readers and sometime very tricky; this is a one: “*tīh’ ākārehi paṭhamam jhānam samāpajjin ti.*” I. B. Horner considers that the whole of it is the words of the lying-monk as seen in her translation. On the other hand, I think that the monk in this case only said: “*paṭhamam jhānam samāpajjin*” and that “*tīh’ ākārehi*” signals the process of telling a lie undergoing three stages as explained by the Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa:

“*tīh’ ākārehīti sampajānamusāvādassa aṅgabhūtehi tīhi kāraṇehi. pubbevassa hotīti pubbabhāge yeva assa puggalassa evam hoti, musā bhaṇissanti (sic) bhaṇantassa hotīti bhaṇamānassa hoti. bhaṇitassa hotīti bhaṇite assa hoti, yaṃ vattabbaṃ tasmim vutte hotīti attho.*”² = “*by three stages*” means by three existing facts, by three events for telling a conscious lie. “*Before he has lied*” means just before the moment that

¹ PED. 119.

² VA. II, 498.

person knows thus “I am going to lie;” “*while lying*” means he is saying; “*having lied*” means he already said, that means “what should be said has been spoken out.”

Similar adjustment should be done in her translation for other instances such as *catūh’ ākārehi* (by four stages), *pañcah’ ākārehi* (by five stages), ... *sattah’ ākārehi* (by seven stages), also suitable choices should be made for other verbal forms such as simple present tense, present perfect tense for past passive participle, passive voice, etc in the followings. See also § 48b, 70a, 72a, 144a, 146b, 185c.

b/ *samāpajjīṃ*: is the first person, singular, aorist tense, indicative active of the verb *samāpajjati* (= *sam* + *ā* + √*pad* + *ya*), not optative as translated by I. B. Horner, i.e. “may I enter.”

c/ *jhānaṃ*: (Skt. *dhyāna*) is a technical term involving meditative process, it often be translated as “meditation.” The Encyclopedia of Buddhism published by the government of Sri Lanka has a long article about the term *jhānaṃ*.¹ I. B. Horner gives the English equivalent for *paṭhamaṃ jhānaṃ* as “*first musing*,” but I prefer “*first trance*,” some others keep the *Pāli* word not translated, i.e. “*first jhāna*.” This is just a matter of word choice.

--ooOoo--

19. *sāmaṇera, upajjhāya & saddhivihārika, ācāriya & antevāsika* (BD. I, 173):
(Pārājika 04)

Now at one time a certain monk spoke thus to another monk: “Your reverence, those who are pupils of our teacher are all men perfected.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu aññataraṃ bhikkhuṃ etad avoca : ye āvuso amhākaṃ upajjhāyassa saddhivihārikā sabbeva arahanto ’ti. (Vin. III, 101)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

¹ Vol. VI, 50-55.

Now at one time a certain monk spoke thus to another monk: “Your reverence, those who are pupils of our preceptor are all men perfected.”

DISCUSSION:

In order to avoid confusions, it is worth to consider the translation for these five terms: *sāmaṇera*, *upajjhāya*, *ācāriya*, *saddhivihārika*, *antevāsika*.

a/ ***sāmaṇera***: I. B. Horner gives the English counterpart as “novice.” From the *Vinayapiṭaka*, we know that *sāmaṇera* is the general term to call the one who goes forth (*pabbājeti*) at the age of less than twenty years old, but older than fifteen.¹ Later, due to a report of Ven. Ānanda about two orphanages younger than fifteen, the Buddha allowed a boy who is younger than fifteen years old to go forth (*anujānāmi bhikkhave ūnapannarasavassam dāraḥ kākūḍḍepakaḥ pabbājetun ti*),² but the boy should be able to hold in his left hand, sit down, and drive away crows coming before enjoying his meal delivered to him (***kākūḍḍepakan ti yo vāmahatthena leḍḍuṃ gahetvā nisinno sakkoti āgatāgate kāke uḍḍāpetvā purato nikkhattaṃ bhattaṃ bhujjituṃ, ayaṃ kākūḍḍepako nāma, taṃ pabbājetuṃ vaṭṭati***).³

b/ ***upajjhāya & saddhivihārika***: In fact, while going forth to become either *sāmaṇera* (novice) or *bhikkhu* (monk) in Buddhism, one must have an *upajjhāya* (preceptor) by requesting three times: “*upajjhāyo me bhante hohi*” = “Venerable sir, please be my preceptor” to a monk who is senior at least ten years and fulfills some other requirements. Once the preceptor agrees, he will take the responsibility as that of a father to his pupil, who is called *saddhivihārika* literally means “the one who lives together in the same dwelling place.” And the pupil should behave as a son and fulfill the task towards his preceptor.⁴ At

¹ Vin. I, 78-79.

² *Ibid.* 79.

³ VA. V, 1003.

⁴ Vin. I, 45.

the *upasampadā* ceremony (higher ordination), the preceptor is also specified in front of the *bhikkhusaṅgha*, which is the Order of monk, attending the ceremony as witnesses.¹

c/ *ācāriya & antevāsika*: Whereas *ācāriya* (teacher) is the monk who replaces the *upajjhāya* (preceptor) in case of the latter's going away, leaving the monkhood, passing away, or converting to another sects. Then if any of such situations happens to his preceptor, a monk who is not fulfilled his basic studies and still in the dependent period is required to have an *ācāriya* (teacher) by requesting there times: “*ācariyo me bhante hohi, āyasmato nissāya vacchāmi* = Venerable sir, please be my teacher. I will live depending on you.”² The *ācāriya* (teacher) also must fulfill some requirements as those of an *upajjhāya* (preceptor) and takes similar responsibility towards his *antevāsika* (student).

To sum up, I think we should keep the English equivalent for *sāmaṇera* as novice. And for the purpose of differentiating *upajjhāya* and *saddhivihārika*, *ācāriya* and *antevāsika*, I propose the translation of those terms as preceptor and pupil, teacher and student respectively.

--ooOoo--

20. *antevāsika* (BD. I, 174):

(Pārājika 04)

“Your reverence, those who are the novices of our teacher are all of great psychic potency, of great majesty.”

PĀLI TEXT:

ye āvuso amhākaṃ upajjhāyassa antevāsikā sabbeva mahiddhikā mahānubhāvā 'ti.
(Vin. III, 101)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

¹ *Ibid.* 56, 93.

² Vin. I, 60.

“Your reverence, those who are the students of our preceptor are all of great psychic potency, of great majesty.”

DISCUSSION:

antevāsika: See the discussion of the previous item. In this case, I presume that the senior monk here was also the teacher (*ācāriya*) of some other student monks (*antevāsika*) beside his own pupils (*saddhivihārika*).

--ooOoo--

21. Instrumental of agent - with *sakkā* (BD. I, 177):

(Pārājika 04)

Now at one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him:

“We hope, your reverence, that you are getting better, we hope that you are able to support life?”

“Your reverence, it is not possible to give in because of this and that.” He was remorseful ... He told this matter to the lord...

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu gilāno hoti. taṃ bhikkhū etad avocum :
kacc’ āvuso khamanīyaṃ, kacci yāpanīyan ti. nāvuso sakkā yena vā tena vā
adhivēsetun ti. tassa kukkucçaṃ ahosi —la—. Bhagavato etamatthaṃ ārocesi... (Vin.
III, 103)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at one time a certain monk was ill. The monks said to him:

“We hope, your reverence, that you are getting better, we hope that you are able to support life?”

“Your reverence, it is not possible to tolerate by any one.” He was remorseful ... He told this matter to the lord...

DISCUSSION:

Instrumental of agent - with *sakkā*: This is an example of the usage of instrumental of agent, in which “the *agent* of the infinitive in - *tum* which exhibits a passive sense when employed with *sakkā*, *sukaram* etc.”¹ So in the item above, the agent of the infinitive *adhivāsetum* will be in the instrumental case, that is to say “*yena vā tena vā*” having the meaning “by this or that, by some or other, by whoever, by any one.”² The meaning of the sentence would be lucid if we switch the translation into active voice: “no one is able to bear (it).”

The next two items will be explained similarly.

--ooOoo--

22. Instrumental of agent - with *sakkā* (BD. I, 178):
(Pārājika 04)

Now at one time a certain monk was ill...

“Your reverence, it is not possible to give in because of the common people.”

He was remorseful...

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro ...

nāvuso sakkā puthujjanena adhvāsetun ti. tassa kukkucam ahosi —la—. (Vin. III, 103)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at one time a certain monk was ill. . .

“Your reverence, it is not possible to tolerate by ordinary people.”

[Or “Your reverence, ordinary people are not able to bear (it)”].

He was remorseful. . .

¹ Wij. 113, §88 b.

² PED. 544.

--ooOoo--

23. Instrumental of agent - with *sakkā* (BD. I, 200-201):

(Saṅghādisesa 02)

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, with daughters-in-law 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

na hi sakkā kulitthīhi kuladhītāhi kulakumārīhi kulasuṇhāhi kuladāsīhi ārāmaṃ vā vihāraṃ vā gantuṃ. sace kulitthiyo kuladhītāyo kulakumāriyo kulasuṇhāyo kuladāsiyo ārāmaṃ vā vihāraṃ vā gaccheyyūṃ tāpi samaṇā Sakyaputtiyā dūseyyunti. (Vin. III, 120)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Women of respectable families, daughters of respectable families, girls of respectable families, daughters-in-law of respectable families, women-slaves of respectable families cannot go to the monastery or to the dwelling place. If women 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 ill-treat them.

DISCUSSION:

Instrumental of agent - with *sakkā*: As mentioned above, the agent of the infinitive *gantuṃ* should be “women of respectable families, daughters of respectable families, girls of

respectable families, daughters-in-law of respectable families, women-slaves of respectable families” in instrumental cases. This is a very good example to illuminate the usage of *sakkā*.

--ooOoo--

24. Genitive vs. Dative (BD. I, 214):

(Saṅghādisesa 03)

Then the venerable Udāyin, showing these women his dwelling and pointing out the privies to them, spoke in praise, spoke in blame and begged and implored and asked and questioned and described and exhorted and abused.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho āyasmā Udāyi tā itthiyo vihāraṃ pekkhāpetvā tāsāṃ itthīnaṃ vaccamaggaṃ passāvamaggaṃ ādissa vaṇṇaṃ pi bhaṇati avaṇṇaṃ pi bhaṇati yācati pi āyācati pi pucchati pi paṭipucchati pi ācikkhati pi anusāsati pi akkosati pi. (Vin. III, 127)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the venerable Udāyin, showing those women his dwelling and pointing out the anus and urinary organ of those women, spoke in praise, spoke in blame and begged and implored and asked and questioned and described and exhorted and abused.

DISCUSSION:

Genitive vs. Dative: The issue here is to decide *tāsāṃ itthīnaṃ* is in dative case as suggested in the translation of I. B. Horner, or alternatively in genitive case. In order to solve the problem, I have made an observation on how the gerund *ādissa* works in other passages:

- the gerund *ādissa* has double accusatives:

“... *bhikkhu ca naṃ itthiyā vaccamaggaṃ passāvamaggaṃ ādissa vaṇṇaṃ pi bhaṇati ...*”¹ = ... the monk, having pointed out the anus and urinary organ of the woman to her, speaks in praise ...”

¹ Vin. III, 129.

Here *ādissa* has two objects in accusative case, which are *naṃ* (her, the woman) and “*vaccamaggaṃ passāvamaggaṃ*” (the anus and urinary organ), and leaves out *itthiyā* (of the woman) which must be in genitive case. The two following examples in this explanatory section confirm the genitive case of *itthiyā*: “... *bhikkhu ca naṃ dvinnaṃ itthīnaṃ vaccamaggaṃ ...*,” “... *bhikkhu ca naṃ ubhinnaṃ itthīnaṃ vaccamaggaṃ ...*”¹

- evidence from the genitive case of the personal pronoun “*te*” (of you, your) in a similar position as that of *tāsaṃ itthīnaṃ*:

tena kho pana samayena aññatarā itthī navarattaṃ kambalaṃ pārutā hoti. aññataro bhikkhu sāratto taṃ itthiṃ etadavoca: lohitaṃ kho te bhaginīti. sā na paṭivijāni, ām’ ayya navaratto kambalo ’ti = At one time a certain woman was wearing a newly dyed blanked. A certain monk, being infatuated, said to this woman: “Sister, is that red thing yours?” She did not understand and said: “Yes, master, it is a newly dyed blanked.”²

Considering the structure of these two examples, I argue that in the passage above if Ven. Udāyi was pointing out the privies to those women as interpreted by I. B. Horner, then the text should be *tā itthiyo* (or *tā itthī*, *tāyo itthiyo*, *tāyo itthī*) in accusative case instead of *tāsaṃ itthīnaṃ* (due to the reason that *ādissa* has double accusatives); the only choice left here is to take *tāsaṃ itthīnaṃ* as genitive case of *vaccamaggaṃ passāvamaggaṃ*. Such choice can also be inferred from the genitive case of the personal pronoun “*te*” in the second excerpt. Ven. Thanissaro’s writing also strengthens my choice: “He makes remarks referring to her genitals, anus...” or “Making lustful reference to a woman about her genitals, anus...”³ See also § 50a, 52, 78, 79a.

--ooOoo--

25. Textual discrepancy, *kismiṃ viya, yācāpeyya* (BD. I, 229):

¹ *Ibid.*

² Vin. III, 130; BD. I, 219.

³ Tha. I, 111, 114.

(Saṅghādisesa 05)

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. But if, honoured sir, the master would beg, we might give this girl to that youth.”

PĀLI TEXT:

te evaṃ vadanti : ete kho bhante amhe na jānanti ke vā ime kassa vā ’ti, kismiṃ viya kumārikāya vatthum. sace bhante ayyo yācāpeyya dajjeyyāma mayam imaṃ kumārikaṃ tassa kumārakassā ’ti. (Vin. III, 135)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

They said thus: “Indeed, honoured sir, they do not know us, nor who we are, nor to whom we belong. It looks like a shame for us to speak for the girl! But if, honoured sir, the master would have them propose (marriage), we might give this girl to that youth.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Textual discrepancy:** There is an alternative spelling *vattum* as given in other sources¹ instead of *vatthum* as in the PTS. publication (and also in Thai Scriptures²). I. B. Horner renders her translation faithfully to the PTS. edition, but also gives an alternative translation in footnote replacing *vatthum* by *vattum*: “we should be ashamed to speak thus for the girl(‘s sake)” I prefer her latter choice, i.e. *vattum*.

b/ ***kismiṃ viya*:** Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa has explanation about this idiom:

kismiṃ viyā ti kicchaṃ viya kilesa viya hiri viya amhākaṃ hotīti adhippāyo. kumārikāya vatthun ti imaṃ tumhe gaṇhathā ’ti kumārikāya kāraṇā vatthum.³ = *Kismiṃ viya* means “For us it seems to be a difficulty, it seems to be a defilement, it looks like a shame!” *Kumārikāya vatt(h)um* means to say due to the reason of the daughter: “You take this (girl)”

¹ Be. Vol. 1, 197; BJTS. Vol. 1, 338.

² Syā. Vol. 1, 295.

³ VA. III, 552.

The new dictionary of the PTS. also has this phrase with similar interpretation: “— **kismiṃ viya + inf.** [*cf* S. kim-, “*what sort of ..., a bad ...*”], *it is shameful (to)*; Vin III 135, ...”¹ So I tentatively come up with the translation above similar to that of I. B. Horner presented in the footnote.

b/ **yācāpeyya**: is the form of the third person singular, optative mood, of the causative verb *yācāpeti* = √*yāc* + *āpe* + *ti* having the meaning as “to cause someone to beg/ask for something.” The context here is that the venerable Udāyi, as a middleman, went to the girl’s family on the behalf of the boy’s family, and the girl’s parents answered to him that they wanted him to tell the boy’s family to propose marriage, not himself to do it; so the translation “beg” is not suitable here. I keep the causative sense in my proposed translation.

--ooOoo--

26. **gantabbaṃ (BD. I, 234):**

(Saṅghādisesa 05)

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

sā evam āha : ahaṃ khv ayyo tumhe na jānāmi ke vā ime kassa vā ’ti, ahañ c’ amhi bahubhaṇḍā bahuparikkhārā bahinagarañ ca gantabbaṃ, nāhaṃ gamissāmīti. (Vin. III, 138)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

She said thus: “Indeed, masters, I do not know you, nor who you are, nor to whom you belong; and I am the one who has many goods and many belongings. Even if being invited to go outside the city, I will not go.”

¹ DOP. 601.

DISCUSSION:

gantabbaṃ: It seems to me that I. B. Horner translates “I am well-to-do” for *bahuparikkhārā* and “I will not go outside the city” for “*bahinagarañ ca gantabbaṃ, nāhaṃ gamissāmi.*” If so, she drops the future passive participle *gantabbaṃ* not translated. Anyway, the syntax here is not tricky and the meaning is clear: The concubine does not want to go outside the city to entertain those men due to the reason that she has many goods and belongings. My translation is not much different from that of I. B. Horner but a little more literal one, I think.

--ooOoo--

27. *kira, dhanakkītā, vīmaṃsati* (BD. I, 238-239):
(Saṅghādisesa 05)

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

puriso bhikkhuṃ paṇiṇati : gaccha bhante itthannāmaṃ māturakkhitaṃ brūhi hohi kira itthannāmassa bhariyā dhanakkītā ’ti, paṭiggaṇhati vīmaṃsati paccāharati, āpatti saṅghādisesassa. (Vin. III, 140)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

A man sends a monk saying: “Go, honoured sir, and tell to such a one protected by the mother: ‘It is said that you may become a wife bought with money to such a one.’” If he accepts, conveys (the message), and brings back (the reply), it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **kira**: The monk involved in this *saṅghādisesa* offence is performing the task of a matchmaker between the two parties: man and woman, not excluding the case that they are his relatives and even parents.

Here, after receiving the message from the man, he conveys it to the woman saying: “*hohi kira itthannāmassa bhariyā dhanakkītā*.” Here, *kira* is an indeclinable meaning: “people says,” “I have heard,”¹ or “hear-say,” “they say,” “it is said” in other dictionaries. In order to translate *kira*, the speaker should not be specified: As in this offence, if we translate “he says” for “*kira*” in another place we will arrived at “her mother says,” “her father says,” “her mother and father says,” etc.; so I translate as “it is said” then we can keep a uniform for it throughout the text.

b/ **dhanakkītā**: is one of ten kinds of wives mentioned in the *Vinayapāli* and translated by I. B. Horner as “one bought with money.”² Commentary explains that a woman becomes a *dhanakkītā bhariyā* after being bought with a small or big sum of money (*dhanakkītādīsu appena vā bahunā vā dhanena kītā dhanakkītā*).³ Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa gives the meaning of *dhanakkītā bhariyā* as “a wife who is purchased with money.”⁴

Here, I. B. Horner takes *itthannāmassa* as genitive case and placed it in the middle of the term *dhanakkītā* then comes up with the translation as “the wife of such a one bought for money.” On the other hand, I prefer to interpret *itthannāmassa* as dative case and keep my translation in a literal fashion, i.e. “a wife bought with money to such a one.”

c/ **vīmaṃsati**: No matter which side the monk as a match-maker represents, if three factors were fulfilled: he agreed to convey the message, said it to the second party, then brought back the reply, he would have transgressed a *saṅghādisesa* offence, which is an

¹ PED. 215.

² Vin. III, 139; BD. I, 237.

³ VA. III, 555.

⁴ Vaj. I, 60.

offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains these three factors thus:

“*paṭiggaṇhātīti* so bhikkhu tassa purisassa *gaccha bhante itthannāmaṃ māturakkhitaṃ brūhi, hohi kira itthannāmassa bhariyā dhanakkītā* ti evaṃ vuttavacanaṃ sādhu upāsakā ’ti vā hotū ’ti vā ārocessāmīti vā yena kenaci ākārena vacābhedaṃ katvā vā sīsakampanādīhi vā sampaṭicchati. *vīmaṃsatīti* evaṃ paṭiggaṇhitvā tassā itthiyā santikaṃ gantvā taṃ sāsanaṃ āroceti. *paccāharatīti* tena ārocite sā itthī sādhu ’ti sampaṭicchatu vā paṭikkhipatu vā lajjāya vā tuṇhī hotu puna āgantvā tassa purisassa taṃ pavattiṃ āroceti¹ = *paṭiggaṇhātīti* means: To the spoken words of that man “Go, honoured sir, to such a one protected by the mother, and explain: ‘It is said that you may become the wife bought with money to such a one,’” that monk agrees (saying) ‘That’s good, O devotee’ or ‘Be it’ or ‘I will speak (for you)’ by any way either speaking words or shaking the head, etc. *vīmaṃsati* means: Having accepted thus, the monk goes to the presence of that woman and tells her his message. *paccāharati* means: Being told by the monk, that women would agree (saying): ‘That’s good’ or refuse or be silent due to embarrassment, the monk comes back and tells the man the incident.

According to the Commentary, we should not take the meanings given by dictionaries, i.e. “to consider, examine, find out, investigate, test, trace, think over,”² but another one for this context. Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa gives the meaning of *vīmaṃsati* as “to convey,”³ whereas Ven. Thanissaro still keeps its original meaning as “to inquire.”⁴ I prefer Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa’s choice. One reminder for the one who learns this offence is that lacking one or two factors, the monk would fall into *thullaccaya* (grave offence) or *dukkata* (offence of wrong-doing) respectively.

--ooOoo--

28. Syntactic - punctuation, *ādikammika* (BD. I, 243): (Saṅghādisesa 05)

¹ VA. III, 556.

² PED. 644.

³ Vaj. I, 61.

⁴ Tha. I, 118.

There is no offence if it is for the Order, or for a shrine, or if he is ill, if he is going on business, if he is mad, if he is a beginner.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti saṅghassa vā cetiyassa vā gilānassa vā karaṇīyena gacchati, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā 'ti. (Vin. III.143)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

There is no offence if he is going due to a business for the Order or for a shrine or for a sick, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Syntactic - punctuation:** One should be paid attention to punctuation while looking for the meaning of *Pāli* passages. In this case, I. B. Horner seemed to ignore the punctuation made by the PTS. editor or not to check the explanation in the Commentary. Here, we should understand that there are three kinds of monks who are not transgressing the *saṅghādisesa* of being a match-maker: the first is the one who is performing some task relating to the monk community, concerning to a pagoda under construction, or he is looking for medicines in order to relieve a sick person (*saṅghassa vā cetiyassa vā gilānassa vā karaṇīyena gacchati*). *Karaṇīyena* is a future passive participle meaning “something that needs to be done or made”¹ and governs three nouns in genitive case: *saṅghassa*, *cetiyassa*, *gilānassa* connected by the conjunction *vā*. The other two are the monk who is mad (*ummattaka*) and the one who first transgressed the code (*ādikammika*).²

b/ **ādikammika:** Here I. B. Horner translates it as “beginner,” whereas in other BD. books she uses the phrase “first wrong-doer.” I think the latter is more appropriate so that I restore it my proposed translation. One thing to keep in mind that *ādikammika* was not guilty in any

¹ A. P. Bud. part I, 88.

² VA. III, 559-560.

transgression that he ignited, for example Sudinna in the first *pārājika*, Dhaniya in the second, etc.

--ooOoo--

29. *saṃyācīkāya* (BD. I, 246):

(Saṅghādisesa 06)

At that time the monks of Ālavī, begging in company, were having huts built with no benefactor, for their own advantage, and not according to measure; but these were not finished.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena ālavakā bhikkhū saṃyācīkāyo kuṭīyo kārāpentī assāmīkāyo attuddesīkāyo appamāṇīkāyo, tāyo na niṭṭhānaṃ gacchantī. (Vin. III, 144)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

At that time the monks of Ālavī, begging by themselves, were having huts built with no benefactor, for their own advantage, and not according to measure; but these were not finished.

DISCUSSION:

saṃyācīkāya: In this paragraph, we need to pay attention to the compound *saṃyācīkāyo*, also to the rest three *assāmīkāyo attuddesīkāyo appamāṇīkāyo*. Their appearances suggest that they are *bahubbīhi* compounds modifying the feminine noun *kuṭīyo* in accusative case, feminine, plural. We also have the explanation of *saṃyācīkāya* as *sayam yācitvā* in the *Vinaya* text itself,¹ and also from the Commentary:

saññācīkāyo ti sayam yācitvā gahitūpakaraṇāyo.² = *saññācīkāyo* means after begging by themselves, (they have) the building materials taken.

¹ Vin. III, 149.

² VA. III, 561.

One should notice that *saññācīkāyo* is just an alternative form of *saṃyācīkāyo* due to phonological reason.¹ So from the two *Pāli* sources, we have *saṃ* in *saṃyācīkāyo* is *sayam* having the meaning “self, by himself.”

However, while looking at the entry of *saṃyācīkā* in the PED., I found something interesting that should be noticed:

Sañyācīkā (f.) [collective abstract from *saṃ* + *yāc*] begging, what is begged; only in instrumental °āya (adv.) by begging together, by collecting voluntary offerings Vin III, 144 (so read for °āyo), 149 (explained incorrectly as “*sayam yācitvā*”); Jātaka II, 282 (so read for °āyo)²

It is clearly that PED. backs up the translation “begging together” of I. B. Horner and points out a change of spelling *saṃyācīkāyo* in the two scriptures instead of *saṃyācīkāya*. In order to deal with the contradiction, we should take one more evidence into consideration from the *mātikā*, which is the rule summary for recitation:

saññācīkāya pana bhikkhunā kuṭiṃ kārāyamānena assāmikaṃ attuddesaṃ pamāṇikā kāretabbā.³ = Again a monk while having a hut made, begging by himself, without benefactor, intended for him, should restrict to the measure allowed.

At this point, I am convinced by the PED. that we should take *saṃyācīkāya/saññācīkāya* as an adverb with the ending *-āya*, but reject its interpretation of *saṃ* as “together.” The reason is very simple because this rule is applied to an individual monk, he does not need other monks to beg with him, he can do it by himself alone; and the change from the ending “*āya*” into “*āyo*” may be due to phonological reasons.

One more support for my choice is that in the translation for the *Parivāra*, I. B. Horner suggests amending her translation for *saññācīkā* based on the evidence she found in

¹ See *haññati* at § 10.

² PED. 656.

³ Vin. III, 149.

*Kaṅkhāvitāraṇī-Aṭṭhakathā*¹ explaining *saññācīkā* as *sayam yācanā . . . attano yācanā*.² Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa translates *saññācīkā* as “by his own asking,” Ven. Thanissaro as “from his own begging,” and K. R. Norman as “by his own begging.”³ See also § 252, 254.

--ooOoo--

30. *diṭṭhi* (BD. I, 293):

(Saṅghādisesa 09)

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, 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, nor a ceremony performed by a chapter of monks.”

PĀLI TEXT:

bhikkhu saṅghādisesaṃ ajjhāpajjanto diṭṭho hoti, saṅghādisese saṅghādisesadiṭṭhi hoti. tañce pārājikena codeti : assamaṇo ’si, asakyaputtiyo ’si, n ’atthi tayā saddhim uposatho vā pavāraṇā vā saṅghakammaṃ vā ’ti. (Vin. III, 170)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

A monk is seen committing an offence that entails a formal meeting of the Order; there is a view as to an offence that entails a formal meeting of the Order in the offence that entails a formal meeting of the Order. If one (another monk) reprimands him for a matter involving defeat, saying: “You are not a (true) recluse, you are not a (true) son of the Sakyans; there is no (holding) the observance-day (ceremony), nor the ceremony at the termination of the rains, nor a ceremony performed by a chapter of monks with you.”

DISCUSSION:

¹ KanA. 40.

² Footnote 6 (BD. V, 10).

³ Vaj. I, 63; Tha. I, 120; Norman 15.

diṭṭhi: The context here is that the second monk was trying to accuse the first one of violating an offence involving defeat (*pārājika*) based on the pretext of something else (*yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhum duṭṭho doso appatīto aññabhāgiyassa adhikaraṇassa kiñcidesaṃ lesamattaṃ upādāya pārājikena dhammena anuddhamseyya*),¹ and the pretext in this case is that the former had violated an offence, which was believed an offence that entails a formal meeting of the Order (*saṅghādisesa*).

Now taking the first sentence into account: “*bhikkhu saṅghādisesaṃ ajjhāpajjanto diṭṭho hoti saṅghādisese saṅghādisesadiṭṭhi hoti*,” we see that it has two independent clauses with two finite verbs *hoti* in present tense indicative mood presenting the facts that, firstly the monk violated a *saṅghādisesa* offence and secondly others thought that he had violated a *saṅghādisesa* offence. So it is better to translate the phrase “*saṅghādisesadiṭṭhi hoti*” as “there is a view” more than “there is a wrong view” even though both “view” and “wrong view” are acceptable translations for *diṭṭhi*.

There are also two minor points should be concerned that the ambiguous English usage “he reprimands him” should be avoided. And the personal pronoun *tayā* (with you) should be seen as related to all three nouns connected by the conjunction *vā*, not only *uposatho* as suggested by I. B. Horner’s translation (*n ’atthi tayā saddhiṃ uposatho vā pavāraṇā vā saṅghakammaṃ vā*).

--ooOoo--

31. *ñatti & kammavācā* (BD. I, 302):
(*Saṅghādisesa* 10)

According to the motion there is an offence of wrong-doing; according to the two resolutions there are grave offences; 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

¹ Vin. III, 168.

meeting of the Order, the offence of wrong-doing according to the motion and the grave offences according to the two resolutions, subside.

PĀLI TEXT:

ñattiyā dukkaṭaṃ, dvīhi kammavācāhi thullaccayā, kammavācāpariyosāne āpatti saṃghādisesassa. saṃghādisesaṃ ajjhāpajantassa ñattiyā dukkaṭaṃ dvīhi kammavācāhi thullaccayā paṭippassambhanti. (Vin. III, 174)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

There is an offence of wrong-doing by the motion; there are grave offences by the two resolutions; there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order at the end of the (third) resolution. For the one who has reached the offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order, the offence of wrong-doing by the motion and the grave offences by the two resolutions are nullified.

DISCUSSION:

ñatti & kammavācā: It seems to me that I. B. Horner was not able to figure out the ritual performed by the monks although she found the explanation from the Commentary as shown in her note (i.e. footnote number two): “VA. 609. *He to whom these three offences do not seem good, should speak*” for the clause “*yassa nakkhamati so bhāseyya.*” Let’s take a look at the whole explanation from the Commentary:

tattha ñattiyā dukkaṭaṃ dvīhi kammavācāhi thullaccayā. paṭippassambhantīti yañ ca ñattipariyosāne dukkaṭaṃ āpanno ye ca dvīhi kammavācāhi thullaccaye tā tisso pi āpattiyo yassa nakkhamati so bhāseyyā ’ti evaṃ yyakāraṃ pattamattāya tatiyakammavācāya paṭippassambhanti saṃghādisese yeva tiṭṭhati.¹ = In this case, “the offence of wrong-doing by the motion and the grave offences by the two resolutions are nullified” means the offence of wrong-doing that he commits at the end of the motion and the grave offences by the two resolutions; those three offences are nullified as soon as the sound “*yya*” in “*yassa nakkhamati so bhāseyya*” of the third

¹ VA. III, 609.

resolution is made, he stands right in the offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order.

To make it clear, we need to define the terminology. Let's take the whole admonition message in a religious act of the Order (*saṅghakamma*) for this case:

suṇātu me bhante saṅho. ayaṃ itthannāmo bhikkhu samaggassa saṅghassa bhedāya parakkamati. so taṃ vatthum na paṭinissajjati. yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṃ, saṅho itthannāmaṃ bhikkhum samanubhāseyya tassa vatthussa paṭinissaggāya. esā ñatti. (A)

suṇātu me bhante saṅho. ayaṃ itthannāmo ... na paṭinissajjati. saṅho itthannāmaṃ bhikkhum samanubhāsati tassa vatthussa paṭinissaggāya. yassāyasmato khamati itthannāmassa bhikkhuno samanubhāsanaṃ tassa vatthussa paṭinissaggāya so tuṅh' assa, yassa nakkhamati so bhāseyya. (B)

dutiyampi etamatthaṃ vadāmi —pa— (C)

tatiyampi etamatthaṃ vadāmi ... yassa nakkhamati, so bhāseyya. (D)

samanubhaṭṭho saṅghena itthannāmo bhikkhu tassa vatthussa paṭinissaggāya. khamati saṅghassa ... dhārayāmīti.

Here is the explanation for the divisions of the *Pāli* passage:

- (A) is at the end of the *ñatti*, which is translated by I. B. Horner as motion.
- Each part ends with (B), (C), (D) is called *kammavācā*, which is translated as resolution.
- The last sentence in the passage above is the conclusion of the act of the Order and does not relate to our discussion here.

So the *Pāli* passage should be interpreted this way: “For the admonished monk, by (A) there is an offence of wrong-doing, by (B) there is a grave offence, by (C) there is another grave offence, and at the end of (D) there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order. When the offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order is effective, the offence of wrong-doing and the two grave offences are nullified.”

--ooOoo--

32. Syntactic - parallel structure (BD. I, 319):

(Saṅghādisesa 13)

“... Lord, those men who formerly had faith and were virtuous now have no faith and are not virtuous. 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 in Kiṭāgiri may be settled.”

PĀLI TEXT:

ye pi te bhante manussā pubbe saddhā ahesuṃ pasannā te pi etarahi assaddhā appasannā, yāni pi tāni saṃghassa pubbe dānapathāni tāni pi etarahi upacchinnāni, riñcanti pesalā bhikkhū nivasanti pāpabhikkhū. sādhu bhante bhagavā Kiṭāgirim bhikkhū paṇeyya yathāyaṃ Kiṭāgirimim āvāso saṅghaheyyā ’ti. (Vin. III, 181)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“... Lord, those men who formerly had faith and were virtuous now have no faith and are not virtuous. Those who formerly were channels for gifts to the Order are now cut off. The well-behaved monks leave, and the 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.”

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - parallel structure: Let’s take the sentence “*riñcanti pesalā bhikkhū nivasanti pāpabhikkhū*” into account. We have two verbs *riñcanti* and *nivasanti* and there two subjects “*pesalā bhikkhū*” and “*pāpabhikkhū*” respectively. One thing should be noticed is the parallel construction of the sentence.

I. B. Horner seems to ignore such fact then translated *pesalā bhikkhū* as the direct object of the verb *riñcanti*. If that were the case, *pāpabhikkhū* would have similar function to the verb *nivasanti*; but it is not possible due to the reason that *nivasanti* (= *ni* + $\sqrt{\text{vas}}$, to live, to dwell, to inhabit, to stay) is an intransitive verb and does not need direct object(s). So,

pāpabhikkhū must be the subject of *nivasanti* then *pesalā bhikkhū* should be the subject of *riñcanti* accordingly.

Moreover, Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains:

*riñcantīti visuṃ honti nānā honti pakkamantīti vuttaṃ hoti.*¹ = *riñcanti* means “they, being an individual or being in groups, go away,” thus it is said.

So that the appropriate conclusion is that the well-behaved monks is the subject of the verb *riñcanti* (= leave, forsake, abandon), not “they” (people) as given by I. B. Horner.

--ooOoo--

33. *paṭicchannaṃ* (BD. I, 332):

(Aniyata 01)

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

paṭicchannaṃ nāma āsanaṃ kuḍḍena vā kavāṭena vā kilañjēna vā sāṇipākārena vā rukkhena vā thambhena vā kotthalīyā vā yena kenaci paṭicchannaṃ hoti. (Vin. III, 188-189)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

A *concealed seat* means: it is concealed by anything whatever: either by a wall 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.

DISCUSSION:

paṭicchannaṃ: In this passage there is only one verbal *paṭicchannaṃ*, which is the past passive participle of the verb *paṭicchādeti* (*paṭi* + \sqrt{chad} + *e* + *ti*, to cover over, to conceal).² It has a series of nouns in instrumental case separated by conjunction “*vā*.” One should be noticed that the last “*vā*” goes with *kotthalīyā*, not *yena kenaci*.

¹ VA. III, 623.

² CPED. 156.

Norman's translation for "*paṭicchannaṃ āsanaṃ*" as "a screened seat" sounds also good.¹

--ooOoo--

¹ Norman 25.

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE

VOLUME II

(Nissaggiya Pācittiya 01–30 & Pācittiya 01-60)



34. *adhiṭṭheti, vikappeti, vissajjeti, acchinditvā* (BD. II, 10):

(Nissaggiya 01)

There is no offence if, within ten days, 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti anto dasāhaṃ adhiṭṭheti vikappeti vissajjeti nassati vinassati dayhati acchinditvā gaṇhanti vissāsaṃ gaṇhanti, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā 'ti. (Vin. III, 197)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

There is no offence if, within ten days, it is determined, placed under dual ownership, given away, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear off then take it away, if they take it on trust; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *adhiṭṭheti, vikappeti, vissajjeti*: We have just a matter of word choices in translating these verbs: *adhiṭṭheti, vikappeti, vissajjeti, acchindati*. For the first three words, I choose the interpretations given by Ven. Thanissaro, “to determine, to place under dual ownership, to give away” respectively, thinking that the new ones make more sense.

b/ *acchinditvā*: I. B. Horner’s translation of the phrase “*acchinditvā gaṇhanti*” as “if they tear it from him” may cause two confusions: Firstly it does not express two actions occurring

in sequence (*acchinditvā gaṇhanti*), and secondly the robe sounds being torn by the action but in fact it was not. From the PED., we find that “**Acchindati** [ā + chindati, lit. to break for oneself] to remove forcibly, to take away, rob, plunder.”¹ It seems to me that the verb *acchindati* (ā + √chid + ṅ + ti) although comes from the root √chid = *tear, cut*, only its figurative meanings remain as given by the PED., CPED., and DOPL. I have found the meaning “to tear off” given by Cone that seems to be the best due to the reason that it keeps the root “tear, cut” but expresses the removing action by force.² See also § 98, 99, 166.

--ooOoo--

35. Futur passive participle (BD. II, 21):

(Nissaggiya 02)

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. A foot of a tree comes to be for various families; it must not be removed from the reach of the hand.

PĀLI TEXT:

ekakulassa rukkhamaḷaṃ hoti: yaṃ majjhantike kāle samantā chāyā pharati anto chāyāya cīvaraṃ nikkhipitvā anto chāyāya vatthabbaṃ. nānākulassa rukkhamaḷaṃ hoti : hatthapāsā na vijahitabbaṃ. (Vin. III, 202)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

In case that the foot of a tree belongs to one family, if one puts down the robe inside entire the area shaded by the tree at the time of mid-day, one should stay within that area. In case that the foot of a tree belongs to many families; the robe should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

DISCUSSION:

Future passive participle: I have just rephrase I. B. Horner’s translation with some other vocabularies slightly different in meanings. The main issue needs to be emphasized here is

¹ PED. 09.

² DOP. 29.

the use of the auxiliary “must” to interpret the Buddha’s words expressed by future passive participle; generally we should understand that He used to give advices instead of commands in such case.

--ooOoo--

36. *paccuddharati* (BD. II, 22-23):

(Nissaggiya 02)

If he thinks that it is taken away when it is not taken away, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

PĀLI TEXT:

appaccuddhate paccuddhaṭasaññī aññatra bhikkhusammutiyā, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ. (Vin. III, 202)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

If he thinks that it is rescinded (its determination) when it is not rescinded, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

DISCUSSION:

paccuddharati: The issue here is the meaning of the verb *paccuddharati*, having *paccuddhata* as its past passive participle. I. B. Horner seemed to have troubles specifying the meaning. At footnote 3, she writes that “*Meaning doubtful*” and goes on with a long discussion but was not able to catch the meaning.¹ Dictionaries are not helpful in this case; there is no such entry in the dictionary of Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta, whereas Childers’ and the PED. give inapplicable meanings.

In fact, *paccuddharati* has the reverse meaning of *adhiṭṭhāti* (*adhi* + *ṭhā* + *ti*) = “to stand firmly, to determine” in the context relating to the requisites of Buddhist monks. The explanation of Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa about the process of determining robes from the Commentary may clear out the point:

¹ BD. II, 22.

tattha yasmā dve cīvarassa adhiṭṭhānā kāyena vā adhiṭṭheti vācāya vā adhiṭṭhetīti vuttam, tasmā purāṇasaṅghāṭim paccuddharāmīti paccuddharitvā navam saṅghāṭim hatthena gahetvā imam saṅghāṭim adhiṭṭhāmīti cittena ābhogaṃ katvā kāyavikāram karontena kāyena adhiṭṭhātabbam, idam kāyena adhiṭṭhānam, tam yena kenaci sarīrāvayavena aphasantassa na vaṭṭati, vācāya adhiṭṭhāne pana vacībhedaṃ katvā vācāya adhiṭṭhātabbā . tatra duvidham adhiṭṭhānam, sace hatthapāse hoti imam saṅghāṭim adhiṭṭhāmīti vācā bhinditabbā, atha antogabbhe vā uparipāsāde vā sāmantavihāre vā hoti ṭhapitaṭṭhānam sallakkhetvā etam saṅghāṭim adhiṭṭhāmīti vācā bhinditabbā, esa nayo uttarāsaṅge antaravāsake ca nāmamattam eva hi viseso, tasmā sabbāni saṅghā ṭim uttarāsaṅgaṃ antaravāsakan ti evam attano nāmen'eva adhiṭṭhātabbāni¹ = In that case, because it is said that “*there are two ways to determine a robe: determine by the body or determine by word,*” therefore determining an outer-robe by the body means: After rescinding the old outer-robe (by thinking or saying): “*I rescind (paccuddharāmi) this outer-robe,*” the monk should hold the new outer-robe by hand, thinking in mind that “*I determine (adhiṭṭhāmi) this outer-robe*” and performing the changing (of the robe) on the body; this is the determination by the body. This process does not count if the monk is not touching the outer-robe by any part of his body. Moreover, when determining by word, the monk should say the formula out loud then the outer-robe will be determined by word. In such case, the determination can be performed in two ways: a/- If the outer-robe is within the reach of the hand, then he should say out loud the words: “*I determine this (imam) outer-robe.*” b/- In case the monk knows that the outer-robe is placed inside the room or above the palace or in the perimeter of the monastery, he should say out loud the words: “*I determine that (etam) outer-robe.*” This method is also applied to the case of upper-robe and inner-robe, but the name (of the robes) should be different. Therefore, thus all “*outer-robe, upper-robe, inner-robe*” should be determined by the name of their own.

Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* also says: “*paccuddharāmīti ṭhapemi, pariccajāmīti vā attho.*”² According to it, *paccudharati* has the meaning as *ṭhapeti* (*ṭhā + ṭhāpe + ti*, causative of *ṭṭhati*, = to set aside), or *pariccajati* (*pari + vacaj + ti*, = to give up, to abandon, to leave

¹ VA. III, 643.

² VT. II.342.

behind). So *paccudharati* denotes the act of giving up an old robe before determining (*adhiṭṭhāti*) a new one then wearing it. The Buddha taught that nine kinds of robe-cloths should be determined, i.e. three robes (*ticīvara*) that are outer-robe (*saṅghāṭi*), upper-rober (*uttarāsaṅga*), and inner-robe (*antaravāsaka*), rains-bathing cloth (*vassikasāṭika*), sitting cloth (*nisīdana*), sleeping cloth (*paccattharana*), skin-eruption cloth: (*kaṇḍuppaṭicchādi*), handkerchief (*mukhapuñchanacoḷa*), other cloth requisites (*parikkhāracoḷa*):

Anujānāmi, bhikkhave, ticīvaraṃ adhiṭṭhātuṃ na vikappetuṃ; vassikasāṭikaṃ vassānaṃ cātumāsaṃ adhiṭṭhātuṃ, tato paraṃ vikappetuṃ; nisīdanaṃ adhiṭṭhātuṃ na vikappetuṃ; paccattharaṇaṃ adhiṭṭhātuṃ na vikappetuṃ; kaṇḍuppaṭicchādiṃ yāva-ābādā adhiṭṭhātuṃ tato paraṃ vikappetuṃ; mukhapuñchanacoḷaṃ adhiṭṭhātuṃ na vikappetuṃ; parikkhāracoḷaṃ adhiṭṭhātuṃ na vikappetunti.¹

The practice of determination (and of rescission if replacing the old one by a new one) is also related to the bowl (*patta*) for alms.²

Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa translates the verb *paccudharati* as “to give up (the robe)” and Ven. Thanissaro as “to rescind (its determination);”³ I use the meaning given by the latter.

--ooOoo--

37. *paccuddharati, vissajjeti, acchinditvā* (BD. II, 23):
(Nissaggiya 02)

There is no offence if before sunrise it 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti anto aruṇe paccuddharati vissajjeti nassati vinassati ḍayhati acchinditvā gaṇhanti vissāsaṃ gaṇhanti, bhikkhusammutiyā, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ’ti.
(Vin. III, 202)

¹ Vin. I, 297.

² See *nissaggiya pācittiya* rule 21 (Vin. III, 242 ff.).

³ Vaj. I, 90; Tha. I. 232.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

There is no offence if before sunrise he rescinded (the robe), given away, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear off then take it away, 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.

DISCUSSION:

paccuddharati, vissajjeti, acchinditvā: The proposed definitions of *paccuddharati* = to rescind, *vissajjeti* = to give away, *acchinditvā ganhanti* = they tear off (remove it by force) then take it away, are already discussed previously; see § 34a, 34b, 36.

--ooOoo--

38. *bhattavissaggaṃ* (BD. II, 30):

(Nissaggiya 04)

Now at that time 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena āyasmato Udāyissa purāṇadutiyikā bhikkhunīsu pabbajitā hoti, sā āyasmato Udāyissa santike abhikkhaṇaṃ āgacchati, āyasmāpi Udāyi tassā bhikkhuniyā santike abhikkhaṇaṃ gacchati. tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Udāyi tassā bhikkhuniyā santike bhattavissaggaṃ karoti. (Vin. III, 205)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time 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 have his meal in the presence of this nun.

DISCUSSION:

bhattavissaggaṃ: When I read the sentence “the venerable Udāyin used to participate in a meal with this nun,” I think of a picture of one monk and one nun having a meal together;

such activity must not have been existed. The key word of the issue is the meaning of the phrase “*bhattavissaggaṃ karoti.*” The Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* explains:

catutthe bhattavissagganti pālīpadassa bhattakiccanti attho veditabbo,
‘bhattasaṃvidhānan’¹ ti pi keci.¹ = In the fourth *nissaggiya pācittiya* rule, the meaning of the *Pāli* word ‘*bhattavissaggaṃ*’ should be understood as ‘the duty while eating.’ Others also say ‘the arrangement for a meal.’

So, I propose a description for this scene is that Ven. Udayin would have his meal in a place where the nun as his former wife is hanging around, so that both of them have the chance to see each other.

--ooOoo--

39. *dinnaṃyeva* (BD. II, 37):

(Nissaggiya 05)

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,” and having spoken thus, he departed.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho so coragāmaṇiko maṃse pakke varamaṃsāni gahetvā paṇṇapuṭaṃ bandhitvā
Uppalavaṇṇāya bhikkhuniyā avidūre rukkhe ālaggetvā yo passati samaṇo vā
brāhmaṇo vā dinnaṃyeva haratū ’ti vatvā pakkāmi. (Vin. III, 208)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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: “This is already given, any recluse or brahmin sees it, let him take it,” and departed.

DISCUSSION:

dinnaṃyeva: (*dinnaṃ-y-eva*) Here, the past passive participle *dinnam* should be taken as a verbal noun in accusative case governed by the 3rd person imperative verb *haratu*. The use

¹ VṬ. 2, 352.

of *eva* is just to emphasize that the meats are ownerless, and the letter *y* is just an insertion due to *sandhi* rule.

One more thing should be noticed is that I. B. Horner translated the gerund *vatvā* two times, “said” and “having spoken,” that seems redundant.

--ooOoo--

40. *nissatṭhaṃ, katabhaṇḍaṃ* (BD. II, 92-93):
(Nissaggiya 16)

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 that; if he conveys something stolen that he has got back; if he conveys something destroyed that he has got back; if he makes another convey goods tied up in a bundle; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti tiyojanaṃ harati, ūnakatiyojanaṃ harati, tiyojanaṃ harati pi paccāharati pi, tiyojanaṃ vāsādhippāyo gantvā tato paraṃ harati, acchinnaṃ paṭilabhitvā harati, nissatṭhaṃ paṭilabhitvā harati, aññaṃ harāpeti katabhaṇḍaṃ, ummattakassa, ādikammikassāti. (Vin. III, 234)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 that; if he conveys something stolen that he has got back; if he conveys something given up that he has got back (after having confessed the *nissaggiya pācittiya* offence); if he makes another one convey it; if it is an end-product (goods made of sheep’s wool); if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *nissatṭhaṃ*: Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains:

nissatṭham paṭilabhitvā ti vinayakammakatam paṭilabhitvā ti attho.”¹ = *nissatṭham paṭilabhitvā* means “having received back the thing that had been undergone through the process of *Vinaya*.”

The clue from his explanation reminds us of the verb *nissajati* and its derivatives, the past passive participle *nissatṭha* and future passive participle *nissaggiya*, which is used in the name of the offence *nissaggiya pācittiya*. So, in this case the guilty monk handed over the sheep’s wool that he had carried more than three *yojanas* (# 48 km) to either an individual monk, a group of two or three monks, or an Order with more than four monks, and confessed his *nissaggiya pācittiya* offence (which is the sixteenth). After that, he was given back the sheep’s wool that he had just given up; such thing is called *nissatṭham*. I think this is an example of a past passive participle used as a noun. Then again he was able to carry it another distance of less than three *yojanas* without worrying of breaking the *nissaggiya* rule.

b/ ***katabhaṇḍam***: There is a problem of punctuation in the *Vinaya* texts published by the PTS. in the non-offence part that “*aññaṃ harāpeti katabhaṇḍam*” should be broken into two clauses “*aññaṃ harāpeti*” (= if he makes another one convey it) and “*katabhaṇḍam*,” which is also a troublemaker and it is worth a discussion. In footnote 1, I. B. Horner writes: “*katabhaṇḍa*; cf. below, p. 98. VA. 689 says “goods tied up (*kataṃ bhaṇḍam*) in a blanket, fleecy cover, sheet and so on, anything even if it is tied up only with a thread.”² Her interpretation of the Commentary contradicts to the origin story, in which the monk tied those sheep’s wools into a bundle with his outer robe then went on the road (*atha kho so bhikkhu tāni eḷakalomāni uttarāsaṅgena bhaṇḍikaṃ bandhitvā agamāsi*),³ but his act was complained and criticized by people and consequently the rule was regulated by the Buddha. I am going to translate the Commentary differently:

¹ VA. III, 688-689.

² BD. II, 93.

³ Vin III, 233.

katabhaṇḍaṃ ti kataṃ bhaṇḍaṃ kambalakojavasanthatādi yaṃ kiñci antamaso suttakena baddhamattam pi. = *Katabhaṇḍaṃ* (end-product) is produced merchandise such as a blanket, fleecy cover, carpet of any kind even if it is just bound with a thread.

Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains further:

yo pana tanukapattatthavikantare vā āyoga-aṃsabaddhakakāyabandhanādīnaṃ antaresu vā pipphalikādīnaṃ malarakkhaṇatthaṃ sipāṭiyam vā antamaso vātābādhiko kaṇṇacchidde pi lomāni pakkipitvā gacchati, āpatti yeva. suttakena pana bandhitvā pakkhittam katabhaṇḍatthāne tiṭṭhati, veṇiṃ katvā harati idaṃ nidhānamukhaṃ nāma, āpatti yevā ti.¹ = Moreover, the one who puts a little sheep's wool inside the bag for carrying the bowl, or uses as stuff inside the shoulder trap and waistband, etc., or as the sheath to protect scissors, etc. from rusting, even the one who is having illness caused by the wind puts wool in the ears and goes (over three *yojanas*) also violates the offence. Again, the sheep's wool being bound with a thread stands as an end-product, if he plaits it and carry along (over three *yojanas*), he also violates the offence.

Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa writes “[w]oven goats-wool cloth is not included here,”² and Ven. Thanissaro in the summary mentions of “[c]arrying wool that has not been made into cloth or yarn;” both follow the Commentary and seems to avoid translate the word. Anyway, my interpretation for this term as “end-product” is strengthened in the next item.

--ooOoo--

41. *katabhaṇḍaṃ* (BD. II, 97-98):

(Nissaggiya 17)

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 bundle; if it is (washed) by a female probationer, by a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ VA. III, 689.

² Vaj. I, 104; Tha. I, 214.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti ñātikāya dhāvantiyā aññātikā dutiyā hoti, avuttā dhovati, aparibhuttaṃ katabhaṇḍaṃ dhovāpeti, sikkhamānāya, sāmaṇeriyā, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ’ti. (Vin. III, 236)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 end-product; if it is (washed) by a female probationer, by a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

katabhaṇḍaṃ: I reject I. B. Horner’ interpretation as “goods tied up in a bundle” by questioning whether the nun can wash something tied up in a bundle. Finally, I have the support from the new dictionary of the PTS., “~bhaṇḍa, *n.*, *something manufactured (eg cloth or worked metal); something not in its natural state*” with quotations from this item and the one above.¹ So, my choice as “end-product” or “produced merchandise” should work.

--ooOoo--

42. *upanikkhittaṃ, vā* (BD. II, 103):

(Nissaggiya 18)

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

upanikkhittaṃ vā sādiyeyyā ’ti, idaṃ ayyassa hotū ’ti upanikkhittaṃ vā sādiyati, nissaggiyaṃ hoti saṃghamajjhe nissajjitabbaṃ. (Vin. III, 238)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

¹ DOP. 650.

Or ‘should consent to its being deposited’ means: Or if (the donor) says: ‘Let this be for the master,’ he consents to its being deposited; it is to be forfeited, it should be forfeited in the midst of the Order.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **upanikkhattam** (*vā sādīyati*): is the ppp. of the verb *upanikkhipati* (*upa + ni + √khip + ati*) having its literal meaning as “to put down (*ni*) near (*upa*);” it is used as a noun representing for some kind of money, gold, or silver. Ven. Thanissaro has a good description about this:

He (the donor), saying, ‘This is for the master,’ places it, and the bhikkhu consents.”

According to the K/Commentary, *placing* covers two sorts of situations:

(1) The donor places money anywhere in the bhikkhu’s presence, and says, “This is for the master;” OR

(2) The donor tells him, “I have some money placed in such-and-such a location. It’s yours.” (One of the implications of this second case is that any monastery with a donation box should make clear that money left in the box is being placed with the steward).¹

The expression “*upanikkhattam vā sādīyati*” is translated by Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa as “[to] be glad at the money kept for him,”² and by Ven. Thanissaro as “[to] consent to its being deposited (near him).”³ I use Ven Thanissaro’s translation for my proposed one.

b/ **vā**: is a conjunction. I. B. Horner takes it (the second *vā* in the *Pāli* text quoted) as a separator of the clause “*upanikkhattam vā sādīyati*” to the previous one “*idaṃ ayyassa hotū ’ti*.” On the other hand, I think it separates the whole excerpt to the previous parts; so that I place its English equivalent “or” at the beginning of the translation (of the explanation also of the heading).

¹ Tha. I, 217.

² Vaj. 105.

³ Tha. I. 214.

The Sri Lankan and Burmese *Pāli* Scriptures drops this “*vā*” (the second in the *Pāli* text quoted) perhaps to avoid confusion.¹

--ooOoo--

43. *pi* (BD. II, 107):

(Nissaggiya 19)

Various means: shaped 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. *(Partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped* means: both of these.

PĀLI TEXT:

nānappakāraṃ nāma kataṃ pi akataṃ pi katākataṃ pi. kataṃ nāma sīsūpaṃ gīvūpaṃ hatthūpaṃ pādūpaṃ kaṭūpaṃ. akataṃ nāma ghanakataṃ vuccati. katākataṃ nāma tadubhayaṃ. (Vin. III, 239)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Various kinds means: shaped, 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. *(Partly) shaped (partly) unshaped* means: both of these.

DISCUSSION:

pi: This is just a matter of punctuation. In the phrase “*katam pi akatam pi katakata pi*,” there are three items divided by the conjunction “*pi*,” translated as “and” by I. B. Horner. But the way she punctuated her English translation might confuse the readers: using a comma to break the compound *katākataṃ* into two parts, “shaped and unshaped and (partly) shaped,

¹ Be. Vol. 1, 346; BJTS. Vol. 1, 582.

(partly) unshaped.” I rather use commas to break the phrase into three items following standard format, “shaped, unshaped, and (partly) shaped (partly) unshaped.

--ooOoo--

44. Locative absolute (BD. II, 134):

(Nissaggiya 24)

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

chabbaggiyā bhikkhū bhagavatā vassikasāṭikā anuññātā ’ti paṭikacc’ eva vassikasāṭikacīvaram pariyesanti paṭikacc’ eva katvā nivāsenti, jīṇṇāya vassikasāṭikāya naggā kāyaṃ ovassāpentī. (Vin. III, 252)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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. When the cloths for the rains were worn out, they being naked let their bodies get wet with the rain.

DISCUSSION:

Locative absolute: The locative absolute denoting time is obvious here, *jīṇṇāya vassikasāṭikāya*.¹ In this case, the phrase should be translated in a subordinate clause telling the time when the action took place.

One more thing should be mentioned here is that the monks were not *going* naked, but *bathing* naked.

--ooOoo--

¹ Wij. 232 ff.

45. ukkaḍḍhiyyati (BD. II, 137-138):

(Nissaggiya 24)

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 rains; 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, if the robe-material is destroyed, if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti māso seso gimhānan ti vassikasāṭīkacīvaram pariyesati, addhamāso seso gimhānan ti katvā nivāseti, ūnakamāso seso gimhānan ti vassikasāṭīkacīvaram pariyesati, ūnakaddhamāso seso gimhānan ti katvā nivāseti. pariyiṭṭhāya vassikasāṭīkāya vassam ukkaḍḍhiyyati, nivatthāya vassikasāṭīkāya vassam ukkaḍḍhiyyati, dhovitvā nikkhipitabbam, samaye nivāsetabbam. acchinnacīvarassa, naṭṭhacīvarassa, āpadāsu, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ’ti. (Vin. III, 254)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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; when the cloth for the rains was sought then the rainy season is delayed, when the cloth for the rains has been worn then the rainy season is delayed, (the cloth for the rains) should be washed and put aside. (There is no offence) if the

robe-material is stolen, if the robe-material is destroyed, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

ukkaḍḍhiyyati: As revealed in the footnote 2, I. B. Horner seemed not to be able to find out the meaning of the phrase “*vassaṃ ukkaḍḍhiyyati*.” The Commentary explains:

vassaṃ ukkaḍḍhiyatīti ettha sace katapariyositāya vassikasāṭikāya gimhānaṃ pacchimamāsaṃ khepetvā puna vassānassa paṭhamamāsaṃ ukkaḍḍhitvā gimhānaṃ pacchimamāsaṃ eva karonti, vassikasāṭikā dhovitvā nikkhipitabbā.¹ = In this case, when the rains-bathing cloth was sought and made, if people discard (the third month as) the last month of the hot season and pull up the first month of the rainy season then make it the last month of the hot season, the rains-bathing cloth should be washed and put aside.

The entry *ukkaḍḍhati* including its passive form *ukkaḍḍhiyyati* is found in the new dictionary of the PTS. with the reference to this very quote: “**ukkaḍḍhati**, *pr. 3 sg.* [S. utkarṣati], 1. *put off, postpones (the beginning of the rainy season residence); ... — pass. pr. 3 sg. ukkaḍḍhiyyati, ~īyati, Vin III 254,7 (vassaṃ ~iyyati); ...*”² I tentatively analyze its passive form as: *ukkaḍḍhiyyati* = *ud* + *√kaḍḍh* + *īya* + *ti*, and propose its passive meaning as: “to be dragged up, to be pulled up, to be postponed, to be delayed.”

Perhaps the concept of adding an extra thirteenth month into some year in lunar calendar might be unfamiliar to someone. The reason of adding another lunar month to such year is to make the lunar year keep up with the solar year. Solar year has 365 and 1/4 days divided into 12 months, whereas lunar year has 12 months and the total days is less than 360 days; so after 3 or 4 years, the lunar calendar will fall behind the solar calendar around a month, therefore one month is added in order the two calendar systems to be paralleled again.

--ooOoo--

¹ VA. III, 721.

² DOP. 385.

46. *dukkaṭa* or *anāpatti* (BD. II, 141):
(Nissaggiya 25)

If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrongdoing.

PĀLI TEXT:

anupasampanne anupasampannasaññī, āpatti dukkaṭassa. (Vin. III, 255)

DISCUSSION:

***dukkaṭa* or *anāpatti*:** Here I am not discussing about I. B. Horner's translation but about her questioning the precision of the text at footnote 1: "Here text is surely corrupt, for instead of *āpatti dukkaṭassa* it should read *anāpatti*. Oldenberg gives no variant reading."¹ The passage above is also found inside the texts of *pācittiya* 42, 52, 54, 55, 60, 71, 72, 74, 74, 76, 77, 78. Perhaps I. B. Horner thinks that the monk should have no offence because his perception is right. However, in a rule that perception is not a decisive factor, once a monk commits the act, the offence will be established no matter his perception is right or wrong. In short, we should understand the meaning of such message from its own context and the confusion as that of I. B. Horner will be wiped out when the statement above is presented in full: *anupasampanne anupasampannasaññī, [cīvaraṃ datvā kupīto anattamano acchindati vā acchindāpeti vā,] āpatti dukkaṭassa*" (the Pāli text between the brackets [] is supplied by myself).

--ooOoo--

47. *attha*, *ayye*, *ayyo* (BD. II, 146):
(Nissaggiya 27)

Then that weaver, as soon as the yarn had been brought, setting it up on the loom, went up to that woman, and having gone up he said to that woman:

"The master wants yarn."

¹ BD. II, 141.

“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 that 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.’”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho so tantavāyo yathābhatam suttaṃ tante upanetvā yena sā itthī ten’
upasaṅkami, upasaṅkamtivā taṃ itthiṃ etad avoca : suttena ayye attho’ti. nanu tvaṃ
ayyo mayā vutto iminā suttena cīvaram vināhīti. saccāhaṃ ayye tayā vutto iminā
suttena cīvaram vināhīti, api ca maṃ ayyo Upanando evaṃ āha : iṅha tvaṃ āvuso
āyatañ ca karohi vitthatañ ca appitañ ca, na tena suttena paṭibaddhaṃ bhavissatīti.
(Vin. III, 258)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then that weaver, as soon as the yarn had been brought, setting it up on the loom, went up to that woman, and having gone up he said to that woman:

“Lady, there is the need with yarn.”

“Were not you, sir, told by me: ‘Weave robe-material with that yarn’?”

“It is true that I, lady, was told by you: ‘Weave robe-material with that 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.’”

DISCUSSION:

a/ **attha**: The *Pāli* term *attha*, as a noun, has many different meanings, but in the case it goes with another noun in instrumental, e.g. “*suttena ayye attho’ti*,” it has a specific meaning that is mentioned in the new dictionary of the PTS.: “— 2. *use, need, want (+ instr.)*.”¹ To fulfill the translation, an understood verb should be supplied, i.e. “there is.”

b/ **ayye**: There are two vocative cases *ayye* addressed the lady by the weaver:

¹ DOP. 73.

- *suttena ayye attho 'ti*

- *saccāhaṃ ayye tayā vutto iminā suttena cīvaram vināhīti.*

I. B. Horner missed the first one but not the second.

c/ *ayyo*: There are also two *ayyo*(s) in this excerpt:

- *nanu tvaṃ ayyo mayā vutto iminā suttena cīvaram vināhīti*

- *api ca maṃ ayyo Upanando evaṃ āha*

The first *ayyo* is a vocative case addressed the weaver by the lady, in which I use the “sir” for the weaver instead of “master” in order to avoid the confusion with the monk Upananda also called “master,” and the second is a nominative case, which is an appellation for Ven. Upananda. See also § 234, 238, 239.

--ooOoo--

48. *vācasikā, iti/ti* (BD. II, 166):

(Pācittiya 01)

Telling a conscious lie means: the words, the utterance, the speech, the talk, the language, the intimation, the un-ariyan statements of one intent upon deceiving with words, saying: “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, 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

sampajānamusāvādo nāma viṣaṃvādanapurekkhārassa vācā girā byappatho vacībhedo vācasikā viññatti [atṭha] anariyavohārā: aditṭhaṃ ditṭhaṃ me 'ti, asutaṃ suttaṃ me 'ti, amutaṃ mutaṃ me 'ti, aviññātaṃ viññātaṃ me 'ti, ditṭhaṃ aditṭhaṃ me 'ti, suttaṃ asutaṃ me 'ti, mutaṃ mutaṃ me 'ti, viññātaṃ aviññātaṃ me 'ti. (Vin. IV, 2)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Telling a conscious lie means: the words, the utterance, the speech, the talk, the verbal intimation of the one who has intention upon deceiving with words having (eight) ignoble

demonstrations: about what not having seen (saying) “I have seen it,” about what not having heard (saying) “I have heard it,” about what not having sensed (saying) “I have sensed it,” about what not having cognised (saying) “I have cognised it,” about what having seen (saying) “I have not seen it,” about what having heard (saying) “I have not heard it,” about what having sensed (saying) “I have not sensed it,” about what having cognised (saying) “I have not cognised it.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *vācasikā*: I. B. Horner takes “*vācasikā viññattī*” as two separate items and translates them as “the language, the intimation.” But the Commentary suggests us to take both of them in one expression, “*vācasikā viññattī ’ti vacīviññattī*.”¹ So that *vācasikā* should be understood as an adjective having the meaning as “connected with speech, verbal” and modifying the noun *viññattī*. Due to that, I propose a translation for the phrase as “verbal intimation, verbal gesture.”

b/ *iti/ti*: There are eight *iti/ti*(s) found in the *Pāli* text. And in the *Pāli* Scriptures that belong to other sources, there is a numero *aṭṭha* (eight) inserted in front of *anariyavohārā* but not in the PTS. Edition.² I take the compound *anariyavohārā* as the predicate of the preceding phrase “*visaṃvādanapurekkhārassa vācā girā byappatho vacībhedo vācasikā viññattī*” and interpret it as “(eight) ignoble demonstrations, (eight) ignoble manifestations, or (eight) ignoble expressions.”

I also interpret each expression differently than that of I. B. Horner: For example of the first expression “*adiṭṭhaṃ diṭṭhaṃ me ’ti*,” I take the first past passive participle *adiṭṭhaṃ* as verbal noun to be left out of the quote, and translate the rest of the sentence as a speech in active form: “about what not having seen (saying) ‘I have seen it.’” One may argue that the

¹ VA. IV, 736.

² Be. Vol. 2, 2; BJTS. Vol. 2, 4; Syā. Vol. 2, 154.

Pāli particle *iti/ti* can be translated into English either direct or indirect speech, but in this case the direct speech should be used for the sake of clarifying the meaning, not the other. See also § 18a, 70a, 72a, 144a, 146b, 185c.

--ooOoo--

49. *pi*, *akkosena* (BD. II, 173):

(Pācittiya 02)

Insulting speech means: he insults in ten ways: about birth and name and clan and work and craft and disease and distinguishing mark and passion and attainment and mode of address.

PĀLI TEXT:

omasavādo nāma, dasahi ākārehi omasati : jātiyāpi nāmena pi gottena pi kammaena pi sippena pi ābādhena pi liṅgena pi kilesena pi āpattiyāpi, akkosena pi. (Vin. IV, 6)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Insulting speech means: he insults in ten ways: about birth, about name, about clan, about work, about craft, about disease, about distinguishing characteristic, about moral defilement, about offence (and attainment), and by abusing.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *pi*: For the list of ten items of insulting speech, I. B. Horner presents them connecting together by conjunction “and” (for the translation of *pi*) without punctuation; presenting such way may lead to the assumption that an insulting speech must combine all ten factors. I prefer to break each item by comma (for *pi*) and leave the conjunction “and” merely for the last item.

b/ *akkosena*: Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa points out the discrepancy between the one-sided meaning of *akkosena* used in the origin story and the broad explanation developed by the compilers:

akkosena pī 'ti ettha pana yasmā parato dve akkosā hīno ca akkoso ukkaṭṭho cā 'ti vibhajitukāmo tasmā yathā pubbe hīnena pi akkosena khuṃsentī 'ti vuttaṃ. evaṃ avatvā akkosena icc evam āha.¹ = In the case of '*akkosenapi*' (by abusing), because there is somewhere else the intention to analyze '*dve akkosā hīno ca akkoso ukkaṭṭho ca akkoso*' (two kinds of abusing: low abusing and highly abusing), then not saying as it is said above: '*hīnenapi akkosena khuṃsentīti*' (They jeer at them with low abuse), so the book said thus: '*akkosena*' (by abusing).

Based on the meanings of the ten items defined in the *Pāli* Canon, the right word for *kilesa* should be “defilement” not “passion,” and *āpatti* in negative sense is “fault, offence, sin” not “attainment.”

One more thing should be noticed is that in the *Pāli* passage, “*sabbāpi āpattiyo hīnā, api ca sotāpatti samāpatti ukkaṭṭhā,*”² the ancient compilers seems to have the intention to show an example of playing with the word *āpatti*, *sotāpatti* (*sota-āpatti*) and *samāpatti* (*sam-āpatti*). It is hard to reproduce it in English so that I take both and interpret *āpatti* as “offence (and attainment).”

--ooOoo--

50. Genitive vs. Dative, *bhaṇḍanaṃ, kalaha, vivāda, vivādāpannānaṃ, pesuññaṃ, imassa & amussa, akkhāyati* (BD. II, 186):
(Pācittiya 03)

Now at that time the group of six monks brought slander against monks for quarrelling, for disputing, for engaging in contention; hearing of this they were proclaimed for that and this dissension; hearing of that they were proclaimed 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū bhikkhūnaṃ bhaṇḍanaajātānaṃ kalahajātānaṃ vivādāpannānaṃ pesuññaṃ upasaṃharanti, imassa sutvā amussa

¹ VA. IV, 738.

² Vin. IV, 7.

akkhāyanti imassa bhedāya, amussa sutvā imassa akkhāyanti amussa bhedāya, tena anuppannāni c’ eva bhaṇḍanāni uppajjanti uppannāni ca bhaṇḍanāni bhiyyobhāvāya vepullāya saṃvattanti. (Vin. IV, 12)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks brought slander among the monks who are having quarrels, who are having disputes, who are engaging in contention. Having heard from this one they talk to that one for the dissension to this one; having heard from that one they talk to this one for the dissension to that one, so that quarrels that had not arisen arose, and also quarrels that had arisen rolled on for becoming more, for expansion.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Genitive vs. Dative:** As I understand from this passage is that the group of six monks brought slander in order to create dissension among monks, not to engage word-fighting with them; so that I translate the phrase “*bhikkhūnaṃ bhaṇḍana-jātānaṃ*” as “among the monks who are having quarrels,” taking *bhikkhūnaṃ* as genitive case (among) not dative case (against) as given by I. B. Horner. My choice is based on the explanation from the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī*:

Tatiye bhaṇḍanaṃ jātaṃ etesanti bhaṇḍana-jātā.¹ = In the third *pācittiya* rule, ‘*bhaṇḍana-jātā*’ means ‘the quarrel has been arisen among those (monks).’

See also § 24, 52, 78, 79a.

b/ ***bhaṇḍanaṃ, kalaha, vivāda, vivādāpannānaṃ***: Moreover, the Commentary also gives clear explanation about the words used in this context, i.e. *bhaṇḍanaṃ, kalaha, vivāda, vivādāpannānaṃ*:

bhaṇḍanan ti kalahassa pubbabhāgo, iminā ca iminā ca idaṃ kataṃ, evaṃ vutte evaṃ vakkhāmā ’ti ādikaṃ sakasakapakkhe sammantanaṃ. *kalaho* ti āpattigāmiko kāyavācā vītikkamo. *vivādo* ti viggāhikakathā, taṃ vivādaṃ āpannānaṃ

¹ VṬ. III, 4.

vivādāpannānaṃ¹ = ‘*Bhaṇḍanaṃ*’ (quarrel) is the preceding part of a *kalaha* (dispute). At first, there is the consulting together in each own group such as (saying): ‘This is done by this one and by that one,’ ‘We are telling what we have heard.’ ‘*Kalaha*’ (dispute) is the going beyond gestures and words that has the potential of committing offences. ‘*Vivāda*’ (contention) is the talking that leads to strife. ‘*Vivādāpannānaṃ*’ means among those who are engaging in that contention.

c/ ***pesuññaṃ*** (slander): is the key word of this rule; it is briefly defined in the *Pāli* Canon and explained further by Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa:

pesuññaṃ ti piṣuṇavācaṃ, piyabhāvassa suññaakaraṇavācaṃ ti vuttaṃ hoti. *bhikkhupesuñña* ’ti bhikkhūnaṃ pesuñña bhikkhuto sutvā bhikkhunā bhikkhussa upasaṃhaṭapesuñña ’ti attho.² = ‘*pesuññaṃ*’ is malicious talebearing, the words making the amiability nullified, it is said. ‘*Bhikkhupesuñña*’ is ‘in slandering among monks,’ having listened to a monk then in the slander that is brought to (another) monk against (that) monk.

d/ ***imassa & amussa***: are two demonstrative pronouns *idaṃ* and *amu*. The former is familiar, while the latter “refers to a more remote object. It is used when it is necessary to distinguish a further object from a nearer, or to contrast two persons or groups.”³ So I understand that *imassa* and *amussa* in the *Pāli* Canon referring to two different monks, this monk and that monk, then consequently propose a translation as that of above. See also § 146a, 211.

e/ ***akkhāyati***: The only problem I am having is to explain the verb form of “*akkhāyanti*,” it seems to be the passive form of “*akkhāti* (*ā + √khā + ti*, = to announce, to tell, to declare),” but I have to take it as an active verb in order to have a decent interpretation. Lately I found that Cone in her dictionary considers *akkhāyati* having active sense also passive.⁴

--ooOoo--

¹ VA. IV, 740.

² *Ibid.*

³ Warder, 231.

⁴ DOP. 5-6.

51. *vāceti* (BD. II, 190):

(Pācittiya 04)

Whatever monk should make one who is not ordained speak dhamma line by line, there is an offence of expiation.

PĀLI TEXT:

yo pana bhikkhu anupasampannaṃ padaso dhammaṃ vāceyya, pācittiyā ti. (Vin. IV, 14)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Whatever monk have one who is not ordained recite Dhamma line by line (with him), there is an offence of expiation.

DISCUSSION:

vāceti: is the causative verb from the root \sqrt{vac} having its literal meaning as “to make someone speak,” but such meaning should not be applied in the context of this rule because it may cause confusion. There are two factors should be considered:

- *vāceti* also has the meaning as “to teach.” Such conclusion is drawn from the two *pācittiya* offence 48 and 49 for nuns: “*yā pana bhikkhunī tiracchānavijjaṃ pariyāpuṇeyya, pācittiyā ti*” and “*yā pana bhikkhunī tiracchānavijjaṃ vāceyya, pācittiyā ti*,”¹ so *vāceti* is the antonym of *pariyāpuṇāti* having the meaning as “to learn (by heart), to master, to gain mastery over, to learn thoroughly.”²

- *padaso dhammaṃ*: is explained in the *Pāli* Canon and translated beautifully by I. B. Horner. However, Ven. Thanissaro’s interpretation seems to be easier to understand:

The Vibhaṅga lists four ways in which a person might be trained to be a reciter of a text:

1) The teacher and student recite in unison, i.e. beginning together and ending together.

¹ Vin. IV, 305-306.

² PED. 433.

- 2) The teacher begins a line, the student joins in and they end together.
- 3) The teacher recites the beginning syllable of a line together with the student, who then completes it alone.
- 4) The teacher recites one line, and the student recites the next line alone.¹

And here is Ven. Thanissaro's translation about the rule: "Should any bhikkhu have an unordained person recite Dhamma line by line (with him), it is to be confessed."² Whereas Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa's translation is somehow obscure in the verb "rehearse": "Should any bhikkhu rehearse the Dhamma word by word (with text and Commentary) together with one who is not fully admitted (to the Sangha), this entails expiation."³ So, I use Ven. Thanissaro's translation as a model to revise that of I. B. Horner. See also § 257.

--ooOoo--

52. Genitive vs. Dative (BD. II, 221-222):
(Pācittiya 09)

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 transgression which is very bad or which is not very bad, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is very bad offence when it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he in doubt as to whether it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

PĀLI TEXT:

aduṭṭhullaṃ āpattiṃ āroceti, āpatti dukkaṭassa. anupasampannassa duṭṭhullaṃ vā aduṭṭhullaṃ vā ajjhācāraṃ āroceti, āpatti dukkaṭassa. aduṭṭhullāya āpattiyā duṭṭhullāpattisaññī, āpatti dukkaṭassa. aduṭṭhullāya āpattiyā vematiko, āpatti dukkaṭassa. (Vin. IV, 32)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

If he tells of an offence that is not very bad, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he tells of a transgression which is very bad or which is not very bad of one who is not ordained,

¹ Tha. I, 269.

² *Ibid.* 356.

³ Vaj. I, 127.

there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is very bad offence when it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he in doubt as to whether it is not a very bad offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

DISCUSSION:

Genitive vs. Dative: To the clause “*anupasampannassa ... ajjhācāraṃ āroceti*,” I. B. Horner take *anupasampannassa* as dative case, i.e. “he tells the transgression TO an unordained person,” on the contrary I interpret it as genitive case, i.g. “he tells the transgression OF an unordained person.” There are many ways to prove my choice:

- In the rule *pācittiya* 09, “*yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhussa duṭṭhullaṃ āpattim anupasampannassa āroceyya aññatra bhikkhusammutiyā, pācittiyā ti*,” = Whatever monk should speak of a monk’s very bad offence to one who is not ordained, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation,”¹ one should pay attention to the position of two words *bhikkhussa* in genitive case and *anupasampannassa* in dative. So in our case, if *anupasampannassa* were dative case, it should have been close to the verb *āroceyya*; but it is not.

- The approval from the work of Ven. Thanissaro:

A bhikkhu’s non-gross offences, and an unordained person’s misbehavior-gross or not-are grounds for a dukkata. (The passage on which this last point is based is sometimes translated, “tells one who is not ordained of a transgression” when it should read, “tells of an unordained person’s transgression.” According to the Commentary, *gross misbehavior* on the part of an unordained person means breaking any of the five precepts. Anything else would count as not gross.²

- I. B. Horner seems to be struggling with terminology, *ajjhācāra*; she was trying to assign *ajjhācāra* to the monk, whereas the Commentary states clearly that *ajjhācāra* in this

¹ Vin. IV, 31; BD. II, 220.

² Tha. I, 289.

context refers to lay people, *anupasampannassa duṭṭhullaṃ vā aduṭṭhullaṃ vā ajjhācāran ti ettha ādito pañcasikkhāpadāni duṭṭhullo nāma ajjhācāro, sesāni aduṭṭhullāni*.¹

See also other cases of Genitive vs. Dative at § 24, 50a, 78, 79a.

--ooOoo--

53. Causative verb - *ujjhāpeti* (BD. II, 236-237):
(Pācittiya 13)

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 shame to one who is ordained (and) agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings or as distributor of meals or as apportioner of conjei or as apportioner of fruit or as apportioner of solid foods or as disposer of trifles, 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 bring blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame to one who is not ordained (but) not agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings ... as disposer of trifles, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

PĀLI TEXT:

ujjhāpanakaṃ nāma, upasampannam (kamma) saṅghena sammatam
senāsanapaññāpakam vā bhattuddesakam vā yāgubhājakam vā phalabhājakam vā
khajjabhājakam vā appamattakavissajjakam vā avaṇṇam kattukāmo ayasam

¹ VA. IV, 754.

kattukāmo maṅkuṃ kattukāmo upasampannam (kattu) ujjhāpeti vā khīyati vā, āpatti pācittiyassa.

...

anupasampannam (kamma) ujjhāpeti vā khīyati vā, āpatti dukkaṭassa. upasampannam (kamma) saṅghena asammatam senāsanapaññāpakam vā ... maṅkuṃ kattukāmo upasampannam vā anupasampannam (kattu) vā ujjhāpeti vā khīyati vā, āpatti dukkaṭassa. anupasampannam (kamma) saṅghena sammatam vā asammatam vā senāsanapaññāpakam vā ... maṅkuṃ kattukāmo upasampannam vā anupasampannam vā (kattu) ujjhāpeti vā khīyati vā, āpatti dukkaṭassa. (Vin. IV, 38-39)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Making (someone) look down upon means: Desiring to bring blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame UPON one who is ordained (and) agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings or as distributor of meals or as apportioner of conjei or as apportioner of fruit or as apportioner of solid foods or as disposer of trifles, if he makes one who is ordained look down upon or if he criticises, there is an offence of expiation.

...

If he makes (one who is not ordained) look down upon or if he criticises, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Desiring to bring blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame UPON one who is ordained (but) not agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings ... as disposer of trifles, if he makes one who is ordained or one who is not ordained look down upon or if he criticises, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Desiring to bring blame, desiring to bring discredit, desiring to bring shame UPON one who is not ordained (and) not agreed upon by the Order as assigner of lodgings ... as disposer of trifles, if he makes one who is ordained or one who is not ordained look down upon or if he criticises, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

DISCUSSION:

Causative verb - *ujjhāpeti*: One interesting point of this item is to help us to understand more about the patients of causative verbs. From the *Pāli* text of this *pācittiya*, I have

discovered that the causative verb *ujjhāpeti* have two accusative cases; I quote a passage from the origin story to present the evidence:

te āyasmantaṃ Dabbaṃ Mallaputtaṃ bhikkhū ujjhāpentī: chandāya Dabbo Mallaputto senāsaṇaṃ paññāpetī chandāya ca bhattāni uddisaṭṭī. ye te bhikkhū appicchā ...vipācenti: kathaṃ hi nāma Mettiyabhummajakā bhikkhū āyasmantaṃ Dabbaṃ Mallaputtaṃ bhikkhū ujjhāpessantī — pa —. saccaṃ kira tumhe bhikkhave Dabbaṃ Mallaputtaṃ bhikkhū ujjhāpethā 'ti. saccaṃ bhagavā 'ti. = These made monks look down upon the venerable Dabba, the Mallian, saying: “Dabba, the Mallian, assigns lodgings through favouritism 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.”¹

We need to differentiate the differences of terminology: *hetukattu* (the agent as subject of the causative verb in nominative case), *kattu* (who or which performs the action in accusative case, often should be in instrumental), *kamma* (who or which undergoes the action in accusative case). For three examples of the causative verb *ujjhāpeti* above, we are going to decide *hetukattu*, *kamma*, *kattu* in each clause and arrange them in respective order:

1/- *te, āyasmantaṃ Dabbaṃ Mallaputtaṃ, bhikkhū (ujjhāpentī)*

2/- *Mettiyabhummajakā bhikkhū, āyasmantaṃ Dabbaṃ Mallaputtaṃ, bhikkhū (ujjhāpessantī)*

3/- *tumhe, Dabbaṃ Mallaputtaṃ, bhikkhū (ujjhāpetha)*

The accusative that precedes the verb often to be the doer (*kattu*), and the other the receiver of the action (*kamma*). However, in a sentence that there is only one accusative, the other accusative should be found somewhere around, either existing in another clause or being understood from the context. Applying such observation to the main text of our item, I have inserted the two terms *kattu* and *kamma* into the *Pāli* text quoted above for the verb

¹ Vin. IV, 38; BD. II, 235.

ujjhāpeti in order to make the point clear. And we have a drastic change in the proposed translation. My point has the approval from Cone's dictionary.¹

--ooOoo--

54. *majjhimassa purisassa* (BD. II, 241):
(Pācittiya 14)

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 outward stone-throw of a man of average height, there is an offence of expiation.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpuccham vā gaccheyyā 'ti bhikkhum vā sāmaṇeraṃ vā ārāmikaṃ vā anāpucchā majjhimassa purisassa leḍḍupātaṃ atikkamantassa āpatti pācittiyassa. (Vin. IV, 40)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 outward stone-throw of a man of average strength, there is an offence of expiation.

DISCUSSION:

majjhimassa purisassa: Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa states clearly the word *thāma* (strength) in his explanation: “*leḍḍupātaṃ atikkamantassa āpatti pācittiyassā 'ti thāmamajjhimassa purisassa leḍḍupātaṃ atikkamantassa pācittiyam.*”² See also the discussion on §11, 133b.

--ooOoo--

55. *otāpento* (BD. II, 242):
(Pācittiya 14)

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

¹ DOP. 404.

² VA. IV, 774.

the sun, he goes away; if it comes to be taken possession of by something; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti uddharitvā gacchati, uddharāpetvā gacchati, āpuccham gacchati, otāpento gacchati, kenaci palibuddham hoti, āpadāsu, ummattakassa, ādikammikassāti. (Vin. IV, 40)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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, while letting it dried in the sun, he goes away; if it comes to be taken possession of by something; if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

otāpento: is the present participle of the causative verb *otāpeti* (*o + √tap + e + ti*) having the meaning as “warms, warms in the sun, dries; puts (in the sun) to dry.”¹ The question is what he put in the sun to dry, his body or some kind of furniture? The answer must be the latter because he was going away, then how could he stay there to warm his body in the sun; the answer is very clear from the context. On the contrary, I. B. Horner chose the other, i.e. he let his body dried in the sun. In fact she did consult the Commentary but missed the point that *otāpeti* is a causative verb; I am showing her work for evidence:

otāpento gacchatī’ti ātape otāpento āgantvā uddharissāmī’ti gacchati evam gacchato anāpatti. = there is no offence if, drying himself in the heat of the sun, he thinks, ‘Coming back I will remove it.’²

I think the opening story (*nidānavatthu*) misled I. B. Horner’s thinking:

tena kho pana समयena bhikkhū hemantike kāle ajjhokāse senāsanam paññāpetvā kāyam otāpento kāle ārocite tam pakkamantā n’ eva uddharimṣu na uddharāpesum

¹ DOP. 568.

² VA. IV, 776; BD. II, 242 (footnote 6).

anāpucchā pakkamiṃsu. senāsanam ovaṭṭham hoti. = Now at that time, monks preparing lodgings winter-time in the open air, drying their bodies in the sun, when the time was announced, setting forth neither removed them nor had them removed, (but) set forth without having asked (for permission). The lodgings became damp.¹

And the Commentary also explains according to the related context:

kāyaṃ otāpentā ’ti mañcapīṭhādīsu nisinnā bālātapena kāyaṃ otāpentā.² = *kāyaṃ otāpentā* means “sitting on the beds, chairs, etc., (the monks) were letting their body dried by the heat of the newly-risen sun.

Unfortunately, in the context of this excerpt the things to be dried were the lodgings. I owe Ven. Thanissaro for his discovery about this point:

Non offences. As stated above, there is no offence if one departs having set furnishings belonging to the Community or another individual out in the sun with the purpose of drying them, and thinking, “I will put them away when I come back.”³

--ooOoo--

56. *parittaṃ*, Gerund (BD. II, 263):

(Pācittiya 21)

“Lord, how could the exhortation be effective? The masters, the group of six monks, giving merely inferior talk on dhamma, spending the day in worldly talk dismissed us, saying. ‘Go, sisters.’”

PĀLI TEXT:

kuto bhante ovādo iddho bhavissati, ayyā chabbaggiyā parittaṃ ñeva dhammiṃ katham katvā divasaṃ tiracchānakathāya vītināmetvā uyyojesun ti. (Vin. IV, 50)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Lord, how could the exhortation be effective? The masters belong to the group of six monks, having given merely a short talk on Dhamma, having spent the day in worldly talk, then dismissed.”

¹ Vin. IV, 39; BD. II, 238.

² VA. IV, 772.

³ Tha. I, 307.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *parittaṃ*: I prefer to take the meaning of the adjective *paritta* as “a little, few,” and not to translate *paritta* as “inferior” due to the reason that “inferior talk” and “worldly talk” (*tiracchānakathā*) seem to be redundant, and another reason is to emphasize the point that those monks talked less about the Dhamma but more about unnecessary topics relating to worldly life. One more thing is that the command “Go, sisters” should not appear in her translation; perhaps I. B. Horner forgot to take it out while having copied the translation of a preceding passage, i. e.:

atha kho chabbaggiyā bhikkhū bhikkhunīnaṃ parittaṃ ñeva dhammiṃ kathaṃ katvā divasaṃ tiracchānakathāya vītināmetvā uyyojesaṃ gacchatha bhaginiyo ’ti = Then the group of six monks, giving the nuns merely inferior talk on dhamma, spending the day in worldly talk, dismissed them, saying: “Go, sisters.”¹

b/ **Gerund**: For a series of verbs expressed by gerunds, which are indeclinable participles ending with suffixes *tvā*, *itvā*, *tūna*, or *ya* and widely used in *Pāli* texts, I prefer to translate those as finite verbs in a sequence of tenses complied with the tense of the last *Pāli* finite verbal. A quote from the grammar book *Introduction to Pali* by A. K. Warder could be helpful because I think that it conveys a good and comprehensive explanation about this linguistic structure:

The gerund (*pubbakiriyā*), an indeclinable participle, is used to express an action preceding (*pubba*) the action of the main verb of a sentence. It may thus conclude a subordinate clause. The agent of the gerund is the same as that of the main action. Complex sentences are constructed with clauses concluded by participles or gerunds preceding the main clause with the main verb. In this way the agent is described as performing a group or series of actions. Each clause may have its own patient (i.e. gerunds may take patients in the accusative, like other verb forms). (48)

¹ Vin. IV, 50; BD. II, 263.

Based on such knowledge, I think some other ways of interpreting gerunds might be acceptable due to their lucidity and comprehensibility. Here are two alternatives:

“Lord, how could the exhortation be effective? The masters belong to the group of six monks gave merely a short talk on Dhamma and spent the day in worldly talk, then dismissed.”

“Lord, how could the exhortation be effective? After giving merely a short talk on Dhamma, the masters belong to the group of six monks spent the day in worldly talk, then dismissed.”

See also § 73, 115b, 145c, 158, 160, 177a, 206b, 225.

--ooOoo--

57. bahukatā (BD. II, 279):

(Pācittiya 24)

Now at that time monks who were elders, exhorting nuns, came to receive requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicines for the sick. The group of six monks spoke thus:

“The monks who are elders are not doing a service in exhorting nuns; the monks who are elders are exhorting nuns for the sake of gain.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena therā bhikkhū bhikkhuniyo ovađantā lābhino honti cīvarapiṇḍapātasenāsanagilānappaccayabhesajjaparikkhārānaṃ. chabbaggiyā bhikkhū evaṃ vadanti : na bahukatā therā bhikkhū bhikkhuniyo ovađituṃ, āmisahetu therā bhikkhū bhikkhuniyo ovađantīti. (Vin. IV, 57-58)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time monks who were elders, exhorting nuns, came to receive requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, and medicines for the sick. The group of six monks spoke thus:

“The monks who are elders exhort nuns not because of revering to the Dhamma; the monks who are elders are exhorting nuns for the sake of gain.”

DISCUSSION:

bahukatū: I. B. Horner also got the meaning of *bahukatā* given by the Commentary:

“*na bahukatā*. VA. 804 says *na katabahumānā na dhammabahumānaṃ katvā*, “not revering, not doing reverence to dhamma,” apparently not rendering a service.”¹

However, I still do not understand why she still keeps her translation as “not doing a service.” So my job is just to rephrase the explanation given by her for my proposed translation.

--ooOoo--

58. *kiṃ pana* (BD. II, 286):

(Pācittiya 26)

People ... spread it about, saying:

“How little these nuns fear blame, they are sly, they have no shame, 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

manussā ... vipācenti: yāva chinnikā imā bhikkhuniyo dhuttikā ahirikāyo, yatra hi nāma cīvare paṭibhānacittaṃ vuṭṭhāpessantīti. bhikkhuniyo evam āhaṃsu: kass’ idaṃ kamman ti. ayyassa Udāyissā ’ti. ye pi te chinnakā dhuttakā ahirikā tesam pi evarūpaṃ na sobheyya, kiṃ pan’ ayyassa Udāyissā ’ti. (Vin. IV, 61)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

People ... spread it about, saying:

¹ Footnote 2 (BD. II, 279).

“How little these nuns fear blame, they are sly, they have no shame, inasmuch as they raise up a bold design on a robe.”

Nuns spoke thus: “Whose work is this?”

“Master Udāyi’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 truly master Udāyi’s?” they said.

DISCUSSION:

kiṃ pana: I. B. Horner translates “*kiṃ pan’ ayyassa Udāyissā ’ti*” as “Is it not master Udāyin’s?” And my question is whether “*kiṃ pana*” in *Pāli* can convey a negative meaning?

Perhaps, I. B. Horner’s translation is based on the PED.: “**kim pana** = nonne: kim pana bhante addasa? “Have you not seen?” D II. 132, kim pana tvam maññasi what then do you think = do you not think then, that? . . . J I. 171.”¹

My opposition is based on logical reasoning so that some grammatical knowledge and the background of the story need to be checked. For the interrogative pronoun *kiṃ*, I have the explanation from A. K. Warder’s grammar book:

The neuter singular form *kiṃ* is sometimes used as an indeclinable, simply making the sentence interrogative (= inversion + “?” in English): *kiṃ saddaṃ assosi* = “Did he hear the noise?” As Pali favours direct speech *kiṃ saddaṃ assosī ti* . . . will translate “(. . . he asked) whether he heard the noise”. The interrogative usually stands at the beginning of its clause.²

And at the entry *pana* –(2), the PED. gives its meaning as “then, now” when it goes with *kiṃ*.³

The Commentary has explanation about the “bold design” on the nun’s robe:

¹ PED. 213.

² Warder 74.

³ PED. 411.

so kira cīvaraṃ rajitvā tassa majjhe nānāvaṇṇehi vippakatamethunam itthipurisarūpam akāsi.¹ = it is said that after dying the robe, he drew a multicolored design of a woman and a man being coupling in the middle of it (i.e. the robe of the nun who had asked him to sew for her).

Due to that, the venerable Udāyi carefully advised the nun thus:

“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.”²

He said that because he was thinking:

sace sā bhikkhunī taṃ cīvaraṃ āditova pārūpeyya, aññā bhikkhuniyo disvā ujjhāpeyyuṃ, tato mahājano passituṃ na labhatīti maññamāno “yathāsaṃhaṭaṃ haritvā nikkhipitvā”ti ādimāha = If that nun just put on that robe earlier, other nuns could see and make her look down upon (it), consequently people have no chance to see the design.” Therefore he said: “Take this robe as it was folded and place it aside.”³

As the nuns thought that people who were depraved still did not do such a thing, so they did not believe that venerable Udāyin had gut to draw such a picture, so that they asked, “*kiṃ pan’ ayyassa Udāyissā ’ti*” in order to confirm the fact. I do not think that “*pana*” in *Pāli* can convey a negative meaning as “*na* or *nu*” in a question; so I propose my interpretation like this: “Is it truly the work of master Udāyi?” See also § 69.

--ooOoo--

59. *sathagamanīya* (BD. II, 289):

(Pācittiya 27)

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

¹ VA. IV, 804.

² BD. II, 285.

³ VṬ. III, 45.

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhuniyā saddhiṃ saṃvidhāya ekaddhānamaggaṃ paṭipajjeyya antamaso gāmantarampi aññatra samayā, pācittiyaṃ. tathāyaṃ samayo: satthagamanīyo hoti maggo sāsaṅkasammato sappatibhayo, ayaṃ tattha samayo 'ti. (Vin. IV, 63)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 is supposed to be traveled by caravan, and being agreed upon as dangerous, frightening. This is the right time in this case.

DISCUSSION:

satthagamanīya: We also have the explanation from the *Pāli* Canon: “*satthagamanīyo nāma maggo na sakkā hoti vinā satthena gantum*,” but it does not help much because the term *satthena* is repeated.

I. B. Horner made her choice stating in footnote 3:

satthagamanīya. I follow rendering of *Vin. 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 *P. E. D.* For *Old Comy.*’s definition would, in conjunction with this phrase, make nonsense if “caravan-road” were meant. *Sattha* may be, more specifically, “knife,” cf. Defeat III.

Ven. Thanissaro opposes to her idea:

A road to be traveled by caravan is one too dubious or risky to travel alone. (Some have translated this as a “road to be traveled with a weapon,” but since bhikkhus and bhikkhunis are not allowed even to touch weapons, it's a doubtful translation at best).¹

¹ Tha. I, 330.

Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa also translates *satthagamanīyo maggo* as “the journey is to be undertaken by a caravan,”¹ so does K. R. Norman.²

I am on the side of the majority. See also § 105a.

--ooOoo--

60. *ajjhohāra* (BD. II, 298):

(Pācittiya 29)

An arrangement with the householder means: they are relations or they are invited or they are ordinarily prepared (for the monk).

If he says: ‘I will eat,’ and accepts (a meal), unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For each mouthful there is an offence of expiation.

PĀLI TEXT:

gihisamārambho nāma ñātakā vā honti pavāritā vā pakatipaṭiyattā vā.
aññatra pubbe gihisamārambhā bhuñjissāmīti paṭiggaṇhāti, āpatti dukkaṭassa.
ajjhohāre ajjhohāre āpatti pācittiyassa. (Vin. IV, 67)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

An arrangement with the householder means: they are relations or they are invited or they are ordinarily prepared (for the monk).

If he says: ‘I will eat,’ and accepts (a meal), unless there is a prior arrangement with the householder, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For each swallowing there is an offence of expiation.

DISCUSSION:

ajjhohāra: (*adhi* + *ava* + *√har* + *a*) Dictionaries give its basic meaning as “eating, taking food, swallowing.” I choose “swallowing” based on the *upasagga* “*ava*” expressing the

¹ Vaj. I, 145.

² Norman 55.

moving downward instead of “mouthful” given by I. B. Horner. The reason is that I. B. Horner already reserves the English term “mouthful” for *kabalaṃ* in the *sekhiya* 39:

‘nātimahantaṃ kabalaṃ karissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā’ = ‘I will not make up too large a large mouthful,’ is a training to be observed.¹

On the same side with I. B. Horner, Ven. Thanissaro also uses the English word “mouthful” to translate the two *Pāli* terms, *ajjhohāra* and *kabalaṃ*:

- “a pacittiya for every mouthful one eats”² (*ajjhohāre ajjhohāre āpatti pācittiyassa*).

- “I will not take an extra-large mouthful: a training to be observed” (*sekhiya* 39).³

See also the discussion of *ajjhoḥarati* at § 203 that would be more convincing.

--ooOoo--

61. *paṭiyālokaṃ* (BD. II, 322):

(Pācittiya 34)

Now at that time a certain caravan was desirous of going from Rājagaha to the south.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro sattho Rājagahā Paṭiyālokaṃ gantukāmo hoti. (Vin. IV, 79)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time a certain caravan was desirous of going from Rājagaha to the west.

DISCUSSION:

paṭiyālokaṃ: In order to confirm her translation, at footnote 3 I. B. Horner writes: “*paṭiyāloka*. Same phrase occurs at *Vin.* iv. 131. *VA.* 868 supports above rendering.”

But the Commentary says:

paṭiyālokan ti sūriyālokassa paṭimukhaṃ pacchimadisanti attho.⁴ = *paṭiyālokaṃ* is the opposite side of the sunlight, so that it means the west direction.

¹ Vin. IV, 194; BD. III, 133.

² Tha. I, 335.

³ *Ibid.* 677.

⁴ VA. IV, 868.

The Sub-Commentary also confirms it:

paṭiyālokanti pacchimam disaṃ, paccādiccanti vuttaṃ hoti.¹ = *paṭiyālokaṃ* is the west, and it is said the opposite side of the sun.

So, the caravan must travel towards the west, not the south.

--ooOoo--

62. *pavārito, bhojana*, Obscure English (BD. II, 328-329):
(Pācittiya 35)

Being satisfied means: eating is to be seen, a meal is to be seen, standing within a reach of the hand, he asks (him), a refusal is to be seen.

PĀLI TEXT:

pavārito nāma asanaṃ paññāyati bhojanaṃ paññāyati, hatthapāse ṭhito abhiharati, paṭikkhepo paññāyati. (Vin. IV, 82)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Being satisfied means: eating is to be seen, the food is to be seen, (the donor) standing within a reach of the hand offers (the food to the monk), a refusal (by the monk) is to be seen.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *pavārito*: is the past participle of the verb *pavāreti*. I. B. Horner translates it as “being satisfied.” However, she seems not to be content with her English translation as she mentions in footnote that the verb *santappati* also has meaning “to satisfy.”² Ven. Thanissaro interprets the passage more clearly using the Commentary:

Turning down an offer for further food. The Vibhanga defines this as an act with five factors:

- 1) The bhikkhu is eating.
- 2) There is further staple food.
- 3) The donor is standing within *hatthapasa* (1.25 meters) of the bhikkhu.

¹ VT. III, 52.

² BD. II, 326.

- 4) He/she offers the food.
- 5) The bhikkhu turns it down.¹

Observing the Sri Lankan monks cover their bowls or plates while they do not want the food offered by donors, I think of one way to analyze the verb *pavāreti* as “*pa + √var + e + ti*,” in which the root *√var* has the meaning “cover” similar to the root *√vr* in Sanskrit,² that is to link to the verb *pravṛinoti* that has the meaning “to ward off, to keep away” as specified in the Sanskrit English Dictionary.³

Anyway, both translators agree on the same point that such action is a gesture of refusal. I keep the translation of I. B. Horner, “being satisfied.” See also § 159, 212a.

b/ *bhojana*: Even though dictionaries give the meaning of *bhojana* as either “meal” or “food,” in this case one item of food offered also counts so that I replace “meal” by “food” in my translation. This is just a matter of word choice.

c/ **Obscure English**: The translation of I. B. Horner for “*hatthapāse ̥hitā abhiharati*” as “standing within a reach of the hand, he asks (him)” is not clear in specifying who is “he” and whom is “him,” so that I prefer to revise it, “(the donor) standing within a reach of the hand offers (the food to the monk).”

This is also applied to the bhikkhunī’s pācittiya 54 (Vin. IV, 311; BD. III, 348).

--ooOoo--

63. udakadantapona (BD. II, 345):
(Pācittiya 40)

Whatever monk should convey to his mouth nutriment not given, except water for cleansing the teeth, there is an offence of expiation.

¹ Tha. I, 357.

² Whitney 162.

³ SED. 693.

PĀLI TEXT:

yo pana bhikkhu adinnaṃ mukhadvāraṃ āhāraṃ āhareyya aññātra udakadantaponā,
pācittiyā ti. (Vin. IV, 90)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Whatever monk should convey to his mouth nutriment not given, except water and toothpick, there is an offence of expiation.

DISCUSSION:

udakadantapona: It seems to me that I. B. Horner analyzes *udakadantapona* as some kind of *tappurisa* compound, but it cannot be. Because if it were a *tappurisa* compound, the English equivalent should have been “tooth-cleaner for water” not “water for cleansing the teeth,” otherwise the *Pāli* word-order should be reversed i.e. *dantapona-udaka* in order to match the English counterpart given by I. B. Horner.

In fact, *udakadantapona* is a *dvandva* compound having the meaning as “water and tooth-cleaner,” but just saying that would not be convincing. So in order to prove the point, my strategy is to see whether *udaka* and *dantapona* are mentioned apart in the context of this rule. There is no help from the *Pāli* Canon. Whereas in the Commentary, the term *dantapona* is mentioned just once at the closing sentence “*dantaponaṣikkhāpadaṃ dasamaṃ*,”¹ but *udaka* fourteen times to explain what kind of water should be available for monks, e.g.:

- deve vassante piṇḍāya carantassa sarīrato vā cīvarato vā kiliṭṭha-udakaṃ patte patati, taṃ paṭiggahetabbaṃ.² = When it is raining, the impure water from the body or the robes of the monk who is walking for alms drips into the bowl, that water should be accepted.

- sace pana sattāhaṃ vassante deve suddhaṃ udakaṃ hoti abbhokāsato vā patati, vaṭṭati.³ = If it has been raining for seven days, the water become pure and falls from the sky, that water is proper (to be consumed). etc.

¹ VA. IV, 855.

² *Ibid.* 848.

³ *Ibid.*

The Sub-Commentary takes *udakadantapona* as a *dvandva* compound and explain *dantapona* is some kind of wood used for the teeth (*dantakaṭṭha*):

Udakañhi yathāsukhaṃ pātuṃ dantakaṭṭhañca dantaponaparibhogena paribhuñjitum vaṭṭati, tassa pana rasam gilitum na vaṭṭati. Sacepi dantakaṭṭharaso ajānantassa anto pavisati, pācittiyameva.¹ = It is proper to drink water as much as comfortable and to enjoy tooth-wood with the use of a toothpick, but not proper to swallow its juice. Even if the juice of tooth-wood goes in (the throat) of monk who does not know, there is also an offence of expiation (*pācittiya*).

Ven. Thanissaro has some explanation about *dantakaṭṭha* that is worth to mentioned:

Tooth-cleaning sticks, as used in the time of the Buddha, were semi-edible. They were sticks of soft wood, like balsam, cut four to eight inches long, chewed until they were reduced to fiber and spat out. People in India still use tooth-cleaning sticks of this sort even today.”²

It is also interesting that the Buddha encouraged the monks to chew *dantakaṭṭha*, it is mentioned in the *Cullavaggapāḷi*:

pañc’ ime bhikkhave ānisaṃsā dantakaṭṭhassa khādane: cakkhussaṃ, mukhaṃ na duggandhaṃ hoti, rasaharaṇiyo visujjhanti, pittaṃ semhaṃ bhattaṃ na pariyanandhati, bhattaṃ assa chādeti. ime kho bhikkhave pañca ānisaṃsā dantakaṭṭhassa khādane. anujānāmi bhikkhave dantakaṭṭhan ti. = Monks, there are five advantages in chewing tooth-wood: it is good for the eyes, the mouth does not become hasty smelling, the channels of taste are purified, phlegm 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.³

Ven. Vajirañānavarorasa also interprets the compound as “(pure) water and tooth-sticks.”⁴

K. R. Norman also translates similarly, “water and a tooth stick.”⁵

¹ VT. 3, 63.

² Tha. I, 370.

³ Vin. II, 137-138; BD. V, 192.

⁴ Vaj. I, 156.

⁵ Norman 61.

In conclusion, *dantakaṭṭha* in one kind of *dantapoṇa* and *udakadantapoṇa* should be taken as a *dvandva* compound and translated accordingly, i.e. water and toothpick.

--ooOoo--

64. *sabhojane kule* (BD. II, 355-356):

(Pācittiya 43)

Whatever monk, intruding upon a family with food, should sit down, there is an offence of expiation.

...

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

yo pana bhikkhu sabhojane kule anupakhajja nisajjaṃ kappeyya, pācittiyaṃ ti.

...

sabhojanaṃ nāma kulaṃ itthi c' eva hoti puriso ca itthi ca puriso ca ubho anikkhantā honti, ubho avītarāgā. (Vin. V, 95)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Whatever monk, intruding upon a house having a couple, should sit down, there is an offence of expiation.

...

House having a couple 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.

DISCUSSION:

sabhojane kule: The *Pāli* texts including the original story and the Commentary make clear that the meaning of this phrase mentions of a man and a woman staying in the house (*saha+ubho+hi+janehi*).¹ However, based on the literal meaning of the phrase as “upon a

¹ VA. IV, 856.

family with food” (*sa+bhojane kule*), I. B. Horner has long note to defend her choice referring to ancient texts and also the works of others.¹

Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa, although firmly taking on the same side as that of I. B. Horner, but he also asks others to do more research on the topic.

On the other hand, Ven. Thanissaro takes the other stand “a house having a man and a woman” as stated in the summary, i.e. “To sit down intruding on a man and a woman in their private quarters—when one or both are sexually aroused, and when another bhikkhu is not present—is a pācittiya offense,”² but still mentions the rule the other way with the translation for *sabhojane* in quotation marks: “Should a bhikkhu sit intruding on a family “with its meal,” it is to be confessed,”³

K. R. Norman also shares the same ideal translating the compound as “having food” but mentions in foot note that “Sabhojana could mean “having food” or “having sex.”⁴

To me the rule is very clear, there is no need to be bothered with “food or meal” in this case once the meaning is already explained in the *Pāli* Canon and Commentary.

--ooOoo--

65. *paripucchā* (BD. II, 395):

(Pācittiya 54)

There is no offence if he speak, saying: ‘Thus the version of our teachers is an interrogation;’ if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti evaṃ amhākaṃ ācariyānaṃ uggaho paripucchā ’ti bhaṇāti, ummattakassa, ādikammikassāti. (Vin. IV, 114)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

¹ Footnote 3 (BD. II, 355).

² Tha. I, 384.

³ *Ibid.* 385.

⁴ Norman 61.

There is no offence if he says: ‘Thus the version, the enquiring of our teachers;’ if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

paripucchā: This passage is the non-offense part, and the context of this case is that a monk, while being admonished by another monk towards his behaviors, shows disrespect to the accuser or to the monastic rules. At the footnote 2, I. B. Horner writes: “*paripucchā*. Perhaps ‘questionable.’ Cf. above, pp. 271, 275, 278” (395); but *paripucchā* ’ti in this excerpt cannot be analyzed as an adjective, if so it would be *paripuccho*. In fact, it is a feminine noun, *paripucchā*, from the root √*pucch* (to ask, to question, to enquire), and it should be an apposition to *uggaho* “[from *uggaṇhāti*; cf *BHS* *udgraha*], taking hold of (mentally), grasping; grasp; learning, what is learn.”¹ I take it as an action noun having the meaning as “enquiring.”

--ooOoo--

66. *asambhinnena, vilepanena* (BD. II, 401): (Pācittiya 57)

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 morning approached the lord, anointed, perfumed; 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?”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho rājā Māgadho Seniyō Bimbisāro vikāle sīsaṃ nhāyitvā nagaradvāre thakite bahinagare vasitvā kālass’ eva asamhinnena vilepanena yena bhagavā ten’ upasaṅkami, upasaṅkamitvā bhagavantaṃ abhivādetvā ekamantaṃ nisīdi. ekamantaṃ

¹ DOP. 394.

nisinnaṃ kho rājānaṃ Māgadhaṃ Seniyaṃ Bimbisāraṃ bhagavā etadavoca: kissa tvaṃ mahārāja kālass' eva āgato asambhinnena vilepanenā 'ti. (Vin. IV, 117)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 morning with ointment not deodorized approached the lord, anointed, perfumed; 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, with ointment not deodorized?”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *vilepanena*: is not an adjective or ppp., i.e. “perfumed” as suggested by I. B. Horner’s translation. In fact, it is the neuter noun in its singular, instrumental case, i.e. *vilepanam* meaning “ointment, cosmetic, toilet perfume.”¹

b/ *asambhinnena*: Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa says nothing about this, whereas the Sub-Commentary explains:

sattamasikkhāpadassa pāliyaṃ asambhinnenāti amakkhitena, anattthenāti attho = *asambhinnena* of the seventh precept in the *Pāli* Canon has the meaning as “not to be smeared, without good thing.”²

From the question of the Buddha in this story, I believe that the ointment on the body of the king was uncomfortable to the nose. Obviously *asambhinnena* is the negative of *sambhinnena*, which is the ppp. of the verb *sambhindati* (*sam* + \sqrt{bhid} + *η* + *a* + *ti*) having the meaning as “to mix, to break.” So it is safe to conclude that the ointment on the king’s body was not well prepared and had a smell due to the reason that he was away from his palace where the aromatic compound was available, but not at the place he spent the night.

¹ PED. 636; CPED. 244.

² VṬ. III, 73.

--ooOoo--

67. *apaccuddhāraṇaṃ* (BD. II, 411-412):
(Pācittiya 59)

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.

...

(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.

PĀLI TEXT:

yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhussa vā bhikkhuniyā vā sikkhamānāya vā sāmaṇerassa vā sāmaṇeriyā vā sāmamaṃ cīvaraṃ vikappetvā apaccuddhāraṇaṃ paribhuñjeyya, pācittiyā ti. (Vin. II, 121)

apaccuddhāraṇaṃ nāma tassa vā adinnaṃ tassa vā avissāsento paribhuñjati, āpatti pācittiyassa. (*Ibid.* 122)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 rescinded (by the latter), there is an offence of expiation.

...

(The robe) not having been rescinded 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.

DISCUSSION:

apaccuddhāraṇaṃ: (*na+paccuddhāraṇaṃ*) is the antonym of the derivative noun from the verb *paccuddharati* (to rescind) applied in the case that a monk at first determinates

(*adhiṭṭheti*) his new requisite, i.e. his bowl and nine kinds of robes and cloths, then later rescinds it before determining a new one (discussed at § 36).

But in this case, the term *paccuddhāraṇaṃ* involves the process of placing under dual ownership (*vikappeti*) the six kinds of robes with a co-religious person, i.e. *bhikkhunī*, *sikkhamānā*, *sāmaṇera*, or *sāmaṇerī* (nun, female probationer, male novice, or female novice). After placing the robe under dual ownership, the monk can keep the extra robe as long as he wants without transgressing the first *nissaggiya pācittiya* (offence of expiation involving forfeiture). However, if the monk wants to use the robe already placed under dual ownership, he needs the other to rescind it first; if he uses the robe when the rescission is not yet given by the other (*apaccuddhāraṇaṃ*), he will commit an offence of expiation.

Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa translates *apaccuddhāraṇaṃ* as “without (the other) relinquishing (his share),” Ven. Thanissaro as “without the shared ownership’s being rescinded,”¹ and K. R. Norman as “without a formal taking back [i.e. rescinding of the assignment].”²

The ritual performance to rescind a robe being placed under dual ownership is also explained by the two venerables under the heading of this rule.³

--ooOoo--

¹ Vaj. I, 173; Tha. I, 415.

² Norman 67.

³ Vaj. I, 174-175; Tha. I, 416-417.

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE

VOLUME III

(From Pācittiya 61 to Adhikaraṇasamatha)



68. *so 'haṃ & tassa me, Textual discrepancy*(BD. III, 7):

(Pācittiya 64)

“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, so I am under probation. I, your reverence, am experiencing a feeling, let the venerable one conceal me, saying: ‘He is experiencing a feeling.’”

PĀLI TEXT:

ahaṃ āvuso sañcetanikaṃ sukkavissatṭhiāpattiṃ āpajjitvā saṃghaṃ tassā āpattiyā parivāsaṃ yāciṃ, tassa me saṃgho tassā āpattiyā parivāsaṃ adāsi, so 'haṃ parivasāmi. vediyāṃ' ahaṃ āvuso, vediyatīti maṃ āyasmā dhāretū 'ti. (Vin. IV, 127)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“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, so I am under probation. I notify (you of this), your reverence. May the reverence acknowledges me as ‘one who has notified.’”

DISCUSSION:

The saying above is of a monk who was undergoing the probation *parivāsa* after having committed the *saṅghādisesa* offence of intentional emission of semen. During the probation period, his obligation is to notify his status to other monks as stated in the Cullavagga.

pārivāsikena bhikkhave bhikkhunā āgantukena ārocetabbaṃ, āgantukassa ārocetabbaṃ, uposathe ārocetabbaṃ, pavāraṇāya ārocetabbaṃ, sace gilāno hoti dūtena pi ārocetabbaṃ = Monks, a monk under probation should announce it 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.¹

a/ *so 'haṃ & tassa me*: The first notice is that “*so 'haṃ*” is the contracted form of “*so ahaṃ*.” In this passage, *so* and *ahaṃ* both are in nominative case singular, *tassa* and *me* in dative case singular, all refer to the speaker, i.e. the monk who was under probation. The use of the two demonstrative adjectives *so* and *tassa* modifying the two personal pronouns *ahaṃ* and *me* is to emphasize that the speaker is talking just about himself, not about anyone else. The emphasis used here is to avoid the confusion that he is speaking on behalf of another probationer monk. I leave the two terms *so* and *tassa* not translated. Geiger in his grammar book mentions this usage of *so*, *sā*, *taṃ* but calls them pronouns.²

b/ **Textual discrepancy - *vediyati***: The purpose of the probation monk when saying “*vediyāṃ' āhaṃ āvuso, vediyatīti maṃ ayasmā dhāretu*” to another monk coming to his place or at the monastery that he has arrived is to let the other monk know that he is performing the duties of a probationer; and the purpose of his deed will be accomplished if the witness acknowledges about his status and his performing of the duties. I. B. Horner takes the meaning of the verb *vediyati* from the PED. as “to feel, to experience a sensation or feeling (usually with *vedanaṃ* or pl. *vedanā*)”³ and comes up with the translation above. Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta takes it as a passive verb, “**Vediyati** (vid + i + ya), to be felt or experienced;”⁴ so that the spoken words above should be translated as: “I am known, your reverence. May the reverence acknowledge me as ‘one who is known.’” On the other hand, the Tipiṭaka in Thai Scriptures presents the above sentence as “*vedayāṃ' ahaṃ vedayatīti maṃ ayasmā*

¹ Vin. II, 32; BD. V, 46.

² Geiger, §106.

³ PED. 648.

⁴ CPED. 249.

*dhāretu*¹ = I notify (you of this). May the reverence acknowledges me as ‘one who has notified.’” In this case, I assume that the verb *vedayati* is the causative verb of √*vid* and its meaning should be “let someone know, make someone ascertain, to notify.” I prefer this revision due to it makes sense and complies with the grammar rules.

--ooOoo--

69. *kiṃ pana* (BD. III, 7-8):

(Pācittiya 64)

“Your reverence, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having fallen into the offence of intentional emission of semen, said to me: ‘Do not tell anyone.’”

“But are you, then, your reverence, not concealing (him)?”

“Yes, your reverence.”

PĀLI TEXT:

ayaṃ āvuso āyasmā Upanando Sakyaputto sañcetanikaṃ sukkavissatṭhiāpattiṃ
āpajjitvā so me āroceti: mā kassaci ārocesīti. kiṃ pana tvaṃ āvuso paṭicchādesīti.
evam āvuso ’ti. (Vin. IV, 127)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Your reverence, this venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having fallen into the offence of intentional emission of semen, said to me: ‘Do not tell anyone.’”

“But are you, then, your reverence, concealing (his offence)?”

“Yes, your reverence.”

DISCUSSION:

kiṃ pana: In the question “*kiṃ pana tvaṃ āvuso paṭicchādesi?*” *kiṃ* is an interrogative particle introduce a question, in fact a yes-no question² as confirmed by the answer “*evam āvuso ’ti*” (= Yes, your reverence). And *pana* used in a question, i. e. *kiṃ pana*, *kahaṃ pana*,

¹ Syā. Vol. 2, 418.

² PED. 212.

kena pana, katamaṃ pana has the meaning: then, now.¹ The meaning of the verb *paṭicchādeti* is explained in the *Pāli Canon*:

paṭicchādeyyā 'ti imaṃ jānitvā codessanti sāressanti khuṃsessanti vambhessanti, maṅkuṃ karissanti nāroccsāmīti dhuraṃ nikkhittamatte, āpatti pācittiyassa. = *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, I will not tell,' in the mere fact that responsibility is thrown off, there is an offence of expiation.²

However, the monk in the story conceals the fact that the other monk has violated a serious offence, not conceal the presence of that guilty monk as given by I. B. Horner, i.e. "concealing (him)." The negative "not" in I. B. Horner's translation is meaningless referring to the context. See also § 58.

--ooOoo--

70. *vinayapariyattiyā* (BD. III, 40):
(Pācittiya 72)

Now at that time the lord 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhagavā bhikkhūnaṃ anekapariyāyena vinayakathaṃ katheti vinayassa vaṇṇaṃ bhāsati vinayapariyattiyā vaṇṇaṃ bhāsati ādissa ādissa āyasmato Upālissa vaṇṇaṃ bhāsati. (Vin. IV, 142)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the lord in many a figure talks a talk on discipline to the monks, he speaks in praise of discipline, he speaks in praise of learning discipline, he speaks in praise of the venerable Upāli, referring (to him) again and again.

¹ PED. 411.

² Vin. IV, 128; BD. III, 8.

DISCUSSION:

vinayapariyattiyā: The interpretation given by I. Horner “accomplishment in discipline” perhaps is based on the general meaning of the term *pariyatti*; it has the sense of acquisition, achievement, which is a further step in the process of accumulating the knowledge about discipline, or the process of learning discipline. According to Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa:

vinayapariyattiyā vaṇṇaṃ bhāsatī ’ti vinayaṃ pariyāpuṇantānaṃ vinayapariyattimūlakaṃ vaṇṇaṃ guṇaṃ ānisaṃsaṃ bhāsatī¹ = To speak in praise of learning discipline is to speak of quality, virtue, benefit derived from learning discipline among those who are learning thoroughly the discipline.”

So the venerable takes *pariyatti* as the derivative of the verb *pariyāpuṇāti* (*pari* + √*āp*) having the meaning as “to learn,” not of *pariyāpajjati* (*pari* + *ā* + √*pad*), “to be finished.” He also gives such meaning of *pariyatti* in the context of the true doctrine (*saddhamma*):

saddhammatṭhitiyā paṭipanno hotī ’ti ettha pana tividho saddhammo pariyatti paṭipatti adhiḡamavasena, tattha tepītaḡaṃ buddhavaḡanaṃ pariyattisaddhammo nāma, terasa dhutaṅguṇā cuddasakhandhakavattāni dveasīti mahāvattānī ’ti ayaṃ paṭipattisaddhammo nāma. cattāro maggā cattāri phalāni ca ayaṃ adhiḡamasaddhammo nāma² = *The practicing for the stability of the true doctrine* is the threefold of the true doctrine in terms of learning (*pariyatti*), of practicing (*paṭipatti*), of higher attainment (*adhiḡama*). Here, the true doctrine for learning (*pariyattisaddhammo*) is the Buddha’s teachings, which is the Tipītaḡa. The true doctrine for practicing (*paṭipattisaddhammo*) is the thirteen virtues of ascetic observance, the fourteen duties in Khandhaka texts (in *Cullavagga* to be specific), the eighty-two main duties (for probationer monk). The true doctrine for higher attainment (*adhiḡamasaddhammo*) is the four Paths and Fruits.

So that the meaning of *pariyatti* in this context should be “learning” instead of “accomplishment.”

¹ VA. IV, 871.

² *Ibid.* 874.

One more thing is that I preserve the historical present “talks, speaks” in my proposed translation instead of switching them to past tense forms as those of I. B. Horner.

--ooOoo--

71. *iti/ti, sutta* (BD. III, 43):

(Pācittiya 73)

Now at one time the group of six monks, thinking: “Let them understand that having indulged in bad habits, we are fallen through ignorance,” while the Pātimokkha was being recited, spoke thus: “Only now do we 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū anācāraṃ ācaritvā aññānakena āpannā ’ti jānantū ’ti pātimokkhe uddissamāne evaṃ vadenti: idān’ eva kho mayaṃ jānāma ayam pi kira dhammo suttāgato suttapariyāpanno anvaddhamāsaṃ uddesaṃ āgacchatīti. (Vin. IV, 144)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at one time the group of six monks having indulged in bad habits, thinking: “Let them perceive that we transgressed the rule due to lacking of knowledge,” while the Pātimokkha was being recited, spoke thus: “Only now do we understand that this rule is, as is said, handed down in the Pātimokkha, contained in the Pātimokkha, (and) comes up for recitation every half-month.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *iti/ti*: In *Pāli*, the particle *iti/ti* is “used to point out something just mentioned or about to be mentioned and to show that a sentence is finished.”¹ The starting point of the quote is often to be decided through the context. For this item, I leave the gerund phrase “*anācāraṃ ācaritvā*” out of the quote and the thought of the group of six monks should be: “Let them

¹ CPED. 50.

perceive that we transgressed the rule due to lacking of knowledge.” See also § 18a, 48b, 72a, 144a, 146b, 185c.

b/ *sutta*: Another issue need to be mentioned is the meaning of the term *sutta* in *Vinaya* context. This term is also found in the name of one division of the *Vinaya Piṭaka* called *Suttavibhaṅga*, which is the *Pāli* texts classifying and explaining the rules for monks and nuns. We also have its meaning from the PED.: “**Sutta**² (nt.) – 4. a rule, a clause (of the *Pātimokkha*), ... – 7. book of rules, ... **Suttavibhaṅga** classification of rules Vin II.97. Also title of a portion of the *Vinaya Piṭaka*.”¹ So the term *sutta* in the two compounds *suttāgato*, *suttapariyāpanno* can be analyzed either in singular or plural sense; I take it as plural and interpret them as “handed down in the rules” and “contained in the rules” respectively. Furthermore, the summary of those rules included in the text called *Pātimokkha* that is supposed to be recited every half-month (*anvaddhamāsaṃ uddesaṃ āgacchati*) in the *Uposatha* day, so that in my translation I prefer to give the meanings of “*suttāgato* *suttapariyāpanno*” as “handed down in the *Pātimokkha*, contained in the *Pātimokkha*” in order to fit with the *Vinaya* context.

--ooOoo--

72. mohanake (BD. III, 44):

(Pācittiya 73)

This for him on whom the confusion is put is an offence of expiation.

PĀLI TEXT:

Idaṃ tasmim̐ mohanake pācittiyā”ti (Vin. IV, 144).

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

This is an offence of expiation in that deception.

¹ PED. 718.

DISCUSSION:

mohanake: The context here is that the group of six monks did know about the rules but behaved as if they did not know (the rules), and they tried to fool other monks into thinking of their ignorance that those rules had not been regulated by the Buddha. The offence is meant for their cheating behaviors in deceiving (*mohanakam*) other monks. Grammatically, I take *tasmim* as demonstrative adjective modifying *mohanake*.

--ooOoo--

73. *iti/ti, gacchati* (BD. III, 56):

(Pācittiya 78)

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, I will make him ashamed,’ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If standing where he hears, there is an offence of expiation.

PĀLI TEXT:

upassutiṃ tiṭṭheyā ’ti imesaṃ sutvā codessāmi sāressāmi paṭicodessāmi paṭisāressāmi maṅkuṃ karissāmīti gacchati, āpatti dukkaṭassa. yattha ṭhito suṇāti, āpatti pācittiyassa. (Vin. IV, 150)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Should stand overhearing means: (thinking): ‘After listening to these, I will reprove (him), I will remind (him), I will reprimand (him), I will make (him) remorseful, I will make him ashamed,’ then goes (near by), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If standing where he hears, there is an offence of expiation.

DISCUSSION:

a/ ***iti/ti***: Again, the starting point of the quote is to be decided through the context, in which the monk who stands eavesdropping the argument, quarrel, or dispute of other monks

has the purpose of using overheard information against them, either to reprove, remind, reprimand those monks, or to make them remorseful or ashamed. In this case, the content of the thought should include the phrase “*imesaṃ sutvā*” so that it can express the intention of the eavesdropper. See also § 18a, 48b, 70a, 144a, 146b, 185c.

b/ *gacchati*: has its basic meaning as “to go;” but which direction, going away or approaching, in this context? I. B. Horner takes the former and I the latter. My reasoning is that after having such thinking the eavesdropper monk should approach those monks in order to listen to their talking, how is he supposed to go away? Ven. Thanissaro supports my choice.¹ So that this passage should be interpreted thus: Having such thought, if he approaches them in order to hear the words, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if he stands nearby and listens, there is an offence of expiation.

--ooOoo--

74. Gerund (BD. III, 81):

(Pācittiya 84)

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, having deposited them in the hands of those who there are suitable householders.

PĀLI TEXT:

tamhā āvāsā pakkamantena ye tattha honti bhikkhū patirūpā tesam hatthe nikkhipitvā pakkamitabbaṃ. no ce honti bhikkhū patirūpā, ye tattha honti gahapatikā patirūpā tesam hatthe nikkhipitvā pakkamitabbaṃ. (Vin. IV, 163-164)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

While setting out from that residence, he should deposit them in the hand(s) of monks who are suitable there then depart. But if there are no suitable monks, he should deposit them in the hand(s) of householders who are suitable there then depart.

¹ Tha. I, 452.

DISCUSSION:

Gerund: I have just rephrased the translation of I. B. Horner hoping that the meaning is easier to understand and to bring out two grammatical issues relating to the future passive participle *pakkamītabbaṃ*: (i) its agent is often in instrumental case, i. e. *pakkamāntena* = the one who is setting out, and (ii) its mood affects the gerund *nikkhipitvā* in the previous clause “*tesaṃ hatthe nikkhipitvā* = he should deposit in the hand(s) of them. See also § 56b, 115b, 145c, 158, 160, 177a, 206b, 225.

--ooOoo--

75. *yassa & so, tāvakālikaṃ, paṃsukūla* (BD. III, 81): (Pācittiya 84)

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-robber; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti ratanaṃ vā ratanasammatam vā ajjhārāme vā ajjhāvasathe vā uggahetvā vā uggahāpetvā vā nikkhipati yassa bhavissati so harissatīti, ratanasammatam viśāsam gaṇhāti, tāvakālikaṃ gaṇhāti, paṃsukūlasaññissa, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ’ti.
(Vin. IV, 164)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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: ‘Whoever is the owner will (come back and) take it’; if he takes on trust what is considered as a jewel; if he takes it for a while; if he thinks it is a discarded item; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *yassa & so*: As I understand the English phrase “It will be for him who will take it” that everyone is able to declare the owner of the lost or dropped item, but the case here is that only the owner can receive back his or her own belonging as explained in the word-analysis section, “*yassa bhaṇḍaṃ naṭṭhaṃ so āgacchatū’ti* = Let him come whose goods are lost.”¹ So that the literal translation of “*yassa bhavissati so harissati*” should be: “To whom it (will) belongs, that one will take it,” and my proposed translation is slightly rephrased from it.

b/ *tāvakālikaṃ*: The meaning of *tāvakālikaṃ* as “for a while, temporary” is already mentioned previously, see § 13a.

c/ *paṃsukūla*: The Concise Pāli-English Dictionary explains *paṃsukūla* in the entry of “*paṃsu*, *m.* soil; dust. —*kūla*, *nt.* a dust heap. —*kūlacīvara*, *nt.* a robe made of rags taken from dust-bins. —*kūlika*, *a.* one who wears such robes.”² Even though the term *paṃsukūla* is often found in the context of rag-ropes for monks, but here it should be taken its general meaning as an item from a dust heap, or figuratively a waste thing, the thing that was discarded, was thrown away.

--ooOoo--

76. Textual discrepancy (BD. III, 86): (Pācittiya 85)

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 village; 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.

¹ Vin. IV, 163; BD. III, 81.

² CPED. 181.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti tathārūpe accāyike karaṇīye, santam bhikkhum āpucchā pavisati, asantam bhikkhum anāpucchā pavisati, antarāgāmaṃ gacchati, bhikkhunūpassayaṃ gacchati, titthiyaseyyaṃ gacchati, paṭikkamanaṃ gacchati, gāmena maggo hoti, āpadāsu, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā 'ti. (Vin. IV, 166)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 to another monastery; 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.

DISCUSSION:

Textual discrepancy - *antarāgāmaṃ* vs. *antarārāmaṃ*: The interpretation of the clause “*antarāgāmaṃ gacchati*” as “if he is going into a village” is inappropriate due to the reason that it conflicts to the purpose of this rule preventing monks going to a village in the wrong time from after noon until the following dawn. In fact this must be a mistake in reading the Scriptures of the PTS. editors; instead of *antarāgāmaṃ* it should be *antarārāmaṃ* as found in the *Pāli* Scriptures from other sources.¹

Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa also read it as *antarārāmaṃ*:

antarārāman ti ādīsu na kevalaṃ anāpucchā kāyabandhanaṃ abandhitvā saṅghāṭiṃ apārupitvā gacchantassapi anāpatti.² = *inside a monastery* means there is no offence to the one who is going inside such places not only without taking leave but also without wearing the belt, without putting on the outer-robe.

From this explanation of him, I deduce the meaning of *antarārāmaṃ* as “inside a monastery.”

¹ Be. Vol. 2, 216; BJTS. Vol. 2 (1), 442; Syā. Vol. 2, 497.

² VA. IV, 883.

However, in another place the Great Commentator explains it as a monastery inside a village (*antarārāman ti antogāme vihāro hoti taṃ gacchati*).¹

Ven. Thanissaro translates the clause “*antarārāmaṃ gacchati*” as “one is on one’s way to another monastery.”² It seems reasonable because the next clause shows that his destination is a nunnery or a sleeping place belonging to another religion.

Cone in her dictionary takes both, **1.** (adv.) inside; on the way, ... ind., **1.** at intervals ...⁰ -**magge**, ind., on the way ...³

From these observations, I take its literal meaning as “between the two monasteries,” or in other words I am complying with the interpretation of Ven. Thanissaro, “to another monastery.”

Similar structure are also found in other words, e.g. *antarāmagge* (on the way, in the middle of the journey), *antaragharaṃ* (amidst the houses).

--ooOoo--

77. Textual - missing translation (BD. III, 103-104):

(Pāṭidesanīya 01)

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:

“How can these revered sirs accept food from the hand of a nun? Women obtain things with difficulty.”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho sā bhikkhunī seṭṭhissa gahapatissa etam atthaṃ ārocesi. seṭṭhi gahapati taṃ bhikkhuniṃ gharaṃ netvā bhojetvā ujjhāyati khīyati vipāceti: kathaṃ hi nāma bhadantā bhikkhuniyā hatthato āmisam paṭiggahessanti, kicchālābho mātuḡāmo ’ti.
(Vin. IV, 175)

¹ VA. IV, 857.

² Tha. I, 469.

³ DOP. 150.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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, having served her with food, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“How can these revered sirs accept food from the hand of a nun? Women obtain things with difficulty.”

DISCUSSION:

Textual - missing translation (*bhojetvā*): In her translation, I. B. Horner missed the gerund *bhojetvā*. It is a causative verb (= ($\sqrt{bhuj} + e + ti$) having the meaning “to make to eat, to feed.”

--ooOoo--

78. Genitive vs. Dative (BD. III, 108):

(Pāṭidesanīya 02)

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 others; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti attano bhattaṃ dāpeti na deti, aññesaṃ bhattaṃ deti na dāpeti, yaṃ na dinnāṃ taṃ dāpeti, yattha na dinnāṃ tattha dāpeti, sabbesaṃ samakaṃ dāpeti, sikkhamānā vosāsatī, sāmaṇerī vosāsatī, pañca bhojanāni ṭhapetvā sabbattha anāpatti, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ’ti. (Vin. IV, 178)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

There is no offence if she makes (another) give her own meal, (but) does not (herself) give; if she gives others’ meal (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 others; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

Genitive vs. Dative: Parallel construction is often found in the *Pāli* language. I am going to use it to decide the case of *aññesaṃ* in “*aññesaṃ bhattaṃ deti na dāpeti*” to be similar to the genitive case of *attano* in the first clause “*attano bhattaṃ dāpeti na deti.*” The phrase “*attano bhattaṃ*” is translated as “her own meal, a meal of her own,” so that a similar interpretation should take place in the phrase “*aññesaṃ bhattaṃ* = a meal of others = others’ meal.” Grammatically, *aññesaṃ* should be in genitive case not in dative case as shown by I. B. Horner’s translation, “a meal to others.” I am also presenting here the interpretation of Ven. Thanissaro to make the point clear:

There is no offense –
if the bhikkhuni gets others to give her food to the bhikkhus;
if she herself gives the food of other people to the bhikkhus;
if she gets the donors to give food they have forgotten;
if she gets them to give to a bhikkhu they have passed over;
if she gets them to give the food equally to all;
if she is a female probationer or novice; or
if she gets them to give anything but the five staple foods.¹

See also § 24, 50a, 52, 79a.

--ooOoo--

79. Genitive vs. Dative, *yāvakālikaṃ yāmakālikaṃ sattāhakālikaṃ yāvajīvikaṃ*, Textual discrepancy (BD. III, 114):
(Pāṭidesanīya 03)

¹ Tha. I, 483.

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 give; 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 day; if, when there is a reason, he gives (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night, during seven days, during life, and he makes use of it; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti nimantitassa, gilānassa, nimantitassa vā gilānassa vā sesakaṃ bhuñjati, aññesaṃ bhikkhā tattha paññattā hoti, gharato nīharitvā denti, niccabhattake, salākabhatte, pakkhike, uposathike, pāṭipadike, yāmakālikaṃ sattāhakālikaṃ yāvajīvikaṃ sati paccaye paribhuñjati deti, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā 'ti. (Vin. IV, 181)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 the alms-food prepared there is of other donors; if having taken it out from the house, they give; 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 day; if the family gives thing that may be consumed for that very day and night, thing that may be consumed during seven days, thing that may be consumed during life (saying): "Use it in case of need;" if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Genitive vs. Dative:** In the clause "*aññesaṃ bhikkhā tattha paññattā hoti,*" *aññesaṃ* could be either in the case of dative or genitive plural. I. B. Horner takes it as dative case (for others); if such is the case, the monk who is not ill, not invited, receives any kind of the five

staple food of the family, and eats will violate this rule even though the food is prepared for others. The reason is that the essence of this rule is to prevent the monks from overusing the charity of the laity who, having good faith, are willing to sacrifice everything to the Triple Gems; there are many stories in the *Tipiṭaka* showing that such people often keep their stomach empty in order to offer their own meal to the monks. Moreover, if the word *aññesaṃ* were in dative case, it should have been, I think, grammatically placed right before the ppp. *paññattā*. So the choice left is that *aññesaṃ* should be in genitive case (of others). I found no comments on this from Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa; but my choice is approved by Ven. Thanissaro.¹ See also § 24, 50a, 52, 78.

b/ ***yāvakālikaṃ yāmakālikaṃ sattāhakālikaṃ yāvajīvikaṃ***: Another issue is the meaning of these four technical terms: *yāvakālikaṃ*, *yāmakālikaṃ*, *sattāhakālikaṃ*, *yāvajīvikaṃ*. The explanation for each term is found in the *Vinayapiṭaka*: *yāvakālikaṃ* in terms of *khādanīyaṃ* and *bhojanīyaṃ* in *Suttavibhaṅga*. (Vin. IV, 83; BD. II, 330), *yāmakālikaṃ* in *Mahāvagga* (Vin.I, 245-246; BD. IV, 336-369), *sattāhakālikaṃ* in *Mahāvagga* (Vin.I, 199-200, 209; BD. IV, 269-270, 285), *yāvajīvikaṃ* in *Mahāvagga* (Vin.I, 200-2; BD. IV, 271-3). Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa gives a long explanation for those four terms in his Vinaya book in Thai language, *Vinayamukha*, translated into English as *The Entrance to the Vinaya*;² I am going to quote from his book the very first part of the chapter XIX “The Four Timely Supports”:

Things which can be swallowed are called *kālika* because they have a limit within which they can be used temporarily. They can be classified into four kinds:

1. Things which may be consumed within a certain time, from dawn until noon, are called *yāvakālika*.
2. Things which may be consumed within a certain time, for one day and one night, are called *yāmakālika*.

¹ Tha. I, 656.

² Vaj. II, 131–43.

3. Things which may be consumed within a certain time, for seven days, are called *sattāhakālika*.

4. Things which may be consumed within time limitation are called *yāvajīvika*.

The name ‘kālika’ may perhaps only refer to three kinds, from one to three above. Since this subject should be covered entirely, however, the things which are not arranged within kālika are therefore called *yāvajīvika*, translated as ‘things for use all one’s life’, (that is, until the item to be consumed is finished or the consumer of the item is no longer in existence), so that altogether there are four kinds. (131)

c/ **Textual Discrepancy:** There is also a discrepancy among the *Pāli* Scriptures from different sources about the clause “*sati paccaye paribhuñjati*,” the Sri Lankan is similar to the PTS. edition,¹ but not the Burmese and Thai, “*sati paccaye paribhuñjāti*.”² I follow the *Pāli* text of the Burmese and Thai revealing the particle *iti/ti*, and then render the whole sentence “*yāmakālikaṃ sattāhakālikaṃ yāvajīvikaṃ sati paccaye paribhuñjāti deti*” into English as shown above.

--ooOoo--

80. *parivāro* (BD. III, 117-118):

(Pāṭidesanīya 04)

If it is announced in regard to conje~~y~~ that the ingredients 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.

¹ BJTS. Vol. 2 (1), 478.

² Syā. Vol. 2, 525; Be. Vol. 2, 234.

PĀLI TEXT:

yāguyā paṭisaṃvidite tassā parivāro āhariyyati, etaṃ paṭisaṃviditaṃ nāma. bhāttena paṭisaṃvidite tassa parivāro āhariyyati, etaṃ paṭisaṃviditaṃ nāma. khādaniyena paṭisaṃvidite tassa parivāro āhariyyati, etaṃ paṭisaṃ viditaṃ nāma. kulena paṭisaṃvidite yo tasmim kule manusso khādaniyaṃ vā bhojaniyaṃ vā āharati, etaṃ paṭisaṃviditaṃ nāma. gāmena paṭisaṃvidite yo tasmim gāme manusso khādaniyaṃ vā bhojaniyaṃ vā āharati, etaṃ paṭisaṃviditaṃ nāma. pūgena paṭisaṃvidite yo tasmim pūge manusso khādaniyaṃ vā bhojaniyaṃ vā āharati, etaṃ paṭisaṃviditaṃ nāma. (Vin. IV, 183)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

When it is announced in regard to conje, accessory of that (conje) may be conveyed; this is called announced. When it is announced in regard to a meal, accessory of that (meal) may be conveyed; this is called announced. When it is announced in regard to solid food, accessory of that (solid food) may be conveyed; this is called announced. When it is announced in regard to a family, the person who is of that family may convey solid food or soft food; this is called announced. When it is announced in regard to a village, the person who is in that village may convey solid food or soft food; this is called announced. When it is announced in regard to a guild, the person who is in that guild may convey solid food or soft food; this is called announced.

DISCUSSION:

parivāro: For the meaning of *parivāro*, perhaps I. B. Horner takes it as “ingredient” from the PED.: – 3. ingredient, accessories (pl.), requisite ...¹ However, *parivāro* should be understood as “accessory,” which is anything that accompanies as subordinate, aids in a secondary way, is additional, comes along with the announced food; such conclusion is clearly seen from the context.

¹ PED. 435-436.

Another issue should be noticed is that this excerpt is found in the word-analysis section (*padabhājanīya*), so I prefer not to begin each sentence with the conjunction “if” and replace it by “when” denoting the locative case *appaṭisamvidite*.

--ooOoo--

81. *supaṭicchanno*, Textual - misreading (BD. III, 121-122):
(Sekhiya 04)

“... ‘Properly clad will I go (sit down) amidst the house,’ 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 wrongdoing.

There is no offence if it is unintentional, if he is not thinking, if he does not know, if he is ill (*in Ch. 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

supaṭicchanno antaraghare gamissāmīti (nisīdissāmīti) sikkhā karaṇīyā.
supaṭicchannena antaraghare gantabbaṃ (nisīditabbaṃ). yo anādariyaṃ paṭicca kāyaṃ vivarivā antaraghare gacchati (nisīdati), āpatti dukkaṭassa.
anāpatti asaṅcicca, asatiyā, ajānantassa, gilānassa, (*in Chap. 4 it is added here, vāsūpagatassa*), āpadāsu, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ’ti. (Vin. IV, 186)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“... ‘Well covered will I go (sit down) amidst the house,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should go (sit down) amidst the houses well covered. Whoever out of disrespect, having uncovered the body, goes (sits down) amidst the houses, 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 (*in Ch. 4 it is added here: if he has gone into a dwelling place*), if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *supaṭicchanno* (*su* + *paṭi* + *c* + *channo*): *Paṭicchanna* is the past passive participle of the causative verb *paṭichādeti* (*paṭi* + √*chad*) having the meaning as “to cover over; to conceal,”¹ and the prefix *su* has the function as an adverb of manner with a positive meaning.

Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains:

supaṭicchannenā ’ti na sasīsaṃ pārutena, atha kho gaṇṭhikaṃ paṭimuñcivā ubhato anuvātantena gīvaṃ paṭicchādetvā ubho kaṇṇe samaṃ katvā paṭisaṃharitvā yāva maṇibandhaṃ paṭicchādetvā antaraghare gantabbaṃ.² = *well covered* means not veiled the head, one should untie the knot, cover the neck on both side with the border (of the robe), even up the two edges, pull down and cover up to the wrists, then may go amidst the houses.

This is just a matter of word choice, but in this context “well covered” served a better purpose of concealing the body than “properly clad.” I borrow the words “well covered” from the work of Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa, Ven. Thanissaro, and also K. R. Norman.³

b/ **Textual - misreading** (*vāsūpagatassa* vs. *vassūpagatassa*): It seems to me that I. B. Horner misread *vāsūpagatassa* as *vassūpagatassa* then translated it accordingly, i.e. “if he has gone into residence for the rains.” To the compound *vāsūpagatassa* (*vāsa*+*upagatassa*), Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa says:

vāsūpagatassā ’ti vāsathāya upagatassa rattibhāge vā divasabhāge vā kāyaṃ vivaritvā nisīdato anāpatti.⁴ = There is no offence for the one who has entered a dwelling place, if he opens out the body and sits down at daytime or night-time.

Moreover, Ven. Thanissaro emphasizes that “[a]ccording to the Vinayamukha, this means within one's room if one is staying overnight in a lay person's home; when outside of one's room, though, one should follow the rule.”⁵

¹ CPED. 156.

² VA. IV, 890.

³ Vaj. I, 205; Tha. I, 491; Norman 89.

⁴ VA. IV, 890.

⁵ Tha. I, 491.

The term *vāsūpagatassa* is also added in *sekhiya* 10 prohibiting of lifting up the robes while sitting down amidst the houses.¹

--ooOoo--

82. *pallatthikā* (BD. III, 126):

(Sekhiya 26)

Now at that time the group of six monks sat down amidst the houses lolling ... “...

‘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.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū pallatthikāya antaraghare nisīdanti

— pa —.

na pallatthikāya antaraghare nisīdissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

na pallatthikāya antaraghare nisīditabbaṃ. yo anādariyaṃ paṭicca hatthapallatthikāya vā dussapallatthikāya vā antaraghare nisīdati, āpatti dukkaṭassa. (Vin. IV, 189)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks sat down amidst the houses clasping the knees with hands ... “...

‘Not clasping the knees with hands will I sit down amidst the houses,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not sit down amidst the houses clasping the knees with hands. Whoever out of disrespect sits down amidst the houses clasping the knees with arms or clasping the knees with a cloth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

DISCUSSION:

pallatthikā: The issue of this item is to define the term *pallatthikā*, which is a sitting position that should not be practice in formal situations such as in front of lay people in

¹ Vin. IV, 187; BD. 123.

inhabited areas. This term is also seen at *sekhiya* 65 prohibiting teaching the doctrine to the listeners who are sitting in such position. Commentaries are not helpful in giving a description of the posture. Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa just explains a kind bandage (*āyoga*) used in such case, (*dussapallatthikāyā* 'ti ettha āyogapallatthikāpi dussapallatthikāy' eva).¹

I. B. Horner, for another passage, translates “*saṅghāṭipallatthikāya nisīdimṣu*” as “sat down squatting against their outer cloaks.”² And other translators:

- Kabilsingh translates “*na pallatthikāya*” as “not embracing the knees,”³
- K. R. Norman as “not sit lolling [= holding on to my knees?],”⁴
- Ven. Thanissaro as “not sit holding up the knees,”⁵
- Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa explains the term more clearly:

“The manner of sitting here is to clasp the knees with the arms or to bind up the body with a cloth and is prohibited by the latter training-rule. To sit clasping the knees with the hands and arms is much used in this country but to sit binding the body with a cloth is not practiced. I have seen ancient pictures showing fat men who used this latter method because it helped them to balance their bodies.”⁶

I take the explanation of Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa for granted.

--ooOoo--

83. *pattasaññī* (BD. III, 127):

(Sekhiya 28)

“... ‘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.

¹ VA. IV, 891.

² Vin. II, 78; BD. V, 102.

³ Kabilsingh 39.

⁴ Norman 95.

⁵ Tha. I, 494.

⁶ Vaj. I, 209.

PĀLI TEXT:

pattasaññī piṇḍapātaṃ paṭiggahessāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

pattasaññinā piṇḍapāto paṭiggahetabbo. yo anādariyaṃ paṭicca taḥaṃ taḥaṃ olokento piṇḍapātaṃ paṭiggaṇhāti, āpatti dukkaṭassa. (Vin. IV, 190)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

‘Having attention (focused) on the bowl will I accept almsfood,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should accept almsfood having attention (focused) on the bowl. Whoever out of disrespect accepts almsfood, looking about here and there, there is an offence of wrongdoing.

DISCUSSION:

pattasaññī: Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains:

pattasaññī’ ti patte saññaṃ katvā.¹ = having *saññā* on/in/at the bowl.”

Saññā is an operation of mind and its meaning is varied: sense, perception, consciousness, awareness, etc. The translation of I. B. Horner “thinking of the bowl” does not express precisely the mental action in the context of receiving (and eating) almsfood; the mind must be more active than the act of thinking alone. The translation of Kabilsingh as “looking at the bowl” focusing much more on bodily action is not an appropriate translation.² Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa gives the translation as “with attention on the bowl,”³ so does K. R. Norman as “with attention to the bowl,”⁴ and Ven. Thanissaro explains further as “with attention focused on the bowl.”⁵ Now we should go back to the Commentary:

pattasaññī ’ti patte saññaṃ katvā = *pattasaññī* means having attention (focused) on/in/at the bowl.

¹ VA. IV, 891.

² Kabilsingh 39.

³ Vaj. I, 210.

⁴ Norman 95.

⁵ Tha. I, 495.

Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* also gives further instruction about the meaning of *pattasaññā*:

Tatīyavagge patte saññā pattasaññā, sā assa atthīti pattasaññī, attano bhājane upanibandhasaññī hutvāti attho. Byañjanaṃ pana anādiyitvā atthamattameva dassetuṃ “patte saññaṃ katvā”ti vuttam.¹ = In the third group, *pattasaññā* is attention (focused) on the bowl, the monk whose attention is focused on the bowl is *pattasaññī*; that is to say being in the state of having attention attached on his own plate. Moreover, ‘paying attention on the bowl’ is explained to show the meaning as a whole, not heeding only food.”

This compound *pattasaññī* is again seen at the *sekhiya* 32 stating such appropriate behavior while having meal.²

--ooOoo--

84. *sapadānaṃ, omasati* (BD. III, 129):
(Sekhiya 33)

‘On continuous alms-tour will I eat almsfood,’ is a training to be observed.”

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, if piling up (food) into another’s vessel he is impatient, if there are dainties, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

sapadānaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

sapadānaṃ piṇḍapāto bhuñjitabbo. yo anādariyaṃ paṭicca taḥaṃ taḥaṃ omadditvā piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjati, āpatti dukkaṭassa.

anāpatti asaṅcicca, assatiyā, ajānantassa, gilānassa, aññesaṃ dento omasati, aññaṃsa bhājane ākiranto omasati, uttaribhaṅge, āpadāsu, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ’ti.
(Vin. IV, 191)

¹ VT. III, 96.

² Vin. IV, 191; BD. III, 129.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

‘I will eat almsfood successively,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should eat almsfood successively. 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 picks out, if scattering (food) into another’s vessel he picks out, if there are dainties, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *sapadānaṃ*: Scholars have no agreements for its etymology, but accepts its meaning as: “without interruption, constant, successive, etc.” Childers explains it as followed: “SAPADĀNAM, In the common phrase *sapadānaṃ piṇḍāya carati*, which is explained to mean ‘goes his begging rounds uninterruptedly,’ that is from house to house in regular succession, without passing any by.”¹ Such term is often found in compounds such as *sapadānacārī*, *sapadānacāriko*, *sapadānacārikaṅgaṃ* that mention one of the thirteen ascetic practices of Buddhist monks. I. B. Horner gives in footnote 3 the meaning of *sapadānaṃ* as explained by Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa: “*sapadānanti tattha tattha odhiṃ akatvā anupaṭipāṭiyā* = not having made a distinction (*odhiṃ akatvā*) here and there, successively,”² but mistook its meaning in the context of going for almsfood by means of not choosing houses (rich, poor, etc.). On the other hand, in the context of having meal, a monk should eat the food successively from one side of the bowl to another, not pick out the food items from here and there.

b/ *omasati*: The PED. gives the meaning as: “[o + mas = Sk. *mṛṣ*] – 1. (lit.) to touch J. V. 446. – 2. (fig.) to touch a person, to reproach, insult Vin IV.4 sq. – pp. *omaṭṭha*,” DOP. of

¹ DOPL. 461.

² VA. IV, 893).

Cone explains: “touches, strokes (in a downward direction)” with a quotation from this *sekhiya* rule; the dictionary of Ven. A.P. Buddhadatta also gives similar definition.¹ I. B. Horner again takes us back to the context of going for almsfood as mentioned in the footnote 4: “omasati = ava + √mṛs. 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 such information is not necessary for our searching.

The only choice we have left is to rely on the context and look for the hint. We should observe in the non-offence section that the verb *omasati* describe an action that has the meaning somehow opposite to the expression *sapadānaṃ*, i.e. “not having made a distinction here and there, successively.” We can have some terms such as “to choose, to select,” but the expression “to pick out” from Ven. Thanissaro seems to be a good one.³

--ooOoo--

85. ekato, Contextual (BD. III, 130):
(Sekhiya 35)

Now at that time the group of six monks having chosen from the top, 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, having chosen from one side; if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū thūpakato omadditvā piṇḍapātāṃ
bhuñjanti — pa —.

¹ PED. 169; DOP. 582; CPED. 71.

² BD. III, 129.

³ Tha. I, 495.

na thūpakato omadditvā piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

na thūpakato omadditvā piṇḍapāto bhuñjitabbo. yo anādariyaṃ paṭicca thūpato omadditvā piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjati, āpatti dukkaṭassa.

anāpatti asaṅcicca, assatiyā, ajānantassa, gilānassa, parittake sese ekato saṃkaḍḍhitvā omadditvā bhuñjati, āpadāsu, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā 'ti. (Vin. IV, 192)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks having chosen from the top, 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 he gathers the insignificant remainders together, chooses, then eats; if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **ekato**: Cone’s dictionary gives the most comprehensive explanation for this term: “**ekato**, ind. [*S.* ekatas], **1.** from one; ... — **2.** on one side, on one part; on each side; to one side, separately; ... — **3.** all on one side, in one body; together; ...”¹ For this passage, it seems to me that I. B. Horner chose the meaning of *ekato* in ablative sense, i.e. “from one side,” whereas I take the meaning “together” from Cone’s work: “— **3.** all on one side, in one body; together,...” The reason for such choice is going to be discussed next. See also § 91b.

b/ **Contextual**: For this rule, Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa merely gives a short explanation, which is:

*thūpato ti matthakato vemajjhato ti attho.*² = from the top means from the peak or from the middle.

¹ DOP. 539.

² VA. IV, 893.

In translating one language to another, especially an ancient language such as *Pāli*, figuring out the context is an important task. In the clause “*parittake sese ekato samkaḍḍhitvā omadditvā bhuñjati*,” I. B. Horner took the meaning of “*ekato*” as “from one side” and “*parittake sese*” as “among insignificant remainder” in locative case singular, then arrived at the translation as “if among an insignificant remainder he eats, having selected, having chosen from one side.” Such translation is fine grammatically, but not suitable to the context.

In fact, the text mentions about dragging and gathering (*samkaḍḍhati*) something into a heap (*thūpa*); moreover *ekato* also has the meaning “together.” And “*parittake sese*” could be analyzed as accusative case, plural, being the direct object of the verbe *samkaḍḍhati* (to gather). So the translation of the clause above should be “if he gathers the insignificant remainders together, chooses, then eats.” Ven. Thanissaro supports my choice with a detailed explanation:

This refers to the rice in one's bowl. The Commentary translates *from a heap* as from the top or from the middle. The Vinayamukha notes that is a custom among bhikkhus before eating to level off the rice in their bowls so that its surface is even. One would then work from one side, as under Sekhiya 33. The no-offense clauses state that if a little food remains scattered in one's bowl, there is no offense in gathering it together in a small heap and eating from that. The Vinayamukha adds that if one is served other foods—such as sweets—stacked on a platter, it would be impolite to level them off, so in such cases one may take from the top of the heap.¹

--ooOoo--

86. *odanena* (BD. III, 130):

(Sekhiya 36)

Now at that time the group of six monks covered up the curry and the condiment with conjey, desiring something more ...

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū sūpaṃ pi byañjanaṃ pi odanena paṭicchādentī bhīyyokamyataṃ upādāya — pa —. (Vin. IV, 192)

¹ Tha. I, 498.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks covered up the curry and the condiment with boiled rice, desiring something more ...

DISCUSSION:

odanena: I prefer to take the meaning of *odana* as “boiled rice” given by many *Pāli* dictionaries,¹ instead of “conjei” given by I. B. Horner. This item is just a matter of word choice.

--ooOoo--

87. *mukhadvāraṃ* (BD. III, 134):

(Sekhiya 41)

Now at that time the group of six monks open the door of the face when the mouthful was not brought close ...

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū anāhaṭṭe kabaḷe mukhadvāraṃ vivaranti
— pa —. (Vin. IV, 194)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks open the mouth when the mouthful was not brought close ...

DISCUSSION:

mukhadvāraṃ: I prefer to take its meaning as “the mouth” instead of “the door of the face.” This item is also just a matter of word choice.

--ooOoo--

88. *piṇḍukkhepakāṃ* (BD. III, 135):

(Sekhiya 44)

Now at that time the group of six monks ate tossing up balls (of food)... “...

¹ CPED. 70; DOP. 570; DOPL. 298.

‘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.

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, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū piṇḍukkhepakam bhuñjanti — pa —
na piṇḍukkhepakam bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
na piṇḍukkhepakam bhuñjitabbam. yo anādariyam paṭicca piṇḍukkhepakam
bhuñjati, āpatti dukkaṭassa.
anāpatti asaṅcicca, assatiyā, ajānantassa, gilānassa, khajjake, phalāphale, āpadāsu,
ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ’ti. (Vin. IV, 195)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks ate taking up balls (of food) repeatedly. ... “... ”

‘I will not eat taking up balls (of food) repeatedly,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat taking up balls (of food) repeatedly. Whoever out of disrespect eats taking up balls (of food) repeatedly, 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, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

piṇḍukkhepakam: I. B. Horner seemed unsatisfied with her translation of *piṇḍukkhepakam* as “tossing up balls (of food),” so that she added the explanation of the Commentary and her translation at footnote 3: “*piṇḍukkhepakam* = *piṇḍam ukkhipitvā ukkhipitvā*, tossing up the balls (the lumps of almsfood) again and again, VA. 893.” Her

interpretation as “tossing up the balls” would be fine if there was not the non-offence section that “there is no offence if they are solid victuals (*khajjake*), all sorts of fruits (*phalāphale*),”¹ that means solid victuals and all sorts of fruits are allowable for such action, i.e. “tossing them up to the mouth while eating.” That does not make sense. So that *piṇḍukkhepakam* should describe a different action but not tossing up the ball (of food) into the mouth, or more exaggeratedly interpreted as tossing the ball of food up to the air then catching it by the mouth. To solve this problem, we need to get rid of the habit of being stuck with the basic meaning of *ukkipati* [*ut* + √*khipati*, √*kṣip*] as “to throw up,” but “to hold up, to take up, to lift up, to raise up” and the like.² Then the explanation from the Commentary “*piṇḍam ukkipitvā ukkipitvā*” could be interpreted as “taking up the balls of food repeatedly,” in which the double gerunds *ukkipitvā ukkipitvā* describing the actions being repeated is translated by the verb itself “taking up” with the adverb “repeatedly.” That means the monk can to take up such kind of food as many times as he needs in order to fill up his mouth before chewing and swallow it.

In addition to that, solid victuals and all sorts of fruits also exempts the monks from observing the *sekhiya* rule 39, “*nātimahantaṃ kavaḷaṃ karissāmi* = I will not make up too large a mouthful,” and the *sekhiya* rule 40 “*parimaṇḍalaṃ ālopaṃ karissāmi* = I will make up the pieces (of food) into a round.”³ The two rules mean that a monk should make moderate and round balls of food while eating; so that each ball of food taken up into the mouth is suitable and ready for the monk to chew then swallow it. Solid victuals and all sorts of fruits are immune from these two rules due to the reason that the monk is not able to make balls from solid food or fruits.

¹ Vin. IV, 195; BD. III, 135.

² PED. 125; DOP. 390.

³ Vin. IV, 194; BD. III, 133.

To sum up, for solid victuals and all sorts of fruits a monk does not have to “make up the pieces (of food) into moderate and round balls” and he can “take them up to the mouth repeatedly” as many times as he needs to.

Ven. Thanissaro has the credit of bringing to light this *sekhiya* rule and the next one also.

--ooOoo--

89. *kabaḷāvacchedakaṃ* (BD. III, 135):
(Sekhiya 45)

Now at that time the group of six monks ate, breaking up the mouthfuls... “...

‘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, all sorts of fruits, dainties, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū kabaḷāvacchedakaṃ bhuñjanti — pa —
na kabaḷāvacchedakaṃ bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
na kabaḷāvacchedakaṃ bhuñjitabbaṃ. yo anādariyaṃ paṭicca kabaḷāvacchedakaṃ
bhuñjati, āpatti dukkaṭassa.
anāpatti asaṅcicca, assatiyā, ajānantassa, gilānassa, khajjake phalāphale,
uttaribhaṅge, āpadāsu, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ’ti. (Vin. IV, 195-196)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks ate, nibbling at the mouthfuls... “...

‘I will not eat nibbling at the mouthfuls,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat nibbling at the mouthfuls. Whoever out of disrespect eats nibbling at 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, all sorts of fruits, dainties, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

kabaḷāvacchedakaṃ: Here, the literal translation of *kabaḷāvacchedakaṃ* as “breaking up the mouthfuls” makes sense. However, looking at Horner’s footnote 4, “*kabaḷāvacchedakaṃ*, dividing the mouthfuls (into small parts); probably with the fingers and not ‘nibbling at,’ as at *Vin. Texts i*, 64,” and the double gerunds in the Commentary, “*kabaḷāvacchedakanti kabaḷaṃ avacchindivā avacchindivā*”¹ makes me think the issue over again.

We should consider some factors: First of all, this rule is not applied for solid food, all sorts of fruits, and dainties. The second is that this rule seems redundant compared to the *sekhiya* 39 and 40 stating that moderate and round balls of food should be made while eating, that means the ball of food should be put in the mouth at one time; so that the act of breaking up the balls of food does not have a chance to occur. The last factor is the repetition of the gerund *avacchindivā* from the Commentary. For those reasons, I understand that the action not to be taken in this rule is that a monk should not bite the ball of food bit by bit as the hint that Horner gives at her footnote “*nibbling at.*”

--ooOoo--

90. *hatthanillehakaṃ* (BD. III, 138): (Sekhiya 52)

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū hatthanillehakaṃ bhuñjanti — pa —.

¹ VA. IV, 893.

“Na hatthanillehakaṃ bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā. (Vin. IV, 198)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks ate licking the hand ...

“ ...

‘I will not eat licking the hand,’ is a training to be observed.”

DISCUSSION:

hatthanillehakaṃ: Perhaps I. B. Horner follows the Commentary, “*hatthanillehakan* ti hatthaṃ nillehitvā nillehitvā, bhuñjantena hi aṅgulimattam pi nillehituṃ na vaṭṭati.”¹ However, I prefer that *hattha* should be translated as “hand,” not finger (*aṅguli*). This item is just a matter of word choice.

--ooOoo--

91. *pattanillehakaṃ, ekato* (BD. III, 138):

(Sekhiya 53)

... 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, having licked at one side, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

PĀLI TEXT:

Tena samayena buddho bhagavā sāvattiyam viharati jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ārāme. tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū pattanillehakaṃ bhuñjanti — pa
—.

“na pattanillehakaṃ bhuñjissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

¹ VA. IV, 894.

na pattanillehakam̐ bhuñjitaḅam̐. yo anādariyam̐ paṭicca pattanillehakam̐ bhuñjati, āpatti dukkaṭassa.

anāpatti asañcicca, assatiyā, ajānantassa, gilānassa, parittake sese ekato saṅkaḍḍhitvā nillehitvā bhuñjati, āpadāsu, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ’ti. (Vin. IV, 198)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks ate scraping the bowl ...

“... ”

‘I will not eat scraping the bowl,’ is a training to be observed.”

One should not eat scraping the bowl ...

There is no offence if it is unintentional ... if he is ill, if having collected small remainders together he scrapes (them) then eats, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *pattanillehakam̐*: The three *sekhiya* rules 52, 53, 54 prohibit the action of “*nillehakam̐*” performed on three different things: the hand (*hatthanillehakam̐*), the bowl (*pattanillehakam̐*) and the lips (*oṭṭhanillehakam̐*) while eating. I. B. Horner translates “*nillehakam̐*” as “licking” for all of three acts: licking the fingers, licking the bowl, and licking the lips. Such interpretation is safe to apply to the first and the last items, which are licking the fingers and licking the lips, but the second, licking the bowl, is problematic.

The PED. does not have any entry for *nillehakam̐* or similar forms. For the entry of *lehati*, the PED. refers to *lihati* taken from the root \sqrt{lih} having the meaning as “to lick” and *lehati* is the present tense.¹ Childers’ and Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta’s dictionaries simply give the meaning as “licking.” I think, we are able to make an analysis like this: *nillehakam̐* = *ni-l-lehakam̐* = the act of licking out, and the instrument to perform the task is assumed to be the tongue.

¹ PED. 584.

However, the meaning “to lick” does not work in some cases: e.g. One from the non-offence section:

parittake sese ekato saṅkaḍḍhitvā nillehitvā bhuñjati = having collected small remainders together, he scrapes (them) then eats.”

And another from the Commentary:

tasmā ekaṅgulyāpi patto na nillehitabbo¹ = due to that, the bowl should not be scraped even with only one finger.”

So, from the context of this rule *nillehakam* must have a broader meaning. I prefer to interpret the compound *pattanillehakam* as “scraping the bowl” to “licking the bowl” given by I. B. Horner. Kabilsingh translates “clean the bowl.”² Ven. Thanissaro mentions the explanation from the Commentary and agrees with it, but still keeps the word “licking” in his translation.³

b/ *ekato*: Again, I. B. Horner mistook the meaning of *ekato* as “at one side” instead of “together,” so that her interpretation becomes meaningless and inappropriate. See also § 85a.

Another observation is that the adverbial *ekato* precedes the verb *saṅkaḍḍhitvā* but not *nillehitvā*, so it must modify *saṅkaḍḍhitvā* not *nillehitvā* as shown in I. B. Horner’s translation.

--ooOoo--

92. Textual discrepancy (BD. III, 140):
(Sekhiya 56)

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 removed or broken up or covered up or taken out, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

¹ VA. IV, 894.

² Kabilsingh 40.

³ Tha. I, 502.

PĀLI TEXT:

anāpatti asañcicca, assatiyā, ajānantassa, gilānassa, uddharitvā vā bhinditvā vā paṭiggahetvā vā nīharitvā vā chaḍḍeti, āpadāsu, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā 'ti.
(Vin. IV, 199)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 out (rinsings of the bowl) after taking (the lumps of boiled rice) up or smashing (them) up or (receiving them) in a receptacle or carrying (them) outside, if there are accidents, if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

Textual discrepancy: This *sekhiya* rule states that “*na sasitthakaṃ pattadhovanam antaraghare chaḍḍessāmi* = I will not throw out amidst the houses rinsings of the bowl with lumps of boiled rice.”¹ But in the non-offence section, there is discrepancy between the *Pāli* Scriptures among different sources. The PTS. Edition says, “*paṭiggahetvā vā nīharitvā vā chaḍḍeti*” whereas *Pāli* Scriptures from other countries and also the Commentary of the PTS. edition shows: “*paṭiggahe vā nīharitvā vā chaḍḍeti*,” whereas the Thai drops the last preposition *vā*, “*paṭiggahe vā nīharitvā chaḍḍeti*.”²

Moreover, the Commentary divides the quote “*uddharitvā vā bhinditvā vā paṭiggahe vā nīharitvā vā chaḍḍeti*” into four clauses decided by three gerunds and the finite verb *chaḍḍeti*, then explains them one by one:

uddharitvā vā ti sitthāni udakato uddharitvā ekasmiṃ ṭhāne rāsiṃ katvā udakaṃ chaḍḍeti. *bhinditvā* 'ti sitthāni bhinditvā udakagatikāni katvā chaḍḍeti. *paṭiggahe vā* 'ti paṭiggahena paṭicchannāniṃ paṭiggahe chaḍḍeti. *nīharitvā* 'ti bahi nīharitvā chaḍḍeti, evaṃ chaḍḍentassa anāpatti.³ = *uddharitvā vā* means after taking up the lumps of boiled rice from the water and making them into a heap in one place, he

¹ Vin. IV, 199; BD. III, 140.

² Be. Vol. 2, 261; BJTS. Vol. 2 (1), 536; VA. IV, 894; Syā. Vol. 2, 557.

³ VA. IV, 894.

throws out the water. *bhinditvā* means after smashing up the lumps of boiled rice and dissolving them in the water, he throws out. *paṭiggāhe vā* means with a receptacle he throws in a receptacle having a cover. *nīharitvā* means after carrying outside, he throws out. There is no offence to the one who is throwing out in this manner.

To sum up, the purpose of this rule is to remind the monks that after rinsing the bowls they should not throw out the water having lumps of boiled rice amidst the houses; perhaps for the hygienic conditions of the habitat inside the inhabited areas. I take the *Pāli* text of the majority but I. B. Horner follows the PTS. edition, so that her translation is slightly different.

--ooOoo--

93. *uccāra & passāva* (BD. III, 150):
(Sekhiya 73)

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū ṭhitā uccārampi passāvampi karonti
— pa —.

“na ṭhito agilāno uccāraṃ vā passāvaṃ vā karissāmīti sikkhā karaṇīyā. (Vin. IV, 205)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks release excrement as well as urine while standing ...

“...

‘I will not release excrement or urine while standing if not ill,’ is a training to be observed.”

DISCUSSION:

uccāra & passāva: This is just a matter of word choice. The meanings of *uccāra* (excrement) and *passāva* (urine) are clear. The only notice here is that I. B. Horner perhaps avoids using “ugly words.” This is also applied to the next two *sekhiya* rules 74 and 75.

--ooOoo--

94. *kiṃ, hi* (BD. III, 158):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pārājika 01)

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 contact with the nun Sundarīnandā, also filled with desire.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho Sālho Migāranattā yena Sundarīnandā bhikkhunī ten’ upasaṅkami, upasaṅkamtivā Sundarīnandaṃ bhikkhuniṃ etadavoca: kin te ayye aphāsu, kissa nīpannāsīti. evaṃ h’ etam āvuso hoti yā anicchantaṃ icchatīti. ky āhaṃ taṃ ayye na icchissāmi, api cāhaṃ okāsaṃ na labhāmi taṃ dūsetun ti avassuto avassutāya Sundarīnandāya bhikkhuniyā kāyasaṃsaggaṃ samāpajji. (Vin. IV, 212)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then Sālha, Migāra’s grandson, approached the nun Sundarīnandā; having approached, he spoke thus to the nun Sundarīnandā: “Lady, are you discomfort? Why are you lying down?”

“Because thus is the matter, sir: She desires a man who is not desiring (her)”

“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 contact with the nun Sundarīnandā, also filled with desire.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *kiṃ*: The question “*kin te ayye aphāsu*” should be translated as a yes-no question: “Lady, are you discomfort?” Such usage is explained in the PTS. dictionaries: “**Kiṃ** —2. as

interr. particle, introducing a question;” or “**kiṃ** (*very often strengthened* by nu, nu kho, (s)su, sa), **1. interrogative particle**; . . .”¹ And such interpretation is in accordance with the next question of his: “Why are you lying down?” It is also confirmed by the answer of the nun Sundarīnandā that is explained next.

b/ *hi*: as the meaning given in the PTS. dictionary, “for, because; indeed, surely,”² I understand that the indeclinable *hi* can take the role of either a conjunction or an emphatic particle. Here I assume that I. B. Horner takes the particle *hi* having the role of the latter, whereas I prefer the former, i.e. a conjunction, then come up with a slightly different interpretation for the answer of the nun Sundarīnandā: “*evañ h’ etaṃ āvuso hoti yā anicchantam icchatīti* = because thus is the matter, sir: She desires a man who is not desiring (her).” See also 228a, 234.

One thing should be mentioned is that the gender of the present participle *anicchantam* leads me to insert “a man” in my translation in order to make the meaning comprehensible.

--ooOoo--

95. Textual - missing translation (BD. III, 177):

(Bhikkhunī’s saṅghādisesa 01)

Now at that time a certain lay-follower, having given a store-room to an Order of nuns, passed away. He had two sons, one of no faith, not believing, 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro upāsako bhikkhunīsaṅghassa udositam datvā
kālaṅkato hoti. tassa dve puttā honti, eko assaddho appasanno eko saddho pasanno, te

¹ PED. 212; DOP. 601.

² PED. 731.

pettikam sāpateyyam vibhajimsu. atha kho so assaddho appasanno tam saddham pasannaṃ etad avoca: amhākaṃ udosito, tam bhājāmā 'ti. (Vin. IV, 223)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time a certain lay-follower, having given a store-room to an Order of nuns, passed away. He had two sons, one of no faith, not believing, the other with faith, believing. They divided up the paternal property. Then he of no faith, not believing, spoke thus to him with faith, believing: “The store-room is ours, let us deal it out.”

DISCUSSION:

Textual - missing translation: The PTS. dictionary explains, “**sāpateyya** (nt.) [sā (= guṇa of sva) + pateyya (abstr. fr. pati lord), Cf. ādhi-pateyya] property, wealth ...”¹ The problem of this item is that the sentence “*te pettikam sāpateyyam vibhajimsu* = they divided up the paternal property” is missing from the English translation of I. B. Horner.

--ooOoo--

96. Syntactic - sentence structure (BD. III, 189-190):

(Bhikkhunī's saṅghādisesa 03)

Or should go to the other side of a river alone means: having covered up the three circles, it is called a river there wherever, as a nun is crossing over, the inner robe is made wet.

PĀLI TEXT:

ekā vā nadīpāraṃ gaccheyyā 'ti, nadī nāma timaṇḍalaṃ paṭicchādetvā yattha kattrhaci uttarantiyā bhikkhuniyā antaravāsako temiyati. (Vin. IV, 230)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Or should go to the other side of a river alone means: Wherever the inner robe a nun— who is covering her inner robe up the three circles and crossing over—gets wet is called a river.

¹ PED. 704.

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - sentence structure: Even though the structure of the *Pāli* sentence above is complicated but its meaning does not seem difficult, i.e. the definition of a river depending on its depth that could be estimated around half a meter or a little less. Here I. B. Horner's translation is obscure so that I am just trying to show another English version.

--ooOoo--

97. Double negative (BD. III, 216):

(Bhikkhunī's Nissaggiya 01)

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."

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhuniyo nissatṭhapattaṃ na denti.
bhagavato ... ārocesuṃ. na bhikkhave nissatṭhapatto na dātabbo. Yā na dadeyya, āpatti
dukkaṭassā 'ti. (Vin. IV, 245)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 not to be given back. Whosoever should not give it back, there is an offence of wrong-doing."

DISCUSSION:

Double negative: The negation "na" at the beginning of the spoken sentence escaped the eyes of I. B. Horner while she translated it.

--ooOoo--

98. acchinna (BD. III, 217):

(Bhikkhunī's Nissaggiya 02)

Now at that time several nuns, having spent the rains in a village-residence, went to Sāvattṭhī keeping the customs, 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena sambahulā bhikkhuniyo gāmakāvāse vassaṃ vuṭṭhā Sāvattṭhiṃ agamaṃsu vattasampannā iriyāpathasampannā duccolā lūkhacīvarā. upāsakā tā bhikkhuniyo passitvā imā bhikkhuniyo vattasampannā ... lūkhacīvarā, imā bhikkhuniyo acchinnā bhavissantīti bhikkhunīsaṅghassa akālacīvaram aḍaṃsu. (Vin. IV, 245)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time several nuns, having spent the rains in a village-residence, went to Sāvattṭhī keeping the customs, 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 be tattered,” gave robe-material to the Order of nuns not at the right time.

DISCUSSION:

acchinna: Even though the verb *acchindati* [*ā + √chid + ṅ + a + ti*] has the root *√chid* (cut off), many dictionaries still give its primary meanings as “to take away, to take by force, to remove forcibly, to rob, to plunder,” so that its ppp. should be figured out in the same manner. As a matter of fact, Cone gives its past passive participle as: “— *pp acchinna, mfn.* [S. āchinna], 1. removed forcible, taken away; plundered; ... — 2. robbed; ...”¹ And I. B. Horner perhaps following dictionaries translates the sentence “*lūkhacīvarā, imā bhikkhuniyo acchinnā bhavissantīti*” as “wearing shabby robes, these nuns will have been robbed,” ignoring the illogical meaning of her interpretation, i.e. How could those nuns would have been robbed if their robes were in terrible condition?

¹ DOP. 29-30.

The possible situation for those the nuns was that their robes being worn out would soon not have been able to cover their bodies well, so that lay people offered new robe-material to the Order of nuns. I think somehow the main meaning of the root \sqrt{chid} (cut off) must stay. Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta in his dictionary shows a secondary meaning of *acchindati* as “to break off” that is close to the meaning I need for this context.¹ I tentatively propose “tattered” for *acchinna*. See also § 34b, 99, 166.

--ooOoo--

99. *acchindati & acchindāpeti* (BD. III, 220-221):
(Bhikkhunī’s Nissaggiya 03)

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 cause (another) to tear it away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

PĀLI TEXT:

yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā saddhiṃ cīvaraṃ parivattetvā sā pacchā evaṃ vadeyya: hand’ ayye tuyhaṃ cīvaraṃ, āhara metaṃ cīvaraṃ; yaṃ tuyhaṃ tuyham ev’ etaṃ, yaṃ mayhaṃ mayham ev’ etaṃ; āhara metaṃ, sakam paccāharā ’ti acchindeyya vā acchindāpeyya vā, nissaggiyaṃ pācittian ti. (Vin. IV, 247)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Whatever nun, having exchanged a robe with a nun, should afterwards speak thus: ‘Lady, take your robe. Bring that robe to me. This which was yours will be yours, that which was mine will be mine. Bring that to me, take back your own,’ (and) should tear it off or should cause (another) to tear it off, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

DISCUSSION:

acchindati & acchindāpeti: On the contrary to the item above, the meaning as “to tear off, to take away, to take by force” is appropriate for the verb *acchindati* in this context, and

¹ CPED. 03.

an analogous one for its causative verb *acchindāpeti*. The interesting point here is to differentiate between the two English phrasal verbs: “to tear off” (to remove by force) and “to tear away” (to plunder, to rob).¹ See also § 34b, 98, 166.

One more thing is that I prefer to give two different meanings, i.e. “this” and “that,” to the demonstrative pronoun *etaṃ* depending on the position of the robe being referred to is near or far away from the nun who was speaking.

--ooOoo--

100. Semantic (BD. III, 223):

(Bhikkhunī’s Nissaggiya 04)

“The lady says that she does not need ghee, master, she needs oil. You take 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 for the purchase of oil (and) you shall take oil.”

PĀLI TEXT:

na kir’ ayyo ayyāya sappinā attho, telena attho. handa te sappiṃ, telaṃ me dehīti. sace mayam ayyo vikkītam bhaṇḍam puna āharissāma, kadā amhākaṃ bhaṇḍam vikkāyissati. sappissa kayena sappi haṭam, telassa kayam āhara, telaṃ harissasīti.
(Vin. IV, 248)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“The lady says that she does not need ghee, master, she needs oil. You take the ghee (and) give me the oil.”

“If we, master, take back again goods that were bought, when will our goods be sold? With the money for ghee, ghee was taken. (You) bring the money for oil, you will take oil.”

¹ Wija. 188.

DISCUSSION:

Semantic: I think I. B. Horner hesitates while translating the sentence “*sappissa kayena sappi haṭaṃ, telassa kayam āhara, telam harissasi.*” In footnote 2, she says:

āhara = *yācivā*, VA. 917, but I think the above translation better show that the shopkeeper was, as he states, unwilling to change goods once bought.¹

I found out the text from the Commentary, but it seems to me that I. B. Horner did not make sense out of it. I analyze the structure of the text differently:

viññāpetvā 'ti jānāpetvā, idaṃ nāma āharā 'ti yācivā vā² = *Having requested* means having make (someone) to look for, or having asked: “(You) bring this (named).”

But it does not relate to the excerpt above. However, I. B. Horner gets the point that the shopkeeper was “unwilling to change goods once bought.”

There is a crucial clue from the Commentary: “*kayenā 'ti mūlena*”³ explaining the spoken words of the shopkeeper so that we can translate *kayena* as “with the money,” not an action noun “with the purchase” given by I. B. Horner.

--ooOoo--

101. *sambādha, saṃharāpetvā* (BD. III, 247):

(Bhikkhunī's Pācittiya 02)

Now at that time the group of six nuns, having let the hair of the body grow, bathed naked together with prostitutes at the same ford of the river Aciravatī.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhuniyo sambādhe lomaṃ saṃharāpetvā Aciravatiyā nadiyā vesiyāhi saddhiṃ naggā ekatitthe nhāyanti. (Vin. IV, 259-260)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

¹ BD. III, 223.

² VA. IV, 917.

³ *Ibid.* 917.

Now at that time the group of six nuns, having shaved the hair in the secret parts (of the body), bathed naked together with prostitutes at the same ford of the river Aciravatī.

DISCUSSION:

In order to understand this *pācittiya* rule, we need to find out the meaning of the two terms: *sambādha* and *saṃharāpeti*. Dictionaries are helpless in this case. Moreover, the PED misled I. B. Horner to take the meaning of *saṃharāpeti* as “to let the hair grow.”¹ We have to rely on the Scriptures and its Commentaries.

a/ *sambādha*: From the *Pāli* Canon we have its explanation: “*sambādho nāma ubho upakacchakā muttakaraṇaṃ*² = both armpits and urinary organ.”

The Commentary adds more:

sambādheti paṭicchannokāse. tassa vibhāgadassanattamaṃ pana ‘ubho upakacchakā muttakaraṇaṃ’ti vuttaṃ.³ = *sambādhe* means on the covered part. Moreover, for the purpose of realizing the division of that place, it is said that ‘both armpits and urinary organ.’

So I take the meaning of *sambādha* as “secret part(s)” from the clue of the *Pāli* Canon stating that the prostitutes were able to see those parts of the group of six nuns while they were being naked and taking bath in the river with them. Wijayaratna translates *sambādha* as “private parts,” but such translation does not cover the two armpits.

b/ *saṃharāpetvā*: I. B. Horner seems to be confused about the meaning of this causative verb. We can get its meaning from the Commentary:

ekampi lomanti kattariyā vā saṅḍāsakena vā khurena vā yena kenaci ekapayogena vā nānāpayogena vā ekaṃ vā bahūni vā saṃharāpentiyā payogagaṇanāya pācittiyāni, na lomagaṇanāya.⁴ = *even one hair* means to the nun who is cutting/pulling out/shaving one (hair) or many (hairs) by any application or different applications by means of

¹ PED. 659.

² Vin. IV, 260.

³ VA. IV, 921.

⁴ *Ibid.*

scissors or by means of tweezers or by means of a razor, there are pācittiya offences counting by applications not by counting the hairs.

So depending to the usage of instruments such as scissors, tweezers, and razor, we can give the appropriate meaning to the causative verb *saṃharāpeti*: “to cause a hair to be cut,” or in other words, “to cut a hair,” etc. Wijayaratna translates the verb as “to remove.” So this *pācittiya* rule states:

yā pana bhikkhunī sambādhe lomam saṃharāpeyya, pācittiyān ti = If any nun should cut/pull out/remove/ shave the hair on a secret part, there is an offence of expiation.

--ooOoo--

102. talaghātakaṃ (BD. III, 248):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pācittiya 03)

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?”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena dve bhikkhuniyo anabhiratiyā pīlītā ovarakaṃ pavisitvā talaghātakaṃ karonti. bhikkhuniyo tena saddena upadhāvitā tā bhikkhuniyo etad avocum: kissa tumhe ayye purisena saddhiṃ sampadussathā ’ti. na mayaṃ ayye purisena saddhiṃ sampadussāmā ’ti. (Vin. IV, 260)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time two nuns, tormented by dissatisfaction, having entered an inner room, rubbed 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?”

DISCUSSION:

talaghātakaṃ: We are going to discuss about the meaning of the term “*talaghātakaṃ karoti*.” The reason makes me to reconsider the English equivalent given by I. B. Horner as “slapping with the palms of the hands” is the non-offence section:

anāpatti ābādhapaccayā = there is no offence if it is because of illness.¹

The Commentary also has explanation about the illness:

*ābādhapaccayāti gaṇḍaṃ vā vaṇaṃ vā paharituṃ vaṭṭati*² = because of illness means she proceeds to slap/beat/touch/rub a boil or a wound.

One thing should be noticed that the boil or wound is somewhere close to her urinary organ because the *Pāli* Canon says (with I. B. Horner's translation kept intact):

talaghātakaṃ nāma samphassaṃ sādīyantī antamaso uppalapattena pi muttakaraṇe pahāraṃ deti, āpatti pācittiyassa. = *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, there is an offence of expiation.³

So from the information given above, there are many factors should be considered:

- There is contact between the palms of the hands of a nun to the urinary organ of her own or of another nun

- she has been in a state of dissatisfaction (*anabhiratiyā pīlitā*)

- she is enjoying the contact

- there is sounds that made the listeners think of an intercourse between man and woman has been occurred

- the touching must not be too harsh because it can apply to a boil or wound, but not be too soft because the verb describing the action is “*pahāraṃ deti, paharati* = to give a blow, to beat.”

Based on these information, my conclusion is that this is a way of masturbation of a woman at her urinary organ, so that I propose the English equivalent in this context is “to rub.” And the rule given by the Buddha should be translated as:

¹ Vin. IV, 260; BD. III, 248.

² VA. IV, 921.

³ Vin. IV, 261; BD. III, 248.

talaghātake pācittiyam = in rubbing with the palms of the hands (at the urinary organ), there is an offence of expiation.

Wijayaratna is on the side with I. B. Horner translating *talaghātake* as “in slapping with the palms of the hands,” but Kabilsingh interprets “*talaghātakaṃ karoti*” as “to touch.”¹

--ooOoo--

103. *cirāciraṃ* (BD. III, 249):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pācittiya 04)

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññatarā purāṇarājorodhā bhikkhunīsu pabbajitā hoti. aññatarā bhikkhunī anabhiratīyā pīlitā yena sā bhikkhunī ten’ upasaṅkami, upasaṅkamitvā taṃ bhikkhuniṃ etad avoca: rājā kho ayye tumhe cirāciraṃ gacchati, kathaṃ tumhe dhārethā ’ti. jatumaṭṭhakena ayye ’ti. kiṃ etaṃ ayye jatumaṭṭhakan ti. atha kho sā bhikkhunī tassā bhikkhuniyā jatumaṭṭhakaṃ ācikkhi. (Vin. IV, 261)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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, for a very long time came to see you. How did you manage?”

“By means of an application of lac, lady.”

¹ Kabilsingh 19.

“What is this application of lac, lady?”

Then this nun showed an application of lac to that nun.

DISCUSSION:

cirāciraṃ: This is just a matter of work choices concerning about the logic of the context. This *pācittiya* rule is against a form of masturbation with an instrument, and the reason for a woman to do it is the lack of a male partner. In the story above, if the king would have constantly visited his concubine who later became a nun, why did she have to use the application of lac, which is the use of a polished stick made of lac? She would use it because the king did not visit her often. That is the logic of the context. Besides, the Commentary also explains: “*cirāciraṃ gacchatīti cirena cirena gacchati*¹ = he come for a very long time means he come for a long and long time.”

--ooOoo--

104. *cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ* (BD. III, 292):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pācittiya 25)

Whatever nun should wear a robe that should be handed back, there is an offence of expiation.

PĀLI TEXT:

yā pana bhikkhunī cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ dhāreyya, pācittiyā ti. (Vin. IV, 282)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Whatever nun should wear an indispensable robe (of another nun), there is an offence of expiation.

DISCUSSION:

cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ: Here we need to find the meaning of the compound *cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ*. The *Pāli* Canon explains:

¹ VA. IV, 921.

cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ nāma upasampannāya pañcannaṃ cīvarānaṃ aññataraṃ cīvaraṃ tassā vā adinnaṃ taṃ vā anāpucchā nivāseti vā pārupati vā, āpatti pācittiyassa. = [cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ] means: if she dresses in or puts on any one robe of the five (kinds of) robes of one who is ordained, either if it was not given to her or without asking (permission) for it, there is an offence of expiation.¹

I would like to look for another English equivalent for the term *cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ* to replace the one given by I. B. Horner, i.e. “a robe that should be handed back.” Dictionaries are helpless for the task, except for the PED. with the entry of “Sankanta [pp. of saṅkamati] gone together with (-⁰).”² Such meaning shares the same idea with the Commentary:

cīvarasaṅkamanīyanti saṅkametabbaṃ cīvaraṃ; aññissā santakaṃ anāpucchā gahitaṃ puna paṭidātabbacīvaranti attho.³ = *cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ* means the robe should be gone together; that is to say ‘if her belonging is taken without asking (permission), the robe should be handed back.’

Etymologically, *saṅkamanīyaṃ* and *saṅkametabbaṃ* have the same meaning, which is “should be gone together;” both are derivatives of the verb *saṅkamati* (= *saṃ* + √*ka* + *a* + *ti*) having the basic meaning is “to go together.”

For a nun, there are five (kinds of) robes, i.e. outer cloak (*saṅghāṭī*), upper robe (*uttarāsaṅgo*), inner robe (*antaravāsakaṃ*), vest (*saṃkacchikā*), and bathing-cloth (*udakasāṭīkā*). In order to become a *bhikkhunī*, the candidate is asked about these five robes at the higher ordination (*upasampadā*). That is to say without any one robe of the five, the ordination cannot proceed.⁴ And these five robes are supposed to be kept close to the nun; if she is away separated from them even for one night she commits an offence of expiation involving forfeiture, except on the agreement of the nuns.⁵ So the literal meaning of *cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ* should be “a robe that should be gone together” instead of “a robe that

¹ Vin. IV, 282; BD. III, 292-293.

² PED. 662.

³ VA. IV, 930.

⁴ Vin. II, 272; BD. V, 376.

⁵ Vin. III, 198; BD. II, 15.

should be handed back” as given by I. B. Horner. To shorten the phrase, I propose “an indispensable robe” as the English equivalent for the compound *cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ*.

--ooOoo--

105. *asatthikā, cārikaṃ carati* (BD. III, 317):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pācittiya 37)

Now at that time nuns walked without a weapon on almstour within (their own) region (when this was) agreed upon as dangerous, frightening.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhuniyo antoraṭṭhe sāsāṅkasammate sappaṭibhaye asatthikā cārikaṃ caranti. (Vin. IV, 295)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time nuns walked on tour without (having joined) a caravan within the region that was agreed upon as dangerous, frightening.

DISCUSSION:

a/ ***asatthikā***: The *Pāli* Canon says: “*asatthikā nāma vinā satthena*.” At footnote 1, I. B. Horner mentions the two possible interpretation of the term *sattha* whether it means “without a weapon” (*sattha* is a neuter noun having the meaning as a weapon, a sword) or “not (having joined) a caravan” (*sattha* is a masculine noun having the meaning as a troop, a caravan); and she keeps the former. On the contrary, I prefer the latter due to the thought that a weapon is not applicable for monk and nun who is supposed not to kill, not to harm any kind of beings including the tiny ones:

upasampanna bhikkhunā sañcicca paṇo jīvitā na voropetabbo, antamaso kunthakipillikaṃ upādāya = when a monk is ordained he should not intentionally deprive a living thing of life, even if it is only an ant.¹

¹ Vin. I, 97; BD. IV, 125.

The new dictionary of Cone also supports my choice giving the entry of this word together with the reference of this excerpt, “**asatthika**, *mfn.* [a³ + sattha⁴ + ika; *BHS* (Bhī Vin p. 267, 12) asārthika], *not travelling with a company or caravan.*”¹ See also § 59.

b/ *cārikaṃ carati*: The meaning of this phrase is similar to the verb *carati* having the meaning as “to walk or roam about, to wander.” I. B. Horner translates “*cārikaṃ carati*” as “to walk on almstour” but in fact the *Pāli* equivalent of “to walk on almstour” should be *piṇḍāya carati*.

--ooOoo--

106. Textual - misreading (BD. III, 329):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pācittiya 44)

Household work means: if she cooks conjei or rice or solid food for a layman, 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, 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

gihiveyyāvaccam nāma agārikassa yāguṃ vā bhattam vā khādanīyam vā pacati, sātakaṃ vā veṭṭhanaṃ vā dhovati, āpatti pācittiyassa.

anāpatti yāgupāne, saṅghabhatte, cetiyapūjāya, attano veyyāvaccakarassa yāguṃ vā bhattam vā khādanīyam vā pacati sātakaṃ vā veṭṭhanaṃ vā dhovati, ummattikāya, ādikammikāya ’ti. (Vin. IV, 300-301)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Household work means: if she cooks conjei or rice or solid food for a layman, if she washes a cloak or a turban, there is an offence of expiation.

¹ DOP. 261.

There is no offence if it is a drink of conje, if it is for the Order; if it is for worship at a shrine; if she cooks conje or rice or solid food, washes a cloak or a turbanin for her own attendant; if she is mad, if she is the first wrong-doer.

DISCUSSION:

Textual - misreading (*veyyāvaccakara* vs. *veyyāvacca*): The tricky point of this rule is that the *Pāli* Canon mentions the term *veyyāvacca* (household work) in the *pācittiya* rule sayings:

yā pana bhikkhunī gihiveyyāvaccam kareyya, pācittiyam. = If a nun should do household work, there is an offence of expiation.”¹

But at the end it changes to *veyyāvaccakara*, literally means the one who does the household work, in other words an attendant or a servant. Perhaps the suffix *-kara* slipped the attention of I. B. Horner.

Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa also has explanation about the term *veyyāvaccakara*:

*attano veyyāvaccakarassā ’ti sace ’pi mātāpitaro āgacchanti yaṃ kiñci vījanim vā sammuñjanīdaṇḍakam vā kārāpetvā veyyāvaccakarattāhāne tthapetvā ’va yaṃ kiñci pacitum vaṭṭati.*² = *one’s own attendant* means even if her father and mother come, after asking them to make a fan or a broom-stick and placing them in the position as an attendant, it is right to cook any thing (for them).

So my task is to restore the meaning of *veyyāvaccakara* in I. B. Horner’s translation.

--ooOoo--

107. ko, saṃharati (BD. III, 343):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pācittiya 52)

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?”

¹ Vin. IV, 300; BD. III, 329.

² VA. IV, 935.

PĀLI TEXT:

addasaṃsu kho chabbaggiyā bhikkhuniyo āyasmantaṃ Kappitakaṃ piṇḍāya carantaṃ, disvāna evaṃ āhaṃsu: ayaṃ Kappitako jīvati, ko nu kho amhākaṃ mantāṃ saṃharatīti. (Vin. IV.308)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The group of six nuns saw the venerable Kappitaka walking for almsfood; seeing him, they spoke thus: “This Kappitaka is alive, whoever foils our plan?”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *ko*: is an interrogative pronoun, which is the nominative singular of *kiṃ*. Its English equivalent is “who? which one?” When *ko* combines with the affirmative indefinite particle *nu*, a possible English translation could be “whoever.” So that I think the mistake here is made by the typist. Perhaps I. B. Horner’s translation would be: “This Kappitaka is alive, whoever did foil our plan?”

b/ *saṃharati*: The background of the story is that the group of six nuns planned to kill the venerable Kappitaka by bombarding his dwelling place with stones and clods of earth. Fortunately, the venerable Upāli knew the plan then told him to leave the place beforehand. And such words were spoken by the group of six nuns while seeing the venerable Kappitaka walking for almsfood on the next day.

According to the Commentary, “saṃharīti saṅkāmesi. saṃhaṭoti saṅkāmito,”¹ the verb *saṃharati* should be in the perfect form *saṃhari*. I. B. Horner states in the footnote 6 that “foil (our) plan” is the English interpretation for “*mantāṃ saṃharati*.” The Commentary gives the equivalent of *saṃharati* as *saṅkāmeti*, which is the causative of and has the meaning as “to pass over, to cause to go, to move, to shift.”² Other applicable definitions for either one of the two verbs *saṅkamati* and *saṅkāmeti* are not to be found in dictionaries; so that based on

¹ VA. IV, 937.

² PED. 602.

the hint from the PED. and the context, I think the tentative interpretation of I. B. Horner for *saṃharati* as “to foil” is acceptable.

--ooOoo--

108. āpannasattā (BD. III, 361):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pācittiya 61)

Pregnant woman means: she is called entered by beings.

PĀLI TEXT:

gabbhinī nāma āpannasattā vuccati. (Vin. IV, 317)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Pregnant woman means one who has a being conceived.

DISCUSSION:

āpannasattā: I. B. Horner explains in footnote that she translates “entered by beings” for the *Pāli* compound *āpannasattā*. Whereas I think the compound should be explained as a *bahubbhīhi* compound modifying “*gabbhinī*” in nominative feminine gender, singular so that “*sattā*” is nominative masculine singular, not nominative masculine plural as suggested by the word “beings” from I. B. Horner’s translation.

--ooOoo--

109. ūnadvādasavassā gihigatā (BD. III, 369):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pācittiya 65)

Now at that time nuns ordained a girl married for less than twelve years. These 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhuniyo ūnadvādasavassaṃ gihigataṃ vuṭṭhāpentī. tā
akkhamā honti sītassa uṇhassa jighacchāya pipāsāya

ḍamsamakasavātātapasiriṃsapasamphassānaṃ duruttānaṃ durāgatānaṃ
vacanapathānaṃ uppannānaṃ sārīrikānaṃ vedanānaṃ dukkhānaṃ tībbaṇaṃ
kharānaṃ kaṭukānaṃ asātānaṃ amanāpānaṃ pāṇaharānaṃ anadhivāsakajātikā honti.
(Vin. IV, 321)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time nuns ordained a girl married (at the age of) less than twelve years. These 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.

DISCUSSION:

In this rule, the meaning of the phrase “*ūnadvādasavassā gihigatā*” seems to be troublesome. Firstly, we should see the meaning of each part of the combination.

a/ *gihigatā*: The *Pāli* Canon explains the meaning of *gihigatā* as:

*gihigatā nāma purisantaragatā vuccati. = Girl married means: one cohabiting with a man.*¹

Literally, *gihigatā* means “one going (or gone) to a householder” and *purisantaragatā* “one going (or gone) among men,” or “one who has intercourse with man.”² I. B. Horner also gives a footnote saying that this is the definition of *itthī*, woman found in some books of *Suttantapiṭaka*, i.e. “MA. ii. 209; DA. 78. Cf. Jā. i. 290; M. i. 77; A. i. 295, ii. 206.” In the context of higher ordination for women to become a *bhikkhunī*, we have two terms to categorize the female candidates: *gihigatā* and *kumāribhūtā* (who is being a girl, a maiden, a virgin). There are two different sets of *pācittiya* rules applied to them while considering their ordinations: 65, 66, 67 for *gihigatā* and 71, 72, 73 for *kumāribhūtā*. The main different characteristic between the two is the virgin-hood; I will come back to this point later.

¹ Vin. IV, 322; BD. III, 370.

² BD. III, Intro. xlix.

b/ *ūnadvādasavassā*: For this term, the Commentary says:

ūnadvādasavassā nāma appattadvādasavassā. = *Less than twelve years* means: not attained to twelve years.”¹

For the combination of the two terms “*ūnadvādasavassā gihigatā*,” I. B. Horner gives two possible interpretations:

1/- A married girl who is less than twelve years of age

2/- A girl married for less than twelve years.

She has a long discussion about her rejecting the former and keeps the latter.² The advantage of her choice is the hint from the Commentary:

dasavassāya gihigatāya sikkhāsammūtiṃ datvā paripuṇṇadvādasavassam upasampādetuṃ vaṭṭati.³ = Having given the agreement as to training to the girl married for ten years then proceed to ordain her when twelve years is completed.

On the other hand, Ven. Juo-Hsüeh Shih takes the former, i.e. the actual age of the married girl based on a thorough research not only from the *Pāli* Commentaries but also from other Sanskrit and Chinese texts.⁴

I do not agree with both. To reject the former, I think that “a married girl who is less than twelve years of age” would fail when being asked “*paripuṇṇavāsativassāsi*” = “Have you completed twenty years of age?” at the ordination.⁵ Ven. Juo-Hsüeh Shih has a long discussion about this point based on some new evidence found in Sanskrit and Chinese texts but still lets the argument open. For the latter, we need to consider an important factor stated in the *Pāli* Canon that the Buddha refused to accept a “*ūnadvādasavassā gihigatā*” into the *bhikkhunī* Order due to the reason that she was not able to endure cold, heat, hunger, thirst, ... So that a “girl married for less than twelve years” would be not strong enough to endure cold, heat, hunger, thirst, ... is implausible; I. B. Horner’s stand seems not strong enough.

¹ Vin. IV, 322; BD. III, 370.

² BD. III, Intro. xlix ff.

³ VA. IV, 941.

⁴ Shih 479-496.

⁵ Vin. II, 271; BD. V, 375.

Such factors make me think of the other interpretation. I interpret the phrase “*ūnadvādasavassā gihigatā*” as “the girl who has intercourse with a man when she is less than twelve years of age (whether she is married or not).” I allege that the physical state of such a young girl is not ready to have sexual intercourse with a man and the result of such violation leaves serious devastations in her body, physically and mentally. I came up with such interpretation while knowing that the law in Sri Lanka considers having sexual intercourse with a girl less than twelve years old is a crime and need to be punished.¹

To sum up the issue, in order to be ordained to become a member of the bhikkhunī Order based on the *Vinayapiṭakapāli*, a female candidate need to be fulfilled some requirements:

1/- having at least twenty years of age whether she is a *gihigatā* or a *kumāribhūtā*.

2/- if she is not a virgin (she is a *gihigatā*), she should not have sexual contact with man before twelve years of age.

3/- going through two years of training as a probationer (*sikkhamānā*)

4/- at the end of the two-year training, she is agreed upon by the bhikkhunī Order.

--ooOoo--

110. *vuṭṭhāpitam* (BD. III, 377):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pācittiya 69)

Whatever nun for two years should not wait upon an ordained woman instructor, there is an offence of expiation.

PĀLI TEXT:

Yā pana bhikkhunī vuṭṭhāpitam pavattinim dve vassāni nānubandheyya, pācittiyā ti.
(Vin. IV, 326)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Whatever nun for two years should not wait upon a female instructor who made (her) to be ordained, there is an offence of expiation.

¹ Gero 76.

DISCUSSION:

vuṭṭhāpitaṃ: is the past passive participle of the verb *vuṭṭhāpeti*, which is the causative verb of *vuṭṭhahati*, *vuṭṭhāti* (*u* + √*thā* + *a*).¹ The *Pāli* Canon has explanation for the term *vuṭṭhāpitaṃ* as well as for the noun it modifies, *pavattinī*:

*vuṭṭhāpitanti upasampāditaṃ. pavattinī nāma upajjhāyā vuccati.*²

I. B. Horner's translation for the second part containing the word *pavattinī* is fine, "Woman instructor means: she is called a woman preceptor;" but not for the first part of the word *vuṭṭhāpitaṃ*: "Ordained means: the *upasampadā* ordination conferred."³ The reason is that her translation does not reflect the causative sense of both participles *vuṭṭhāpitaṃ* and *upasampāditaṃ*, so that I propose a revised version: "Made to be ordained means: made the higher ordination to be conferred."

The *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* Commentary also has explanation about the two words:

Navame **vuṭṭhāpitaṃ pavattinī** ti vuṭṭhāpita-pavattiniṃ; yāyaṃ upasampādītā taṃ upajjhāyiniṃ ti attho.⁴ = In the ninth rule (which is 69th), *vuṭṭhāpitaṃ pavattiniṃ* (or *vuṭṭhāpita-pavattiniṃ*) means through whom she is made to be ordained, that one is (her) female preceptor.

To sum up, the senior nun who bestows the higher ordination upon a *sikkhamānā* is called *pavattinī*, and the rule states that a new ordained nun should attend to her *pavattinī* for two years (at least).

--ooOoo--

111. alaṃ (BD. III, 387):

(Bhikkhunī's Pācittiya 76)

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 tested the nun Caṇḍakālī, saying: "You

¹ CPED. 248.

² Vin. IV, 326.

³ BD. III, 377.

⁴ KanA. 198.

have ordained sufficiently, lady, for the time being,” did not give her the agreement to ordain.

The nun Caṇḍakālī answered “Very good.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena Caṇḍakālī bhikkhunī bhikkhunīsaṅghaṃ upasaṅkamtivā
vuṭṭhāpanasammutiṃ yācati. atha kho bhikkhunīsaṅgho Caṇḍakālīṃ bhikkhuniṃ
paricchitvā: alaṃ tāva te ayye vuṭṭhāpitenā ’ti, vuṭṭhāpanasammutiṃ na adāsi.
Caṇḍakālī bhikkhunī sādhu ’ti paṭisuṇi. (Vin. IV, 331)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 tested the nun Caṇḍakālī, saying: “For the time being, lady, there is no need of you to make the higher ordination,” did not give her the agreement to ordain. The nun Caṇḍakālī answered “Very good.”

DISCUSSION:

alaṃ: Here the refusal of the Order to the nun Caṇḍakālī, “*alaṃ tāva te ayye vuṭṭhāpitenā,*” seems to be troublesome. The translation of I. B. Horner loses the causative sense of the past participle *vuṭṭhāpitenā* that is already discussed in the previous item.

The Dictionary of Pāli Idioms has the translation for it as “Venerable, it is useless to have you been ordained,”¹ but it is not a good one.

The *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* Commentary explains:

Alaṃ tāva te ayye vuṭṭhāpitenāti vuccamānāti vuṭṭhāpanasammutiyā yācitāya saṅghena upaparikkhipitvā yasmā bālā abyattā ca alajjinī ca hoti, tasmā alaṃ tāva tuyhaṃ upasampāditenā ti evaṃ nivārīyamānā.² = Being said: “For the time being, lady, there is no need of you to make the higher ordination” means: When the permission to ordain is requested, the Order ascertains: “Since she is ignorant, inexperienced, and unscrupulous,” therefore she is being prevented thus: “For the time being, there is no need of you to make the higher ordination.”

¹ DPI. 133.

² KanA. 200.

So in order to make up my proposed translation, I tentatively restore the causative sense for the ppp. *vuṭṭhāpitena* (by being made someone to be ordained = to make the higher ordination) and for the indeclinable *alam*, I choose its meaning as “there is no need of” given by Cone in her dictionary.¹

--ooOoo--

112. *vuṭṭhitāya parisāya* (BD. III, 396-397):

(Bhikkhunī’s Pācittiya 81)

Whatever nun should ordain a probationer by showing favourism to (monks) placed on probation, there is an offence of expiation. ...

By showing favourism to (monks) placed on probation means: to a company that has risen.

PĀLI TEXT:

yā pana bhikkhunī pārivāsikachandadānena sikkhamānaṃ vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ ti.

...

pārivāsikachandadānenā ’ti vuṭṭhitāya parisāya. (Vin. IV, 335)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Whatever nun should ordain a probationer with the consent given by monks under probation, there is an offence of expiation. ...

With the consent given by monks under probation means when the group (of monks) has risen.

DISCUSSION:

vuṭṭhitāya parisāya: According to the introductory story, the nun Thullanandā dismissed the elders that had been convened earlier then invited Devadatta, Kokālika, Kaṭamorakatissaka, Khaṇḍadeviyā putta, Samuddadatta to perform the ordination for a

¹ DOP. 237.

probationer (*sikkhamānā*).¹ Based on that, I think the meaning of *pārivāsikachandadānena* can be translated literally as “with the consent given by monks under probation” assuming that the monk Devadatta and his followers are probationers.²

However, the Commentary replaces the word *pārivāsika* by *pārivāsiya* and explains “*pārivāsiyachandadānenā* ’ti *pārivāsiyena chandadānena*.”³ I have no clues about it. Nonetheless, the Commentary has some words about the clause “*vuṭṭhitāya parisāya*” that may help to understand the rule:

vuṭṭhitāya parisāyā ’ti chandaṃ vissajjetvā kāyena vā vācāya vā chandavissajjanamatten’ eva vā uṭṭhitāya parisāya anāpatti. *avuṭṭhitāya parisāyā* ’ti chandaṃ avissajjetvā avuṭṭhitāya anāpatti.⁴ = *vuṭṭhitāya parisāya* means in case that the group has arisen there is no offence if the consent has been given by means of the body, or by spoken words, or just by giving the consent. *avuṭṭhitāya parisāya* means Not having given the consent, there is no offence if the group has not arisen.

So I understand this rule is to prevent a nun who is a *pavattinī* while bestowing a higher ordination to a new female candidate should have the consent of the Order of monks as a whole, not of only the chosen individuals who attend the ceremony.

It seems to be the essence of the rule has been acquired but the meaning of the sentence “*pārivāsikachandadānenā* ’ti *vuṭṭhitāya parisāya*” of the *Pāli* Canon has not yet figured out successfully. The Commentary already proposed a solution as mentioned above but it does not work well. I propose a solution by taking “*vuṭṭhitāya parisāya*” as locative absolute denoting time “when the group (of monks) has risen.” Such choice does not require a change in the *Pāli* Canon and it complies with the explanation from the Commentary.

--ooOoo--

¹ Vin. IV, 335; BD. III, 396.

² See *Saṅghādisesa* offence 10 & 11 (Vin. III, 171 ff.; BD. I, 296 ff.); *Saṅghabhedakakkhandhakaṃ* (Vin. II, 196 ff.; Vin. V, 275 ff.).

³ VA. IV, 943.

⁴ *Ibid.* 944.

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE
VOLUME IV - MAHĀVAGGA



CHAPTER I (MAHĀKHANDHAKAṀ):

113. arah' asi, anantajina (BD. IV, 12):

“According to what you claim, your reverence, you ought to be victor of the unending”
(Upaka said).

PĀLI TEXT:

yathā kho tvam āvuso paṭijānāsi arah' asi anantajinoti. (Vin. I, 8)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“According to what you claim, your reverence, you deserve to be a boundless victor”
(Upaka said).

DISCUSSION:

a/ *arah' asi*: I. B. Horner gives a long discussion in footnotes 3, 4, 7 about the meanings of “*arah' asi*” and “*anantajino*.” For the verb “*arah' asi*,” as mentioned by I. B. Horner and evidence from the Commentary, “*arahasi anantajino ti anantajino bhavituṃ yutto 'si*,”¹ it should be read as *arahasi*, the second person singular of the verb *arahati*. I. B. Horner also in footnote mentions of two alternative meanings as “you deserve to be, are worthy or fit to be,” and emphasizes that the expression “ought to be” having a slightly contemptuous sense due to the reason that Upaka was not really to be convinced by the declaration of the Buddha about his attainment. On the other hand, I prefer the expression of “deserve to be” taken from the

¹ VA. V, 964.

meaning of “yutto = joined, connected, attached” explained by the Commentary. This is just a matter of word choice.

b/ *anantajino*: I analyze the compound *anantajino* not the same way as that of I. B. Horner. She takes it as a *tappurusa* compound (victor of the unending), on the other hand I believe that it should be analyzed as a *kammadhāraya* one (boundless victor) with the clue from the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī*: “anantañāṇo jitakilesoti anantajino¹ = *anantajino* is (having) boundless knowledge, (having) defilement conquered.”

--ooOoo--

114. *nisajja, āvuso* (BD. IV, 13):

The Lord sat down on the seat made ready, and the Lord, while he was sitting down, washed his feet. Further, they addressed the Lord by name and with the epithet of “your reverence.”

PĀLI TEXT:

nisīdi bhagavā paññatte āsane, nisajja kho bhagavā pāde pakkhālesi. api ’ssu bhagavantam nāmena ca āvusovādena ca samudācaranti. (Vin. I, 9)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The Lord sat down on the seat made ready. Having sat down, the Lord washed his feet. Further, they addressed the Lord by name and with the term “Friend.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *nisajja*: The issue here is that the gerund *nisajja* (*ni* + \sqrt{sad} + *ya*) describes the scene that the Bhagavā already sat down on the seat then started washing His feet. Moreover, one cannot perform two actions “sitting down” and “washing the feet” at the same time; so the progressive form used by I. B. Horner is inappropriate.

¹ VṬ. III, 150.

b/ *āvuso*: Taken from Buddhist literature, *āvuso* was used as an addressing term showing an equal relationship between the two speakers and often translated as “friend, brother.” In this context, the Buddha advised the group of five monks not to call him by the term *āvuso* in order to let them realize that they should have shown respect towards Him because the one they were talking to in that particular time was an Enlightened One, not the ascetic Gotama as they had known previously. So, “your reverence” should not to be used here, but “friend” or “brother” instead. Moreover, the Buddha before passing away ordered the monks that the junior should address the senior by the term *bhante* and vice versa by the term *āvuso*.¹ See also § 241a, 243.

--ooOoo--

115. Vocabulary, Gerund (BD. IV, 13):

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-faring for the sake of which young men of family rightly go forth from home into homelessness, you will abide in it.”

PĀLI TEXT:

evaṃ vutte bhagavā pañcavaggiye bhikkhū etad avoca : mā bhikkhave tathāgataṃ nāmena ca āvusovādena ca samudācaratha. araham bhikkhave tathāgato sammāsambuddho. odahatha bhikkhave sotaṃ, amataṃ adhigataṃ, ahaṃ anusāsāmi, ahaṃ dhammaṃ desemi. yathānusiṭṭhaṃ tathā paṭipajjamānā nacirass’ eva yass’ atthāya kulaputtā sammad eva agāasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajanti, tad anuttaraṃ

¹ *Mahāparinibbānasuttaṃ*, D. II, 154.

brahmacariyapariyosānaṃ diṭṭheva dhamme sayaṃ abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajja viharissathā 'ti. (Vin. I, 9)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

When this had been said, the Lord spoke thus to the group of five monks: “Do not, monks, address a Thus Gone One by name, and with the term ‘friend.’ A Thus Gone One, monks, is a worthy one, a fully awakened one. Give ear, monks, the deathless that has been attained (by me), I teach, I preach dhamma. While practicing according to what has been instructed, not for long right in this very life time by your own super-knowledge you will realise, attain, and abide in that supreme goal of the Noble practice, for the sake of which young men of family rightly go forth from home into homelessness.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Vocabulary:** For the purpose of making the translation easier to understand, in this passage I have chosen different meanings for some words instead of keeping those of I. B. Horner: “Thus Gone One” for *tathāgataṃ* instead of “Truthfinder,” “I teach” for *anusāsāmi* instead of “I instruct,” “I preach” for *desemi* instead of “I teach,” “has been instructed” for *anusiṭṭhaṃ* (ppp. of *anusāsati*, to teach, instruct) instead of “has been enjoined,” “practicing” for *paṭipajjamānā* instead of “going along,” “not for long” for *nacirass’eva* instead of “soon,” “in this very life time” for *diṭṭheva dhamme* instead of “here and now,” “Noble practice” for *brahmacariya* instead of “Brahma-faring.”

b/ **Gerund:** For the series of gerunds “*sayaṃ abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajja viharissatha*,” I prefer to interpret them as a series of finite verbs complying with the last one in future tense: “by your own super-knowledge you will realise, attain, and abide in that ...” In I. B. Horner’s translation, the gerund *upasampajja* seems to be dropped out, “having soon realised ... you will abide in it.” See also § 56b, 73, 145c, 158, 160, 177a, 206b, 225.

--ooOoo--

116. Dative - *me, dukkhaṃ ariyasaccaṃ* (BD. IV, 16):

On thinking, ‘This is the ariyan truth of ill’, among things not heard before by me, monks, vision arose, knowledge arose, wisdom arose, higher knowledge 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

idaṃ dukkhaṃ ariyasaccan ti me bhikkhave pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhuṃ udapādi, ñāṇaṃ udapādi, paññā udapādi, vijjā udapādi, āloko udapādi. taṃ kho pan’ idaṃ dukkhaṃ ariyasaccaṃ pariññeyyan ti me bhikkhave —la— pariññātan ti me bhikkhave pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhuṃ udapādi, ñāṇaṃ udapādi, paññā udapādi, vijjā udapādi, āloko udapādi. (Vin. I, 11)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

To me, monks, the vision arose, the knowledge arose, the wisdom arose, the higher knowledge arose, the light arose about things not heard before, (such thing is) ‘This is the noble truth of suffering.’ Again, to me, monks, . . . (such thing is) ‘This is the noble truth of suffering should be completely known’ . . . Again, to me, monks, the vision arose, the knowledge arose, the wisdom arose, the higher knowledge arose, the light arose about things not heard before, (such thing is) ‘This is the noble truth of suffering has been known.’

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Dative - me:** In this excerpt, the *Pāli* personal pronoun *me* (*amha*) should not be taken as instrumental case then accordingly translated into English as “by me;” but it is the indirect object in dative case of the verb *udapādi* in a series then should be translated as “to me, upon me.” I take the clue from the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī*:

Pubbe ananussutesūti ito pubbe ‘idaṃ dukkhan’ti-ādinā na anussutesu assutapubbesu catusaccadhammesu¹ = *The things not heard before* are the Four Noble Truths that were not heard before, that were not heard in the past from now: This is suffering, etc.

¹ VṬ. III, 165.

So I understand that the agent of the act “not heard” (*ananussutesu*) is not the Buddha but everyone, the mankind including gods, which is understood.

b/ *dukkhaṃ ariyasaccaṃ*: The meaning of *dukkha* in the context of the Four Noble Truth has many interpretations such as “ill, pain, unsatisfactoriness, suffering, etc.” Here, I choose “suffering.” However, I think that keeping *dukkha* not translated sometime conveys a better sense or makes it easier to understand for the readers who are familiar with Buddhist terminology. And *ariya* is an adjective having the meaning as “noble, distinguished” and modifying the noun *sacca* (truth). So that the phrase “*idaṃ dukkhaṃ ariyasaccaṃ*” should be translated as “This is the noble truth of suffering,” which is the vision, the knowledge, the wisdom, the higher knowledge, and the light that arose in the mind of the Blessed One while he was sitting at the foot of the Bodhi tree in Bodh Gayā.

Others similar passages should be understood in the same manner as well.

--ooOoo--

117. Genitive - *me, ñāṇadassanaṃ, paccaññāsim* (BD. IV, 17):

“And so long, monks, the vision of knowledge of these four ariyan truths, with the three sections and twelve modes 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 brahmans, 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 brahmans, 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.’”

PĀLI TEXT:

yāva kīvañ ca me bhikkhave imesu catusu ariyasaccesu evaṃ tiparivaṭṭaṃ dvādasākāraṃ yathābhūtaṃ ñāṇadassanaṃ na suvisuddhaṃ ahoṣi, n' eva tāvāhaṃ bhikkhave sadevake loke samāraḷe sabrahmaḷe sassamaṇabrāhmaṇiyā pajāya sadevamaṇussāya anuttaraṃ sammāsambodhiṃ abhisambuddho 'ti paccaññāsiṃ. yato ca kho me bhikkhave imesu catusu ariyasaccesu evaṃ tiparivaṭṭaṃ dvādasākāraṃ yathābhūtaṃ ñāṇadassanaṃ suvisuddhaṃ ahoṣi, athāhaṃ bhikkhave sadevake loke samāraḷe sabrahmaḷe sassamaṇabrāhmaṇiyā pajāya sadevamaṇussāya anuttaraṃ sammāsambodhiṃ abhisambuddho 'ti paccaññāsiṃ. ñāṇaṃ ca pana me dassanaṃ udapādi: akuppā me cetovimutti, ayaṃ antimā jāti, n' atthi dāni punabbhavo 'ti. (Vin. I, 11)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“And so long, monks, the vision and knowledge of mine about these four ariyan truths, with the three sections and twelve modes as they really are, was not well purified, so long I, monks, did not claim the supreme full awakening that “I am thoroughly awakened” to the world with its devas, with its Māras, with its Brahmās, with its recluses and brahmans, its creatures with devas and men.

“But when, monks, the vision and knowledge of mine about these four ariyan truths, with the three sections and twelve modes as they really are, was well purified, then monks, I did claim the supreme full awakening that “I am thoroughly awakened” to the world with its devas, with its Māras, with its Brahmās, with its recluses and brahmans, its creatures with devas and men.

“Moreover, to me the vision and knowledge arose: ‘Freedom of mind of mine is unshakeable, this is the last birth, there is not now again-becoming.’”

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Genitive - me:** I. B. Horner takes it as instrumental case being the agent of the ppp. *suvisuddhaṃ* and translates it accordingly, “the vision of knowledge was well purified by me;” but I prefer to take it as genitive case modifying the compound “*ñāṇadassanaṃ*” and

translate it as “the vision and knowledge of mine was well purified.” Also, the *Pāli* personal pronoun *me* in the clause “*akuppā me cetovimutti*” should be taken as genitive case also.

b/ *ñāṇadassanaṃ*: For the compound *ñāṇadassanaṃ*, instead of analyzing it as a *tapurisa* compound like I. B. Horner, I analyze it as a *dvanda* compound taking the hint from “*ñāṇaṇ ca pana me dassanaṃ udapādi*” at the end of this passage.

c/ *paccaññāsīṃ*: (*paṭijānāti = paṭi + √ñā + ā + ti*). The Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* explains:

abhisambuddhoti paccaññāsīnti abhisambuddho ahaṃ patto paṭivijjhivā ṭhitoti evaṃ paṭijāniṃ.¹ = ‘*I am thoroughly awakened, I claimed*’ means ‘I became thoroughly awakened after having penetrated (it), attained (it), then abode (in it),’ thus I claimed.

So I take the verb “*paccaññāsīṃ*” as having two direct objects: the first one is the accusative case “*sammāsambodhiṃ*” and the second is the direct quote “*abhisambuddhoti*,” it seems to me that I. B. Horner missed the particle “*iti*” at the end of the word *abhisambuddho*.

--ooOoo--

118. Names of heavens (BD. IV, 18):

Having heard the sound of the earth *devas*, the *devas* of the Four Great Kings 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 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

bhummānaṃ devānaṃ saddaṃ sutvā Cātumahārājikā devā saddaṃ anussāvesuṃ —
la— Cātumahārājikānaṃ devānaṃ saddaṃ sutvā Tāvatiṃsā devā —la— Yāmā devā

¹ VT. III, 165.

—la— Tusitā devā —la— Nimmānaratī devā —la— Paranimmitavasavattī devā —
la— Brahmakāyikā devā saddaṃ anussāvesuṃ: evaṃ bhagavatā Bārāṇasiyaṃ
Isipatane migadāye anuttaraṃ dhammacakkaṃ pavattitaṃ appaṭivattiyaṃ samaṇena
vā brāhmaṇena vā devena vā Mārena vā Brahmunā vā kenaci vā lokasmin ti. (Vin. I,
12)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Having heard the sound of the gods of the earth, the gods of the *Cātumahārājikā* heaven made this sound heard ... Having heard the sound of the gods of the *Cātumahārājikā* heaven, the gods of the *Tāvatisa* heaven ... the gods of the *Yāma* heaven ... the gods of the *Tusitā* heaven ... the gods of the *Nimmānarati* heaven ... the gods of the *Paranimmitavasatti* heaven ... the gods of *Brahmā*'s retinue made this sound heard: “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 by a brahmin or by a god or by Māra or by Brahmā or by anyone in the world.”

DISCUSSION:

Names of heavens: As specified in footnote 1, I. B. Horner recommends a longer list of *devas* at M. I, 289. One thing should be noted that the names given to those *devas* are the names of different spheres (*bhūmi*) in which they belong to. So those names should be translated as the names of the spheres in order to avoid confusion; otherwise the *Pāli* terms should be kept the same not translated. In the translation of *Majjhima Nikāya, The Middle Length Discourse of the Buddha*, Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoni and Bhikkhu Bodhi give a clearer translation as “... the gods of the heaven of the Four Great Kings! ... in the company of the gods of the heaven of the Thirty-three...the *Yāma* gods...the gods of the *Tusitā* heaven...the gods who delight in creating...the gods who wield power over others' creations...the gods of *Brahmā*'s retinue...”, but make the same clumsiness as that of I. B. Horner, the translation of those names some capitalized, some not.¹ Whereas in the table of “The 31 Realms of

¹ MidLD. 384.

Existence” from Bhikkhu Bodhi’s textbook *A Comprehensive Manual of Abhidhamma*, the name of the first six heavens are kept in *Pāli* forms, not translated;¹ I prefer such way.

One more thing should be mentioned is that I. B. Horner left one clause untranslated, “*Cātumahārājikānaṃ devānaṃ saddaṃ sutvā*” that in my proposed translation I underline the missing words for the convenience of making reference.

--ooOoo--

119. Textual discrepancy (BD. IV, 19):

Then the Lord, eating the food brought back by these, exhorted, instructed those remaining monks with *dhamma*-talk, saying: “Let the group of six live on whatever the three monks bring when they have walked for almsfood.”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho bhagavā tadavasese bhikkhū nīhārabhatto iminā nihārena dhammiyā kathāya ovadi anusāsi: yaṃ tayo bhikkhū piṇḍāya caritvā āharanti, tena chabbaggo yāpeti.
(Vin. I, 13)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the Lord, having the food brought back and with this (food) brought back, exhorted, instructed those remaining monks with *dhamma*-talk. The group of six manages to survive with whatever the three monks bring back after walking for almsfood.

DISCUSSION:

Textual discrepancy: I. B. Horner was misled by the colon placed after “*anusāsi*” by the editor. In fact, there is no direct speech in this passage and the colon should be replaced by a period due to the reason that the quotation marker “*iti*” does not exist. In the Sri Lankan, Thai, and Burmese *Pāli* Scriptures, the sentence “*yaṃ tayo bhikkhū piṇḍāya caritvā āharanti*

¹ Bodhi (1999), 186-187.

*tena chabbaggo yāpeti*¹ is an independent clause explaining the situation that the group of six managed to survive with the alms-food that Koṇḍañña, Vappa, Bhaddiya brought back.

One more thing is that the Sri Lankan, Thai, and Burmese *Pāli* Scriptures have only the compound “*nīhārabhatto*” without the phrase “*iminā nihārena.*” I. B. Horner seemed to be struggling with this phrase while translating it as “by these.” I have tried to link it to the preceding compound “*nīhārabhatto*” but it seems to be redundant.

--ooOoo--

120. Genitive - *me*, *pacchāsamaṇa* (BD. IV, 25):

“... 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

adhivāsetu me bhante bhagavā ajjatanāya bhattaṃ Yasena kulaputtana
pacchāsamaṇenā ‘ti. adhivāsesi bhagavā tuṅhībhāvena. (Vin. I, 17)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“... Oh Lord, may the Lord consent a meal of mine on the morrow with Yasa Kulaputta as the second?” The Lord consented by being silent.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Genitive - *me***: At the first glance, I feel the translation of the sentence seems odd while thinking that the Buddha was going to have a meal WITH a layman in a general sense. Grammatically, *adhivāseti* (*adhi* + $\sqrt{vās}$ + *e*) is the causative verb of *adhivasati* (*adhi* + \sqrt{vas} + *a*, to inhabit, to live in, to dwell in) having the direct object *bhattaṃ* in accusative case.² Grammatically, the personal pronoun *me* could be in accusative, instrumental, dative, or genitive case.³ The possible choice for the case of the *Pāli* personal pronoun *me* in

¹ Be. Vol. 3, 18; BJTS. Vol. 3, 26; Syā. Vol. 4, 24.

² A. P. Bud. part II, § 88, 121.

³ *Ibid.* part I, § 20, 18.

“*adhivāsetu me*” should be a genitive case (a meal of mine), whereas Ven. Thanissaro seems to take it as an ablative case (a meal from me).¹ Anyway, the meaning of this excerpt should be understood that the father of the venerable Yasa invited the Buddha to have a meal offered by him, not to eat with him as suggested by I. B. Horner’s translation.

b/ *pacchāsamaṇa*: The context here is that the venerable Yasa’s father requested the Buddha to let the monk Yasa also receive the food at his house. And the question is whether the venerable Yasa was an attendant of the Buddha at that particular moment or not. The answer is no due to there is no evidence in the *Pāli* text. According to Ven. A. P. Bud., *pacchāsamaṇa* is “a junior monk who walks behind a senior on his rounds;”² so that I tentatively translate *pacchāsamaṇa* as “the second.” One more thing is that I prefer to keep the name of Yasa Kulaputta intact not translated; otherwise his name should be Yasa, the son of rich family, not “Yasa, the young man of family” given by I. B. Horner.

--ooOoo--

121. Syntactic - punctuation, Contextual (BD. IV, 28):

Monks, teach *dhamma* which is lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the ending. 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

desetha bhikkhave dhammaṃ ādikalyāṇaṃ majjhekalyāṇaṃ pariyosānakalyāṇaṃ
sāttamaṃ savyañjanaṃ kevalaparipuṇṇaṃ parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ pakāsetha.
santi sattā apparajakkhājātikā assavanatā dhammassa parihāyanti, bhavissanti
dhammassa aññātāro. (Vin. I, 21)

¹ Tha. II, 378.

² CPED. 153.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Monks, teach *Dhamma* which is lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the ending, having the meaning, having the letter. Explain the Noble practice that is completely fulfilled, wholly pure. There are beings who are having little defilement will become the ones who understand the dhamma, (now) lacking of the hearing about dhamma they are deteriorating.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Syntactic - punctuation:** The problem of this item is punctuation and sentence structure. In the first sentence, we have two verbs, *desetha* and *pakāsetha* having two direct objects, *dhammaṃ* and *brahmacariyaṃ*, and seven adjectival compounds in accusative case modifying either one of the two direct objects. Taking clues from the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī*, “*Sāthanti sātthakaṃ katvā desetha. Sabyañjananti byañjanehi ceva padehi ca paripūraṃ katvā desetha,*”¹ I take the two *bahubbīhi* compounds *sātthaṃ* and *sabyañjanaṃ* modifying *dhammaṃ*, which is the direct object of the verb *desetha*, not modifying *brahmacariyaṃ* as shown in the translation of I. B. Horner.

b/ **Contextual:** The second sentence has three clauses with three finite verbs, *santi*, *parihāyanti*, and *bhavissanti*. The three clauses share the same subject *sattā* (beings) and those beings have special characteristics of having little defilement (*apparajakkhajātikā*). The context shows that those beings who do not have chance to listen to the *Dhamma* are deteriorating, decaying, falling off the righteousness; however they have the potentiality to understand the *Dhamma* and if they hear it they will become enlightened ones (*aññātāro*, plural of *aññātu*, which belongs to the noun-group of *gantu*-goer, *sotu*-hearer, *detu*-giver, *jetu*-winner, etc.).

--ooOoo--

¹ VṬ. III, 182.

122. *eva* (BD. IV, 29):

Then, Māra, the Evil One, thinking, “The Lord knows me, the well-farer knows me,” pained, afflicted, vanished then and there.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho Māro pāpimā jānāti maṃ bhagavā, jānāti maṃ sugato ’ti dukkhī dummano tath’ ev’ antaradhāyīti. (Vin. I, 21)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then, Māra, the Evil One, (thinking) “The Lord knows me, the Well-Farer knows me,” pained, afflicted, vanished right there.

DISCUSSION:

eva: The indeclinable *eva* emphasizes the preceding word, here is *tattha*; so *tath’eva* should be interpreted as “right there, at that very spot.” See also § 228b.

There are also some notices: First of all, *Sugato* is one of the nine titles of the Buddha and the translation of it should be capitalized the first letters. Secondly, *dukkhī* is an adjectival noun having the meaning as “the one who has *dukkha*,” *dummano* is a *bahubbīhi* compound having the meaning as “having a sad mind;” however I still keep I. B. Horner’s translation in my proposed one.

--ooOoo--

123. *vaseyyāma, agaru, Bahubbīhi* Compound (BD. IV, 33):

Then the Lord approached the hermitage 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho bhagavā yena Uruvelakassapassa jaṭilassa assamo ten' upasaṅkami, upasaṅkamitvā Uruvelakassapaṃ jaṭilaṃ etad avoca: sace te Kassapa agaru, vaseyyāma ekarattaṃ agyāgāre 'ti. na kho me mahāsamaṇa garu, caṇḍ' ettha nāgarājā iddhimā āsiviso ghoraviso, so taṃ mā viheṭhesīti. (Vin. I, 24)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the Lord approached the hermitage 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, we should stay for one night in the fire-room.”

“It is not convenient to me, great recluse, here there is a fierce dragon king having psychic power (and) snake venom, which is a terrible venom. Do not let him harm you.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *vaseyyāma*: is the first person plural, optative mood; so I prefer to translate it literally as “we should stay” without researching further that the proposal of the Blessed One means the two of them or just He alone.

b/ *agaru*: The answer of the ascetic Kassapa, “It is not convenient to me,” is a strong statement about his unwillingness to let the Buddha spending the night in the fire-room; and the rest of his reply explains about the situation of the fire-room. I. B. Horner translation as “It is not inconvenient to me” reveals that perhaps while writing it I. B. Horner was under the influence of English usage.

c/ ***Bahubbīhi Compound***: In the words of Kassapa explaining about the fire-room, there are two adjectives, *caṇḍo* and *iddhimā*, and two *bahubbīhi* compounds, *āsiviso* and *ghoraviso*, all describe the characters of the dragon king. Grammatically, we can explain all of them modifying *nāgarājā*, but semantically, for the last two compounds, I prefer to take the former modifying *nāgarājā* and the latter modifying the former.

--ooOoo--

124. *tathārūpaṃ* (BD. IV, 33):

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?”

Then the Lord, having worked a work of psychic power, blew forth smoke.

PĀLI TEXT:

Atha kho so nāgo bhagavantam pavitṭham addasa, disvāna dukkhī dummano padhūpāsi. atha kho bhagavato etad ahosi:: yaṃ nūnāhaṃ imassa nāgassa anupahacca chaviṇ ca cammaṇ ca maṃsaṇ ca nhāruṇ ca atṭhiṇ ca atṭhimiṇjaṇ ca tejasā tejaṃ pariyādiyeyyan ti. atha kho bhagavā tathārūpaṃ iddhābhisankhāraṃ abhisankharitvā padhūpāsi. (Vin. I, 24-25)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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?”

Then the Lord, having worked a psychic power work of such form, blew forth smoke.

DISCUSSION:

tathārūpaṃ: I have just added the translation “of such form” for the *Pāli* compound *tathārūpaṃ* into I. B. Horner’s translation. The context is that the Buddha utilized the same psychic power as that of the dragon king but a more powerful and effective one.

--ooOoo--

125. *abhikkanta* (BD. IV, 35):

Then the Lord stayed in a certain woodland grove near the hermitage of the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa. Then the four Great Kings, having illumined the entire woodland

grove on a glorious night with glorious colour, approached the Lord; having approached, having greeted the Lord, they stood at the four quarters like huge fires.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho bhagavā Uruvelakassapassa jaṭilassa assamassa avidūre aññatarasmim vanasaṇḍe vihāsi. atha kho cattāro Mahārājāno abhikkantāya rattiyā abhikkantavaṇṇā kevalakappaṃ vanasaṇḍaṃ obhāsetvā yena bhagavā ten' upasaṅkamimsu, upasaṅkamitvā bhagavantaṃ abhivādetvā catuddisā aṭṭhaṃsu seyyathāpi mahantā aggikkhandhā. (Vin. I, 26)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the Lord stayed in a certain woodland grove near the hermitage of the matted hair ascetic Uruvelakassapa. Then when the night is waned out, having illumined the entire woodland grove, the four Great Kings with glorious colour approached the Lord. Having approached and greeted the Lord, they stood at the four quarters like huge fires.

DISCUSSION:

abhikkanta: There is an interesting grammatical point in this passage. Here the ppp. *abhikkanta* (*abhi* + \sqrt{kam} + *ti* = to go beyond) has different meanings in different contexts: “waned, exhausted” in the phrase *abhikkantāya rattiyā* and “glorious” in *abhikkantavaṇṇā*. Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa gives clear explanations about this. For the first phrase *abhikkantāya rattiyā*, which is a locative absolute denoting time, he says:

tena abhikkantāya rattiyā parikkhīṇāya rattiyāti vuttaṃ hoti.¹ = therefore, it is said that ‘abhikkantāya rattiyā’ is when the night is waned out.’

Also in the same text, he explains about the second:

tena abhikkantavaṇṇā abhirūpacchavīti vuttaṃ hoti = therefore, *abhikkantavaṇṇā* means having extremely beautiful complexion (having glorious colour).

So according to him, the former is explained as a verbal adjective but the latter a descriptive one. Indeed, Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa mentions four meanings of

¹ DA. III, 961.

abhikkanta, which are *khaya-sundara-abhirūpa-abbhanumodanā*, having the meanings as “wane, beautiful, good shape, rejoicing” respectively. Such information is also found in the PED.¹

--ooOoo--

126. Genitive - *te* (BD. IV, 43):

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 path 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho bhagavā Uruvelakassapaṃ jaṭilaṃ etad avoca : n’ eva kho tvaṃ Kassapa arahā, na pi arahattamaggaṃ samāpanno; sā pi te paṭipadā n’ atthi, yāya tvaṃ arahā vā assa arahattamaggaṃ vā samāpanno ’ti. (Vin. I, 32)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 even you still don’t have that practice, by which you either could be a perfected one or could have entered on the way to perfection.”

DISCUSSION:

Genitive - *te*: In the clause “*sā pi te paṭipadā n’ atthi*,” I prefer to take the pronoun *te* as a genitive case “of you” to a dative case “for you.” However, there is a semantic problem: we cannot interpret that the way to perfection is “not for Kassapa” as I. B. Horner did, because indeed such practice is “for him,” in fact very soon later he became an *Arahat*. Neither can we say that such practice is “of him” due to the fact that the path to deliverance is only taught

¹ PED. 62.

by Buddhas, the Fully Enlightened Ones. In fact, the matted hair ascetic Kassapa had not known nor realized such path existed until that very moment, at which the Lord made this statement. So in order to reveal the genitive case of the pronoun *te* in English translation, I resort to the technique that instead of translating “Of him there is a house,” I can interpret “He has a house” alternatively, and finally come up with the interpretation as shown above.

--ooOoo--

127. *uttiṭṭha* (BD. IV, 57):

While people were eating, they held their almsbowls close above the soft food for the remains, 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 beverages for the remains, and having themselves asked for curry and boiled rice, they ate it, and they remained in the refectory making a loud noise, a great noise.

PĀLI TEXT:

te manussānaṃ bhuñjamānānaṃ upari bhojane pi uttiṭṭhapattaṃ upanāmenti, upari khādaniye pi uttiṭṭhapattaṃ upanāmenti, upari sāyanīye pi uttiṭṭhapattaṃ upanāmenti, upari pānīye pi uttiṭṭhapattaṃ upanāmenti, sāmaṃ sūpam pi odanam pi viññāpetvā bhuñjanti, bhattagge pi uccāsaddā mahāsaddā viharanti. (Vin. I, 44)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

While people were eating, they present their almsbowls raised up above the soft food, and they present their almsbowls raised up above the solid food, and they present their almsbowls raised up above the savoury food, and they present their almsbowls raised up above the beverages, and having themselves asked for curry and boiled rice, they ate it, and they remained in the refectory making a loud noise, a great noise.

DISCUSSION:

uttiṭṭha: is the past passive participle of the verb *uttiṭṭhati* used as an adjective modifying the noun *patta*. Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains:

uttiṭṭhapattan ti piṇḍāya caraṇakapattam. tasmim̐ hi manussā ucchiṭṭhasaññino, tasmā uttiṭṭhapattan ti vuttam̐. atha vā uṭṭhahitvā pattam̐ upanāmentī ’ti evam ettha attho datṭhabbo.¹

I. B. Horner and Cone² takes the meaning of *uttiṭṭha* as “for the remains,” whereas I follow the second meaning from the Commentary, “*uṭṭhahitvā pattam̐ upanāmenti* = they raise up the bowl and bring it close to.” So that I translate the phrase “*uttiṭṭhapattam̐ upanāmenti*” as “they present their almsbowl raised up (above the soft food, etc.)”

--ooOoo--

128. *adhisīla, ajjhācāra, atidiṭṭhi* (BD. IV, 82-83):

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, in regard to moral habit, he comes to have fallen away from moral habit; if, in regard to good habits, he comes to have fallen away from good habits; if, in regard to (right) view, he comes to have fallen away from (right) view; if he comes to have heard little, if he comes to be of poor intelligence.

PĀLI TEXT:

aparehi pi bhikkhave pañcaḥ’ aṅgehi samannāgatena bhikkhunā na upasampādetabbaṃ, na nissayo dātabbo, na sāmaṇero upaṭṭhāpetabbo: adhisīle sīlavipanno hoti, ajjhācāre ācāravipanno hoti, atidiṭṭhiyā diṭṭhivipanno hoti, appassuto hoti, duppañño hoti. (Vin. I, 63)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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, in regard to higher virtue, he has failed in virtues; if, in regard to higher behavior, he has failed in behaviors; if, in regard to higher view, he has failed in (right) views; if he comes to have heard little, if he comes to be of poor intelligence.

¹ VA. V, 977.

² DOP. 415.

DISCUSSION:

adhisīla, ajjhācāra, atidiṭṭhi: There is problem of terminology concerning to the three terms, *adhisīla, ajjhācāra* (in fact it is *adhi+ācāra*), and *atidiṭṭhi*. I. B. Horner translates them as moral habit, good habit, and (right) view respectively. The Commentary says:

*adhisīle sīlavipanno ti ādisu pārājikañ ca saṅghādisesañ ca āpanno adhisīle sīlavipanno nāma. itare pañcāpattikkhandhe āpanno ajjhācāre ācāravipanno nāma. sammādiṭṭhiṃ pahāya antaggāhikāya diṭṭhiyā samannāgato atidiṭṭhiyā diṭṭhivipanno nāma.*¹

According to the Commentary:

- *adhisīla* relates to *pārājika* and *saṅghādisesa* offences,
- *ajjhācāra* relates the rest five groups of offences, which are *thullaccaya, nissaggiya pācittiya, pācittiya, dukkaṭa*, and *dubbhāsita* offences,
- and *atidiṭṭhi* is *antaggāhikā diṭṭhi* translated as “view assuming finiteness” by Ven. Ñāṇamoli in his translation *The Path of Discrimination for Paṭisambhidāmagga* of *Khuddakanikāya*. The book *Paṭisambhidāmagga* has the list of *antaggāhikā diṭṭhi* (view assuming finiteness):

Sassato loko = The world is eternal,

Asassato loko = The world is not eternal,

Antavā loko = The world has an end [in space],

Anantavā loko = The world has no end [in space],

Taṃ jīvaṃ taṃ sarīraṃ = The soul and the body are the same,

Aññaṃ jīvaṃ aññaṃ sarīraṃ = The soul is one, and the body is another,

Hoti Tathāgato paraṃ maraṇā = A Perfect One is after death,

Na hoti Tathāgato paraṃ maraṇā = A Perfect One is not after death,

Hoti ca na ca hoti Tathāgato paraṃ maraṇā = A Perfect One is and is not after death,

N’eva hoti na na hoti Tathāgato paraṃ maraṇā = A Perfect One neither is nor is not after death.²

¹ VA. V, 989.

² Pts. 151; Ñāṇamoli (1982), 150-151.

Such list is also found in other *Pāli* texts such as *Dīghanikāya I*, 188; *Majjhimanikāya I*, 158; *Aṅguttaranikāya V*, 187, 193, 197; *Mahāniddeśa I*, 64, 65, 75, 86, 113, 161, 162, 173, 183, 192, 195, 202; II, 293, 300, 305, 319, 323, 326, 331; *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* 202; but only the *Paṭisambhidāmagga* categorizes those views into a group called *antaggāhikā diṭṭhi* (view assuming finiteness).

Ven. Thanissaro gives the meaning of *adhisīla* as “heightened virtue;”¹ whereas I prefer to translate *adhisīla*, *ajjhācāra*, *atidiṭṭhi* as “higher virtue, higher behavior, higher view” respectively.

--ooOoo--

129. Bahubbīhi Compound (BD. IV, 97):

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho tesaṃ dārakānaṃ mātāpitaro sabbe p’ime dārakā samānacchandā kalyāṇādhippāyā ’ti anujāniṃsu. te bhikkhū upasaṅkamtivā pabbajjaṃ yāciṃsu. te bhikkhū pabbājesuṃ upasampādesuṃ. (Vin. I, 77-78)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the parents of those boys consented, thinking: “All these boys are having similar wish, having good intention.” These, having approached monks, asked for the going forth. These monks let them go forth, they ordained them.

DISCUSSION:

Bahubbīhi Compound: I would like to notify that in the *Pāli* excerpt above there is an application of two *bahubbīhi* compounds, *samānacchandā* and *kalyāṇādhippāyā*. The

¹ Tha. II, 221.

describe the characteristics of the preceding noun *dārakā* and have the basic meanings as “(these boys) whose wish is similar, whose intention is good.” The way of interpreting and translating a *bahubbīhi* compound is varied.

--ooOoo--

130. *paṇḍaka, dūseti, tayā* (BD. IV, 108):

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 monk refused, saying: “Be off, eunuch, depart, eunuch. What need have you?”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro paṇḍako bhikkhūsu pabbajito hoti, so dahare-dahare bhikkhū upasaṃkamitvā evaṃ vadeti: etha maṃ āyasmanto dūsethā ’ti. bhikkhū apasādentī: nassa paṇḍaka, vinassa paṇḍaka, ko tayā attho ’ti. (Vin. I, 85)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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, spoil me.” The monk refused, saying: “Be off, eunuch, depart, eunuch. What is the need (to be) with you?”

DISCUSSION:

a/ ***paṇḍaka***: The term *paṇḍaka* could be worth to pay some attention. The *Vinayapiṭaka* gives three kinds of them, “*tayo paṇḍakā manussapaṇḍako amanussapaṇḍako tiracchānagatapaṇḍako*”¹ categorizing according of their natures: human, non-human, and animal. Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa presents five types of *paṇḍaka(s)* according to their behaviors and activities: *āsittapaṇḍako*, *usuyyapaṇḍako*, *opakkamiyapaṇḍako*,

¹ Vin. III, 28.

pakkhapaṇḍako, napuṃsakapaṇḍako.¹ Perera in his book, *Sexuality in Ancient India: A Study Based on the Pāli Vinayaṭṭaka*, has a long discussion about this term² and comes up with this conclusion:

It appears, then, that the terms *paṇḍaka* and *paṇḍikā* refer to persons sexually ineffective. Such ineffectiveness may be the outcome of undeveloped or indistinct primary sexual characteristics, or may be due to artificial amputation of sexual organs, even if the persons concerned be considered male or female by virtue of other characteristics. (113)

So, the one who is called *paṇḍaka* has no sexual organ either naturally at birth or artificially by amputation. The *Vinayaṭṭaka* also mentions *ubhatovyañjanaka*,³ which is a person with both male and female (sexual) characteristics, as the counterpart of *paṇḍaka*.⁴ I keep the same translation “eunuch” for the term *paṇḍaka*, but just give a notice for the concept of it.

b/ *dūseti & tayā*: We need to take a look at the two clauses: “*etha maṃ āyasmanto dūsethā ’ti*” and “*ko tayā attho ’ti*.” The meanings of these two clauses are straight forward; I just present my proposed translation as “Come, venerable ones, spoil me” and “What is the need (to be) with you?” respectively and need not to explain further. This is the case of disadvantage while reading a translation without referring to the original text.

--ooOoo--

131. *upasampādentena, pucchitum*, Textual discrepancy (BD. IV, 120):

Now at that time ordained (monks) were to be seen who were (afflicted by) leprosy and boils and eczema and consumption and epilepsy. 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-blocks for him.”

¹ VA. V, 1016.

² Perera 113-148.

³ Vin. I, 89, 121, 122, 161, ...

⁴ *Ibid.* 154.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena upasampannā dissanti kuṭṭhikāpi gaṇḍikāpi kilāsikāpi
sosikāpi apamārikāpi. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave
upasampādentena tassa antarāyike dhamme pucchituṃ. (Vin. I, 93)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time ordained (monks) were to be seen to be (afflicted by) leprosy and boils
and eczema and consumption and epilepsy. They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“I allow, monks, to ask about things that are obstacles of him (the candidate) by the one
who is bestowing the higher ordination.”

DISCUSSION:

There are three interesting issues concerning the words of the Buddha: “*anujānāmi
bhikkhave upasampādentena tassa antarāyike dhamme pucchituṃ*”: the first one is the
meaning of the present participle *upasampādentena*, the second is the agent of the infinitive
pucchituṃ, and the last one is the validity of the personal pronoun *tassa*.

a/ ***upasampādentena***: is the present participle of the causative verb *upasampādeti* (*upa* +
sam + \sqrt{pad}) in instrumental case, masculine, singular. Here, it is used as a noun having the
meaning as “by the one who is making someone become a bhikkhu,” or in other words, “by
the one who is bestowing the higher ordination (upon someone).” In this context, that one
was a senior monk who was going to ask the candidate about the thirteen obstacles in order to
confirm whether or not the candidate was in suitable conditions to become a *bhikkhu*. Then
he would recite an announcement four times in order to gain the approval of the monks who
were present in the ordination ceremony. Such a one is not “the one who is being ordained”
as translated by I. B. Horner. He is indeed the agent of the infinitive *pucchituṃ*.

b/ ***pucchituṃ***: is the infinitive of the verb *pucchati*, which is a double accusative verb.
Such statement could be attested by evidences found in the *Pāli Canon*:

atha kho āyasmā mahākassapo saṅghaṃ ñāpesi: suṇātu me āvuso saṅgho. yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṃ, ahaṃ Upāliṃ vinayaṃ puccheyyan ti. = 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 I could question Upāli on discipline.”¹

Here, the verb *puccheyyaṃ* has two accusatives, *Upāli* and *vinayaṃ*. So in this item if the senior monk asked a candidate about “things which are stumbling-blocks” in accusative case (*antarāyike dhamme*), the candidate must be also placed in accusative case. Or, I wonder, due to the reason the senior monk asked the candidate whether he had them or not, so that the pronoun presenting the candidate is put in genitive case *tassa*, not accusative?

c/ **Textual discrepancy - *tassa or terasa***: As discussed above, *tassa* cannot be the object of the verb *pucchitum*, and whether *tassa* represents the candidate or not is still in doubt because nothing of the candidate is mentioned previously (*upasampādentena* does not refer to the candidate but to his *ācāriya*). So the arising question is what the role of *tassa* is in this excerpt? The *Tipiṭaka* from other sources such as Sri Lankan, Thai, Burmese substitutes *tassa* by *terasa*,² which is the number of questions asking about obstacles that block the way to become a *bhikkhu* of a new candidate.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER II (UPOSATHAKHANDHAKAṀ):

132. *avippavāsaṃ* (BD. IV, 142):

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 monks is) not away, separated from the three robes.

¹ Vin. II, 286; BD. V, 396.

² Be. Vol. 3, 130; BJTS. Vol. 3, 230; Syā. Vol. 4, 188.

PĀLI TEXT:

bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. yā sā bhikkhave saṅghena sīmā sammatā samānasamvāsā ekuposathā, saṅgho taṃ sīmaṃ ticīvarena avippavāsaṃ sammannatu.
(Vin. I, 109)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

They told this matter to the Lord. He said:

“A boundary, monks, is agreed upon by an Order for the same communion having one Observance, let the Order agree (to regard) that boundary (as a place) having no concern about the *nissaggiya* rule of being separated from (one of) the three robes.”

DISCUSSION:

avippavāsaṃ: There is no argument against the translation of I. B. Horner, literally and grammatically, for the phrase “*sīmaṃ ticīvarena avippavāsaṃ*” as “boundary (as a place where a monks is) not away, separated from the three robes.” However, such interpretation is opposite to the applicable meaning of this rule, which means a monk can be away, separated from one of his three robes without violating the *nissaggiya* rule. In fact, while staying in such boundary, a bhikkhu is able to pass through the night without thinking whether or not one of his three robes is separated away from him. I have the support from the *Vinaya Mukha* stating that *ticīvara-avippavāsa sīmā* “allow[s] the bhikkhus to be without the three robes in that area.”¹ Whereas the interpretation by Ven. Thanissaro explains that such *sīmā* “may be further authorized as an area where one is not apart from one’s set of three robes”² or is “the not being without one’s triple robe;”³ such interpretations do not convey its complete sense. One may question whether all of the three robes or just one of three is concerned here. The answer is just one of the three with evidence is taken from the word-analysis section for the *nissaggiya pācittiya* rule n^o 2:

¹ Vaj. III, 29.

² Tha. II. 202.

³ *Ibid.* 425.

ekarattam pi ce bhikkhu ticivarena vippavaseyya 'ti, saṅghāṭiyā vā uttarāsaṅgena vā antaravāsakena vā. = *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.¹

Coming back to the issue how to translate this rule in order to reconcile the conflict between grammar and semantics, I approach this differently; let's take a look at the *nissaggiya pācittiya* rule n° 2:

. . . *ekarattampi ce bhikkhu ticivarena vippavaseyya aññatra bhikkhusammutiyā, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyān ti* = . . . if this monks should be away, separated from the three robes, even for one night, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.²

I take *vippavāsam* as the representative of this whole rule and understand it accordingly by analyzing: *avippavāsam* = *a* + *vippavāsam* (no concern about the *nissaggiya* rule of *vippavāsam*). So, a bhikkhu while staying in a *ticivara-avippavāsa sīmā* may not concern about such rule and may be separate away from any one of the three robes (*ticivarena* is singular) but not from all three of them.

--ooOoo--

133. *sabba, majjhimassa purisassa* (BD. IV, 145):

No river, monks, is a boundary, no 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

sabbā bhikkhave nadī asīmā, sabbo samuddo asīmo, sabbo jātassaro asīmo. nadiyā vā bhikkhave samudde vā jātassare vā yaṃ majjhimassa purisassa samantā udakukkhepā, ayaṃ tattha samānasamvāsā ekuposathā 'ti. (Vin. I, 111)

¹ Vin. III, 199; BD. II, 15.

² *Ibid.*

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The whole river, monks, is not a boundary, the whole sea is not a boundary, the whole natural lake is not a boundary. In a river, monks, or in a sea, or in a natural lake, the distance that a man of average (strength) can throw water all round, in this case, is (the boundary) for the same communion having one Observance.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *sabba*: I. B. Horner translates “*sabbā nadī asīmā*” as “no river is a boundary;” it seems to me that she drops the adjective *sabbā* out of the context. *Sabba* has its common meaning in collective sense as “whole, entire” that can be found in dictionaries.¹ Ven. Thanissaro interprets *sabbā* as a numerical (all, every) and translates as “[a]ll rivers are non-territories.”² He also explains further that “[a]ll oceans are non-territories. All natural lakes are non-territories. In a river, ocean, or natural lake, (the area) a man of average size can splash water all around it the (territory for) common communion and a single uposatha there.”³ Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa interprets the whole paragraph as “the surface of a body of water cannot be determined as a *sīmā*, but it is said that an area of concord can be limited to within the radius measured by the distance water can be thrown by an average man.”⁴ See also § 161a.

b/ *majjhimassa purisassa*: is explained clearly by Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa:

evaṃ udakaṃ vā vālikaṃ vā hatthena gahetvā thāmamajjhimena purisena sabbathāmena khipitabbaṃ⁵ = a man of average strength should hold water or sand then throw it with all of his strength.

It is weird that all the three great translators ignored the point. In fact, to throw something away, the strength is a crucial factor, height is not. See also § 11, 54.

--ooOoo--

¹ e.g. PED. 680, CPED. 263, etc.

² Tha. II. 205.

³ *Ibid.* 194, 205.

⁴ Vaj. III, 44.

⁵ VA. V. 1052.

134. *ajjhottharati* (BD. IV, 145):

Now at that time the group of six monks placed boundary within boundary.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū sīmāya sīmaṃ ajjhottharanti. (Vin. I, 111)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks spread a territory over a territory.

DISCUSSION:

ajjhottharati: I. B. Horner interprets the phrase “*sīmāya sīmaṃ ajjhottharanti*” as the new boundary is placed inside the old one (which must be bigger). Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa seems to have the same idea while explaining the case of an inner *sīmā* inside a bigger one, which he calls *mahā sīmā*, and the application of *sīmantarika*, which is the space between the two *sīmā*.¹ On the other hand, Ven. Thanissaro translates the verb *ajjhottharati* as “submerge” and explains that it should be “covering a part or the whole of a pre-existing territory.”² There is no doubt that such interpretation of his comes from the Commentary: “*sīmāya sīmaṃ ajjhottharanti* ti attano sīmāya paresaṃ baddhasīmaṃ ajjhottharanti paresaṃ baddhasīmaṃ sakalaṃ vā tassā padesaṃ vā anto katvā attano sīmaṃ bandhanti.”³

Taking the etymology of “*ajjhottharati* = *adhi* + *ava* + *√thar* + *a* + *ti*” into consideration, I prefer Ven. Thanissaro’s interpretation due to it conveys the meaning that the new *sīmā* is spread over (*adhi*) the old one.

Nonetheless, the topic of *sīmā* is a complicated and controversial one; it deserves a separate thoughtful and comprehensive research.

--ooOoo--

¹ Vaj. III. 35-38.

² Tha. II. 196.

³ VA. V, 1056.

135. *uddisamānā, sāveti* (BD. IV, 152):

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena chabbaggiyā bhikkhū saṅghamajjhe pātimokkham uddisamānā sañcicca na sāventi. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. na bhikkhave pātimokkhuddesakena sañcicca na sāvetabbaṃ. yo na sāveyya, āpatti dukkaṭassā 'ti.
(Vin. I, 115)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the group of six monks, while reciting the Pātimokkha in the midst of the Order, intentionally did not make (others) hear (did not pronounce distinctively). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, a reciter of the Pātimokkha should not intentionally make (others) not hear. Whoever makes (others) not hear, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *uddisamānā*: is the present participle of the verb *uddisati* (*ud* + √*dis* + *a* + *ti*) in masculine, plural, nominative, and having an active meaning “being recited,” not a passive one as given by I. B. Horner. In fact, the masculine noun *bhikkhū* (plural, nominative) governs the present participle *uddisamānā* and performs the causative verb *sāventi* also in the third person, plural, present tense.

b/ *sāveti*: I. B. Horner interprets that the group of six monks were the listeners when the *Pātimokkha* was being recited, and they intentionally did not hear. On the other hand, Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa interprets the rule as: “If he pretends to recite mumbling the words

indistinctly, he is dukkaṭa;”¹ and Ven. Thanissaro translates it as: “One reciting the Paṭimokkha should not intentionally not make himself be heard. Whoever should do so: an offense of wrong-doing.”² In fact, she got the right root verb \sqrt{su} (hear), but did not take *sāveti* as a causative verb of *suṇāti*.³ Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta gives its meanings as “to make hear; to announce; to declare.”⁴

So, the passage above should be understood that the group of six monks while reciting the *Pāṭimokkha* intentionally pronounced indistinctively in order to make other bhikkhus not being able to hear what they recited.

--ooOoo--

136. *kadā* (BD. IV, 154):

They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to count the monks.”

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 groups or to take (a count) by ticket.”

PĀLI TEXT:

bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave bhikkhū gaṇetun ti. atha kho bhikkhūnaṃ etad ahoṣi: kadā nu kho bhikkhū gaṇetabbā ’ti. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave tadah’ uposathe gaṇamaggena gaṇetuṃ salākaṃ vā gāhetun ti. (Vin. I, 117)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to count the monks.”

Then it occurred to monks: “Now, when 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 groups or to take (a count) by ticket.”

¹ Vaj. II. 106.

² Tha. II. 254.

³ PED. 707.

⁴ CPED. 281.

DISCUSSION:

kadā: The question word *kadā* (when) asking about the time, occasion should not be translated as “how” (*katham*). Perhaps I. B. Horner was misled by the answer of the Buddha, “to count by way of groups or to take (account) by ticket.”

--ooOoo--

137. *kālavato* (BD. IV, 154-155):

Now at that time monks, not knowing, “To-day 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, ‘To-day is an Observance day’.” 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū ajānantā ajj’ uposathoti dūraṃ gāmaṃ piṇḍāya caranti. te uddissamāne pi pātimokkhe āgacchanti uddiṭṭhamatte pi āgacchanti. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave ārocetuṃ ‘ajjuposatho ’ti. atha kho bhikkhūnaṃ etad ahoṣi: kena nu kho ārocetabbo ’ti. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave therena bhikkhunā kālavato ārocetun ti. (Vin. I, 117)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time monks, not knowing, “To-day 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, ‘To-day is an Observance day’.” Then it occurred to monks: “Now by whom should it be announced?” They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, I allow a monk who is an elder to announce it in early morning.”

DISCUSSION:

kālavato: Ven. Thanissaro chooses the same interpretation as that of Horner, which is “in good time.”¹ Such meaning is very vague. Cone in her *Pāli* dictionary gives the meaning of *kālavato* as “at a right time; at a suitable time; in good time; in the morning.”² The Commentary explains: “*kālavato ti kālass’eva, pagevā ti attho*”³ that means “at very early time.” My thinking is that the announcement should be done before the monks go out for alms-food, so that I interpret *kālavato* as “in early morning.”

--ooOoo--

138. Instrumental of agent (BD. IV, 158):

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 declare entire purity on behalf of a monk who is ill.”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho bhagavā bhikkhū āmantesi: sannipatatha bhikkhave, saṅgho uposatham karissatīti. evaṃ vutte aññataro bhikkhu bhagavantam etad avoca: atthi bhante bhikkhu gilāno, so anāgato ’ti. anujānāmi bhikkhave gilānena bhikkhunā pārisuddhim dātuṃ. (Vin. I, 120)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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: “Monks, I allow the monk who is ill to give (his) purity.”

¹ Tha. II, 252.

² DOP, 676.

³ VA, V, 1060.

DISCUSSION:

Instrumental of agent: The concepts *pārisuddhiṃ deti* (to give the purity, to declare his purity) and *pārisuddhiṃ harati* (to convey the purity) is explained clearly in the *Pāli Canon*.¹ The former is applied to the monk who is sick that he should declare his purity to another monk and ask that one to convey the message to the Order. The latter is the task of the monk who agrees to convey the purity of the sick monk to the Order. The use of instrumental of agent explained in Wijesekera's grammar book² is applied here: “*anujānāmi bhikkhave gilānena bhikkhunā pārisuddhiṃ dātuṃ* = Monks, I allow the monk who is ill to give (his) purity.” See also § 139, 140, 149, 172a.

--ooOoo--

139. Instrumental of agent (BD. IV, 161):

He said: “I allow you, monks, to give the consent for a monk who is ill.”

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave gilānena bhikkhunā chandaṃ dātuṃ. (Vin. I, 121)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

He said: “Monks, I allow the monk who is ill to give the consent.”

DISCUSSION:

Instrumental of agent: This is the case of giving and conveying the consent (*chanda*) of a monk who is ill; it is similar to the one above, giving and conveying the purity (*pārisuddhi*) of a monk who is ill.

--ooOoo--

140. Instrumental of agent (BD. IV, 162):

I allow you, monks, on an Observance day, to give the consent also, by declaring the entire purity; they are the Order's business.”

¹ Vin. I, 120-121; BD. IV, 158-160.

² Wij. 113, §88 b.

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave tadah’ uposathe pārisuddhiṃ dentena chandam pi dātuṃ santi saṅghassa karaṇīyan ti. (Vin. I, 122)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Monks, on an Observance day I allow the one who is giving the purity to give the consent also in case that the Order has works to be done.

DISCUSSION:

Instrumental of agent: Here is another example of instrumental of agent. My interpretation has the approval from Ven. Thanissaro: “I allow on the uposatha day, when purity is given, that consent be given as well, when the Community has something to be done.”¹ Similar cases related to giving and conveying the purity and consent are found in the chapter IV, *Parivāṇākkhandhakaṃ* of *Cullavagga*.²

One should be noticed that the disagreement between the noun *karaṇīyaṃ* and its predicate *santi*. The Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* points out that the verbal noun *karaṇīyāni* should be in plural, “*santi saṅghassa karaṇīyānī’ ti vattabbe vacanavipallāsenā ‘karaṇīyan’ ti vuttaṃ.*”³

--ooOoo--

141. ekadā (BD. IV, 163):

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. (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.

¹ Tha. II, 253.

² Vin. I, 161; BD. IV, 214.

³ VṬ. III, 252.

PĀLI TEXT:

dve 'me bhikkhave ummattakā; atthi bhikkhu ummattako sarati pi uposathaṃ na pi sarati, sarati pi saṅghakammaṃ na pi sarati, atthi n' eva sarati, āgacchati pi uposathaṃ na pi āgacchati, āgacchati pi saṅghakammaṃ na pi āgacchati, atthi n' eva āgacchati.
(Vin. I, 123)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

There are, monks, these two (kinds of) mad persons: the monk who is a mad person sometimes remembers the Observance and sometimes does not remember, sometimes remembers a (formal) act of the Order and sometimes does not remember; there is (another) one who even does not remember at all. He sometimes comes to the Observance and sometimes does not come, sometimes comes to a (formal) act of the Order and sometimes does not; there is (another) one who even does not come at all.

DISCUSSION:

ekadā: For this passage, Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains:

sarati pi uposathaṃ na pi saratī 'ti ekadā sarati, ekadā na sarati. *atthi n' eva saratī* 'ti yo ekantaṃ n'eva sarati, tassa sammutidānakiccaṃ n' atthi.¹ = *sarati pi uposathaṃ na pi saratī ti* means sometimes he remembers, sometimes he does not remember. *atthi n' eva saratī 'ti* means (to) the one who even does not remember at all, there is no duty of giving an agreement upon him.”

I think that I. B. Horner inserts the adverb “now” in her translation for *ekadā* taken from the Commentary. In the same way, Ven. Thanissaro also adds the adverb “sometimes” in his translation. To me, the adverb “now” in this context seems vague, adding the adverb “sometimes” could be better. In fact, my proposed translation is just a revised version from the work of Ven. Thanissaro.²

--ooOoo--

¹ VA. V. 1062.

² Tha. II. 188-189.

142. *akāmā* (BD. IV, 171):

[A]nd 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 willing.

PĀLI TEXT:

te ce bhikkhave bhikkhū tassa bhikkhuno vacanena taṃ āpattiṃ paṭikareyyuṃ, icc etaṃ kusalaṃ, no ce paṭikareyyuṃ, na te bhikkhave bhikkhū tena bhikkhunā akāmā vacanīyā 'ti. (Vin. I, 128)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

[A]nd if, monks, those monks should make amends for that offence at that monk's advice, that is good. But if they should not make amends for it, then, monks, those monks should not be advised by that monk unwillingly.

DISCUSSION:

akāmā (*a+kāmā*): At first glance, *akāmā* looks like an adjectival modifying *bhikkhū*, masculine plural nominative. If this were the case, *akāmā* should have been placed close to the noun it modifies *bhikkhū*, either before or after. I. B. Horner's translation as "if he is not willing" seems to be diverted away from her literal translating style, and the footnote also reveals her uncertainty about the meaning of *akāmā*. On the other hand, taking a hint from the Commentary for a similar expression, *nākāmā dātabbā'ti na anicchāya dātabbā*,¹ I takes *akāmā* as an adverbial in ablative case and translate it as "unwillingly." See also *nākāmā* § 145a.

--ooOoo--

143. Future passive participle (BD. IV, 172):

This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence several resident monks, four or more, collected together on an Observance day. They did not know that there were other resident

¹ VA. V, 1065.

monks who had not arrived. Thinking of the rule, thinking of discipline, thinking that they were complete, they carried out the Observance, they recited the Pātimokkha while they were incomplete. When the Pātimokkha has just been recited 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

idha pana bhikkhave aññatarasmiṃ āvāse tadah' uposathe sambahulā āvāsikā bhikkhū sannipatanti cattāro vā atirekā vā, te na jānanti ath' aññe āvāsikā bhikkhū anāgatā 'ti. te dhammasaññino vinayasaññino vaggā samaggasaññino uposathaṃ karonti pātimokkhaṃ uddisanti. tehi uddissamāne pātimokkhe ath' aññe āvāsikā bhikkhū āgacchanti bahutarā. tehi bhikkhave bhikkhūhi puna pātimokkhaṃ uddisitabbaṃ, uddesakānaṃ anāpatti. (Vin. I, 129)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence several resident monks, four or more, collected together on an Observance day. They did not know that there were other resident monks who had not arrived. Thinking of the rule, thinking of discipline, thinking that they were complete while they were incomplete, then they carried out the Observance, they recited the *Pātimokkha*. When the *Pātimokkha* has just been recited by them, other resident monks, a larger number, arrive. Monks, the *Pātimokkha* should be recited again by these monks, and there is no offence for the reciters.

DISCUSSION:

Future passive participle: This is just a matter of the English usage. For the future passive participle *uddisitabbaṃ*, I prefer to interpret it in a stronger sense “should be recited again,” in stead of “may be recited again” translated by I. B Horner.

The change should be also applied to the next three similar cases: the assembly has not arisen (*avuṭṭhitāya parisāya*), part of the assembly has risen (*ekaccāya vuṭṭhitāya parisāya*),

the whole assembly has risen (*sabbāya vuṭṭhitāya parisāya*). And when the *Pātimokkha* is recited again, both the residents and the new arrivals should be present.

--ooOoo--

144. *iti/ti*, Interrogative (BD. IV, 174):

This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence several resident monks, four or more, collect together on an Observance day. They know that there are other resident monks who have not arrived. Saying, ‘These are perishing, those are being destroyed, what good are these to you?’ they carry out the Observance and recite the *Pātimokkha* aiming at a schism.

PĀLI TEXT:

idha pana bhikkhave aññatarasmim āvāse tadah’ uposathe sambahulā āvāsikā bhikkhū sannipatanti cattāro vā atirekā vā, te jānanti atth’ aññe āvāsikā bhikkhū anāgatā ’ti. te nassante te vinassante te ko tehi attho ’ti bhedapurekkhārā uposatham karonti pātimokkham uddisanti. (Vin. I, 131)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

This is a case, monks, where in a certain residence several resident monks, four or more, collect together on an Observance day. They know that there are other resident monks who have not arrived. Saying, ‘Are they perished? Are they destroyed? What is the need (to be) with them?’ they carry out the Observance and recite the *Pātimokkha* aiming at a schism.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *iti/ti*: The issue here is to decide where the spoken words signaled by the particle *iti/ti* begins. Taking a clue from the *Parivāra Aṭṭhakathā*: “*tisso ti nassante te vinassante te ko tehi attho ti bhedapurekkhārānam uposathakarane thullaccayam, ...*”¹ I analyze the sentence like this “Te, ‘*nassante te vinassante te ko tehi attho* ’ti, bhedapurekkhārā uposatham karonti pātimokkham uddisanti,” leaving the first *te* out of the quote. So that the first *te*, with its

¹ VA. VII, 1318.

apposition *bhedapurekkhārā*, is the agent of the two finite verbs *karonti* and *uddisanti*, and the rest is their saying: “*nassante te, vinassante te, ko tehi attho ’ti.*” See also § 18a, 48b, 70a, 72a, 146b, 185c.

b/ **Interrogative:** One observation should be made here is that the reverse order between verb and noun implies the form of a Yes/No question.¹ Here, the first two clauses “*nassante te vinassante te*” should be translated as questions, “Are they perished? Are they destroyed?” For the last clause “*ko tehi attho,*” the existence of the question word *ko* confirms an interrogative sense.

--ooOoo--

145. *nākāmā, sāmaggī, Gerund (BD. IV, 175):*

This is a case, monks, where the first day of a lunar fortnight 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 meeting with the incoming 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

idha pana bhikkhave āvāsikānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ pāṭipado hoti, āgantukānaṃ pannaraso. sace āvāsikā bahutarā honti, āvāsikehi āgantukānaṃ nākāmā dātabbā sāmaggī. āgantukehi nissīmaṃ gantvā uposatho kātabbo. sace samasamā honti, āvāsikehi āgantukānaṃ nākāmā dātabbā sāmaggī. āgantukehi nissīmaṃ gantvā uposatho kātabbo. sace āgantukā bahutarā honti, āvāsikehi āgantukānaṃ sāmaggī vā dātabbā nissīmaṃ vā gantabbaṃ. (Vin. I, 132)

¹ Parniola 389, § 302d.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

This is a case, monks, where the first day of a lunar fortnight is (the Observance day) for resident monks, the fifteenth for incoming ones. If the resident ones are larger in number, the resident ones should not give the unity to the incoming ones unwillingly, the incoming ones should go outside the territory and carry out the Observance. If they are equal in number, the resident ones should not give the unity to the incoming ones unwillingly, the incoming ones should go outside the territory and carry out the Observance. If the incoming ones are larger in number, the resident ones should give the unity to the incoming ones or they should go outside the territory.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *nākāmā*: Taking a hint from the Commentary “*nākāmā dātabbā ’ti na anicchāya dātabbā*,”¹ I analyze *nākāmā* = *na+akāmā* in its ablative case (similar to *anicchāya* either in instrumental or ablative case); it is used as an adverbial modifying the future passive participle *dātabbā*.

b/ *sāmaggī*: is a feminine noun (from *samagga* = *sam+agga*). I. B. Horner does not give its literal meaning but interprets it as “holding a meeting with.” In fact, *sāmaggī* can be interpreted as “unity, harmony, concord, etc;”² so I translate it accordingly.

c/ **Gerund**: The issue here is the use of gerunds in a sequence of actions³ and of the instrumental agent with the future passive participle. In this case, the clause “*āgantukehi nissīmaṃ gantvā uposatho kātabbo*,” when being translated into English in active voice, the instrumental case *āgantukehi* will become the subject of the sentence, and the gerund *gantvā* will be treated the same way as that of *kātabbo*; so its English counterpart for such clause

¹ VA. V, 1065.

² CPED. 279; DOPL. 425; PED. 704.

³ Warder 48.

should be: “The incoming ones should go outside the territory and perform the Observance.”

See also § 56b, 73, 115b, 158, 160, 177a, 206b, 225.

Such explanation should be applied to other similar cases below.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER III (VASSŪPANĀYIKAKHANDHAKAṀ)

146. *amukasmim, iti/ti* (BD. IV, 199):

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, you reverences, a schism in the Order is called serious by the Lord, 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

idha pana bhikkhave vassupagato bhikkhu suṇāti: amukasmim kira āvāse sambahulā bhikkhū saṅghabhedāya parakkamantīti. tatra ce bhikkhuno evaṃ hoti: te kho me bhikkhū mittā, ty āhaṃ vakkhāmi: garuko kho āvuso saṅghabhedo vutto bhagavatā, māyasmantānaṃ saṅghabhedo ruccitthā ’ti, karissanti me vacanaṃ sussūsissanti sotaṃ odahissantīti, pakkamitabbaṃ. anāpatti vassacchedassa. (Vin. I, 150)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

This is a case, monks, where a monk who has entered upon the rains hears: “It is said that several monks in such 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, you reverences, a schism in the Order is called serious by the Lord, please do not let a schism in

the Order be promoted by the venerable ones.’ They will do my bidding, they will attend, they will give ear,” he should depart. There is no offence in cutting short the rains.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *amukasmim*: I. B. Horner gives a vague meaning while translating “*amukasmim āvāse*” as “in a certain residence.” Cone in her dictionary gives information about this case under the entries of *amu*, *amuka*, *asu*, *asuka*, having the meaning as “such and such a person or a thing,” “so and so,” and “a certain” in some cases.¹ I take its definite sense because here in this passage the context reveals clearly that the speaker and listener must have known exactly where the place that they were talking about situated. So the translation as “in such residence” would work. See also § 50d, 211.

b/ *iti/ti*: There are two words “*iti*” found in the long underlined *Pāli* passage above signaling two quotes should be detected. I. B. Horner takes them as two separate thoughts, but in my opinion, there is indeed a saying inside the thought of that monk. See also § 18a, 48b, 70a, 72a, 144a, 186c.

--ooOoo--

147. Syntactic - sentence structure, Optative (BD. IV, 205):

This is a case, monks, . . . and having something to do before the Invitation, 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

idha pana . . . so sattāhaṃ anāgatāya pavāraṇāya sakaraṇīyo pakkamati. āgaccheyya vā so bhikkhave bhikkhu taṃ āvāsaṃ na vā āgaccheyya, tassa bhikkhave bhikkhuno purimikā ca paññāyati paṭissave ca anāpatti. (Vin. I, 155)

¹ DOP. 228, 264.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

This is a case, monks, . . . seven days to the Invitation that has not come yet, he departs for something need to be done. Monks, whether that monk may return or may not return to that residence, the earlier period is valid for that monk, and also there is no offence in the assent.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Syntactic - sentence structure:** There is an interesting structure in the sentence “*so sattāhaṃ anāgatāya pavāraṇāya sakaraṇīyo pakkamati.*” The issue here is to decide whether the adverbial *sattāhaṃ* belongs to the clause “*anāgatāya pavāraṇāya*” or to the other “*so sakaraṇīyo pakkamati.*” I. B. Horner takes the latter “he departs for seven day,” whereas Ven. Thanissaro prefers the former “seven days before the Invitation he departs on some business.”¹ Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains:

sattāhaṃ anāgatāya pavāraṇāyā ’ti ettha navam ito paṭṭhāya gantum vaṭṭati, āgacchatu vā mā vā, anāpatti.² = “seven days to the future Invitation” means in this case it is alright to go from the ninth (of the month), whether let one return or not there is no offence.

So, it is clearly that I. B. Horner’s translation is not appropriate. I takes the phrase “*sattāhaṃ anāgatāya pavāraṇāya*” as a absolute clause denoting time and translate it accordingly.

b/ **Optative:** Another observation should be made that the verb form *āgaccheyya* is in optative form; but I. B. Horner translates it in indicative mode, so does Ven. Thanissaro, “Whether or not he returns to that residence, his earlier period is valid, and there is no offense in the assent.”³ Their translations mean that when a monk goes for something need to be done during the last seven days of his rain retreat, whether or not he returns to his place, he does

¹ Tha. II, 151, 158.

² VA. V, 1073.

³ Tha. II, 158.

not break his rain retreat and commits no offence. On the other hand, Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa although does not reject that point but he is reluctant to accept it by saying: “In other places it is mentioned that one should return within seven days because it is not yet the end limit of the Rains-residence.”¹ Once in doubt carefulness is always better, I agree with Ven. Vajirañāṇavarorasa’s opinion and keep the optative sign “may” and “may not” in my translation.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER IV (PAVĀRAṆĀKKHANDHAKAṀ)

148. Syntactic - sentence structure, *anulomatā, vuṭṭhānatā, purekkhāratā* (BD. IV, 211):

I allow, monks, monks who have kept the rains to ‘invite’ in regard to three matters: what has been seen or heard or suspected. That will be what is suitable for you in regard to one another, a removal of offences, an aiming at (grasping) the discipline.

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave vassaṃ vuṭṭhānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ tīhi ṭhānehi pavāretuṃ diṭṭhena vā sutena vā parisaṅkāya vā. sā vo bhavissati aññamaññānulomatā āpattivuṭṭhānatā vinayapurekkhāratā. (Vin. I, 159)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

I allow, monks, monks who have kept the rains to ‘invite’ in regard to three matters: what has been seen or heard or suspected. That will be for your conformity in regard to one another, for your getting out of offences, for your respect for the discipline.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Syntactic - sentence structure:** In this sentence, “*sā vo bhavissati aññamaññānulomatā āpattivuṭṭhānatā vinayapurekkhāratā,*” the demonstrative pronoun *sā*

¹ Vaj. II, 90.

has three appositional compounds and all three of them should be attributive to the personal pronoun *vo* in dative/genitive case. Ven. Thanissaro translates it as: “That will be for your mutual concord, for your arising out of offenses, for your respect for the Vinaya.”¹ And I translate the sentence following the structure given by him: “That will be for your ..., for your ..., for your ...”

b/ *anulomatā, vuṭṭhānatā, purekkhāratā*: For these three abstract nouns, Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains:

aññamaññānulatā ’ti aññamaññaṃ vattum anulomabhāvo. vadantu maṃ āyasmanto ti hi vadantaṃ sakkā hoti kiñci vattum, na itaraṃ. *āpattivuṭṭhānatā vinayapurekkhāratā* ’ti āpattīhi vuṭṭhānabhāvo, vinayaṃ purato katvā caraṇabhāvo. vadantu maṃ āyasmanto ti hi vadanto āpattīhi vuṭṭhahissati vinayañ ca purakkhitvā viharissatī ’ti vuccati.² = *aññamaññānulatā* means the suitable condition to talk to one another. Since it is possible to say something to the one who is saying: “Venerable sirs, please tell me,” not to anyone else. *āpattivuṭṭhānatā vinayapurekkhāratā* means the condition to getting out of offences, the condition of practicing the discipline after put it in front (honoring it). Since it is said that the one who is saying: “Venerable sirs, please tell me,” will get out of offences, and after honoring the discipline, he will abide.

My translation for the first two nouns are not much different from those of I. B. Horner, except for the third one, i.e. “respect for the discipline” instead of “an aiming at (grasping) the discipline.” This is just a matter of word choice.

--ooOoo--

149. Instrumental of agent (BD. IV, 214):

I allow you, monks, on an Invitation day to give the consent also by giving the Invitation; they are the Order’s business.”

¹ Tha. II, 273.

² VA. V, 1073-1074.

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave tadahu pavāraṇāya pavāraṇaṃ dentena chandam pi dātuṃ santi saṅghassa karaṇīyan ti. (Vin. I, 161)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

On an Invitation day, monks, I allow the one who is giving the invitation to give the consent also in case that the Order has works to be done.

DISCUSSION:

Instrumental of agent: This item is already discussed above, see also § 138, 139, 140, 172a. Here is the translation of Ven. Thanissaro for your consultation: “I allow that, on the Invitation day, when an invitation is given, that consent be given as well, when the Community has something to be done.”¹

--ooOoo--

150. *samānavassikaṃ* (BD. IV, 221):

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

bāḷhataraṃ savarabhayakaṃ ahoṣi. bhikkhū nāsakkhiṃsu ekavācikaṃ pavāretuṃ. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave samānavassikaṃ pavāretuṃ ti. (Vin. I, 168)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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, monks, to invite (in unison) for those who have equal years (of seniority).”

¹ Tha. II, 274.

DISCUSSION:

samānavassikaṃ: Literally, the compound *samānavassikaṃ* can be interpreted depending on how we understand the meaning of the term *vassa*; it can be “a rain, rain retreat season, year, year of seniority, etc.” So, it seems to be possible to translate the term in either way: “keeping the rain together” as that of I. B. Horner, or “having equal years of seniority” as it should be in this context. It is understandable that I. B. Horner made such choice due to her lack of knowledge about the monastic activities.

--ooOoo--

151. *samānavassikaṃ* (BD. IV, 221):

Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. 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. 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.'

PĀLI TEXT:

suṇātu me bhante saṅgho. manussehi dānaṃ dentehi yebhuyyena ratti khepitā. sace saṅgho tevācikaṃ pavāressati, apavārito 'va saṅgho bhavissati, athāyaṃ ratti vibhāyissati. yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṃ, saṅgho dtevācikaṃ ekavācikaṃ samānavassikaṃ pavāreyyā 'ti. (Vin. I, 168-169)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. 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. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may invite by a twofold formula, by a onefold formula, (in unison) for those who have equal years (of seniority).'

DISCUSSION:

samānavassikaṃ: The discussion about the term *samānavassikaṃ* continues to here: As discussed above, I. B. Horner chose the meaning of *samānavassikaṃ* as “those who keep the

rains together,” consequently she has problem in converting the word-order while translating the clause “*saṅgho dhevācikaṃ ekavācikaṃ samānavassikaṃ pavāreyya.*” The context here is that the monks at that residence, if saying the invitation formula three times, were not able to complete their *Pavāraṇā* ceremony by the end of the night. So the Buddha gave ways for abridgement the ceremony in their effective orders depending on how much time they have left before the dawn of the next day: each monk says the formula twice, says the formula only once, and many of equal years in seniority say in unison.

--ooOoo--

152. Contextual (BD. IV, 230):

I allow you, monks, to carry out two or three Observances with these monks on the fourteenth (day), thinking: ‘How can we invite before those monks (invite)?’

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave tehi bhikkhūhi dve tayo uposathe cātuddasike kātuṃ kathaṃ mayam tehi bhikkhūhi paṭhamataram pavāreyyāmā ’ti. (Vin. I, 175)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Monks, I allow these monks to carry out two or three Observances on the fourteenth (day), thinking: ‘How can we invite before those monks (invite)?’

DISCUSSION:

Contextual: The background for this regulation should be known before discussing further: At that time, a group of monks entered the rain retreat season in Kosala country. Some other monks who were trouble makers having entered the rain retreat season in a place nearby and had the intention to come to the invitation day of the first group and suspend the invitation of these monks. The first group knew that and try to avoid such situation would happen. They told the Buddha and be advised by Him as above. One thing should be noticed here is that the first phrase *tehi bhikkhūhi* mentions the monks of the first group and the latter

relates to the ones of the second group. The first phrase *tehi bhikkhūhi* is the agent of the infinitive *kātuṃ* and the other is the ablative case governed by the comparative adverbial *paṭhamataram*. The Commentary also has explanation about the application of this teaching:

dve tayo uposathe cātuddasike kātuṃ ti ettha catutthapañcamā dve cātuddasikā tatiyo pana pakatiyāpi cātuddasiko yevā 'ti tasmā tatiyacatutthā vā tatiyacatutthapañcamā vā dve tayo cātuddasikā kātabbā. atha catutthe kate te suṇanti, pañcamo cātuddasiko kātabbo, evam pi dve cātuddasikā honti. evaṃ karontā bhaṇḍanakāraṇaṃ terase vā cātuddase vā ime paṇṇarasīpavāraṇaṃ pavāressanti.¹ = “Carry out two or three Observances on the fourteenth (day) means in this case the fourth and the fifth are two uposathas (should be carried out) on the fourteenth, and another one, which is the third, normally is an uposatha on the fourteenth day; therefore, two or three uposathas--the third and the fourth, or the third the fourth and the fifth (of the rain retreat season)--should be carried out on the fourteenth (day). Then, when the fourth uposatha was done, they hear that the fifth uposatha will be carried out on the fourteenth (day) so that there are just two uposathas on the fourteenth (day). Doing like that, the monks that are troublemakers, on the thirteenth or fourteenth (day), will think: “They will invite the invitation on the fifteenth.”

Following such teaching of the Buddha, the first group is able to avoid the nuisance that the second group might cause to them because the invitation of the first group would have been already performed one or two days earlier when the second group arrived on the fifteenth.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER V (CAMMAKKHANDHAKAṂ):

153. *diṭṭhadhammike & samparāyike* (BD. IV, 236):

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

¹ VA. V, 1079.

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho rājā Māgadho Seniyo Bimbisāro tāni asītiṃ gāmikahassāni diṭṭhadhammike atthe anusāsivā uyyojesi: tumhe khv attha bhaṇe mayā diṭṭhadhammike atthe anusāsītā, gacchatha taṃ bhagavantam payirupāsatha, so no bhagavā samparāyike atthe anusāsissatīti. atha kho tāni asīti gāmikahassāni yena Gijjhakūṭo pabbato ten’ upasaṅkamimsu. (Vin. I, 179)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having instructed those eighty thousand village chiefs in matters pertaining to the present life, dismissed them (saying): “You, good sirs, are now instructed by me in matters pertaining to the present life; go along, pay homage to that Lord, and that Lord of us will instruct (us) in matters pertaining to the future life.” Then those eighty thousand village chiefs approached Mount Vulture Peak.

DISCUSSION:

diṭṭhadhammike & samparāyike: The two phrases *diṭṭhadhamme atthe* and *samparāyike atthe* have some kind of opposite meanings. Here is an example taken from the *Pāli* Canon:

“Dve ’māni bhikkhave vajjāni. Katamāni dve? Diṭṭhadhammikaṅ ca vajjam samparāyikaṅ ca vajjam,”¹

And also explanation from the Commentary:

“*Diṭṭhadhammikan* ti diṭṭhe va dhamme imasmiṃ yeva attabhāve uppannaphalam. *Samparāyikan* ti samparāye anāgate attabhāve uppannaphalam.”²

¹ A. I, 47.

² AA. II, 88.

Their meanings can also be found in dictionaries, e.g. “**Diṭṭhadhammika**, a. belonging to this world,” and “**Samparāyika**, a. belonging to the next world;”¹ or more comprehensive ones from the dictionary of the PTS.²

I. B. Horner chooses the meaning of *diṭṭhadhammike atthe* as “matters concerning this world;” such choice is fine. But for the second, *samparāyike dhamme*, instead of taking the interpretation as “matters belonging to the next world” of the PED., she gives the meaning as “transcendental matters;” such meaning seems to be inappropriate. I prefer the interpretation of *diṭṭhadhammike* as “pertaining to the present life” and *samparāyike* as “pertaining to the future life” given by Ven. Bodhi in his translation for the *Samyuttanikāya*.³

--ooOoo--

154. *adhimutto* (BD. IV, 242):

... 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 upon 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

āyasmā Soṇo bhagavantam etad avoca: yo so bhante bhikkhu arahaṃ khīṇāsavo
vusitavā katakaraṇīyo ohitabhāro anuppattasadattho parikkhīṇabhavasamaṃyojano
sammadaññāvimutto, so cha tṭhānāni adhimutto hoti: nekkhammādhimutto hoti,

¹ CPED. 125, 270.

² PED. 320, 691.

³ Bodhi 2000, 578.

pavivekādhimutto hoti, avyāpajjādhimutto hoti, upādānakkhayādhimutto hoti, taṇhakkhayādhimutto hoti, asammoḥādhimutto hoti. (Vin. I, 183)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

... 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 inclined to six matters: he comes to be inclined to renunciation, he comes to be inclined to aloofness, he comes to be inclined to non-harming, he comes to be inclined to the destruction of grasping, he comes to be inclined to the destruction of craving, he comes to be inclined to non-confusion.

DISCUSSION:

adhimutto: Taking the first definition of this term from the PED., I. B. Horner translates the phrase “*adhimutto hoti*” as “come to be intent upon;” such translation seems inappropriate in this case due to the reason that the six matters/things mentioned are already acquired by an Arahāt and become his nature, not being his goals to attain any more (I arrive to such conclusion taking the explanation of the verb intend from the Webster English Dictionary: “To fix the mind upon (something to be accomplished); to be intent upon; to mean; to design; to plan; to purpose”). Whereas the DOP. by Cone cites and gives meaning for this excerpt as “*who is inclined to; applying oneself (to, acc. or loc.); believing in; set on; Vin I 183, 26 (so cha tṭhānāni ~o hoti)*” (93).

And explanations from the Commentary might be more convincing:

cha tṭhānāni ’ti cha kāraṇāni. *adhimutto hoti* ’ti paṭivijjhitaṃ paccakkhaṃ katvā tṭhito hoti *nekkhammādhimutto* ti sabbaṃ arahattavasena vuttaṃ.¹ = *cha tṭhānāni* means six

¹ VA. V. 1082.

things/matters. *adhimutto hoti* means having penetrated, having made (them) present, he remains. *nekkhammādhimutto ...* all is said in respect of the state of an Arahat.

So that I replace “to be intent upon” in I. B. Horner’s translation by “to be inclined to” and come up with the proposed translation above. Such correction should be applied to the next item also.

--ooOoo--

155. *āyasmato* (BD. IV, 242):

“Perhaps, Lord, one of the venerable ones here might think: ‘Could it be that this venerable one is intent upon renunciation depending 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

siyā kho pana bhante idh’ ekaccassa āyasmato evam assa: kevalaṃ saddhāmatṭakam nūna ayam āyasmā nissāya nekkhammādhimutto ’ti. na kho pan’ etaṃ bhante evaṃ daṭṭhabbaṃ. khīṇāsavo bhante bhikkhu vusitavā katakaraṇīyo karaṇīyam attānaṃ asamanupassanto katassa vā paṭicayaṃ khayā rāgassa vītarāgattā nekkhammādhimutto hoti, khayā dosassa vītadosattā nekkhammādhimutto hoti, khayā mohassa vītamohattā nekkhammādhimutto hoti. (Vin. I, 183)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Perhaps, Lord, a certain venerable one here might think: ‘Could it be that this venerable one is inclined upon renunciation depending 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 in himself what to be done or to be added to what has been done, being passionless comes to be inclined to renunciation because of the destruction of passion, being without hatred comes to be inclined to renunciation because of the destruction of hatred, being without confusion comes to be inclined to renunciation because of the destruction of confusion.

DISCUSSION:

āyasmato: It seems to me that I. B. Horner takes *āyasmato* in genitive case plural (one of the venerable ones), but the form of *āyasmato* is either dative or genitive case singular. And in this context, it should be dative. The English translation is not a literal one due to its conventional usage.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER VI (BHESAJJAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

156. *aṃsabandhakam, bandhanasuttakam* (BD. IV, 276-277):

Now at that time monks carried about ointment-boxes and ointment-sticks in their hands. They told this matter to the Lord. “I allow, monks, a bag for the ointment-box.” There was no strap at the edge. They told this matter to the Lord. “I allow, monks, a strap at the edge, a thread for tying.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū añjanim pi añjanisalākam pi hatthena pariharanti. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave añjanitthavikan ti. aṃsabandhako na hoti. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave aṃsabandhakam bandhanasuttakan ti. (Vin. I, 204)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time monks carried about ointment-boxes and ointment-sticks in their hands. They told this matter to the Lord. “I allow, monks, a bag for the ointment-box.” There was no

shoulder-trap. They told this matter to the Lord. “I allow, monks, a shoulder-trap (and) a thread for tying.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ ***aṃsabandhakaṃ***: We are going to discuss the meanings of *aṃsabandhakaṃ* and *bandhanasuttakaṃ* in the context of a *thāvikā*, which is a bag that the monks used to carry things such as a bowl, tubes for steam, water-strainer, ointment-boxes and ointment-sticks; or lay people also used it to carry money such as the Brahmin in the opening story of the *pācittiya* 84.¹ The compound *aṃsabandhakaṃ* has two elements, *aṃsa* and *bandhaka*. According to dictionaries, we can grasp the meaning of *aṃsa* as (1) edge, corner; or (2) shoulder. I. B. Horner mentions both in footnote and prefers the former meaning of *aṃsa* and translates *aṃsabandhakaṃ* as “a strap at the edge.” Then she takes *bandhanasuttakaṃ* as an apposition of *aṃsabandhakaṃ* and gives it the meaning as a thread for tying. Such choice makes sense, but inapplicable in this context.

On the other hand, Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta and Cone takes the latter meaning of *aṃsa*, which is shoulder, and translates *aṃsabandhakaṃ* as “a shoulder-trap.”² I prefer the latter’s choice due to its practical application for the monks carrying his belongings when moving from place to place by walking on foot. I have found a piece of evidence from the *Pāli* Canon to support:

āraññikaṃ bhikkhave bhikkhunā kālasseva utthāya pattamaṃ thavikāya pakkhipitvā
aṃse ālaggetvā. = Monks, a monk who is a forest-dweller, getting up early, having
placed his bowl in a bag, having hung it on his shoulder.³

So *aṃsabandhakaṃ* should better be “a shoulder-trap.”

b/ ***bandhanasuttakaṃ***: There is no argument about the meaning of the latter word *bandhanasuttakaṃ*, which is some kind of thread for tying, but another grammatical matter

¹ Vin IV, 161.

² DOP. 1; CPED. 39.

³ Vin II, 217; BD. V, 304.

related to the two compounds in accusative case “*aṃsabandhakaṃ bandhanasuttakaṃ*”: Is the second compound an apposition of the first (as shown by I. B. Horner), or are they separate items? Grammatically we should take the former choice. However, in this case, ancient texts suggest we should follow the latter:

- thavikā aṃsabaddhañca tathā bandhanasuttakā¹ = a bag and a shoulder-strap, so as the thread for tying.
- “anujānāmi, bhikkhave, aṃsabaddhakaṃ bandhanasuttakan”ti (mahāva. 265) vacanato añjanitthavikāya aṃse lagganathāya aṃsabaddhakampi bandhanasuttakampi vaṭṭati.² = From the saying “*anujānāmi, bhikkhave, aṃsabaddhakaṃ bandhanasuttakan”ti*,” it comes to allow that “a shoulder-trap also a thread for tying” for the purpose of hanging the bag for ointment-boxes and ointment-sticks on the shoulder.

So, *aṃsabandhakaṃ bandhanasuttakaṃ* should be two separate items, then I add an “(and)” in parentheses in my translation, “I allow, monks, a shoulder-trap (and) a thread for tying.”

--ooOoo--

157. *chārikaṃ* (BD. IV, 286):

“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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

sace bhikkhave thaddhatthāya guḷe piṭṭham pi chārikam pi pakkhipanti so ca guḷo tv eva saṅkhaṃ gacchati, anujānāmi bhikkhave yathāsukhaṃ guḷaṃ paribhuñjitun ti. (Vin. I, 210)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“If, monks, they put flour also ashes 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.”

¹ Vin II, 143.

² *Vinayaṅkāra Tīkā*, VRI. 2. 304.

DISCUSSION:

chārikam: This is a matter of word choice. In the PED. and others *Pāli* dictionaries, I did not see the meaning “syrup” under the entry of *chārikā*, but “ashes” instead. In fact, the use of flour and ashes in the processing molasses from sugarcane is obvious. I owe the discovering of this to the Ven. Thanissaro.¹

--ooOoo--

158. Gerund (BD. IV, 289):

“I allow you, monks, if one anywhere sees solid food that is fruit, but if there is no one to make it allowable, having taken 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) offered it to you. I allow you, monks, to receive (formally) what you have picked up.”

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave yattha phalakhādaniyaṃ passati kappiyakārako ca na hoti sāmāṃ gahetvā haritvā kappiyakāraṃ passitvā bhūmiyaṃ nikkhipitvā paṭiggahāpetvā paribhuñjitum. anujānāmi bhikkhave uggahitaṃ paṭiggahitum ti. (Vin. I, 212)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Monks, if a monk anywhere sees solid food that is fruit and if there is no one to make it allowable, I allow to take it himself, and to carry it away until seeing someone to make it allowable, then to lay it down on the ground, to tell the other (to prepare the fruit then) to offer (to him), and to partake the fruit. I allow you, monks, to receive (formally) what you have picked up.”

DISCUSSION:

Gerund: The interpretation of a series of gerunds as many “having + past participle” given by I. B. Horner seems to be clumsy and obscure. I interpret this rule like this: When a

¹ Tha. II, 61.

monk sees solid food that is fruit somewhere and he has no one to make the fruit become allowable, e.g. splitting it open, taking out the seeds, etc., the Buddha allows the monk to pick it up himself (*sāmaṃ gahetvā*), to carry it along (*haritvā*) until he meets someone that can help him to make it allowable (*kappiyakāraṃ passitvā*). Then he should lay the fruit down on the ground (*bhūmiyaṃ nikkhipitvā*) then tells the other to make the fruit allowable and offers it to him (*paṭiggahāpetvā*). After formally receiving the fruit, now the monk can enjoy it (*paribhuñjitum*). I treat all gerunds in this excerpt complying with the last verbal in infinitive form, *paribhuñjitum*, and come up with the translation above. See also § 56b, 73, 115b, 145c, 160, 177a, 206b, 225.

One thing should be noticed is that “this is an “allowance” only for a time of scarcity,” as pointed out by I. B. Horner in footnote.¹

--ooOoo--

159. *pavāreti, pavārito, pavāritena* (BD. IV, 291):

Now at that time because food was scarce 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. (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 taken back from there.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū dubbhikkhe appamattake pi pavārenti paṭisaṃkhāpi paṭikkhipanti, sabbo ca saṃgho pavārito hoti, bhikkhū kukkuccāyantā na paṭiggaṇhanti. paṭiggaṇhatha bhikkhave paribhuñjatha. anujānāmi bhikkhave tato nīhaṭaṃ bhuttāvinā pavāritena anatirittaṃ paribhuñjitun ti. (Vin. I, 213)

¹ BD. IV, 289.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time, when food was scarce the monks (took) only a little then refused, even after considering they also rejected (the food). And the whole Order was offered (food), but the monks, being scrupulous, did not accept it. (The Lord said):

“Monks, accept (the food), make use of it. Monks, I allow the one who having eaten and being satisfied, to make use of food that is not left over and if it was brought back from there.”

DISCUSSION:

pavāreti, *pavārito*, *pavāritena*: There is the need to say something about these three terms. They originate from the same root \sqrt{var} , but their meanings seem to be apart:

- Dictionaries only give the meaning of *pavāreti* as “to cause to choose, to invite, to perform the Invitation ceremony at the end of the rain retreat season, etc.”¹ This meaning could be applied for *pavārito* (to be offered, to be invited).

- But *pavāreti* also has another meaning taken from the entry *vāreti*, “to prevent, to obstruct, to hinder.”² The prefix *pa* just describes a going forward of the action and does not change the meaning much. In the context of food, especially applied to the monks, the meaning of *pavāreti* could be: to refuse, to reject, or to satisfy, to relinquish eating figuratively.

So that three different meanings are going to be given to the three verbals in order to make out the meaning of the passage above:

- *pavārenti* = (the monks) refuse (to take),
- *pavārito* = (the Order) is offered (invited),
- *pavāritena* = by the one who (having eaten) is satisfied.

See also discussion for *pavārito* at § 62, 212a.

¹ CPED. 178; PED. 443; DOPL. 374.

² CPED. 231.

In order to understand more about the rule, there is the need to make a further research in ancient texts. The Commentary *Samantapāsādikā* explains:

tato nīhaṭan ti yattha nimantitā bhuñjanti, tato nīhaṭaṃ.¹ = *tato nīhaṭaṃ* means (the food) is brought back from the place where they have been invited and eaten.

And the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* says:

Appamattakepi pavārentīti appamattakepi gahite pavārenti, “bahumhi gahite aññesaṃ nappahoṭī”ti maññamānā appamattakaṃ gahetvā pavārentīti adhippāyo. *Paṭisaṅkhāpi paṭikkhipantīti* “divā bhojanatthāya bhavissatī”ti sallakkhetvāpi paṭikkhipanti.² = *Appamattakepi pavārenti* means when even though only a little is taken, they refuse. The meaning is that while thinking “(if) a lot is taken there is not enough to others, they took only a little and refuse (to take more).” *Paṭisaṅkhāpi paṭikkhipanti* means Having considered “At daylight there will be (time) for the need of a meal,” they reject (the food).

This regulation is to lessen the rigidity of the pācittiya 35, which states:

yo pana bhikkhu bhuttāvī pavārito anatirittaṃ khādaniyaṃ vā bhojaniyaṃ vā khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ”ti. = Whatever monk, having eaten, being satisfied, should eat or partake of solid food or soft food that is not left over, there is an offence of expiation.³

And one notice should be mentioned that the rule above is applied only during the time of scarcity of food.

--ooOoo--

160. Gerund (BD. IV. 291):

Now at that time the family who supported the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sent solid food for the Order, saying: “Having pointed it out as for master Upananda, it should be given to the Order.”

¹ VA. V, 1093.

² VT. III.278.

³ Vin. IV, 82; BD. II, 328.

...

“Honoured sirs, having pointed it out this solid food as for master Upananda, it should be given to the Order.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena āyasmato Upanandassa Sakyaputtassa upaṭṭhākakulam saṃghass’ atthāya khādaniyaṃ pāhesi: ayyassa Upanandassa dassetvā saṃghassa dātabban ti. (Vin. I, 213)

...

idaṃ bhante khādaniyaṃ ayyassa Upanandassa dassetvā saṃghassa dātabban ti. (Vin. I, 213-214)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the family who supported the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sent solid food for the Order, saying: “It should be shown to master Upananda (first) then it should be given to the Order.”

...

“Honoured sirs, it should be shown to master Upananda (first) then it should be given to the Order.”

DISCUSSION:

Gerund: As mentioned in many places previously, this is the case of a sequence of verbs, one happens after another. All the verbs in gerundive mode should take the form of the last one and should be translated accordingly. The example above can be interpreted this way: “It should be shown to master Upananda before giving (it) to the Order,” or “It should be giving to the Order after showing (it) to master Upananda.” See also § 56b, 73, 115b, 145c, 158, 177a, 206b, 225.

--ooOoo--

161. *sabbam, dhaññaphalarasam, dākarasam, madhukapuppharasam* (BD. IV, 339):

I allow you, monks, the juice of all fruits except the juice of the fruit of corn. I allow you, monks, the juice of all leaves except vegetable juice. I allow you, monks, the juice of all flowers except liquorice juice. I allow you, monks, sugar-cane juice.

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave sabbam phalarasam thapetvā dhaññaphalarasam. anujānāmi bhikkhave sabbam pattarasam thapetvā dākarasam. anujānāmi bhikkhave sabbam puppharasam thapetvā madhukapuppharasam. anujānāmi bhikkhave ucchurasan ti.
(Vin. I, 246)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Monks, I allow all fruit-juice except the juice of grains. Monks, I allow all the leaf-juice except the juice of (cooked) vegetable. Monks, I allow all flower-juice except the juice of liquorice-flower. Monks, I allow sugar-cane juice.

DISCUSSION:

a/ ***sabbam***: modifies *rasam*, translated as “the juice” in all three phrases. So a literal translation should be “all the juice of ...” not “the juice of all ...” as those of I. B. Horner. See also § 133a.

b/ ***dhaññaphalarasam***: The Commentary mentions seven kinds of grains but not their specific names (*dhaññaphalarasan ti sattannaṃ dhaññānaṃ phalarasam*).¹ The PED. give: “[t]hese seven are sālī & vīhi (rice-sorts), yāva (barley), godhuma (wheat), kangu (millet), varaka (beans) kudrūsaka (?) Vin IV, 264.”²

c/ ***dākarasam***: is vegetable juice. The Commentary explains “*dākarasan ti pakkadākarasam*”³ so that I add in parenthesis (cooked = *pakka*) in order to avoid confusion.

¹ VA. V, 1102.

² PED. 334.

³ VA. V, 1102.

d/ *madhukapuppahasam*: I just rephrase I. B. Horner's interpretation but keep the word *puppha* (flower) that was left out by the translator.

I owe Ven Thanissaro about this finding but not follow his interpretation all the way.¹

--ooOoo--

162. *yāvakālikam yāmakālikam sattāhakālikam yāvajīvikam* (BD. IV, 348):

There are four terms in this page that are already discussed previously (§ 79b) but their meanings should be reminded. Here are I. B. Horner's translation for the four terms:

- 1/ (food that may be eaten) during a watch of the night,
- 2/ (food that may be eaten) during a short period,
- 3/ (food that may be eaten) during seven days,
- 4/ (food that may be eaten) during life.

PĀLI TEXT:

1/ *yāvakālikam*, 2/ *yāmakālikam*, 3/ *sattāhakālikam*, 4/ *yāvajīvikam*. (Vin. I, 251)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

- 1/ *yāvakālikam* = (thing that may be consumed) from dawn until noon,
- 2/ *yāmakālikam* = (thing that may be consumed) for that very day and night,
- 3/ *sattāhakālikam* = (thing that may be consumed) during seven days,
- 4/ *yāvajīvikam* = (thing that may be consumed) during life.

DISCUSSION:

yāvakālikam yāmakālikam sattāhakālikam yāvajīvikam: Explanations can be found at § 79b discussing about the rule *pāṭidesanīya* 03.

--ooOoo--

¹ Tha. II, 47.

CHAPTER VII (KAṬHINAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

163. *attharati, kukkukatena, sannidhikatena, nissaggiyena, akappakatena* (BD. IV, 355-356):

kaṭhina-cloth does not become made by its being temporary; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made by postponement; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made if it has to be abandoned; *kaṭhina*-cloth does not become made if it is not made allowable; ...

PĀLI TEXT:

na kukkukatena atthataṃ hoti kathinaṃ, na sannidhikatena atthataṃ hoti kathinaṃ, na nissaggiyena atthataṃ hoti kathinaṃ, na akappakatena atthataṃ hoti kathinaṃ. (Vin. I, 254)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

kaṭhina (ceremony) is not spread with a cloth made temporarily, *kaṭhina* (ceremony) is not spread with a cloth that is stored up (overnight); *kaṭhina* (ceremony) is not spread with a cloth to be forfeited; *kaṭhina* (ceremony) is not spread with a cloth that is not made allowable; ...

DISCUSSION:

a/ *attharati*: I. B. Horner interprets it as “to become made;” Childers as “to spread, to lay out, to cover [ā + str];” A. P. Bud as “(ā + √thar + a), to spread; to lay out;” and the two dictionaries of PTS. also give similar meanings. We can assume that the literal meaning of *attharati* in the context of *Kathina* is to spread out the *kaṭhina* frame in order to make the robe for the sake of the *Kathina* ceremony, but its figurative sense is to accomplish all the procedures required for such ceremony beginning with the tasks of making the robe: washing, measuring the cloth, cutting, etc. Once the robe is done, the monk who is responsible for spreading the *Kathina* needs to mark a circle in the corner of the robe in order to make it allowable, then to determine it, to declare the spreading of the *Kathina*, and finally to ask the

approval from other monks who have spent the rain retreat season together with him.¹ So that the interpretation of “*kāṭhinaṃ attharati*” as “to spread the Kathina” given by the Ven. Thanissaro could be the most applicable one in this context.²

For the four terms in instrumental case, *kukkukatena*, *sannidhikatena*, *nissaggiyena*, *akappakatena*, mentioning about the four characteristics (among twenty-four) of the *Kāṭhina* ceremony, evidences from the *Pāli* literature are enough for us to grasp their meanings.

b/ ***kukkukatena***: The fifth book *Parivārapāli* of the *Vinayapiṭaka* explains:

“*kukkukataṃ nāma anādiyadānaṃ vuccati*³ = *kukkukataṃ* is called the gift is not to be taken.”

And the Commentary *Samantapāsādikā* explains:

“*kukkukatenā* ’ti tāvakālikena.⁴ = *kukkukatenā* means “for the time being, temporary.”

Ven. Thanissaro interprets *kukkukatena* as “borrowed.” Whereas I take the meaning given by the Commentary and interpret the clause “*na kukkukatena atthataṃ hoti kāṭhinaṃ*” as “*kāṭhina* (ceremony) is not spread with a cloth made temporarily.”

c/ ***sannidhikatena***: I. B. Horner interprets as “by postponement” and Ven. Thanissaro as “kept overnight.” The *Parivārapāli* says:

*sannidhi nāma: dve sannidhiyo karaṇasannidhi ca nicayasannidhi ca.*⁵ = by name *sannidhi* (storing up, hoarding), there are two kinds of storing up, storing up by doing and storing up by accumulation.

The Commentary *Samantapāsādikā* explains further:

sannidhikatenā ’ti ettha duvidho sannidhi karaṇasannidhi ca nicayasannidhi ca. tattha tadah’ eva akatvā ṭhapetvā karaṇaṃ karaṇasannidhi nāma. saṅgho ajja kāṭhinadussam

¹ Vin. V. 174.

² Tha. II, 287.

³ Vin. V. 172.

⁴ VA. V. 1111.

⁵ Vin. V, 172.

labhitvā punadivase deti, ayaṃ nicayasannidhi nāma.¹ = *sannidhikatena* means here sannidhi (storing up, hoarding) has two ways: storing up by doing and storing up by accumulation. In this case, *karaṇasannidhi* means not having done at that very day and left the work aside. The Order receives the kaṭhina-cloth today but bestows it (to a specific monk who is responsible for spreading the kaṭhina) on another day; this is called nicayasannidhi (storing up by accumulation).

So, I keep its literal meaning for the clause “na sannidhikatena atthatam hoti kathinam” as “*kaṭhina* (ceremony) is not spread with a cloth that is stored up (overnight).”

d/ *nissaggiyena*: I. B. Horner interprets as “if it has to be abandoned” and Ven. Thanissaro as “to be forfeited.” The *Parivārapāli* says:

nissaggiyaṃ nāma: kayiramāne aruṇaṃ udriyati.² = nissaggiyaṃ means when it is being made, the dawn arises.”

The Commentary repeats the same explanation of the *Parivārapāli*.

nissaggiyena ’ti rattinissaggiyena. Parivāre ’pi vuttaṃ nissaggiyaṃ nāma kariyamāne aruṇaṃ udriyatī ’ti.³

The Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* explains “*rattinissaggiyena*” as “*ratti-atikkantena*,”⁴ which means due to going beyond the night. I. B. Horner gets the exact idea by saying in footnote that [a]ll the various processes in the making of the *kaṭhina* robes had to be carried out on one and the same day.⁵ I keep the translation of Ven. Thanissaro, “*kaṭhina* (ceremony) is not spread with a cloth to be forfeited.”

e/ *akappakatena*: (*a-kappa-katena*) means “ by not being made allowable.” The Commentary explains:

¹ Vin. V, 172.

² *Ibid.*

³ VA. V, 1111.

⁴ VT. III, 306.

⁵ BD. IV, 356.

“*akappakatenā*” ti anādinna-kappabindunā = a small circle to make the cloth allowable not being given.¹

I keep my interpretation similar to that of I. B. Horner. Ven. Thanissaro also has the same idea, “with a robe that is not made allowable.”² That means the monk who spreads the *kathina* did not small circles at the four corners of the robe as stated in the *pācittiya* rule 58,³ and did not say three times, “*Imaṃ bindukappaṃ karomi.*”

--ooOoo--

164. *kathinaṃ, anumodati* (BD. IV, 356):

And even if *kathina*-cloth comes to be quite properly made, but if no one gives thanks for it standing outside the boundary, thus also *kathina*-cloth come to be not made.

PĀLI TEXT:

sammā c’ eva atthataṃ hoti kathinaṃ tañ ce nissīmaṭṭho anumodati evaṃ pi anattathaṃ hoti kathinaṃ.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

And even if the *kathina*-ceremony is spread properly, but the one who expresses the approval about it standing outside the boundary, thus the *kathina*-ceremony is also not spread.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *kathinaṃ*: The thing to do is to comment about the translation of I. B. Horner that in this context the term *kathina* does not stand for only the making of the *kathina*-cloth but the whole procedure of the *kathina*-ceremony. And once the *kathina*-ceremony is properly spread, the monks who have completed the rain retreat season together at one place are eligible for the benefits of it. But only one among them will be their representative for the

¹ VA. V, 1111.

² Tha. II. 293.

³ Vin. IV, 120-121.

task of spreading the *kaṭhina*-ceremony; he is called *atthāraka*, any monk among the rest will be called *anumodaka(s)*; such conclusion is supported from the *Parivārapāli*.

kaṭhinatthāro jānitabbo 'ti: sace saṃghassa kaṭhinadussaṃ uppannaṃ hoti saṃghena kathaṃ paṭipajjitabbaṃ, atthārakena kathaṃ paṭipajjitabbaṃ, anumodakena kathaṃ paṭipajjitabbaṃ = “The formal making of kaṭhina cloth should be known” means: if cloth for kaṭhina cloth has accrued to an Order, what line of action should be taken by the Order, what line of action should be taken by (the monk) who is the formal maker of it, what line of action should be taken by (the monk) who gives the thanks.”¹

The main point of this excerpt is that the *anumodaka* while expressing his approval must be standing inside the boundary as explained in the Commentary: “*nissīmaṭṭho anumodatī 'ti bahuupacārasīmāya ṭhito anumodati.*”²

b/ *anumodati*: (*anu + √mud + a + ti*). I. B. Horner interprets it as “to give thanks,” which is the same expression that she uses for the case of a monk saying his appreciation to the donor(s) after receiving food. As mentioned previously, the literal meaning of *anumodati* as “to appreciate, to rejoice at the deed or act of another” works well in such case and also in this context. Here, the *anumodaka* monks show their appreciation to the task that has been well done by the *atthāraka* monk. By doing that, they will also partake in the five *kaṭhina*-benefits. I prefer Ven. Thanissaro’s interpretation, “to express approval.”³

I also present here the opposite statement and my proposed translation for it:

sammā ce atthataṃ hoti kathaṃ, tañ ce sīmaṭṭho anumodati, evaṃ pi atthataṃ hoti kathaṃ.⁴ = And if the *kaṭhina*-ceremony is spread properly, and the one who expresses the approval about it standing inside the boundary, thus the *kaṭhina*-ceremony is also spread.

--ooOoo--

¹ Vin. V, 176; BD. VI, 285-286.

² VA. V, 1111.

³ Tha. II, 286.

⁴ Vin. I, 255.

CHAPTER VIII (CĪVARAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

165. *uttarāḷumpaṃ* (BD. IV, 405):

“I allow you, monks, a little dye-pot in which to boil the dye.” The dye was spilt. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, you, monks, to arrange a basin (to prevent the dye from) spilling.”

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave rajanaṃ pacituṃ cullarajanakumbhin ti. rajanaṃ uttariyati.
bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave uttarāḷumpaṃ bandhituṃ ti.
(Vin. I, 286)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Monks, I allow a little dye-pot in which to boil the dye.” The dye was spilt. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, I allow to bind a collar (to prevent the dye from spilling over).

DISCUSSION:

uttarāḷumpaṃ: The context here is that the Buddha told the monks to perform a tactic, “*uttarāḷumpaṃ bandhituṃ*,” to prevent the water spilt over a little dye-pot in which the dye was being boiled. The interpretation of I. B. Horner, “to arrange a basin,” reveals that she is not familiar with such method. Cone, in her dictionary, seems to be reluctant using the word “contrivance” to translate *uttarāḷumpaṃ*.¹ Whereas Ven. Thanissaro is more decisive to interpret such method as “a collar be tied on to prevent boiling over.”²

We should take a look at the *Aṭṭhakathā*:

¹ DOP. 412.

² Tha. II, 29.

uttarāḷuvan ti vaṭṭādhāraḱaṃ. rajanakumbhiyā majjhe ṭhapetvā taṃ ādhāraḱaṃ parikkhipitvā rajanaṃ pakkhipitum anujānāmī 'ti attho. Evaṃ hi kate rajanaṃ na uttarati.¹ = *uttarāḷuvan* is a *vaṭṭādhāraḱaṃ*. The meaning is that I allow to throw in the dye after put in that *ādhāraḱaṃ* and placed it in the middle of the dye-pot.”

The Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* explains a little further:

Rajanakumbhiyā majjhe ṭhapetvāti antorajanakumbhiyā majjhe ṭhapetvā evaṃ vaṭṭādhāraḱe antorajanakumbhiyā pakkhitte majjhe udakaṃ tiṭṭhati, vaṭṭādhāraḱato bahi samantā antokumbhiyaṃ rajanacchalli. Rajanaṃ pakkhipituntī rajanacchallim pakkhipitum.² = *Having placed in the middle of the dye-pot* means having placed in the middle and inside of the dye-pot. When the *vaṭṭādhāraḱa* is thrown in the middle and inside of the dye-pot, the water stays still. The dye-bast is outside and around the *vaṭṭādhāraḱa* and inside of the pot. *To throw the dye in* means to throw the dye-bast in.

One thing for sure is that that *ādhāraḱa* must be round (*vaṭṭa*). Ven. Thanissaro translates it as “a collar,” which seems fit to the description of the ancient texts. Similarly, while steaming the beans or bones the Vietnamese often put in a small clay bowl.

--ooOoo--

166. *acchinne* (BD. IV, 407):

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

rajanaṃ ekato galati. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesum. anujānāmi bhikkhave samparivattakaṃ - samparivattakaṃ rajetum na ca acchinne theve pakkamitun ti. (Vin. I, 286)

¹ VA. V, 1126.

² VT. III, 310.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The dye dripped down on one side. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, I allow to dye it by turning it around back and forth, and not to go away until the drips have become cut off (discontinuous).”

DISCUSSION:

acchinne: The Commentary has a clear explanation about this:

na ca acchinne theve pakkamitun ti yāva rajanabindu galitaṃ na chijjati, tāva aññatra na gantabbaṃ. = na ca acchinne theve pakkamituṃ means “he is not to go elsewhere until the dripping drops of dye have been cut off (ceased).”¹

The problem is that she translates *acchinne* as “cut off” but interprets it as “ceased.” Her interpretation seems to be less practical than that of Ven. Thanissaro, “I allow that it be dyed turning back and forth, and that (once it is hung up to dry) one not leave until the drips have become discontinuous.”² I combine the works of both into my proposed translation. The issue here is just a matter of different way of interpretation. See also § 34b, 98, 99.

--ooOoo--

167. *tassā me*, Syntactic - sentence structure, *indriya* (BD. IV, 419):

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tassā me tad anussarantiyā pāmujjam jāyissati, pamuditāya pīti jāyissati, pītimanāya kāyo passambhissati, passaddhakāyā sukham vediyissāmi, sukhiniyā cittaṃ

¹ VA. V, 1126; Footnote 2 (BD. IV, 407).

² Tha. II, 29.

samādhīyissati, sā me bhavissati indriyabhāvanā balabhāvanā bojjhaṅgabhāvanā. imāhaṃ bhante ānisaṃsaṃ sampassamānā tathāgataṃ aṭṭha varāni yācāmi. (Vin. I, 294)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

To me, while calling that to mind, delight will be born; due to being delighted joy will be born; due to joyful mind body will become calm; due to the body being calm I will experience pleasantness, due to obtaining pleasantness the mind will concentrate; that to me will be the development of faculties, the development of powers, and the development of enlightenment-factors. Seeing this advantage in mind, Lord, I am asking the Thus-gone for the eight boons.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *tassā me*: Here is the words of the lady Visākā, in which the first pronoun *tassā* is used to strengthen the other *me*.¹ Both are in dative case, feminine, singular, having the meaning as “to that me, for this me.” And “*tassā me*” is not only the indirect object of the verb “*jāyissati*” but also the agent of the present participle “*anussarantiyā*” that must be in dative case also.

b/ **Syntactic - sentence structure**: The sentence structure applied for the first half of the passage should be explained thus: While doing A, B arises; due to B, C arises; due to C, D arises; etc.

c/ *indriya*: The last notice is terminology. Upon hearing *indriya*, *bala*, *bojjhaṅga*, etc., one with an adequate Buddhist knowledge should be able to decide context then grasp their meanings. Here *indriya* means the five faculties: *saddhindriya*, *viriyindriya*, *satindriya*, *samādhindriya*, *paññindriya*, not five sense-organs as interpreted by I. B. Horner.

--ooOoo--

¹ Geiger 100-101, § 106.1(a).

168. Vocabulary (BD. IV, 420):

Now at that time 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, saw the lodging stained by impurity; seeing it, he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying “Why, Ānanda, is this lodging stained by impurity?”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana समयena bhikkhū paṇītāni bhojanāni bhuñjitvā muṭṭhassaṭṭī asampajānā niddaṃ okkamenti, tesam muṭṭhassaṭṭīnaṃ asampajānānaṃ niddaṃ okkamantānaṃ supinanta asuci muccati, senāsanaṃ asucinā makkhiyati. atha kho bhagavā āyasmatā Ānandena pacchāsamaṇena senāsanacārikaṃ āhiṇḍanto addasa senāsanaṃ asucinā makkhitaṃ, disvāna āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ āmantesi: kiṃ etaṃ Ānanda senāsanaṃ makkhitaṃ ti. (Vin. I, 294)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time monks, having eaten delicious food, fell asleep, thoughtless, careless. While they were sleeping, thoughtless, careless, their semen was emitted as the result of a dream; the bedding was stained by the semen. Then the Lord, as he was touring the lodgings with the venerable Ānanda as his attendant, saw the bedding stained by semen; seeing it, he addressed the venerable Ānanda, saying “Why, Ānanda, is this bedding stained?”

DISCUSSION:

Vocabulary: The matter in this item is word choice and there is not much to discuss about it. In short, I prefer to translate:

- *paṇītāni bhojanāni* as “delicious food” instead of “abundant food,”
- *asuci* as “semen” instead of “impurity;”
- *senāsanaṃ* as “bedding” instead of “lodging.”

However I keep I. B. Horner's translation for *senāsanam* as "lodgings" in the compound *senāsanacārikam*. See explanation about the term *senāsanam* at § 16a.

One notice is that the question of the Buddha to Ānanda has an unnecessary phrase "by impurity;" perhaps I. B. Horner put it by mistake or forgot to place it in parentheses.

--ooOoo--

169. Vocabulary (BD. IV, 433):

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, not (from) amity of mind; 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, is one who tends the sick not fit to tend the sick.

PĀLI TEXT:

pañcahi bhikkhave aṅgehi samannāgato gilānupaṭṭhāko nālaṃ gilānaṃ upaṭṭhātuṃ: na paṭibalo hoti bhesajjaṃ vidhātuṃ, sappāyāsappāyaṃ na jānāti asappāyaṃ upanāmeti sappāyaṃ apanāmeti, āmisantaro gilānaṃ upaṭṭhāti no mettacitto, jegucchi hoti uccāraṃ vā passāvaṃ vā kheḷaṃ vā vantaṃ vā nīhātuṃ, na paṭibalo hoti gilānaṃ kālena kālaṃ dhammiyā kathāya sandassetuṃ samādapetuṃ samuttejetuṃ sampahaṃsetuṃ. imehi kho bhikkhave pañcah' aṅgehi samannāgato gilānupaṭṭhāko nālaṃ gilānaṃ upaṭṭhātuṃ. (Vin. I, 303)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Endowed with five qualities, monks, a sick-attendant is not fit to tend the sick: he is not competent to prepare 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 with the motive of material gain, not from the mind of loving-kindness; he becomes one who loathes to remove excrement or urine or phlegm or vomit; he is not

competent to point out, to instigate, to rouse, to delight the sick from time to time with *dhamma*-talk. Endowed with these five qualities, monks, a sick-attendant is not fit to tend the sick

DISCUSSION:

Vocabulary: The issue here is also a matter of word choice. There are some explanations from the *Aṭṭhakathā*:

nālan ti nappaṭirūpo na yutto upaṭṭhātuṃ. *bhesajjaṃ saṃvidhātuṃ* ti bhesajjaṃ yojetuṃ asamatto hoti. *āmisantaro* ti āmiṣaṃ assa antaran ti āmisantaro. *antaran* ti kāraṇaṃ vuccati. āmisakāraṇo yāgubhattapattacīvarāni patthento upaṭṭhātī 'ti attho.¹ = *nālaṃ* means not suitable, not fit to tend (the sick). *bhesajjaṃ saṃvidhātuṃ* means he is unmatched to prepare the medicine. *āmisantaro* means the motive could be material gain. *antaraṃ* is called the cause. The motive of material gain has the meaning that he tend (the sick) wishing for soup, meal, bowl, and robe.”

and also from the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī*:

Bhesajjaṃ yojetuṃ asamatto hotīti vejjena “idañcidañca bhesajjaṃ gahetvā iminā yojetvā dātabban”ti vutte tathā kātuṃ asamattohoti attho. Nīhātunti nīharituṃ, chaḍḍetunti attho.² = *Bhesajjaṃ yojetuṃ asamatto hoti* means: When being said by the doctor: “You should take this and this medicine, with this prepare and give,” he is unmatched to perform accordingly. *Nīhātunti* is *nīharituṃ*; the meaning is “to remove, to throw away.”

I am going to present the *Pāli* words and the meanings chosen by I. B. Horner, by Ven. Thanissaro,³ then by me in such orderly manner:

- *gilānupaṭṭhāko*: one who tends the sick, nurse, sick- attendant;

- *āmisantaro*: in the hope of gain, motivated by material gain, with the motive of material gain;

- *mettacitto*: (from) amity of mind, by thoughts of good will, from the mind of lovingkindness;

¹ VA. V, 1133.

² VT. III, 313.

³ Tha. II, 53.

- *kheḷaṃ*: sweat, saliva, phlegm;
- *sandassetuṃ*: to gladden, to instruct, to point out;
- *samādapetuṃ*: to rejoice, to urge, to instigate.

--ooOoo--

170. *lahu & garu* (BD. IV, 435-436):

... 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 quarters—those who have come in, those who have not come in—they are not to be disposed of, not to be divided up.

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave saṃghena ticīvaraṃ ca pattāṃ ca gilānupaṭṭhākānaṃ dātuṃ, yaṃ tattha lahubhaṇḍaṃ lahuparikkhāraṃ taṃ sammukhībhūtena saṃghena bhājetuṃ, yaṃ tattha garubhaṇḍaṃ garuparikkhāraṃ taṃ āgatānāgatassa cātuddisassa saṃghassa avissajjikaṃ avebhaṅgikaṃ ti. (Vin. I, 305)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

... Monks, I allow the Order to give the three robes and the bowl to the sick-attendants; (allow) the Order that is present to divide (among them) whatever light goods and light requisites that are there and (allow) whatever heavy goods and heavy requisites that are there are belong to the Order of the four quarters—those who have come and those who have not come—they are not to be disposed of, not to be divided up.

DISCUSSION:

lahu & garu: It is safe to take the literal meanings of *lahu* and *garu*, which are “light” and “heavy” respectively for this context. Moreover, the translation of Ven. Thanissaro supports my choice.¹

¹ Tha. II, 403-404.

For the term *garubhaṇḍa*, the Vinaya text *Cullavaggapāḷi* has the list of *avissajjikam* (things that are not to be disposed of) or *avebhaṅgikam* (things that are not to be divided up),¹ but the term *garubhaṇḍa* is not mentioned. However, many Commentaries mention the term *garubhaṇḍa* and define it as *avissajjikam* or *avebhaṅgikam*.²

--ooOoo--

¹ Vin. II, 170.

² VA. VI, 1228, 1237-1239, 1240-1245; VA. V, 1110; Nidd-A. I, 398-400; Vibh-A. 334-337.

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE
VOLUME V - CULLAVAGGA



CHAPTER I (KAMMAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

171. *duvūpasantaṃ* (BD. V, 3-4):

“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, if it is carried out when there is no interrogation, if it is carried out without the acknowledgment. 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

tīhi bhikkhave aṅgehi samannāgataṃ tajjanīyakammaṃ adhammakammañ ca hoti avinayakammañ ca duvūpasantañ ca : asammukhā kataṃ hoti, apaṭipucchā kataṃ hoti, apaṭiññāya kataṃ hoti. imehi kho bhikkhave tīh’ aṅgehi samannāgataṃ tajjanīyakammaṃ adhammakammañ ca hoti avinayakammañca duvūpasantañ ca.
(Vin. II, 3)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“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 unduly settled: (that is to say) if it is carried out not in the presence of, if it is carried out when there is no interrogation, if it is carried out without the acknowledgment. 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 unduly settled.

DISCUSSION:

duvūpasantaṃ: The issue here is to discuss the two common prefixes *su-* and *du-* (Skt. *duḥ-*, *duṣ-*); the former implies a positive sense and the latter negative. In the context of censuring a monk in a formal act, the main point is whether the act follows the right method; if so the formal act is called “well settled,” otherwise “ill-settled.” I. B. Horner’s interpretation as “easily” (settled) and “hard to” (settle) reflects the meanings of the two prefixes *su-* and *du-* but inappropriate in this context. Ven. Thanissaro translates *duvūpasantaṃ* as “poorly settled.”¹ I prefer to translate *duvūpasantaṃ* as “unduly settled.”

--ooOoo--

172. Instrumental of agent, Future passive participle, Objective, Textual discrepancy (BD. V, 7-8):

“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 case: he should not ordain, he should not give guidance, a novice should not attend him, the agreement for him to exhort nuns 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, 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, he should not set up authority, he should not act for leave, he should not reprove, he should not make remember, he should not quarrel with monks.

PĀLI TEXT:

tājjanīyakammakatena bhikkhave bhikkhunā sammāvattitabbaṃ. tatrāyaṃ
sammāvattanā : na upasampādetabbaṃ, na nissayo dātabbo, na sāmaṇero
upaṭṭhāpetabbo, na bhikkhunovādakasammuti sādītābā, sammatena pi bhikkhuniyo

¹ Tha. II, 182.

na ovaditabbā, yāya āpattiyā saṃghena tajjanīyakammaṃ kataṃ hoti sā āpatti na āpajjitabbā, aññā vā tādisikā, tato vā pāpiṭṭhatarā, kammaṃ na garahitabbā, kammikā na garahitabbā, na pakatattassa bhikkhuno uposatho ṭhapetabbo, na pavāraṇā ṭhapetabbā, na savacanīyaṃ kātappaṃ, na anuvādo paṭṭhapetabbo, na okāso kāretabbo, na codetabbo, na sāretabbo, na bhikkhūhi sampayojetabban ti. (Vin. II, 5)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Monks, the monk who is charged with a (formal) act of censure should conduct himself properly. This is the proper conduct in this case: he should not bestow higher ordination, he should not give guidance, he should not let a novice attend (him), he should not consent to the agreement for him to exhort nuns, and even if being agreed upon he should not exhort, 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, he should not find fault with those who carry out the (formal) act, (relating) to a regular monk he should not suspend (his) Observance, he should not suspend his Invitation, he should not issue commands (to him), he should not take charge of authority, he should not ask (him) for leave, he should not reprove (him), he should not remind (him), he should not cause (monks) quarrel with monks.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Instrumental of agent:** *tajjanīyakammakatena* is an adjectival compound modifying the noun *bhikkhunā* in instrumental case. Literally, “*tajjanīyakammakatena bhikkhunā*” can be translated as “by the *bhikkhu* who is charged with a (formal) act of censure.” The way I. B. Horner interprets it as a subordinate clause is fine but does not follow her literal style of translation. I take *bhikkhunā* as the subject (instrumental of agent) in my proposed translation. See also § 138, 139, 140, 149, 237.

b/ **Future passive participle:** Here, in this item we have a series of future passive participles carrying a passive sense for the whole *Pāli* passage. Then switching into an active

voice when translating seems to be a common strategy. Furthermore, keeping the consistency and parallel structure should be observed in one's translation. So, in this case the noun *bhikkhu* (monk) will become the subject for those actions expressed in finite forms as shown above. Also the clause “*na sāmaṇero upaṭṭhāpetabbo*” should be translated as “he should not let a novice attend (him),” and similar strategy should be applied to the next two clauses dealing with nuns.

c/ **Objective:** In this item, the phrase “*pakattassa bhikkhuno*” has a semantic connection with a series of clauses that follow: [*pakattassa bhikkhuno*] *na uposatho ṭhapetabbo, na pavāraṇā ṭhapetabbā, na savacanīyaṃ kātappaṃ, na anuvādo paṭṭhapetabbo, na okāso kāretabbo, na codetabbo, na sāretabbo*. All of these actions point to the same target “*pakattassa bhikkhuno*,” so the translation should reflect such relationship.

d/ **Textual discrepancy:** Another issue is that a variant for the last clause is found in the Thai Tipiṭaka “*na bhikkhū bhikkhūhi sampayojetappaṃ*” and Ven. Thanissaro translates as “he should not join bhikkhus in disputing with bhikkhus.”¹ Evidence from the Commentary *Samantapāsādikā* supports the Thai edition:

*na sampayojetabban ti aññaṃaññaṃ yojetvā kalaho na kāretabbo.*² = having joined one with another he should not create a quarrel.

I. B. Horner reveals the Commentary in footnote but her discussion about this point seems to fall out of track. Another support for the Thai edition is that *sampayojeti* is a causative verb and requires a direct object (*bhikkhū*); I stick my proposed translation to the Commentary and the Thai edition.

--ooOoo--

¹ Tha. II, 352.

² VA. VI, 1163.

173. Syntactic - parallel structure, *upagatassa, uttānamukhā* (BD. V, 15):

People, having seen this monk, spoke thus:

“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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

manussā taṃ bhikkhuṃ passitvā evaṃ āhaṃsu : kv āyaṃ abalabalo viya mandamando viya bhākuṭikabhākuṭiko viya, ko imassa upagatassa piṇḍakam pi dassati. amhākaṃ pana ayyā Assajipunabbasukā saṇhā sakhilā sukhasambhāsā mihitapubbaṅgamā ehivāgatavādino abbhākuṭikā uttānamukhā pubbabhāsino, tesam kho nāma piṇḍo dātabbo ’ti. (Vin. II, 10-11)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

People, having seen this monk, spoke thus:

“Who can this be like an idiot among idiots, like a fool among fools, like a supercilious among supercilious persons? Who will give a lump of food to that one when he has come near? Our masters, the followers of Assaji and Punabbasu are polite, genial, pleasant of speech, beaming with smiles, saying: ‘Come, you are welcome,’ are not supercilious, having cheerful face, they are the first to speak. Therefore alms should be given to them.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Syntactic - parallel structure:** There are three phrases ending with *viya* describing the appearance of the traveler monk, “*ayaṃ abalabalo viya mandamando viya bhākuṭikabhākuṭiko viya*.” I prefer to keep a consistent translation for those three expressions; so that the third phrase “*bhākuṭikabhākuṭiko viya*” should be translated as “like a supercilious among supercilious persons.”

b/ *upagatassa*: This is a past passive participle of *upa* + $\sqrt{\text{gam}}$ (to approach); it is in dative case singular and has agreement with the personal pronoun *imassa* . It denotes the action of *imassa*, which is the traveler monk, so that it should be understood accordingly: “the one who has approached,” or “the one who has come near.”

c/ *uttānamukhā*: This is definitely a *bahubbīhi* compound due to the change of *mukhaṃ* (face) from neuter gender to masculine in order to describe the characteristics of the monks at Kiṭāgiri. For the meaning of *uttāna*, Cone takes this quote and gives the meaning as “open, welcoming, ready to speak,”¹ whereas I take the hint from the Commentary *Samantapāsādikā*, “*uttānamukhā ti iminā mandamandākārassa ye hi cakkhūni ummīletvā ālokanena uttānamukhā honti na te mandamandā*,”² and translate *uttānamukhā* as “having cheerful face.”

--ooOoo--

174. *labbhati* (BD. V, 15-16):

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

addasā kho aññataro upāsako taṃ bhikkhuṃ Kiṭāgirismiṃ piṇḍāya carantaṃ, disvāna yena so bhikkhu ten’ upasaṃkami, upasaṃkamitvā taṃ bhikkhuṃ abhivādetvā etad avoca : api bhante piṇḍo labbhatīti. na kho āvuso piṇḍo labbhatīti. ehi bhante gharaṃ gamissāmā ’ti. (Vin. II, 11)

¹ DOP. 413.

² VA. III, 623.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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, he greeted him then said: “Honoured sir, are the alms obtained?”

“No, sir, alms are not obtained.”

“Come, honoured sir, we will go to (my) house.”

DISCUSSION:

labbhati: It seems to me that I. B. Horner mistook *labbhati* for *labbhā*, which is an indeclinable having the meaning as “possible, allowable, may be obtained.”¹ In fact, *labbhati* is a passive form of √*labh* + *ya* having the meaning as “to be obtained or received.”

--ooOoo--

175. Genitive - *me*, *āgantukabhattaṃ* (BD. V, 23):

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 elders consent to come to a meal with me on the morrow.” The monks who were elders consented by becoming silent.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho Citto gahapati āyasmataṃ Sāriputtena dhammiyā kathāya sandassito samādapito samuttejito sampahaṃsito there bhikkhū etad avoca: adhivāsentu me bhante therā svātanāya āgantukabhattaṃ ti. adhivāsesuṃ kho therā bhikkhū tuṅhībhāvena. (Vin. II, 16)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the householder Citta, delighted ... gladdened with the venerable Sāriputta’s talk on *dhamma*, spoke thus to the monks who were elders: “Honoured sirs, may the elders consent a guest meal of mine on the morrow.” The monks who were elders consented by being silent.

¹ CPED. 221.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Genitive - me:** is the genitive case of the personal pronoun *amha*. See discussion at § 120a.

b/ ***āgantukabhattaṃ*:** is a *tappurisa* compound having the meaning “a meal for newcomers.” I. B. Horner gives the translation as “food for those coming in” in other places; e.g. in the story of the Lady Visākhā requesting the Buddha’s permission to offer eight things for the rest of her life, *āgantukabhattaṃ* is one among the eight namely *saṃghassa vassikasāṭhikaṃ* (cloths for the rains to the Order), *āgantukabhattaṃ* (food for those coming in), *gamikabhattaṃ* (food for those going out), *gilānabhattaṃ* (food for the sick), *gilānupaṭṭhākabhattaṃ* (food for those who tend the sick), *gilānabhesajjaṃ* (medicine for the sick), *dhuvayāguṃ* (a constant supply of conje), *bhikkhunisaṃghassa udakasāṭhikaṃ* (bathing-cloths for the Order of nuns).¹ Ven. Thanissaro translates *āgantukabhattaṃ* as “new-comers-meal.”²

--ooOoo--

176. Textual discrepancy (BD. V, 24):

Formerly, honoured sir, some merchants of the Deccan went to an eastern district 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.”

¹ Vin. I, 290-294; BD. IV, 413-420.

² Tha. II, 378.

PĀLI TEXT:

bhūtapubbaṃ bhante Dakkhiṇāpathakā vāṇijā puratthimaṃ janapadaṃ agamaṃsu vāṇijjāya, te tato kukkuṭiṃ ānesuṃ. atha kho sā bhante kukkuṭi kākēna saddhiṃ saṃvāsāṃ kappesi, sā potakaṃ janesi. yadā kho so bhante kukkuṭapotaṃ kākavassaṃ vassitukāmo hoti kukkuṭakā' ti vassati, yadā kukkuṭavassaṃ vassitukāmo hoti kākā' ti vassati. evam eva kho bhante bahumhi ratane buddhavaṇe vijjamāne ayyena Sudhammena yad eva kiñci bhāsitaṃ yad idaṃ tilasaṃgūlikā 'ti. (Vin. II, 17)

... Yadā kho so bhante kukkuṭapotaṃ kākavassaṃ vassitukāmo hoti, 'kākakukkuṭā' ti vassati. Yadā kukkuṭavassaṃ vassitukāmo hoti, 'kukkuṭakākā' ti vassati ... (BJTS, Vol. V, 68)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Formerly, honoured sir, some merchants of the Deccan went to an eastern district 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 "caw-caw-cockadoodle-doo", whenever it wanted to utter the cry of a cock it uttered a "cockadoodle-doo-caw-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."

DISCUSSION:

Textual discrepancy: There is nothing to discuss about I. B. Horner's translation because she follows the *Pāli* texts of PTS.. The *Pāli* scriptures of Sri Lanka, Myanmar, and Thai somehow are different. My translation follows the edition of the Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series in Sinhala characters. Moreover, the translation from the Thai Tipiṭaka of Ven. Thanissaro gives me the approval about this.¹ However, the metaphor in this story seems ambiguous to me.

--ooOoo--

¹ Tha. II, 379.

177. Gerund, añjaliṃ paggaṇhāpeti (BD. V, 29):

If [while he is being spoken to thus, he forgives him] 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 sight 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, should cause that offence to be confessed.”

* The text between the two brackets [] is to be filled in by myself from her translation in previous part.

PĀLI TEXT:

evaṇ ce . . . kusalaṃ, no ce khamati anudūtena bhikkhunā Sudhammo bhikkhu Cittassa gahapatino dassanūpacāraṃ avijahāpetvā savanūpacāraṃ avijahāpetvā ekaṃsaṃ uttarāsaṅgaṃ kārāpetvā ukkuṭikaṃ nisīdāpetvā añjaliṃ paggaṇhāpetvā sā āpatti desāpetabbā ’ti. (Vin. II, 20)

To read in full one should fill in . . . with: vuccamāno khamati icc etaṃ

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

If while being spoken to thus, he (the householder Citta) forgives him (the monk Sudhamma), that is good; if he does not forgive, the companion messenger monk should not let the monk Sudhamma to be dismissed from reach of the sight, should not let him to be dismissed from reach of the hearing of the householder Citta, should make him to arrange his upper robe over one shoulder, should make him to sit down on his haunches, should make him to raise his joined hand up (to the head), then should make him to confess that offence.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Gerund:** As being discussed previously, a gerund or a series of them should be placed in the tone and mood of the final verbal, here is the future passive participle *desāpetabbā* so

that those gerunds should be translated accordingly.¹ In this case, I switch my proposed translation into an active voice in order to be easier to understand. See also § 56b, 73, 115b, 145c, 158, 160, 206b, 225.

b/ *añjaliṃ paggaṇhāpeti*: The description in I. B. Horner’s translation, “having made him salute with joined palms,” may cause a confusion that a saluting act was performed, but the monk Sudhamma, in fact was asked to raise his joined hand up (to the head) while confessing his transgression; such performance is still being practiced by the monks nowadays at the beginning of any kind of formal acts.

--ooOoo--

178. *saṃbhoga* (BD. V, 30):

Well then, monks, let the Order carry out a (formal) act of suspension against the monk Channa for not seeing his offence, (and there should be) no eating with an Order.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena hi bhikkhave saṃgho Channassa bhikkhuno āpattiyā adassane ukkhepanīyakammaṃ karotu asaṃbhogaṃ saṃghena. (Vin. II, 21)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Well then, monks, let the Order carry out a (formal) act of suspension against the monk Channa for not seeing his offence, (and there should be) no communal benefit with the Order.

DISCUSSION:

saṃbhoga: is a noun derived from the verb *saṃbhuñjati* (*saṃ* + \sqrt{bhuj}). The meaning given in dictionaries often relates *saṃbhoga* with food as seen in the introductory story (*nidānavatthu*) of the *pācittiya* 69. Then, in the word-analysis section (*padabhājanīya*) its meaning is explained further as:

¹ Wij., 23.

saṃbhogo nāma dve saṃbhogā āmisasaṃbhogo ca dhammasaṃbhogo ca. āmisa-saṃbhogo nāma āmisaṃ deti vā paṭiggaṇhāti vā, āpatti pācittiyassa. dhamma-saṃbhogo nāma uddisati vā uddisāpeti vā ... = there are two (kinds of) eating, eating food and eating dhamma. Eating food means, if he gives or accepts food, there is an offence of expiation. Eating dhamma means, he recites or causes to recites. . .¹

Even though I. B. Horner keeps translating the word as “eating,” the meaning of *saṃbhoga* does not relate to only food but materials in general (*āmisa*) also the Buddha’s Teachings (*Dhamma*). Literally, *saṃbhoga* can be translated as “enjoying together, communal benefit.” I understand that the punishment applied to the monk Channa is some kind of boycotting from the Order against him. Ven. Thanissaro translates the phrase “*asambhogam saṃghena*” as “(to have) no communion with the Community.”²

--ooOoo--

179. piṭṭhiparikammaṃ (BD. V, 32):

... 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, ...

PĀLI TEXT:

... na pakatattassa bhikkhuno abhivādanam paccuṭṭhānam añjalikammaṃ sāmīcikkammaṃ āsanābhīhāro seyyābhīhāro pādodakam pādapīṭham pādakathalikam pattacīvarappaṭiggahaṇam nahāne piṭṭhiparikammaṃ sādītabbam, ... (Vin. II, 22)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

... 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,

¹ Vin. IV, 137-138; BD. 27-30.

² Tha. II, 515.

bringing forward a sleeping-place, water for (washing) the feet, a footstool, a foot-stand, the receiving of bowl and robe, rubbing (dirt from) his back in the bath, ...

DISCUSSION:

piṭṭhiparikammaṃ: Somehow, the cultural differences block the view of I. B. Horner so that she altered the context of bathing (*nahāne*) into massaging; perhaps she was thinking that bathing is a private activity that should be done alone. I am not able to find in Commentaries a specific explanation for *parikammaṃ* in this context. But Childers defines it as an act of “cleansing” in his dictionary: “*pādaparikammaṃ piṭṭhiparikammaṃ*, washing, perfuming, etc., the feet and back (Dh. 189, Ten. J. 34).”¹ Figuratively, I prefer “rubbing (dirt from) the back” for *piṭṭhiparikammaṃ* in order to fit into the context of bathing described in the Scriptures. Ven. Thanissaro translates *piṭṭhiparikammaṃ* as back-scrubbing.²

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER II (PĀRIVĀSIKAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

180. Syntactic - sentence structure (BD. V, 45-46):

Monks, a monk under probation should not approach the families of a regular monk 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, he should not have almsfood taken back for this reason: that he thinks, ‘Do not let them find out about me.’

PĀLI TEXT:

na bhikkhave pārivāsikena bhikkhunā pakatattassa bhikkhuno puresamaṇena vā
pacchāsamaṇena vā kulāni upasaṅkamtabbāni, na āraññaṅkaṅgaṃ samāditabbam, na

¹ DOP. 342.

² Tha. II, 99, 102.

piṇḍapātikaṅgaṃ samādāttaṃ, na tappaccayā piṇḍapāto nīharāpetabbo mā maṃ jāniṃsū 'ti. (Vin. II, 32)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Monks, a monk under probation should not approach (householders') families as a recluse either walking in front or behind of a regular monk, he should not undertake the forest-practice, he should not undertake the almsman's practice, not because of that reason he should have almsfood brought (to him with the intention that): 'Do not let them find out about me.'

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - sentence structure: In order to understand more about the passage above, we should take look at the explanations from the Commentary:

puresamaṇena vā pacchāsamaṇena vā 'ti nātipavāritatṭhāne ettake bhikkhū gahetvā āgacchathā 'ti nimantitena bhante asukaṃ nāma kulaṃ bhikkhū nimanteti, etha tattha gacchāmā 'ti evaṃ saṃvidhāya bhikkhū puresamaṇena vā pacchāsamaṇena vā katvā na gantabbaṃ. bhante asukasmim nāma gāme manussā bhikkhūnaṃ āgamaṇaṃ icchanti, sādhu vata sace tesam saṅghaṃ kareyyāthā 'ti evaṃ ca pana pariyāyena kathetuṃ vaṭṭati.¹ = puresamaṇena vā pacchāsamaṇena vā: In case of being requested by relatives: "You take such number of monks and come." Having arranged thus: "Venerable sirs, that family invites the monks. Let us come and go there," and rendered the monks either walking in front of him or behind him, the invited monk (who is under probation) should not go. "Venerable sirs, people in that village want the coming of monks, it would be good if we might meet them," thus it is proper to say that way.

na ca tappaccayā 'ti nihatabhatto hutvā vihāre yeva nisīditvā bhuñjanto rattiyo gaṇayissāmī 'ti gacchato gāme bhikkhū disvā anārocentassa ratticchedo siyā 'ti iminā kāraṇena piṇḍapāto na nīharāpetabbo. mā maṃ jāniṃsū 'ti mā maṃ ekabhikkhu pi jānātū 'ti iminā ajjhāsayena vihāre sāmaṇerehi pacāpetvā bhuñjituṃ pi na labhati.

¹ VA. VI, 1164.

gāmaṃ piṇḍāya pavisitabbam eva.¹ = And *not because of that reason*: Having the meal already prepared, he (the monk under probation) sits down right in the monastery eating (thinking) “I will count the nights.” To the monk who is going and meeting the monks in the village but not announces (to them about his probation), there would be a disruption of his probation period; due to that reason, he should not have almsfood brought (to him). *Do not let them find out about me*: With this intention: “Do not let even one monk find out about me,” after having made the novices in the monastery cook, he should not receive (the food) to eat. He should enter a village for almsfood.

There is an interesting points about the clause, “*na bhikkhave pārivāsikena bhikkhunā pakatattassa bhikkhuno puresamaṇena vā pacchāsamaṇena vā kulāni upasaṃkamitabbāni*”: I. B. Horner’s translation shows that the phrase “*pakatattassa bhikkhuno*” goes with *kulāni*, if that would be the case, such phrase should not be separated with *kulāni* by the phrase “*puresamaṇena vā pacchāsamaṇena vā*.” One more notice about her translation is that she seems to confuse *samaṇena* with *samaṇera* (novice).

Whereas Ven. Thanissaro takes the phrase “*pakatattassa bhikkhuno*” with “*puresamaṇena vā pacchāsamaṇena vā*,” i.e. “he should not approach lay families with a regular bhikkhu as the contemplative who precedes him or follows him.”²

On the other hand, taking a clue from the Commentary, I takes the phrase “*puresamaṇena vā pacchāsamaṇena vā*” as appositive of “*pārivāsikena bhikkhunā*” and come up with the proposed translation as shown above, or in other words he should not go.

--ooOoo--

181. Technical English, Locative absolute (BD. V, 50):

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 monk ... with a

¹ VA. VI, 1165.

² Tha. II, 353.

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

na bhikkhave mūlāya paṭikassanārahena bhikkhunā pārivāsikena bhikkhunā saddhiṃ —la—, mūlāya paṭikassanārahena vuḍḍhatarena bhikkhunā saddhiṃ —la—, mānattārahena bhikkhunā saddhiṃ —la—, mānattacārikena bhikkhunā saddhiṃ —la—, abbhānārahena bhikkhunā saddhiṃ ekacchanne āvāse vatthabbaṃ . . . na chamāya caṅkamante caṅkame caṅkamitabbaṃ. (Vin. II, 35)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 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 monk who deserves rehabilitation ... he should not pace up and down in a place to pace up and down while the other one is pacing up and down on the ground.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Technical English:** Here there are two issues about English usage in I. B. Horner's translation: The first one is that the second phrase *mūlāya paṭikassanārahena* that modifies *vuḍḍhatarena bhikkhunā* is lost during the process of trimming the repeating passages.

The second one is that I. B. Horner also uses the English personal pronoun *he* to represent anyone among the other monks—i.e. a monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning, or a senior monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning, or a monk who deserves *mānatta* (discipline), etc.— That makes the translation obscure and confusing. I prefer to keep the pronoun “he” for “the monk who deserves to be sent back to the beginning” and “the other one” for “anyone among the others.”

b/ **Locative absolute:** I prefer to take the phrase *chamāya caṅkamante* as a subordinate clause,” and translate it accordingly, “while the other one is pacing up and down on the ground.”

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER III (SAMUCCAYAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

182. *tadupādāya, purimaṃ upādāya* (BD. V, 71, 74):

Well then, monks, that monk should do probation for two months from that date (BD. V, 71). . . .

Monks, that monk should do probation for two months from the earlier date (*Ibid.* 74).

PĀLI TEXT:

tena bhikkhave bhikkhunā tadupādāya dve māsā parivasitabbā. (Vin. II, 54)

. . .

tena bhikkhave bhikkhunā purimaṃ upādāya dve māsā parivasitabbā (*Ibid.* 57)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Well then, monks, that monk should do probation for two months on account of that (the other offence concealed for two months). . . .

Monks, that monk should do probation for two months on account of the former confession (of the two offences concealed for two months).

DISCUSSION:

a/ *tadupādāya* (*tad-upādāya*): *upādāya* is the gerund of *upādiyati* (*upa + ā + √dā*), but in this case it is “used as a postposition”¹ having the meaning “with reference to, according to;”² “with, out of, because of; with reference to, in respect of; relative to, in comparison with.”³

¹ Perniola 377.

² CPED. 63; PED. 149.

³ DOP. 483.

tad is a demonstrative pronoun in neuter gender representing something mentioned previously, in this case *tad* represents “the other offence concealed for two months;” this is to be applied to other similar cases.

b/ *purimaṃ*: is the object of the gerund *upādāya* having the meaning “the previous one, the former thing;” in this case it refers to the two offences concealed for two months.

In short, the general regulation is that as long as a *saṅghādisesa* offence is concealed, so long the *parivāsa* period should be observed.

--ooOoo--

183. *parivuttho, suparivuttho* (BD. V, 79):

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: whatever probation is granted is properly granted, whoever does probation does probation thoroughly, he must do probation (for any portion of time) remaining.

PĀLI TEXT:

Idha pana bhikkhave bhikkhu parivasanto vibbhamati. vibbhantakassa bhikkhave parivāso na rūhati. so ce puna upasampajjati, tassa tad eva purimaṃ parivāsadānaṃ, yo parivāso dinno sudinno, yo parivuttho suparivuttho, avaseso parivasitabbo. (Vin. II, 60)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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: whatever probation was granted is (still) properly granted, whatever probation was observed is properly observed, he must do probation (for any portion of time) remaining.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *parivuttho*: is the past passive participle of *parivasati* (*pari* + √*vas* + *a* + *ti*) having the meaning “to live under probation, to observe the *parivāsa* probation.” It shares the declension with the relative pronoun *yo*, which relates to the noun *parivāso*, masculine singular nominative case in the previous clause. So that *yo* in this clause does not represent the monk who was doing probation but the probation itself. This is to be also applied to other similar cases that follow.

b/ *suparivuttho* (*su-parivuttho*): Prefix *su-* in this case performs the role of an adverb conveying a positive meaning and modifying the past passive participle *parivuttho*. The meaning is clear.

I add Ven. Thanissaro’s translation here for consultation:

“There is the case where a bhikkhu, while on probation, disrobes. The probation of one who has disrobed does not expire. If he reordains, his earlier granting of probation is as it was. Whatever probation was granted is (still) well-granted. Whatever probation was observed is well-observed. The remainder is to be observed.”¹

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER IV (SAMATHAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

184. Textual - missing translation (BD. V, 96):

The missing text should insert in between the last paragraph and the previous one after the sign || I || 1 ||.

PĀLI TEXT:

adhammavādī puggalo, adhammavādī sambahulā, adhammavādī saṃgho,
dhammavādī puggalo, dhammavādī sambahulā, dhammavādī saṃgho. (Vin. II, 73)

¹ Tha. II, 359-360.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

An individual who professes non-*dhamma*, several who profess non-*dhamma*, an Order which professes non-*dhamma*, an individual who professes *dhamma*, several who profess *dhamma*, an Order which professes *dhamma*.

DISCUSSION:

Textual - missing translation: This part is served as a heading (*mātikā*). It might be dropped out intentionally by I. B. Horner. My proposed translation is regenerated from other parts of I. B. Horner's translation.

--ooOoo--

185. *bimbohanam, vaccaṭṭhānam & passāvattṭhānam, iti/ti* (BD. V, 100):

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 or) the Order's agreement, this is the time it should be entered upon, this the time it should be departed from.

PĀLI TEXT:

tesaṃ āyasmā Dabbo Mallaputto evaṃ senāsanam paññāpeti: ayaṃ mañco idaṃ pīṭham ayaṃ bhisī idaṃ bimbohanam idaṃ vaccaṭṭhānam idaṃ passāvattṭhānam idaṃ pāniyam idaṃ paribhojaniam ayaṃ kattaradaṇḍo idaṃ saṃghassa katikasaṅṭhānam imam kālam pavisitabbaṃ imam kālam nikkhamitabban ti. (Vin. II, 76)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The venerable Dabba the Mallian assigned them lodgings thus: “This is the couch, this the chair, this the mattress, this the pillow, this a place for urinating, this a place for defecating, this the drinking water, this the water for washing, this the staff, this is the Order's agreement: “This is the time it should be entered upon, this the time it should be departed from.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *bimbohanam*: This is a matter of word choice: The meaning of *bimbohanam* is pillow. Here I. B. Horner translates it as “squatting mat,” but “pillow” somewhere else in her translation.

b/ *vaccaṭṭhānaṃ & passāvaṭṭhānaṃ*: Whereas the two terms *vaccaṭṭhānaṃ* and *passāvaṭṭhānaṃ* should be given two different meanings according to their uses in order to bring out the particular construction of a Buddhist monastery in the past that such two activities were performed at two different places (perhaps they are similar to public toilets in the present time).

c/ *iti/ti*: The last thing should be mentioned is that the particle *iti/ti* should be signaled by the quotation-marks in order to avoid confusion. See also § 18a, 48b, 70a, 72a, 144a, 146b.

--ooOoo--

186. *catukkabhataṃ* (BD. V, 100):

Now at that time a householder who had nice food gave the Order in continuous food supply meals consisting of four ingredients.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena kalyāṇabhattiko gahapati saṃghassa catukkabhataṃ deti niccabhattaṃ. (Vin. II, 77)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time a householder who had nice food gave the Order in continuous food supply meals consisting of four portions.

DISCUSSION:

catukkabhataṃ: The Commentary explains that *catukkabhataṃ* is “four meals” in one place, “*catukkabhataṃ dehīti cattāri bhattāni deti, taddhitavohārena pana catukkabhattan ti*

vuttam,”¹ and “to four monks” in another, “aṭṭhannaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ dema catunnaṃ demā ’ti evaṃ dinnam pana aṭṭhakabhattañ c’eva catukkabhattañ ca.”² I. B. Horner did correct the error in footnote 3: “‘A meal for four monks’ at *B. D. i. 276* should be corrected to the above rendering.”

--ooOoo--

187. *amhākaṃ, anattamano* (BD. V, 101):

“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?”

PĀLI TEXT:

“kassa, bhante, amhākaṃ ghare svātanāya bhattaṃ uddiṭṭhan”ti?
“Mettiyabhūmajakānaṃ kho, gahapati, bhikkhūnaṃ tumhākaṃ ghare svātanāya bhattaṃ uddiṭṭhan”ti. atha kho kalyāṇabhattiko gahapati anattamano ahoṣi. kathañhi nāma pāpabhikkhū amhākaṃ ghare bhuñjissantīti. (Vin. II, 77)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“For whom, honoured sir, is the meal apportioned for tomorrow in our 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 displeased and said: “Why should these depraved monks enjoy themselves in our house?”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *amhākaṃ*: is the genitive case plural of the personal pronoun *amha*. It should be translated as “our, of us” not “my.” Here is just the matter of word choice.

¹ VA. III, 580.

² *Ibid.* VI, 1271.

b/ *anattamano*: I think “displeased, discontent” could convey better the meaning of *anattamano*, whereas “sorry” often used to express a sad feeling or lightly grieving one.

--ooOoo--

188. *saṅghāṭipallatthikāya* (BD. V, 102):

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

Atha kho mettiyabhūmajakā bhikkhū pacchābhattaṃ piṇḍapātappaṭikkantā ārāmaṃ gantvā pattacīvaraṃ paṭisāmetvā bahārāmakotṭhake saṅghāṭipallatthikāya nisīdimṣu tuṅhībhūtā maṅkubhūtā pattakkhandhā adhomukhā pajjhāyantā appaṭibhānā. (Vin. II, 78)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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, clasping the knees with (their) outer cloak, silent, abashed, their shoulders bent, their heads lowered, brooding, speechless.

DISCUSSION:

saṅghāṭipallatthikāya: This is a posture of sitting down on the floor using an outer cloak to clasp the knees. See § 82 for the discussion about *pallatthikā*.

--ooOoo--

189. *ummattakālayaṃ karoti* (BD. V, 108-109):

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 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.

* The text between the two brackets [] is to be filled in by myself from previous part.

PĀLI TEXT:

idha pana bhikkhave bhikkhu ummattako [hoti cittavipariyāsakato, tena ummattakena cittavipariyāsakatena bahum assāmaṇakaṃ ajjhāciṇṇaṃ hoti bhāsita-parikantaṃ. tam eṇaṃ codeti saṃgho vā sambahulā vā ekapuggalo vā sarat’ āyasmā evarūpiṃ āpattiṃ]* āpajjitā ’ti. so ummattako ummattakālayaṃ karoti: aham pi evaṃ karomi, tumhe pi evaṃ karotha, mayham pi etaṃ kappati tumhākaṃ p’ etaṃ kappatīti. tassa saṃgho amūḷhavinayaṃ deti: dhammikaṃ amūḷhavinayassa dānaṃ. (Vin. II, 83)

* The text between the two brackets [] is to be filled in by myself from previous part.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 is mad and acts on the ground of a mad man, (saying): ‘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.

DISCUSSION:

ummattakālayaṃ karoti: The problem in this case can be detected from I. B. Horner’s translation by logical reasoning: The two clauses “he is mad” and “pretends to be mad” are

contradictory; moreover if he pretends to be mad, how could the Order give him a verdict of past insanity that is considered legally valid? So the translation of the clause “*ummattakālayaṃ karoti*” needs a revised one. Considering *ummattakālayaṃ* as a *tappurusa* compound “*ummattaka+ālayaṃ*,” I treat it as an adverbial, “on the ground of a mad man,” and come up with the translation above. Ven. Thanissaro translates the clause “*so ummattako ummattakālayaṃ karoti*” as “he is actually insane and acts insane;”¹ it is not much different comparing to that of mine.

--ooOoo--

190. *sānuvādo* (BD. V, 113):

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, 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

pañc’ imāni bhikkhave dhammikāni tassapāpiyyasikākammaṃ karaṇāni: asuci ca hoti, alajjī ca, sānuvādo ca, tassa saṃgho tassapāpiyyasikākammaṃ karoti, dhammena samaggo. imāni kho bhikkhave pañca dhammikāni tassapāpiyyasikākammaṃ karaṇāni. (Vin. II, 86)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Monks, these five factors for a (formal) act for specific depravity are legally valid: if he is impure, and if he is unconscientious, and if he is blamed, if an Order carries out a (formal) act for specific depravity against him by righteous way and with the unanimity (of the Order). These five factors, monks, for a (formal) act for specific depravity are legally valid.

¹ Tha. II, 180.

DISCUSSION:

sānuvādo: The Commentary says:

asucī 'ti asucīhi kāyavacīkammehi samannāgato. *alajjī* 'ti sañcicca āpajjanādinā alajjīlakkaṇena samannāgato. *sānuvādo* 'ti saupavādo. iti imesañ ca tiṇṇaṃ aṅgānaṃ vasena tīṇi kāraṇāni, saṅghena karaṇaṃ dhammena samaggena karaṇan ti imāni ca dve ti pañca tassapāpiyasikākammaṃ karaṇāni nāma honti.¹

Based on Commentary, I am going to use the explanations from the Commentary (placed in parentheses) for my proposed translation to replace the meaning given by I. B. Horner, which are:

- “factors” (*aṅgāni*) instead of “grounds,”
- “he is blamed (*sa-upavādo*)” instead of “he is fault-finding,”

One more thing is that I prefer to translate “*asuci ca hoti*” as “he is impure” instead of “he becomes impure” because such quality is a fact, not something to become.

For the last two factors, the Commentary points out that they are *dhammena* (by righteous way) and *samaggo* (with the unanimity of the Order) in the last clause “*saṅghena karaṇaṃ dhammena samaggena karaṇan ti imāni ca dve ti pañca tassapāpiyasikākammaṃ karaṇāni nāma honti,*” so that the comma separating “*dhammena samaggo*” from the rest should be taken out not only from the English translation but from the *Pāli* Canon itself also. I quote the translation of Ven. Thanissaro for a comparison:

Five requirements for a further-misconduct transaction:

- 1) He (the bhikkhu in question) is impure;
- 2) he is unconscientious;
- 3) he is accused (*sānuvāda*);
- 4-5) the Community imposes on him an act of further misconduct
— in accordance with the Dhamma,
— in harmony.²

--ooOoo--

¹ VA. VI, 1193.

² Tha. II, 182.

191. *anupakhajja* (BD. V, 116-117):

Now at that time monks disputed with monks and nuns disputed with monks and the monk Channa, intruding into the nuns' (quarters), disputed together with the monks and was prejudiced on the side of the nuns.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū pi bhikkhūhi vivadanti bhikkhuniyo pi bhikkhūhi vivadanti Channo pi bhikkhu bhikkhunīnaṃ anupakhajja bhikkhūhi saddhiṃ vivadati bhikkhunīnaṃ pakkhaṃ gāheti. (Vin. II, 88)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time monks dispute with monks, nuns also dispute with monks, the monk Channa, going over to the nuns' (side), also disputes with the monks and is prejudiced on the side of the nuns.

DISCUSSION:

anupakhajja: is the gerund of *anupa[k]khandati* having the meaning “pushes oneself forward, encroaches on; intrudes, works one’s way in; goes over to.”¹ I. B. Horner translates *anupakhajja* as “intruding into” perhaps taking the hint from the Commentary:

bhikkhunīnaṃ anūpakhajjā ’ti bhikkhunīnaṃ anto pavisitvā. vivādādhikaraṇādīnaṃ vacanattho duṭṭhadosaṃvaṇṇanāyaṃ vutto yeva.²

On the other hand, I prefer to translate the gerund as “going over to” due to the reason that the monk Channa was taking the nuns’ side in the dispute, not performing a physical move as the English word “intruding into” may cause the confusion. I also interpret the conjunction *pi* in its basic meaning as “also” comparing to the English conjunction “and” given by I. B. Horner.

--ooOoo--

¹ DOP. 117.

² VA. VI, 1194.

192. *apalokanakammaṃ* (BD. V, 118):

“What is here a legal question arising from obligations? Whatever is an Order’s business and ought to be done (by it): a (formal) 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 called a legal question arising from obligations.

PĀLI TEXT:

tattha katamaṃ kiccādhikaraṇaṃ. yā saṃghassa kiccayatā karaṇīyatā apalokanakammaṃ ñattikammaṃ ñattidutiyakammaṃ ñatticatutthakammaṃ idaṃ vuccati kiccādhikaraṇaṃ. (Vin. II, 89)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“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 of giving a notice, 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 called a legal question arising from obligations.

DISCUSSION:

apalokanakammaṃ: *Parivārapāḷi* mentions four (formal) acts of the Order that are the same as the four quoted above, and *apalokanakammaṃ* is the first among them (*cattāri kammāni apalokanakammaṃ ñattikammaṃ ñattidutiyakammaṃ ñatticatutthakammaṃ*).¹ Through out her entire translation for the *Vinayapiṭakapāḷi*, I. B. Horner did not translate the four terms but interpreted them instead. The interpretation given to the last three, which are *ñattikammaṃ ñattidutiyakammaṃ ñatticatutthakammaṃ*, conveys the meanings well; but for the first one, which is *apalokanakammaṃ*, the interpretation as “a (formal act) for which

¹ Vin. V, 126.

leave ought to be asked” is problematic. Perhaps, I. B. Horner consulted the PED.; in which the right clue is found, but unfortunately she chose an inappropriate meaning for the term *apalokana*. Let take look at the two dictionaries of the PTS.:

- **apalokana** (nt.) [fr. *apaloketi*] permission, leave, in °kamma proposal of a resolution, obtaining leave (see kamma 1.3) Vin II.89; IV.152.”¹

- **apalokana-kamma**, n. 2. a (formal) act (of the saṅgha) giving permission or approval.²

Indeed, *apalokana* is the noun derived from the verb *apaloketi* (*apa* + √*lok* + *e* + *ti*) having the meaning as “to give notice.”³ So that *apalokanakamma* should be translated as “a (formal) act of giving a notice.”

The *Vinaya Parivārapāḷi* states five (formal) acts that are called *apalokanakamma*:

apalokanakammaṃ katamāni pañca ṭhānāni gacchati. osāraṇaṃ, nissāraṇaṃ
bhaṇḍukammaṃ brahmadāṇḍaṃ kammalakkhaṇaṃ ñeva pañcamaṃ.
apalokanakammaṃ imāni pañca ṭhānāni gacchati. = Which are the five possibilities to
which a formal act [of giving a notice] has access? Restoration, being sent away, close
shaving, the higher penalty, a characteristic mark of the formal acts is itself the fifth.
These are the five possibilities to which a formal act [of giving a notice] has access.⁴

There are detailed explanations about these five (formal) acts of giving a notice found in the Commentary.⁵ I. B. Horner also gives references of some examples in footnotes.⁶

For the rest three formal acts, I keep the interpretation given by I. B. Horner. And I have a mnemonic device based on the announcement “*suṇātu me bhante/āvuso saṅgho*”: Such phrase is said once in *ñattikamma*, twice (*dutiya*) in *ñattidutiyakamma*, and four times (*catuttha*) in *ñatticatutthakamma*.

--ooOoo--

¹ PED. 52.

² DOP. 168.

³ CPED. 22.

⁴ Vin. V, 222; BD. VI, 363.

⁵ VA. VI, 1402-1409.

⁶ BD. VI, 363.

193. *siyā, sammati, samatho, assa vacanīyaṃ, yathākathaṃ viya* (BD. V, 133-134):

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 who has remembered fully.

PĀLI TEXT:

anuvādādhikaraṇaṃ katīhi samathehi sammati. anuvādādhikaraṇaṃ catūhi samathehi sammati sammukhāvinayena ca sativinayena ca amūlḥavinayena ca tassapāpiyasikāya ca. siyā anuvādādhikaraṇaṃ dve samathe anāgamma amūlḥavinayaṇ ca tassapāpiyyasikaṇ ca dvīhi samathehi sammeyya sammukhāvinayena ca sativinayena cā ’ti. siyā ’ti ’ssa vacanīyaṃ. yathākathaṃ viya. idha bhikkhū bhikkhuṃ amūlikāya sīlavipattiyā anuddhaṃsenti. tassa kho taṃ bhikkhave bhikkhuno sativapullappattassa sativinayo dātabbo. (Vin. II, 99)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

By how many (kinds of) settlements is a legal question arising from censure settled? A legal question arising from censure is settled by four (kinds of) settlements: 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 a legal question arising from censure has no recourse to two (kinds of) settlements—the verdict of past insanity and the decision for specific depravity—might it be settled by two (kinds of) settlements—the verdict in the presence of and the verdict of

innocence?’ ‘It might be,’ is what should be said. In what manner? In the case that 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 who has remembered fully.

DISCUSSION:

At first glance, I. B. Horner’s English translation seems to be alright because it makes out the meaning of the *Pāli* passage, but taking a careful comparison between the two texts, *Pāli* and English, something should to be paid attention in order to understand deeper about the structure of the *Pāli* language. It should be noticed that the entire excerpt above is a quote from the words of the Buddha.

a/ *siyā*: The first notice is that the verbal *siyā* (potential form of \sqrt{as} = to be) is part of the question, it should not be taken out in a separate clause, “If one says,” as shown by I. B. Horner’s translation; such conclusion is made by the clue from the answer itself “*siyā ’ti*.”

b/ *sammati*: (\sqrt{sam} + *ya* + *ti*) is a passive verb having the meaning “to be appeased or calmed; to cease; ... ppp. *santa*.”¹ Ven. Thanissaro in his textbook suggests its translation as “to be settled;”² I going to use such meaning for my proposed translation.

One thing should be mentioned here is that the meaning “agree upon” chosen by I. B. Horner makes me think that she might take it from the verb *sammannati* (*sam* + \sqrt{man} + *a* + *ti*) having the meaning “to authorize; to agree to, to assent ... ppp. *sammata*.”³ Concerning about this point, if my word choice is correct then a vast revision needs to be made throughout the whole I. B. Horner’s translation.

Another notice is that in the clause “*siyā anuvādādhikaraṇaṃ . . . dvīhi samathehi sammeyya*,” the subject of the verb *sammeyya*, which is the optative form of the passive verb

¹ PED. 695.

² Tha. I, 511.

³ PED. 695.

sammati, is not any person as shown by I. B. Horner’s translation “one may agree upon,” but the compound noun *anuvādādhikaraṇaṃ*.

c/ *samatho*: I. B. Horner translates it as “decision.” In fact, it is a noun derived from the verb *sammati* (to be settled), so that its meaning in this context should be “settlement,” I am not able to find any explanation about such derivative formation from grammar books, but one excerpt from two different Commentaries to show the relationship between the two, *sammati* and *samatho*:

Sammukhā vinayādisattavidho adhikaraṇasamatho nāma. Taṃ hi āgamma tāni adhikaraṇāni sammanti vūpasammanti, tasmā so adhikaraṇasamatho ti vuccati.¹

d/ *assa vacanīyaṃ*: As discussed above, *assa* should not stand for any person in this passage as reflected by I. B. Horner’s translation: “he should be told.” Indeed, *assa* in this case is also a potential form of the irregular verb \sqrt{as} = (to be), beside *siyā* mentioned above.²

e/ *yathākathaṃ viya*: should be translated in the form of a question: “In what manner?”³ Such correction is based on the observation that the way of asking questions and giving answers by the Buddha himself while preaching is often found in the *Pāli* Canon.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER V (KHUDDAKAVATTHUKKHANDHAKAṀ):

194. *parittaṃ* (BD. V, 148):

Monks, I allow you to suffuse with loving-kindness of mind these four royal snake families, (and) to make a charm for the self for self-protection, for self-guarding.

¹ NiddA. II, 389; Dhs. 144.

² A. P. Bud., part III, 21.

³ DOP. 626.

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave imāni cattāri ahirājakulāni mettena cittena pharituṃ attaguttiyā
attarakkhāya attaparittaṃ kātuṃ. (Vin. II, 110)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Monks, I allow you to suffuse with loving-kindness of mind these four royal families of snakes, (in order) to make a self-protection for (the purpose of) self-guarding, for (the purpose of) self-warding.

DISCUSSION:

parittaṃ: The issue here is to find an English equivalent for the term *parittaṃ* (or *parittā*).¹ The meaning “charm” given by I. B. Horner seems unsuitable because it may produce in the readers’ mind a superstitious view about Buddhism. According the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī*, the term *parittaṃ* is a shorter form of *parittāṇa*:

Attaguttiyāti attano guttatthāya. Attarakkhāyāti attano rakkhaṇatthāya. Attaparittaṃ
kāntuntī attano parittāṇatthāya attaparittaṃ nāma kātuṃ anujānāmīti attho.²

And the PED. gives its etymology and meaning as: “**Parittāṇa** (nt.) [pari + tāṇa. Cf. Epic Skt. paritrāṇa] protection, shelter, refuge, safeguard, safety.”³ Its equivalent Sanskrit root must be $\sqrt{trā}$ (rescue), which is a secondary root from \sqrt{tr} .⁴ So we can see that *gutti*, *rakkhā*, and *parittaṃ* are synonyms. My job is just to revise the literal translation of I. B. Horner, while Ven. Thanissaro seems to interpret it according to the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthidīpanī*: “I allow that these four royal families of snakes be suffused with an attitude of good will for the sake of self-guarding, for the sake of self-protection, for the sake of self-warding.”⁵

--ooOoo--

¹ PED. 426.

² VṬ. III, 348.

³ PED. 427.

⁴ Whitney 67.

⁵ Tha. II, 144.

195. Vocative - bhagavā (BD. V, 151):

... 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).

PĀLI TEXT:

assosum kho bhante manussā : ayyena kira Piṇḍolabhāradvājena Rājagahakassa setṭhissa patto ohārito ’ti, te ca bhante manussā uccāsaddā mahāsaddā āyasmantaṃ Piṇḍolabhāradvājaṃ piṭṭhito-piṭṭhito anubaddhā, so eso bhante bhagavā uccāsaddo mahāsaddo ’ti. (Vin. II, 111)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

... Indeed, 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, those people (making) a loud noise, a great noise, have followed close after the venerable Piṇḍola the Bhāradvāja’; thus, Lord, is that loud noise, the great noise.

DISCUSSION:

Vocative - bhagavā: It seems to me that I. B. Horner takes *bhagavā* as nominative case, “which the Lord (hears).” In fact, *bhagavā* or *bhante bhagavā* are addressing terms to the Buddha, they are in vocative case.¹

--ooOoo--

196. Textual - missing translation (BD. V. page 153):

“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.”

¹ A. P. Bud. part I, 27.

PĀLI TEXT:

na bhikkhave citrāni pattamaṇḍalāni dhāretabbāni rūpakokiṇṇāni bhatikammakatāni.
yo dhāreyya, āpatti dukkaṭassa. anujānāmi bhikkhave pakatimaṇḍalan ti. (Vin. II, 113)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Monks, variegated circular bowl-rests spread with pictures, made with relief artwork should not be used. Whoever should use one, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow you, monks, ordinary circular rests.”

DISCUSSION:

Textual - missing translation: The issue here is to decide the meaning of the phrase “*citrāni pattamaṇḍalāni ... rūpakokiṇṇāni bhatikammakatāni.*” I. B. Horner only translates “carved circular bowl-rests” for the whole phrase so that “*rūpakokiṇṇāni bhatikammakatāni*” is left out; she is also reluctant to give the meaning of *citrāni* as “carved.”¹ Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa says nothing about this. Whereas the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* gives only one part of the rule:

“*rūpakākiṇṇānīti itthirūpādīhi ākiṇṇāni.*”² = *spread with pictures* means spread with female figures, etc.”

So the rest must be relied on dictionaries. In fact, I have no trouble to locate the term *citra/citta* in dictionaries, in which “variegated, manifold, beautiful” are given. And for the compound *bhatikammakatāni*, the Scriptures from other countries show *bhittikammakatāni*,³ so that I translate the compound as “made with relief artwork.” Ven. Thanissaro presents his translation as: “Decorated circular bowl rests—full of little figures, made with ornamentations—should not be used. Whoever should do so: an offense of wrong-doing. I allow ordinary circular rests”⁴ I owe the venerable for the finding of this item.

--ooOoo--

¹ Footnote 4 (BD. V, 153).

² VṬ. III, 353.

³ Be. Vol. 4, 248; BJTS. Vol. 5 (2), 24; Syā. Vol. 7, 28.

⁴ Tha. II, 38.

197. paṃsukūlika (BD. V, 156):

“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-robes. Whoever should be, there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

PĀLI TEXT:

na bhikkhave chavasīsassa patto dhāretabbo. yo dhāreyya, āpatti dukkaṭassa. na ca bhikkhave sabbapaṃsukūlikena bhavitabbaṃ. yo bhaveyya, āpatti dukkaṭassā ’ti.
(Vin. II, 115)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Monks, a bowl made from a skull should not be carried. Whoever should carry one, there is an offence of wrong-doing. And, monks, one should not be a holder of all taken from dust heap. Whoever should be (following such practice), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

DISCUSSION:

paṃsukūlika: According to the Commentary, the term of *paṃsukūlika* does not only relate to clothes alone but other belongings such as chair and bedding also:

“*sabbapaṃsukūlikena* ’ti ettha cīvaraṇ ca mañcapīṭhaṇ ca paṃsukūlaṃ vaṭṭati.”¹

The meaning of the clause “*na ca sabbapaṃsukūlikena bhavitabbaṃ*” is that the Buddha prohibits the way of surviving totally based on things that are taken from dust (*paṃsu*) heaps (*kūla*). However, rendering it into English literally seems troublesome. Ven. Thanissaro interprets it by conversing it into active voice: “the practice of using nothing but thrown away things should not be followed.”²

--ooOoo--

¹ VA. VI, 1205.

² Tha. II, 41.

198. *parissāvanam, kaṭacchuparissāvanam, dhammakarakam* (BD. V, 162):

Now at that time on a certain road there was water that was not allowable. 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena antarā magge udakam akappiyam hoti, parissāvanam na hoti. bhagavato etam attham ārocesum. anujānāmi bhikkhave parissāvanan ti. coḷakam na ppahoti. anujānāmi bhikkhave kaṭacchuparissāvanan ti. coḷakam na ppahoti. bhagavato etam attham ārocesum. anujānāmi bhikkhave dhammakarakan ti. (Vin. II, 118)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time on a certain road there was water that was not allowable, there is no water-strainer. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a water-strainer.” A little piece of cloth was not enough. “I allow, monks, a ladle-strainer.” The little piece of cloth was not enough. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow a water-strainer cylinder.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *parissāvanam*: The clause “*parissāvanam na hoti*” from the first sentence of the *Pāli* text is missing from I. B. Horner’s translation. Nonetheless, in the following I. B. Horner gives the meaning of *parissāvanam* as “strainer,” whereas Ven. Thanissaro translates it as “water-strainer.” I borrow the venerable’s word due to the reason that it serves better in revealing the context, then present my proposed translation for the missing part as “there is no water-strainer.”

b/ *kaṭacchuparissāvanam*: I assume that *kaṭacchuparissāvanam* is an instrument used to filter the water in order to make it drinkable. Linguistically, *kaṭacchuparissāvanam* is a

compound, and the meaning of *kaṭacchu* is a spoon, a ladle so that I. B. Horner’s translation for it as “a strainer on a ladle” seems reasonable. However, the Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa explains it quite differently “*kaṭacchuparissāvanam* nāma tīsu daṇḍakesu vinandhitvā kaṭam.”¹ Ven. Thanissaro quotes the Commentary but seems to ignore it and gives a similar translation like that of I. B. Horner, a ladle-strainer.

c/ ***dhammakarakaṃ***: Another kind of water-strainer mentioned in the Scripture is *dhammakarakaṃ*. There is no explanation found in the Commentary. The PED. says that *dhammakaraka* is “a proper or regulation (standard) water-pot, i.e. a pot with a filter for straining water as it was used by ascetics,”² and a similar one found in the CPED.: “**Dhamakaraka**, m. a filter or water-strainer. (Often seen as **dhammakaraka**).”³ I. B. Horner follows the PED.; Ven. Thanissaro proposes another English term for it, water-strainer cylinder.⁴

So we have here three kinds of water-strainers: *parissāvanam*, *kaṭacchuparissāvanam*, and *dhammakarakaṃ*; these were for personal use. I employ the translations given by Ven. Thanissaro, which are water-strainer, ladle-strainer, and water-strainer cylinder, for the three *Pāli* terms consecutively. Ven. Thanissaro also explains about two other methods of filtering water⁵ that will be discussed in the next item.

--ooOoo--

199. *navakammaṃ, sammati, daṇḍaparissāvanam, ottharakaṃ* (BD. V, 163):

Now at that time monks were making repairs. The water-strainer did not cease (to be in use). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a double water-strainer.”

¹ VA. VI, 1207.

² PED. 338.

³ CPED. 132.

⁴ Tha. II, 40.

⁵ *Ibid.* 35-36.

The double water-trainer did not cease (to be in use). They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a filter.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū navakammaṃ karonti, parissāvanaṃ na sammati. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave daṇḍaparissāvānaṃ ti. daṇḍaparissāvanaṃ na sammati. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave ottharakaṃ ti. (Vin. II, 119)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time monks were making new construction. The water-strainer was not enough. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a stick-strainer.” The stick-trainer was not enough. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a net-strainer.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *navakammaṃ*: is literally translated as “new work,” and in the *Vinaya* context it can be further speculated as “new building, new construction.” The meaning “repair” chosen by I. B. Horner perhaps comes from the PTS. dictionary;¹ such meaning should be applied to the context that some work is in the process of renewal.

b/ *sammati*: The Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* explains “*na sammatīti nappahoti*,”² and “*nappahoti*” is translated as “was not enough” by I. B. Horner in the previous item; dictionaries show no conflicts with her choice. If we take *sammati* as a passive verb, √*sam* + *ya* + *ti* (to be calm, to be ceased, to be purified); we could also arrive at the same interpretation. So I keep the explanation of the Sub-Commentary and I. B. Horner’s translation for this, which is “was not enough.”

¹ PED. 348.

² VT. III, 354.

c/ *daṇḍaparissāvanam* and *ottharakam*: Besides the three instruments used to filter the water mentioned above, *parissāvanam*, *kaṭacchuparissāvanam*, and *dhammakarakam*; there are two others that were more efficient in producing a vast amount of water, *daṇḍaparissāvanam* and *ottharakam*. The Commentary gives descriptions about the two:

daṇḍaparissāvanan ti rajakānaṃ khāraparissāvanam viya catūsu pādesu bandhanissethikāya sātakaṃ bandhitvā majjhe daṇḍake udakaṃ āsiñcitabbaṃ. taṃ ubho 'pi koṭṭhāse pūretvā parissāvati. *ottharikam* nāma yaṃ udake ottharivā ghaṭena udakaṃ gaṇhanti, taṃ hi catūsu daṇḍakesu vatthaṃ bandhitvā udake cattāro khānūke nikhaṇitvā tesu bandhitvā sabbe pariyante udakato mocetvā majjhe ottharivā ghaṭena udakaṃ gaṇhanti.¹

I am not able to figure out how these two look like. However, Ven. Thanissaro has an explanation about them; so I quote his words here:

For straining large amounts of water, two methods are allowed: The first is using a water-strainer mounted on sticks. This, according to the Commentary, is like a dyer's strainer for lye-water: a ladder with four steps is placed over a basin, with cloth draped over the steps. Water is poured in the middle section, between steps two and three, and then flows through the cloth to fill the sections of the basin on either side.

The second allowance is for using a filter cloth spread in the water (of a lake, river, or other large body of water). The Commentary's directions: tie a filter cloth to four stakes, let it sag in the middle to below the surface of the water, and take water from the filtered water in the middle above the cloth.²

Ven. Thanissaro only gives interpretations for these two kinds of strainers, "a water-strainer mounted on sticks" and "a filter cloth to be spread in the water,"³ but not specific terms. So I take the opportunity to speculate the meaning of *daṇḍaparissāvanam* as "stick-strainer" and *ottharakam* as "a net-strainer."

--ooOoo--

¹ VA. VI, 1207.

² Tha. II, 36.

³ *Ibid.* 40.

200. *parikammaṃ, jantāgharaṃ, kukkuccāyati* (BD. V, 168):

Now at that time monks were doubtful about doing a service both when in a bathroom and in the water.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū jantāghare pi udake pi parikammaṃ kātuṃ kukkuccāyanti. (Vin. II, 122)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time monks had doubts about performing (back-) rubbing when in a sauna and also in the water.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *parikammaṃ*: As mentioned previously, *parikammaṃ* is the act of scrubbing or rubbing off the dirt. See also *piṭṭhiparikammaṃ* § 179.

b/ *jantāgharaṃ*: is not a common bathroom but a place where one can have a steam bath.¹ I prefer the translation of *jantāgharaṃ* as “sauna” given by Ven. Thanissaro.²

c/ *kukkuccāyati*: is a denominative verb from *kukkuccaṃ*, which is a “mental agitation (arising from anxiety that one has done or might do wrong, or might fail to do right); a feeling of guilt; remorse; worried (over-)scrupulousness.”³ In this context, the verb *kukkuccāyati* is translated as “to be doubtful” by I. B. Horner and “to have scruples” by Ven. Thanissaro, but “to have doubts” by me.

--ooOoo--

201. *kāretuṃ & kattuṃ* (BD. V, 169, 170):

Now at that time a certain layfollower was anxious to build a tank for an Order.

¹ CPED. 108; PED. 278.

² Tha. II, 99, 102.

³ DOP. 699.

...

Now at that time a certain monk was anxious to build a bathroom with a curving roof for an Order.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro upāsako saṃghassa atthāya pokkharaniṃ kāretukāmo hoti. (Vin. II, 122-123)

...

tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu saṃghassa atthāya nillekhaṃ jantāgharam kattukāmo hoti (*Ibid.* 123)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time a certain layfollower was anxious (to cause) to build a tank for the sake of the Order.

...

Now at that time a certain monk was anxious to build a sauna with a curving roof for the sake of the Order.

DISCUSSION:

kāretuṃ & kattuṃ: One thing needs to emphasize here is the difference between the two infinitives *kāretuṃ* and *kattuṃ* (found in *kāretukāmo* and *kattukāmo*): both are derived from the verb *karoti* ($\sqrt{\text{kar}}$, to do, to perform, etc.) but the former has a causative meaning, i.e. the layfollower orders others to build, whereas the latter has an active meaning, i. e. the monk himself is going to build it.

--ooOoo--

202. Dative vs. Genitive (BD. V, 173):

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Because of this, monks, let the Order turn the Licchavi Vaddha’s bowl upside down, let it impose non-eating with the Order.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho bhagavā bhikkhū āmantesi: tena hi bhikkhave saṃgho Vaḍḍhassa
Licchavissa pattam nikkujjatu asambhogam saṃghena karotu. (Vin. II, 125)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Because of this, monks, let the Order turn the bowl upside down to Licchavi Vaḍḍha and make him have no communal benefit with the Order.

DISCUSSION:

Dative vs. Genitive: The interesting issue here is to deciding the case of “*Vaḍḍhassa Licchavissa*” whether they are in dative or genitive case, I. B. Horner’s choice is the latter. An objection to her choice could be explained that Vaḍḍha Licchavi was a layperson, so that he did not have a begging bowl. Moreover, Vaḍḍha Licchavi, in this incident, had made a fault accusation against the venerable Dabba Mallaputta, who was an Arahat, so that the Order obeying the command of the Buddha decided not to have any communion with him, either to teach him the *Dhamma* or to receive gifts from him; that is the sense of turning the bowl upside down TO him. Ven. Thanissaro makes this point very clearly in the transaction statement of the formal act for this case.¹

Similarly, the translation for the clause “*upāsakassa patto ukkujjitabbo*” should be revised as “the bowl should be turned upright TO him,” not “his bowl may be set upright.”²

For the term *asambhogam*, see the discussion for *sambhogam* at § 178.

--ooOoo--

203. *ajjho harati* (BD. V, 183):

Now at that time a certain monk was a ruminator, he ate ruminating continually. Monks ... spread it about, saying: “This monk is partaking of a meal at the wrong time.” Then these monks told this matter to the Lord. He said:

¹ Tha. II, 514.

² BD. V, 175.

“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 mouth to outside of it. Whoever should (so) eat should be dealt with according to the rule.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu romanthako hoti, so romanthitvā-romanthitvā ajjhoharati. bhikkhū ujjhāyanti khiyyanti vipācenti: vikāle ’yaṃ bhikkhu bhojanaṃ bhuñjatīti. bhagavato etaṃ atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. eso bhikkhave bhikkhu aciraṃ goyoniyā cuto. anujānāmi bhikkhave romanthakassa romanthanaṃ. na ca bhikkhave bahi mukhadvārā nīharitvā ajjhoharitabbaṃ. yo ajjhohareyya, yathādhammo kāretabbo ’ti. (Vin. II, 132)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time a certain monk was a ruminator, having ruminated continually he swallows. Monks ... spread it about, saying: “This monk is partaking of a meal at the wrong time.” 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, after taking anything out of the mouth one should not swallow (it). Whoever should swallow should be dealt with according to the rule.”

DISCUSSION:

ajjhoharati: Dictionaries gives both meanings “to swallow and to eat” to the term *ajjhoharati*.¹ I. B. Horner takes latter and I the former. In order to understand the context of the passage, we should take a look at the Commentary:

romaṭṭhakassā’ ti ettha ṭhapetvā romaṭṭhakaṃ sesānaṃ āgataṃ uggāraṃ mukhe santhāretvā gilantānaṃ āpatti. sace pana asantharitam eva paragalaṃ gacchati, vaṭṭati.² = *romaṭṭhakassa*: in this case, except for a ruminator, for the remaining ones

¹ PED. 13, DOP. 42; DOPL. 22.

² VA. VI, 1210.

who hold back spittle coming up in the mouth, to the ones who swallow (it) there is a transgression. In case that the spittle is not held back and it goes to the throat, it is all right.

The verb *gilati* (to swallow, to devour) and the noun *gala* (throat) found in the Commentary give me more confidence in my choice. Another approval is that Ven. Thanissaro translates *ajjhoharati* as “take in (ingest).”¹ See also § 60.

--ooOoo--

204. *karaṇīya, yāvadatthaṃ* (BD. V, 193):

“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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave sati karaṇīye porisiyaṃ rukkhaṃ abhirūhituṃ, āpadāsu yāvadatthan ti. (Vin. II, 138)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“I allow you, monks, to climb a tree to the height of a man if there is something ought to be done, (and) as high as necessary in cases of being in danger.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *karaṇīya*: is the future passive participle of the verb *karoti*; it can be used as an adjective or a noun with the meaning “something ought to be done.”

b/ *yāvadatthaṃ*: is an adverbial modifying the infinitive *abhirūhituṃ*. Here the meaning of *atthaṃ* is revised in order to fit in the context that in case of danger climbing up a tree in order to save one’s own life is necessary whether one likes it or not.

--ooOoo--

¹ Tha. II, 48.

205. *passāvaṃ karoti, vaccaṃ karoti* (BD. V, 196):

Now at that time monks relieved themselves here, there and everywhere in a monastery; the monastery was soiled.

...

Now at that time monks evacuated here, there and everywhere in a monastery; the monastery was soiled.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū ārāme taḥaṃ-taḥaṃ passāvaṃ karonti, ārāmo dussati. (Vin. II, 140)

...

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū ārāme taḥaṃ-taḥaṃ vaccaṃ karonti, ārāmo dussati. (*Ibid.* 141)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time monks urinated here and there in a monastery; the monastery was soiled.

...

Now at that time monks defecated here and there in a monastery; the monastery was soiled.

DISCUSSION:

This is just a matter of word choice.

--ooOoo--

206. *anta, santharati, Gerund* (BD. V, 196-197):

Sitting inside, they fell off. ... “I allow you, monks, to evacuate having spread (something) and made a hole in the middle.”

PĀLI TEXT:

ante nisinnā vaccaṃ karontā paripatanti. anujānāmi bhikkhave santharivā majjhe chiddaṃ katvā vaccaṃ kātun ti. (Vin. II, 141)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Sitting on the edge while defecating, they fell off. ... “I allow you, monks, to cover and make a hole in the middle (of the cesspool) then defecate.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *anta and santharati*: This excerpt is one part of the story telling how a cesspool in a monastery came into existence. At first, a monastery had no place for the monks to defecate. As the need of sanitation arrived, the Buddha allowed to build a cesspool and later step by step adjusted the construction for the sake of being more convenience. In order to make the passage more conveyable according to the context, I borrow from the work of Ven. Thanissaro two words that are alternative meanings of the two terms *anta* and *santharati* as “the edge” and “to cover” respectively:

(Defecating as they sat on the edge [of the cesspool], they fell in) ... “I allow that you defecate having covered [the cesspool] and put a hole in the middle.”¹

b/ **Gerund**: For a series of gerunds, I prefer to interpret and translate those gerunds complied with the character of the main *Pāli* verb or verbal,² in this case is the infinitive *kātuṃ*. See also § 56b, 73, 115b, 145c, 158, 160, 177a, 225.

--ooOoo--

207. olambanaka (BD. V, 197):

Now at that time a certain monk, weak through age, having evacuated, fell down as he getting up. They told matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a chair with supports.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu jarādubbalo vaccaṃ katvā vuṭṭhahanto paripatati. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave olambanakan ti.
(Vin. II, 141-142)

¹ Tha. II, 90.

² Wij. 23.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time a certain monk, weak through age, having evacuated, fell down as he getting up. They told matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow, monks, a hanger.”

DISCUSSION:

olambanaka: It seems that we have no specific translation for the term *olambanaka*. I. B. Horner takes the meaning given in the PED.;¹ Margaret Cone, in her dictionary, speculates the meaning referring to this passage: “something hanging down to be clung to;”² and Ven. Thanissaro translates the rule as: “I allow a sling (to pull oneself up with).”³ I think of something to hold when standing up, so I pick the English “hanger” as the equivalent for the term *olambanaka*.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER VI (SENĀSANAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

208. Textual - technical error, *iriyāpatha, pasīdati* (BD. V, 204):

Now at that time a (great) merchant of Rājagaha went early one morning to a pleasure grove. The (great) merchant of Rājagaha saw these monks going out from this and that place: from a forest, [from the root of a tree, from a hillside, from a glen, from a mountain cave, from a cemetery, from a forest glade, from the open air,]* from a heap of straw, (sic) and seeing them he made up his mind.

* The text between the two brackets [] is to be filled in by myself from previous part.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena Rājagahako seṭṭhi kālass’ eva uyyānaṃ agamāsi. addasā kho Rājagahako seṭṭhi te bhikkhū kālass’ eva tato-tato upanikkhamante arañña [rukkhamulā pabbatā kandarā giriguhā susānā vanapatthā ajjhokāsā palālapuñjā

¹ PED. 170.

² POD. 587.

³ Tha. II, 91.

pāsādikena abhikkantena paṭikkantena ālokitena vilokitena samiñjitena pasāritena okkhittacakkhū]* iriyāpathasampanne, disvān' assa cittaṃ pasīdi. (Vin. II, 146)

* The text between the two brackets [] is to be filled in by myself from previous part.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time a (great) merchant of Rājagaha went early one morning to a pleasure grove. The (great) merchant of Rājagaha saw these monks going out from this and that place: from a forest, from the root of a tree, from a hillside, from a glen, from a mountain cave, from a cemetery, from a forest glade, from the open air, from a heap of straw, pleasing when approaching and when receding, when looking before, when looking back, when bending back (their arms), when stretching them out, having eyes cast down and possessed of (good) deportment, seeing (that) he developed high regard for them.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Textual - technical error:** Filling up the repetition to be cut short in the *Pāli* text sometime is confusing; I. B. Horner left such a careless one in her translation, i.e. leaving out a long passage, i.e. “pleasing when approaching and when receding, when looking before, when looking back, when bending back (their arms), when stretching them out, having eyes cast down and possessed of pleasant behaviour,” at the place signaled by the sign “(sic).” I have come up with such statement after checking the Scriptures from other sources.¹

b/ *iriyāpatha*: I. B. Horner’s translation of *iriyāpatha* as “pleasant behaviour” seems not a good one. In fact, *iriyā* is the movement of the body and *patha* is a path, a way, a range of (in compound), so that *iriyāpatha* describes the four postures: walking, standing, sitting, and lying down. In *Pāli* Scriptures, “*iriyāpathasampanno*” is often used to describe a monk who has his body movement (deportment) combined with mindfulness, I translate the phrase as “being possessed of (good) deportment.”

¹ Be. Vol. 4, 290; BJTS. Vol. 5 (2), 128; Syā. Vol. 7, 85.

c/ *pasīdati*: Another case of word choice is that the interpretation of “*assa cittaṃ pasīdi*” as “he made up his mind” seems to be unsatisfactory to I. B. Horner so that she gives an alternative one for it in footnote “his mind became clear or bright,” but it also does not fit the context. In this case, the (great) merchant has the feeling of admiring, of respecting, of having faith in those monks. A literal translation could be “his mind was pleased,” but I think “to be pleased” does not convey successfully the state of mind in this context. So, I interpret the clause “*assa cittaṃ pasīdi*” as “he developed high regard for them,” keeping the same pattern as that of I. B. Horner.

--ooOoo--

209. *koṭi, santhara* (BD. V, 222):

... and seeing it, he approached 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

disvāna yena Jeto kumāro tenupasaṅkami, upasaṅkamtivā Jetam kumāraṃ etad avoca : dehi me ayyaputta uyyānaṃ ārāmaṃ kātun ti. adeyyo gahapati ārāmo api koṭisantharenā ti. (Vin. II, 158)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

... and seeing it, he approached 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 spreading of a ten million.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *koṭi*: I. B. Horner takes the meaning of *koṭi* as “a hundred thousand” given by the PED., but other dictionaries give “a ten million;” I follow the majority.

b/ *santhara*: There is no doubts that the noun *santhara* derives from the verb *santharati* (*saṃ* + *√thar*) having the basic meaning as “to spread; to strew; to cover with.”¹ I prefer to keep its literal meaning as “spreading” instead of the speculative translation “price” given by I. B. Horner.

--ooOoo--

210. Negative (BD. V, 226):

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Formerly, 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, polite to one another.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho bhagavā bhikkhū āmantesi : bhūtapubbaṃ bhikkhave Himavantapasse mahānigrodho ahosi, taṃ tayo sahāyā upanissāya vihariṃsu tittiro ca makkato ca hatthināgo ca. te aññaṃaññaṃ agāravā appatissā asabhāgavuttikā viharanti. (Vin. II, 161)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the Lord addressed the monks, saying: “Formerly, 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, being not courteous, not deferential, not polite to one another.

DISCUSSION:

Negative: Even I. B. Horner realizes that these three terms are found in other *Vinaya* books, but here for some unknown reason she gives wrong meanings (opposite ones) while in others she gives the correct ones: “not respectful, not deferential, not courteous.”² I am just to restore her translation for this passage. I also have the support from the translation of Ven.

¹ CPED. 261.

² BD. II, 190; IV, 106.

Thanissaro for the same story: “They were disrespectful, discourteous, and impolite toward one another.”¹

--ooOoo--

211. *amukasmim̐ okāse* (BD. V, 226):

“Then, monks, the monkey and the bull-elephant asked the partridge: ‘You, friend, what long-ago thing do you remember?’

“‘Friend, 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.’

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho bhikkhave makkaṭo ca hatthināgo ca tittiraṃ pucchimsu : tvam̐ samma kim̐ porāṇaṃ sarasīti. amukasmim̐ sammā okāse mahānigrodho ahoṣi, tato ahaṃ ekaṃ phalaṃ bhakkhitvā imasmim̐ okāse vaccaṃ akāsim̐, tassāyaṃ nigrodho jāto. tadā p’ ahaṃ sammā jātiyā mahantataro ’ti. (Vin. II, 161-162)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Then, monks, the monkey and the bull-elephant asked the partridge: ‘You, friend, what long-ago thing do you remember?’

“‘Friend, in that specific place there was a great banyan. I, having eaten one of its fruits, relieved myself in this place, and this banyan has grown from that. So I, friends, am the eldest by birth.’

DISCUSSION:

amukasmim̐ okāse: Even though the meaning “a certain” for *amuka* can be found in both dictionaries of the PTS. beside “such a one, this or that,” such meaning should be avoided in the context of this story due to the reason that three animals surely knew where the great

¹ Tha. II, 96.

banyan was standing. Ven. Thanissaro translates the phrase “*amukasmim okāse*” as “over there in that spot.”¹ See also § 50d, 146a.

--ooOoo--

212. *pavārito, paṭibāhati* (BD. V, 231):

“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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

na bhikkhave vippakatabhojane bhikkhu vuṭṭhāpetabbo. yo vuṭṭhāpeyya āpatti dukkaṭassa. sace vuṭṭhāpeti pavārito ca hoti, gaccha udakaṃ āharā ’ti vattabbo. evaṃ ce taṃ labhetha icc etaṃ kusalaṃ, no ce labhetha sādhukaṃ sitthāni gilitvā vuḍḍhatarassa āsanaṃ dātabbaṃ. na tv evāhaṃ bhikkhave kenaci pariyāyena vuḍḍhatarassa bhikkhuno āsanaṃ paṭibāhitabban ti vadāmi. yo paṭibāheyya āpatti dukkaṭassāti.” (Vin. II, 165)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“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 turn (another) away who is done with eating, that one should be told, ‘Go and fetch water.’ If this is thus accomplished, that is good; if it is not accomplished, (that one) should swallow lumps of boiled rice properly then offer his seat to a senior monk. However, monks, I do not say that a seat of a senior monk should be withheld by any way. Whoever should withhold (a seat of a senior monk), there is an offence of wrong-doing.”

¹ Tha. II, 97.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *pavārito*: As being discussed previously, the verb *pavāreti* can have the meaning either “to cause to choose, to invite, to perform the Invitation ceremony” or “to refuse, to reject” depending on the context. The Commentary just gives an explanation for the sentence containing the ppp. *pavārito*, but has no specific meaning for it:

*pavārito ca hotī 'ti yaṃ so vuṭṭhāpeti, ayañ ce bhikkhu pavārito hoti, tena vattabbo gaccha udakaṃ āharā' ti*¹ = He turn a bhikkhu away if that one is satisfied (done with eating). He should say: “Go and fetch water.”

So in the context of a monk, being satisfied with the eating, rejects to take more food offered, figurative meanings for the ppp. *pavārito* such as “being satisfied, relinquishing eating, done with eating, etc.” should be chosen. See also § 62, 159.

b/ *paṭibāhati*: The PED. says that *paṭibāheti* is the causative form of *paṭibāhati* but has the same meaning “[paṭi + bāh of bahis adv. outside] to ward off, keep off, shut out, hold back, refuse, withhold, keep out, evade.”²

According to Childers, the verb *paṭibāhati* and *paṭibāheti* has the meaning as “to put away, reject, avert, repel” and the root equivalent in Sanskrit is *prati + √vāh*.³

Whereas the dictionary of Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta says: “*paṭibāhati* (paṭi + vah + a), to ward off; to evade; to keep off; to refuse.”⁴

It seems to me that the meanings given are not consistent among dictionaries so that we should take look at some excerpts from the *Vinaya* context with the meanings given by I. B. Horner in quotation marks:

- The nun Thullanandā “held back” (delayed) a legally valid division of robe-material of the nun.⁵

¹ VA. VI, 1222.

² PED. 397.

³ DOPL. 358.

⁴ CPED. 158.

⁵ Vin. IV, 284; BD. III, 296.

- or she “held back” (prevented) a legally valid removal of the *kaṭhina* privileges.¹

- In the answer of the Buddha to the question whether it is allowable or not allowable to something that the Buddha has not decided yet, *paṭibāhati* has the meaning “to go against.”²

- In the context of valuating a monk about his knowledge, it seems to have the meaning as “to grasp, to seize, to cling to”:

so atthaṃ asallakkhento byañjanacchāyāya atthaṃ paṭibāhati = not considering the meaning, he holds back the meaning under the shadow of the letter.³

- In the context of privileges according to seniority, *paṭibāhati* is translated as “to reserve”:

yo paṭibāheyya āpatti dukkaṭassā ’ti. = Whoever should (so) reserve it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁴

- But it is translated as “to withhold” in the context of taking away something from a senior monk even though both share the same pattern:

yo paṭibāheyya āpatti dukkaṭassā ’ti. = Whoever should withhold it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.⁵

- In the case of occupying something for one’s own use, *paṭibāhati* is also translated as “to reserve”:

anujānāmi bhikkhave vassānaṃ temāsaṃ paṭibāhituṃ, utukālaṃ pana na paṭibāhituṃ ti. = I allow you, monks, to reserve it for the three months of the rains, but not to reserve it for the dry season.⁶

I. B. Horner seems to be struggling in finding a consistent meaning for the verb. I am also showing here the interpretation by Ven. Thanissaro for reference:

¹ Vin. IV, 288; BD. III, 302.

² *Ibid.* I, 250; *Ibid.* IV, 347.

³ *Ibid.* II, 97; *Ibid.* V, 130.

⁴ *Ibid.* II, 162; *Ibid.* V, 227.

⁵ *Ibid.* I, 356; *Ibid.* IV, 509.

⁶ *Ibid.* II, 173; *Ibid.* V, 243.

“When the meal is unfinished, a bhikkhu should not be made to get up. Whoever should make him get up: an offense of wrong doing. If he makes one who has been invited (and refused further food) get up, he is to be told, ‘Go fetch water for me.’ If that can be managed, well and good. If not, then having properly swallowed his rice (i.e., the food in his mouth) he should give his seat to the more senior bhikkhu. But in no way should a seat of a senior bhikkhu be laid claim to. Whoever should do so: an offense of wrong doing.”¹

I take the meaning of the verb *paṭibāhati* as “to withhold” for my proposed translation.

--ooOoo--

213. *samānāsānika* (BD. V, 237):

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bahū bhikkhū āyasmato Upālissa santike ṭhitakā uddesaṃ patimānentā kilamanti. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave samānāsānikehi saha nisīditun ti. atha kho bhikkhūnaṃ etad ahoṣi : kittāvatā nu kho samānāsāniko hotīti. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave tivassantarena saha nisīditun ti. (Vin. II, 169)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 together with those entitled to an equal seat.” Then it occurred to monks: “Now, in respect of

¹ Tha. II, 102.

what is one entitled to an equal seat? They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “I allow you, monks, to sit down together with one who is within three years (of your) standing.”

DISCUSSION:

samānāsanika: Apparently I. B. Horner takes the meaning of *samānāsanika* from the PED. under the entry of *samāna*: “entitled to seat of the same height.”¹

Following the explanation of Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta about secondary derivation (*taddhita*),² and according to *sandhi* rule, *samānāsanika* can be analyzed as “*samāna* + *āsana* + *ika*” having the meaning as “one who belongs to an equal/same/similar seat.”

I also present the translation of Ven. Thanissaro for reference: “I allow you to sit together (on the same piece of furniture) with those entitled to an equal seat. . . . I allow you to sit together with one within three years of standing.”³

I take Ven. Thanissaro’s words for my proposed translation, i.e. I prefer the meaning of *samānāsanika* as “one entitled to an equal seat” to “one entitled to seat of the same height.”

--ooOoo--

214. *pacchimaṃ* (BD. V, 237):

He said: “I allow you monks, except with 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).”

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave ṭhapetvā paṇḍakam mātugāmaṃ ubhatovyañjanakam
asamānāsanikehi saha dīghāsane nisīditun ti. atha kho bhikkhūnaṃ etad ahoṣi:
kittakapacchimaṃ nu kho dīghāsanam hotī ti. anujānāmi bhikkhave yaṃ tiṇṇam
pahoti ettakapacchimaṃ dīghāsanam ti. (Vin. II, 169)

¹ PED. 685.

² A. P. Bud., part II, 141-143; Warder 253-254.

³ Tha. II, 101.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

He said: “I allow you monks, except with a eunuch, a woman, a hermaphrodite, to sit down on a long seat with those not entitled to an equal seat.” Then it occurred to the monks: “Now, what is the minimum (length) of a ‘long seat’?”

“I allow, monks, a ‘long seat’ having the minimum (length) that suffices (to seat) three (persons).”

DISCUSSION:

pacchimaṇ: According to the PED. *pacchima* is the superlative form of *pacchā* (behind, after), and its meaning is “hindmost, aftermost, backmost, the last.”¹ So that in case of height it should be understood as “the lowest” and in case of length “the shortest.” A similar logical conclusion could be drawn from the context also. Moreover, I have the confirmation of such choice from the translation of Ven. Thanissaro: “I allow one sufficient for three people as the smallest long seat.”²

--ooOoo--

215. Syntactic - parallel structure (BD. V, 248):

If there comes to be ghee or oil or honey or molasses for an Order, it may be given to be partaken of at once; 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

sace hoti saṃghassa sappi vā telaṃ vā madhu vā phāṇitaṃ vā, sakiṃ paṭisāyitum dātabbaṃ, sace puna pi attho hoti, puna pi dātabbaṃ, sace puna pi attho hoti, puna pi dātabban ti. (Vin. II, 177)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

If there comes to be ghee or oil or honey or molasses for an Order, it should be given to be partaken of at once; if there is more benefit again, it should be also given again; if there is more benefit again, it should be also given again.

¹ PED. 386.

² Tha. II, 101.

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - parallel structure: The meaning of the noun *attho* in nominative case of the last clause is varied. I. B. Horner takes its meaning as “need” then translates the clause accordingly, i.e. “if any monk has more need, the good should be given again to him.” Ven. Thanissaro also has the same thought: “If the Community has ghee, oil, honey, molasses, an individual is to be given one sip. If he has need of more, he is to be given another. If he has need of still more, he is to be given yet another.”¹

However, if we pay attention to the parallel construction of the previous clause, the nominative *attho* is in the place of *sappi*, or *telam*, or *honey*, or *molasses*, so that the meaning of the second *sace* clause should be “if there is more ghee or oil or honey or molasses accrued to the Order, it should be also given again” (to every monks not to the one who has the need). The issue I am trying to raise here is that the monk who is the disposer of trifles (*appamattakavissajjako*) should distribute the goods, i.e. ghee or oil or honey or molasses, to the monks each time the goods are accrued to the Order, not because of the need of the monks. I prefer to translate *attho* in this case as “benefit, good, thing.”

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER VII (SAṄGHABHEDAKAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

216. *pi, imam, atthavasam* (BD. V, 258-259):

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, dependent on others, with a mind become as a wild creature's. This, Lord, was the circumstance I was

¹ Tha. II, 331.

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!’”

PĀLI TEXT:

etarahi kho panāhaṃ bhante araññagato pi rukkhamūlagato pi suññāgāragato pi abhīto anubbiggo anussāṅkī anutrasto appossukko pannalomo paradattavutto migabhūtena cetasā viharāmi. imaṃ kho ahaṃ bhante atthavasam sampassamāno araññagato pi rukkhamūlagato pi suññāgāragato pi abhikkhaṇaṃ udānaṃ udānemi : aho sukhaṃ aho sukhaṃ ti. (Vin. II, 184)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

But now, Lord, although being gone to a forest, although being gone to the root of a tree, although being gone to an empty place, I, being unafraid, not anxious, not fearful, not alarmed, unconcerned, unruffled, dependent on others, live with the mind having the state of a wild creature. Oh Lord, while realizing this reason, although being gone to a forest, although being gone to the root of a tree, although being gone to an empty place, I constantly uttered this utterance, ‘Ah, what happiness! Ah, what happiness!’”

DISCUSSION:

Here I am just replacing I. B. Horner’s translation with a more literal one in order to reveal the main and subordinate clauses of this passage.

a/ *pi*: The emphatic particle *pi*, in this case, should be in the role of a conjunction more than a preposition as shown in I. B. Horner’s translation. It should be noticed that the main verb of the first sentence should be “I live” (*viharāmi*), not “I am” because the series of adjectivals “*abhīto anubbiggo anussāṅkī anutrasto appossukko pannalomo paradattavutto*” is to describe the mental state of the venerable Bhaddhiya while he was staying in such places.

b/ *imaṃ*: in the next sentence is an demonstrative adjective modifying the noun *atthavasam*, not a pronoun as shown in I. B. Horner’s interpretation.

c/ *atthavasam*: I take it as an direct object of the present participle *sampassamāno* and prefer to take its meaning as “reason, motive” given by Cone with the reference to this very passage.¹

--ooOoo--

217. *aññatr’ eva* (BD. V, 278):

Then the venerable Ānanda, 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 to the Lord and in contradistinction to the Order of monks and will (so) carry out (formal) acts of the Order.”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho āyasmā Ānando pubbaṅhasamayam nivāsetvā pattacīvaram ādāya Rājagahaṃ piṇḍāya pāvisi. addasā kho Devadatto āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ Rājagahe piṇḍāya carantaṃ, disvāna yenāyasmā Ānando ten’ upasaṃkami, upasaṃkamtivā āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ etad avoca : ajjatagge dān’ āhaṃ āvuso Ānanda aññatr’ eva bhagavatā, aññatr’ eva bhikkhusaṃghā uposathaṃ karissāmi saṃghakammaṃ karissāmīti. (Vin. II, 198)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the venerable Ānanda, 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, reverend Ānanda, I will carry out Observance, I will carry out (formal) acts of the Order absolutely apart from the Lord, absolutely apart from the Order.”

¹ DOP. 75.

DISCUSSION:

aññatr' eva: I. B. Horner states in footnote that the phrase “in contradistinction to” is the translation for “*aññatr' eva*.” Whereas Cone in her dictionary gives the meaning of *aññatra* as “but for, besides, except, apart from; without (with abl. or instr. [and acc.?]).”¹ To illustrate Cone’s point, I am to show two examples having the term *aññatra*, one from the *pārājika* IV “*aññatra adhimānā* = apart from the undue estimate of himself,”² and the other from the *saṅghādisesa* I “*aññatra supinantā* = except during a dream.”³

And the emphatic particle “*eva*” is just to emphasize the meaning of *aññatra*.

Reading the translation of I. B. Horner, I have the thought that the phrase “in contradistinction to” seems to depict that Devadatta might have conducted his business in a different and opposite way comparing to that of the Buddha; but that is not the case, the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* explains:

Tattha *aññatreva bhagavatā*ti vinā eva bhagavantaṃ, taṃ satthāraṃ akatvāti attho. *Aññatra bhikkhusaṅghā uposathaṃ karissāmi saṅghakammāni cāti* bhagavato ovādakāraṃ bhikkhusaṅghaṃ vinā maṃ anuvattantehi bhikkhūhi saddhim āveṇikaṃ uposathaṃ saṅghakammāni ca karissāmi.⁴ = In that case, “*aññatreva bhagavatā*” means “absolutely without the Blessed One, not having the Master.” “*Aññatra bhikkhusaṅghā uposathaṃ karissāmi saṅghakammāni ca*” means “I will carry out independent Observance and (formal) acts of the Order with the monks who are following me without the Order of monks who obeys the instruction of the Blessed One.”

Another observation is that in this passage the two phrases “*aññatr' eva bhagavatā*, *aññatr' eva bhikkhusaṅghā*” go along with both independent clauses containing two distinct finite verbs “*karissāmi*.”

--ooOoo--

¹ DOP. 46.

² Vin. III, 91; BD. I, 159.

³ *Ibid.* 112; *Ibid.* 196.

⁴ VṬ. III, 378.

CHAPTER VIII (VATTAKKHANDHAKAM):

218. Textual - missing translation (BD. V, 292):

Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance for incoming monks which should be observed by incoming monks.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena hi bhikkhave āgantukānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ vattaṃ paññapessāmi yathā āgantukehi bhikkhūhi sammā vattitabbaṃ. (Vin. II, 207)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Well then, monks, I will lay down an observance for incoming monks which should be observed properly by incoming monks.

DISCUSSION:

Textual - missing translation (*sammā*): The indeclinable *sammā* is missing from I. B. Horner's translation. It has the equivalent in Sanskrit as *samyak* and the meaning given in the PTS. dictionary as "thoroughly, properly, rightly; in the right way, as it ought to be, best, perfectly (opp. *micchā*)."¹

The translation of *sammā* is also not seen in other similar passages.

--ooOoo--

219. Syntactic - punctuation & sharing object (BD. V, 299):

"If the time is announced in a monastery, (a monk), having dressed with the inner robe all round him for covering the three circles, having tied on 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 a village carefully and unhurriedly.

¹ PED. 695.

PĀLI TEXT:

sace ārāme kālo ārocito hoti timaṇḍalaṃ paṭicchādentena parimaṇḍalaṃ nivāsetvā,
kāyabandhanaṃ bandhitvā, saṅgaṇaṃ katvā, saṃghāṭiyo pārūpitvā, gaṇṭhikaṃ
paṭimuñcitvā, dhovivā, pattamaṃ gahetvā, sādhukaṃ ataramānena gāmo pavisitabbo.
(Vin. II, 213)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“If the time is announced in a monastery, (a monk), having dressed with the inner robe all round him for covering the three circles, having tied on his waistband, having made (his upper robe) a lining then put on his outer robes (two robes), having fastened the block, having washed and taken the bowl, he may enter a village carefully and unhurriedly.

DISCUSSION:

This item should be discussed previously in the chapter concerning the Vinaya book *Mahāvagga*, but I postpone it for now due to there are some issues relating to it found in the book *Cullavagga*. One thing should be noticed is that punctuation plays an important role in figuring out the meaning of a *Pāli* passage. Thanks to a hint from the book of Ven. Thanissaro, I am able to find out two similar passages in the two Vinaya books *Mahāvagga* and *Cullavagga*, i. e. “kāyabandhanaṃ dātabbaṃ, saṅgaṇaṃ katvā saṃghāṭiyo dātabbā, dhovivā patto saudako dātabbo”¹ in order to solve the two problems presented here:

a/ **Syntactic - punctuation:** Let’s take this excerpt “*saṅgaṇaṃ katvā saṃghāṭiyo pārūpitvā*” into consideration: Without a comma (,) placed between the two gerunds *katvā* and *pārūpitvā*, it seems to be easier to catch the context of the passage. First of all, we need to specify the terminology for the three robes of a monk, which are *antarāsāvakaṃ* (inner robe), *uttarāsāṅgaṃ* (upper robe), and *saṅghāṭi* (outer robe, or outer cloak as called by Ven. Thanissaro). The monk in the description above, before going to the village, wore his inner robe and tied his waistband, after that put his upper robe and outer robe together then covered

¹ Vin. I, 46; II, 223.

himself with both robes. Such conclusion is based on the explanations from the Commentary also from the Sub-Commentary for the *Pāli* passage in *Mahāvagga*, not from the one above:

saguṇaṃ katvā 'ti dve cīvarāni ekato katvā, tā ekato katvā dve pi saṅghāṭiyo dātabbā. sabbaṃ pi hi cīvaraṃ saṅghāṭitattā saṅghāṭi 'ti vuccati. tena vuttaṃ *saṅghāṭiyo dātabbā* 'ti.¹ = having put two robes together; those, having put together, still are two (so that) *saṅghāṭiyo* (in plural) should be given. Due to the reason that every robe has the state of being binding together, so that a robe is called “*saṅghāṭi*.” Therefore, it is said “*saṅghāṭiyo* (in plural) should be given.”²

Dve cīvarānīti pārupanaṃ saṅghāṭiṅca sandhāya vadati. Yadi evaṃ “saṅghāṭiyo”ti kasmā vuttanti āha “*sabbañhi cīvaraṃ saṅghāṭitattā saṅghāṭi vuccati*”ti.³ = “Two robes” means to talk about an upper robe and an outer robe. If it is thus, why it is called outer robes (*saṅghāṭiyo* in plural)? So Buddhaghosa said “*Due to the reason that every robe has the state of being binding together, so that a robe is called 'saṅghāṭi'.*”

b/ Syntactic - punctuation and sharing object: Now this is the turn to consider about this excerpt “*dhovivā pattaṃ gahetvā*”: Again, the *Pāli* version of the PTS. places a comma (,) in between so that I. B. Horner translates as “having washed, having taken the bowl.” A question may arise here, e.g. “What thing did the monk wash, his hands or his body?” “Is there any clue in her translation specifying that the monk washed his bowl then took it?” The answer is “None.”

Taking the phrase “*dhovivā pattaṃ gahetvā*” quoted above into consideration and applying the sentence pattern to this item, i.e. “*dhovivā pattaṃ gahetvā*,” we can arrive at the conclusion that the two gerunds *dhovivā* and *gahetvā* share the same direct object *pattaṃ* in accusative case. Such phenomenon happens a lot in the *Pāli* Scriptures, but it is difficult to recognize the sentence structure in this case. So the picture in this passage is that the monk washed the bowl then carried it along to the village for alms-food.

¹ VA. V, 978.

² Cf. footnote 2 (BD. IV, 60).

³ VṬ. III, 211.

I also quote the translation of Ven. Thanissaro for a comparison:

If the time is announced in the monastery, having put on the under robe wrapped all around him, covering the three circles, having tied his waistband, having made the upper robe a lining for the outer cloak, having put on the outer cloak, having fastened the fastener, having washed (the bowl), having taken the bowl, he should enter the village properly and unhurriedly.¹

--ooOoo--

220. *bhāṇavāra* (BD. V, 301):

The First Portion for Repeating.

PĀLI TEXT:

bhāṇavāraṃ paṭhamaṃ. (Vin. II, 215)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The First Portion for Recital.

DISCUSSION:

bhāṇavāra: This is perhaps just a typo. In another place, I. B. Horner gives the translation as “The First Portion for Recital” for the same phrase.² According to dictionaries, *bhāṇa* is a derivative from the verb *bhaṇati* ($\sqrt{bhaṇ}$ + *a* + *ti*) having the meaning as “to speak, to tell, to preach,” and *bhāṇavāra* is “a section of the Scriptures, divided into such for purposes of recitation.”³ Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta says that a *bhāṇavāra* contains 8,000 letters.⁴

--ooOoo--

221. *nivesanaṃ, iminā* (BD. V, 302):

When he is going amid the houses he should consider: “I will enter in this (fashion), I will leave in this.”

¹ Tha. II, 113.

² BD. V, 343.

³ PED. 501.

⁴ CPED. 198.

PĀLI TEXT:

nivesanaṃ pavisantena sallakkhetabbaṃ iminā pavisissāmi iminā nikkhamissāmīti.
(Vin. II, 216)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

While entering a dwelling-place, he should consider: “I will enter by this way, I will go out by this way.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *nivesanaṃ*: I. B. Horner uses the phrase “amid[st] the houses” for the translation of “*antaraghare*” in many places, especially in the context relating to the *sekhiya* rules.¹ In the story leading to the regulation of this rule, she translates “dwelling” for the term *nivesanaṃ*, so I restore the word “dwelling” in my proposed translation, i.e. a dwelling-place, instead of “amid the houses.” One more thing is that the present participle *pavisantena* of the verb *pavisati* (*pa + √vis + a + ti*) is in the case of an instrumental of agent.

b/ *iminā*: This interpretation of this term is to be decided by the context of the introductory story; it mentions a location, a route to enter, not the manner while entering. I take the idea from the work of Ven. Thanissaro: “When entering a house compound he should observe, ‘I will enter by this way and leave by this way’.”²

--ooOoo--

222. *ubbhujitvā & ubbhujitabbaṃ, paṭicchādetabbaṃ* (BD. V, 311):

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.

...

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

¹ BD. III, 121 ff..

² Tha. II, 113.

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

cīvaravaṃse vā cīvararajjuyā vā cīvaraṃ nikkhipitvā sādhukaṃ ataramānena vaccakuṭī pavisitabbā. nātisahasā pavisitabbā, na ubbhujitvā pavisitabbā, vaccapādukāya ṭhitena ubbhujitabbam. (Vin. II, 222)

...

vaccapādukāya ṭhitena paṭicchādetabbam. nātisahasā nikkhamitabbam, na ubbhujitvā nikkhamitabbam. ācamanapādukāya ṭhitena ubbhujitabbam. na capucapukārakaṃ ācametabbam, na ācamanasarāvake udakaṃ sesetabbam. ācamanapādukāya ṭhitena paṭicchādetabbam. (*Ibid.*)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 pulling up (one's inner robe). Standing on the privy shoes one should pull up (one's inner robe).

...

One should cover himself while standing on the privy shoes. One should not depart too hastily. One should not depart pulling up (one's inner robe). Standing on the rinsing shoes one should pull up (one's inner robe). One should not rinse smacking lips. One should not leave water in the saucer for rinsing (-water). One should cover himself while standing on the rinsing shoes.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *ubbhujitvā & ubbhujitabbam*: I. B. Horner gives two different meanings to the two terms *ubbhujitvā* and *ubbhujitabbam*, forcibly and firmly respectively; perhaps she was misled by the definition given in the PED.¹ Apparently both of them derive from the same

¹ PED. 154.

origin, *ud* + \sqrt{bhuj} , Cone gives its meaning as “pull up (one’s clothes),” which is similar to the one given by Ven. A. P. Buddhadatta.¹

b/ *paṭicchādetabbam*: is the future passive participle of the verb *paṭicchādeti* (causative form of *paṭi* + \sqrt{chad}) having the meaning as “to cover over, to conceal.” Such meaning fits the context that one should cover himself before going out of the toilet. I am not able to figure out where I. B. Horner gets the meaning of it as “should get rid of it.” For the translation of this excerpt, I also have the support from the work of Ven. Thanissaro.²

One technical error should be noticed here is that the tone of the instruction changes from “one” in the first passage to “you” in the second, perhaps it is due to the carelessness while copying a similar part from somewhere else.

--ooOoo--

223. *patto saudako* (BD. V, 312):

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

sace upajjhāyo gāmaṃ pavisitukāmo hoti, nivāsanaṃ dātabbaṃ, paṭinivāsanaṃ paṭiggahetabbam, kāyabandhanaṃ dātabbaṃ, saṅgaṇaṃ katvā saṃghāṭiyo dātabbā,

¹ DOP. 502; CPOD. 65.

² Tha. II, 118.

dhovitvā patto saudako dātabbo. sace upajjhāyo pacchāsamaṇaṃ ākaṅkhati, timaṇḍalaṃ paṭicchādentena parimaṇḍalaṃ nivāsetvā kāyabandhanaṃ bandhitvā sagaṇaṃ katvā saṃghāṭiyo pārupitvā gaṅṭhikaṃ paṭimuñcitvā dhovitvā pattam gahetvā upajjhāyassa pacchāsamaṇena hotabbaṃ. (Vin. II, 223)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 made (his upper robe) a lining the outer robes are to be given (to him); (his) bowl should be washed then given (to him) while it is still wet. 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 made (his upper robe) a lining then having put on the outer robes, having fastened the ties, having washed and taken his bowl, should be the preceptor's attendant.

DISCUSSION:

patto saudako: At the first glance, the meaning of “*patto saudako*” seems to be simple, “a bowl with water, a bowl having water.” One would presume that the bowl has some water in it; but that is not the case. I. B. Horner, in a translation passage for *Mahāvagga*, gives her explanation about *saudako* in footnote: “*saudako* means with the drops of water remaining in the bowl after rinsing it, not drying it;” but she does not give the reference.¹ Ven. Thanissaro also explains: “Having rinsed out the bowl, give it to him while it is still wet (i.e., pour out as much of the rinsing water as possible, but don't wipe it dry.”² In order to clear out any doubt concerning the interpretation of the two translators, I am citing here an excerpt found in the *Cullavagga*:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū **saudakaṃ pattam** paṭisāmenti, patto dussati.
bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. na bhikkhave **saudako patto** paṭisāmetabbo. yo

¹ BD. IV, 60.

² Tha. II, 120.

paṭisāmeyya, āpatti dukkaṭassa. anujānāmi bhikkhave otāpetvā pattam paṭisāmetun ti. tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū **saudakaṃ pattam** otāpenti, patto duggandho hoti. bhagavato etam attham ārocesum. na bhikkhave **saudako patto** otāpetabbo. yo otāpeyya, āpatti dukkaṭassa. anujānāmi bhikkhave **vodakaṃ katvā** otāpetvā pattam paṭisāmetun ti. = 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. 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**, having dried it in the sun.¹

From this passage, there is the need of further speculation in order to decide the meaning of the term *saukado*: The first impression is that one is not going to put away his bowl or dry it under the sun when it contains a quantity of water in it, so that such interpretation should be eliminated.

Another question may arise in one’s mind is how to differentiate a bowl that is “*saudako*” and another that is in the state of “*vodakaṃ katvā*”? The latter should have the meaning of “completely out of water,” i. e. the bowl is dried with a cloth; so the possible answer left for a bowl “*saudako*” is a bowl that is wet, not the one having some water in it. However, I do not understand why a monk should give to his preceptor a bowl while it is still wet? Should it be the evidence that he did wash the bowl?

--ooOoo--

224. *bhaṇamāno* (BD. V, 312):

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.

¹ Vin. II, 113; BD. V, 153.

PĀLI TEXT:

na upajjhāyassa bhaṇamānassa antarantarā kathā opātetabbā. upajjhāyo āpattisāmantā bhaṇamāno nivāretabbo. (Vin. II, 223)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

When the preceptor is speaking, his words should not be interrupted in the middle. (But) if the preceptor is bordering on an offence while speaking, he should be warned.

DISCUSSION:

bhaṇamāno: The issue here is that who is the agent of the present participle, the preceptor or his pupil? I. B. Horner takes the latter, but I the former.

Another thing is that I. B. Horner seems to be confused while converting *nivāretabbo* into active voice in English, whereas the literal translation made by me states clearly that three nominative cases, i.e. *upajjhāyo*, *bhaṇamāno*, and *nivāretabbo*, refer merely to the preceptor; so the basic equivalent English pattern is “the preceptor, while speaking, should be warned.”

Ven. Thanissaro also has his interpretation about this excerpt:

Do not interrupt the preceptor when he is speaking. If he is bordering on an offense, one should speak in an indirect way so as to call him to his senses.¹

--ooOoo--

225. Gerund (BD. V, 313):

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

bhuttāvissa udakaṃ datvā pattam paṭiggahetvā nīcam katvā sādhuṃ aparighamsantena dhovitvā vodaṃ katvā muhuttam uṇhe otāpetabbo, na ca uṇhe patto nidahitabbo. (Vin. V, 223)

¹ Tha. II, 120.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

When (his preceptor) has eaten, he should give him water, then receive the bowl, lower it, wash it properly without rubbing it, clean out the water, and dry it for a short time in the sun's warmth, but a bowl should not be laid aside in the warmth.

DISCUSSION:

Gerund: The form “having + past participle” is a good equivalent for a literal translation of a gerund. However, in case a series of gerunds as this example, the repetition of such format makes the translation become clumsy, and sometime obscure. In such case, I prefer to put all of the gerunds in the tense and mode complying with the characteristics of the last verbal. See also § 56b, 73, 115b, 145c, 158, 160, 177a, 206b.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER IX (PĀTIMOKKHAṬṬHAPANAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

226. *cudito* (BD. V, 348):

“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?”

“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. The venerable one reprovved [about what is not fact, not about what is fact—you have no need for remorse. The venerable one reprovved with harshness, not with gentleness—you have no need for remorse. The venerable one reprovved with what is unconnected with the goal, not with what is connected with the goal—you have no need for remorse. 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.”

* The text between the two brackets [] is to be filled in by myself from previous part.

PĀLI TEXT:

adhammacuditakassa pana bhante bhikkhuno katīh’ ākārehi avippaṭisāro upadahātabbo ’ti. adhammacuditakassa Upāli bhikkhuno pañcah’ ākārehi avippaṭisāro upadahātabbo: akālenāyasmā cudito no kālena alan te avippaṭisārāya [abhūtenāyasmā cudito no bhūtena alan te avippaṭisārāya, pharusenāyasmā cudito no saṅghena alan te avippaṭisārāya, anattasamhitenāyasmā cudito no atthasamhitena alan te avippaṭisārāya,]* dosantarenāyasmā cudito no mettacittena alan te avippaṭisārāyā ’ti. adhammacuditakassa Upāli bhikkhuno imehi pañcah’ ākārehi avippaṭisāro upadahātabbo ’ti. (Vin. II, 250)

* The text between the two brackets [] is to be filled in by myself from previous part.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“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?”

“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 was reprovved at a wrong time, not at a right time—you have no need for remorse. The venerable one was reprovved about what is not fact, not about what is fact—you have no need for remorse. The venerable one was reprovved with harshness, not with gentleness—you have no need for remorse. The venerable one was reprovved with what is unconnected with the goal, not with what is connected with the goal—you have no need for remorse. The venerable one was 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.”

DISCUSSION:

cudito: Perhaps this is a mistake made by the copyist because I. B. Horner in footnote states clearly: “Here the one reprovved is being spoken to;” she means that the one who is

reproved is the listener in this case. Moreover, *codito* evidently is a past passive participle of the verb *codeti*, so that the translation must be placed in passive voice.

The same correction should be applied to a similar case in the next page.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER X (BHIKKHUNĪKHANDHAKAṀ):

227. *alaṃ Gotamī mā te rucci* (BD. V, 352):

As she was standing at a respectful distance, the Gotamid, Pajāpati the Great, spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, it were well that women should obtain the going forth from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”

“Be careful, Gotamī, of the going forth of women from home into homelessness in this *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”

PĀLI TEXT:

ekamantaṃ ʃitā kho Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī bhagavantaṃ etad avoca: sādhu bhante labheyya mātugāmo tathāgatappavedite dhammavinaye agāasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajjan ti. alaṃ Gotamī mā te rucci mātugāmassa tathāgatappavedite dhammavinaye agāasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajjā ’ti. (Vin. II, 253)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

As she was standing at a respectful distance, Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī spoke thus to the Lord:

“Lord, it were well that women should obtain the going forth from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”

“Enough, Gotamī, do not be interested in the going forth of women from home into homelessness in this *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”

DISCUSSION:

alam Gotami mā te ruc̥i: In this case, I. B. Horner seems to put aside her literal style in translating the Buddha’s warning to Mahāpajāpati Gotamī concerning the going forth of women. On the other hand, I am going to keep the common meaning “enough” for *alam* and “to be delighted, to be interested” for *ruc̥ati* ($\sqrt{ruc} + ya + ti$), so that a literal translation for it could be: “Enough, Gotami, let it not be delighted by you.” Whereas Ven. Thanissaro’s interpretation seems to be elaborated: “Enough, Gotami. Don’t advocate a woman’s going forth from the home life into homelessness in the Tathagata’s doctrine and discipline.”¹

There is nothing tricky for the sentence structure, it is just a matter of word choice.

--ooOoo--

228. *hi, eva* (BD. V, 353):

“Well now, Gotami, stay here a moment, 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena hi Gotami muhuttaṃ idh’ eva tāva hohi yāvāhaṃ bhagavantaṃ yācāmi
mātugāmassa tathāgatappavedite dhammavinaye agārasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajjan ti.
(Vin. II, 254)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“On account of that, Gotami, stay right here for a moment while I ask the Lord for the going forth of women from home into homelessness in the *dhamma* and discipline proclaimed by the Truth-finder.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *hi*: The indeclinable “*hi*” in this passage does not have the sense of an interjection as shown by I. B. Horner’s translation. For this, the Sanskrit - English Dictionary not only gives

¹ Tha. II, 405.

the meaning “for, because, on account of” to the indeclinable “*hi*” as that of the *Pāli* dictionaries.¹ but also a more thorough explanation that the indeclinable *hi* “never stand[s] first in a sentence, but generally after the first word and used enclitically, sometimes after pronoun ...”² See also 94b, 234.

b/ *eva*: is an emphatic particle having its affect on the previous word, in this case *idha* (here); so that *idh’ eva* should be translated as “right here.”

I also include here Ven. Thanissaro’s translation for reference: “In that case, Gotami, stay right here for a moment while I ask the Blessed One to allow a woman's Going-forth from the home life into homelessness in the Tathagata's doctrine and discipline.”³ See also § 122.

--ooOoo--

229. Imperative mood - *pañcamī* (BD. V, 354):

If, Ānanda, the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, accepts eight important rules, that may be ordination for her.

PĀLI TEXT:

sace Ānanda Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī ime at̐tha garudhamme paṭiggaṇhāti sā’ v’ assā hotu upasampadā ’ti. (Vin. II, 255)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

If, Ānanda, Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī accepts eight important rules, let that be the ordination for her.

DISCUSSION:

Imperative mood - *pañcamī*: Even though the imperative mood is used to express command, prayer, advice or wish,⁴ the first one, i.e. command should be applied in this case.

--ooOoo--

¹ PED. 731; CPED. 293; DOPL. 155.

² SED. 1297.

³ Tha. II, 406.

⁴ A. P. Bud. part I, 31.

230. Textual - missing translation (BD. V, 355):

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

ekamantaṃ nisinno kho āyasmā Ānando bhagavantaṃ etad avoca: paṭiggahitā bhante Mahāpajāpatigotamiyā aṭṭha garudhammā, upasampannā bhagavato mātucchā ’ti.
(Vin. II, 256)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

As he was sitting down at one side, the venerable Ānanda spoke thus to the Lord: “Lord, the eight important rules were accepted by Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī. The aunt of the Lord has been ordained.”

DISCUSSION:

Textual - missing translation: I. B. Horner missed the translation for the last sentence.

--ooOoo--

231. may’ amhā (BD. V, 357):

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho tā bhikkhuniyo Mahāpajāpatiṃ Gotamiṃ etad avocum: ayyā anupasampannā, may’ amhā upasampannā, evaṃ hi bhagavatā paññattaṃ: bhikkhūhi bhikkhuniyo upasampādetabbā ’ti. (Vin. II, 257)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then those nuns spoke thus to Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī: “Madam is not ordained, we are ordained, for it was thus laid down by the Lord: nuns should be ordained by monks.”

DISCUSSION:

may' amhā: We need to take look at the previous part of this story: Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī, after accepting the eight important rules from the venerable Ānanda and becoming a nun, came to the Buddha to ask Him about the case of other five hundred Sakyan women. The Buddha said: “*anujānāmi bhikkhave bhikkhūhi bhikkhuniyo upasampādetun ti* = I allow, monks, nuns to be ordained by monks;”¹ and the story continues with this excerpt. Even though it is not stated clearly in the Scriptures, the story implies that the ordination for the five hundred Sakyan women had been taken place before they came to see Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī and said to her that according to the regulation of the Buddha, only they were ordained but Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī was not. Hearing that, Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī came to the venerable Ānanda to tell him what the nuns said then Ānanda related it to the Buddha. The Buddha, again, confirmed that the act of accepting the eight important rules was the ordination for Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī. So that the negative sense “neither are we ordained” in the I. B. Horner’s translation should be rejected.

Coming back to the Scriptures, I do not know how to explain grammatically the phrase “*may' amhā*”? It is clearly that *amhā* is the first person, plural, present tense of the verb *atthi* (to be); but what does the contracted form “*may*” (in *may' amhā*) stand for? The Burmese and Thai Scriptures give “*mayañcamhā*” (= and we are); that seems grammatically correct.²

--ooOoo--

232. *yadaggena ... tadeva, upasampannā* (BD. V, 357):

“At the time, Ānanda, when the eight important rules were accepted by the Gotamid, Pajāpatī the Great, that was her ordination.”

¹ Vin. II, 257.

² Be. Vol. 4, 448; Syā. Vol. 7, 328.

PĀLI TEXT:

yadaggena Ānanda Mahāpajāpatigotamiyā aṭṭha garudhammā paṭiggahitā, tad eva sā upasampannā 'ti. (Vin. II, 257)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“From the moment, Ānanda, when the eight important rules were accepted by Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī, she was ordained from that very moment.”

DISCUSSION:

a/ *yadaggena ... tadeva*: The instrumental case *aggena* has the meaning “beginning from, according to;”¹ so that the phrase “*yadaggena ... tadeva*” in this case denotes the starting point of a specific time, i.e. the moment that the eight important rules were accepted by Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī.

b/ *upasampannā*: is not a noun, in fact it is the past passive participle of *upasampajjati* and the noun derived from it is *upasampadā* (ordination). So that in this case the literal translation for “*upasampannā*” should be “to be ordained.”

--ooOoo--

233. pi (BD. V, 362):

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) act and those who had committed an offence.

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū bhikkhunīnaṃ adhikaraṇaṃ vūpasamenti, tasmim kho pana adhikaraṇe vinicchiyamāne dissanti bhikkhuniyo kammappattāyo pi āpattigāminiyo pi. (Vin. II, 261)

¹ POD. 10.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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 not only the nuns who were entitled to take part in a (formal) act but also those who had committed an offence.

DISCUSSION:

pi: In this case, *pi* (indeclinable) is an enclitic form of *api* having the meaning as “also, and also, even so.”¹ The existence of two *pi*(s) in the *Pāli* text must be for the emphatic purpose; so that here is nothing wrong with the I. B. Horner’s translation, i.e. “both ... and,” but I propose my revised one “not only ... but also” as a prelude to the next item and with the hope that its meaning might be easier to understand. This is just a matter of word choice.

--ooOoo--

234. *ayyā, hi* (BD. V, 362):

The nuns spoke thus: “It were well, honoured sirs, if the ladies themselves 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

bhikkhuniyo evam āhaṃsu: sādhu bhante ayyā ’va bhikkhunīnaṃ kammaṃ karontu, ayyā ’va bhikkhunīnaṃ āpattiṃ paṭiggaṇhantu; evaṃ hi bhagavatā paññattaṃ: bhikkhūhi bhikkhunīnaṃ adhikaraṇaṃ vūpasametabban ti. (Vin. II, 261)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The nuns spoke thus: “It were well, honoured sirs, if the venerables themselves could carry out (formal) acts for nuns, if the venerables themselves could acknowledge an offence of nuns, since it was thus laid down by the Lord: ‘Nuns’ legal questions should be settled by monks’.” They told this matter to the Lord.

¹ PED. 456.

DISCUSSION:

ayyā & hi: As given in footnote v, “*ayyā va*. The nun are not asking the monks to do these things, as made out at *Vin. Texts* iii. 333, but are hoping to get the Lord’s decree altered,”¹ I. B. Horner states that she opposes to the translation of her predecessors that the honorific noun *ayyā* should be in nominative case, feminine plural, not masculine. However, I take the side of the latter. To solve the problem, the inclinable *hi* in the next clause should be taken into account. In fact, *hi* is an indeclinable having the meaning as “for, because, on account of,”² so that the clause following the indeclinable *hi* has the function of explaining the act of the previous one. See also 94b, 228a.

In this case, the clause “*bhikkhūhi bhikkhunīnaṃ adhikaraṇaṃ vūpasametabbaṃ* = Nuns’ legal questions should be settled by monks” is the Buddha’s words; so that the meaning of the former clauses in imperative mood must be conformed to the latter: “Let the venerables themselves carry out (formal) acts for nuns. Let the venerables themselves acknowledge an offence of nuns.” To make it in plain English, I understand that the nuns said like this: “Venerable sirs, you have to do it because the Buddha said it should be done by you.”

To sum up, *ayyā* in this case should be in nominative case, masculine plural, not feminine as determined by I. B. Horner. See also § 47b, 47c, 238, 239.

--ooOoo--

235. ropeti (BD. V, 362):

“I allow you, monks, having cancelled 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 acknowledgment) by monks of nuns’ offences, to give it into the charge of nuns to acknowledge nuns’ offences by nuns.”

¹ BD. V, 362.

² PED. 731; CPED. 293; DOPL. 155.

PĀLI TEXT:

anujānāmi bhikkhave bhikkhūhi bhikkhunīnaṃ kammaṃ ropetvā bhikkhunīnaṃ niyyādetuṃ bhikkhunīhi bhikkhunīnaṃ kammaṃ kātuṃ, bhikkhūhi bhikkhunīnaṃ āpattiṃ ropetvā bhikkhunīnaṃ niyyādetuṃ bhikkhunīhi bhikkhunīnaṃ āpattiṃ paṭiggahetun ti. (Vin. II, 261)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Monks, I allow monks to determine the (formal) act then to give it into the charge of nuns and (allow) the nuns to carry out nuns’ (formal) acts. (I allow) monks to determine the nuns’ offense then to give it over to nuns and (allow) the nuns to acknowledge nuns’ offenses.

DISCUSSION:

ropeti: I. B. Horner picked the wrong meaning for the verb *ropeti*; perhaps she misunderstood the PED.:

Ropeti² [Caus. of rūhati². See lumpati]1. to cause to break off, to cause to suspend or cancel; to pass off, refuse Vin. II. 261 (bhikkhūhi bhikkhunīnaṃ kammaṃ ropetvā bhikkhunīnaṃ niyyādetuṃ, i. e. by the bhikkhus is an act of the nuns to be passed off and to be referred to the nuns).”¹

As I know, the meaning of the English verb “to pass off” is “to determine, to give judgment upon,” so that the PED. gives the correct meaning for the quote of this item. Similarly, Ven. Thanissaro in his translation for this passage also chose the meaning of *ropeti* as “to determine”:

I allow the bhikkhus, having determined the transaction, to give it over to the bhikkhunis, and that the bhikkhunis perform the transactions of the bhikkhunis. I allow the bhikkhus, having determined the offense, to give it over to the bhikkhunis, and that the bhikkhunis settle bhikkhunis’ offenses.”²

So I take the meaning of *ropeti* as “to determine” for my proposed translation.

--ooOoo--

¹ PED. 577.

² Tha. II, 415.

236. Textual - missing translation (BD. V, 366):

‘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.’—(*one part is missing*)—It should be said by the one who recites the Pātimokkha: ‘Is there any monk agreed upon as exhorter of the nuns?’

PĀLI TEXT:

bhikkhunīsaṃgho ayya bhikkhusaṃghassa pāde vandati ovādūpasamkamaṇaṇ ca yācati, labhatu kira ayya bhikkhunīsaṃgho ovādūpasamkamanan ti. tena bhikkhunā pātimokkhuddesako upasaṃkamitvā evam assa vacanīyo: bhikkhunīsaṃgho bhante bhikkhusaṃghassa pāde vandati ovādūpasamkamaṇaṇ ca yācati, labhatu kira bhante bhikkhunīsaṃgho ovādūpasamkamanan ti. pātimokkhuddesakena vattabbo: atthi koci bhikkhu bhikkhunovādako sammato ’ti. (Vin. II, 264)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Master, the Order of nuns honours the feet of the Order of monks and asks (for permission) to approach (the Order of monks) for exhortation: ‘May the Order of nuns, master, receive (permission) to approach (the Order of monks) for exhortation?’” That monk should approach the one who recites the Pātimokkha and say (to him) thus: “Venerable sir, the Order of nuns honours the feet of the Order of monks and asks (for permission) to approach (the Order of monks) for exhortation: ‘May the Order of nuns, venerable sir, receive (permission) to approach (the Order of monks) for exhortation?’” It should be said by the one who recites the Pātimokkha: “Is there any monk agreed upon as exhorter of the nuns?”

DISCUSSION:

Textual - missing translation: The missing passage could be a mistake of the copyist.

One more thing is that for the clause “*ovādūpasamkamaṇaṇ ca yācati*,” Ven. Thanissaro translates it as “asks for permission to approach for the exhortation,”¹ whereas I. B. Horner is

¹ Tha. II, 416.

more cautious about her literal style putting adding words in parentheses, i.e. “asks about (the right time for) coming for exhortation.” It should be noticed that “permission” and “the right time” are speculated by the two translators and inserted into the translation in order to make the meaning clear. I take the translation of Ven. Thanissaro and revise it for my proposed one, i.e. “asks (for permission) to approach (the Order of monks) for exhortation.”

--ooOoo--

237. Instrumental of agent (BD. V, 373-374):

Now at that time the food for monks that was stored was (too) 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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

tena kho pana samayena bhikkhūnaṃ sannidhikataṃ āmisaṃ ussannaṃ hoti. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. anujānāmi bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṃ sannidhiṃ bhikkhunīhi bhikkhūhi paṭiggahāpetvā paribhuñjitun ti. (Vin. II, 270)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Now at that time the food that was stored for monks was (too) abundant. They told this matter to the Lord. He said: “Monks, I allow nuns to make use of a store of food of monks after having it to be taken from monks.”

DISCUSSION:

Instrumental of agent: I. B. Horner’s translation for the rule seems to be obscure, so the Commentary should be consulted:

bhikkhūhi bhikkhunīhi paṭiggāhāpetvā ’ti hiyyo paṭiggahetvā ṭhapitāmisam ajja aññasmiṃ anupasampanne asati bhikkhūhi paṭiggāhāpetvā bhikkhunīhi paribhuñjitabbaṃ. bhikkhūhi paṭiggahitaṃ hi bhikkhunīnaṃ apaṭiggahitaṭṭhāne tiṭṭhati. bhikkhūnaṃ pi bhikkhunīsu es’ eva nayo.¹ = *bhikkhūhi bhikkhunīhi*

¹ VA. VI, 1294.

paṭiggāhāpetvā means “The food that was received yesterday (by monks) and kept until today should be eaten by nuns after having it to be taken from the monks if there is not another one who is not ordained (to offer it). Since it was received by the monks, it is alright for nuns due to the reason that the nun did not receive the food (yesterday). This is the guidance for monks in regard to nuns.”

The difficulty in translating this rule is to make out an English sentence conveying the meaning of the causative gerund *paṭiggāhāpetvā*. Ven. Thanissaro presents it in a subordinate clause: “Now at that time the bhikkhus had an abundance of stored up food. ‘I allow that it be consumed by the bhikkhunis when the bhikkhus have arranged for them to formally accept it.’”¹ On the other hand, I take *bhikkhunī* as instrumental of agent and translate the rule in active voice.

--ooOoo--

238. ayyā (BD. V, 378):

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.

PĀLI TEXT:

tāvad eva ādāya bhikkhusaṃghaṃ upasaṃkamitvā ekasamṃ uttarāsaṅgaṃ kārāpetvā bhikkhūnaṃ pāde vandāpetvā ukkuṭikaṃ nisīdāpetvā añjaliṃ paggaṇhāpetvā upasampadaṃ yācāpetabbā: ahaṃ ayyā itthannāmā itthannāmāya ayyāya upasampadāpekkhā ekatoupasampannā bhikkhunīsaṃghe visuddhā saṃghaṃ ayyā upasampadaṃ yācāmi, ullumpatu maṃ ayyā saṃgho anukampaṃ upādāya. (Vin. II, 273-274)

¹ Tha. II, 418.

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

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, venerables sirs, named 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). Venerables sirs, I am asking the Order for ordination. Venerables sirs, may the Order raise me up out of compassion.

DISCUSSION:

ayyā: is in vocative case, plural, masculine gender. Its counterpart in feminine gender plural is *ayye*; and supporting evidence can be found directly from the Scriptures:

- The formula of asking for ordination from a female candidate to the Order of nuns is:

saṅghaṃ ayye upasampadaṃ yācāmi, ullumpatu maṃ ayye saṅgho anukampaṃ upādāya. = Ladies, I am asking the Order for ordination. Ladies, may the Order raise me up out of compassion.¹

- Or in the case that an experienced, competent nuns informs the Order of nuns:

sunātu me ayye saṅgho. = Ladies, let the Order listen to me.²

In this case, *ayyā* is the addressing term that the one-side ordained nun informs the Order of monks. There is a similar case of *ayyā* in the next item. See also § 47b, 47c, 234, 239.

--ooOoo--

239. *ayyā* (BD. V, 383-384):

“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

¹ Vin. II, 273; BD. V, 377.

² *Ibid.* 273; *Ibid.* 377.

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. The ladies So-and-so is asking the Order for ordination; may the Order out of compassion raise up that lady.

PĀLI TEXT:

tāya dūtāya bhikkhuniyā saṃghaṃ upasaṃ`kamtivā ekamsaṃ uttarāsaṅgaṃ karitvā bhikkhūnaṃ pāde vanditvā ukkuṭikaṃ nisīditvā añjaliṃ paggahetvā evam assa vacanīyo: itthannāmā ayyā itthannāmāya ayyāya upasampadāpekkhā. ekatoupasampannā bhikkhunīsaṃghe visuddhā, sā kenacid eva antarāyena nāgacchati. itthannāmā ayyā saṃghaṃ upasampadaṃ yācati, ullumpatu taṃ ayyā saṃgho anumāpaṃ upādāya. (Vin. II, 277)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“That nun who is the messenger, 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, should speak to it thus: ‘Venerables sirs, 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. Venerables sirs, So-and-so is asking the Order for ordination; may the Order out of compassion raise up that one.

DISCUSSION:

ayyā: See explanation from the item above. See also § 47b, 47c, 234, 238.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER XI (PAÑCASATIKAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

240. *api*, Past participle in active sense (BD. V, 393):

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.’

PĀLI TEXT:

addasaṃ kho ahaṃ āvuso taṃ ājīvakaṃ dūrato ’va āgacchantaṃ, disvāna taṃ ājīvakaṃ etad avocaṃ: ap’ āvuso amhākaṃ satthāraṃ jānāsīti. āmāvuso jānāmi, ajja sattāhapariniibbuto samaṇo Gotamo, tato me idaṃ mandāravapupphaṃ gahitaṃ ti.
(Vin. II, 284)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then I, your reverences, saw that Naked Ascetic coming in the distance, and seeing him I spoke thus to him: ‘Do you, your reverence also know about our Teacher?’ He said: ‘Yes, I know, your reverence, today the recluse Gotama has attained nibbāna for seven days. Because of that I picked up this flower of the Coral Tree.’

DISCUSSION:

a/ *api*: For the conjunction *api*, I prefer to stick to its basic meaning “also,” thinking that it is more suitable to the context than the translation “not” given by I. B. Horner.

b/ **Past participle in active sense**: The past participle *pariniibbuto* in this case has an active meaning describing an event has just happened lately, so that the present perfect in English should be used.¹

One more thing is that the adverb *ajja* is left out in I. B. Horner’s translation. The Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* explains:

ajja sattāhapariniibbutoti ajja divasato paṭilomato sattame ahani pariniibbuto.² = He has attained nibbāna in the seventh day counting backward from today.

--ooOoo--

¹ Perniola. 360-362.

² VT. III, 408.

241. *bimbohanam* (BD. V, 395-396):

Then the venerable Ānanda, thinking: “To-morrow 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.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho āyasmā Ānando sve sannipāto, na kho me taṃ patirūpaṃ yo ’haṃ sekkho samāno sannipātaṃ gaccheyyan ti bahud eva rattiṃ kāyagatāya satiyā vītināmetvā rattiyā paccūsasamayaṃ nipajjissāmīti kāyaṃ āvajjesi, apattañ ca sīsaṃ bimbohanam bhūmito ca pādā muttā: etasmiṃ antare anupādāya āsavehi cittaṃ vimucci. atha kho āyasmā Ānando arahā samāno sannipātaṃ agamāsi. (Vin. II, 286)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the venerable Ānanda, thinking: “To-morrow 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 pillow 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.

DISCUSSION:

bimbohanam: In fact, *bimbohanam* is a pillow,¹ not a mattress (*bhisi*).

--ooOoo--

¹ DOPL. 92.

CHAPTER XII (SATTASATIKAKKHANDHAKAṀ):

242. *āvuso, appasādaṃ* (BD. V, 408):

Then the monks who were Vajjis of Vesālī, saying: “This reverend Yasa, the son of Kākandakā, is reviling and abusing layfollowers who are faithful and believing; come, let us carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for him.’ carried out a (formal) act of reconciliation for him.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū ayaṃ āvuso Yaso Kākaṇḍakaputto upāsake saddhe pasanne akkosati paribhāsati appasādaṃ karoti, haṇḍ’ assa mayaṃ paṭisāraṇiyakammaṃ karomā ’ti. te tassa paṭisāraṇiyakammaṃ akaṃsu. (Vin. II, 295)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the Vajjī monks of Vesālī (saying): “Reverend sirs, this Yasa, the son of Kākandakā, reviles, abuses faithful and believing layfollowers, and affords the unbelief; come, let us carry out a (formal) act of reconciliation for him.’ carried out a (formal) act of reconciliation for him.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *āvuso*: It should be noticed here is that *āvuso* is an addressing term to a junior monk (or monks) by a senior one, and *bhante* in a reverse situation; such way of addressing among the monks was regulated by the Buddha before His passing away.¹ And this story happened around 100 years after the demise of the Buddha. See also § 114b, 244.

b/ *appasādaṃ*: The translation of the phrase “*appasādaṃ karoti*” in this paragraph is missing from I. B. Horner’s translation; so that I add “(he) affords the unbelief” in my

¹ *Mahāparinibbānasutta*, D. II, 154.

proposed one. However, in the next page I. B. Horner gives the translation “I afford little satisfaction” for “*appasādaṃ karomi.*”¹ I assume that she analyzed “*appasādaṃ*” as “*appasādaṃ*” (*appa* = little); on the contrary, I analyze “*appasādaṃ*” as “*a-p-pasādaṃ*” (*a* = *na*, negative prefix) and translate it as “unbelief;” so did I. B. Horner in her translation for some other passages, e.g:

appasannānaṃ pasādāya pasannānaṃ bhiiyobhāvāya = for the benefit of non-believers, for the increase in the number of believers²

In fact, the noun *pasāda* and ppp. *pasanna* terminologically are derived from the same root “*pa + √sad.*”

--ooOoo--

243. Syntactic - sentence structure (BD. V, 417):

“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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

kappati bhante gāmantarakappo ’ti. ko so āvuso gāmantarakappo ’ti. kappati bhante idāni gāmantaraṃ gamissāmīti bhuttāvinā pavāritena anatirittaṃ bhojanaṃ bhuñjitun ti. nāvuso kappatīti. (Vin. II, 300)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“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 for a monk—who had eaten and satisfied, thinking: ‘I will go now among the villages’—to eat food that is not leftover?’”

¹ BD. V, 409.

² Vin. III, 21; BD. I, 38.

“Your reverence, it is not allowable.”

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - sentence structure: There is the need to discuss about the underlined part in I. B. Horner’s translation due to its obscurity. The main clause of the underlined passage above is “*kappati bhante anatirittam bhojanam bhuñjitum* = Honoured sir, is it allowable to eat food that is not leftover?” The agent of the infinitive *bhuñjitum* is the monk presented by the two verbal nouns in instrumental case, i.e. *bhuttāvinā* and *pavāritena*, and he is having the thought of going to a village that is signaled by the particle *iti*: “*idāni gāmantaram gamissāmīti*.”

One notice should be mentioned is that the issue of this item relates to the *pācittiya* 35 of the *pāṭimokkha* rules:

yo pana bhikkhu bhuttāvī pavārito anatirittam khādaniyam vā bhojaniyam vā khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā, pācittiyam”ti. = Whatever monk, having eaten, being satisfied, should eat or partake of solid food or soft food that is not left over, there is an offence of expiation.¹

And I. B. Horner, while discussing the term *anatirittam* of the *pācittiya*, mentions about this passage and makes out its meaning very clearly.²

--ooOoo--

244. *attho, āvuso* (BD. V, 420):

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.”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho āyasmā Uttaro Vesālikehi Vajjiputtakehi bhikkhūhi nippīliyamāno ekam cīvaram aggahehi vadeyyāthāvuso yen’ attho ’ti. (Vin. II, 303)

¹ Vin. IV, 82; BD. II, 328.

² footnote 4 (BD. II, 328).

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the venerable Uttara, being pressed by the Vajjī monks of Vesālī, took one robe (saying): “Reverend sirs, please tell me what the purpose with this is?”

DISCUSSION:

attho & āvuso: According to the context, the Vajjī monks of Vesālī were attempting to bribe the venerable Uttara into convincing the venerable Revata to support their side in the dispute concerning ten points about *Vinaya*, and the venerable Uttara asked them about the purpose (*attho*) of the gift. The reason of taking the meaning of the *Pāli* term *attho* as “purpose” is based on the answer they gave him in the next speech that he should convince the venerable Revata to support their side in the dispute.

Due to the reason that “*attho*” is in nominative case so that “*yen’ attho*” should be standing as another independent clause separated from the previous one “*vadeyyāthāvuso*,” in which *āvuso* is in vocative case plural, not nominative (See § 114b, 242a). In my opinion, the relative pronoun *yena* represents for *ekaṃ cīvaraṃ*, so that I take the meaning of “*yen’ attho*” as “the purpose with this” then convert the phrase into a question with the verb “to be,” which is understood.

--ooOoo--

245. Textual discrepancy (BD. V, 421):

“Are not you, your reverence, a senior of twenty years’ standing?”

“Yes, your reverences.”

“Then we shall take up guidance under (you as) teacher.”

PĀLI TEXT:

nanu tvam āvuso vuḍḍho vīsativasso ’sīti. āmāvuso ’ti. api nu ca mayaṃ garuṇissayaṃ gaṇhāmā ’ti. (Vin. II, 303)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Are not you, your reverence, a senior of twenty years’ standing?”

“Yes, your reverences. But we still take up guidance from teacher.”

DISCUSSION:

Textual discrepancy: In the context of this story, the Vajjis monks of Vesālī were surprised at the fact that the venerable Uttara being a bhikkhu of 20 years still stayed under the guidance of the venerable Revata, and the venerable Uttara confirmed it.

Let’s take the explanation from the Sub-Commentary *Sāratthadīpanī* into consideration:

*Nanu tvaṃ āvuso vuḍḍho vīsativassosīti nanu tvaṃ āvuso vīsativasso, na nissayapaṭibaddho, kasmā taṃ thero paṇāmetīti dīpenti. Garunissayaṃ gaṇhāmāti kiñcāpi mayaṃ mahallakā, etaṃ pana therayaṃ garuṃ katvā vasissāmāti adhippāyo.*¹ = *Nanu tvaṃ āvuso vuḍḍho vīsativassosi* means “Are not you, your reverence, having twenty years’ standing, not bound to taking guidance? Why does the elder salute that one?” they point out. *Garunissayaṃ gaṇhāma* has the meaning as “Even though we are some kind of senior, we will respect this elder and abide.”

Furthermore, Scriptures from other sources show that the next speech is also the words of the venerable Uttara and has no particle *nu*:

āmāvuso, api ca mayaṃ garunissayaṃ gaṇhāmā ’ti.²

So that the teacher (*garu*) here could be any teacher in general or the venerable Revata according to the Sub-Commentary (*etaṃ pana therayaṃ*), but not the venerable Uttara as specified in I. B. Horner’s translation. Then the translation would be: “Yes, your reverences. But we still take up guidance from teacher.” I follow the *Pāli* text of the majority and present my proposed translation accordingly as shown above.

--ooOoo--

¹ VT. III, 414.

² Be. Vol. 4, 502; BJTS. Vol. 5 (2), 586; Syā. Vol. 7, 413.

246. *katama, etarahi, bahulaṃ* (BD. V, 422):

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, abide now in the fullness thereof?”

“Because of abiding in loving-kindness, do I, honoured sir, abide now in the fullness thereof.”

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho āyasmā Sabbakāmī rattiyaṃ paccūsasamayaṃ āyasmantaṃ Revataṃ etad avoca: katamena tvaṃ bhummi vihārena etarahi bahulaṃ viharasī'ti. mettāvihārena kho ahaṃ bhante etarahi bahulaṃ viharāmīti. (Vin. II, 304)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then at the end of the night towards dawn, the venerable Sabbakāmin spoke thus to the venerable Revata: “In which abiding do you, dear, abide frequently in the present?”

“Frequently in the present, honoured sir, I abide in the abiding of loving-kindness.”

DISCUSSION:

My proposed translation is just a revised version from the one of I. B. Horner. There are some points that need to be emphasized:

a/ *katama*: is an adjective used in a question with the meaning “which one (of two or more)? which ...? what?”¹ I believe that the venerable Sabbakāmin asked the venerable Revata such question in order to know what kind of meditation that the venerable Revata had been practicing (among others that were taught by the Buddha), not a new technique that he was not aware of.

b/ *etarahi*: (*etarhi* in Sanskrit) should be a duration of time starting from some point in the past up to the present and future also;² it is not just “that very present moment” as expressed by the word “now” in English.

¹ DOP. 623.

² *Ibid.* 543.

c/ *bahullaṃ*: is in accusative case singular of the adjective *bahulla* (much, abundant, etc.). It is used as adverbial modifying *viharasi* and *viharāmi*; I chose the adverb “frequently” as its English equivalent instead of the phrase “in the fullness” given by I. B. Horner.

--ooOoo--

247. *vinicchiyamāne, viññāyati*, Textual discrepancy (BD. V, 424):

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. He selected four monks from the East, four monks from Pāvā.

PĀLI TEXT:

atha kho āyasmā Revato saṃghaṃ ñāpesi : suṇātu me bhante saṃgho. amhākaṃ imasmiṃ adhikaraṇe vinicchiyamāne anaggāni c’ eva bhassāni jāyanti na c’ ekassa bhāsitassa attho viññāyati. yadi saṃghassa pattakallaṃ, saṃgho imaṃ adhikaraṇaṃ ubbāhikāya vūpasameyya. cattāro Pācīnake bhikkhū cattāro Pāṭheyake bhikkhū uccini. (Vin. II, 305)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Then the venerable Revata informed the Order (saying): “Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. While this legal question of us is being investigated, (there are) endless disputations arisen but not one speech has the meaning that is acknowledged. If it seems right to the Order, the Order may settle this legal question by means of a referendum. The Order selected four monks from the East, four monks from Pāvā.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *vinicchiyamāne* and *viññāyati*: There are different ways to translate or interpret a passage from one language to another; here I am just trying to propose a literal one in order to

reveal the passive meaning of the two verbals: present passive participle *vinicchiyamāne* (*vi* + *ni* + \sqrt{chi} + *ya* + *ti*) in locative case singular and *viññāyati* (*vi* + $\sqrt{ñā}$ + *ya* + *ti*) in third person, singular, present tense.

b/ **Textual discrepancy:** In this passage, one thing should be noticed is that the subject of the aorist *uccini* is in third person singular: I. B. Horner's choice is the Venerable Revata presented by "He" and another one is "The Order" as specified in the Scriptures from other sources having *saṅgho* at the beginning of the sentence: "*Saṅgho cattāro pācīnake bhikkhu cattāro pāveyyake bhikkhū uccini.*"¹ The subject of the aorist *uccini* should be "the Order" not only because of the decision of majority but also of logical reasoning, in fact in the meeting of seven hundred monks to decide the ten points raised by the Vajjis monks of Vesālī, the Order was the decisive factor and the venerable Revata was just performing the role of a speaker

--ooOoo--

248. Syntactic - sentence structure (BD. V, 425-426):

"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.

PĀLI TEXT:

suṇātu me bhante saṅgho. idaṃ paṭhamañ vatthum saṅghena vinicchitaṃ iti p' idaṃ vatthum uddhammañ ubbinayaṃ apagatasatthusāsanam, idaṃ paṭhamañ salākaṃ nikkhipāmi. (Vin. II, 306)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

"Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This first point has been investigated by the Order that this point is against *dhamma*, against discipline, not of the Teacher's instruction. I cast aside this first (voting-) ticket.

¹ Be. Vol. 4, 504; BJTS. Vol. 5 (2), 590; Syā. Vol. 7, 417.

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - sentence structure: My proposed translation is just a revised version from that of I. B. Horner with the modification of two things:

The first one is that I take “*idaṃ paṭhamam vatthum saṃghena vinicchitam*” as the main clause and the rest are subordinate due to the existence of the conjunction *pi* signaling additional information.

The second is that I translate the last sentence “*idaṃ paṭhamam salākaṃ nikkhipāmi*” in a simple format: subject + verb + object.

--ooOoo--

THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE
VOLUME VI - PARIVĀRA



CHAPTER I (MAHĀVIBHAṄGA):

249. Subject (BD. VI, 3-4):

“By which recital does one come to the recital?” By the second recital one comes to the recital.

...

Of the six origins of offences by how many origins does (a monk) originate (the offence)?” He originates it by one origin—he originates it by body and by mind, not by speech.

PĀLI TEXT:

katamena uddesena uddesaṃ āgacchatīti dutiyena uddesena uddesaṃ āgacchati.

...

channaṃ āpattisamuṭṭhānānaṃ katthi samuṭṭhānehi samuṭṭhātīti ekena samuṭṭhānena samuṭṭhāti kāyato ca cittato ca samuṭṭhāti na vācato. (Vin. V, 2)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“By which recital does it (the offence) come to the recital?” By the second recital it (the offence) comes to the recital.

...

Of the six origins of offences from how many origins does it (the offence) originate?” It (the offence) originates from one origin—it (the offence) originates from body and from mind, not from speech.

DISCUSSION:

Subject: The two questions without answers in the two excerpts above are also seen at the *mātikā* section at the first page of the BD.VI, but I skipped them and waited until now in order to be easier to see the context. There are two cases that I. B. Horner took the wrong subjects for the two verbs, *āgacchati* in the first excerpt and *samuṭṭhāti* in the second.

- Subject of *āgacchati*: Even though I. B. Horner already consulted the Commentary, “*dutiyena uddesenā ti nidānogadhamṃ nidānapariyāpannam pi samānaṃ. tatr’ ime cattāro pārājikā dhammā ti ādinā dutiyen’ eva uddesena uddesaṃ āgacchati,*”¹ she did not figure out the hint to see the subject of the verb *āgacchanti* from the first sentence of the *nidāna*, i.e. “*tatr’ ime cattāro pārājikā dhammā uddesaṃ āgacchanti.*” If she had done so, there would be no confusion about the subject of the verb *āgacchati*: it must be the first offence involving Defeat in this case, and each of the other single offences in other similar cases.

- Subject of *samuṭṭhāti*: Similarly, the subject of the verb *samuṭṭhāti* should not be the monk (he), but the offence also, i.e. the first offence involving Defeat (*paṭhamaṃ pārājikaṃ*) in this case. My choice has the approval from the Commentary: “*methunaṃ dhammaṃ paṭisevantassa āpattiyo channaṃ āpattisamuṭṭhānānaṃ katihī samuṭṭhānehi samuṭṭhahantī ti ādippabhedo samuṭṭhānavāro.*”² It can easily see from the Commentary that the verb *samuṭṭhahanti* (third person plural present tense) has the noun *āpattiyo* (feminine plural nominative) as its subject. So that *samuṭṭhahati* or its substitute form *samuṭṭhāti*³ (third person singular present tense) has the noun *āpatti* (feminine singular nominative), i.e. the name of each single offence, as its subject.

Such corrections for these two mistakes should be done for similar cases in the first two chapters of this volume, i.e. pp. 1-112.

--ooOoo--

¹ VA. VII, 1303.

² *Ibid*, 1304.

³ PED. 687.

250. bahubbīhi compounds, Contextual, Relative pronouns (BD. VI, 5):

“Who train themselves?” Learners and ordinary people who are morally good.

“Who have trained themselves in the training?” Arahants have trained themselves in the training.

“In what state?” The state of desiring the training.

“Who know by heart?” Those who know by heart the procedure of these.

PĀLI TEXT:

ke sikkhantīti sekkhā ca puthujjanakalyāṇakā ca sikkhanti. ke sikkhitasikkhā ’ti arahanto sikkhitasikkhā. kattha ṭhitan ti sikkhākāmesu ṭhitam. ke dhārentīti yesam vattati te dhārenti. (Vin. V, 2)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Who train themselves?” Learners and ordinary people who are morally good train themselves.

“Who have the training (already) trained?” Arahants have the training (already) trained.

“Where has it (the state of training) remained?” It has remained in whom who have the desire in the training.

“Who uphold (the training)?” Those to whom the training is carried on uphold it.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *bahubbīhi* compounds - *sikkhitasikkhā* & *sikkhākāmesu*: These two are *bahubbīhi* compounds: the former (masculine plural nominative) is in apposition to the arahants who have completed the course of training in Buddhism, and the latter (masculine plural locative) in apposition to the ones who have the desire to observe the rules regulated by the Buddha.

I. B. Horner seems to have doubt about the meaning of the compound *sikkhitasikkhā* found in the *Pāli* text referring to the definition of a female probationer: “*sikkhamānā nāma dve vassāni chasu dhammesu sikkhitasikkhā*.¹ = Probationer means: a lady who has the

¹ Vin. IV, 122, 343.

training trained in six regulations for two years.” There is no contradiction to my analysis above due to the fact that the compound *sikkhitasikkhā* in the cited definition is also a *bahubbīhi* compound, feminine singular nominative.

b/ **Contextual:** I. B. Horner seemed to be struggling with the clause “*kattha ʒhitan ti*” also. In footnote, she suggested a revision for the Scriptures as *kattha-ʒhitaṃ* and translated it accordingly, “in what condition or state?”¹

At my first glance to the phrase at the beginning of the book, “*paṭhamam pārajikam kattha paññattaṃ?*” = Where was that which is the first offence involving Defeat laid down ...?² I have the thought that the past participle *ʒhitaṃ* in the question “*kattha ʒhitan ti*” complies with the neuter noun *pārajikam*. If this was the case, in the next portion for *saṅghādisesa* offence, I expected that the question should have been “*kattha ʒhito ti*” due to the reason that *saṅghādisesa* is a masculine noun as seen in the *Pāli* text, “*uppakkamitvā asuciṃ mocentassa saṅghādiseso kattha paññatto?*”³ (*saṅghādisesa* is masculine noun, so that nominative singular is *saṅghādiseso*). However, the question still keeps the same form, unchanged, with the past participle in neuter case, “*kattha ʒhitan ti;*” so that *ʒhitaṃ* in such questions does not relate to any name of offence, i.e. *pārajikam*, *saṅghādiseso*, and the like. The only way to understand this question is that we have to assume that the past participle *ʒhitaṃ* acquires an understood subject, which is generally an abstract concept, in this case I presume that it is “the state of training.”

c/ **Relative pronouns** (*yesam* and *te*): The relationship between *yesam* and *te* is obvious in the *Pāli* text under the form of a question followed by an answer, “*ke dhārentī ti yesam vattati te dhārenti*” = To whom the training takes place, those uphold it. The Commentary has explanation about this but there is no need to translate it:

¹ Footnote 8 (BD. V, 2).

² Vin. V, 1; BD. VI, 1.

³ Vin. V, 4.

yesaṃ vattatī ti yesaṃ vinayaṭṭakaṅca aṭṭhakathā ca sabbā paṇṇā ti attho. *ke dhārentī* ti ke etaṃ paṭhamapārājikaṃ pālito ca atthato ca dhārenti. na hi sakkā sabbāṃ. vinayaṭṭakaṃ ajānantena etassa attho jānitun ti.¹

The interpretation of I. B. Horner is definitely influenced by the Commentary but it seems obscure to me, so that I try to do the translation again, keeping it as literal as I can.

--ooOoo--

251. Present participle - used as verbal noun (BD. VI, 8):

Where was that offence requiring a Formal Meeting of the Order laid down by that Lord who knows, who sees, perfected one, fully Self-Awakened One, for the emission of semen using (the hand)? Concerning whom? On what subject? . . .

PĀLI TEXT:

yan tena bhagavatā jānatā passatā arahatā sammāsambuddhena upakkamivā asuciṃ mocentassa saṃghādiseṣo kattha paññatto, kaṃ ārabba, kismiṃ vatthusmiṃ . . .
(Vin. V, 4)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Where was that offence requiring a Formal Meeting of the Order laid down by that Lord—who knows, who sees, perfected one, fully Self-Awakened One—for the one who is striving and causing semen released? Concerning whom? On what subject? . . .

DISCUSSION:

Present participle - used as verbal noun: The logic here is that the offence should fall on the monk who is doing the action (the one who is causing semen released), not the action itself (emission of semen).

--ooOoo--

¹ VA. VII, 1303-1304.

252. *saññācīkāya* (BD. VI, 10-11):

Where was that offence requiring a Formal Meeting of the Order laid down . . . for begging for having a hut built for oneself?” It was laid down in Āḷavī . . .

Concerning the monks of Āḷavī . . .

On the subject of the monks of Āḷavī begging for having a hut built for themselves . . .

PĀLI TEXT:

— pe — saññācīkāya kuṭiṃ kārāpentassa saṃghādiseso kattha paññatto ’ti Āḷaviyā paññatto . . . Āḷavake bhikkhū ārabha . . . Āḷavakā bhikkhū saññācīkāya kuṭiyo kārāpesuṃ . . . (Vin. V, 6)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Where was that offence requiring a Formal Meeting of the Order laid down . . . for the one who is having a hut built, begging by himself?” It was laid down in Āḷavī . . .

Concerning the monks of Āḷavī . . .

(On the subject that) the monks of Āḷavī had huts built, begging by themselves . . .

DISCUSSION:

saññācīkāya (*saṃyācīkāya* = begging by himself): The term *saññācīkāya* was discussed previously at § 29. The repetition is made due to the reason that I. B. Horner confirms in footnote that her interpretation for the term *saññācīkāya* should be amended, but she still keeps the same translation for it. This term *saññācīkāya* will be discussed again at § 254.

--ooOoo--

253. *taduttariṃ* (BD. VI, 16):

“. . . involving Forfeiture laid down for one who asks a man or woman householder who is not a relation for more robe-material than that (which they had invited him to accept)?” It was laid down at Sāvatti . . .

Concerning the group of six monks . . .

The group of six monks, not knowing moderation, asked for much robe-material . . .

PĀLI TEXT:

— la — aññātakam gahapatiṃ vā gahapatāniṃ vā taduttariṃ cīvaram viññāpentassa nissaggiyaṃ . . . Sāvattiyā paññattam . . . chabbaggiye bhikkhū ārabha . . . chabbaggiyā bhikkhū na mattam jānitvā bahum cīvaram viññāpesum . . . (Vin. V, 9)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“ . . . involving Forfeiture laid down for one who asks a man or woman householder who is not a relation for robe-material more than that (which are a lower robe and an upper robe)?” It was laid down at Sāvatti . . .

Concerning the group of six monks . . .

The group of six monks, not knowing moderation, asked for much robe-material . . .

DISCUSSION:

taduttariṃ (*tad-uttariṃ*): The meaning of *taduttariṃ* (more than that) is not difficult to grasp if one studies thoroughly the word-analysis section of the *nissaggiya* offence # 7; *tad* (that) in this regulation is defined as:

santaruttaraparaman tena bhikkhunā tato cīvaram sādītābbaṃ ti. sace tīṇi naṭṭhāni honti dve sādītābbāni, dve naṭṭhāni ekaṃ sādītābbaṃ, ekaṃ naṭṭhaṃ na kiñci sādītābbaṃ. = If the three (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.¹

The same mistake is repeated in her translation for a similar context:

aññātakam gahapatiṃ vā gahapatāniṃ vā taduttariṃ cīvaram viññāpento . . . = Asking a man or woman householder who is not a relation for more robe-material than that (which they had invited him to accept) . . .²

--ooOoo--

¹ Vin. III, 214; BD. II, 52.

² *Ibid.* V, 35 ; *Ibid.* VI, 53.

254. *saññācikāya* (BD. VI, 51):

Begging for having a hut built for oneself he falls into three offences: if he has one 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 requiring a Formal Meeting of the Order.

PĀLI TEXT:

saññācikāya kuṭiṃ kārāpento tisso āpattiyo āpajjati; kārāpeti payoge dukkaṭaṃ; ekam piṇḍaṃ anāgate āpatti thullaccayassa; tasmim piṇḍe āgate āpatti saṅghādisesassa.
(Vin. V, 34)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

While having a hut built, begging by himself, he falls into three offences: if he has one 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 requiring a Formal Meeting of the Order.

DISCUSSION:

saññācikāya: The main factor for a monk committing this offence is to have someone build a hut (*kuṭiṃ kārāpento*) for himself with the materials begged by himself, not due to the act of begging by himself (*saññācikāya*). See also § 29, 252.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER II (BHIKKHUNĪVIBHAṄGA):

255. Subject, Contextual (BD. VI, 81):

“Where was that which is the seventh offence involving Defeat for nuns laid down?” It was laid down in Sāvattḥī. ... Concerning the nun Thullanandā ... The nun Thullanandā imitated the monk Ariṭṭha who formerly had been a vulture-trainer and had been suspended

by a complete Order ... One laying down ... She originates it by one origin in throwing off responsibility.

PĀLI TEXT:

bhikkhunīnaṃ sattamaṃ pārājikaṃ kattha paññattan ti Sāvattiyā paññattaṃ . . .
Thullanandaṃ bhikkhuniṃ ārabba . . . Thullanandā bhikkhunī samaggena saṃghena
ukkhittaṃ Ariṭṭhaṃ bhikkhuṃ gaddhabādhipubbaṃ anuvatti . . . ekā paññatti . . .
ekena samuṭṭhānena samuṭṭhāti dhuranikkhepe. (Vin. V, 55)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Where was that which is the seventh offence involving Defeat for nuns laid down?” It was laid down in Sāvattihī. ... Concerning the nun Thullanandā ... The nun Thullanandā imitated the monk Ariṭṭha who formerly had been a vulture-trainer and had been suspended by a complete Order ... One laying down ... It originates from one origin (as) in throwing off responsibility.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Subject of *samuṭṭhāti*:** As mentioned at § 249, the subject of the verb *samuṭṭhāti* in the last sentence should be the offence, in this case is “*sattamaṃ pārājikaṃ*,” not she – i.e. *Thullanandā bhikkhunī*.

b/ **Contextual:** I. B. Horner lost the context in this case even though she did get the right context in the translation for previous parts, e.g. *kaṭhinake*: (*as in*) the *kaṭhina* (-robe Section),¹ *eḷakalomake*: (*as*) in Sheep’s Wool,² *padasodhamme*: (*as*) in Dhamma line by line.³ So I just restored the missing word “(as)” to her translation, also replace “she” by “it” as just being discussed about the subject of *samuṭṭhāti* above: “It originates from one origin (as) in throwing off responsibility.”

¹ Vin. V, 12; B.D. VI, 22.

² *Ibid.* 14; *Ibid.* 24.

³ *Ibid.*; *Ibid.*

And the complete sense for the statement (the last sentence above) should be: “The seventh offence involving Defeat originates from one origin: It originates from body and from speech and from mind (as) in throwing off responsibility” (*kāyato ca vācato ca cittato ca samuṭṭhāti*).¹

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER IV. (1) (ANANTARAPEYYĀLA):

256. Syntactic - sentence structure (BD. VI, 135):

Could one fall into an offence involving Defeat by means of the first origin of offences? It should be said “Oh no”. Could one fall into an offence requiring a Formal Meeting of the Order? It should be said “One might”. Could one fall into a grave offence ... an offence of Expiation ... an offence to be Confessed ... an offence of wrong-doing? It should be said “One might”. Could one fall into an offence of wrong speech? It should be said “Oh no”.

PĀLI TEXT:

paṭhamena āpattisamuṭṭhānena pārājikaṃ āpajjeyyā ’ti: na hīti vattaḃbaṃ. saṃghādisesaṃ āpajjeyyā ’ti: siyā ’ti vattaḃbaṃ. thullaccayaṃ āpajjeyyā ’ti: siyā ’ti vattaḃbaṃ. pācittiyaṃ . . . pāṭidesaniyaṃ . . . dukkaṭaṃ āpajjeyyā ’ti: siyā ’ti vattaḃbaṃ. dubbhāsitaṃ āpajjeyyā ’ti: na hīti vattaḃbaṃ. (Vin. V, 93)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

By means of the first origin of offences: could one fall into an offence involving Defeat? It should be said “Oh no;” could one fall into an offence requiring a Formal Meeting of the Order? It should be said “One might;” could one fall into a grave offence? ... an offence of Expiation? ... an offence to be Confessed? ... an offence of wrong-doing? It should be said “One might;” could one fall into an offence of wrong speech? It should be said “Oh no.”

¹ Vin. V, 55.

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - sentence structure: The phrase “by means of the first origin of offences” should be placed at the beginning due to the reason that it affects the whole the paragraph.

Similar application should be made to other paragraphs of this chapter.

--ooOoo--

257. *vāceti* (BD. VI, 137):

A monk, thinking it is allowable, makes someone who is not ordained teach Dhamma line by line, there is an offence of Expiation.

PĀLI TEXT:

bhikkhu kappiyasaññī anupasampannaṃ padaso dhammaṃ vāceti, āpatti pācittiyassa.
(Vin. V, 95)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

A monk, thinking it is allowable, has one who is not ordained recite Dhamma line by line, there is an offence of Expiation.

DISCUSSION:

***vāceti*:** ($\sqrt{vac} + e + ti$) is a causative verb having the meaning: “to make speak, utter, or recite; to teach.”¹ I. B. Horner got the right meaning “to make speak” while translating the offence *pācittiya* n^o 4: “yo pana bhikkhu anupasampannaṃ padaso dhammaṃ vāceyya, pācittiyān ti. = Whatever monk should make one who is not ordained speak dhamma line by line, there is an offence of expiation;”² but here made a deviation from it. See also § 51.

--ooOoo--

¹ PED. 607.

² Vin. IV, 14; BD. II, 190.

CHAPTER IV. (2) (SAMATHABHEDA):

258. Interrogative (BD. VI, 154):

A deciding is a verdict in the presence of, a verdict in the presence of is a deciding. A deciding is a decision of the majority, a decision of the majority is a deciding. A deciding is a verdict of innocence . . . a verdict of past insanity . . . a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment . . . a decision for specific depravity . . . is a covering over (as) with grass, a covering over (as) with grass is a deciding.

A decision of the majority, a verdict of innocence, a verdict of past insanity, a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment, a decision for specific depravity, a covering over (as) with grass—these decidings are decidings, but not a verdict in the presence of. A verdict in the presence of is a deciding as well as being a verdict in the presence of.

A verdict of innocence, a verdict of past insanity, a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment, a decision for specific depravity, a covering over (as) with grass, a verdict in the presence of—these decidings are decidings, but not the decision of the majority. A decision of the majority is a deciding as well as being a verdict in the presence of.

.....

A verdict in the presence of, a decision of the majority, a verdict of innocence, a verdict of past insanity, a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment, a decision for specific depravity—these decidings are decidings, but not a covering over (as) with grass. A covering over (as) with grass is a deciding as well as being a covering over (as) with grass.

Concluded is the Eleventh Chapter: on A Verdict in the Presence of being a Deciding.

PĀLI TEXT:

samatho sammukhāvinayo, sammukhāvinayo samatho. samatho yebhuyyasikā, yebhuyyasikā samatho. samatho sativinayo . . . amūḷhavinayo . . . paṭiññātakaraṇaṃ . . . tassapāpiyasikā . . . tiṇavatthārako, tiṇavatthārako samatho.

yebhuyyasikā sativinayo amūḷhavinayo paṭiññātakaraṇaṃ tassapāpiyasikā tiṇavatthārako— ime samathā samathā no sammukhāvinayo, sammukhāvinayo samatho c’ eva sammukhāvinayo ca.

sativinayo amūḷhavinayo paṭiññātakaraṇaṃ tassapāpiyasikā tiṇavatthārako sammukhāvinayo— ime samathā samathā no yebhuyyasikā, yebhuyyasikā samatho c’ eva yebhuyyasikā ca.

.....
sammukhāvinayo yebhuyyasikā sativinayo amūḷhavinayo paṭiññātakaraṇaṃ tassapāpiyasikā, ime samathā samathā no tiṇavatthārako, tiṇavatthārako samatho c’ eva tiṇavatthārako ca.

samathasammukhāvinayavāraṃ niṭṭhitaṃ ekādasamaṃ. (Vin. V, 104-105)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Is a deciding a verdict in the presence of? Is a verdict in the presence of a deciding? Is a deciding a decision of the majority? Is a decision of the majority a deciding? Is a deciding a verdict of innocence? . . . a verdict of past insanity? . . . a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment? . . . a decision for specific depravity? . . . a covering over (as) with grass? Is a covering over (as) with grass a deciding?

A decision of the majority, a verdict of innocence, a verdict of past insanity, a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment, a decision for specific depravity, a covering over (as) with grass—these decidings are decidings, but not a verdict in the presence of. A verdict in the presence of is a deciding as well as being a verdict in the presence of.

A verdict of innocence, a verdict of past insanity, a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment, a decision for specific depravity, a covering over (as) with grass, a verdict in the presence of—these decidings are decidings, but not the decision of the majority. A decision of the majority is a deciding as well as being a verdict in the presence of.

.....
A verdict in the presence of, a decision of the majority, a verdict of innocence, a verdict of past insanity, a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment, a decision for specific depravity—

these decidings are decidings, but not a covering over (as) with grass. A covering over (as) with grass is a deciding as well as being a covering over (as) with grass.

Concluded is the Eleventh Chapter: on A Verdict in the Presence of being a Deciding.

DISCUSSION:

Interrogative: This is a matter of the *Pāli* text: the errors made by the editor misled I. B. Horner's judgment. In fact, questions and answers is the basic format of the *Parivārapāli*, so that in this case the first paragraph is the questions and the rest is the answers. I. B. Horner missed that point in this Eleventh Chapter and the next chapter that is presented next.

--ooOoo--

259. Interrogative (BD. VI, 154-155):

A verdict is a verdict in the presence of, a verdict in the presence of is a verdict . . . a verdict is a covering over (as) with grass, a covering over (as) with grass is a verdict.

A verdict may be a verdict in the presence of and it may not be a verdict in the presence of. A verdict in the presence of is a verdict as well as being a verdict in the presence of.

A verdict may be a decision of the majority . . . a verdict of innocence . . . a verdict of past insanity . . . a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment . . . a decision for specific depravity . . . a covering over (as) with grass and it may not be a covering over (as) with grass. A covering over (as) with grass is a verdict as well as being a covering over (as) with grass.

Concluded is the Twelfth Chapter: on Verdict.

PĀLI TEXT:

vinayo sammukhāvinayo, sammukhāvinayo vinayo . . . vinayo tiṇavatthārako, tiṇavatthārako vinayo.

vinayo siyā sammukhāvinayo siyā na sammukhāvinayo. sammukhāvinayo vinayo c' eva sammukhāvinayo ca.

vinayo siyā yebhuyyasikā . . . sativinayo . . . amūḷhavinayo . . . paṭiññātakaraṇam . . . tassapāpiyasikā . . . tiṇavatthārako, siyā na tiṇavatthārako. tiṇavatthārako vinayo c’ eva tiṇavatthārako ca.

vinayavāraṃ niṭṭhitam dvādasamaṃ. (Vin. V, 105)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Is a verdict a verdict in the presence of? Is a verdict in the presence of a verdict? . . . Is a verdict a covering over (as) with grass? Is a covering over (as) with grass a verdict?

A verdict may be a verdict in the presence of and it may not be a verdict in the presence of. A verdict in the presence of is a verdict as well as being a verdict in the presence of.

A verdict may be a decision of the majority . . . a verdict of innocence . . . a verdict of past insanity . . . a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment . . . a decision for specific depravity . . . a covering over (as) with grass and it may not be a covering over (as) with grass. A covering over (as) with grass is a verdict as well as being a covering over (as) with grass.

Concluded is the Twelfth Chapter: on Verdict.

DISCUSSION:

Interrogative: See the discussion for the item above. I have also found out another similar case on page 287 of this book discussing about *kaṭhina* cloth (Vin. V, 177).

--ooOoo--

260. Syntactic - sentence structure (BD. VI, 155):

Where a decision of the majority is possible there a verdict in the presence of is possible; where a verdict in the presence of is possible there a decision of the majority is possible. Not possible there is a verdict of innocence . . . a verdict of past insanity . . . a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment . . . a decision for specific depravity . . . a covering over (as) with grass.

PĀLI TEXT:

yattha yebhuyyasikā labbhati tattha sammukhāvinayo labbhati, yattha sammukhāvinayo labbhati tattha yebhuyyasikā labbhati. na tattha sativinayo labbhati,

na tattha amūḷhavinayo labbhati . . . paṭiññātakaraṇaṃ . . . tassapāpiyasikā . . .
tiṇavatthāraḷako labbhati. (Vin. V, 106)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Where a decision of the majority is possible there a verdict in the presence of is possible;
where a verdict in the presence of is possible (if) there a decision of the majority is possible,
(then) a verdict of innocence is not possible there, a verdict of past insanity is not possible
there, a carrying out on (his) acknowledgment . . . a decision for specific depravity . . . a
covering over (as) with grass is not possible there.

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - sentence structure: The argument presented in the paragraph above can be summarized like this: Where (yattha) A exists, there (tattha) B exists; where B exists, (if) A exists there (then) C does not exist there, D does not exist there, E . . . , F . . . , G does not exist there. The conditional format “if . . . then” is inserted into my translation in order to make the statement easier to understand.

One notice should be mentioned here is that the period (.) on the second line of the *Pāli* text after the second *labbhati* should be replaced by a comma (,) in order to make the argument meaningful. Only the Thai Scriptures has this edited, i.e. having no punctuation at all for the whole paragraph and other similar ones,¹ whereas the Sri Lankan and Burmese have a period at that very spot as that of PTS. Edition. .

--ooOoo--

261. Syntactic - *iti/ti* (BD. VI, 157):

“Legal question” or “deciding”—are these things associated or dissociated, and is it possible, having analysed these things again and again, to point to a difference between them? “Legal question” or deciding”—these things are dissociated, not associated, and it is

¹ Syā. Vol. 8, 270-272.

possible to point to a difference between them—this should be certainly not be said. “Legal question” or deciding”—these things are associated, not dissociated, and it is not possible, having analysed these things again and again, to point to a difference between them. What is the reason for this? Was it not said by the Lord: “There are, monks, these four legal questions and seven decidings. Legal questions are settled by decidings; decidings are settled by legal questions. Thus these things are associated, not dissociated, and it is not possible . . . to point to a difference between them.”

Concluded is the Sixteenth Chapter: on Associated.

PĀLI TEXT:

adhikaraṇaṇ ti vā samathā ’ti vā ime dhammā saṃsaṭṭhā udāhu visaṃsaṭṭhā labbhā ca paṇṇāpetun ti. adhikaraṇaṇ ti vā samathā ’ti vā ime dhammā visaṃsaṭṭhā no saṃsaṭṭhā, labbhā ca . . . paṇṇāpetun ti: so mā h’ evaṇ ti ’ssa vacaṇīyo. adhikaraṇaṇ ti vā samathā ’ti vā ime dhammā saṃsaṭṭhā no visaṃsaṭṭhā, no ca labbhā imesaṃ dhammānaṃ vinibbhujitvā vinibbhujitvā nānākaraṇaṃ paṇṇāpetuṃ. taṃ kissa hetu. nanu vuttaṃ bhagavatā: cattār’ imāni bhikkhave adhikaraṇāni, satta samathā. adhikaraṇā samathehi sammanti, samathā adhikaraṇehi sammanti. evaṃ ime dhammā saṃsaṭṭhā no visaṃsaṭṭhā no ca labbhā . . . paṇṇāpetun ti.

saṃsaṭṭhavāraṃ niṭṭhitiaṃ soḷasamaṃ. (Vin. V, 107)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“Legal question” or “deciding”—are these things associated or dissociated, and is it possible, having analysed these things again and again, to point to a difference between them? “Legal question” or deciding”—these things are dissociated, not associated, and it is possible to point to a difference between them. That one should be said: “Please do not say thus.” “Legal question” or deciding”—these things are associated, not dissociated, and it is not possible, having analysed these things again and again, to point to a difference between them. What is the reason for this? Was it not said by the Lord: “There are, monks, these four legal questions and seven decidings. Legal questions are settled by decidings; decidings are

settled by legal questions. Thus these things are associated, not dissociated, and it is not possible . . . to point to a difference between them.”

Concluded is the Sixteenth Chapter: on Associated.

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - *iti/ti*: Our focus on this item is to find out the right interpretation for the sentence: *so mā h’ evan ti ’ssa vacanīyo*. I. B. Horner translates it as: “this should be certainly not be said.” I am wondering that firstly if she takes “so” as personal pronouns, her translation should be “this one;” however such a case does not suit her literal translating style, “that one” should be used instead. Secondly, should she mean “this” as representing for the previous answer? Thus could not be because the *Pāli* word would be “*taṃ*” or “*etaṃ*.”

On the other hand, I analyze the sentence differently: The paragraph begins with a question, and a reply, then an objection to the reply beginning with “*so ‘mā hi evaṃ’ iti assa vacanīyo*,” which could be rearranged in a simpler order, “*so assa vacanīyo: ‘mā hi evaṃ*.”” and the rest is the explanation why such reply is unacceptable.

In summary, breaking a speech into two parts is often seen in the *Pāli* Scriptures, in this case perhaps to emphasize what is going to present next.

--ooOoo--

262. Interrogative (BD. VI, 162):

Decidings are stopped by decidings, decidings are stopped by legal questions, legal questions are stopped by decidings, legal questions are stopped by legal questions.

It may be that decidings are stopped by decidings . . . not stopped by decidings; it may be that decidings are stopped by legal questions . . . not stopped by legal questions; it may be that legal questions are stopped by decidings . . . not stopped by decidings; it may be that legal questions are stopped by legal questions . . . not stopped by legal questions.

PĀLI TEXT:

samathā samathehi sammanti, samathā adhikaraṇehi sammanti, adhikaraṇā samathehi sammanti, adhikaraṇā adhikaraṇehi sammanti.

siyā samathā samathehi sammanti, siyā samathā samathehi na sammanti, siyā samathā adhikaraṇehi sammanti, siyā samathā adhikaraṇehi na sammanti, siyā adhikaraṇā samathehi sammanti, siyā adhikaraṇā samathehi na sammanti, siyā adhikaraṇā adhikaraṇehi sammanti, siyā adhikaraṇā adhikaraṇehi na sammanti. (Vin. V, 109-110)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Are decidings stopped by decidings, are decidings stopped by legal questions, are legal questions stopped by decidings, are legal questions stopped by legal questions?

It may be that decidings are stopped by decidings . . . not stopped by decidings; it may be that decidings are stopped by legal questions . . . not stopped by legal questions; it may be that legal questions are stopped by decidings . . . not stopped by decidings; it may be that legal questions are stopped by legal questions . . . not stopped by legal questions.

DISCUSSION:

Interrogative: Again, we should follow the format ‘question and answer’ of the text: the first paragraph is the question and the second is the answer. One more time, the editor of the *Pāli* text misled I. B. Horner’s translation.

At § 193, I have pointed out the relationship between the passive verb *sammanti* and the noun *samatha*, and proposed their meanings as “to be settled” and “settlement” respectively. Here I would like to direct the focus to the format “question - answer” so that I do not replace I. B. Horner’s words by my proposed ones.

--ooOoo--

263. *idha* (BD. VI, 165):

How is it like that? As to this monks are disputing, saying, “It is Dhamma” or “It is not Dhamma” or “It is Discipline” or “It is not Discipline” or . . .

PĀLI TEXT:

yathā katham viya. idha bhikkhū vivadanti ‘dhammo ’ti vā adhammo ’ti vā vinayo ’ti vā avinayo ’ti vā . . . (Vin. V, 111)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

How is it like that? In this case monks are disputing, saying, “It is Dhamma” or “It is not Dhamma” or “It is Discipline” or “It is not Discipline” or . . .

DISCUSSION:

idha: The simple meaning of the adverb *idha* is “here,” or “in this case” figuratively. The same passage is found in *Cullavagga*¹ and I. B. Horner’s translation for “*idha*” is “in this case;”² so I just restore her words to this.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER VI (EKUTTARAKA):

264. *sāvajjapaññatti & anavajjapaññatti* (BD. VI, 172):

. . . an offence the description (of which) is “blamable” should be known; an offence the description (of which) is “non-blamable” should be known; . . .

PĀLI TEXT:

. . . sāvajjapaññatti āpatti jānitabbā; anavajjapaññatti āpatti jānitabbā; . . . (Vin. V, 115)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

. . . an offence having the regulation owing to blame should be known; an offence having the regulation not owing to blame should be known; . . .

¹ Vin. II, 88.

² BD. V, 117.

DISCUSSION:

sāvajjapaññatti & *anavajjapaññatti*: are two *babubbīhi* compounds, attributive to the noun *āpatti*, feminine singular nominative. Literally, the two should be translated as “regulation owing to blame” and “regulation not owing to blame” respectively. The corresponding Commentary explains:

sāvajjapaññattī ti lokavajjā *anavajjapaññattī* ti paṇṇattivajjā = *sāvajjapaññatti* is “blame by the world (by people), *anavajjapaññatti* is “blame by regulation” (by the Buddha).¹

The Commentary for *Mahāvagga* explains further:

duvidhaṃ hi sikkhāpadaṃ: lokavajjaṃ paṇṇattivajjaṃ ca. tatha yassa sacittakapakkhe cittaṃ akusalam eva hoti taṃ lokavajjaṃ nāma, sesaṃ paṇṇattivajjaṃ . . .² = Indeed, the course of training is twofold: “blame by the world” and “blame by regulation.” There in the group involving consciousness, which course of training has the mind that is absolutely unwholesome, that (course of training) is called “blame by the world;” the rest is called “blame by regulation.”

Moreover, in *Milindapañhā* the Elder Nāgasena illustrates the topic while answering the King Milinda’s questions, e.g. Eating at the wrong time (*vikālabhojanaṃ*), injuring vegetation (*bhūtagānavikopanaṃ*), playing in the water (*udake hassadhammaṃ*) does not belong to the former type (*sāvajjapaññattī*, *lokavajjā*) but to the latter (*anavajjapaññattī*, *paṇṇattivajjā*).³

--ooOoo--

265. Syntactic - sentence structure, *sātisāraṃ* (BD. VI, 180):

Two individuals are incapable of consciously falling into an offence: the ariyan individuals who are monks and nuns. Two individuals are capable of consciously falling into an offence: ordinary individuals who are monks and nuns. Two individuals are incapable of

¹ VA. VII, 1319.

² *Ibid.* I, 228.

³ Miln. 266.

consciously transgressing a matter that goes too far: ariyan individuals who are monks and nuns. Two individuals are capable of consciously transgressing a matter that goes too far: ordinary individuals who are monks and nuns.

PĀLI TEXT:

dve puggalā abhabbā sañcicca āpattiṃ āpajjituṃ bhikkhū ca bhikkhuniyo ca ariyapuggalā. dve puggalā bhabbā sañcicca āpattiṃ āpajjituṃ bhikkhū ca bhikkhuniyo ca puthujjanā. dve puggalā abhabbā sañcicca sātisāraṃ vatthuṃ ajjhācarituṃ bhikkhū ca bhikkhuniyo ca ariyapuggalā. dve puggalā bhabbā sañcicca sātisāraṃ vatthuṃ ajjhācarituṃ, bhikkhū ca bhikkhuniyo ca puthujjanā. (Vin. V, 117)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Two individuals are incapable of consciously falling into an offence: monks and nuns who are ariyan individuals. Two individuals are capable of consciously falling into an offence: monks and nuns who are ordinary individuals. Two individuals are incapable of consciously transgressing a matter that contains wrongness: monks and nuns who are ariyan individuals. Two individuals are capable of consciously transgressing a matter that contains wrongness: monks and nuns who are ordinary individuals.

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Syntactic- sentence structure:** Taking the phrase *bhikkhū ca bhikkhuniyo ca ariyapuggalā* and I. B. Horner’s translation “the ariyan individuals who are monks and nuns” into consideration, one can have the question whether the ariyan individuals who are not monks and nuns—i.e. ariyan lay people—are capable of consciously falling into an offence e.g. stealing, lying, etc.; that is not true, so such interpretation should be avoided. Besides, one can see, according to the word order, *ariyapuggalā* is the attribute to *bhikkhū ca bhikkhuniyo ca*, not vice versa. So I just switch the order in I. B. Horner’s translation: “Two individuals are incapable of consciously falling into an offence: monks and nuns who are ariyan individuals.”

Similar explanation for the other case: *bhikkhū ca bhikkhuniyo ca puthujjanā* = monks and nuns who are ordinary individuals.

b/ *sātisāraṃ*: The Commentary explains:

sātisāraṃ ti sadosaṃ, yaṃ ajjhācaranto āpattiṃ āpajjati¹ = *sātisāraṃ* as having fault, having wrongness, while transgressing the matter that contains fault or wrongness, one commits an offence.

I translate the compound according to the Commentary.

--ooOoo--

266. Syntactic - sentence structure (BD. VI, 192):

If a monk is possessed of three qualities: if he is unconscientious and if he is ignorant and if he is not a regular monk (but if) he has suspended the Observance in the midst of an Order (but if other monk) have snubbed him, saying: “That’s enough, monk; let there be no strife, no quarrel, no dispute, no contention,” the Observance may be carried out by the Order.

PĀLI TEXT:

tīh’ aṅgehi samannāgatassa bhikkhuno saṃghamajjhe uposathaṃ ṭhapentassa alaṃ bhikkhu mā bhaṇḍanaṃ mā kalahaṃ mā viggahaṃ mā vivādan ti omadditvā saṃghena uposatho kātabbo, alajjī ca hoti bālo ca apakatatto ca. (Vin. V, 122)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The Order should snub the monk possessed of three qualities—he is unconscientious, ignorant, and not a regular monk—who is suspending the Observance in the midst of an Order (by saying): “That’s enough, monk; let there be no strife, no quarrel, no dispute, no contention,” then should carry out the Observance.

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - sentence structure: We should analyze this complex sentence into small elements in order to see its structure:

¹ VA. VII, 1323.

- the agent is the Order, which is *saṃghena* in instrumental case.
- the main verbal is the future passive participle *kātabbo* (should be carried out), its mood also has the effect on the gerund *omadditvā* (should be snubbed).
- the monk possessed of three qualities is the patient of the gerund *omadditvā* and the agent of the present participle *thapentassa* in masculine singular dative case.

So the sketch of the sentence in active voice should be “The Order should snub the monk possessed of . . . who is suspending . . . then should carry out the Observance.” Once the rest is filled in, the translation is complete.

--ooOoo--

267. *kamma* in Vinaya terminology (BD. VI, 196):

There is the offence one falls into through doing, rises from through not doing . . . falls into through not doing, rises from through doing . . . falls into through doing, rises from through doing . . . falls into through not doing, rises from through not doing.

PĀLI TEXT:

atth’ āpatti kammaena āpajjati akammaena vuṭṭhāti, atth’ āpatti akammaena āpajjati kammaena vuṭṭhāti, atth’ āpatti kammaena āpajjati kammaena vuṭṭhāti, atth’ āpatti akammaena āpajjati akammaena vuṭṭhāti. (Vin. V, 125)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

There is the offence one falls into through (formal) act, rises from not through (formal) act. There is the offence one falls into not through (formal) act, rises from through (formal) act. There is the offence one falls into through (formal) act, rises from through (formal) act. There is the offence one falls into not through (formal) act, rises from not through (formal) act.

DISCUSSION:

kamma: In Vinaya terminology, *kamma* is used to describe a meeting together of at least four regular monks in order to perform some business regulated by the Buddha. Depending

on the matter, some other *kamma*(s) require a group more than four regular monks: a group of five, a group of ten, a group of twenty, or a group of more than twenty regular monks:

pañca saṃghā: catuvaggo bhikkhusaṃgho, pañcavaggo bhikkhusaṃgho, dasavaggo bhikkhusaṃgho, vīsativaggo bhikkhusaṃgho, atirekavīsativaggo bhikkhusaṃgho.¹

kamma in this sense is translated as “(formal) act” by I. B. Horner, and such translation should be applied here.

--ooOoo--

268. Syntactic - sentence structure (BD. VI, 197):

Four offences involving Defeat are shared by monks and nuns. Four offences involving Defeat are not shared by monks and nuns.

PĀLI TEXT:

cattāro pārājikā bhikkhūnaṃ bhikkhunīhi sādharmaṇā. cattāro pārājikā bhikkhunīnaṃ bhikkhūhi asādharmaṇā. (Vin. V, 125)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Four offences involving Defeat of monks are shared by nuns. Four offences involving Defeat of nuns are not shared by monks.

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - sentence structure: The monks observe four offences involving Defeat (*pārājika*); whereas nuns have to observe eight: the first four are similar to those of monks and four more, so that the total is eight; the first four belongs to the group called *sādharaṇāpaññatti* (regulation that is shared and applied to both monks and nuns) and the last four to the group called *asādharaṇāpaññatti* (regulation that is not shared and applied either for only monks or for only nuns). My explanation is based on the Commentary:

¹ Vin. I, 319.

sādhāraṇapaññattī ti bhikkhūnañ c'eva bhikkhunīnañ ca sādhāraṇapaññatti.
suddhabhikkhūnam eva hi suddhabhikkhunīnaṃ vā paññattaṃ sikkhāpadaṃ
asādhāraṇapaññatti nāma hoti. ¹

Other offences such as *saṅghādisesa*, *nissaggiya pācittiya*, *pācittiya*, etc. are also divided into these two groups as well.

--ooOoo--

269. *sampassamānena*, Active vs. Passive (BD. VI, 220):

That monk should not be suspended for not seeing an offence by one possessed of eight advantages. That offence should be confessed even out of faith in others if they are possessed of eight advantages.

PĀLI TEXT:

aṭṭhānisamse sampassamānena na so bhikkhu āpattiyā adassane ukkhipitabbo.
aṭṭhānisamse sampassamānena paresam pi saddhāya sā āpatti desetabbā. (Vin. V, 136)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The monk who is seeing clearly eight advantages should not suspend that monk for not seeing an offence. The monk who is seeing clearly eight advantages should confess that offence even out of faith in others.

DISCUSSION:

a/ *sampassamānena*: Perhaps I. B. Horner mistook *sampassamānena* with *sampannena* (possessed of). In fact, *sampassamānena* is the present participle, masculine singular instrumental case of the verb *sampassati* (*sam* + *√dis*) having the meaning as “to see by oneself, to see totally or clearly” speculatively. Ven. Commentator Buddhaghosa points out that the eight advantages are mentioned in *Mahāvaggapāḷi*:

. . . bhavissati saṃghassa tatonidānaṃ bhaṇḍanaṃ kalaho viggaho vivādo
saṃghabhedo saṃgharāji saṃghavavatthānaṃ saṃghanānākaraṇaṃ ti, bhedagarukehi
bhikkhave bhikkhūhi na so bhikkhu āpattiyā adassane ukkhipitabbo. = . . . from this

¹ VA. VII, 1302.

source, there will be strife, dispute, contention, brawls to the Order, there will be schism in the Order, dissension in the Order, altercation in the Order, differences in the Order.’ Monks, the monks who are bent on schism should not suspend that monk for not seeing an offence.¹

b/ **Active vs. Passive:** As being mentioned previously at § 172b, in some cases the English translation should be placed in active voice in order to make the translation easier to understand. Here I convert the present participle *sampassamānena* in instrumental case into the subject, i.e. “the one who is seeing clearly . . .” in my proposed translation.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER XII (CŪḶASAṄĠĀMA):

270. Textual - missing translation, Syntactic - sentence structure, Active vs. passive (BD. VI, 264-265):

There should be respect for an Order, for an approved individual, for an adjudicator, for one anxious to adjudicate, not respect for an individual. There should be respect for True Dhamma, not respect for the material things of the world. There should be pursuit of the goal, not conformity to an assembly.

PĀLI TEXT:

saṅghena anumatena puggalena anuvijjakena anuvijjitukāmena saṅghagarukena bhavitabbaṃ no puggalagarukena, saddhammagarukena bhavitabbaṃ no āmisagarukena, atthavasikena bhavitabbaṃ no parisakappiyena . . . (Vin. V, 163)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

The one who is an individual approved by an Order, the one who is adjudicator, the one who is anxious to adjudicate should respect for the Order, not respect for an individual;

¹ Vin. I, 339; BD. IV, 485 (revised).

should respect for True Dhamma, not respect for the material things of the world; should be in pursuit of the goal, not in conformity to an assembly . . .

DISCUSSION:

a/ **Textual - missing translation:** The English equivalent for *saṃghena* (by an Order) in the phrase “*saṃghena anumatenā puggalena*” is missing from I. B. Horner’s translation.

b/ **Syntactic - sentence structure:** One should be notice that the three agents: *saṃghena anumatenā puggalena* (the one who is an individual approved by an Order), *anuvijjakena* (the one who is adjudicator), *anuvijjitukāmena* (the one who is anxious to adjudicate) govern the whole paragraph dividing into pairs of opposite meanings beginning with “*saṃghagarukena bhavitabbaṃ no puggalagarukena*” (should be respect for the Order, not respect for an individual), “*saddhammagarukena bhavitabbaṃ no āmisagarukena*” (should be respect for True Dhamma, not respect for the material things of the world), etc.

c/ **Active vs. passive:** Again, I put my proposed translation into active voice for the sake of the readers.

--ooOoo--

271. Syntactic - sentence structure (BD. VI, 266):

Thus is an adjudicator when he adjudicates thus both a doer of the Teacher’s Dispensation, and is dear to learned men and to his fellow Brahma-farers and liked by them, and he is esteemed and to be respected.

PĀLI TEXT:

evaṃ ca pana anuvijjako anuvijjamāno satthu c’ eva sāsana-karo hoti viññūnaṃ ca sabrahmacārīnaṃ piyo ca hoti manāpo ca garu ca bhāvaniyo ca. (Vin. V, 164)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

Moreover, thus an adjudicator while adjudicating is not only a teacher but also one who complies with the rules, and to the learned fellow Brahma-farers he is dear, pleasing, honored, and respected (by them).

DISCUSSION:

Syntactic - sentence structure: There are two finite verbs *hoti* in this sentence signaling two independent clauses: “*satthu c’ eva sāsana-karo hoti*” and “*viññūnañ ca sabrahma-cārīnaṃ piyo ca hoti manāpo ca garu ca bhāvaniyo ca;*” both clauses are attributive to the noun *anuvijjako*, masculine, singular, nominative. In the first clause, there are two attributes *satthu* and *sāsana-karo*, and four in the second: *piyo*, *manāpo*, *garu*, *bhāvaniyo*. One thing should be noticed here is that these four attributes in the second clause govern the noun *sabrahmacārīnaṃ* and its attribute *viññūnaṃ* in masculine, plural, dative case.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER XIII (MAHĀSAṄGĀMA):

272. anulomaṃ (BD. VI, 271):

“He should know what has been done and what has not been done” means: he should know sexual intercourse, he should know the proper order of sexual intercourse, he should know the earlier part of sexual intercourse. He should know that sexual intercourse means that consummation between a couple is to be known. He should know the proper order of sexual intercourse means: the monk takes hold of another’s male organ with his own mouth. He should know the earlier part of sexual intercourse means: the different colours (of semen), physical, lewd speech, ministering to one’s own pleasure, intercourse.

PĀLI TEXT:

katākataṃ jānitabban ti: methunadhammo jānitabbo methunadhammassa anulomaṃ jānitabbaṃ methunadhammassa pubbabhāgo jānitabbo. methunadhammo jānitabbo 'ti: dvayaṃdvayasamāpatti jānitabbā. methunadhammassa anulomaṃ jānitabban ti: bhikkhu attano mukhena parassa aṅgajātaṃ gaṇhāti. methunadhammassa pubbabhāgo jānitabbo 'ti: vaṇṇāvaṇṇo kāyasamsaggo duṭṭhullavācā attakāmapāricariyā vacanamanuppadānaṃ. (Vin. V, 167)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“He should know what has been done and what has not been done” means: he should know sexual intercourse, he should know what is in accordance with sexual intercourse, he should know the earlier part of sexual intercourse. He should know that sexual intercourse means that consummation between a couple is to be known. He should know what is in accordance with sexual intercourse means: the monk takes hold of another’s male organ with his own mouth. He should know the earlier part of sexual intercourse means: the different colours (of semen), physical, lewd speech, ministering to one’s own pleasure, intercourse.

DISCUSSION:

anulomaṃ: Again, I. B. Horner picked the wrong meaning for the term *anulomaṃ* from the PED. as “proper order.”¹ In fact, taking hold of another’s male organ by the mouth is not the prelude to sexual intercourse, but such act is considered *methunadhamma* activity applied to a monk. That is stated in the first *pārājaka*: If a monk lets his male organ enter to any one of the three places (*magga*), which are anus (*vaccamagga*) vagina (*passāvamagga*) mouth (*mukha*), of twelve kinds of beings including human, non-human, and animal, he commits an offence involving Defeat.² So the right meaning for in this context should be the other: “state of fitting in,³ being in accordance with, conformity.”⁴

--ooOoo--

¹ PED. 42.

² Vin. III, 28.

³ PED. 42.

⁴ DOP. 134; CPED. 17.

CHAPTER XIV (KAṬHINABHEDA):

273. Dative (BD. VI, 279):

“By whom is kaṭhina cloth not formally made?” means: kaṭhina cloth is not formally made by two individuals: by him who does not formally make it and by him who does not give thanks. Kaṭhina cloth is not formally made by these two individuals.

“By whom is kaṭhina cloth formally made?” means: kaṭhina cloth is formally made by two individuals: by him who formally makes it and by him who gives thanks. Kaṭhina cloth is formally made by these two individuals.

PĀLI TEXT:

kassa kaṭhinaṃ anattathan ti: dvinnaṃ puggalānaṃ anattataṃ hoti kaṭhinaṃ anattāarakassa ca ananumodakassa ca. imesaṃ dvinnaṃ puggalānaṃ anattataṃ hoti kaṭhinaṃ.

kassa kaṭhinaṃ attathan ti: dvinnaṃ puggalānaṃ attataṃ hoti kaṭhinaṃ attāarakassa ca anumodakassa ca. imesaṃ dvinnaṃ puggalānaṃ attataṃ hoti kaṭhinaṃ. (Vin. V, 172)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

“To whom is kaṭhina cloth not formally made?” means: kaṭhina cloth is not formally made to two individuals: to the one who does not formally make it and to the one who does not express approval. Kaṭhina cloth is not formally made to these two individuals.

“To whom is kaṭhina cloth formally made?” means: kaṭhina cloth is formally made to two individuals: to the one who formally makes it and to the one who expresses approval. Kaṭhina cloth is formally made to these two individuals.

DISCUSSION:

Dative: There are two reasons to replace the preposition “by” by “to”:

- The first reason is that the case here is dative not instrumental,

- The second is that the *kaṭhina* ceremony is formally made not by the Order, not by a group of monks, but by just one monk who is the *atthāraka* in a (formal) act (*na saṃgho kaṭhinam attharati, na gaṇo kaṭhinam attharati, puggalo kathinam attharatīti*).¹

Once the *Kaṭhina* ceremony has successfully performed, the monk who formally made it and the one(s) who expresses approval to it acquire five advantages for a period of time, which are:

kati nu kho bhante ānisaṃsā kaṭhinatthāre 'ti. pañc' ime Upāli ānisaṃsā kaṭhinatthāre. katame pañca. anāmantacāro asamādānacāro gaṇabhojanam yāvadatthacīvaram yo ca tattha cīvaruppādo so nesam bhavissati. ime kho Upāli pañca ānisaṃsā kaṭhinatthāre 'ti. = How many advantages are there, revered sir, in formally making kaṭhina cloth. What five? Going (to families for alms) without having asked for permission, walking (for alms) not taking the three robes, agroup-meal, as much robe-material as is required, and whatever robe-material accrues there, that will be for them. These, Upāli, are the five advantages in formally making the kaṭhina cloth.²

One more thing is that *anumodaka* should be translated as “the one who expresses approval, not “the one who gives thanks” given by I. B. Horner. See also § 164b.

--ooOoo--

CHAPTER XIX (THE FIVE DIVISIONS):

274. *catuvaggakaraṇe kamme, chando* (BD. VI, 361):

How are formal acts invalid as to assembly? In twelve ways are formal acts invalid as to assembly: when a formal act is being carried out by an incomplete fourfold assembly, if as many monks as are entitled to take part in the formal act are not come, if the leave of absence of those fit to declare their leave of absence is not sent, if those who are present protest; . . .

¹ Vin. V. 177.

² Vin. V, 205; BD. VI, 329.

PĀLI TEXT:

kathaṃ parisato kammāni vipajjanti. dvādasahi ākārehi parisato kammāni vipajjanti.
catuvaggakaraṇe kamme yāvatikā bhikkhū kammaṭṭā te anāgatā honti,
chandārahānaṃ chando anāhaṭo hoti, sammukhībhūtā paṭikkosanti, . . . (Vin. V, 221)

TRANSLATION PROPOSED:

How are formal acts invalid as to assembly? In twelve ways are formal acts invalid as to assembly: in a formal act that is the affair of a group of four, if as many monks as are entitled to take part in the formal act are not come, if the consent of those fit to declare their consent is not sent, if those who are present protest; . . .

DISCUSSION:

a/ *catuvaggakaraṇe kamme*: In this case, *catuvaggakaraṇe* is *bahubbīhi* compound modifying the noun *kamme* in locative case. The compound *catuvaggakaraṇa* internally is analyzed as genitive *tappurisa* compound—*catuvagga-karaṇa*, and *catuvagga* as digu-compound (in general, this compound can also be said as a *kammadhāraya* compound); so that its meaning should be “the affair of the group of four.” In the following we also have similar terms as *pañcavaggakaraṇe kamme* (the affair of the group of five), *dasavaggakaraṇe kamme* (the affair of the group of ten), *vīsativaggakaraṇe kamme* (the affair of the group of twenty).

b/ *chando*: I cannot find out from where I. B. Horner gets the meaning for *chando* as “leave of absence.” The PED. states clearly the meaning of *chanda* in Vinaya context as: “2. (in the monastic law) consent, declaration of consent (to an official act: kamma) by an absentee Vin I. 121-2.”¹ Ven. Thanissaro interprets it as “consent by proxy.”² I prefer to keep it short, i.e. consent.

--ooOoo--

¹ PED. 274.

² Tha. II, 527.

CONCLUSION

The present dissertation is basically a critical reading of the *Vinayapiṭakapāḷi* with the help from the English translation, i.e. *The Book of the Discipline* in six volumes translated by I. B. Horner. Reading the ancient text is to become familiar with the *Pāli* syntax and gathering Buddhist knowledge from original sources and using the English translation is to ease the pain of consulting dictionaries or recalling the linguistic knowledge.

In the Introduction, besides presenting some materials that belong to the Vinaya studies, I have tried to raise the point regarding the information conveyed in the *Vinayapiṭakapāḷi* that should be paid more attention by scholars, researchers, and Buddhist learners who hold the misconception that the *Vinayapiṭakapāḷi* only presents monastic rules and is intended for Buddhist monks and nuns. There is only one complete translation available for English readers, i.e. the work of I. B. Horner. In my opinion, the English translation of I. B. Horner is good enough to serve the readers; unfortunately some unexpected mistakes were made during the process of translation. This study is to find and diminish those instances with better and reasonable solutions in order to strengthen the value her remarkable work that as I expect might still be the unique one for a longer time.

The core of this study is the “Catalogue” consisting of six parts presenting problematic items found in each volume of the English translation.

And in the catalogue, my contribution is presented in two parts, “Translation Proposed” and the “Discussion.” There are some points about my work that should be made clear:

- My intention is to keep my proposed translation as close as possible to that of I. B. Horner in order to bring out the issue hidden under the underlined word(s).

- In the discussion, for conclusive cases I often ignore others' translations that are similar to that of I. B. Horner but mention those that support my choice, and for tentative ones I have tried to present others' works briefly before taking a stand with a reasonable solution to the best of my knowledge.

- Overall, there are some issues that are trivial to someone but might be useful to others.

- Due to the nature of my research related to many aspects and scattered into many small items, my aim is to find plausible and acceptable answers but not to perform a thorough and exhausted research for every single one.

- For those items that are repeated throughout the whole translation, I have no courage to sort all of them out.

- I have the difficulty to find the materials needed, e.g. For the *Pāli* Commentaries, there are only two printed copies available to me, *Samantapāsādikā* and *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* of the PTS., others such as *Sāratthadīpanī-Ṭīkā* I have to rely on the *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana* CD of the Vipassanā Research Institute. And many others are not accessible even though their names are known.

- I have proposed some new tentative translation and interpretation for *piṇḍukkhepakam*, *kabaḷāvacchedakam*, *pattanillehakam*, *talaghātakam*, *ūnadvādasavassā gihigatā*, *vuṭṭhitāya parisāya* that have been discussed or suggested by others. However, my work is just based on limited supportive facts from the ancient texts, also on my observation in actual activities and logical reasoning, so that a conclusive answer for them has still not been reached.

To conclude, upon working on this dissertation, more or less experience has arrived to my knowledge that should be recorded:

- For the reading task, consulting the *Pāli* Scriptures from other sources for textual discrepancy in some cases may have the answers thanks to the work of other editors.

- Context plays an important role in shaping the meaning of the words. Being unfamiliar with monastic activities seems to have caused lots of difficulties to I. B. Horner in figuring out the meaning of the text.

- The syntax of the *Pāli* language is coherent, for some difficult terms or sentences the clues are often found somewhere in the text itself.

- Proposing a new translation seems to be easier than explaining the reason to reject the old one.

- Learning grammar from books and recognizing its usage in practical situations seems to have a big gap. Some experience is only gained through reading the *Pāli* text itself.

At this point I might say that during the course of completing this dissertation even though some progress has been made by me such as critical reading skill, comprehensive knowledge, research methodology, logical reasoning, etc., still there are some unsatisfactory items that need more work of more intellectual researchers in order to promote the learning of the *Vinayapiṭakapāli* and the language itself in general.

--ooOoo--

APPENDIX: SELECTED BOOK REVIEW:

While working on this dissertation, I have read and summarized varieties of books on the *Vinaya* literature that are available to me in Sri Lanka. I have also written down some notes for each point I did not agree with the authors for later reference. In order to prove the raised point about “problems in translation and interpretation related to the *Vinayapiṭakapāli*,” I selected some books that meet the criteria and present them here. For the ones presented here I have no means that these books are not worth reading or others not shown are perfectly safe from the inaccuracy of the information conveyed. My thinking is that critical reading is a required skill for every reader living in the age of “information explosion.”

--ooOoo--

Dutt, Sukumar. *Early Buddhist Monachism*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1996.

Sukumar Dutt states in the preface of the book that he tries to outline the activities of an individual monk (*bhikkhu*) and those of the monk community (*saṅgha*) at the earliest period of Buddhism. In the first chapter, he argues that historical information found in the *Pāli* texts should be evaluated critically due to the reasons that it may not reflex the background of the Buddha’s time and that rules and regulations “were adopted by his monk-followers from time to time under the aegis of the Founder’s name,” and he then proposes four guidelines that need to be followed while interpreting *Vinaya* rules (29). Sukumar Dutt examined various Sanskrit sources in order to come up with a theory of the origin of the primitive *parivrājaka*, a religious tradition that has conclusive effects in shaping the life and activities of Buddhist monks (chapter II). In chapter III, he discusses the meaning of the two terms *saṅgha* and *pātimokkha* based on literary evidences found in the ancient scriptures, *Pāli* and *Sanskrit*

texts. He also makes a further research looking for the true number and content of the *Pātimokkha* in Tibetan and Chinese sources. In chapter IV, he looks at the application of the monastic codes *Pātimokkha* in rituals such as *Uposatha* or *Pavāraṇā*. Here we can observe his wrong understanding of such religious performances. For example, we can observe that in his wrong perception about the confession of a *bhikkhu*: He sees it as a form of redemption when he gives translation of one crucial part in the *Nidāna* of the *Pātimokkha*, i.e. “*āpatti āvikātabbā āvikatā hi ’ssa phāsu hoti*” as “*unconfessed offences are cleared up on confession*” (85). In fact, there is nothing “to be cleared up” but something to be acquired, which is *phāsu*, an easeful psychological state, appearing to the guilty *bhikkhu* (*assa*) when he confesses his bad deeds. His statement about the *Uposatha* ritual “[f]rom being an instrument of monastic discipline it came to be nothing more than the organized expression of the communal and corporate life of the Sangha” does not express successfully the essence of the ceremony (87). Then in chapter V, he presents a thorough explanation of terms such as *ārāma*, *vihāra*, *sīmā*, *āvāsa* but unfortunately comes up with the wrong conclusion about “the gradual transition from the eremitical to the cenobitical life among the early Buddhists in India” (112). This is already being disputed by other scholars such as Professor J. Dhirasekara and Dr. Wijayaratna. Finally, in the last two chapters, Sukumar Dutt tries to outline the activities of the monk community through legal acts (*saṅghakamma*), either disciplinary ones to guilty *bhikkhu* or non-disciplinary ones to other matters. He also gives the list of constructions of a monastery as described in the ancient Buddhist texts and the appointment of monks to some special tasks in order to maintain the communal life in a monastery. He gives the right function of *kappiyakāraka* but confuses that such appointed person is a *saṅgha* officer, in other word a *bhikkhu* (154). In fact *kappiyakāraka* should be a layperson, or maybe a novice (*sāmanera*) assigned to some simple tasks.

--ooOoo--

Holt, John Clifford. *Discipline: The Canonical Buddhism of the VINAYAPITAKA*. Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass, 1995.

First of all, I am going to give the citation from the foreword written by Professor Reynolds of the University of Chicago stating that John C. Holt's dissertation is a "careful and comprehensive analysis of the *Vinaya*, to refine and enrich the religio-historical category of discipline. As a result of Holt's work, historians of religions will now be able to recognize discipline as an interpretative category having equal status with other primary categories such as "devotion," "meditation," and the like" (viii). Indeed, John C. Holt did make a lot of effort to study the *Vinaya* not only from the work of Miss I. B. Horner, which is the English translation of the *Vinayapiṭaka*, but also some other books that relate to the topic. His reasoning is straightforward with reminders of what he said previously or introductions for the turning point that will be coming up. His interpretation of some chapters of the *Vinayapiṭaka* may help the readers grasp the concept faster instead of spending time reading through original texts or translations that are heavy with many passages repeated and verbose.

However, some unavoidable weaknesses are present in his work: For instance, he mentions the terms *thūpa* and *cetiya* in *Pāli*, *dāgaba* (Sinhalese) (141), and *stūpa* (Sanskrit) (142) but I am not sure whether he sees the equivalence among them or not. Another matter is that he often uses Sanskrit vocabulary in his discussion but quotes from *Pāli* sources such as the case of *Tri-ratna* (Triple Gem) (143) in stead of *Ti-ratana*; at least he should clear out the point in footnotes. But the most important thing is that he left many wrong interpretations in his work, perhaps through misunderstanding of others' translation or unluckily citing faulty translations. Let us take a look at some passages quoted from his book:

1/- "If a *bhikkhu* had left the *Saṅgha* to join another *śramaṇa* group and returned desiring to be re-admitted, he was usually required to spend four months of probation. However, if the

bhikkhu had defected to the Jainas or Jaṭilas, the four months of probation was waved” (25); the truth is that this rule is applied to a new converter to Buddhism, not a *bhikkhu*.

2/- “Each rule, therefore, represents a device invented by the Buddha or the *Saṅgha* to prevent the expression of such a motive. When the rule is observed or when one is mindful of the reason for the rule, the *bhikkhu* ideally acts in the absence of these motives. Or better, the *bhikkhu* acts “purely.” That is, he will act in a manner *detached* or *apart* from wrongful intent” (88). I really do not understand how he can reach such conclusion.

3/-“... the matter is reported to the Buddha who then admonishes Sudinna and expells him from the order” (89); he gives us a reference from the translation of I. B. Horner (B. D. 1: 21-38) and concludes that “Sudinna is therefore expelled from the community because of his incapacity to control *rāga* (90). I am sure that he does not catch the point that the *Pātimokkha* rules do not apply to the first-wrong doers (*ādikammika*) and let Miss Horner take the burden.

4/- “They concluded that the *bhikkhu* of the *vihāra* had engaged in sexual intercourse with the monkey and asked the *bhikkhu* about the matter when he returned. He admitted to the accusation but defended himself by saying ...” (90). It would have been better to state exactly that other *bhikkhus* had waited for his return and had witnessed his engaging in sexual intercourse with the monkey.

5/- In the footnote on page 118, he comments about the expulsion of novices committing sexual intercourse with a *bhikkhunī* that “this last rule being redundant since sexual intercourse is prohibited in the *pañcaśīla*,” indeed, he confuses the sexual intercourse in the five precepts and ten precepts, the former case is adultery whereas the latter has a broader meaning.

6/- Holt is not familiar with the monastic tradition by saying that on a *Uposatha* day the code is recited by all of the participants, but in reality only one “learned and competent” monk recites the *Pātimokkha* code and “asks all members present if they are pure with regard

to the rules just cited” (130). He also says that “[i]f an offence is concealed and later becomes known, severe penalties are enforced i.e., *Pārājika* 4;” but in reality that monk committed an additional *pācittiya* offence due to his lying status” (130).

--ooOoo--

Kabilsingh, Chatsumarn. *The Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*. Bangkok: Thammasat Universit Press, 1991.

Kabilsingh’s book presents the discipline of nuns (*Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha*) of the six schools preserved in Chinese *Tripitaka*. The six schools named in her books are: *Theravāda*, *Mahāsaṅghika*, *Mahisāsaka*, *Sarvāstivāda*, *Dharmagupta*, *Mūla-Sarvāstivāda*. The focus in this summary is only on the *bhikkhunī pātimokkha* of *Theravāda*. As said in her introduction, she follows the English translation of I. B. Horner and makes a comparison with the Thai *Tripitaka* version, (which is not included *sādhāraṇapaññatti*, i.e. the monastic codes shared between the two Orders; those can be found in the texts used for monks, *Bhikkhupātimokkha*). For the whole list of rules for nuns, she relies on the text *Ubhatopātimokkha*, which is the monastic codes for both Orders monks and nuns, translated into Thai language by Mr. Sqr. Pornpote Kabilsingh. In order to present her work to English readers, she made a lot of efforts to overcome the two language barriers, Chinese and *Pāli* as she reveals that her Chinese is only fundamental and she left many *Pāli* words incorrectly spelled in her introduction and footnotes. My interest in her work is that it provides my research with the list of the nuns’ monastic codes and shows me in footnotes some discrepancies between the Thai and English versions. In the process of translation through another medium, which is the Thai language, some parts of her English translation become obscure and inappropriate.

--ooOoo--

Misra, G. S. P. *The Age of Vinaya: A Historical and Cultural Study*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1972.

As the book title suggests and as he states that “*As a whole the Pāli Vinaya proves to be a reliable and important source in the formation of the history of the Buddhist Saṅgha,*” Misra presents a comprehensive research giving us the background of the ancient past in India related to many aspects such as religious practices and belief, education, politics, also art and architecture. In fact, he does not only represent the environment of the Buddhist monks in the ancient past but also uses the information from the *Tipiṭaka*, Sanskrit texts, and the works of others such as T. W. Rhys Davids, Oldenberg, Frauwallner, G. C. Pande, N. Dutt, etc., to illustrate the Indian society of the time of the Buddha and later. In addition, he goes further with theoretical explanations related to the *Vinaya* practice with small headings such as *The Human Action and Moral standard, Detached Action, Keeping Away form Sense-Objects, Control and Mastery over Mind, Constant Vigilance, etc.*

From his nine-chapter book, I have read so far three chapters, which I think necessary to my studies about *Vinaya*; they are chapter I: *Vinaya and its Development*, chapter III: *Doctrinal and Moral Basis of Buddhist Discipline*, and chapter IV: *Buddhist Monasticism*. I am impressed by the labor put in this book and vast knowledge about the topic, as well as the clear helpful references for students and researchers. However, my attention was drawn to some unexpected mistakes in his work: When he discusses the two terms *Dhamma* and *Vinaya* that relates to the First Council, I do not know whether he mistakenly or deliberately leaves out the term *Vinaya* out of the Buddha’s instruction before leaving the world. He gives a citation from *Mahāparinibbānasutta* like this: “*dhammo vo, bhikkhave, mamaccayena satthā,*” whereas the Buddha’s words towards Venerable Ānanda is more comprehensive: “*Yo vo Ānanda mayā Dhammo ca Vinayo ca desito paññatto, so vo mam’ accayena Satthā*” (11). In fact, he did not double-check this and did not give the page number for reference.

Moreover, when he mentions about the ten point controversy raised by the Vajjian monks, which was the reason for the second Council convened, his judgment about the president of the Council, Sabbakāmī, seems to be arbitrary and improper:

It is surprising to note that a learned monk like Sabbakāmī did not know the true signification of most of the points concerned and excepting the last two viz., ‘*adasakanisīdana*’ and ‘*jātarūparajāta*’ the other eight points were asked for explanation. (16)

He may mislead the readers by his words instead of presenting the fact alone and leaving deduction to readers. Oppose to his statement, I allege that the purpose of Venerable Sabbakāmī is not to educate himself but to inform the issues to the rest of the monks in the Council.

In the footnote 51, when he says that Mahākassapa who convened the First Council was a Jaṭila,¹ he was perhaps thinking of Uruvelakassapa, Nadīkassapa, and Gayākassapa.² But according to *Apadānapāḷi* and *Theragāthā-Aṭṭhakathā*,³ Mahākassapa was a Brahmin named Pippalimāṇava who married Bhaddā Kāpilānī and later both renounced the world and became famous monk and nun of the Buddha.

Another item is his explanation about the *Kaṭhina* ceremony performed after the rain retreat. He writes: “According to formal rule, if a monk was selected for the making of the robes, as a compensation of the trouble involved in it he was granted five privileges concerning his food, dress and daily life” (124). But the truth is that the five privileges were not granted to him alone but also to other monks who completed the rain retreat at the same place with him and revealed their rejoicing with his accomplishment in making the robe and other rituals of the *Kaṭhina* ceremony.

¹ Footnote 51, p. 115.

² Vin. I, 24.

³ Ap. II, 583, verse 56 ff.; TheA. III, 121 ff.

One more thing needs to be mentioned is that he prefers using Sanskrit terms but gives the *Pāli* sources. For example, he discusses about the role of *upādhyāya* and *ācārya* referring to the text *Cullavaggapāli*; to me it seems odd.

Overall, despite of some unsatisfactory factors, his book gave me not only an overview of the *Vinayapiṭaka* but also the necessary knowledge about the Indian society in the past; moreover some vocabulary from chapter IX: Economic Conditions and Material Culture that is not available in dictionaries.

--ooOoo--

Olivelle, Patrick. *The Origin and The Early Development of Buddhist Monachism.* Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co. Ltd., 1974.

In part two of this work named *The Growths of Buddhist Coenobitical Life*, there are four chapters making up one-third of the book, in which Olivelle proves his points mainly with reference to the *Vinayapiṭaka*. His assumptions are attested by the titles given to each of the four chapters. They are *The Vassa and the Āvāsa* saying about the raining season and the settling of Buddhist monks, *The Uposatha and the Pāṭimokkha* about the ceremony performed twice a month on the eve of the full moon and the new moon days and the recitation of the monastic codes, *The Growth of Monastic Life and the Development of Vinaya Rules* dealing with materials related to each individual or community in monastic life, and *The Entry into the Bhikkhu-Saṅgha* mentioning the requirements and procedure of becoming *sāmaṇera* (novice) and *bhikkhu* (monk) involving two *Pāli* terms *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā*. Even though Olivelle performs a good task in summarizing many parts of the *Vinayapiṭaka*, some of his interpretations about *Vinaya* concepts conflict with mine. A few examples are: the distance that “a man of average height could throw water all around” for a boundary in water (37), the meaning of *nānāvāsaka* and *samānavāsaka* (38-39), the way of

dealing with materials in the *Kaṭhina* ceremony after raining seasons (40-41), the significance of ritual confession in a *Uposatha* day, his prejudice in calling Venerable Purāṇa (*āyasmā Purāṇa*) who is the leader of five hundred monks as “th[e] aged bhikkhu [who] refused to submit to what had been agreed upon at the First Council at Rājagrha” (55), or his wrong statement of the *pācittiya* offence 35th instead of 39th while relating to the prohibition of fish and meat (59).

--ooOoo--

Ratnapala, Nandasena. *Crime and Punishment in the Buddhist Tradition*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 1993.

As revealed by the title, the content of this book hangs upon the rules applied to the followers of Buddhism, especially to the clerical members, i.e. *bhikkhu(s)* and *bhikkhunī(s)*. As an expert in the field of criminology, the author makes an attempt to approach the field of *Vinaya* studies and tries to gain knowledge from Buddhist tradition in order to suggest supplements to the contemporary law. Furthermore, he also tries to see the philosophy of Buddhist Law under the view of the present judicial system. First of all, the author presents the background of Buddhist Law, in other words the condition and situation that led to the *Pātimokkha* rules (chapter I). Then he continues with chapter II *The Nature and Type of Buddhist Law*, which is a general view about offences in the *Pātimokkha* rules under four current modern trends: crimes against property, crimes against persons, crimes against public safety and morals, and crimes against the social order. He also presents the origin and causes of such offences under the evolutionary, political and economic, socio-psychological, and karmic points of views (chapter IV). In the next five chapters (V to IX), he summarizes the content of *Suttavibhaṅga* containing the rules for monks and nuns. Finally, in the rest of his book, chapters X to XV, he mainly uses materials in the first four chapters of *Cullavagga*

dealing with legal disputes (*adhikaraṇa*), settlement (*adhikaraṇasamatha*), and acts of punishment such as act of censure (*tajjanīyakamma*). He also picks out some information from *Mahāvagga* that have relation with his thesis and analyzes them under the view of the modern jurisprudence. Despite the introduction in the cover of his book that he has deep knowledge and capability for this topic including his skill in ancient languages, some unavoidable weaknesses have come up: For example, his discussion is mainly based on the *Vinayapiṭaka* translation of I. B. Horner, but sometimes he quotes Sukumar Dutt without questioning how and where Sukumar Dutt had reached such conclusion (64, 186). For some unknown reasons, in a few places he gives references to the *Pāli* scriptures instead of translation of other translators. Another important issue is that while doing research based on translations of others, he gives wrong interpretation for the passages quoted (93, 95, 98, 185, 198).

--ooOoo--

Thanissaro, Ven. Phra Jeffrey. *The Buddhist Monastic Code: The Pātimokkha Training Rules Translated and Explained*. California: Metta Forest Monastery, 1993.

This book is an attempt of the author to present an organized and detailed account of the monastic codes *Pātimokkha*, which are the training rules for monks in *Theravāda* tradition, with information drawn from the *Vinayapiṭaka*. Each rule is analyzed into its component factors: intention, perception, object, effort, and result in order to help *Vinaya* learners grasp a strong knowledge for each rule. The author not only puts in his book as much information from the ancient scriptures as possible but also tries to apply the rules in the environment of the modern time by giving vivid examples created by his own imagination. Such examples are helpful; however some of them have wrongly suggestive sense or go too far beyond the reality. That may cause unpleasant feelings to the readers, whether they are religious or lay

people. For instance, giving examples for the second rule of *saṅghādisesa*, he says “a bhikkhu who fondles the breasts or buttocks of a fully-clothed woman would incur only a thullaccaya since the contact was indirect” (106), or “if he lustfully rubs up two women in a bus, he incurs two saṅghādisesas” (109). Or in the second rule of *pācittiya*, he translates “You camel! You goat! You ass! You penis! You vaginal” and emphasizes in parentheses that “[a]ll five of these come from the Vibhaṅga” (263). The *Pāli* passage in the *Vinayapiṭaka* for his translation could only be: “*oṭṭhosi meṇḍosi goṇosi gadrabhosi tiracchānagatosi nerayikosi*” (Vin. IV, 7), but its meaning is slightly different: “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” (BD. II, 178); so where did the venerable author get the last two items, penis and vaginal, for his translation?

As said in his introduction, besides the *Vinayapiṭaka*, the author has consulted five primary works, which are *Samantapāsādikā*, *Kaṅkhavitāranī*, *Sāratthadīpanī*, *Vimativinodanī*, *Atthayojanā*, including the English translation of I. B. Horner and many other books as well. Leaving out some weaknesses mentioned above, this book is recommended to read in order to understand more about the *Vinayapiṭaka*.

--ooOoo--

Wijayaratna, Mohan. *Buddhist monastic life: according to the texts of the Theravāda tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Although being undergone the process of translation from French into English language, Wijayaratna’s book still preserves its lucid and easy to understand writing style. For the content of the book, as the title suggested, readers can find information relating to the life of religious members of the Buddhist community beginning with the introduction about the term *saṅgha*, which “refer[s] specifically to the Community of monks and nuns in the terminology

of Theravāda monasticism” with historical facts about its formation and the stories of some remarkable disciples of the Buddha (1). Wijayaratna arranges his book into general headings: *Dwelling Places, Clothing, Food, Money, Chastity, Solitude, The Rules of the Community*, so that readers can easily find information that interests them or fulfills their need. In order to perform such task, Wijayaratna must have strong knowledge about Buddhism. I think that he was not only spending a lot of times reading the vast materials about Buddhism but also exerted a lot of labors generalizing and categorizing the knowledge acquired before composing this book, and that he has also achieved a high level in the *Pāli* language.

Unfortunately, he still made some misinterpretations about *Vinaya* concepts. For examples, he translate a long passage from the *Vinayapiṭaka* but drops important information at the last sentence “*I allow you, monks, three robes: saṅghāti, uttarāsaṅga, and antarāvāsaka.*”¹ He had better translate precisely as two-layer *saṅghāti*, one-layer *uttarāsaṅga*, and one-layer *antarāvāsaka* (41). It seems to me that he confuses the concept of sharing ownership (*vikappeti*) of an extra robe with another monastic member while interpreting an excerpt from Vin. IV, 121 (48). He also gives wrong interpretation of the *pācittiya* rule 31, which states that a monk if not sick should receive food at a charity center only one day (71), also of the *pāṭidesanīya* rule 4 about receiving food that is not informed in advanced (*appaṭisamviditaṃ*) while living in dangerous forests; the concept about the food from a stranger may mislead readers that the rule is supposed to protect the monks from poisoned but in fact to keep the donors from the danger of being attacked by robbers (72, 142). The juice extracted from sugar cane is acceptable drinking in inappropriate time (*vikāla*)² but he means in the contrary (74). And the *pācittiya* rule 70, the advice to a novice who upheld false opinion is given once not three successive occasions as that of Wijayaratna’s interpretation (151). Wijayaratna quotes the invitation, “*Etha bhikkhavo.*

¹ anujānāmi bhikkhave ticīvaram diguṇaṃ saṅghāṭiṃ ekacciyam uttarāsaṅgaṃ ekacciyam antarāvāsakan ti (Vin I, 289).

² anujānāmi bhikkhave ucchurasan ti (Vin. I, 246).

Svākkhāto dhammo, caratha brahmacariyaṃ sammā dukkhassa antakiriyaṃ” at Vin. I, 23 and translates as “Come, monks practice the life of purity to bring a complete end to suffering,” (117) he missed an important part, i.e. *svākkhāto dhammo*. He also states that such quote was the original formula used by the Master in the first days of the Community to bestow the Ordination on monks and nuns;” in fact it was applied to monks, not to nuns.

Despite such unavoidable mistakes, his book offers a good general knowledge about Buddhism for the readers who have the curiosity of how the life and activities in a Buddhist monastery looks like. This book is recommended to the readers of all levels due to its appeal in transparent writing style and its richness of Buddhist monastic information.

--ooOoo--

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES:

Āṅguttaranikāya Vol. I. Ed. Rev. Richard Morris. London: The Pali Text Society, 1961.

Āṅguttaranikāya Atthakathā (Manorathapūranī) Vol. II. Ed. Max Wellerser & Hermann Kopp. London: The Pali Text Society, 1967.

Dīghanikāya Vol. I. Ed. T. W. Rhys Davids & J. Estlin Carpenter. London: The Pali Text Society, 1975.

Dīghanikāya Atthakathā (Samaṅgalavilāsini) Part I, III. Ed. T. W. Rhys Davids & J. Estlin Carpenter. London: The Pali Text Society, 1968.

Dīghanikāya Ṭīkā. Chatṭha Saṅgāyana CD-ROM Version 3. Vipassana Research Institute.

Dhammasaṅgaṇī. Ed. Edward Müller. London: The Pali Text Society, 1978.

Dhammasaṅgaṇī Atthakathā (Atthasālinī). Ed. Edward Müller. London: The Pali Text Society, 1979.

Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī nāma Mātikaṭṭhakathā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on The Pātimokkha. Ed. Dorothy Maskell. London: The Pali Text Society, 1981.

Mahāniddesa (Niddesa I). Ed. L. de La Vallée Poussin, E. J. Thomas, London: The Pali Text Society, 1978.

Milindapañhā. Ed. Chatṭha Saṅgāyana CD-ROM Version 3. Vipassana Research Institute.

Niddesa-Atthakathā Vol. II (*Saddhammapajjotikā*). Ed. A. P. Buddhadatta. London: The Pali Text Society, 1941.

Paṭisambhidāmagga. Ed. Arnold C. Taylor. London: The Pali Text Society, 1979.

Vibhaṅga Atthakathā (Sammohavinodanī). Ed. A. P. Buddhadatta. London: The Pali Text Society, 1980.

Vinaya Pitakam

Ed. Hermann Oldenberg. 5 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1879.

Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series, 9 Vols. Colombo: Buddhist Cultural Centre, 2005.

Thai Editions, 8 vols.

- BUDSIR for Thai Translation 3.0. Bangkok: Mahidol University.

- Digital Pali Reader (*Thai Tipitaka*).

Burmese Editions, 5 vols.

- Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana CD-ROM Version 3. Vipassana Research Institute.

- Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana Romanized Project by Bhaddanta Aggasāmi.

Vinaya Atthakathā (Samanatapāsādikā). Ed. J. Takakusu, M. Nagai and K. Mizuno, 7 vols. The Pali Text Society, 1966-1981.

Vinaya-Ṭīkā (Sāratthadīpanī). Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana CD-ROM Version 3. Vipassana Research Institute.

--ooOoo--

SECONDARY SOURCES:

Bodhi, Bhikkhu.

- *A Comprehensive Manual of Abhidhamma*, 2nd ed. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1999.

- *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*, Boston: Wisdom Publication, 2000.

Buddhadatta, A. P.

- *The New Pali Course*, 3 Parts, Colombo: Buddhist Cultural Center, 1997.

- *Concise Pāli – English Dictionary*, Colombo: The Colombo Apothecaries' Co., Ltd., 1968.

Dhirasekhara, Jotiya. *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: A Study of its Origins and Development in Relation to the Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas*. Colombo: M.D. Gunasena, 1982.

Dutt, Sukumar. *Early Buddhist Monachism*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1996.

Geiger, Wilhelm. *A Pāli Grammar*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2000.

Hinüber, Oskar von. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 2001.

Holt, John Clifford. *Discipline: The Canonical Buddhism of the Vinayapiṭaka*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1995.

Horner, I. B. Trans. *The Book of the Discipline (Vinayapitaka)* 5 vols. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1997-2000.

Juo-Hsüeh Shih Bhikkhunī. *Controversies over Buddhist Nuns*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2000.

Kabilsingh, Chatsumarn. Trans. *The Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*. Bangkok: Thammasat Universit Press, 1991.

Misra, G.S.P. *The Age of Vinaya: A Historical and Cultural Study*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1972.

Ñāṇamoli Thera.

- Trans. *Pātimokkha: The Rule for Buddhist Monks*. Bangkok: Mahāmakutt Rājavidyālaya Press, 1992.

- Trans. *The Path of Discrimination (Paṭisambhidāmagga)*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1982.

- Trans. with Bhikkhu Bodhi. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha (Majjhimanikāya)*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1995.

Norman, K. R. Trans. *The Pātimokkha*. Ed. William Pruitt. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2001.

- Olivelle, Patrick. *The Origin and The Early Development of Buddhist Monachism*. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena & Co. Ltd., 1974.
- Perera, L. P. N. *Sexuality in Ancient India: A Study Based on the Pali Vinayapitaka*. Colombo: The Postgraduate Institute of Pali and Buddhist Studies, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka, 1993.
- Perniola, Vito S. J. *Pali Grammar*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1997.
- Ratnapala, Nandasena. *Crime and Punishment in the Buddhist Tradition*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 1993.
- Thanissaro, Ven. Phra Geoffrey De Graff.
- *The Buddhist Monastic Code: The Pāṭimokkha Training Rules Translated and Explained*. California: Metta Forest Monastery, 1994.
- *The Buddhist Monastic Code II: The Buddhist Monastic Code II: The Khandhaka Rules Translated & Explained*. California: Metta Forest Monastery, 2001.
- Vajirañāṇavarorasa, Krom Phrayā. *The Entrance to the Vinaya (Vinayamukha)*. 3 vols. Translated from the Thai. Bangkok: Mahāmakūṭa Rājavidyālaya Press, 1969-89.
- Warder, A. K. *Introduction to Pali*, 3rd ed. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2001.
- Whitney, William Dwight. *The Roots, Verb-forms and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1997.
- Wijayaratna, Mohan.
- *Buddhist Monastic Life: According to the Texts of the Theravāda Tradition*. Trans. Claude Grangier and Steven Collins. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- *Buddhist Nuns: The Birth and Development of a Women's Monastic Order*. Colombo: Wisdom, 2001.
- Wijesekera, O. H. de A., *Syntax of the Cases in the Pali Nikayas*, Colombo: The Postgraduate Institute of Pali and Buddhist Studies, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka, 1993.

--ooOoo--

DICTIONARIES, ENCYCLOPAEDIA:

Concise Pāli-English Dictionary. A. P. Buddhadatta. Colombo: The Colombo Apothecaries' Co., Ltd., 1968.

A Dictionary of Pāli, Part I, a-kh. Margaret Cone. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2001.

Dictionary of Pāli Idioms: An Aid to the Student of Pāli. Kākkāpalliye Anuruddha Thera. Hongkong: The Chi Lin Nunnery, 2004.

A Dictionary of the Pali Language. Robert Cæsar Childers. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 1993

Encyclopaedia of Buddhism. Ed. G. P. Malalasekera. Colombo: The Government of Ceylon, 1961- .

Pali-English Dictionary. Ed. T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 2001.

Sanskrit English Dictionary. Monier-Williams. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 2005.

--ooOoo--

INDEXES

1. Index of Contents

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Active vs. Passive | 269b, 270c | Optative | 147b |
| <i>Bahubbīhi</i> compound | 123c, 129, 250a | Past participle in active sense | 240b |
| Causative verb - <i>ujjhāpeti</i> | 53 | Present participle - as verbal noun | 251 |
| Contextual - <i>dukkāṭa</i> or <i>anāpatti</i> | 46, 85b, 121b, 152, 250b, 255b | Relative pronouns | 250c |
| Dative | <i>assa</i> 273, <i>me</i> 116a, 273 | Semantic | 100 |
| Dative vs. Genitive | 202 | Subject | 249, 255a |
| Double negative | 97 | Syntactic - <i>iti/ti</i> | 261 |
| Futur passive participle | 35, 143, 172b | Syntactic - parallel structure | 32, 173a, 215 |
| Genitive - <i>me</i> | 117a, 120a, 175a, | punctuation | 28a, 121a, 219a |
| - <i>te</i> | 126 | punctuation and sharing object | 219b |
| Genitive vs. Dative | 24, 50a, 52, 78, 79a | sentence structure | 1a, 96, 147a, 148a, 167b, 180, 243, 248, 256, 260, 265a, 266, 268, 270b, 271 |
| Gerund | 56b, 74, 115b, 145c, 158, 160, 177a, 206b, 225 | Technical English | 181a |
| Instrumental of agent - with <i>sakkā</i> | 21, 22, 23 | Textual discrepancy | 7a, 25a, 68b, 76, 79c, 92, 119, 131c, 172d, 176, 231, 245, 247b, 260 |
| Instrumental of agent | 138, 139, 140, 149, 172a, 237 | Textual - missing translation | 77, 95, 184, 196, 198a, 218, 230, 236, 242b, 270a |
| Interrogative | 144b, 258, 259, 262 | Textual - misreading | 17, 81b, 106, 260 |
| Imperative mood - <i>pañcamī</i> | 229 | Textual - technical error | 208a |
| Locative absolute | 44, 181b | Vegetarianism in Buddhism | 15 |
| Names of heavens | 118 | Vocabulary | 115a, 168, 169 |
| Negative | 210 | Vocative - <i>bhagavā</i> | 195 |
| Objective | 172c | | |
| Obscure English | 62c | | |

--ooOoo--

2. Index of Words

| | | | |
|--|---------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>akappakatena</i> | 163e | <i>anusāsati</i> | 115a |
| <i>akāmā</i> | 142 | <i>anekapariyāyena</i> | 2a |
| <i>akkosena</i> | 49b | <i>anta</i> | 206a |
| <i>akkhāyati</i> | 50e | <i>antarāgāmaṃ</i> | 76 |
| <i>agaru</i> | 123b | <i>antevāsika</i> | 19c, 20 |
| <i>acchindati</i> (to tear off) | 99 | <i>apacayassa</i> | 2c |
| causative <i>acchindāpeti</i> | 99 | <i>apaccuddhāraṃ</i> | 67 |
| gerund <i>acchinditvā</i> | 34b, 37 | <i>apalokanakammaṃ</i> | 192 |
| <i>acchinna</i> (tattered, broken off) | 98 | <i>api</i> | 240a |
| <i>acchinne</i> (to be cut off) | 166 | <i>appasādaṃ</i> | 242b |
| <i>ajjhācāra</i> | 128 | <i>abhikkanta</i> | 125 |
| <i>ajjhottharati</i> | 134 | <i>abhiññā</i> | 1c |
| <i>ajjhoharati</i> | 203 | <i>amukasmim</i> | 146a |
| <i>ajjhohāra</i> | 60 | <i>amukasmim okāse</i> | 211 |
| <i>añjaliṃ paggaṇhāpeti</i> | 177b | <i>amhākaṃ</i> | 187a |
| <i>aññatr' eva</i> | 217 | <i>ayyā</i> | 234, 238, 239 |
| <i>atidiṭṭhi</i> | 128 | <i>ayye</i> | 47b |
| <i>attha</i> | 47a | <i>ayyo</i> | 47c |
| <i>attharati</i> | 163a | <i>arah' asi</i> | 113a |
| <i>atthavasam</i> | 216c | <i>ariyaka</i> | 4 |
| <i>attho</i> | 244 | <i>alam</i> | 111 |
| <i>addhiṭṭheti</i> | 34a | <i>alam Gotami mā te rucci</i> | 227 |
| <i>adhimutto</i> | 154 | <i>avippavāsaṃ</i> | 132 |
| <i>adhisīla</i> | 128 | <i>asatthikā</i> | 105a |
| <i>anattamano</i> | 187b | <i>asambhinnena</i> | 66a |
| <i>anantajina</i> | 113b | <i>asāvetukāma</i> | 5b |
| <i>anavajjapaññatti</i> | 264 | <i>asuci</i> | 168 |
| <i>anupakhajja</i> | 191 | <i>assa vacanīyaṃ</i> | 193d |
| <i>anumodati</i> | 164b | <i>aṃsabandhakaṃ</i> | 156a |
| <i>anulomatā</i> | 148b | <i>āgantukabhattaṃ</i> | 175b |
| <i>anulomaṃ</i> | 272 | <i>ācāriya</i> | 19c |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| <i>ādikammika</i> | 28b | <i>ekadā</i> | 141 |
| <i>āpannasattā</i> | 108 | <i>etarahi</i> | 246b |
| <i>āmisantaro</i> | 169 | <i>eva</i> | 122, 228b |
| <i>āyasmato</i> | 155 | <i>otāpento</i> | 55 |
| <i>ārāmika</i> | 3 | <i>ottharakam</i> | 199c |
| <i>āvuso</i> | 114b, 242a, 244 | <i>odanena</i> | 86 |
| <i>iti/ti</i> | 18a, 48b, 71a, 73a, 144a, 146b, 185c | <i>omasati</i> | 84b |
| <i>itthilinga</i> | 6b | <i>olambako</i> | 12a |
| <i>idha</i> | 263 | <i>olambanaka</i> | 207 |
| <i>indriya</i> | 167c | <i>kaṭacchuparissāvanam</i> | 198b |
| <i>imassa & amussa</i> | 50d | <i>katabhaṇḍam</i> | 40b, 41 |
| <i>imaṇ</i> | 216b | <i>katama</i> | 246a |
| <i>iminā</i> | 221b | <i>kattum</i> | 201 |
| <i>iriyāpatha</i> | 208b | <i>kathinaṇ</i> | 164a |
| <i>ukkaddhiyyati</i> | 45 | <i>kadā</i> | 136 |
| <i>uccāra</i> | 93 | <i>kabalāvacchedakam</i> | 89 |
| <i>ujjhāpeti</i> | 53 | <i>kamma in Vinaya terminology</i> | 267 |
| <i>ujjhāyati</i> | 16b | <i>kammavācā</i> | 31 |
| <i>uttarāḷumpaṇ</i> | 165 | <i>karaṇīya</i> | 204a |
| <i>uttānamukhā</i> | 173c | <i>kalaha</i> | 50b |
| <i>uttiṭṭha</i> | 127 | <i>kāretum</i> | 201 |
| <i>udakadantapona</i> | 63 | <i>kālavato</i> | 137 |
| <i>uddisamānā</i> | 135a | <i>kira</i> | 27a |
| <i>upakkamivā</i> | 7c | <i>kismiṇ viya</i> | 25b |
| <i>upagatassa</i> | 173b | <i>kiṇ</i> | 94a |
| <i>upajjhāya</i> | 19b | <i>kiṇ pana</i> | 58, 69 |
| <i>upanikkhittaṇ</i> | 42a | <i>kukkukatena</i> | 163b |
| <i>upasampannā</i> | 232b | <i>kukkuccāyati</i> | 200c |
| <i>upasampādentena</i> | 131a | <i>ko</i> | 107a |
| <i>ubbhujitvā & ubbhujitabbaṇ</i> | 222a | <i>koṭi</i> | 209a |
| <i>ummattakālayaṇ karoti</i> | 189 | <i>khandhaṇ oropeti</i> | 12b |
| <i>uruntarikāya</i> | 7a | <i>khīyati</i> | 16b |
| <i>ūnadvādasavassā</i> | 109b | <i>kheḷaṇ</i> | 169 |
| <i>ekato</i> | 85a, 91b | <i>gacchati</i> | 73b |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|-----------|
| <i>gantabbam</i> | 26 | <i>duvūpasantaṃ</i> | 171 |
| <i>garu</i> | 170 | <i>dūseti</i> | 130b |
| <i>gilānupaṭṭhāko</i> | 169 | <i>dhaññaphalarasaṃ</i> | 161b |
| <i>gihigatā</i> | 109a | <i>dhanakkītā</i> | 27b |
| <i>catukkabhattaṃ</i> | 186 | <i>dhammakarakaṃ</i> | 198c |
| <i>catuvaggakarane kamme</i> | 274a | <i>navakammaṃ</i> | 199a |
| <i>cārikaṃ carati</i> | 105b | <i>nākāmā</i> | 145a |
| <i>cirāciraṃ</i> | 103 | <i>niruttipatho</i> | 14 |
| <i>cīvarasaṅkamanīyaṃ</i> | 104 | <i>nivesanaṃ</i> | 221a |
| <i>cudito</i> | 226 | <i>nisajja</i> | 114a |
| <i>chando</i> | 274b | <i>nissaggiyena</i> | 163d |
| <i>chah' ākārehi</i> | 13b | <i>nissatṭhaṃ</i> | 40a |
| <i>chārikaṃ</i> | 157 | <i>paccaññāsīṃ</i> | 117c |
| <i>jantāgharaṃ</i> | 200b | <i>paccuddharati</i> | 36, 37 |
| <i>jhānaṃ</i> | 18c | <i>pacchāsamaṇa</i> | 120b |
| <i>ñatti</i> | 31 | <i>pacchimaṃ</i> | 214 |
| <i>ñāṇadassanaṃ</i> | 117b | <i>paṭicchannaṃ</i> | 33 |
| <i>ḍākarasaṃ</i> | 161c | <i>paṭicchādetabbaṃ</i> | 222b |
| <i>tajjanīyakammakatena</i> | 172a | <i>paṭibāhati</i> | 212b |
| <i>tathārūpaṃ</i> | 124 | <i>paṭiyālokaṃ</i> | 61 |
| <i>taduttariṃ</i> | 253 | <i>paṇītāni bhojanāni</i> | 168 |
| <i>tadupādāya</i> | 182a | <i>paṇḍaka</i> | 130a |
| <i>tayā</i> | 130b | <i>pattanillehakaṃ</i> | 91a |
| <i>talaghātakaṃ</i> | 102 | <i>pattasaññī</i> | 83 |
| <i>tassā me</i> | 167a | <i>patto saudako</i> | 223 |
| <i>taṃ yeva</i> | 6b | <i>parikammaṃ</i> | 179, 200a |
| <i>tāvakālikaṃ</i> | 13a, 75b | <i>parittaṃ - adj.</i> | 56a |
| <i>daṇḍaparissāvanaṃ</i> | 199c | <i>parittaṃ - noun</i> | 194 |
| <i>davāya</i> | 5a | <i>paripucchā</i> | 65 |
| <i>diṭṭhadhammike</i> | 153 | <i>parivāro</i> | 80 |
| <i>diṭṭhi</i> | 30 | <i>parivuttho</i> | 183a |
| <i>dinnaṃ</i> | 9a | <i>parissāvanaṃ</i> | 198a |
| <i>dinnaṃyeva</i> | 39 | <i>pallatthikā</i> | 82 |
| <i>dukkhaṃ ariyasaccaṃ</i> | 116b | <i>pavārito</i> | 62a, 212a |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| <i>pavāreti, pavārito, pavāritena</i> | 159 | <i>yadaggena ... tadeva</i> | 232a |
| <i>pasīdati</i> | 208c | <i>yassa & so</i> | 75a |
| <i>passāva</i> | 93 | <i>yācāpeyya</i> | 25c |
| <i>passāvaṭṭhānaṃ</i> | 185b | <i>yāmakālikaṃ</i> | 79b |
| <i>passāvaṃ karoti</i> | 205 | <i>yāvakālikaṃ</i> | 79b |
| <i>paṃsukūla</i> | 75c | <i>yāvajīvikaṃ</i> | 79b |
| <i>paṃsukūlika</i> | 197 | <i>yāvadatthaṃ</i> | 204b |
| <i>pi</i> | 43, 49a 216a, 233 | <i>ravāya</i> | 5a |
| <i>piṭṭhiparikammaṃ</i> | 179, 200a | <i>ropeti</i> | 235 |
| <i>piṇḍukkhepaṃ</i> | 88 | <i>labbhati</i> | 174 |
| <i>pucchituṃ</i> | 131b | <i>lahu</i> | 170 |
| <i>purimaṃ upādāya</i> | 182b | <i>vaccaṭṭhānaṃ</i> | 185b |
| <i>purekkhāratā</i> | 148b | <i>vaccaṃ karoti</i> | 205 |
| <i>pesuññaṃ</i> | 50c | <i>vattthuṃ</i> | 25a |
| <i>bandhanasuttakaṃ</i> | 156b | <i>vaseyyāma</i> | 123a |
| <i>bahukatā</i> | 57 | <i>vā</i> | 42b |
| <i>bahulaṃ</i> | 246c | <i>vācasikā</i> | 48b |
| <i>bimbohanaṃ</i> | 185a, 241 | <i>vāceti</i> | 51, 257 |
| <i>bhaṇamāno</i> | 224 | <i>vāsūpagatassa</i> | 81b |
| <i>bhaṇḍanaṃ</i> | 50b | <i>vikappeti</i> | 34a |
| <i>bhattavissaggaṃ</i> | 38 | <i>viññāyati</i> | 247a |
| <i>bhaddantā</i> | 16c | <i>vinayapariyattiyā</i> | 70 |
| <i>bhāṇavāra</i> | 220 | <i>vinicchiyamāne</i> | 247a |
| <i>bhojana</i> | 62b | <i>vipāceti</i> | 16b |
| <i>bhojetvā</i> | 77 | <i>vilepanena</i> | 66b |
| <i>majjhimassa purisassa</i> | 11, 54, 133b | <i>vivāda</i> | 50b |
| <i>madhukapuppharasam</i> | 161d | <i>vivādāpannānaṃ</i> | 50b |
| <i>may' amhā</i> | 231 | <i>vissajjeti</i> | 34a, 37 |
| <i>milakkhuka</i> | 04 | <i>vīmaṃsati</i> | 27c |
| <i>mukhadvāraṃ</i> | 87 | <i>vuṭṭhānatā</i> | 148b |
| <i>mettacitto</i> | 169 | <i>vuṭṭhāpitaṃ</i> | 110 |
| <i>mocessāmi</i> | 7b | <i>vuṭṭhitāya parisāya</i> | 112 |
| <i>mohanake</i> | 72 | <i>vuḍḍhapabbajita</i> | 8 |
| <i>yathākathaṃ viya</i> | 193e | <i>vediyati</i> | 68b |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| <i>veyyāvacca</i> | 106 | <i>sammati</i> | 193b, 199b |
| <i>veyyāvaccakara</i> | 106 | <i>sammā</i> | 218 |
| <i>saṅghātipallatthikāya</i> | 188 | <i>sayamaṃ (abhiññā)</i> | 1c |
| <i>sacchikatvā</i> | 1b | <i>saṃgaṇikāya</i> | 2b |
| <i>saññācīkāya</i> | 252, 254 | <i>saṃbhoga</i> | 178 |
| <i>sattāhakālikamaṃ</i> | 79b | <i>saṃyācīkāya</i> | 29 |
| <i>satthagamanīya</i> | 59 | <i>saṃharati</i> | 107b |
| <i>santhara</i> | 209b | <i>saṃharāpetvā</i> | 101b |
| <i>santharati</i> | 206a | <i>sātisāraṃ</i> | 265b |
| <i>sandassetuṃ</i> | 169 | <i>sānuvādo</i> | 190 |
| <i>sannidhikatena</i> | 163c | <i>sāmaggī</i> | 145b |
| <i>saddhivihārika</i> | 19b | <i>sāmaṇera</i> | 19a |
| <i>sapadānaṃ</i> | 84a | <i>sāvajjapaññatti</i> | 264 |
| <i>sabba</i> | 133a, | <i>sāveti</i> | 135b |
| <i>sabbaṃ</i> | 161a | <i>sāvetukāma</i> | 5b |
| <i>sabhojane kule</i> | 64 | <i>siyā</i> | 193a |
| <i>samatho</i> | 193c | <i>sutta</i> | 71b |
| <i>samānavassikaṃ</i> | 150, 151 | <i>supaṭicchanno</i> | 81a |
| <i>samānāsanika</i> | 213 | <i>suparivuttho</i> | 183b |
| <i>samādapetuṃ</i> | 169 | <i>senāsanamaṃ</i> | 16a, 168 |
| <i>samāpajjimaṃ</i> | 18b | <i>so 'haṃ & tassa me</i> | 68a |
| <i>sampayojeti</i> | 172d | <i>haññati</i> | 10 |
| <i>samparāyike</i> | 153 | <i>hatthanillehakaṃ</i> | 90 |
| <i>sampassamānena</i> | 269a | <i>harāpetha</i> | 9b |
| <i>sambādha</i> | 101b | <i>hi - conjunction</i> | 94b, 228a, 234 |

--ooOoo--

(blank page)