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“Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms” (SVTT) III was concerned with parivāsa and mānatta, the specific penalties incurred by Buddhist monks or nuns who have committed a Samghādisesa (Samgh.) offence (that is, the second most serious type of offence listed in the Pātimokkha), and the only one in that list whose redress, dealt with in detail in the second and third Khandhakas of the Cullavagga, is said to entail formal procedures and constant supervision by a regular chapter. The present studies deal with other penalties which are related (whether they also involve procedures or not) both to each other and to those of parivāsa and mānatta: the group of seven other disciplinary procedures detailed in the first Khandhaka of the Cullavagga (SVTT IV); the contrasting terms nissāranā, osāranā, which must be investigated in connexion with those procedures (V); the penalties of expulsion (nāsanā) (VI) and “punishment” (danḍa-kamma) (VII); the disciplinary procedures of proclamation (pakāsanīya-kamma) (VIII) and of boycott of a lay donor’s gifts (patta-nikkujjanā) (IX); and the brahma-danḍa penalty (X).

An important correction to SVTT II 110, §2c (iv) concerning tassa-pāpiyyasikā, will be found at the end of these studies (Appendix I) where it is referred to as TPāp. SVTT V and VI take into account a stimulating work on the same topics by Ven. Juo-hsüeh Shih (Oxford).

*See JPTS XXII, 1996, pp. 73–150.

IV. The disciplinary procedures of tajjanīya-, nissaya-, pabbājanīya-, paṭisāranīya-, and threefold ukkhepanīya-kamma (n.)

1. The second and third chapters of the Cullavagga, where the particulars of the mānatta and parivāsa penalties are detailed, are preceded by the Kamma-kkhandhaka ("Section on procedures"), which deals with a sevenfold set of similar disciplinary procedures, there said to apply to offences that may be redressed by (mere) confession, i.e. neither Pārājika (Pār.) nor Saṅgh. offences. According to Vin I 145,16–18, these penalties apply also to nuns.

A Skt Mū parallel occurs in the first part of the Pāndulohitaka-vastu. For a summary of Chinese data with references, see Fawallner, Vinaya 107–109 (on Chinese and Skt parallels to paṭisāranīya, see also Lévi, “Mss sanscrits” 5–8).

---

1 Vin II 1,6–30,15 with Sp 1155,7–59,20.
3 Vin II 3,8–9,37 with Sp 1155,16–17. On the Pāc. offences that may or may not be redressed by confession (desanā-, adesanā-gāmini āpatti), see SVTT II 112, n. 63.
5 None of these procedures is dealt with in ChinSp (where the parallel to the Kamma-kkhandhaka of the Cullavagga is missing), nor are they mentioned there according to the index. The Campeyya-kkhandhaka (Vin I 312–36), which deals extensively with the conditions of validity of these and other disciplinary procedures in the Thv(M) Vinaya (Vin) and immediately precedes ChinSp’s parallel to the Cullavagga, is mentioned there only insofar as it “needs no explanation” (ChinSp 532 [14]).

6 For convenience, terms occurring with variants -i/-i- will be spelt henceforth in the latter form; those whose gender may be either neuter (n.) or feminine (f.) will be quoted as f.

7 Most often replaced by nīy(yas)as(a), “disrepute”, in Sp (E and C), Vjh (B'), and B of Cullavagga (the heterogeneity of BHS parallel forms, listed at the end of this paragraph, should also be noted). This is not to be confused with the other senses of nissaya, masculine (m.) (no alternative spelling as far as can be seen): (i) “resources” upon which monks and nuns are ideally expected to rely (Vin I 58,10–22; II 274,23, 278,13–16); (ii) “dependence” of a newly ordained monk on his preceptor or instructor (Vin I 60,31–62,11), and revocation thereof (nissaya-paññippassaddhi, Vin I 62,14; (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 9,16 nīśraya-pratiprasrahana [Guṇ-VinSū(Prav-v) 42.1 niśraya- ]; cf. below, SVTT VII, § 4). – Cf. below, § 4 [4].

8 The adjective gihi-patisamyyutta, “connected with laymen”, occurs solely in reference to this offence (Vin V 115,16 with Sp 1320,13–15); the sixth and seventh modes of settlement of formal disputes do not apply to it (cf. SVTT II 112., § 2d). The symmetrical case of a layman who offends monks is dealt with by the procedure of patta-nikkujjanā (see below, SVTT IX).

9 An illustration of an (objectionable) suspension of this kind occurs at Vin I 312,3–13,13; the text then states that groundless charges leading to suspension entail a Dukkata (Dukk.) offence (313,13–15,20, 322,34–25,25). – Skt Sa fragment with Chinese parallel: SHT(V) 36–38 (1049) and notes. – Skt Mū parallel: MSV(D) II 199,4–201,13 (on the right readings, see below, second part of n. 28). – Chinese Mū parallel: Lévi-Chavannes, “Titres” 195–97.
(VII) for refusing to give up a wrong opinion\(^{10}\) (pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā appaṭinissage ukkhepaniya). Two of them, pabbājanīya-\(^{k}\) and pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā ukkhepaniya-\(^{k}\), are also mentioned in the Bhikkhu- and Bhikkhunī-Vinaya-vibhaṅga; the ukkhepaniya-\(^{k}\) is referred to in the Bhikkhunī-Pātimokkha\(^{11}\) (see below, §§ 7b, 8e).

\(^{10}\)This doctrinal ground for an offence stands in striking contrast to the disciplinary grounds for all others (see Bechert, “Schismenendikt” pp. 33–34 = Bechert, Schulz 36). The penalty incurred by a novice in the same case is expulsion (nāsanā, Thv(M) [bhu] 70th Pāc.; see below, SVTT VI, § 2 c). – According to Vin I 142,36–43,6 ≠ 144,30–36, a monk may (and should) break his monsoon retreat when a monk or a nun is to be dissuaded from advocating wrong opinions.

\(^{11}\)The technical terms taJJaniya, nissaya, and pattiśāraṇiya are neither mentioned nor referred to in Pātim or in the vibhaṅga. The statement at SBE XVII 329, n. 4 (cf. Dutt, EBM, p. 15) that grounds quite similar to those for taJJaniya are dealt with in the 8th–11th Thv(M) [bhu] Samgh. (with the contradiction that the former is said, in canonical texts, not to apply to Samgh. offences) are based on the key-word adhikaraṇa that occurs both in the account of how and why taJJaniya was prescribed (see below, § 2 and n. 18), and in the wording of the 8th–11th Samgh. (Vin III 163,25** with Kkh 43,37–38 ≠ Sp 595,11–12 [ChinSp 391–92 (56)]; Vin III 168,5** with Kkh 44,24–45,13, Sp 599,5–600,11; Vin III 172,32** with Kkh 45,28–30 = Sp 607,32–608,2). Now, while there is most probably a historical relation between the earlier and later ways of coping with obstreperous monks (either by the parivāsa/mānāta penalties entailed by Samgh. offences, or by the ones studied here), and while the compilers of the Vinaya had as much reason to draw a formal connexion between the relevant Samgh. offences and the taJJaniya procedure as they had for connecting (as they actually did) the pabbājanīya procedure with the 13th Samgh. and the ukkhepaniya procedure with the 68th Pāc., no such connexion can be traced. There are only a number of scattered rules dealing with dissensions over procedure and the latter’s validity in the nidāna of which the stockphrase bhādanaka-kāraka, etc. (as below, n. 18) often recurs (e.g., in the 53rd bhikkhuni [bhi] Pāc., Vin IV 309,15–28; cf. below, § 6c). There are some exceptions (e.g., in the 63th bhikkhu [bhu] Pāc., which deals with the irregular reopening [ukkoṭana] of a settled dispute; see SVTT II 93 and n. 9 )

I. BHS tarjanīya, n.: Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,3.

Skt tarjanīya, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,5 (c-arha), III 5,2*; Mvy 8642. – (unidentified school) SHT(V) 116 (1121, B1) (c-arha).

tarjanīya karma: (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,13, III 5,14ff. – (Mū ?)\(^{12}\) SHT(V) 103–104 (1108, r\(^{\circ}\) 4, v\(^{\circ}\) 1)

tarjanīya-karma, n.: (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 23, 24, 28; MSV(D) II 208,9f. (c-arha), III 7,4f. (c-kṛta).

II. BHS nigharṣanīya, n., “subduing”: Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,3.


nigarhaṇīya, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,8, III 5,2*; Mvy 8643.

nigarhaṇīya karma, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,13, 208,10–11, III 12,2ff.

nigarhaṇīya-karma, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,13–14 (c-arha), 15 (twice, once c-arha), III 13,10ff. (c-kṛta).

nīśāraṇīya, “dependance”: (Sa ?)\(^{13}\) SHT(V) 47 (1057a, v\(^{\circ}\) 4).

vigarhaṇīya, “rebuke”: (Sa or Mū) SHT(VI) 111 (1388, v\(^{\circ}\) 5).

III. BHS pravrājanīya, n.: Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,4.

Skt pravāsa, m., “sending away”: (Mū) MSV(D) III 5,3*.

pravāsana, n.: (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,4.

\(^{12}\)A-vastukaṃ (r\(^{\circ}\) 5), sa-v\(^{\circ}\) (v\(^{\circ}\) 1), are part of the Mū terminology (see below, second part of n. 28); so is sīhalastha (v\(^{\circ}\) 3–4; see SVTT I 91, n. 41).

\(^{13}\)See SVTT II 111, n. 62.
pravāsāniya, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,13; 14 Mvy 8644.
pravāsāniyaṃ karma, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,16f., III 18,19ff.
pravāsāniya-karma: (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,16f. (°-arha).
pravāhaṇiya, n., “dismissal”: (Sa?) 14 SHT(V) 47 (1057a, v° 4).

IV. BHS pratīsāraṇiya, n.: Prakīṃ(_MOUSE-L) 328,4. — grhinām aprasāde pratīsāraṇiya karma, n.: (prob. Mā or Mā-L) Lévi, “Mss sanscrīts” 8 (5b3, b4, b10).

pratī-samharaṇa, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,11, III 25,10ff., 26,6–7f.; Mvy 8645. — (Sa? 14: SHT(V) 47 (1057a, v° 5). — Cf. (unidentified school) SHT(V) 116 (1121, B2) pratīsamhara. +++//
pratī-samharaṇīya karma, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,13, 208,14ff., III 25,10ff.
pratī-samharaṇīya-karma: (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,18f. (°-arha), III 25,9f. (°-kṛta).

V. BHS āpattiya adarśanena utkṣepaṇīya [misprinted “nī”] karma, n.: BhīVin(Mā-L) 97,5 (cf. 144,14).

Skt adarśanāyotksipta, m(f).: (Sa) SHT(V) 37–38 (1049, v° 2 [v° 3 “niyoṭsks”]). — taka, m(f).: (Mū) KC, Katḥ-v 56,2 (≠ MSV(D) II 157,18); Lévi, “Mss sanscrīts” 34,11 (so read with GBM(FacEd) X.6, 705 [52, v° 8–9]) ≠ MSV(D) IV 66,7; MSV(D) III 70,12 (so read with GBM(FacEd) X.6, 900 [194, r° 9]).

VI. BHS āpattiya apratīkarmena utkṣipta: BhīVin(Mā-L) 99,14 (144,14 °-dharmena).

Skt apratīkarmāhāyotksaṭapāya (with °karmāhāyotksa short for °karmāyotksaṇīyakarmāhāyotksa): (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,21.
(āpatter) apratīkarmaṇaṭaksiptaka, m(f).: (Mū) KC, Katḥ-v 56,2 (≠ MSV(D) II 157,18–19); Lévi, “Mss sanscrīts” 34,11 (so read with GBM(FacEd) X.6, 705 [52, v° 8–9]) ≠ MSV(D) IV 66,7; MSV(D) III 70,12 (so read with GBM(FacEd) X.6, 900 [194, r° 9]).

āpatter apratīkarmāyotksaṭapāya karma: (Mū) MSV(D) II 29,10f. (29,8 °karmaṇaṭaksipta, so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 900 [194, r° 9]).


pāpiṃ drṣṭim apratīnissaranta, m(f).: PrMoSū(Mā-L) 23,27.

Skt apratīnihsṛṣte pāpake drṣṭigate utkṣiptaka: (Mū) KC, Katḥ-v 56,3 (≠ MSV(D) II 157,19). — taka, m(f).

---

14Omitted in MSV(D) after nigarhaṇīyaṃ; see GBM (FacEd) X.6, 887 (187, v° 1).

15On the three kinds of wrong views according to the Mā(-L) tradition, see Nolot, “Règles” p. 83, n. 73.
Édith Nolot

(Mū) MSV(D) III 69,6, 70,11 (ed. wrongly ṇīrṣṭe; see GBM(FacEd) X.6, 921 [204, v° 3–4], 922 [205, r° 1]).

a° p° d° ukt̲eṇaṇīyaṃ karma, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 209,5–8 (so GBM(FacEd) X.6,888 [188, r° 1]).

apratinisṛṣṭe pāpake dṛṣṭigate ukt̲eṇaṇīyaṃ karma: (Mū) MSV(D) III 30,8–9ff. – a° p° d° ṇīyāṃ karma-kṛta 31,8ff. (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 901 [194, v° 10], 902 [195, r° 3–6]).

adārśānāyotkṣeṇaṇīyaṃ apratikāmāyaṭkṣe apratinisṛṣṭe pāpake dṛṣṭigate ukt̲eṇaṇīyaṃ karma: MSV(D) II 207,13–15 (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 887 [187, v° 1–2]). – the second sequence with apratikāmāyaottkṣeṇaṇīya-karmārtha ib., v° 10 (ed. 209,3. 4 ṇkarmārhyottkṣeṇaṇīya-karmārthā). – the third one ib. v° 10 (≠ MSV(D) II 209,2 ṇīrṣṭe).

adārśānāyotkṣeṇapakatva, apratikāmāyaṭksu, apratinisṛṣṭe pāpake dṛṣṭigate ukt̲ś: (Mū) MSV(D) III 67,11–12 (so also GBM(FacEd) X.6, 920 [204, r° 5]; all to be corrected to ukt̲śiptakatva according to BHS S.v. ukt̲śiptaka).

Cf. (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,6–8 ṭapattāv apratikṛṣṭāṃ apratikāryāṃ samvarenādrśtim ubdhāvayantam anicchantam pratikṛṣṭam anuṣṭhātam anutsṛṣṭantam ca pāpikāṃ dṛṣṭim uktśipeyuh.

VII-B. BHS uktśipta, m(f.): BhiVin(Mā-L) 97,8 (misprinted Fast'); 144,3ff.; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 23,26. – uktśiptaka, m(f.): BhiVin(Mā-L) 163,37; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 54.


ukt̲eṇaṇīya-karma, n.: BhiVin(Mā-L) 143,3, 19 (so ms.). – ṇīyāṃ karma: BhiVin(Mā-L) 97,6. 143,4ff.; 151,9, 312,2; Prakṛṭ(Mā-L) 328,6 (misprinted ṇṛīi')

Skt uktśipta, m.: (Sa) PrMoSū 260 (HL, v° 2). – (Mū) MSV(D) II 190,16ff.; 192,13ff.; 194,3, III 69,21.

uktśiptaka, m(f.): (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 103,4; Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 55,21; MSV(D) II 113,15ff.; 154,15 (= KC, Kath-v 53,28), 176,7ff.; 178,5ff.; 190,13ff.; 194,4ff., IV 250,4ff. (= Saṃghabh II 272,12ff.).

uktśepaka, m(f.): (Mū) MSV(D) II 176,16ff.; 179,15, 191,7ff.; IV 250,9ff. (= Saṃghabh II 272,14ff.)

ukt̲eṇaṇīya-karma, n.: (Sa ?)16 SHT(V) 47 (1057a, v° 2, v° 3). – (Mū) BhiKaVā(S) 267,14–15, 268,6; Guṇ-VinSū(Pavr-v) 55,23; MSV(D) II 176,4, 201,13, 202,6.

uktśepaṇīya, n.: Mvy 8646.

uktśepaṇīya-karma, n.: (Sa) Hoernle, MR 12, v° 1. – (Mū) Adhi-k-v 103,13, 104,3f.; BhiKaVā(S) 267,14–15, 268,5–6; MSV(D) II 209,1, 210,17, IV 27,11. – uktśepaṇīkarma: (Sa ?)16 SHT(V) 46 (1057a, v° 1).

2. According to the account in the Cullavagga of the circumstances which are said to have led to the prescription of these disciplinary procedures, taṭjiṇāya applies especially to quarrelsome monks;17 nissaya to unskilled ones who repeatedly commit Saṃgh. offences and who mix unbecomingly with lay people;18 pabbājanīya to those who create a

---

16See SVTT II 111, n. 62.

17This is expressed by the stock phrase bhāṇḍana-kārākā kalaha-kvivāda-kbhassa-kksamge adhikārana-k. “they raise quarrels, strife, dissensions; they raise disputes among the chapter” (Vin II 1,8–10 = I 328,23–27). – Cf. (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,3 kalaha-kārakāḥ tarjayeyukt [so read] karmānā.

18This is expressed by the stock phrase bālo hoti ayavatto ṭapattāv bhūyho anapadāno ghiḥ-saṃsattāho viharati anulanomiteki ghiḥ-saṃsaggehi, “he is unskilled, incompetent, ridden with offences, unable to discern them; he associates unbecomingly with lay people” (Vin II 7,17–19 = I 330,4–6). Contrary to what is stated in SBE XVII 343 n. 1, 384 n. 1 (cf. BD VI 11 n. 3), followed by me in SVTT III 131, § 4c, what is meant in the next sentence is quite clearly the repeated commission of offences that all belong to the Saṃgh. category (Vin II 7,19–21 api ṭsu bhikkhū pakatā parivāsaṁ dentā mādya ṭaṭṭikaṁ mānaṁ tam dentā abhنتā:
scandal by their immoral behaviour and to those who corrupt lay people’s minds;¹⁹ paṭisāraṇiya to those who scoff and jeer at faithful, generous lay followers;²⁰ ukkhepaniya to those who refuse either to see or to redress an offence, or who refuse to give up a wrong opinion.²¹

3. As in the case of parivāsa and mānatta, all the procedures by which the penalties are to be inflicted, then can-

“Moreover, the monks kept granting him probation, sending him to the beginning, granting him re-admission” [BD V 11 (see ib. n. 2) translates pakatā by “were done up with”; Sp 1157,21-22, however, glosses the term by nicca-byāvaṭṭā]. The Samgha’s offences are indeed mentioned explicitly in the Skt and Tib. Mū parallels (MSV(D) III 11.15-16; Banerjee, Sarvārīt 224-225).

¹⁹This is expressed by the stock phrase ime ... bhikkhū kula-dūsakā pāpa-

samācāra, imeṣaṃ pāpakā samācāra dissanti c’ eva suyyanti ca kulāni
c’ imehi duṭṭhāni dissanti c’ eva suyyanti ca, “these monks corrupt the laity, they behave immorally; their immoral behaviour is both to be seen and heard, and so are the lay people they have corrupted” (Vin II 13.3-

6 = I 330.16-19). This stock phrase is extracted from the sikkhāpada of the Thīv(M) 13th [bhu] Saṃgha. (Vin III 184.9-12*ff.; see below, § 7b).

²⁰This is expressed by the stock phrase katham ... tvam ... gahapatim

saddham pasanam dāvakaṃ kāraṇam saṃgh’ upaṭṭhāhakām hīnena

khumsessasi hīnena vambhessasi, “how can you jeer and scoff at a faithful, believing householder who makes gifts, who is active, who supports the community?” (Vin II 18,4-7 f.), or bhikkhu gihī akkositapi
parihāsati, “a monk abuses and reviles laymen” (Vin I 330.22-23), or upāsake saddhe pasanne akkositapi parihāsati appasādam karoti, “he abuses, reviles, spoils the faith of, believing and faithful lay followers” (Vin II 295.2-7, in a debatable procedure).

²¹This is expressed by the stock phrases āpattim āpajjitvā na icchati

āpattim passitum, “although he has committed an offence, he refuses to see it” (Vin II 21.8f. = I 330.28-29); āpattim āpajjitvā na icchati āpattim

paṭikātum, “although he has committed an offence, he refuses to redress it” (Vin II 25.3 = I 330.35); bhikkhuno ... evarāpaṃ pāpikāṃ diṭṭhigatam

uppaṇnam ... so taṃ diṭṭhim na paṭinissajjati, “a monk has formed this kind of wrong opinion … and does not give it up” (Vin II 26,38-27,2), or bhikkhu na icchati pāpikāṃ diṭṭhim paṭinissajjatitum, “a monk refuses to give up a wrong opinion” (Vin I 331.3-4).

celled, are of the most elaborate, fourfold type.²² They may be considered as valid, and the matter as settled, only if each of the following conditions is fulfilled:²³ participation (sammukha)²⁴ of a regular chapter including the required quorum of (four) monks, conformity to rules and to monastic discipline, and participation of the guilty monk in person; due inquiry (paṭipucchā) into the case; acknowledgement (paṭiṇṇa)²⁵ of his offence by the monk; reality of an offence that may be, but is not yet, redressed by confession;²⁶ due reproof (covedvā) of the guilty monk after inquiry; then reminding (sāretvā) him of his offence and charging (ropetvā) him with it.²⁷

²²See SVTT I 84-85. § 3d. An exception is, in the Skt Mū parallel at

MSV(D) III 26,1-10, the onefold jñapti-karma by which the prati-

samhanāniya-karma is to be revoked.

²³Vin II 2.20-4.15 (tajanīya), 8.2-22 (nissaya), 12.37-13.23 (pabbājāniya),

18.11-13 (paṭisāraṇiya), 21.22-22.9 (āpattyā adassane ukkhepaniya),

25.4-5 (āpaṭipakkhami ukkhe), 26.34-27.21 (pāpikāya diṭṭhīya appaṭi-
nissaggake ukkhe).

Skt Mū parallel: MSV(D) III 5,15-7,3 (tarjanīya), 12,4-13,9 (nigar-

hanīya), 18,18-19,8 (pravāsāniya), 24,12-25,8 (pratisamhanāniya), 28,12-

29,3 (āpattar adarsane ukṣepāniya [the procedure however includes the

formula yathā dharmam na pratikaroti, which strictly speaking belongs to

the next kind of ukṣepāniya]), 29,10-30,2 (āpaṭipakkarmāyōtikā),

30,11-31,6 (appāraṇā paṇake drṣṭiateg ukkē).

²⁴Cf. SVTT II 99-101, § 2 a and n. 29.

²⁵See SVTT II 113, n. 64; on these first three provisions, see also Vin I

325,26-326,31.

²⁶This provision contradicts the technical interpretation of the statement

that the penalties dealt with here apply to monks who stray from

morality (sīla-vipanna), i.e., those guilty of a Saṃgha, offence, which

may not be redressed by (mere) confession (see above, § 1, and SVTT II

97, n. 19, 112, n. 63). As to how Vbh solves this contradiction, see be-

low, n. 47.

²⁷Urging a monk to acknowledge his offence also includes asking his

permission (okāsaṃ kārāpetvā) to talk to him about it (see SVTT III

121, n. 16); this stage is not mentioned here, but is prescribed at Sp
The importance of the right performance of these procedures (cf. SVTT I 75–78, §§ 1–2) is further stressed at Vin I 328.25–33.31, which deals at length with each possible ground for formal invalidity, and the disputes that may ensue among the community.

4. There are several differences between these and the mānattalparivāsa procedures, and the penalties entailed.

(a) The range of application of the procedures dealt with here is greater, but they do not, according to the Cullavagga, apply to the unrepeated commission (see above, n. 19) of Saṃgha offences;

(b) no distinction is made between cases when the offence was concealed and when it was not; 28

(c) unlike the proceedings applying to Saṃgha. offences of the yāva-tatiyam sub-class (see below, SVTT X n. 10), no standard (formal or informal) threefold admonition of a monk takes place here before he is officially sentenced as guilty;

(d) this monk is not expected to make a formal, threefold application before the chapter for the penalty he incurs, which is not “granted” (dinna) to him, but “proceeded to” (kata) against him. 29 Accordingly, whereas the stress there is on the willingness of a monk guilty of a Saṃgha. offence to apply to the chapter (samgho icchitabbo) for redress (vuttathū-kāma), 30 what is stressed here is self-submission: a monk undergoing any of the seven penalties dealt with here is expected to “duly observe the restrictions to his rights, behave with subdued manners, and follow the course leading to release” from both his offence and the penalty entailed; 31 only then may he make a formal, threefold application to the chapter in these very same terms (to be repeated by the chairman) for the cancellation of the penalty. 32

624.7–17, among the proceedings preliminary to a pabbājanīya-kamma, which may not, as stressed by Sp ḍ. be carried out without acknowledgement (paṭiṇāha) of his offence by the guilty monk. These proceedings apply to all and any disciplinary procedures, except, according to a late, sub-commentarial statement, to that of brahma-daṇḍa (see below, SVTT X, § 2 c).

As for the Tib. Mū parallel, Banerjee, SarvLit 227 wrongly paraphrases khas-blans, “acknowledgement”, by “a competent monk should acquit the Sangha about the offence”; the Tibetan term actually corresponds to Pāḷi paṭiṇāha, Skt pratiṇāha (Mvy 8637). The latter occurs at MSV(D) II 201.12–13 = 202.5–6, 9–10: tais tasya acodavitāvī apiṣmāriyā avastukam aṣṭāyāyā balād ukṣepanīyaṃ karma kṛtaṃ (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 884 [186, r6 3, r6 6, r6 7]: the editor’s readings, tasyacodavitāvīsmāriyā avastukarma-pratiṇāyā, make no sense; neither does the misreading vyagrena for ‘dyagrena’ at 202.9). At MSV(D) III 5.17, 6.1, 12.69, avastukam aṣṭāyāyā should read ‘jñāya (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 889 [188, v6 5, v6 6], 892 [190, r6 6, r6 7]). 28

Possibly, as O. von Hinüber has suggested to me, because the offences concerned here are, by their very nature, “public”, and therefore “technically impossible” to conceal.


30See SVTT III 117–118, n. 7. As suggested to me by R.F. Gombrich, the expected eagerness of a guilty monk to apply for the mānaita penalty might give a clue as to the etymology of the latter term (cf. SVTT III, 117 n. 6, where the references to the traditional etymology quoted or referred to are all post-canonical except the (Sa) PrMoSū): Skt māna, “self-attribution” (cf. x-mānin, “attributing to oneself the quality of x”) + tva.

In post-canonical literature at least, as far as lexicographical tools allow checking, (v)utthāna-gāmini āpattī refers regularly to samgha-disesa (e.g., Sp 236, 32–33, 584, 5–6, 873, 29, 877, 7, 989, 30, 1319, 24, 1353, 16–17; Vin-vn 3103). Cf. below, TPāp n. 20.


32 This is not so in the Skt Mū parallel, which distinguishes, in its account of tarjaniya, between the restrictions to be observed when undergoing the penalty (MSV(D) III 7.5–11; see below, TPāp n. 22), and the conditions under which the monk may be restored (osārīta; cf. below, n. 36) to full status. Besides submissive behaviour, these specific
(e) except in the case of suspension, the penalties dealt with here are lighter than parivāsa and mānatta: in particular, they include neither constant control by a regular chapter, nor informing each and every monk about one’s status, nor restrictions on moving alone freely;

conditions are (III 7.20–9.14; cf. BhiKaVā(S) 267, 16–18, with Chinese and Tib. Mū parallels in BhiPr 81–83): standing within the boundary (simā) when one applies for restoration (see below, n. 100, and SVTT V n. 31); stating formally that one gives up the misbehaviour for which one was sentenced; relying neither on the king’s household, nor on a yukta kula [?] (also Guñ-VinSū 101, 30), nor on non-Buddhist ascetics, nor on an individual, but on the Samgha exclusively; dressing neither like laymen nor like non-Buddhist ascetics; abstaining from following the latter, and from misbehaving; observing the monks’ training; abstaining from reviling or abusing them, and from wishing for losses to the Samgha (cf. the restrictions said to be entailed by suspension in Thv(M) texts, below §8 a).

As for restoration after nigarāṇīya, the fivefold, specific conditions are just those of submissive behaviour, together with standing within the boundary, and stating formally that one gives up one’s misbehaviour (14.2–4).

As for pravāsanaṇīya, the text is so abridged that neither the restrictions to the sentenced monk’s rights nor the conditions for his restoration are listed (18.18–19.8).

As for pratisampharaṇīya, the restrictions seem to be identical with those applying to tarjāṇīya (25.9–11); the fivefold conditions for restoration are identical with those applying in case of nigarāṇīya (25.19–21).

As for the threefold utkṣepanāṇīya, the restrictions and the conditions for restoration are said to be identical with those applying in case of tarjāṇīya (29.3–4, 30.1–2, 31.6–7, 14–16). – Here, unlike what is prescribed in the Cullavagga, the conditions for restoration applying to the cases of both tarjāṇīya and threefold utkṣepanāṇīya (see below, end of §8 a) are more severe than those applying in case of nigarāṇīya, pravāsanaṇīya, and pratisampharaṇīya.

(f) the duration of these penalties is not fixed in advance,33 but depends on the monk’s manifest self-submission and his explicit acknowledgement of it in the terms quoted above (d);34

(g) in the Kamma-khandaṅhaka of the Cullavagga, the procedure by which the penalty is eventually cancelled is simply termed “cancellation” (patippasaddhi) in all cases,35 and may be carried out by the smallest chapter (of four monks), in contrast to the one that applies to the redress of Samgh. offences, which requires the biggest quorum of monks (twenty) and is designated by the specific term abbhāṇa, “readmission” (see SVTT III 133–35, §6).

5a. The rights of a monk subjected to a tajjanīya procedure are curtailed according to eighteen prescriptions that also apply partly to parivāsa and mānatta:36 he should not grant ordination, give guidance to newly ordained monks,

33Cf. SVTT III 119 ff., §1 a, 2 ff. Sp 1 157, 18–20 states that the penalties dealt with here should last ten or twenty (so E°; Bp, and C° (SHB 1948) 858, 15: “or five”) days.

34Tajjanīya-kammassa [etc.] patippasaddhiyā sammā-vattanā ādi (Vin V 142, 31–36). See also Vin V 182, 34–183, 10, with Sp 1371, 37–29 (reading logically anulomavat te na [C° (SHB 1948) 1018, 10–11] anulomavat te (line 11) na is inconclusive, since a word printed over two successive lines is never hyphenated in this edition)). Sp’s prima facie metaphorical statement that if the sentenced monk does not behave properly, sarajuko va vissajjetabbo, is not clear to me.

35Vin II 6.26–7.15 (tajjanīya), 9.4–27 (nissaya), 15.6–27 (pabbajāṇīya), 21.1–3 (paṭissārāṇīya), 24.29–33, 25.5–7, 28.12–17 (threefold ukkhepāṇīya). On the twofold technical sense of nissaya-patippassaddhi, see above, n. 8. Outside the Kamma-khandhaka, the term osārāṇa, “restoration”, often refers specifically to the cancellation of suspension (see below, SVTT V, §6 b) — unlike its SkMū parallel, which reads consistently osārāṇa here in all cases (MSV(D) III 9.15–11.3 [tarjāṇīya], 14.5–15.9 [nigarāṇīya], [the restoration after pravāsanaṇīya is not mentioned], 26.1–10 [pratisampharaṇīya, a jñapti-karma], 31.6–32.12 [third utkṣepanāṇīya; the restoration after the first two is not dealt with]).

36See SVTT III 119–21, §1 a.
be waited upon by novices, be appointed as exhorter of nuns or exhort them if appointed before he became liable to this procedure, commit again the same, or a similar, or a graver offence, criticize either the procedure or those who carried it out, suspend (on account of some irregularity) the participation of a regular monk in the ceremonies of either uposatha or pavārana, issue commands, exercise authority, urge a monk to acknowledge an offence, or quarrel with other monks.\footnote{Vin II 5.5–16 (tajjanīya) (= 32.2–11 about parivāsa, with Sp 1155.23–56.14, 1157.13–14, the latter referring to 1162.1–63.22). – Skt Mū parallel : MSV(D) III 7.4–13.}

5b. The restrictions imposed by nissaya, pabbājanīya and paṭisāraniya are the same,\footnote{Vin II 8.20–23 (nissaya) = 14.7–9 (pabbājanīya) = 19.18–19 (paṭisāraniya). – Skt Mū parallel : MSV(D) III 13.10–15 ; summary of Tib. Mū parallels : Banerjee, SarvLit 227.} but each include a further, specific clause that occurs first (except for pabbājanīya) in the account of how the Buddha is said to have prescribed it, then consistently as a formula to be uttered by the chairman during the procedure. These are respectively:

(a) nissaya te vatthabbaṁ, “you must live in dependence [on an adviser]”; the sentenced monk is thereby expected to seek advice from learned monks, until he acquires a sound knowledge of doctrine and discipline, and proves able to act with discretion;\footnote{Vin II 8.3–2, 5.7 f., 25–30.}

(b) na [iṭhan-nāmehi] bhikkhūhi [iṭhan-nāmasmiṃ āvāse] vatthabbaṁ, “the monks [So-and-So] must leave [their residence in X]”;\footnote{Vin II 13.8–9 f. Contrary to what is implied by Hüsken, “Stock” 214–15 (§ 8), there is no indication that a monk sentenced to pabbājanīya should leave his residence alone.}

SVTT IV (tajjanīya ... ukkhepanīya)

(c) [iṭhan-nāmo] te gahapati khamāpetabbo, “you must ask the layman [So-and-So] to forgive you”;\footnote{Vin II 29.5.7–18.} the monk is thereby requested to apologize to the offended lay donor, and should observe the prescribed restrictions until he does. When held back by shame from apologizing, he may be accompanied by a mediator monk, duly appointed to this office by a twofold procedure (cf. Vin II 29.5.7–18). If the offended party refuses the offender’s apologies; the mediator is to plead for forgiveness first in the offender’s, then in the monastic community’s name; then, if unsuccessful, to make the offender confess his offence within eye- and ear-shot of the former.\footnote{Vin II 18.9–11, 18–19f. Only here does a corresponding formula occur in the Skt Mū procedure (MSV(D) III 26.10–11 gaccha taṃ gṛhapatiṃ kṣamaya).}

5c. The restrictions imposed by ukkhepanīya are much more severe (see below, § 8a); both the wording of the rule attributed to the Buddha and the procedure include the specific formula that epitomizes them: a-sambhogam samghena, “[suspension] involving suppression of dealings with the community”.\footnote{Vin II 19.21–20.22 āpatti desāpetabbā (DEBMT 132 “admonish the guilty monk” is wrong). One might argue (as I did) that, according to Vin IV 32.11–12, disclosing to laymen a minor offence (a-duṭṭhullā āpatti) committed by another monk entails a Dukkha, offence, unless the Saṃgha moves a formal agreement to do so (for complete references, see below, SVTT VIII n. 8). Here, however, the monk who committed an offence discloses it himself, be it willy-nilly or under the control of a “mediator” monk whose job is to enforce the Saṃgha’s benevolent policy (be it by formal or informal agreement) towards lay donors. I owe the core of this piece of casuistry, for whose elaboration I am solely responsible, to O. von Hinüber.}

6a. Although the narratives and descriptions of procedures in the Cullavagga point to the application of one
specific penalty to one specific type of misbehaviour, the same text goes on to state that a strict correspondence between the two is not a *sine qua non* condition of validity for the procedures entailed: any of the seven procedures except the fourth may be carried out against five types of monks:

(i) quarrelsome ones who foster disputes (*adhikarana*) among the chapter;
(ii) inexperienced ones who constantly commit offences that they are unable even to discern;
(iii) those who mix unbecomingly with lay people;
(iv) those who stray from morality, right behaviour, or right opinions;
(v) those who disparage the Buddha, the doctrine, or the monastic community.\(^{47}\)

---

44Cf. Sp 1158.18 [*paṭisāraṇiyāraho bhikkhu* anāg-a-samānāgato purimehi asadiso.

45See SVTT II.

46*Sīla-*\(^3\), *acāra-*\(^5\), *dīthi-vipatti*; see SVTT II 97, n. 19 (add to the references given there Sp 588,21-27 [ChinSp 389 (48)], 143,3-7,142, Vin-vn 3103-106; cf. BD II 221 n. 1). Vjb 507.9-508.9 solves the technical inconsistency resulting from *sīla-vipatti* = Pār. or Samgh. (to which, according to canonical texts, the penalties dealt with here do not apply: see above, § 3 and n. 27) as follows (full text at the end of this paper, in Appendix II): if a monk strays from morality, the chapter may choose not to charge him with a Samgh. but to stress another aspect of his misbehaviour, and to carry out the relevant procedure. Although the technical definitions of both *sīla-vipatti* and *adesanā-gāminī āpaññā* include the Pār. as well as the Samgh. offences, what is implied here, is according to Vjb, the Samgh. class; the Pār. are mentioned only for the sake of completeness (on the application of this restriction to two synonyms of *adesanā-gāminī āpaññā*, see SVTT III 132, n. 48 [dāthullā āpaññā]; Nolot, “Règles” 401-404 with SVTT III 135, n. 52 [garukā āpaññā]).

47Vin II 4.47-5.3 (*tajjānīya*), 8.20-23 (*nissaya*), 22.7-9, 25.1-7, 27.19-21 (threefold *ukkhepanīya*). The corresponding penalty for novices who disparage them is expulsion (*nāsanā*; see below, SVTT VI, § 2 a-b).

---

48These are, *mutatis mutandis*, the same grounds as those on which a *dāṇḍa-kamma* penalty is to be inflicted on novices who cause losses, etc., to the monks (Vin I 84.9-13), and on monks who cause losses, etc., to the nuns (see below, SVTT VII, § 8 2-3).

49These and the former grounds are the same, *mutatis mutandis*, as those on which a *pattanikkujjana-kamma* is to be carried out against lay followers who do not respect monks (Vin II 125.12-20; see below, SVTT IX).

50Vin II 18.33-19.16 with Sp 1158.22-29. These five applications are further systematized, now including *paṭisāraṇīya*, by triads at Vin V 121.24-122.26 with Sp 1327.10-28.1. Vin V 122.7-10 adds a sixth possibility: the chapter may "contemplate making [the penalty] more stringent" (*āgāhāya cetoṣaya*; cf. v.Hi., “Kasussyntax” § 176) for the same five types of monks; according to Sp 1327.10-13, this means that when the prescribed penalty is not observed properly, the chapter may decide to carry out a procedure of suspension, presumably for refusing to redress one’s offence (cf. below, § 6c; on the greater severity of the penalty entailed by *ukkhepanīya*, see below, § 8 a-b).

51Vin I 325,32-28.23 (Sp 1156,18-22 refers to Vin I 327.1-24).
of the seven procedures the chapter eventually chooses (ākāṅkhāmāno, 121.24–122.10 with Sp 1327.13–28.1), action should be taken (kammām kātabbam) against unscrupulous, incompetent, frivulous, immoral, disparaging monks, and against those who do not observe the penalty inflicted on them properly.

Indeed, one of the main differences between the set of procedures studied here and those of parivāsamānattā lies in the phrase ākāṅkhāmāno saṁgho. This difference is made clear by the occurrences of its synonym saṁgho... kammam kattu-kāmo hoti, in the sentence sace (or idha pana) saṁgho upajjhāyassa (or saddhi-vihiṇākassa, or bhikkhussa, or bhikkhuniyā) kammam kattu-kāmo hoti tajjaniyāṃ vā...  ukkhepanīyāṃ vā...“now if the chapter wishes to carry out a procedure of blame... or of suspension against a preceptor (or his pupil, or a monk, or a nun)...”. This phrase contrasts with the one which precedes it: sace (or idha pana) upajjhāyo (or saddhi-vihiṇikī, or bhikkhu, or bhikkhuni) garu-dhammaṃ ajjhāpanno hoti parivāsāraho (or mānattārarahā) ... “now if a preceptor [etc.] has committed a ‘heavy offence’ [garu-dhamma, i.e., Aṣamghs.; see SVTT III 135–136 n. 52] and is liable to parivāsa (or mānatta).” What this contrast means is that the redress of the five kinds of

52Yadā saṁghena sannipatitvā idāṃ nāma imassa bhikkhuno kammam karomā tī saṁghittamānā katamā hoti, tadā so kammārā hota nāma hoti, tasmā iminā lakkhaṇena tajjaniyādi-kammārāhassa nīya-saṅkhāFreedom karanam [for nissaya- vā; see above, n. 8] adhamma-kammān c‘ eva avinaya-kammān c‘a ti veditabbāno (Sp 1156.26–57.2; cf. Vvm II 205.26–206.7). As Vjb 507.15 puts it, “what is to be considered here is the intention of the agent [of the procedure, i.e., the chapter]” (kattu adhippāyā ettha cintetabbo; see Appendix II, at the end of this paper). See also Sp 1147.7–12 (with Sp† III 346.24–47.14; Vvm II 205.26–206.7) ad Vinn 1 321.29–22.4: even though the specific ground (i.e., kula-dīsaka: see above, § 2 and n. 20) for dismissing a monk (nissārāna: see below, SVTT V, § 6a) by a pabbājaniya-kamma is missing, and the guilty monk is described instead as bālo avyattō... ghī-sampṣagghehi (therefore liable stricto sensu to a nissaya-kamma: see above, § 2 and n. 19). Pabbājaniya is still valid, because of the provision that the chapter may choose to carry out such a procedure (referring to Vinn II 13.23–37 [truncated E° to be filled in with 4.17–5.3]). – Cf. (Mū) Gupta VinnSū (PPrav-v) 13.24–25 kalaha-vivādādīnā tarjaniyādī iṣṭakarma-karanam bhavati: “as concerns quarrels and strife and so on, the decision to apply the procedure of blame or another one is a matter of choice”. – As for how the decision is to be made practically, see below, § 6c.

Sp’s discussion gives further precision to the definition of kammārāh (see SVTT I 75–76, n. 3): a monk or nun is termed “liable to an x-procedure” from the moment the chapter resolves upon it by naming it explicitly (and irrevocably).

53Proceeding by triads; the same materials are dealt with by pentads at Vinn V 181.27–82.27.

54Vinn 122.12 bālo ca apakatutto ca; according to Sp 1327.14–18, bālo here means: “ignorant of what is legitimate and what is not”, and apakatutto menas: “unable to tell what is an offence from what is not” (and therefore “irregular” because guilty of the one or the other, out of ignorance: on pakatutto, see SVTT III 122–123, n. 18–19; 125, n. 27: 134, n. 50; on ignorance of the Pātimokkha rules, see ib. 132, n. 47). No disciplinary action should be taken on just one of these grounds (Sp 1327.15–16 etāvattā kammānā mā kātabbam, misunderstood at BD VI 191 n. 2), but only on both.


56Vinn I 49.18–19 (= II 226.19–20) ≠ 52.31–32 (= II 230.2–3) ≠ 143.6–7f. ≠ 144.36–38.
misbehaviour described above, while it does entail procedures, may be achieved by any of those studied here; it is left to the chapter to stress this or that factor (quarrelsome, ignorance, frivolity, etc.), and to charge a monk accordingly. As to the redress of Samgh. offences by otherwise very similar procedures, it leaves no such choice: the procedures have to be parivāsa and/or mānatta (depending not on the chapter’s decision, but on whether the guilty monk concealed his offence or not).

This interpretation is confirmed by the prescriptions introduced by each of the two contrasting sentences just quoted, and by their commentary at Sp 981.8–20: if a chapter contemplates carrying out a tajjaniya-kamma, etc., against one’s preceptor, etc., one is expected to plead for a lighter penalty, or for nonsuit, or if the procedure has already been carried out, to encourage the sentenced person to behave properly; but if one’s preceptor, etc., is liable to parivāsa and/or mānatta, one has no alternative but to plead for simply being allowed to act according to fixed procedures.59

Further confirmation comes from the very carefully devised stock phrases attributed to the Buddha when framing symmetrical or twin rules: compare pañcāhi bhikkhave anghī samanāgatassa bhikkhu no ākaṅkhamāno sangho pātisāraṇiya-kamman kareyya : gīhīnaṃ alabhāya parissakkati ... gīhī gīhī bhedeti; imehi kho bhikkhave pañcāhī ' anghī sī bhū ākaṅkhamāna sī pī-kamman kareyya. Aperahi pi pañcāhī ... kareyya : gīhīnaṃ buddhassa avanānaṃ bhāsatī ... imehi kho ... kareyya (Vin II 18.33–19.2) with tena hi bhikkhave sangho Vadēhassā Licchavissa pattaṁ nikkujjatu asambhogam samghena karoto. Atthahi bhikkhave anghī samanāgatassa upāsakassa patto nikkujjita : bhikkhumān alabhāya parissakkati ... bhikkhū bhikkhū bhedeti, buddhassa avanānaṃ bhāsati ... Anujānāmi ... pattaṁ nikkujjita (Vin II 125.13–22), and with anujānāmi bhikkhave pañcāhī ' anghī samanāgatassa sāmanerassa dāṇḍa-kamman kātūm : bhikkhumān alabhāya parissakkati ... bhikkhū bhū bhedeti. Anujānāmi bhū imehi pañcāhī ' anghī samū sī dī-kamman kātūm (Vin I 84.9–15) on patta-nikkujjita and dāṇḍa-kamman, see below, resp. SVTT IX and VII; on anujānāmi, "I prescribe", see Becht, "Schism Edict" 63. –A IV 344.24–25 reads however: atthahi bhikkhave anghī samanāgatassa upāsakassa ākaṅkhamāno sangho pattaṁ nikkujjeyya (idem with ukkujjeyya at 345.8–9).


57 Except by pātisāraṇiya according to the Cullavagga, but including it according to the Parivāra (references as above, n. 51), which means that a monk who happens to offend a lay donor may be sentenced to any of the seven penalties, if the chapter decides to stress another aspect of his misbehaviour.

58 This is not, however, what Šāriputta and Mogallāna are reported to have done when enjoined by the Buddha to go and carry out a pabbajjāniya procedure against monks who were, as stressed by the Buddha himself, their own pupils (Vin II 12.30 = III 182.37), unless their reported fright at the idea of dealing with the guilty monks is interpreted, cum grano salis, as an excuse, with the ulterior motive of dissuading the Buddha from taking such a step. The aggressiveness of Assaji and Punabbasuka towards their former upajjāyas is, however, a well documented motif (see, e.g., Vin II 171.3–25).

59 Vin I 49.19–27, 30–37 (= II 226.20–28, 31–38) ≠ 52.32–53.1, 53.5–12 (= II 230.4–12, 15–22) ≠ 143.11–12 f., 143.38–144.2, 7–9 ≠ 145.3–4 f., 22–23, 29–30. Monks may (and should) break their monsoon retreat for up to seven days for the same purposes.
specific Thv(M) innovation (see also Guṇ-VinSū(Pravṛ) 13.24–25, quoted above, end of n. 53).

6c. The leniency of the chapter towards troublesome monks seems to depend chiefly on its choice between the penalties of tajjanīya, nissaya, pabbājanīya, on the one hand, and that of ukkhepanīya on the other: the restrictions on one’s rights imposed by the latter are more severe (see below, § 8a–b).

How the chapter’s choice from the whole set of alternative procedures works is exemplified at Sp 1159.2–4, 15–17 (Sp-Ⅲ 368.15–17), and may well apply to the interpretation of the 53rd Thv(M) [bhī] Pāc. In the nidāna of the latter, whose subject is abusing (akkosati, paribhāsatī) the chapter, a nun is described as bhāndana-kārikā, etc. (as above, n. 18; cf. n. 53). If the implication (at Vin I 145.16–18) that the penalties dealt with here also apply to nuns has some practical application, such a nun is, stricto sensu, liable to a procedure of blame (tajjanīya-kamma) but is said instead to have been sentenced to suspension for refusing to see her offence (āpattiya adassane ukkhepanīya-kamma) (Vin IV 309.26–28, 32, 310.10). \(^{61}\)

In its commentary on the section of the Kamma-kkhandhaka in the Cullavagga that deals with the ukkhepanīya-kamma for refusing to see one’s offence (Vin II 21.6–24.33), Sp 1159.2–4 states: “[The prescription that this kind of suspension may apply to] a quarrelsome monk and so on, means that after he has been charged, on the grounds of [raising] quarrels and so on, with an offence, the [ukkhepaniya] procedure which applies is for the very refusal to see this [offence].” \(^{62}\) As for ukkhepanīya for refusing to give up one’s wrong opinions, Sp 1159.15–17 states: “The [ukkhepanīya] procedure which applies is for the very refusal to give up an opinion advocated in order to raise quarrels, etc.” \(^{63}\) Sp-Ⅲ 368.15–17 (ad Sp 1159.3–4) explains how the reverse applies, i.e., how a monk who refuses to see or redress his offence may be sentenced to a tajjanīya procedure: “As for the procedures of blame and so on, they are to be carried out when [a monk] refuses to see/redress the offence he has been charged with, by taking into account the quarrelsome-factor and so on.” \(^{64}\)

7a. According to the Cullavagga, the restrictions to be observed for pabbājanīya (the same as apply to tajjanīya) include the further provision that the sentenced monk(s) is (are) requested to leave the place. \(^{65}\) As noted by Dutt, EBM 145, and v.Hi., “Buddhist Law” 21 and n. 40, this implies the sanction and assistance of lay authorities; the somewhat

---

\(^{61}\) The first part of this nidāna is identical with that of the 4th Thv(M) [bhī] Samgh. (Vin IV 309.24–310.13 = 230.27–231.18), which deals with the invalid restoration (osārāna; see below, end of § 8b, and n. 100; cf. below, SVTT V, § 6b) of a nun who was suspended for the same offence (for Chinese and Tibetan parallels. cf. BhiPr 79/., 119).

\(^{62}\) Bhāndana-kāraka ‘ti ādisu [Vin II 22.9, to be filled in, mutatis mutandis, with ib. 4.18–5.3] bhāndanādi-paccayā āpanṇāṃ āpattim āropetvā tassā adassane yeva kammaṃ kātabbaṃ.

\(^{63}\) Bhāndana-kāraka ti ādisu yam dīthīṃ nissaya bhāndanādīni karoti, tassā āpattimassagge yeva kammaṃ kātabbaṃ.

\(^{64}\) Tajjanīyādi-kammaṃ pana āpattim āropetvā tassā adassane appajikamme vā bhāndana-kārakādi angehi kātabbaṃ.

\(^{65}\) Vin II 5.5–15 = 8.20–23 = 14.7–9; 6.26–7.15 = 9.6–27 = 15.6–23. Sp 624.18–31 states that the sentenced monk should leave both his residence (vihāra) and all surrounding villages or towns, whatever their size, unlike Upatissa, who would restrict banishment to a few houses if the neighbouring town and its streets are very large; this is, Sp states, just wishful thinking (manorathā-matta). As for the cancellation of this penalty, according to Sp 625.9–16, nothing should be accepted from donors even after it has become effective, except if the latter make gifts explicitly on account of morality (625.14–16 is not clear to me). Contrary to what might be expected logically, banishment is not listed among the threefold post-canonical “expulsions” (nāsanā).
stealthy way, as described at Sp 625.1-7,66 of carrying out the procedure itself so as not to invalidate it by breaking the rules about boundaries (sīmā), also points to the difficulty of enforcing such a decision.

7b. Now, as stressed by Oldenberg, the narrative in the Cullavagga of the framing of the rule and its description of the procedure also occur verbatim in the nidāna of the 13th Thv(M) [bhu] Saṅgh., and an explicit reference to the pabbājaniya procedure is to be found in the canonical commentary.67 The Cullavagga and vibhaṅga accounts as we have them now branch off as follows: the monks who have been subjected to a pabbājaniya-kamma accuse the (chapter of) monks of partiality, then go away, or return to lay life;68 the Buddha then states that (Cullavagga) the penalty should not be revoked;69 (vibhaṅga) monks who object to the

---

66Sp is not clear about exactly how an overlap (ajjhotttharati) of boundaries (that of the guilty monks’ place of residence and that of the incoming chapter who will perform the pabbājaniya procedure) is to be avoided (see Vin I 111.13-20; KP, Sīmā 88-92, 355-58). Neither does it give details about which kind of boundary was in force under the former monks; according to the sikkhāpada of the 13th Saṅgh. (Vin III 184.9-10** gāmaṃ vā nīgamam vā upanissaya viharati), it might have been, accordingly, a gāma- or a nīgamam-sīmā, that is, an “unfixed” (a-sammata, a-buddha) one (see Vin I 110.36-11.1; KP, Sīmā 82-83 and n. 138, 189-90; KP, “Nāgas and Sīmās”, § 3).

67Vin II 9.9-13.22, 14.11-30 ≠ III 179.30-84; Vin III 185.30-31’ ayam itthannāmo bhikkhu samghena pabbājjiyakamma-kato. See Oldenberg, Vin I XVII-XIX, XXIII n. 1. Conversely, the Skt Mū parallel to the Cullavagga refers explicitly to the relevant Saṅgh. rule (MSV/D III 18.18-19).

68Pakkamanti pi vibhakamanti pi (Vin II 14.24-25 = III 183.35): Sp 625.28-30: pakkamanti ... ekace disā pakkamanti [in which case the injunction to leave is respected — but out of rebellion, not submission to it]. Vibhakamanti ekace ghi honti.

69Vin II 14.11-36 (the statement to the contrary in DPPN [I 226] is puzzling). This means that the eighteenfold penalty remains in force even if the sentenced monk returns to lay life (for a similar case with parivāsa/māṇatta, see SVTT III 129-30, § 4).

70Vin III 183.27-84.32; 185.17-18’ so bhikkhu ti so kammakato bhikkhu (cf. 185.30-33; 185.35 is to be filled in, mutatis mutandis, with the help of 173.36-74.8); see Kkh 47.31-48.4; cf. Vin V 7.9-11, Vin-vm 438, and below, n. 75.

71From which a descriptive stock phrase is extracted by the Cullavagga (see above, n. 20). The technical term pabbājaniya-kamma does not occur in this sikkhāpada, although the verb pabbhajeti does (Vin III 184.20**).

72Thv(M) Saṅgh n° 13 [bhu], Vin III 184.9-32** with Kkh 47.26-48.9, Sp 613.25-29,16 (the proceedings are discussed at 624.7-25.30, 629.9-16; n° 17 [bhi]. – Cf. UpālīPr(SR) 48, n° 12. – Fragment from an unidentified school: STH(I) 250 (988). – Conc.: BhPr 54, table II.2 s.v. kuladiśakāh.

it out. Traces of such a reinterpretation can be found in the Skt Sa. and Tib. Mū. stūsapadas of this Saṃgh. rule, whose wording is therefore later than the Pāli Thv(M) version: niḥṣṛjtav āyusmāṁ chandaṇām-vacanaṁ dveṣagāmī-bhayagāmī-mohagāmī-vacanam; ... na cet pratinihṣrey sanabhavasēṣah(VinVbhR) 75, lines 13–17; cf. PrMoSū 115 [Bfd, v° 6] with ib. 132 [BLI, r° 3–5]; niḥṣṛjata imām evamāppam kathām ... na cet pratinihṣreyṣu sanabhavāsēṣah (PrMoSū[Mū]), 20,21–21,2 [reconstructed from Tib.; “Skt Mū.” in Nolot, “Règles” 432–38, should be corrected accordingly]).

See conc. in BhiPr 54, table II.2 s.v. kulādāsakah.

Thv(M) Saṃgh. n° 8 [bhī]. Vin IV 237.31–39.3 with Kkh 165.17–21, Sp 914.29–15.2. – Conc.: BhiPr 54, table II.2 s.v. kismiṇci.

Vjb 362.12–13 quotes Kkh 48.1–2 (with eva for evam) tassa vacanassa paṭinissaggaṇa evam vacanīyo, na kulādāsana-nivāraṇāthathāya.

Conveniently alluded to only vaguely by Vin IV 237.33 kismiṇcī eva adhikarane.

8a. Suspension (ukkhepanīya) entails forty-three restrictions, some of which are identical with those of taṭjanīya: a suspended monk should not grant ordination, give guidance to newly ordained monks, be waited upon by novices, be appointed as exhorter of nuns or exhort them if appointed before he became liable to any of the three procedures of suspension, commit again the same, or a similar, or a graver offence, criticize either the procedure he was subjected to or those who carried it out.

Some other restrictions also apply in the case of parivāsa/mānattā: a suspended monk should refuse outward marks of respect and assistance from regular monks; he should not stay under the same roof as the latter, and should rise from his seat when meeting any of them.

Still others apply also to both taṭjanīya and parivāsa/mānattā: he may not suspend the participation of a regular monk in the ceremonies of uposatha or pavāraṇā; he should neither issue commands, nor exercise authority, nor urge a monk to acknowledge his offence, nor quarrel with other monks.

Lastly, a monk against whom any type of suspension was carried out is subject to a further set of specific restrictions: he should not accuse a regular monk of straying from morality, right behaviour, right opinions, or right means of livelihood (cf. above, n. 27); he should not cause splits between monks; he should dress neither like a layman nor

Traces of such a reinterpretation can be found in the Skt Sa. and Tib. Mū. stūsapadas of this Saṃgh. rule, whose wording is therefore later than the Pāli Thv(M) version: niḥṣṛjtav āyusmāṁ chandaṇām-vacanaṁ dveṣagāmī-bhayagāmī-mohagāmī-vacanam; ... na cet pratinihṣrey sanabhavasēṣah (VinVbhR) 75, lines 13–17; cf. PrMoSū 115 [Bfd, v° 6] with ib. 132 [BLI, r° 3–5]; niḥṣṛjata imām evamāppam kathām ... na cet pratinihṣreyṣu sanabhavāsēṣah (PrMoSū[Mū]), 20,21–21,2 [reconstructed from Tib.; “Skt Mū.” in Nolot, “Règles” 432–38, should be corrected accordingly]).

See conc. in BhiPr 54, table II.2 s.v. kulādāsakah.

Thv(M) Saṃgh. n° 8 [bhī]. Vin IV 237.31–39.3 with Kkh 165.17–21, Sp 914.29–15.2. – Conc.: BhiPr 54, table II.2 s.v. kismiṇci.

Vjb 362.12–13 quotes Kkh 48.1–2 (with eva for evam) tassa vacanassa paṭinissaggaṇa evam vacanīyo, na kulādāsana-nivāraṇāthathāya.

Conveniently alluded to only vaguely by Vin IV 237.33 kismiṇcī eva adhikarane.

Vin II 22.12–23.2 ≠ 23.25–24.27 ≠ 25.1–9 (truncated E°). As for Vin II 27.19–23, see below, end of this paragraph.


Vin II 22.20–23, 29.32 ≠ 31.5–9, 21–23; cf. SVTT III 119–22, § 1a.

Vin II 22.34–23.2 ≠ 5.12–15 ≠ 32.7–11.

This is normally a duty (see Freiberger, Br-Strafe 486–87, with further references; cf. below, SVTT X, § 2 a and n. 10).

Vin II 22.23–29, 33–34; Sp 1155.23–56.12, 1159.1–14.
like a non-Buddhist ascetic, nor follow the latter kind of ascetics, but should follow the monks and train accordingly; he should not repute regular monks.

As for the third kind of suspension, it entails, according to the PTS edition of the Cullavagga, the same eighteen restrictions as apply to tajjaniya (see above, § 5a). B⁶ (1972) 75.6. v however reads tecattālīsa-vattam, and accordingly lists the same forty-three duties as apply to the first two kinds of suspension; this number also occurs at Vin V 212.37*87 ≠ Utt-vn 930b, and in Sp. The latter readings are supported both by the provisions said by canonical and other Thv(M) texts to apply to monks who were suspended on any of the three grounds, and by the Skt Mū parallel (refs. as above, end of n. 33).

8b. In any case, the verdict of suspension is to be made known in all surrounding monastic residences, in the following terms: “The monk So-and-So has been subjected to a procedure of suspension for refusing to see his offence (or to redress it, or to give up a wrong opinion), involving exclusion of his participation in dealings with the community.”

The implications of this verdict are detailed in canonical Thv(M) texts other than the Kamma-khandhaka of the Cullavagga: unlike a monk undergoing any of the other penalties dealt with here, a suspended monk is deprived of participation (saṁbhoga) in the distribution of material things (āmisa) and in the exposition of doctrine (dhamma), and considered as “belonging elsewhere” (nānā-saṁvāsaka) than to the community who motioned suspension (ukkhapeka), until the penalty is revoked and his “restoration” (oś탠anā) is achieved ipso facto. This “companionsless” monk is therefore barred from participation in any procedure (including uposatha and pavāranā) within this community, whose members acting in chapter should all “belong to the same community” (saṁāna-saṁvāsaka).

---

85Vin II 27.19–21 (truncated E⁵, referring to 5.5–15); 27.23 reads explicitly atthārasa-vattam; no v.v.l. are recorded at Vin II 310; no corrections are mentioned at Vin II 363–64, V 259–60.
86B⁶ 75.7–17, referring by pa to 63.21–64.2 = E⁵ Vin II 22.20–34.
87Ukkhitakā taṇo vuttā, tecattārīsa saṁmāvattanā (cf. Sp 1387.25–26).
88Sp 913.30–31 (ad Vin IV 232.21) vatte vattantin ti tecattāllīsamappabhede nethāravatte vattamānām. Sp 1159.18–19 strongly states: saṁmāvattanāyam pi hi idha tecattālīsa yeva vattāni, “indeed, as for proper behaviour, forty-three duties do apply here also”; C⁵ (SHB 1948) 859.28–29 idem, with insignificant v.v.l. Sp 1373.19–20 tividhassa ca ukkhepanīya-kammasa tecattālīsa-vidham vattam; C⁵ (SHB 1948) 1019.29–30 idem.
89See below, § 8b (Hüsken, “Vorschriften” 86, end of n. 105, should be corrected accordingly).
90Ithān-nāmo bhikkhu āpattiya adassane/āpattiya appāṭikamma/papikāya diṭṭhī ya appāṭinissagge ukkhepanīya-kammakatico a-saṁbhoga saṁghena (Vin II 22.4–6 ≠ 27.15–18). The expected sentence is missing at 26.6–7 after dhārayāmīti, but is referred to at SBE XVII 381 (first three lines), and does occur at B⁵ (1972) 60.1–2: avāsa-paramparaṇa ca bhikkhave samatha Channo bhikkhu samghena āpattiya appāṭikamme ukkhepanīyakamma-katico asaṁbhogam samghena ti.
91Vin IV 137.30–35.
92Vin IV 218.34 a-paṭikāro nāma ukkhitto an-ōsārito. See below, SVTT V, § 6.b–c.
93Vin IV 218.16** akata-saḥayo ; 219.1–4 akata-sahayo nāma saṁmāna-saṁvāsākā bhikkhā vuccanti saḥaya. So tehi saddhiṃ n’ aththi tena vuccati akata-sahayo ‘ti.
94This is termed saṁvāsa-nāsanā, “expulsion from where one belongs” at Sp 582.23 (see below, SVTT VI, § 1b and n. 8).
95Vin I 135.30–35, 168.1–5 (both times with yathā dhammo kāretabbo, which refers to the 69th [bhū] Pāc. [cf. next n.]); 320.7–10f., 321.14–16; Kkh 9.14–16 (cf. Kkh 128.2, Sp 582.21–23); see Kiever-Püll, Φιμά 63 and n. 103. Sp 1320.8–31 (ad Vin V 115.23) clearly states: ukkhepanīya-kamma-katico ukkhitatto nāma. Avasesa-catusbhidha-tajjaniyādikamma-
According to the vibhaṅga of the 69th Thv(M) [bhu] Pāc., any monk who deals with, or sleeps under the same roof as, a monk who was suspended for refusing to give up a wrong opinion incurs a Pāc.; so does a nun who deals with a nun who was suspended on the same grounds; ⁹⁶ but if she sides with a suspended monk (on any of the three grounds), she incurs a Pāc., the gravest of offences, entailing immediate, definitive exclusion ⁹⁷ (as far as can be seen, the eventuality of a monk following a suspended nun is not raised). ⁹⁸

One rule, applying specifically to nuns, states that any of them who restores (osāreyya) a suspended nun without formally consulting (an-apaloketvā; see SVTT I 80–81, § 3a) the chapter who moved suspension and securing the

kato anukkhittako nāma. Ayañhi uposathāmaṃ paṭvāraṇaṃ vā dhāmman-paribhojanā vā āmisa-paribhojanā vā na kopeti.

This provision should also apply to the annual kathina ceremony of receiving and sharing cloth given by laymen, and to the privileges attached to it (see DEBM T s.v.). Although the Mahāvagga's Kathina-kkhandha (Vin I 253,3–61,10) and its commentary (Sp 1105,32–14,6 [ChinSp 528–31]) are silent on this point, the Skt Mū parallel explicitly excludes the suspended monk from his share and privileges (MSV(D)I 157,17–19 = KC, Kath-v 56,1–3 = Kath-v(M) 205,6–8).

⁹⁶Thv(M) Pāc. n° 69 [bhu], Vin IV 137,2–38,16 with Kkh 127,14–35. Sp 870,20–32 : n° 147 [bhu]. – Cf. UpāliPr(SR) 80, n° 58. – Dh fragment : CASF(II) 166, n° 69. – Conc. : BhiPr 58, table IV, s.v. utkṣiptaṇuvṛtthi. Any monk or nun who sides respectively with a male or female novice who was expelled for holding wrong opinions also incurs a Pāc. (see below, SVTT VI, § 2c and n. 19).

⁹⁷Thv(M) Pār. n° 3, Vin IV 218,2–20,13 with Kkh 159,1–21, Sp 903,23–904,16 (cf. Vin-vm 1992–16, Utt-vm 176–77). – Conc. : BhiPr 53, table I s.v. ukkhittānuvattikā. – See also (Mū) BhiKaVā(S) 267,13–69,2, with Chinese and Tib. Mū parallels in BhiPr 81–83 (in the three Mū versions, the nun is not precisely described as siding with a suspended monk, but as striving to persuade him that he should not submit to the chapter's sentence).

⁹⁸ Although Vin II 88,8–14 reports the monk Channa siding with (regular) nuns in a controversy (cf. below, SVTT X n. 14).

latter's consent incurs a Saṅgha., unless the suspended nun does behave properly or the chapter who moved suspension is absent. ⁹⁹

⁸c. As long as no one supports him, a suspended monk may therefore be said to belong nowhere (see below, SVTT VI n. 9). If, however, he manages to gather three or more followers (ukkhittānuvattaka), thus reaching the quorum required to create an autonomous Saṅgha, both parties should try to come to terms, so as to avoid a dissension or a split (saṅgha-raji, ⁹⁹-bheda). ¹⁰⁰ In the meantime, procedures carried out separately by each chapter within the same, common boundary (sīma) are valid, since all members of each party belong to the same community (saṃāna-saṃvāsa), and remain distinct (nānā-saṃvāsa) from

⁹⁹Thv(M) [bхи] Saṅgha. n° 4, Vin IV 230,27–32,23 with Kkh 163,34–64,11, Sp 913,27–142 ; cf. Vin V 56,15–17 = 84,3–5 ; Hüsen, "Vorschriften" 83–86. – Conc. : BhiPr 54, table II s.v. ukkhittam (cf. above, n. 62). According to the Thv(M) vibhaṅga of this rule, a nun who plans to restore a suspended nun, and wants to gather a chapter and fix a boundary (cf. KP, Sīma 132–33) for the purpose, should not do so without the agreement of the chapter who moved suspension (Vin IV 223,8 osāressamiti ganaṃ vā pariyesati sīmatāṃ vā saṃmattati ; cf. Kkh 164,2–3, where gana-pariyasane [ = C* (SHB 1930) 165,29] should be corrected to ⁹⁹-pariyasane [so Vin-vm 2073a]). The very sīkṣāpadas of the Chinese Dha, Chinese Sa, Chinese Mi, and Chinese and Tib. Mū parallels make it explicitly part of the offence to step out of the sīma for the purpose without having reached agreement to do so (BhiPr 79–83). The Chinese and Tib. Mū versions are corroborated by the reference to this same [bхи] Saṅgha. rule, at Guṇ-VinSū 65,1, by the words bahi-simmy avasārane, and by the provision that a monk who was sentenced to any of the seven penalties dealt with here should apply for restoration within the boundary where the chapter sentenced him (cf. above, n. 33 : below, SVTT V n. 31).

¹⁰⁰See HH, Po-v 223–25 ; cf. (Mū) Saṅghabhā II 272,12–73,2 (taken over from MSV(D) IV 250,4–514).
those who belong to the other.\textsuperscript{101} If the parties are eventually reconciled, the suspended monk may be restored (\textit{osārita}) by his own followers,\textsuperscript{102} a twofold procedure of reconciliation (\textit{samgha-sāmaggī) is then to be carried out for the purpose of putting an official end to any and all dissensions among the monks. An exceptional \textit{uposatha}, with recitation of the Pātim rules, may then take place.\textsuperscript{103}

\textbf{BHS} \textit{utkṣiptaṇuvartikā, f.} : BhīVin(Mā-L) 102.5.

\textbf{Skt} \textit{utkṣiptaṇupravṛtti, f.}, "following a suspended [monk]": (Mū) Gün-VinŚū 53.12.

\textit{utkṣiptaṇuvartaka}, mfn. : (Mū) BhīKaVā(S) 268.15–16. – \textit{utkṣiptaṇuvartakata}, m.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 176.9–10ff., 179.14, 190.18–19ff. (\textit{aniutvartākāṇuvartaka} 177.6 ff.,

\textsuperscript{101}Vin I 337.1–40.38 with Sp 1148.21–50.2 ; see Kieffer-Pūlā, Simā 25 n. 25, 53–54, 121–23. Sp 1148.22–49.10 has a story about how failing to fill the latrine’s water-pot ended in suspension, then creation of two rival communities; this story occurs also at Dhp-a I 53.16–54.17 ≠ Ja III 486.11–27, which record that the quarrel went so far as to create two factions among the Akanīthī deities. A Skt Mū parallel occurs at MSV(D) II 174.5–76.2 (for Tib. Mū, cf. Banerjee, SarVlit 220–21).

Vin I 340.30–33 (with Sp 1149.24–31) ≠ V I 116.34–37 (with Sp 1322.30–35) distinguishes between one who “belongs elsewhere by one’s own will” (\textit{attanā ... nānā-samvāsaka}) and one who does so because a procedure of suspension was carried out against him; this distinction is expressed in Sp by the resp. terms \textit{laddhi-nānāsamvāsaka}, “belonging elsewhere due to one’s opinion”, and \textit{kamma-n}\textsuperscript{2} (see KP, Simā 63–65; cf. Vin-vn 3107b–109a). Skt Mū parallel: MSV(D) II 176.3–79.13 (cf. Gün-VinŚū 99.28 \textit{utkṣiptaṇ ca svakarānī}).

\textsuperscript{102}Cf. below, SVTT V n. 31.

\textsuperscript{103}Vin I 356.22–58.37 with Sp 1152.24–31 (cf. Kkh 3.29–32) ; see Kieffer-Pūlā, Simā 53–54, 63–64, 121–23. Skt Mū parallel: MSV(D) II 190.13–96.6. – Pj II 196.10–12 \textit{nu naūsa osaṃ vā vaṭṭhaṃ yathā-dhammaṃ vinicchitabbaṃ an-asaṅgēvetā eva vā aṭṭha-maṃgaṃ accayaṃ desāpetvā sāmaggī kātabbā seems to refer to (illegally) dropping a case of suspension with mutual confession instead, followed by general reconciliation.

\textsuperscript{104}Anāpatti sambhoṣe samāṣe, Vin I 97.19–98.25 with Sp 1034.12–17 (see KP, Simā 133) ; Skt Mū parallel: Lévi, “Mss sanscrits” 34.1–11 ≠

SVTT IV (tajjanīya ... ukkhepanīya)

190,20f. ; Saṅghabhi II 272.13 f. (= MSV(D) IV 250.5 f.)

\textit{utkṣiptaṇuvṛtti, t.}: (Mū) Mvy 8480.

\textit{utkṣepakāṇuvartaka}, m. : (Mū) MSV(D) II 177.6–7, 178.15, 191.7 f., IV 250.6 f. (= Saṅghabhi II 272.14 f.) (\textit{aniutvartākāṇuvartaka}, m.: MSV(D) II 177.7, 179.16, 191.8 f.; MSV(D) IV 250.6–7 f. = Saṅghabhi 272.15 f.).

8d. When suspension occurs during the observance of \textit{parivāsa} or \textit{mānatta} on account of some \textit{Saṅgha} offence, the latter penalties are to be resumed after restoration has put an end to suspension (Vin II 61.4–62.4; see SVTT III 129–30, § 4). In the reverse case (when a monk commits a \textit{Saṅgha} offence during the period of suspension) he may not be charged with concealment of the latter offence, and no procedure connected with its redress may be carried out against him by the chapter who motioned his suspension because, as an \textit{ukkhittaka}, he does not belong to it anymore; he is then, presumably, to be restored before he may acknowledge his \textit{Saṅgha} offence and apply for \textit{mānatta} (see SVTT III 123, second part of n. 19).

According to Vin I 97.19–98.24, if a suspended monk returns to lay life (\textit{vibbhamati}), then applies for a second ordination, he may be admitted again as a novice, provided he promises to see or redress his offence, or to give up his wrong opinions. Under the same conditions during each stage, he may be ordained again, then restored (\textit{osāretabba}); if he now agrees to see his offence, etc., the matter is to be considered as settled; if he refuses, and if the chapter reaches unanimous agreement about the case, he should be suspended again; if unanimity is not reached, living in common with him entails no offence.\textsuperscript{104}
8e. As occurs with pabbājanīya (see Oldenberg, Vin I xix and n. 1; above, §7 b), the case of a monk who refuses to give up wrong opinions is also dealt with in the Pātim (where the technical term ukkhapanīya-kamma does not occur), whose provisions contradict those summarized above from texts of the later, Khandhaka type. After an identical nidāna,\textsuperscript{105} the Buddha prescribes carrying out a procedure of suspension (Cullavagga, Vin II 26.30–27.18) and frames the Pātimokkha rule (Vin IV 135.16–30*), which states that a monk who still holds wrong opinions after a threefold, informal admonition to stop doing so, simply incurs a Pāc.,\textsuperscript{106} that is, an offense that may be redressed by just

MSV(D) IV 65.19–66.7. – Contrary to what was stated by Oldenberg (followed by Horner [see BD V vi and 39 n. 1 for references]), this does not really contradict the statement that, if a monk was suspended on account of his wrong opinions returns to lay life, the penalty should be revoked (Vin II 27.24–27.8; B’s (1972) 76.7 idem): these provisions most probably mean that, if the sentenced monk does not turn up again, the case is to be dropped altogether; but if he does and applies for a new ordination, the case is to be taken up again right from the beginning.

\textsuperscript{105} Vin II 25.10–26.29 = IV 133.32–35.16; about the possible derivation of the latter from early sources, see BD III xv–xvi.

\textsuperscript{106} Thv(M) Pāc. n. 68 [bhu]. Vin IV 133.32–36.33 with Kkh 126.26–27.12. Sp 869.7–70.19 (869.26–29 occurs unabridged at Ps II 102.19–103.20; n° 146 [bhi]. – Cf. UpāliPr(SR) 80, n° 57. – Dh fragment: CASF(II) 165–66, n° 68. – Conc.: BhiPr 58, table IV.1 s.v. dṛśṭigātānusargaḥ. – This is, in the Thv(M) [bhu] Pātim, the only Pāc. offence established after a threefold admonition (yāva-tatiyam samanubhāṣanā; cf. below, SVTT X n. 10), from a total of eleven such rules (Vin V 140.16–17 with Thv(M) Pāc. n° 96.7.10 to 13, [bhi] Samgh. n° 7 to 10 (leaving aside the four held in common with monks [bhu] 10–13)], [bhi] Pār. n° 3, [bhi] Pāc. n° 36. The third [bhi] Pār. is explicitly connected with the yāva-tatiyam Samgh. by Kkh 159.14 = Sp 904.42–43. The 36th [bhi] Pāc., together with its Chinese Dha parallel, is most probably considered as a yāva-tatiyam offence because of its analogy with the 9th Thv(M) [bhi] Samgh. (Vin IV 294.6.11* = 239.26–28*); the only other parallels are in Chinese Mā. and BHS BhiVin(Mā-L), which, however, do not make it a yāva-tatiyam offence (see BhiPr

SVTT IV (tajjanīya ... ukkhapanīya)

confessing it to another, regular monk. Although the vibhaṅga turns this admonition into a formal threefold procedure, after which the monk is to be charged with a Pāc. (Vin IV 136.6–25), it mentions no procedure of suspension; neither does the nidāna, nor Kkh.\textsuperscript{107} This procedure is, however, mentioned in the Chinese Sa. nidāna, and in the Mā-L śiksāpada,\textsuperscript{108} which are to be considered later than their respective Thv(M) parallels.

\textsuperscript{103} with conc., ib. 67, table IV.3 II.B.3 s.v. saṃsāttha; cf. BD III xvi–xvii.

Sp 1330.4–7 (ad Vin V 125.22–24) distinguishes the offence dealt with in the 68th Pāc. from suspension: it is committed “before the chapter” (saṃmukhā, i.e., during the procedure of admonition; cf. SVTT II 90–101, § 2a), but redressed without formal procedures, that is, “outside [the chapter]” (parammukhā) (the whole is thus implicitly connected with what follows about Saṃgh. offenses, whose redress does entail procedures; the same is stated explicitly at Utt-vn 515–18). Sp 1329.1–3 makes the same distinction: the offense of advocating a wrong opinion is committed “because of another’s legal statement” (kāmavācā, i.e., procedure), but redressed by one’s own statement when one confesses (desentō) it in front of an individual monk. Parammukhā cannot refer to revoking suspension, which must be carried out by the chapter: desentō refers to the regular redress of Pāc. offenses, not to the observance of the prescribed duties (saṃmā-vattana) required by the procedure of suspension.

\textsuperscript{107} Unlike the case of pabbājanīya. As for the vibhaṅga, Sp 610.18–23 refers indirectly to the procedure of suspension, when arguing that the clause according to which “there is no offence for the first defaulter” (Vin IV 136.33 anāpatti [ . . . ] ādikammikassa) is erroneous, because of the provision of the Khandhaka (Vin II 26.34–36) that the monk has first been reproved, reminded of his offence, and charged with it, but refuses nonetheless to give up a wrong opinion: this is what makes him an offender, whether he be the first one or not. Ādikammika accordingly does not appear at Vin-vn 1703, and Vjh (B’s 1960) states that the anāpatti ādikammikassa clause occurs here “because it came into the scribe’s head” (mukhārāṭha likhitam; see Ud-a(T) II 916 n. 170 [Sp 246.10 shows that mukhārāṭha is not always pejorative]).

\textsuperscript{108} VinVibh(R) 179; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 23.24–25. As for the Chinese Mā śiksāpada, it is not clear from Pachow, CompSt 150, whether the
It is also mentioned in the vibhaṅga of the next Thv(M) [bhu] Pātim rule (Vin IV 137.27'f.), which states that any monk or nun who follows respectively a suspended monk or a suspended nun incurs a Pāc. (references as above, n. 97). It is also referred to in at least one version of the Skt Sa. śiksāpada, and in the Chinese Sa. and Skt Mā-L śiksāpadas of the same rule:¹⁰⁹ here again, these parallels are to be considered as later than the Thv(M) version.

procedure alluded to (“if he does not give up, the Sangha should perform a Karma”) is that of threefold admonition or suspension.

¹⁰⁹PrMoSū 260 (HL, v² 2). – VinVibh(R) 180, BhīPr 93, Pachow, Comp St 151. – PrMoSū(Mā-L) 23.26–27 (here again, it is not clear from Pachow [“Msg. 49”, misprinted for “46”] to which saṃghakarma Chinese Mā refers).

V. Nissāraṇā (f.)/nissāraṇīya (n.), osāraṇā (f.)/osāraṇīya (n.)

1. The literal sense of the two contrasting terms nissāraṇā and osāraṇā is respectively “sounding away, dismissal” and “introduction, invitation to come (back), restoration”.¹ In Vinaya texts, they refer to various procedures whose general object is some kind or other of “dismissal” or “letting in”. When these procedures are themselves each designated by a specific technical term, which is not always the case, nissāraṇā and osāraṇā then stand as contrasting superordinates including these technical terms as co-hyponyms: nissāraṇā includes daṇḍakamma-nāsanā (see below, § 3), patta-nikujjanā (§ 5) and the terms designating the seven disciplinary procedures (tajjanīya-⁰, nissaya-⁰, pabbājanīya-⁰, paṭṭisāraṇīya-⁰, and threefold ukkhepanīya-kamma) studied above in SVTT IV (see below, § 6a). In the same way, osāraṇā includes patta-ukkujjanā (§ 5), abbhāna (only once),² and the revocation (paṭṭipassaddhi, not a technical term strictu sensu) of any of the seven disciplinary

¹ Osāreti < *ava-sārayati, “causes to enter” (Kkh 131.34. Sp 1147.23 pavesanā, “entering”; cf. BD III 28 n. 4, and below, Skt parallels at the end of § 8c), rather than < *ut-svārayati, “propounds, calls” (CPD s.v.). Among the connected entries in CPD, osāraṇa-kriyā (Sp 1346.11-13 ad Vin V 142.20) is not “the formal act of osāraṇa”, but belongs to 1. and means “performance of the exposition of the Pātimokkha”. As will be seen below, apart from Kkh 131.34 and Vin-vn 3006, none of CPD’s references s.v. osāraṇā concern “formal restoration ([ ] after [ ] practice of penance)”.

² Sp 630-2.3, abhētabbo ... abbhānakamma-vasena osāretabbo ti vuttā hoti. CPD’s statement, s.v. osāreti, that this verb is a “syn. of abbheti, avhāyati” (my emphasis), is misleading: the latter term applies specifically, and exclusively, to the readmission (abhāna) of a monk or nun after completion of the parivāsa and/or mānatta penalties (see SVTT III 133–35, § 6). – As for the alleged equivalence of Skt Mū utsāraṇa with ḍhavayaṇa, see below, n. 51.
procedures just mentioned. Besides standing as a superordinate, osāraṇā also has a narrow technical sense in both the Mahāvagga and the Cullavagga, where it often exclusively designates (as it does in the vibhaṅga of several Pātimokkha rules, and in the sikkhāpada of the 4th Thv(M) [bhū] Samgha) the revocation of the three types of suspension (ukkhepaniyaka-kamma; see below, § 6b–c).

Whereas osāraṇīya is a variant of the superordinate osāraṇā, it is not clear whether nissāraṇīya stands in the same relation with nissāraṇā, or whether it connotes, in a specifically technical sense, physical ejection (see below, §§ 7b, 8a–c); whatever the case, it may be worth pointing out that the terms expressing physical ejection de facto are neither nissāreti, “dismisses”, nor pabbājeti, “banishes”, nor nāseti, “expels” (all three of which are de jure) but nikkaddhati, “throws out, ejects”, avarāṇaṃ karoti, “shuts

3See below, SVTT VI, § 2b and n. 15. Ejecting a fellow monk, or having him ejected, from lodgings that belong to the Order (sāmghika vihāra) is a Pāc. offence (Thv(M) Pāc. n° 17 [bhū], Vin IV 44.2–44.3; with Kkh 93.36–94.25, Sp 781.19–82.14; n° 113 [bhū]. – Cf. UpālīPr(SR) 65–66, n° 17. – Conc.: BhiPr 58, table IV.1 s.v. niśkarṣanam). According to the vibhaṅga, ejecting him, or having him ejected, from his own or one’s own private (puggalika) lodgings is respectively a Dukk. offence or no offence. There is no offence, however, in ejecting him or having him ejected, with or without his belongings, if he is unscrupulous (alajjin) or is out of his senses or is a quarrelsome monk who causes disputes among the chapter (bhādana-kāraka kalaha-k2 vivāda-k2 bhassa-k2 sānghe adhikaraṇa-k2; cf. above, SVTT IV § 2 and n. 18), or does not behave correctly (na samād-vattanta) as a pupil (Vin IV 45.25–31). Sp 782.5–9 (cf. Kkh 94.18–22) adds that only a quarrelsome monk may be ejected from the monastery entirely (sakata-sāmghārāmato), for he might gather followers and split the Order (so hi pakkhaṃ labhitaṃ sānghaṃ pi bhindevya); as for the others, they should only be ejected from their residence (attano vassaṇa-ghānato; cf. below, SVTT VII § 2).

Although this rule is also valid between nuns, another rule, applying specifically to nuns, makes it a Pāc. offence to eject a fellow nun from the quarters — provided with a fastening door, given to her by oneself (upassayasam datvā; Vin IV 292.2954: upassayo nāma kāvāṭa-buddho vuccati; Kkh 185.9–10: kāvāṭa-buddham attano puggalikam vihare

off” (see below, SVTT VII, §§ 2–3), paṇāmeti, “evicts” (see ib., § 4), nikkhaṃmeti, “drives out” (Vin II 237.10), be it lawfully or not.

2. As for canonical Thv(M) Vinaya texts, nissāraṇa and osāraṇa occur as a contrasting pair only in relatively late ones:

(a) in this order, at Vin I 321.29–22.4 (see below, §§ 4, 6a), in the Campeyya-kkhandhaka of the Mahāvagga, which deals at length with the various aspects of the (in)validity of procedures; this passage is alluded to in the Ekkutarakā of the Parivāra (Vin V 117.24–27);

(b) in the reverse order (osāraṇa, nissāraṇa), at Vin V 222.22–35, in the Kamnavaṅga of the Parivāra; both are systematically combined here, without any explanation, with each of the four types of legal procedure taking them as their object. This passage provides a convenient frame for the study of both terms, together with Sp 1402.16–12.4 = Kkh 131.31–33.35 (ad Vin IV 152.6** dhammikānāṃ kammānāṃ, about valid procedures), where explanations are to be found about which specific procedure osāraṇa and nissāraṇa are supposed to refer to in each case. Both Kkh and Sp follow (with the inconsistency pointed out below) the order of the Mahāvagga, not that of Vin V 222.22–35 upon which Sp comments; the reason, Sp 1402.19–20 warns us, is that “here, [the Parivāra] says osāraṇaṃ nissāraṇaṃ for the sake of fluency; actually, nissāraṇa comes first, then osāraṇa”. The commentary that follows is consistent with this statement as far as the first, third, and fourth type of legal procedure are
datvā [on kavaṭa, “door-leaf”, see v.Hi., Sprachentwicklung 17, 25, 33]) (Thv(M) Pāc. n° 35, Vin IV 292.4–93.25 with Kkh 185.19–19, Sp 983.12–18. – Conc.: BhiPr 67, table IV.3.II.B.2 s.v. datvā). Although the exceptions to this rule are, mutatis mutandis, exactly the same as those of the 17th [bhū] Pāc., the rule itself is more stringent: as seen above, a monk who ejects a monk from the former’s private lodgings incurs no offence.

4Cf. Vin-vn 2986b, 2992–93a, 3000b, 3006.
4. According to Sp and Kkh, osāraṇa as the object of a single motion (ñatti-kamma; see SVTT I 81–82, § 3 b) refers to the physical introduction, by a monk, of a candidate to ordination before the chapter. At Vin I 322.5–32, however, osāraṇa applies metonymically to the validity of ordination, in a discussion of the cases when a candidate who should not, from the very beginning, have been “made to enter” the monastic fold, is by no means (e.g., when a parricide or an hermaphrodite), or is nonetheless (e.g., when crippled or sick), to be considered as “duly made to enter” the Saṅgha (sosārita, as opposed to dosārita), that is, legally ordained.

As the object of the same type of procedure, nissāraṇa is made to refer by Sp and Kkh to the exclusion of an unskilled monk from the deliberations of a committee (ubbhākā). 12

5. As objects of twofold procedures (ñattidutiya-kamma; see SVTT I 83–84, § 3c), nissāraṇa and osāraṇa refer respectively, according to Sp and Kkh, to the decision to refuse the gifts of an offending lay donor by “turning the monastic bowls upside down” (patta-nikujjanā), and to the

wrong opinions is indeed said to be liable to some kind of unspecified expulsion (nāsessaṇi) at A II 240.17 (cf. Mp III 216.3).

Sp 1409.30–36 (quoting the ṇatti-kamma set forth at Vin I 94.37–95.2) ad Vin V 222.26 (Vin V 222.26–29 is referred to at Sp 1338.28–30); Kkh 132.21–24. BD III 28 n. 4 (cf. ib. xxvii), IV 461, VI 180 “restoration” is erroneous in this context (cf. also Hüskens, “Vorschriften” 83–84, n.92).


The entire proceedings of which entail not only ṇatti-kammatas, but also other types of procedures, including fourfold ones.

Sp 1409.35–36 (≠ Kkh 132.21–30); cf. below, § 7a.

Sp 1402.20–403.13 (ad Vin V 222.22–23). Kkh 131.31–34. Referring indirectly to the 70th Thv(M) [bhu] Pāc. These two procedures are parallel respective to that of ukkhepaniya, “suspension” of a monk (either for the same reason or because he refuses to see or redress an offence), and to that by which suspension is cancelled, also called osāraṇa in a particular context (see below, § 6b). A monk who holds

concerned: each type is said to apply to both of the consecutive, symmetrical stages (nissāraṇa, then osāraṇa) of one and the same legal case 5 (see below, §§ 3, 5, 6a). As for the second type of procedure, however, no such symmetry can be observed: its application is illustrated by two completely heterogeneous cases (see below, § 4); here (this time without warning) Sp reverts to the order of the commented text. 6 To avoid further entanglement, Sp’s fluctuating order will be followed here.

As far as can be seen, no parallels to the term nissāraṇa (as contrasting with osāraṇa) can be traced in BHS or Skt Vinaya texts, except in those of the Mū. school (see below, end of § 8 c and n. 51).

m6

3. When the object of a formal consultation (apalokanā; see SVTT I 80–81, § 3a) is nissāraṇa, the latter refers, according to Sp and Kkh, to the type of expulsion (nāsaṇa; see below, SVTT VI, §§ 1 [c], 2c), known as danḍa-kamma, that applies to novices who hold wrong opinions; osāraṇa accordingly refers to the restoration of such novices, after they have dropped their wrong views and asked the chapter for forgiveness. 7

---

5Sp 1402.20–403.13 (cf. Kkh 131.33–34) (in complete contradiction with the above statement, this section is, unlike the following ones, concluded in Sp by a purely stylistic sentence: evam apalokana-kammam osāraṇaṁ ca nissāraṇaṁ ca gagacchati [C 1046,4 idem]; the only variant recorded in E c carefully omits nissāraṇa ca), 1411.21–24 (cf. Kkh 133.17–20), 1412.2–4 (≠ Kkh 133.36–38).

6Sp 1409.25–36 (≠ Kkh 132.21–30); cf. below, § 7a.

7Sp 1402.20–403.13 (ad Vin V 222.22–23). Kkh 131.31–34. Referring indirectly to the 70th Thv(M) [bhu] Pāc. These two procedures are parallel respective to that of ukkhepaniya, “suspension” of a monk (either for the same reason or because he refuses to see or redress an offence), and to that by which suspension is cancelled, also called osāraṇa in a particular context (see below, § 6b). A monk who holds
revocation of this decision (p°-ukkujjanā) after the donor has apologized.\textsuperscript{13}

6a. As objects of fourfold procedures (nātticatuttha-kamma; see SVTT I 84–85, § 3 d), nissāraṇā and osāraṇā are connected by Sp and Kkh\textsuperscript{14} respectively with the seven disciplinary procedures of blame (taṭṭaniṇa-kamma), etc., and with their revocation,\textsuperscript{15} studied above in SVTT IV.

Nissāraṇā occurs in the same connection at Vin I 321.29–22.4,\textsuperscript{16} which discusses the cases when a monk who is not liable to any of the seven procedures that involve dismissal may nonetheless (when guilty of an offence, and sentenced to such a procedure because the chapter chose to do so),\textsuperscript{17} or may not (when he has committed no offence), be considered as legally dismissed.

6b. In Thv(M) canonical Vinaya texts, osāreti, osāraṇā, are, however, most often used in a narrow technical sense, to

\textsuperscript{13}Sp 1,411,21–24 ad Vin V 222,30–31; Kkh 133,17–21 (see below, SVTT IX).

\textsuperscript{14}Sp 1,412,2–4 ad Vin V 222,34–35; Kkh 133,36–38; cf. Sp 1,154,19–22 ad Vin I 359,29–32*. According to Ap-a 283,12, osāraṇā occurs in the same sense at Ap 43.6.

\textsuperscript{15}At Kkh 155,4–11 ≠ Sv 1042,20–25, osāraṇā refers to the cancellation of the verdict of obstinate wrongness (tassa-pāpiyasikā), which is closely connected with the procedure of blame (see below, TPap); the term is contrasted ib. with nāsanā, the “expulsion” that applies if the monk sentenced according to such a verdict does not behave properly. At Sp 1,199,10, however, the revocation of this verdict is simply termed patippassaddhi, “cancellation”, as contrasting with nāsitaka (the latter term is applied to a similarly obstinate monk at Sp 592,1). – Cf. A IV 169,10 ff. (with Mp IV 74,11–21) [bhikkhu] taṃ enam [bhikkhuṁ] iti viditvā bahiddhā nāsentī (same context).

\textsuperscript{16}With Sp 1,147,7–22, according to which the procedure referred to is that of banishing the monk from his place of residence (pabbajjaniya-kamma; see above, SVTT IV, § 7b–b); Vin I 321.29–31 ≠ V 117,24–26.

\textsuperscript{17}See above, SVTT IV, § 6b and n. 53.

\textsuperscript{18}See above, SVTT IV n. 36, and § 8a–e with notes.

\textsuperscript{19}Unlike the Skt Mū parallel, which consistently has osāraṇā (see above, SVTT IV, § 3d, 3g, with nn. 33 and 36).

\textsuperscript{20}See above, SVTT IV, § 8a.

\textsuperscript{21}Cf. SVTT III 117–18, n. 7.

\textsuperscript{22}See Vin I 338,27–28 (with Sp 1,149,11–17), 341,13–19 (with Sp 1,150,2–13). Vin I 97,31–34 ≠ 98,7–10 ≠ 98,22–25. further testifies to the dangerous possibility of divisions among the chapter: it deals with the case of an isolated, suspended monk who first returns to lay life, then comes back for a second ordination (cf. Hüsken, “Vorschriften”, 84 n. 93); the text denote the revocation of only three among these seven procedures: the three types of suspension (ukkhepaniya-kamma),\textsuperscript{18} the end of which is marked by the “restoration” (osāraṇā) of the sentenced monk or nun.

Osāraṇā and related forms do not occur in the Kammakkhandhaka of the Cullavagga, where these procedures are dealt with systematically: their cancellation is said there to be, mutatis mutandis, identical in all cases, and bears no technical name stricto sensu, being still simply termed “revocation” (patippassaddhi).\textsuperscript{19} According to the same Khandhaka, the only (but significant) difference between suspension and the other procedures is that the former entails the most drastic restrictions on the sentenced monk’s rights.\textsuperscript{20} Their severity reflects the gravity of the cases entailing suspension: refusing to see or to redress one’s offence goes against one of the most important principles of monastic life;\textsuperscript{21} advocating wrong opinions may lead to conflicts and to the creation of factions.

The latter consequence is precisely the one addressed by the Kosambaka-kkhandhaka of the Mahāvagga, where osāraṇā contrasts with ukkhepaniya (and related forms). This chapter deals at length with the danger of a definitive split in the community resulting from the creation of a separate Samgha by a suspended monk who manages to win over other monks to his side\textsuperscript{22} until the facts are
eventually reconciled and the two Sāṁghas are united again. The particular problems raised by such a situation (especially those concerning the validity of separate proceedings carried out inside separate boundaries [sīmā]) called for the accurate formulation of specific, detailed prescriptions, and the need was perhaps felt to refer to the eventual revocation of suspension by a more specific term than the one used throughout in the Kamma-kkhandhaka of the Cullavagga, paṭippassaddhi: the latter could not express the will to “invite back, reinstate” a monk who had endangered the Sāṁgha’s unity, unlike osāraṇā, which perhaps acquired for such reasons, in this context, a narrow technical sense.

6c. The (relatively late) occurrences of suspension and restoration in the Pātimokkha and its canonical commentary point to the same concerns: ukkhepanīya and osāraṇā (and related forms) are contrasted in the padabhājaniya of the 69th Thv(M) [bhu] Pāc.: akatānuddhammo nāma ukhittot anosārito, “one who does not behave according to the rule is one who is suspended, who is not restored”; and further down, in the casuistic commentary (Vin IV 138,1–14). This states that if he still refuses to behave properly, he should not be suspended again if the chapter does not reach unanimous agreement about doing so (see above, SVTT IV, end of § 8d).

23See above, SVTT IV, § 8c.

24As for the Khandhakas, the other occurrences of osāraṇā together with the contrasting ukkhepanīya (or related forms) are at Vin I 97,19–98,24 (see above, n. 22), and in the Samuccaya-kkhandhaka of the Cullavagga, which deals with the case when suspension occurs during the observance of parivāsa (Vin II 61,4–62,4; see above, SVTT IV, § 8d).

25Which makes it an offence to side with a monk who advocates wrong opinions (sikkhāpada) or who was suspended for the same motive (padabhājaniya and vibhanga) (see above, SVTT IV, § 8b–c and n. 97 for references).

26Vin IV 137,27’, with Kkh 127,14–19 ≠ Sp 870,20–26; on akatānuddhammo, see BD III 27 n. 3.

Pātimokkha rule, which also applies between nuns, was then quasi duplicated in the 3rd Thv(M) [bhi] Pār. (Vin IV 218,2 ff.), where the pp. ukkhitta occurs throughout the text (including the sikkhāpada), together with api(p)āṭikāra (“one who does not make amends”, synonymous with akatānuddhammo), and an identical gloss. Lastly, the two terms occur throughout the Thv(M) 4th [bhi] Sāṁgha, the only canonical text of this school that gives (scanty) details about the conditions governing the procedure of restoration, especially as concerns fixing the boundary (sīmā) inside which the procedure is to take place. It is, however, not clear at all whether these details may be applied ex silentio to a monk’s restoration; unfortunately, neither the Kamma-nor the Kosambaka-kkhandhaka gives any such details about the restoration of a monk (whether isolated or with a group of followers).
7a. Among a number of prescriptions made “for two purposes” by the Buddha, both the Paññatti-vagga of the Parivāra and the Atthavasa-vagga of the Anguttara-nikāya list those of osāraṇīya, “involving osāranā”, then nissāraṇīya, “involving nissāranā”\textsuperscript{32}. Unlike the case of the almost contiguous passage it comments upon in the previous pages

restoring an isolated monk is said to be a fourfold one, with the added detail that, like those who were sentenced to tarjāniya, etc., should apply for it within the sīmā (MSV(D) III 31.16-32.12 where pārṇava refers to 8.17-10.11; cf. above, SVTT IV n. 33 and n. 100). In the case of a monk with followers, however, the proceedings are more complex: after the usual, threefold application of the monk himself (MSV(D) II 192.11-18), the chairman is to bring the matter before the chapter by an isolated motion (muktiṁ jñāpi, ib. 192.19-93.4; cf. SVTT I 82-83, n. 18), after which restoration is to be carried out by a twofold procedure (ib. 193.5-16; see SVTT I 83-84, § 3c). The text does not state whether this set of procedures is to be carried out within or outside the sīmā, by the chapter who motioned suspension or by that of the suspended monk’s followers. According to Vin I 3574-5, the latter applies; Sp 1152.24-26 adds that the procedure should take place outside the sīmā; Vjh 506.7-13 comments: “If the chapter who motioned [suspension] is available, the other chapter should not proceed to restoration. If [the latter] does, these monks, having come to terms with the former chapter, [now] belong to the same community; the restoring monks’ procedure is thus disputable if performed without securing the consent of those who motioned suspension. The followers of the suspended monk therefore proceeded to restoration according to the Bhagaṅvat’s injunction to restore that monk [Vin I 3573.4-1]; they did so after they had either stepped out of the boundary, or secured the others’ consent — no doubt one of these [conditions] must apply here” (viṣṇāvāme hi kāraka-saṅghhe ātaro saṅgho osāriṇaṁ na labhati. Osārento ce, te bhikkhū kāraka-saṅghena samānaladhika-bhāvaṁ pattaṁ tena samāna-saṅvāsakā honti; tato ukkhepaṅkānam chaḍham aggahetvā osārentānam kammaṁ kuppati. Tasmā tena hi bhikkhave taṁ bhikkhum osārethā ti bhaggavato vacanena ukkhittānuvatāka osāresu, udāhu nissāmaṁ gantvā, udāhu itaresam chaḍham gahetvā osāresum. Nanu etesam aṇākatam’ ettha bhavatāṁ).

\textsuperscript{32}Vin V 223.30-31 = A I 99.13-14 (at A I 99.13, read osāraṇīyaṁ with v.l., as indicated by CPD s.v. o-sāraṇīya).
here, asammana-vattana-adi [abstract noun] either refers to some misbehaviour for which a monk is then sentenced to any of the seven disciplinary procedures involving some kind of temporary dismissal (in which case Mp agrees with Sp) or it refers to the non-observance by the culprit of the restrictions already imposed on him by one of these procedures. In the latter case, instead of the restoration (osaraṇiya) that would normally have followed, dismissal (nissaraṇiya) would apply in a more severe form than the boycott imposed by the former restrictions. Although this hypothesis accounts for the word order (osaraṇiya first, a point on which neither Mp nor Sp comments), we have no clue as to what the practical implications of such a dismissal might be.

8a. Now, as is well known, nissaraṇiya also occurs in the Pātimokkha, in each and every sikkhāpada of the Thv(M) [bhī] Samgh.; and indeed BD VI 366 n. 10 (ad Vin V 223, 31 nissaraṇiya paññattaṃ), while referring to Sp 1413, 16-18, does connect the term with these Pātimokkha rules.

In surprising contrast with the present participle sammā-vattanta in Mp’s contiguous gloss on osaraṇiya (see above); the suspicion that E6 asammana-vattanaṭisu (no v.l.) might be a misprint for vattanaṭisu is not confirmed by C6 (SHB) 1923 (same reading, no v.l. either). Moreover, what -adi refers to here is obscure.

In Vin, (na) sammāvattati and (a)sammā-vattanā may refer, according to the context, either to the (in)correct behaviour of regular, unsentenced monks and nuns, or to the (non-)observance of penalties by those who have been sentenced.

Fou-hsüeh Shih suggests physical expulsion from the monastery; cf. above, end of § 1 and n. 3. In favour of this hypothesis, it should be noted that osaraṇā contrasts with nāsanā, “expulsion”, in this very order, in commentarial Vinaya literature about the potential non-observance of the verdict of “obstinate wrongness” (tassa-pāpiyiyasikā) by a monk who had been sentenced to it; this disciplinary procedure is, moreover, closely connected with those of the sevenfold set, especially with the first one, taijaniya (see below, TPāp § B and n. 9).

34 In surprising contrast with the present participle sammā-vattanta in Mp’s contiguous gloss on osaraṇiya (see above); the suspicion that E6 asammana-vattanaṭisu (no v.l.) might be a misprint for vattanaṭisu is not confirmed by C6 (SHB) 1923 (same reading, no v.l. either). Moreover, what -adi refers to here is obscure.

35 In Vin, (na) sammāvattati and (a)sammā-vattanā may refer, according to the context, either to the (in)correct behaviour of regular, unsentenced monks and nuns, or to the (non-)observance of penalties by those who have been sentenced.

36 Fou-hsüeh Shih suggests physical expulsion from the monastery; cf. above, end of § 1 and n. 3. In favour of this hypothesis, it should be noted that osaraṇā contrasts with nāsanā, “expulsion”, in this very order, in commentarial Vinaya literature about the potential non-observance of the verdict of “obstinate wrongness” (tassa-pāpiyiyasikā) by a monk who had been sentenced to it; this disciplinary procedure is, moreover, closely connected with those of the sevenfold set, especially with the first one, taijaniya (see below, TPāp § B and n. 9).

In the introduction to her translation of the Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga (BD III xxxiv.) Horner remarked that neither the stock phrase which recurs constantly at the end of each of these sikkhāpadas, nor the padabhājanīya, indicates what (or who) is to be “dismissed”, although, according to Sp 908,5-11, nissaraṇiya refers here to the sentenced nun. The interpretation of this term is still problematic; several hypotheses will be discussed briefly here, bearing in mind that none of them is supported by explicit evidence.

In a discussion of this phrase, of its BHS parallel, and of Sp’s difficult commentary, I argued that the Pāli term does not refer to the nun, but to the offence, which must be “done away with” under the authority of the chapter. Now, in an unpublished, detailed study of nissaraṇa/nissaraṇa,
together with Skt and Chinese parallels, Juo-hsüeh Shih has shown that in Vinaya literature, BHS and Skt niṣṣaraṇīya (simple stem) "[offence] to be got rid of", should be carefully distinguished from the Pāli word niṣāraṇīya (causative) "to be expelled, removed"; "involving dismissal". Although this distinction does not invalidate my argument from a grammatical point of view, it should be noted that in Thv(M) texts, niṣāraṇā/niṣāraṇīya (and their opposites) refer, in all the other contexts where they occur, exclusively to persons, not to objects.\(^{42}\)

8b. Assuming that such is the case here, the question arises as to whether, at the time when the specific [bhī] Samgh. rules of the Thv(M) Pātim were framed,\(^{43}\) niṣāraṇīya was, like niṣāraṇā, simply a superordinate that included (first of all? or also?) the mānatta penalty as a co-hyponym, just as it includes the very similar penalties of tajjanīya, etc., and any other of the various "dismissals" mentioned above, to whose technical definition proper it

\(^{42}\)The term for objects which “must be given away” is niṣaggīya; wrong behaviour or ideas that “should be given up” are paṭinissaggīya (cf. Hüsken, "Vorschriften", 106–107).

\(^{43}\)BD III xxxiv-xxxv tentatively suggests that the first specific [bhī] Samgh. might be earlier than the other rules of the same class that apply specifically to monks; Horner’s main argument is that the sikkhāpada of the first [bhī] Samgh. (Vin IV 224.47*) omits, unlike the following ones, the word pi, “also”, referring to the [bhī] Samgh. rules, possibly because the latter were not yet framed. A very cursory check shows, however, that pi does occur at Kkh 161.3 (C* (SHB 1930) 163.3 idem), but not in the ms used by Wijayaratna, Moniales 173, for his edition of the Bhikkhu-n-Pātimokkhā.

adds nothing specific at all.\(^{44}\) No Vinaya text, as far as we now know, points to any significant difference, on this point, between monks and nuns as regards observance of the mānatta penalty incurred by those who committed a Saṅgh. offence\(^{45}\). If niṣāraṇā/niṣāraṇīya did include mānatta, a

\(^{44}\)As remarked by Horner, "niṣāraṇīya, involving being sent away, adds nothing to the [mānatta] penalty. It is not something extra to the saṅghadisesa penalty incurred by a nun, and hence marks no difference in the penalty imposed on monks and nuns for having committed such an offence. Only the word, as found in each 'rule' of the Nuns' Saṅghadisesas, is extra" (BD III xxxvii).

\(^{45}\)Compare Sp 1184.26–88.12 (summed up at Kkh 50.1–29) with 1171.8–73.3. Sp 1187.9–12 states that if the regular nuns have to go away on some business, one of them should be officially appointed as a companion (dutiyikā) to stay with the nun who is undergoing mānatta, so that the latter does not incur the third [bhī] Saṅgh. offence by spending a night, or going out of the monastery, unaccompanied (see the next part of this n.: cf. Hüsken, "Vorschriften", 107, 441–42; Hüsken, "Stock", 213). According to Sp t III 373.17–18 = Vvm II 219.21–22, official appointment is necessary as a relaxation, agreed by the Order, of the prescription that no one undergoing mānatta may stay under the same roof with a regular monk or nun, unless a break in their observance of it is incurred (sammanṇavā dātābba ti [Sp 1188.10] iminā sammatāya sahaṇāve pi ratti-cchedo na hūtītī dasseti). A mānatta-cārīni may also postpone her observance formally, either in front of another nun staying in the same place, or by going to another vihāra to find one. Exactly the same particulars apply to a mānatta-cārīn monk (compare Sp 1172.21–33 with 1187.9–14); the only difference is that the latter may stay alone for some time, or go unaccompanied to another vihāra if he can reach it on the same day in his search for a witness to formal postponement of mānatta (SVTT III 136 should be completed accordingly). Sp 1187.14–16 goes on to say that, apart from very minor differences, a nun should observe this penalty "just as prescribed in the Parivisa-kkhandhaka [of the Cullavagga]" (i.e., at Vin II 35.25–36.16). Nothing whatsoever points to any kind of technical "dismission" or "expulsion", either in canonical Thv(M) Vinaya texts or in Sp (with Vjj 513.25–14.15, Vvm II 219.15–22 [both beginning ad Sp 1186.18], Sp t III 373.6–18 [beginning ad Sp 1184.21]).

As for the third [bhī] Saṅgh., the canonical commentary states (Vin IV 230.22–24) that there is no offence if one’s companion nun has gone,
further question arises as to why this inclusion left not traces whatsoever in the texts dealing with nissāraṇā, contrary to what the similarity between the penalties of mānatta and tajjāniya, etc., would lead us to expect. These questions lead to the thorny problems raised by the framing of the Samgh. rules as a whole and its historical relation with that of the seven quite similar penalties of tajjāniya, etc.\(^{46}\)

8c. If, however, nissāraṇīya is not just a superordinate, redundant is this context, it must refer to some specifications concerning the observance of mānatta by nuns. Two hypotheses have been set forth recently about what these specifications might be.

According to the first,\(^{47}\) nissāraṇīya might stress the fact that a Thv(M) nun undergoing mānatta must be, just like a monk in the same case, “sent away”, even though this provision contradicts the third [bhi] Samgh. rule according to which no nun may ever stay alone; to avoid this contradiction, the appointment of a companion nun was prescribed.\(^{48}\) If this hypothesis is right, the same appointment

has left the Order (either to return to lay life or to join a non-Buddhist religious group), is dead, or if there is an emergency (i.e., according to Kkh 163,28, if one’s companion nun has to go somewhere else urgently). In the very detailed particulars given at Sp 911,1–13,25 (summed up at Kkh 162,22–63,32), together with Vjb 358,2–60,15, Vmv II 73,2–19, Sp-I III 117,17–18,23, there is not the slightest allusion to any special “dismissal” clause applying to mānatta-cārini nuns.

\(^{46}\)See Nolot, Règles, 432–38, with further references


\(^{48}\)Hüsken, “Stock”, 213–14, contrasts the Thv(M) specifications with the absence of any in BhiVin(Mā-L), where nihśaṁraṇīya refers to the offence. This is so, Hüsken writes, because a Mā-L nun undergoing mānatta is not debarred from staying with the others, and there is therefore no need to stress her being “sent away”. This hypothesis implies, however, extending the Mā-L particularity to all traditions (excluding Thv(M) and possibly Dha) which refer nihśaṁraṇīya to the

would be expected to be prescribed in the case of a suspended nun, who is also debarred from staying under the same roof as a regular nun;\(^ {49}\) there is, however, no evidence either for such a prescription or for the extension of the mānatta specification to the observance of ukkhepaṇīya.

According to the second hypothesis,\(^ {50}\) nissāraṇīya might refer to some technically “extra” dismissal of a nun sentenced to mānatta, whatever the practical implications of this “extra”, which might require, according to the chapter’s decision:

1) that such a nun be expelled altogether (losing her status) from the Order, just like the one who committed a Pār. offence;
2) or that she join another community until re-admitted (by the abbhāna procedure specific to the proceedings relating to Samgh. offences) into the community whose chapter sentenced her;
3) or that she stay in the community where she belongs, but should be more severely isolated from regular nuns than a mānatta-cārini monk is from regular monks.

The only evidence we have is not, however, for any such additional dismissal, but for just the contrary: the probation (parivāsa) to be observed by monks who revealed a Samgh. offence (see references in Nolot, Samgh.). Besides, contrary to what Hüskens writes ib., mānatta can hardly be said to be “dealt with” by the few tautological statements at BhiVin(Mā-L) 63,1–9 (cf. Nolot, Règles 405).

\(^{49}\)See above, SVTT IV, § 8 a.

\(^{50}\)V.Hi., “Buddhist Law” 37 n. 79; Juo-hsüeh Shih, unpublished study. V.Hi. explicitly connects nissāraṇīya, in this context, with the seven disciplinary procedures of tajjāniya, etc., including ukkhepaṇīya; since the latter is said by Sp 582,21–23 to be synonymous with saṁvāsa-nāsaṇā, “expulsion from where one belonged”, nissāraṇīya would refer to some additional “expulsion” (nāsaṇā; V.Hi.: “revocation”; see below, SVTT VI) of a nun who committed a Samgh. offence.
offence does not apply to nuns (see SVTT III 122 ff., 135–136).

**BHS** praty-osārayati, ṭ-osāreṣṭi, “to invite to come back again”: BhiVin(Mā-L) 100,1', 143,13 (ms. ṭ-osāreya)f., 144,9**, 15', 145,16**.

praty-osāraṇā, f. : BhiVin(Mā-L) 145,5.

**Skt** ava-sāraṇa, n. : (Mū) Guṇ-VinŚū 65,1, 2, 102,2, 6; Guṇ-VinŚū(Pravr-v) 4,11: Mvy 9306. – ava-sārayati: (Mū) Guṇ-VinŚū 3,2; Guṇ-VinŚū(Pravr-v) 14,14 f. – avasārayatvaṁ nāśūtasya : Guṇ-VinŚū 103,3.

ut-sārayati, “to drive away”, and ut-sāraṇa, n., contrast with osāraṇa, n., at (Mū) MSV(D) II 206,12–19, and are therefore semantically equivalent to Pāli nissāretp, nissāraṇā.51

osāraṇa, n. : (Mū) BhīKaVā(S) 267,18 ff.

osāraṇa-karma, n. : (Mū) MSV(D) II 210,20, 211,2.

osāraṇā, f. : (Mū) BhīKaVā(S) 267,18, 268,1, 12; MSV (D) II 192,6 f., 193,2,6–7, 12 (so read with GBM(FacEd)

---

51 This passage, with its very terse formulation, seems to parallel Vin I 321,29–22,32. Dutt’s equation of utsāraṇa with āhvayana (MSV(D) II xxii) is doubly wrong in that the latter term is not a synonym of the former, but, as explained above (§ 1 and nn. 1–2), a hyponym included in the superordinate osāraṇa, the very contrary of utsāraṇa. BHSD s.v. utsāraṇa is also inaccurate: the “removal” denoted by the term is not that “of religious disabilities from a monk”, but that of the monk himself (from full, regular status).

MSV(D) II 113,13 usārayantii (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 845 [166, *v*° 1]) should be emended, according to the Corrigenda of the same vol., to usārayantii; usārayati is, however, most probably a copyist’s mistake (the akṣaras u and o being very similar) for osārayati: the text introduced by this key-word reads consistently osārayati, osārita. The term does not refer to any disciplinary procedure but seems to mean “to let [a monk] into” a community that has already settled in a residence for the monsoon, so that he belongs to it for the time being.
VI. Nāsanā (n.f.), "expulsion"¹

1. According to Thv(M) canonical Vinaya texts, expulsion applies to novices who transgress the first five specific rules applying to them, or who commit five other types of offence;² to certain categories of monk who should not have been ordained; to monks or nuns who have committed a Pār. offence;³ and to the nun Mettiyā, said to have been instrumental in groundless accusations against a monk. The term nāsanā is not further specified in these canonical Vinaya texts. As pointed out above (SVTT V, end of § 1 and n. 3), physical ejection itself is not expressed by nāseti/nāsanā.

In Kkh and Sp,⁴ nāsanā is made to include three different penalties,⁵ only the first of which implies the loss of monastic status, with expulsion de jure from the monastery:

---

¹This SVTT was completed in November 1996, and discussed with U. Hüsken, who was then preparing an article (published in 1997) on the same topic.

²Hŏbŏgin V 513b33–35, s.v. Chūranja, erroneously equates a novice’s nāsanā with the pabbājāniya penalty (on the latter, which applies only to monks and nuns, see above, SVTT IV, § 2, 5a, 6a, 7a–b).

³Nāsanantika does not belong here at all: it does not mean “a bhikkhu who is under the penalty of expulsion” (so PED s.v. nāsanā), but “depending on the loss” of material during the period when it may be received from donors and made into clothes (see KP, Simā 148 [4]; DEBMT s.v. kaṭhina-uddhāra [4]).

⁴Sp 582,19–24 (ad Vin III 162,38); 870,35–71,4 ≠ Kkh 127,39–28,5 (ad Vin IV 138,33); 1320,31–34 (ad Vin IV 115,23); 1383,36–84,4 (ad Vin V 211,16). In the last two occurrences, and at Sp 1015,14, linga-nāsanā is referred to with the name of the novice Kaṇṭaka/Kaṇḍaka, who incurred it because of his wrong opinions (CPD s.v. kaṇṭaka-nāsanā, which takes kaṇṭaka.⁶ as a common noun meaning “nonsense” < “thorn”, is erroneous — even though Kaṇṭaka may have been so nicknamed precisely because of his “noxious” behaviour). — Cf. Vin-vn 1713; Utt-vn 933.

⁵The only canonical hint at this triad is in Vin V 211,16. As far as we know, this classification is unparalleled in other schools.

⁶ChinSp 386–387 [44]: “personal ruin”, glossed by “ruin by [one’s own] actions” (the latter square brackets are the editors’); Lin, Aide-mémoire 89 n. 4: “mie-chen, litt. ‘suppression corporelle’”.

⁷Whereby admission as a novice into the monastic community (pabbajjā) takes effect (Sp 970,6–9, 24).

⁸Tāvad ev’ assa sarāṇa-gamanā ca upajjhā-gahana ca senāsana-gāho ca paṭippassambhāti, samgha-lābham na labhati, linga-mattaṁ eva ekam avasithām hoti (Sp 1014,16–18 ad Vin I 85,19); although this passage is about novices, Vmv II 117,5–8 states that it applies also to monks who have committed a Pār. offence. Linga, “outward guise (of a monk)”, occurs at Sp 1016,26 ff. (ChinSp 510–11 [18–19]), as contrasted with ghi-linga, “outward guise of a layman” (1017,23 ff.); on this passage, see Carrithers, Forest Monks, 110–11). DEBMT “depriving of the robe” (s.v. nāsanā) is therefore inaccurate; so are the translators followed by Norman, “Schism Edict” 3 ff. (= Norman, CP III 192 ff.; see Nolot, “Vices” 270–72, § III.1 A-B). DEBMT’s translation relies on the only recorded, abnormal case of expulsion entailing such a consequence, that of the nun Mettiyā (see below, § 5), who is said at Sp 584,12–13 to have been given — not made to wear — white (i.e., lay) clothes; according to Sp 1295,25–30 (ad Vin II 279,29), a nun who takes (but does not wear) lay clothes when returning to lay life (vibbhadatī) may, unlike the one who wears them, be admitted again as a novice (though not reordained). Hüsken, “Nāsanā” 105 should be corrected accordingly.

⁹Samvāsa, “belonging to one community”, does not contrast here with the absolute, but with the relative a-samvāsa, “belonging nowhere”. Absolute a-samvāsa is incurred by monks and nuns who have committed
a Pār. offence and are, as a consequence, deprived of their very status: they are said not to belong to the (universal) Saṃgha anymore (Vin III 21.25**, defined at III 28.20-22' as eka-kammaṇ ek' uddeso sama-sikkhatā eso saṃvāso nāma; so [pārājikī bhikkhu] tena saddhīma n' athi, tena vucait a-samvāso) ; as pointed out by KP, Siṃh 53, the term does not apply to any other monk or nun in Thv(M) canonical Vinaya texts.

As for suspended monks and nuns, they are said in the latter texts to be nānā-saṃvāsaka, “belonging elsewhere” than to the (local) Saṃgha who moved suspension (see above, SVTT IV § 8 b): they are therefore, implicitly, a-saṃvāsa in relation to this particular community. An explicit formulation of this relative a-saṃvāsa, contrasting with saṃāna-saṃvāsa, in fact occurs at Sp 904.3-10 (≠ Kkh 159.7-11): saṃāna-saṃvāsaka bhikkhū vucaanti sahāyāya so tehi saddhīma n' athi ti [Vin IV 219.1-2'] ettha eka-kammaṇ [so read with v.l.] ek' uddeso sama-sikkhatā ti ayaṃ tāva saṃvāso, saṃāno saṃvāso etesan ti saṃāna-saṃvāsaka, eva-rūpā bhikkhū bhikkhussa tasmām saṃvāse saha ayana-bhāvena sahāyā ti vucaanti, idāni yena saṃvāsena te saṃāna-saṃvāsaka ti vutta so saṃvāso tassa ukkhiṭtakassata tehi saddhīma n' athi, yehi ca saddhīma tassa so saṃvāso n' athi na tena te bhikkhū attano sahāyā katā honti — “‘Monks belonging to the same community are called companions; he is not in their company’; here, [monks] belonging to the same community are those for whom community is the same — ‘community’ being defined as ‘united procedures, united recitation [of the Paṭimokkha], common training in the rules’; such monks are called ‘companions’ [sahāya] of a monk in this community because they cultivate a path [ayana] together [saha]. Now, the community due to which they are termed ‘belonging together’ is not shared by this suspended [monk]; and the monks with whom he is not in community do not consider themselves as companions with him” (as for akata-sahāya, both BD III 168 “unfriendly [suspended monk] towards [others]”, and CPD s.v. “who has not taken an advocate” are wrong). Kkh 159.10-11 adds saṃānasamvāsaka-bhāvan anupagantan ti attho: “The meaning is: ‘deprived of the status of one who belongs to the same community’”.

Saṃvāsa-nāsanā is explained by Sp 582,21-23 as āpattiya adassane vā appatīkamme vā pāpikāya [omit ca with v.l.] diṭṭhiya appatiṇissaṣage vā ukkhepaniya-kammaṃ karonti ayaṃ saṃvāsa-nāsanā. Here Sp-t II 345.29 comments: ekakammādi-saṃvāsassa a-karaṇāṃ saṃvāsa-nāsanā, thus referring to the relative a-saṃvāsa of suspended monks and nuns, as defined by Sp 904.3-10, rather than to the absolute a-saṃvāsa incurred by those who committed a Pār. offence — contrary to what is argued by Hūsken, “Nāsanā,” 109, and according to whom saṃvāsa-nāsanā refers specifically to monks and nuns who have been suspended for refusing to see or redress a Pār. offence (furthermore, as seen above [SVTT IV n. 47], the disciplinary procedure of ukkhepaniya may not apply to Pār. offences; in such a case, the relevant procedure would be tassa-pāpīyassikā [see below, TPāp]).

Nāsetuṃ (without further details, as at Vin V 138,16-17, where these ten grounds are referred to). — Summary of Tib. Mū parallel: Banerjee, Sarvītā 181.

Cf. Vin III 40.2-4, where a female probationer and a female novice are said to incur expulsion.

The relevant penalty for monks who disparage them is any of the seven disciplinary procedures studied above, SVTT IV, except pājiśārāṇiya (see ib., § 6a [v]).


Except the last one, these rules are more stringent than for monks. Expulsion is incurred by killing any living being, whether human,
nāsanā; it applies to novices who, instead of making a firm resolve to improve in the future, persist in their wickedness, and are to be eventually thrown out (nikkaḍhitabba). If, however, the novice acknowledges his error without delay, and resolves to improve, he is not to be expelled, but should again be made to take shelter in the Three Refuges, to choose a preceptor, and to strengthen his resolve by a solemn statement that he will observe the ten rules (cf. Sp 970,20–26). His entitlement to a residence during the rains retreat depends on when the second ceremony of the Three Refuges took place: if it was during the earlier retreat, he may get his share of lodgings beginning from the first day of the later one; if it was during the later one, the chapter’s consent has to be secured by a procedure of formal consultation.

2c. Sp 1015,2–23 goes on to explain that transgressing the last five rules to be observed by novices (eating after noon, watching entertainments, wearing ornaments, lying down on high, large beds, accepting gold and silver) does not entail

animal, or vegetable; by stealing even a blade of grass; by any kind of sexual misbehaviour; by telling lies, even for a joke — unlike the Pātimokkha rules applying to monks and nuns, which make the same offences heavier or lighter, depending on the circumstances of the case. Drinking intoxicants, however, entails the expulsion of a novice only if he did so consciously, unlike the Pācā offence entailed by monks in the same case (Sp 1014,12–15, 1014,30–15,2 ; cf. 1386,28–30 [with a misprint dāṇḍa–]). — Cf. below, SVTT VII n. 6.

15Cf. above, SVTT V n. 3. According to Vjb 428,12–13 (= Sp-ṭ III 156,4–6), such novices should be sentenced to expulsion by a formal consultation of the chapter (see SVTT I 80–81, § 3 a) if they do not desist after having been told to do so three times. Should they apply again for admission to the monastic fold, another formal consultation is to be carried out for that purpose (yāva-tattiyam uccamāno na oramati, saṃgham apaloketvā nāsetabba; puna pabbajjaṃ yācāmāno pi apaloketvā pabbājetabba ti vadanti).

16Apaloketvā (Sp 1014,30).

17Vin I 83,35–84,4 ; cf. Sp 1012,32–13,1.

a linga-nāsanā, but only temporary expulsion as a means of “punishment” (dāṇḍakamma-n), consisting in barring the novice from his lodgings (see below, SVTT VII, §§ 2 and 4). As for those who go on disparaging the Buddha, the doctrine, or the monastic community, even after a threefold informal admonition by their preceptors or instructors to stop doing so, they should be punished with the same dāṇḍa-kamma, then urged to acknowledge their transgression; linga-nāsanā should be resorted to only if they refuse to do so.18 The same provisions apply to a novice who holds wrong opinions.19 Both the instigation of this punishment and its eventual cancellation are to be carried out by a procedure of formal consultation (Sp 1402,20–403,13, ad Vin V 222,22 ; cf. above, SVTT V, § 3).

The latter case is dealt with in the Thv(M) [bhū] 70th Pāc. (said to apply also to nuns),20 whose main object is, however, to forbid monks and nuns to have any relation with such a male or female novice. According to the sikkhāpada, the standard formula for expulsion is: "From now on, Master [āvuso] novice, you may neither refer to the Bhagavat as your teacher, nor spend two or three nights in the same place.

18Thus following the Mahā-āṭṭhakathā, unlike the Kurundi, which would apply linga-nāsanā immediately after the threefold admonition (Sp 1015,13–19 ; cf. Hüskens, “Nāsanā”, 106–107).

19This is why Sp 1320,31–34 and 1383,36–844 include, under the key-name Kanṭaka/Kaṇḍaka (cf. above, n. 4), both dāṇḍakamma- and linga-nāsanā.

20Vin IV 138,19–40,31 with Kkh 127,37–28,14, Sp 870,33–71,12 ; n° 48 [bhī]. — Cf. UpālīPr(SR) 80, n° 59. – Dh fragment: CASF(II) 166, n° 70. – Conc.: BhPr 59, table IV.1 s.v. nāsītasamgrahā. – Cf. Hüskens, “Nāsanā”, 98–101, 105–106. A preceptor or instructor, and his pupil, are expected to dissuade each other from holding wrong views (Vin I 49,16–18 [= II 226,17–19] ≠ 52,28–30 [= II 229,38–30,1]); a monk may (and should) break the rains retreat for up to seven days when (female) probationers, or novices of either sex, are to be dissuaded from the same (Vin I 146,1–8 ≠ 146,23–29 ≠ 147,7–14).
as monks, as other novices are allowed to do. Go out, you fool, go to Hell!"  
21 Neither the nidāṇa, nor the sikkhāpada, nor the vibhaṅga specify which kind of expulsion is entailed; Kkh 128,2–5 ≠ Sp 871,2–4 (cf. Sp-I III 345,30–346,1) state that what applies here is danḍakamma-n°, thus making it implicitly parallel with the samāsā-n° incurred by monks and nuns, who are, in the same circumstances, to be sentenced to suspension.  
Sp 1015,23–29 (ad Vin I 85,19; cf. ChinSp 510 [17]) states that the case of novices who rape nuns is a special one, not included, as might be expected, in the third rule (sexual misbehaviour) for novices: unlike another sexual offender, who may, if he firmly resolves to improve, go through the ceremony of the Three Refuges again, then be ordained, someone who rapes a nun may not, whatever his subsequent behaviour; the nāsanā entailed is therefore implicitly a linga-n°.

3. According to Vin I 85,27–89,21, nāsanā also applies to eleven kinds of monk who should not have been admitted to the Order in the first place, and whose ordination is in any other way invalid.

Kkh 128,5–8 ≠ Sp 871,3–4 (cf. Sp-I III 345,30–346,1) state that what applies here is danḍakamma-n°, thus making it implicitly parallel with the samāsā-n° incurred by monks and nuns, who are, in the same circumstances, to be sentenced to suspension.  
Sp 1015,23–29 (ad Vin I 85,19; cf. ChinSp 510 [17]) states that the case of novices who rape nuns is a special one, not included, as might be expected, in the third rule (sexual misbehaviour) for novices: unlike another sexual offender, who may, if he firmly resolves to improve, go through the ceremony of the Three Refuges again, then be ordained, someone who rapes a nun may not, whatever his subsequent behaviour; the nāsanā entailed is therefore implicitly a linga-n°.

4. The expulsion from the Samgha of monks/nuns who have committed a Pār. offence is prescribed at Vin I 173,22, II 78,36 = III 162,16, III 33,25–31, 40,1–2, IV 216,33°=26, etc. In every case, according to Sp 1078,9, 269,9, and Kkh 158,25–26, this expulsion is, implicitly or explicitly, a linga-n°. The expulsion of a monk who was found guilty of obstinate wrongness (tassa-pāpīyyakā), and who did not observe the

24 As contrasted with those who, although they did not fulfil the conditions for ordination either, are nonetheless considered as having a valid ordination (see above, SVTT V, §4). These eleven kinds of monk are referred to at Vin V 140,14–15; according to Sp 139,1.26–28, the same are implied by Vin V 216,32 nāsita, su-nāsita. – Cf. Hüsken, “Nāsanā” 98–99.

25 Or homosexuals, according to Zwilling, “Homosexuality” (referred to by Hüsken, “Nāsanā”, 95 n. 9 as an American publication dated 1992; not available to me, although I did see an article with the same title by the same author, dated 1989 [references at the end of this paper]; the range of application of the term pandaka seems to me, prima facie, to be a bit more complex than can be gathered from Zwilling’s later article).

26 The latter reference is about a nāsita nun (on the vv.II. of the sikkhāpada, see Hüsken, “Nāsanā”, 94 n. 6; cf. Hüsken, “Vorschriften”, 50–51, n. 41); the gloss at Vin IV 217,13–14 runs: nāsita nāma sayam vā vibhāntā hoti anāhīhi vā nāsita – “expelled’ means that she either returned to lay life of her own accord, or was expelled by others” (Kkh 158,25–26: nāsita tī lingaṇāsanāyā sayam vā nathā anāhīhi vā nāsita), unlike the Chinese Sa parallel, which refers explicitly to a formal procedure of expulsion (BhiPr 21 n. 7).
penalty imposed, is most probably of the same type, although this is nowhere specified as far as I can see. 27

5. The emblematic, much discussed case of the nun Mettiyā is dealt with at Vin II 79.20–24 = III 162.37–163.3, 29 the Buddha prescribed her expulsion after she had complied with the request of wicked monks to make a false charge against a monk of raping her (that is, of the first Pār. offence, aggravated by her status as a Buddhist nun [cf. above, end of § 2 a]).

Such behaviour is, however, nowhere said to entail expulsion, and the case gave rise, according to Sp 582.30–84.9, to a controversy 30 about this linga-nāsanā between the Abhayagirivāsins and the Mahāvihāravāsins, who also debated the point whether Mettiyā was expelled because of her acknowledgement of the facts 31 or for another reason. If it was because of her acknowledgement, 32 the monk did take part (kāraka) in the act, and was therefore guilty (sadoṣa, i.e., of a Pār. offence); if it was for another reason, as rightly (so Sp says) argued by the Mahāvihāravāsins on the basis of their own, non-committal Vinaya recension, 33 he was not. Sp goes on to discuss how the abnormal expulsion of Mettiyā was based on her inherent wickedness, 34 not on any Vinaya

27 See below, TPāp, § 8 B-C.

28 Where the context is that of the settlement of formal disputes (see SVTT II 109 and n. 57). The same nīdāna (Vin II 78.25–79.20) recurs, mutatis mutandis, at III 162.5, in the account of how the Buddha prescribed “turning down the bowls” at an offending layman (see below, SVTT IX).

29 In the nīdāna of the rule which makes it a Samgh. offence for a monk or nun to make a groundless charge of a Pār. offence (Thv(M) Samgh. n. 8 [bhu], Vin III 158.2–66.88 with Kkh 42.12–44.21, Sp 575.21–98.9 [ChinSp 382–92]; n. 8 [bhi]. – Cf. UpāḷPr(SR) 47, n. 8. – Conc.: BhiPr 54, table II.1 s.v. amūlakam. – [bhi] Skt Sa fragments: Finot 1913 549; BhiPr 26–27). It may be noted that Rosen’s summary of the nīdāna of the Chinese Sa version of this rule makes no reference at all to the nun’s expulsion (VinVibh(R) 64–65); according to Lin, “Aide-Mémoire”, 90 n. 2, neither does any “Northern” Vinaya text (i.e., other than the Thv(M) ones in Pāli).

30 Said by Sp to have been supervised by King Bhātiya (middle of the first cent. A.D.: V.Hi., “Buddhist Law”, 26 and n. 54); as stressed by v.Hi., ib. 36–38, this testifies to the interference of Sinhalese kings in scholastic debates about Vinaya technicalities. This controversy is not altogether omitted in ChinSp 387 [45] (v.Hi., ib. 36 n. 78), whose account is, however, anything but clear, and does not name any protagonists.

31 Tena hi bhikkhave Mettiyaṃ bhikkhunim sakāya [misprinted sakāya in v.Hi., “Buddhist Law” 37] paṭiṭṭhāya nāsethā (≠ Vin III 162.38–63.1; Abhayagiri version, quoted at Sp 583.10). Contrary to what is stated by v.Hi. ib. (see v.Hi., “Buddhist Law” II 87–89, for further details and a slightly different translation of Sp 269.10–11), this phrase does not refer to the monk’s consent to Mettiyā’s expulsion, but to the latter’s a priori trustworthy acknowledgement (paṭiṭṭhā) of the facts (cf. Vjb (B 50) 196.12 appaṭiṭṭhāyā ti ayyena ’mhi dūsīti ti [≠ Vin III 162.21–22] imaṃ paṭiṭṭhānaṃ vinā eva; see further VmV 281.19–82.24, Sp-ṬI 346.8–16); acknowledgement of the facts or of the offence committed is here, as in all other cases, a prerequisite for any further investigation (see SVTT II 112–13, n. 64). This is further confirmed by Sp 269.9–11 (ChinSp 205 [55]) ad Vin III 33.25 (expulsion of two monks, the first of whom had sexual relations with the second while the latter was asleep): ettha dve pi linga-nāsanena nāsetabba. Tatra dāsakassa paṭiṭṭhā-karanam n’ atti. Dūsīto ti pucchinā paṭiṭṭhāya nāsetabbo; sace na sādhyati na nāsetabbo – “Here, both monks should be sentenced to linga-nāsanā. In this case, there is no acknowledgement [of the facts] by the defiler; [the latter monk] is to be expelled if, when asked whether he was defiled, he did acknowledge [the facts]; if he did not enjoy [the act], he should not be expelled”. – Hüskens, “Nāsanā”, 103–105 should be corrected accordingly.

32 Which is indeed clearly expressed at Vin III 162.27 (to be filled in with ib. 162.18–22), as pointed out to me by O. von Hinüber.

33 Tena hi bhikkhave Mettiyaṃ bhikkhunim nāsetha (= Vin III 162.38–63.1; quoted at Sp 583.12–13).

34 In accordance with the post-canonical, technical equation of sīla-vipatti with the commission of a Pār. offence (see SVTT II, 97 n. 19), VmV I 283.11 states that her very immorality made her guilty of a Pār. and thereby liable to linga-nāsanā.
prescription: normally, a nun who makes false charges against a monk simply incurs a Dukk.35

BHS nāsanā-vaṣtu, n.: Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 329.1.


nāsēti: BhīVin(Mā-L) 78,11, 321,10, 322.1.

Skt nāsana, n.: (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 4, 7, 10 (cf. Guṇ-VinSū(Pravṛ-v) 21,30–22,1, 22,11–12), 99,25, = o-arha, m(f)., “liable to expulsion” : (Mū) MSV(D) IV 53,13 f. (= Lévi, “Mss sanscrits” 27,19 f.).

nāsanīya, n.: (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 53,15; Mvy 8647.

nāsāyati: (Sa) Finot 1911 625 (III b 4). — (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 53,14 f.; MSV(D) IV 53,7, 56,17, 64,17 (= Lévi, “Mss sanscrits” 27,13, 29,9, 33,15 [cf. (Sa) Finot 1913 555 [B3]].) — nāsīta, m(f).: (Sa) PrMoSū 189 (CBd, r° 2 [cf. VinVibh(R) 184 n. 2]), 278 (IS, r° 4). — PrMoSū (Mū) 40,6 (reconstructed from Tib.).

35This invalidates Hüsken’s argument (“Nāsanā”, 96–98) that Mettiyā’s nāsanā was prescribed before the rule about false charges was framed: if so, the legislators would most probably have referred to Mettiyā’s case when framing it. — According to Sp 583,17–84,5 (with Vjh 196,24–25, Vmv I 282,24–83,11, Sp-t II 436,16–47,14), contrary to what might be argued, the first Thv(M) Pāc. (which deals with deliberate lying) does not apply here, just as it does not apply in the case of groundless charges of a Samgh. offence: the latter are dealt with in another, specific Pāc. (Thv(M) n° 76 [bhu]; n° 154 [bhi]) — in both cases, the intentional accusation (anuddhamsanādhīppāya) is what differentiates the offence both from a simple, conscious lie (sampajāna-musāvāda, first Pāc.), and from verbal abuse (omāśa-vāda, 2nd Pāc.), whose distinctive feature is intentional reviling (akkosādhīppāya) (cf. Kkh 43,35–44,16; Upāli Pr(SR) 47, n° 8). As far as can be seen, there is no formal statement, in Thv(M) canonical texts, about the offence (Dukk., Pāc., or other) incurred by a nun who charges a monk with a Pāc. groundlessly; however, the decision that a Dukk. ensues occurs explicitly in the Chinese Sa Upālipariprēcchā (VinVibh(R) 234–35). For further discussion, see v.Hi., “Buddhist Law”–II 89–91.

nāsīta-samgraha, m., “relations with an expelled monk”: (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 53,13, 18; Mvy 8481.

VII. Dāṇḍa-kamma (n.), “punishment”

1. Dāṇḍa-kamma literally means “thrashing”; in Buddhist monastic law, it occurs exclusively in a metaphorical sense,1 and is not a technical term per se, but merely expresses the necessity of some (minor) “punishment”2 whose particulars must then be defined according to the circumstances of the case, as is clear from the wording of the three canonical passages where it is prescribed.3

2. At Vin I 84,5–34, it is said to apply to disobedient novices who stand in the way of the monks’ welfare, or who abuse them, or who foster quarrels among them.4 According

---

1The prescriptions in the Cullavagga (with Sp’s commentary), and those of (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū (see below, § 2 and n. 20), testify that the literal sense of the term (which may apply in lay judicial cases: see, e.g., Vin I 75,29–30, 76,1–2 with Sp 589,24–99,9) had to be explicitly excluded from the lexicon of monastic law.

2As to the alleged technical connection between dāṇḍa-kamma and brahma-dāṇḍa, see below, SVTT X, § 3b.


The imprecise nature of the term is confirmed by its occurrences in Sp (see index s.v. dāṇḍa, "kamma", and below, § 4); as for Kkh, the only occurrence I have been able to trace so far is at 128,1–5 (compounded with o-nāsanā).

These three grounds are, mutatis mutandis, partly the same as those on which a pāṭisārīniya-kamma is to be carried out against monks who stand in the way of the laymen’s welfare, etc. (see above, SVTT IV, § 6 a), and as those on which laymen who stand in the way of the monks’
to Vin I 84.17–85.8, this punishment consists in barring (āvaranāṃ karoti) the sentenced novice from his lodgings; in no case should he be either barred from the whole monastery (cf. above, SVTT V n. 3), or deprived of food, or sentenced to such a punishment without his preceptor’s consent.

Sp 1013.33–34, 1015.2–23, 1386.26–30 extends this penalty to novices of either sex and to (female) probationers who break the last five rules they are expected to observe, or who hold wrong opinions (see above, SVTT VI, § 2c), and to the newly ordained pupils of preceptors and instructors. According to Sp 1013.14–27, the quantity of food and clothes given to a novice sentenced to this dāṇḍa-kamma may be restricted, and he may be requested to fetch water, wood, sand, etc.; but his bowl and outer cloak should not be stored inside his lodgings, and he should not be physically mistreated (cf. below, n. 20).

welfare, etc., may be sentenced to a pattanikkujjanā-kamma (see below, SVTT IX, § 1).


6Sp 1386.26–30 (ad Vin V 212.25*) explains that āpatti, “offence”, is a technical term which applies stricto sensu only to monks and nuns; according to Sp 754.13–17, novices commit “transgressions” (ajjhācāra) that may be either “major” (dusṭhulla) — if they concern the first five precepts (sāmaṇera-sikkhāpada) — or not (a-dusṭhulla) — (if they concern the last five (see above, SVTT VI, § 2a–c). There is therefore, technically, no confession (desanā; see SVTT II 112–13, nn. 63–64) of their offences by novices or probationers, who are to be sentenced instead to dāṇḍa-kamma (cf. above, SVTT VI, § 1 [c] and n. 14; below, SVTT VIII n. 10). Vīj 576.12–14 has the interesting comment that the confession of novices should be avoided because “the Mahāsāṅghikas are said to make even novices confess their offences” (mahāsāṃghikā sāmaṇere pi āpattim desāpenti kira).


8Cf. the prescriptions of Guṇ-VinŚū 9.20–22 (cf. Guṇ-VinŚū(Pravr-v) 42.8–13) about eviction (avasādana, corresponding to Pāli pañāmanā [see below, § 4]) : niṣkāsanan akarāṇīyatāyāṃ layanāt parisāvāna-kundike

SVTT VII (dāṇḍa-kamma)

Kkh and Sp list this punishment as one of the three kinds of “expulsion” (nāsanā), and the only one applying exclusively to novices.9

3. According to Vin II 262.1–24, another kind of dāṇḍa-kamma is to be meted out to lewd monks who play bad jokes on nuns. In this case, the punishment consists in the nuns’ decision to stop greeting the guilty monk (avandiyo kātabbo),10 until, according to Sp 1292.19–27, he begs either the monks’ chapter or another monk to go and ask for the nuns’ forgiveness on his behalf.11

When meted out to a lewd nun who plays bad jokes on monks,12 this punishment is said to be the same as for novices, i.e., barring her (āvaranā) from her lodgings.13 If

datvā sāntaratram ca śrāmaṇerasya; upasampat-prekṣā cet pañca pariśkarān.

9See above, SVTT VI, §§ 1c and 2c.

10Whereby the “important duty” (garudhamma) that nuns should greet monks whatever the circumstances ceases to apply (see Hüsken, “Einrichtung”, 156; Freiberger, Br-Strafe 486–87; Hüsken, “Vorschriften” 226, 378). Sp 1292.15–19 describes the decision as a formal consultation (apakokana-kamma; see SVTT I 80–81, § 3a), and refers, with Kamma-vibhāṅga (1292.27), to Sp 1404.1–16 (ad Vin V 222.23–24), which partly quotes Vin II 262.1–24. According to Sp 1396.26–28, this avandaniya-kamma (Sp 1404.14, Kkh 132.7 avandiya-“) is one of the eight procedures that may be carried out in the absence (a-sammukhā) of the person who is the object of it (see SVTT II 100 n. 30). – This case should not be confused with that of the ten kinds of people “not to be greeted” (Vin II 162.23–28; cf. Utt-vn 661a, Khuddas XX).

11This avandaniya-kamma seems to be the only procedure that a nuns’ chapter may carry out against a monk; according to Vin V 195.5–24 (with Sp 1376.15–20), its grounds also include the cases when a monk stands in the way of the nuns’ welfare, or abuses them (cf above, § 2, and SVTT IV, end of § 6a; the Pāṭim rules about abuse between monks and nuns are dealt with by Hüsken, “Vorschriften” 225–27).

12Cases of immodest jokes between persons of the same sex are not contemplated.

13See above, § 2; cf. Sp 1292.31–93.1.
the nun thus sentenced does not mend her ways, her participation in the fortnightly exhortation (ovāda) of nuns by a monk and in the concomitant uposatha ceremony to be performed in the nuns' chapter are both to be suspended; the monk who suspends her from exhortation should be competent; he should act on serious grounds, and state the decision about the case; having done so, he may not leave that place (Vin II 262.24–63.34 with Sp 1292.31–93.5).


**Skt** *dāṇḍa-karma*: Guṇ-VinSū 103.29 (specification, if any, is unclear to me).

4. Although the imprecise meaning of *dāṇḍa-kamma* need not be problematic in itself, two of its occurrences in Sp are somewhat ambiguous in their context: sace ādīto 'va [upajjhāyo paṇāmitat) na khamati, [paṇāmitena] dāṇḍa-kammaṃ āharitvā tikkhattum tāva sayam eva [upajjhāyo] khamāpetabbo. — “if [a preceptor] does not readily forgive

---

14Throughout this text, the term occurs exclusively in the stock-phrase *asmākam [bhikṣūnām] bhagavān dāṇḍa-karmam deti imeṣām [bhikṣūnām] mukti kā, “the Bh. metes out punishment to us [monks], and frees the other [monks] from liability” *; BhīVin(Mā-L) 249.11 provides the variant *asmākam bhagavatā dāṇḍa-karmam prajñāptam imāsām mokti kā, nowhere is *dāṇḍa-karma* precisely defined (cf. Nolot, “Règles” 271 n. 267, with further references in secondary literature). — As for the syntax of *dāṇḍa-karma*, cf. next note.

15Sp 986.24–25 ([898.8–9 panāmitena dāṇḍa-kammam āharitvā [ācariyo] tikkhattum khamāpetabbo). My translation of *d-kā āhā�ati, “to accept a punishment [inflicted on oneself], is based on a cursory review of its syntax, and may need correction (in Pāli texts, *dāṇḍa-kamma* is also constructed, in the accusative, with *karoti, (pa)ṭṭhapeti, ganhati*, and in

---

16Sp 986.19–22 paṇāmemi tan ti vā ma idha paṭikkāmi ti vā nihara te patta-cīvaram ti vā nāhaṃ tayā upaṭṭhātabbo ti vā iminā pāli-nayena [≠ Vin I 54.4,5–7] mā maṃ gāmappavesamam āpucchitā adinā pālimutta-nayena [cf. Vin I 50.21–22 ≠ (truncated E) 61,13] vā — “I evict you”, or “Do not come back here”, or “Take out your bowl and your clothes”, or “Stop waiting upon me”, or “Do not ask for my permission to go to the village” (nihara te patta-cīvaran is translated inaccurately at BD IV 69 by “Bring back your bowl and robe”).

17Vin I 54.4 paṇāmetabbo is glossed at Sp 982.32 by apa-sādetabbo. This shows that in the Skt Mū parallel (Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 41.29–42.8 [Guṇ-VinSū 9.14–20]), aya-sādayati does not mean “to rebuke” (so ib. xxxv), but “to evict” (cf. below, nn. 19–20).

18Cf. above, SVTT IV n. 8 (ii).
panāmanā, “eviction from dependence” — that is, the separate Vinaya prescriptions about eviction and cancellation of dependence are explicitly connected here.¹⁹

It may be observed that eviction from dependence of an unruly new monk is very similar to the dāṇḍa-kamma barring (āvaranā) a novice from his lodgings; moreover, as noted above, § 2, this dāṇḍa-kamma is also said by Sp to apply to new monks. This raises the question of whether dāṇḍa-kammam āharati refers to eviction proper, or precisely (and semi-technically) to the canonical dāṇḍa-kamma applying to novices. In the latter case, it would have to be interpreted as the implicit merging in Sp of two similar penalties that are considered as distinct by canonical texts: dāṇḍa-kamma applying to novices, defined as āvaranā, “shutting off”, and panāmanā, “eviction” of a newly ordained monk. In favour of this tentative hypothesis, it may be noted that the threefold commentarial classification of nāsānā, “expulsion”, includes this dāṇḍa-kamma (see above, end of § 2), but not panāmanā, contrary to what the close similarity between these two penalties might lead us to expect: this perhaps means that the latter came to be identified with the former.²⁰

---


²⁰A further clue may be found in the prescription occurring in the Skt Mū parallel to the Thv(M) text dealing with eviction, at Gun-VinSū(Pravr-v) 42,13–14 (= Gun-VinSū 9,22–3: cf. above, nn. 17 and 19): na simha-nīṣṭhuro bhave, na vighātā-samvartanam kriyā-kāraṇam kurūn – “[a preceptor or instructor who has dismissed his pupil] should not turn into a fierce lion; neither should [the monks] avail themselves of arrange-

---

VIII. Pakāsanīya-kamma (n.), “procedure of proclamation”

1. This disciplinary procedure is said, in the Samghabheda-kkhandhaka of the Cullavagga (Vin II 189,5–90,9), to have been prescribed by the Buddha for the monk Devadatta, who was plotting to take over the leadership of the monastic community. The chapter was to decide, by a twofold procedure,¹ to proclaim officially to all the people around that the Samgha would not endorse Devadatta’s actions and statements any more; they were then, by the same type of procedure, to appoint (sammānittam) a monk to go and make the proclamation in the following terms: “Devadatta’s character is no more what it used to be; none of his actions and statements should be considered as having anything to do with either the Buddha, the doctrine, or the monastic community, but with himself alone”.²

¹See SVTT I 83–84, § 3c; DEBMT s.v. erroneously makes it a niñatta-tutta-kamma.

²Pubbe Devadattassa aṁañña pakati ahosi, idāni aṁañña pakati; yaṁ Devadatto kareya käyena vācaya na tena Buddhaḥ vā dhammo vā saṁgho vā daṭṭhabbo; Devadatto ’va tena daṭṭhabbo (Vin II 189,7–10). Mukherjee, Devadatta 51, rightly stresses that Devadatta did not thereby lose his status as monk.
The first two chapters of the Cullavagga, where disciplinary procedures are dealt with systematically, do not mention this one. Nor is it referred to in either Thv(M) canonical texts, or commented upon by Sp, Vjb, Vmv or Sp-t. Sp mentions it only twice: at 1396.26, as one of the eight kinds of procedure that may be performed in the absence (a-sammukha) of the person who is its object; and at 1412.32 (akitti-pakāsaniya-kə, "proclamation of ill-repute"), among disciplinary procedures said to be feared in this life.

As shown by Mukherjee and by Waldschmidt, this procedure ad hominem is also mentioned in the Chinese Dh and

---

3 For those of tajjaniya, etc., see above, SVTT IV: for mānatta and parivāsa, see SVTT III.

4 A passing mention of the pakāsaniya-kamma said to have been carried out against Devadatta occurs at Dhp-a I 1403-4, with the variants pabbajaka-; pabbajakā-pakāsaniya-kamma, "proclamation about a rejected [monk]" (?).

5 Cf. SVTT II 100 n. 30. According to Freiberger, "Br-Strafe" 481, 490 and n. 99, the only reason for the inclusion of pakāsaniya-kə in such a list is the tendency to include systematically within the frame of monastic law penalties that were isolated in the Buddha's time; the case, Freiberger argues, would not arise again after the Buddha's death, in the absence of any appointed Saṃgha-leader whose position might be cancelled by plotting. However, as pointed out by v.Hi, "Bemerkung", such a situation was bound to recur in any event after the Buddha's death, so that the procedure, although originally ad hominem, was to find general application. The question remains why it is not listed in Thv(M) canonical texts as a standard procedure (because it was framed later than the first two chapters of the Cullavagga (?). On the similar problems raised by brahma-duṇḍa, see below, SVTT X, §§ 1, 2a-c.

6 DevEp (= Wsch., KlSchr 201-209): Mukherjee, Devadatta 43, 50-54, 96-97, 140 (who points out that the Thv(M) and Mś versions are the more coherent, and that the former might be the older): cf. Frauwallner, *Earliest Vinaya* 119. A. Bareau, "Les agissements de Devadatta selon les chapitres relatifs au schisme dans les divers Vinayapitaka", BEFEO LXXVIII (1991), 87-132 (= Bareau, Recherches III 221-266), is hardly helpful.

---

Chinese Mś Vinayas, though not in the Skt/Chinese Sa or the Chinese Mū. 7

No BHS parallel has been traced so far in this precise context (see below, § 2); as for Skt, as far as we know, the only one is prakāśayati, DevEp 553 (= Wsch., KlSchr 202), və° 6, və° 10.

2. The BHS term prakāśanā-sammuti (f.), "formal agreement to proclamation", occurs at PrMoSū(Mā-L) 19.20, in the text of the 8th [bhu] Pāc., which makes it an offence for a monk or nun to inform (ārocyati; Skt id.; Pāli āroceti) anyone unordained about the major offence (duṣṭhullā āpatti, i.e., in this case, a Saṃgh.) committed by another, unless there is a formal agreement allowing them to do so. 8

Although the object of the exception provided for in this rule is prima facie very similar to that of the procedure of proclamation described above, there are important technical differences in the application of each. Formally, the agreement prescribed in the Pāc. rule is to be achieved, according to Thv(M) post-canonical texts, by three successive procedures of formal consultation (apalokanā), 9 unlike the pakāsaniya-kamma, which involves two successive, twofold procedures. Penally, the latter consists in publicly disclaiming the community's responsibility for whatever a monk may

---

7 Where one monk (Ānanda) is simply requested by the Buddha to go and proceed to the proclamation; the Skt Mū parallel occurs at Saṅghabha II 90.5-14.

8Thv(M) Pāc. n° 9 [bhu], Vin IV 30.24-32.19 with Kkh 86.28-87.8, Sp 753.5-54.29 (ChinSp 450 [721]); n° 105 [bhi]. – Cf. UpālīPr(SR) 62, n° 8 ; Gün-VinSū 37.27-28. – Conc.: BhiPr 57, table IV.1, s. v. duṣṭhulārocanam. – The BHS term is represented in Pāli by bhikkhu-sammuti (Vin IV 31.13-14**), "agreement by the monks"; in Skt, by saṃgha-sammati, ([Sa] Finot 504.2-3; PrMoSū 275 [IN, və° 2: IO, rə 3]), or və° samvrti, "agreement by the chapter" ([Sa] PrMoSū 198 [CGd, və° 5] [cf. saṃgha-sam-++, PrMoSū 48 (AScc, və° 4)]; [Mū] PrMoSū(Mū), 25.8 [so read: see KP, Siṃś 369 and n. 18]).

9Kkh 86.30-33, Sp 754.10; see SVTT I 80-81, § 3a.
do in general, whereas the agreement provided for in the Pāc. rule concerns, and is explicitly restricted to, a specific number of unordained people, and a specific number of precise facts and offences.\(^\text{10}\)

In the absence of any Mā-L commentary in an Indian language, it cannot be decided here whether prakāṣana-s refers to the procedure of agreement mentioned in the Pāli and Skt versions of the same Pāc. rule, or to the procedure of proclamation known in Pāli as pakāsaniya-kamma.\(^\text{11}\) In the latter case, we would have to assume that the Mā-L tradition combines two penalties which are kept apart in the Thv(M) and Sa traditions.

3. In Thv(M) texts, there is only one canonical indication that pakāsaniya-kamma might perhaps have been resorted to in circumstances other than Devadatta’s misdoings. It occurs in an equally exceptional context: that of the controversy said to have taken place in Vesālī, one century after the Buddha’s death, about ten points of monastic discipline.\(^\text{12}\) Vin II 296.16–20 reports that the Vesālī monks decided to carry out a procedure of (unspecified) suspension (ukkhepaniya-kamma) against a visiting monk because “he proclaimed [their wrong practices] to laymen without being formally appointed” to do so (a-sammato gihinam pakāsesi).

Here again, it is impossible to decide which (if any) of the two prescriptions pakāseti refers to.\(^\text{13}\) The reported

\(^{10}\) Vatthu, the facts upon which a charge is based; āpatti, an offence identified by a key-word referring to the Pātimokkha and belonging therefore, stricto sensu, to the jurisdiction governing fully ordained persons (see above, SVTT VII n. 6). On the particular provisions of this rule, see SVTT III 133 n. 48 (to which may be added the Chinese Sa parallel summarized in Vin.Vih(R) 134).

\(^{11}\) As suggested by the ambiguous remarks of Nolot, “Règles” 192 n. 9.

\(^{12}\) See SVTT II 102–106, § 2 b ii for further references.

\(^{13}\) Sp and Vjb are silent on this sentence. BD V xi suggests that pakāseti might have here “at least a semi-technical sense”.

speech of the monk to laymen (Vin II 295.14–98.2) in no way corresponds either to the formula prescribed for pakāsaniya-kamma (see above, n. 2)\(^\text{14}\) or to the Pāc. rule’s definition of (un)lawful information about another monk’s offence (references as above, n. 10). The closest it comes to Vinaya technicalities is its formulation of the circumstances in which the Buddha is reported to have framed each Pātim rule, which mentions what constitutes the offence, but not the latter’s name;\(^\text{15}\) this formulation actually anticipates the discussion of wrong practices by a committee (of monks, i.e., a strictly internal matter, which also involves naming the offence entailed).\(^\text{16}\)

\(^{14}\) If pakāseti does refer to this procedure, and if the proclamation formula was meant to be a fixed one, to be adhered to in all cases for the procedure to be valid — both of which are all but certain — the monk’s proclamation in Vesālī would have been doubly invalid: he was not duly agreed as a proclaimer, and he did not use the prescribed formula.

\(^{15}\) Ekam idam āvuso samayaṃ Bhagavā tath’ eva Rājagaha āyasmaṃ Upanandum Sakya-puttaṃ ārabbha jātāraṇa-rajaṭaṃ paṭikkhipi sikkhatapaṇaḥ ca paññāpasi (Vin II 297.34–37) — which does not, in front of laymen, name the offence (āpatti) itself (see next n.).

\(^{16}\) Vin II 306.14–307.25, which names (see preceding n.) the offence entailed by each wrong practice discussed (e.g., 307.24–25 kim āpa-jjattit? jātāraṇa-rajaṭa-paṭiggahane pācettan), C.f. the formulation of Kkh passim (e.g., 72.17–18 Rājagaha Upanandum ārabbha rūpiya-paṭiggahane-vatthusmiṃ paññātan).
IX. Patta-nikkujjanā/-ukkujjanā (n. f.), “turning down/up the alms-bowls”

1. These two procedures are described in the Khuddakavatthu-khandhaka of the Cullavagga (Vin II 124.14–27.12 with Sp 1209.5–11). The first consists in a decision to refuse the gifts of lay donors who stand in the way of the monks’ welfare; who abuse them; who foster quarrels among them;² or who speak ill of the Buddha, the doctrine, or the monastic community; these grounds are the same as those on which the symmetrical procedure of “summons to be reconciled” (paṭisārāṇīya-kamma) may be carried out against a monk who has offended a lay donor.³

This decision is to be carried out by a twofold procedure, in the absence (a-sammukhā) of the layman concerned;⁴ from now on, the latter’s gifts are “not to be partaken of by

---

This is expressed by pattam nikkujjeti/ukkujjeti, “to turn one’s bowl down/” against, or in respect of (so SBE XX 119.7), a lay donor whose name stands in the gen. case (see v.Hi., “Kassussyntax”, §242; CPD s.v. ukkujjati); BD V 173 and n. 1 are inaccurate. – According to the nidāna, this procedure was prescribed after a layman had complied with the request of wicked monks to make a false charge against another monk of raping his wife; this nidāna is, mutatis mutandis, identical with the account of how the expulsion (nāsanā) of the nun Mettiyā was prescribed, after she had charged a monk with raping her (Vin II 124.15–25.12 ≠ Vin II 78.25–79.20; cf. above, SVTT VI, § 5).

2. These grounds are, mutatis mutandis, the same as those on which a “punishment” (danā-kamma) is to be inflicted on novices (Vin II 125.16–19 = 184.11–13; see above, SVTT VII, § 2).

³Vin II 125.15–22 ≠ A IV 344.24–45.7, with MP IV 159.23–60.3 ≠ 18.33–19.4; see above, SVTT IV, §§ 2 and 5 b [c].

⁴See SVTT I 83–84, § 3c ; SVTT II 100 n. 30. — Unlike the Thv(M) prescriptions, those of the Skt and Chinese Sa Kṣudraka-vastu explicitly state that a monk is to go and inform the sentenced layman of the chapter’s decision (SHT(VI) 69 [1295, v*1f.]; see ib. 70).

---

the monastic community” any longer (a-sambhogam samghena). According to Sp 1209.5–9, this procedure may be performed either within the monastery’s boundary (sīmā) or outside it, e.g., on a river;⁵ the decision to refuse the layman’s pious gifts (deyya-dhamma, that is, merit-making ones) should be communicated to and followed by all neighbouring monastic residences.

2. If the offending layman acknowledges his fault, the penalty may be cancelled by the reverse twofold procedure of “turning up the bowls” (Vin II 126.30–27.12 [126.22–30 ≠ A IV 245.8–16]). After he has approached the chapter in a humble, submissive way and made a threefold application for the purpose, he is, according to Sp 1209.9–11, to step back by one cubit (so that he is considered as absent [a-sammukhā] from the procedure, which his presence would invalidate).⁶

In Kkh and Sp, the procedure of boycott and its cancellation are considered respectively as a kind of dismissal (nissāraṇa) and reinstatement (osāraṇa).⁷


ni-kumjayati : (Sa) SHT(VI) 69 (1295, r°1).

⁵That is, inside a temporary, “unfixed” (a-sammata, a-baddha) boundary, determined by sprinkling water around (udak’ ukkeha-sīmā ; see KP, Śimā, 85–86, 142–143, 334–353: cf. 417).

⁶Ukkujjana-kāle pana yāva-tatiyam yacchapetvā haṭṭha-pāsaṃ vihaṭṭapetvā haṭṭidutiya-kammena ukkujjatabbo. On haṭṭha-pāsaṃ, the minimum distance (ca. 1,10 m) to be respected by people who should not participate in a procedure, see KP, Śimā 55, 87 n. 150, 194–195, 241–242, 264 n. 357. – For the provisions of the Chinese Upālipariprāchā (with a fragmentary Skt parallel) about where the officiating monks should stand, see SHT(V) 54–56, 54 n. 4.

⁷See above, SVTT V, § 5 and n. 13.
The only detailed, canonical Thv(M) account of its prescription and consequences occurs in the Pañcasatikā-khandhaka of the Cullavagga (Vin II 290.9–21, 292.5–29), among various instructions reportedly given by the Buddha, just before his death, to Ānanda. A short account of how it was prescribed occurs in the Mahāparinibbāna-suttanta (D II 154.18–22). A comparative study of the Chinese parallels to the Pāli suttanta is given in ÜLB I 166–68, II 244 (cf. Bareau, Recherches II.ii, 132–35); those of the Mū school are quoted (Skt and Tib. versions) and translated (Chinese version) in MPS 284–85; the Chinese Mś Vinaya parallel to the Cullavagga is translated in Przyluski, Rājagrha 161–62, 166–68 (cf. Bareau, Conciles 25f.).

Apart from MPS 284–85 (29.15, mostly reconstructed from the Tib. version), no BHS or Skt parallels have been traced so far.

2a. According to the report attributed to Ānanda by the Cullavagga and the Dīgha-nikāya, brahma-daṇḍa was prescribed by the Buddha specifically for a monk named Channa, in absentia (a-sammukhā), and was to consist in a kind of ostracism to be imposed after the Buddha’s death. The punishment is said to have been expressed as follows: “Ānanda, Channa may say whatever he likes to the monks; they should neither talk to him, nor exhort him, nor instruct him.” It is not connected here with any precise

---

1See below, § 2c. Other translations are listed by Freiberger, “Br-Strafe” 474.

2See above, respectively SVTT VIII and IX.

3References as above, SVTT VIII n. 3.

4See above, SVTT VIII n. 5.

5On these two versions, see Oldenberg, Vin I xxvii–xxviii; Oldenberg, “Buddhistische Studien”, ZDMG 52 (1898) 622 (= Old., KISchr II 898); Horner, BD V xvii–xviii. Cf. below, n. 15.

6These parallels are discussed briefly by Freiberger, “Br-Strafe” 482–83, 488 n. 95.

7Channa Ānanda bhikkhū yaṃ icceyya taṃ vadeyya, bhikkhūhi Channa bhikkhu n’ eva vattabbo na ovadiatabbo nāmāsāsitabbo (Vin II 290.15–17).

– According to Bareau, Recherches II.ii 133, the Chinese Ekottarāgāma (T.125) states that the offender should not speak to other monks either. – Chinese Mś does not attribute the prescription to the Buddha, but to Mahākāśyapa, and includes lay followers of both sexes in the
misbehaviour,⁸ or any transgression of a Pātimokkha rule. Nor is any procedure prescribed, either for reaching a preliminary decision, or to inflict the penalty itself, or for carrying out its eventual cancellation.⁹ The latter is said to have taken effect from the moment Channa became an Arahant, when he felt so ashamed that he immediately mended his ways and strived after spiritual progress (Vin II 292.14–29).

Now as remarked by v.Hi., “Schriftlichkeit”, 45, the prescription of a penalty ad hominem is quite unusual;

---

enforcement of the penalty (Przyluski, Rājaṭhā 161–62). — A further provision occurs in the Chinese Ekottarāgama, according to which, if Channa would not submit to the penalty, he was to be sentenced by the chapter to some kind of dismissal: Bareu “l’expulsor” might represent suspension (ukkhepaniya-kamma), which entails being debarred from participation in the Upasatha and the exposition of doctrine (see above, SVTT IV, § 8b), just as was to be the case with Channa according to T.1 25 (Bareu, Recherches I/ii 133; cf. id., “La fin de la vie du Buddha selon l’Ekottara-agama”, in Hinduismus und Buddhismus, Festschrift für U. Schneider [1987], 24 [= Bareu, Recherches III 378]). This would imply, however, that suspension is considered here as more severe than brahma-danda, contrary to Vmv’s much more likely implication (see below, § 2c). — On the connexion of a monk named Channa with ukkhepaniya in Thv(M) texts, see Freiberger, “Br-Strafe” 467(4); cf. below, n. 14.

⁸Contrary to the Skt, Chinese and Tibetan versions, which mention quarrelsome-ness and aggressiveness towards fellow monks (Freiberger, “Br-Strafe” 482–83).

⁹Patipassaddhi, said at Vin II 292.27–28 to have been asked for by Channa himself. — According to MPS 284(14–15), if the sentenced monk feels troubled (samvigna) and stops harassing his fellow monks, he should be made to hear the “Sermon to Kātyāyana”. As suggested by Waldschmidt (ib. n. 6), this refers to a parallel to the Buddha’s sermon to Kaccānāgotta (S II 16.34–17.30), which is again recited by Ānanda to Channa at D III 134.3–52.3. Spk II 317.32–18.7 comments that Channa (identified there with the lifelong friend of the Buddha who was to become a quarrelsome monk [cf. below, n. 14]) was then under the penalty of brahma-danda and became so troubled (uppanna-samvegatā) that he begged for exhortation.

---

More precisely, exhorting a misbehaving monk to stop doing so is a characteristic feature of all the Pātimokkha rules which provide that the offence concerned is characterized as such after three informal, then formal admonitions (yāva-tatiyam sāmanubhāsā) from fellow monks (references as above, SVTT IV, first part of n. 107); this is expressed in the casuistic part of the canonical commentary by the clause anāpatti asamanubhāsāntassat bhāsantiyā, “there is no offence if one was not admonished” (Vin III 174.22 ff., IV 220.12, 295.9, etc.). If need be, the formal admonition may be carried out after the monk has been brought before the chapter by force (ākaddhitā, Vin III 173.24–25, 176.10–11, 179.2–3, 185.23–24, etc.).

More exactly, the enforcement of brahma-danda supersedes those two rules (cf. Freiberger, “Br-Strafe” 485–87).

“Br-Strafe” 459–60 and n. 9. 473 n. 55, 490 n. 97.

or explicitly, that the relevant reference is to the Channa who personifies fierceness and obstinacy.¹⁴

2b. As for Thv(M) canonical Vinaya texts, the only other, later mention of brahma-dāṇḍa¹⁵ is in the Parivāra (Vin V 222,23), which simply names it in a list of penalties to be imposed by a procedure of formal consultation (apalokana-kamma; see SVTT I 80–81, § 3 a).

This procedure, and its range of application, are not described in the Parivāra, but in Sp’s commentary ad loc.,¹⁶ according to which it was not just prescribed ad hominem, against Channa, but applies to any scurrilous monk who offends other monks by his unbecoming speech, or who

¹⁴The Cullavagga’s account of brahma-dāṇḍa is clear about Ānanda’s reluctance to deal with him without the support of a whole posse of fellow monks (Vin II 290,19–21 kathāham bhante Channassa bhikkhuno brahma-dāṇḍam añāpēmi, caṇḍo so bhikkhu pharuso ti. Tenā h’ āvuso Ānanda bahu kehi bhikkhūhi saddhiṃ gacchāhi ti). This quarrelsome Channa is also connected with the promulgation of the 12th Samgh (refusing his fellow monks’ advice), of the 12th Pāc. (equivocating about an offence [cf. below, TPāp, § A]), of the 54th Pāc. (off-handedness), of the 71st Pāc. (refusing to learn the Pātimokkha rules until he meets a Vinaya expert), and of suspension (ukkhepaniya-kamma) for refusing to see and to redress his offences (see above, SVTT IV, § 2, § 8a–d). Last but not least, he was “so perverse and so lacking in proper esprit de corps” (DPPN I, 924) that he went so far as to side with nuns in a debate (Vin II 88,8–14, wrongly alleged by DPPN ib. to be the very reason why brahma-dāṇḍa was imposed on him). Whether or not this emblematic character has any historical basis, he was certainly perceived as prone to raise quarrels and strife that might lead to a split in the Order (sāṅgha-bhedā), contrary to Bārānu’s assumptions (Recherches II, 134).

¹⁵As suggested by KP 1994, 218 n. 23, the (earlier) accounts of both D and the Cullavagga must in their turn be later than the first two chapters of the latter text, where, as remarked above, § 1, brahma-dāṇḍa is not listed among the set of standard procedures.

¹⁶Sp 1403,14-404,1; cf. Kkh 131,35–32,3. According to Sp 1396,25, it is performed in the absence of the person concerned (a-sammukhā; see SVTT II 100 n. 30).
contrasted with the disciplinary procedures studied above in SVTT IV:

“It applies to him also” means that it applies, in case of actual garrulousness and so on — without even due inquiry [about the case], without even acknowledgement [of his offence by the accused], without even [formal] charge, even if he did confess his offence21 — to [a monk] who does not desist from scoffing. It does not apply, however, if he desists and asks for forgiveness. “Application of brahma-danda” means “application of severe punishment, of maximal punishment”. For whereas imparting exhortation and teaching [to a monk] is allowed if [he] has been sentenced to blame (taññiya-kamma), etc., doing so for one who was sentenced to brahma-danda is even forbidden to those who have been sentenced to blame, etc. “He should just not be talked to”, and so on: the negation expresses the fact that no conversation or talk whatsoever are allowed: seeing him, monks turn their heads away and do not even look [at him]. Thus should one shun [him], because this punishment was prescribed for the very purpose of subduing. This is precisely why, when Thera Channa, who did not even fear being sentenced to suspension,22 etc., was sentenced to brahma-danda, he fell into a swoon at the thought that he was to be shunned in every way by the Sangha. And should a monk, instead of shunning a monk sentenced to brahma-danda, keep in touch with him knowingly, he should be made to acknowledge an offence of wrong-doing — otherwise, there would be no point in the provision for brahma-danda. “By him”23 means “by the one who was sentenced to brahma-danda”. Like those who were sentenced to blame, etc., and to an even greater extent, he should observe [the penalty] correctly24 by conciliating the Sangha, which is identically expressed by “humble, obedient”, etc. It is said therefore that brahma-danda may be cancelled for the one who observes [the penalty] correctly and asks for forgiveness.

3a. Three hypotheses have been set forth recently as to the etymology and interpretation of the term brahma-danda.

Freiberg, “Br-Strafe”, 489–90, implicitly taking the compound as a tatpurusa with the first member in the dative, would ascribe to this first member a specifically Buddhist metaphorical sense: on the grounds that, in Buddhist texts, brahma- always connotes purity and spiritual progress, and that the imposition of brahma-danda is said at Vin II 292,16–24 to have enabled the monk sentenced to it to reach Arahatship, this author suggests to interpret the compound as “punishment [that leads to] the highest (i.e., to Nibbåna)”.

As far as interpretation is concerned, however, it seems to me more likely that the compound is a karmadhåraya, to be taken here as a metaphorical application of its brahanical meaning: “brahmin’s force”, “brahmin’s curse”25 — i.e., a punishment to be feared in some way; that the Buddhist penalty was felt to be very severe may in fact be inferred from the canonical report that when he was informed he had been sentenced to it by the Buddha, the monk said he was as good as dead (hata), and swooned right on the spot26. This severity is, again, strongly stressed by the gloss of the term, at Vmn II 316,20: khara-danda, ukkañña-danda, “severe, maximal punishment” (see above, § 2c).

3b. Relying on the latter interpretation, and following Rhys Davids-Oldenberg (SBE XX.III, 335 n. 2), KP 1994, 218 n. 24 suggests that this “higher punishment” forms a contrasting pair with danda-kamma, “[lower] punishment”. However, as argued by Freiberg, “Br-Strafe”, 476 n. 66, assuming such a contrast is arbitrary: the gap between the relative mildness of danda-kamma and the severity of

21See above, SVTT IV n. 28.
22Cf. above, n. 14.
23I cannot trace tena here, either in Vin or in Sp.
24On (na) sammā-vattati, see above, SVTT V n. 35.
25References in Freiberg, “Br-Strafe”, 474 n. 56.
brahma-dāṅga is so wide that any other penalty standing between the two might be said to contrast with either.

Furthermore, as far as I can see, no textual evidence supports KP’s hypothesis: Sp’s systematization of the application of brahma-dāṅga does not connect it with any Pāṭimomkkha rule or Vinaya procedure, and its formulaic description of the sentenced monk’s expected behaviour differs from the one that belongs to standard disciplinary procedures. The only source that refers to the set of seven such procedures studied above in SVTT IV is the late Vmv (see above, § 2 c). In any case, brahma-dāṅga is nowhere connected with dāṅga-kamma.

3c. Freiberger’s hypothesis has been criticized on grammatical grounds by v.Hi., “Bemerkung”: a o-dāṅga compound with first member in the dative is unknown in Skt and MI; v.Hi. then suggests that brahma- o might hide an Eastern MI *vam(b)ha < vam(b)heti, “disparaging, scoffing”. Although this is precisely the ground on which, according to Sp29, brahma-dāṅga is to be imposed, the first member cannot, v.Hi. argues, be in the ablative (“penalty for disparagement”), but has to be in the instr., as in vadh-dāṅga, “death penalty”: *vam(b)ha-dāṅga would therefore mean “penalty of disparagement” by regular monks of the monk thus sentenced.

It should be noted, however, that in Vin and Sp, vambheti and related forms denote exclusively verbal contempt. This contradicts the specifications of brahma-dāṅga

---

27 See above, § 2 b.
28 Compare Sp 1403.30–32, quoted above, n. 18, with Vin II 5.18–19 ff., quoted above, SVTT IV n. 32.
29 See above, § 2 b and n. 16.
30 Insulting speech (omasā-vāda), dealt with in the Thv(M) second [bhu] Pāc., is said to consist in “scoffing and disparaging” (khumānā vambhanā, Vin IV 6.1-2; cf. ib. 4.29–33 f.; 7.24–25 f.).
31 See above, § 2 a.
32 See above, § 3 b.
33 It is not clear, however, from Vin II 290.12–15 whether the necessity of a further, more precise definition (katama pana bhante brahma-dāṅga ti; cf. above, SVTT VII, § 1 and n. 3) is due to alternative modes of application of brahma-dāṅga or to the altogether innovative character of the penalty.
34 See above, n. 14.
35 Cf. v.Hi., Mündlichkeit, 27–28. At Sp 739.1–13, ṃapkau-kattukāmo, “intending to humiliate [a regular monk]” (Vin IV 7.24–25) is glossed by garahītu-kattukāmo nītetejī k, “intending to blame, intending to put to shame”. Nīteja again calls to mind niy(yl)ast(s)ā, “disrepute”, v.l. for nissaya-kamma) (see above, SVTT IV, respectively § 1, § 1.11, and n. 8.).
Appendix I (TPāp)

This appendix supersedes SVTT II 110, § 2c(iv), which provided all too brief, and partly inaccurate details about the settlement of “formal disputes about censure” (anuvādādhikarana) by a verdict of “obstinate wrongness” (tassa-pāpiyasiūkā).¹ Research for SVTT IV–VI showed that this verdict is closely connected (exactly how is far from clear to me at the moment) with the sevenfold set of disciplinary procedures and the related technical terminology dealt with above, respectively in SVTT IV and V–VI.

A. According to the Samatha-khandhaka of the Culla-vagga, disputes about censure are to be settled by a verdict of obstinate wrongness (tassa-pāpiyasiūkā) if a convicted offender tries to equivocate about the (Pār.) offence committed when questioned about it before the chapter.² As Dutt, EBM 134, rightly points out, this is one of the grounds that differentiate it from the penalty of blame (tajjanīya): the latter concerns offences (other than Pār.) committed before the guilty monk is summoned before the chapter to account for these very offences. Dutt’s remarks about blame apply to other procedures as well (see below, § B).

---

¹Commentarial and sub-commentarial literature read, almost constantly, ṭāya-pāpiyasiūkā; the canonical reading -yy- will be used here throughout.

²Samgha-majjhī āpattiyā anuyuñjīyamāno avajānītā paṭijānātī paṭijānītā avajānītā aṭṭhena aṭṭhāṃ paṭiccarati sampajāna-mūsā bhāsati (Vin II 85.11-17); bhikkhu bhikkhum samgha-majjhī garukāya āpattiyā codeti (Vin II 101.8-9). Contrary to what is stated by Hüsken, “Nāsānā”, 98 n. 18, paṭicchādeti does not mean “he conceals (his offence)” but “he covers up what he did or said earlier by different actions or statements” (Mp IV 74.11-13 [ad A IV 168.25] aṭṭhena kāraṇena vacanena vā aṭṭhāṃ kāraṇaṃ vacanam vā paṭicchādeti [ = Sp 759.18 (ad Vin IV 35.28, 12th Pāc.), which adds ajjhoththarati]); Kkh 89.29 (12th Pāc.) aṭṭhena vacanena aṭṭhāṃ chādento; etc.

---

36Codeti, sāreī (see SVTT III 121 n. 16).
37Cf. v.Hi., Mündlichkeit, 27-28 (he does not deal with mankum karoti as the third element).
Vin II 85.15–17 occurs in a shorter form at Vin IV 35.26–29. in the nidāna of the 12th Thv(M) [bhu] Pāc. (Vin IV 36.5–14, 33–36). This Pāc. is incurred by any monk who is charged by the chapter, through two successive, twofold procedures, with evasive (aṇḍa-vādam) and vexatious (viheṣaka) answers to questions about his offence. According to Sp 769.22–70.8 (ad Vin IV 35.28), the offence concerned in these questions might be a Pāc. or a Dukk. (Kkh 89.28: a sāvasesā āpatti, i.e., any one but a Pār.; this is what differentiates the 12th Pāc. from the verdict of obstinate wrongness, which applies to unscrupulous monks who give evasive answers to questions about either Pār. offences (i.e., an-avasesā; see SVTT II 112, n. 63) or offences bordering on the latter.

B. A verdict of obstinate wrongness is valid only if the censured monk is actually misbehaving, unscrupulous, and fault-finding; only if he does eventually acknowledge, after due inquiry, the very offence he is charged with; and only if the fourfold procedure (implying a fourfold sammukhā-vinaya) has been carried out according to the rules by a regular chapter.

According to Sp 1193.17–18 (implicitly; see below, n. 16 and end of § C) and 1199.9–11 (explicitly), if the sentenced monk observes the prescribed duties and restrictions (see below, § D), a cancellation (paṭippassaddhi) of the verdict may take place; if he does not, the verdict amounts to his expulsion (nāsanā). As is the case with the other rules for settling disputes, a case thus settled may not be reopened.

6 Cf. SVTT II 112–14 n. 64.

7 Vin II 101.5–102.10 with Sp 1199.1–11; II 85.15–86.30 with Sp 1193.12–20; Kkh 155.4–11 ad Vin IV 207.5 (in Kkh, line 5, read sāmantena; line 7, read osāraṇaṃ ≠ Ps IV 456–14 ad M II 249.1–31 ≠ Sv 1042.20–27 (with a confusing punctuation; cf. Cś (SHB 1925) 762.32–38) ad D III 254.13.

8 Sače sīlavā bhavissati, vattaṃ pāṛēvā paṭippassaddhih labhissati; no ce tathā nāsitaka va bhavissati. According to Vnm II 222.27–23.6, one might argue that no cancellation of the verdict by a procedure of restoration (osāraṇa) may take place, no matter how long the sentenced monk is rebuked; such a restoration is, accordingly, not mentioned in canonical Vinaya texts. It does, however, apply implicitly, by analogy with the canonical restoration of monks who were sentenced to any of the sevenfold set of procedures of blame (tajjānīya), etc., and who duly observe the penalty entailed (kathāṃ pan’ etam paṭippassambhātīti. Keci pan’ ettha so tathā niggahito niggahito ‘va hoti osāraṇaṃ na labhāti; ten’ eva pāliyam osāraṇaṃ na vuttā ti vaddanti. Aṁhe pana pāliyam na upasampādetabban ti [Vin II 86.25] idīna sammā-vattanassa vuttattā sammā-vattivā lājī-dhamme okkantassa osāraṇaṇa avuttpā tajjanīyaṇāni viya navyo kamma-vācāṃ yojetvā osāraṇaṇa kātabbā eva ti vaddanti. Idam yuttam; ten’ eva Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ vakkhi sače sīlavā bhavissati, vattaṃ pariṇāṇetvā paṭippassaddhiḥ labhissati; no ce tato nāsitakā ‘va bhavissati).

9 Cf. above, SVTT VI, § 4. At Sv 1042.22–24 and parallels (references as above, n. 7), it is not paṭippassaddhi, but osāraṇa, that contrasts with nāsanā (in this very order; see above, SVTT V, § 7b and n. 36).
In (Mû) Adhik-v and Guṇ-VinSû, this verdict does not apply to disputes about censure, but, perhaps more logically, to those about offences (see SVTT II 110, 114).

C. According to Vin II 86,19–23, the verdict of obstinate wrongness is a disciplinary procedure which the chapter may choose (ākaṅkhāmaṇo) to resort to (among others); the grounds for doing so are, besides the specific ones mentioned here in § A, exactly the same as those on which the procedures of blame (tajjaniya), etc., may be carried out. This implies that tassa-pāpiyayasikā belongs to the same type of quasi interchangeable procedures as those dealt with in the Kamma-kkhandhaka of the Cullavagga. One may therefore wonder why it is not included in the latter chapter, but rather in the (Adhikaraṇa-)Samatha-kkhandhaka, notwithstanding Sp’s statement that it applies to particularly obdurate monks; the reason might be that, as pointed out above (first part of § A), the equivocation which constitutes the specific grounds for the offence arises during the chapter’s official proceedings, and is therefore considered as a formal dispute (adhikaraṇa).

This would seem to imply that if, as required before any further proceedings, a monk acknowledges a Pâr. offence that he is charged with, it is left to the chapter to decide whether to expel (nâsetuṃ) him immediately, or to give him a second chance by pronouncing a verdict of obstinate wrongness.

D. According to Sp 1193,17–18 sesam ettha tajjaniyādisu vuttanayam eva, the restrictions on the rights of a monk

---

10See SVTT II 93. This point is stated clearly by Vmn II 222,20–26: sesam ettha tajjaniyādisu vutta-nayam eva ti [Sp 1193,17–18] etena tajjaniyā-di-sattukammāni viya idam pi tassapāpiyayasikā-kammaṃ asucībāvādi [Vin II 86,2] dosa-yuttassa saṅghassa ca vinicchaye a-tīṣṭhamānassassa kattabbam visum ekām niggaha-kammānaṃ tassasseta. Etasmiṃ hi niggaha-kammā kate so puggalo aham suddho ti attano suddhiyā sādhanathām saṅgha-majjhānaṃ otaritum saṅgho c' asa vinicchayam ādam na labhati. Tam kammakaraṇa-matten eva ca tam adhikaraṇaṃ vipassan-am hoti – “‘Here, the rest is according to what is said about [the procedures of blame, etc.]: this means to explain that like the seven procedures of blame, etc., the verdict of obstinate wrongness is to be proceeded to, as one separate procedure of rebuke against a [monk] who is corrupted by impurity and so on, and who does not abide by the chapter’s decision. After this procedure of rebuke has been carried out, this man may not say that he committed no offence and appear before the chapter to prove his point: neither may the chapter decide upon his case. And this dispute is definitively settled by the performance of this very procedure.’”

11Cf. Dutt, EBM 133 and n. 37.

12Truncated E° to be filled in with Vin II 4,17–53; complete text in B² (1972) 207,2–30.
who has been sentenced according to a verdict of obstinate wrongness are the same as those applying for tajjanīya,17 i.e., eighteen.

In the Aṭṭhaka-nipāta of the Aṅguttara-nikāya, 18 however, only eight restrictions are listed, the first five of which are identical both with the first five of the eighteenfold list, and with the first five (out of six) actually occurring at Vin II 86.23–27. The sixth restriction in A’s list runs: “he should not accept the chapter’s agreement [to his appointment to some office]”; the seventh, “he should not be raised to a special position”, is equivalent to Vin II 5.13–14 (11th restriction) “he should not exercise authority”;19 the eighth is: “and he should not consider this [special position] as a reason to proceed to redress”.20

17 See above, SVTT IV, § 5a.

18 A IV 347,6–13, corresponding to Vin II 86,23–28.

19 A IV 347,12 reads na kisimīcī paccēka-ṭhāne ṭhāpetabbo; Mp IV 160,13–15 comments: paccēka-ṭhāne ti adhipati-ṭhāne jetthaka-ṭhāne; tam hi jetthakaṃ katvā kīcī sangha-kammāna kātuṃ na labhāti. Vin II 5,14–15 = 32,9 reads na anvāvā paṭṭhapetabbo; Sp comments: na anvāvā ti vihāra-jetthakaṭṭhānam na kātābaṃ (1156,7–8), to which Sp 1163,15–17 adds pātimokkh’ uddesakena vā dharmajjhesakena vā na bhavitabbām; terassu sammaṭṣu ekasammati-vasena pi issariya-kammāna na kātābaṃ (the thirteen sammatis refer to the appointment of monks to various offices, by a formal agreement of the chapter; cf. Sp 1195,22–23).

20 A IV 347,13 na ca tena mūlana vattṭhapetabbam; Mp IV 160,16–17 comments: tām mūlaṃ katvā abbhāna-kammāna kātum na labhāti, “he may not consider this as a reason to carry out a procedure of re-admission [of another monk]” (vattṭhapeti is therefore made by Mp to refer to the category of Samgh. offences; the latter, unlike the Pā. offences, allow redress [vattṭhāna-gāmini], and involve penalties, the end of which is marked by the sentenced monk’s abbhāna [see SVTT III 133–34, § 6; and above, SVTT IV, § 4d and n. 31]).


22 These lists are, for tarjanīya: na pravrājītāvayam, nōpasambādītavayam, na niśrayo deyah, na śramanoddeśa upasūpāyitavayah, na bhikṣṇy avavadītavā, na bhikṣṇy-avavadākaṃ sammantavayah, nāpi pāra-sammatena bhikṣṇy avavadītavā, na bhikṣuṣ codaṭitavayah smārayitavayah śīla-vipattīyā drṣṭi-vā dcāra-vā ṣīva-vipattīyā sthāpayitavayah.
full monk status after undergoing the tarjaniya penalty (cf. above, SVTT IV n. 33).

APPENDIX II

(see above, SVTT IV n. 47)

Vjb 507.9–508.9 ad Vin II 3.8–9, Sp 1155.16–17 (cf. Sp-ı III 365.17–66.12)


na posaddho na pravāraṇa na jñapti-karma na jñapticaturtha-karma (MVS(D) III 7.5–11; GBM(FacEd) X.6, 890 (189, r° 2–3) idem, without editor’s standardization of sandhi; the text seems to be defective from sthāpayitavyah to the end; cf. here below). For the verdict of obstinate wrongness: na pravṛjayaītavyam, nōpasampādayitavyam, na niśrayo deyo, na śrāmanyodeśa upapthāpayitavyah, nānena karma kartavyam, na karma-kārakah sammantavyah, nānena bhikṣunyo avaditavyah, na bhikṣunyāvāvādakaṃ sammantavyah, na pūrva-sammata-na bhikṣunyo vavādityaṃ, nānena bhikṣus caṇḍaṭiyāvaṃ smarāyitavyaṃ sīla-vipattiyā dvṛṣṭi-v° acāra-v° ājīva-v°, nānena vavādahā sīla-vipatyāvaṃ, na posaddhe, na pravāraṇe, na jñapti-dvitye na jñā-caturthe karmani, nāpi samgha-madhya vinayo moktavyah satvä anyeṣu vinaya-dhareṣu pudgaleṣu (Adhik-v 107.14–23).

1I.e., the threefold groups of grounds which invalidate such a procedure (Vin II 3.1–4.15).
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The Sixty-four Destructions according to the Saṃskṛtasaṃskṛta-viniścaya

A. Introduction

Among the Sthavira tenets cited by Daśabalaśrīmitra in his Saṃskṛtasaṃskṛta-viniścaya, which is preserved only in Tibetan translation, is a passage in prose and verse on the "sixty-four destructions" of the world or universe.¹ The citation occurs in Chapter 8, "Analysis of the Aeon" (Kalpa-viniścaya).² I have not been able to trace an exact counterpart of the passage in Pāli, although the prose is close to that of a number of texts, such as the Visuddhimagga and the Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī. The verse is very close to one cited without attribution (or ascribed to the "old masters": ten' āhu porānā)³ in later Pāli works such as the Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī, Sārasaṅgaha,⁴ Lokadīpakasāra,⁵


²Title from end of chapter: Peking Tanjur (Q) 43a6, Derge Tanjur (D) 14085, bskal pa rnam par nes pa ste (Q: Žes bya ba for ste, D) l’eu brgyad pa’o.

³For the "old masters" or "anceients", see E.W. Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, Colombo, 1953, Appendix II.


The sixty-four Destruc

The theory is the same as that of the Vaibhāṣikas, as outlined in the Lokaprajñapti and presented in detail in the Abhidharmakośa, Abhidharmadīpa, and Sārasamuccaya. The present article gives translations (Part B) and texts (Part C) of Daśabalaśrimitra’s citation, along with relevant passages from the Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī, Visuddhimagga, Lokaprajñapti and Abhidharmakośabhāsya.

B. Translations

1. Sanskrit-Sanskrit-viniścaya

According to the system of the Āgama of the Ārya Sthavira school (nikāya) [of the world], there are sixty-four destruc

(1) there are seven destructions by fire in succession (nirantarāṁ), [then] one by water;
(2) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
(3) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
(4) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
(5) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
(6) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
(7) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
(8) after that, seven by fire, one destruction by wind.


2 lung = āgama: from the style of this and other citations it is clear that Daśabalaśrimitra uses āgama in the sense of “tradition” or “authoritative text”, rather than of “canonical text” in the sense of one of the four Āgamas (equivalent to the first four Nikāyas of the Pāli canon).
Thus there are altogether sixty-four destructions.\textsuperscript{1} Further, it is stated:

After each seven turns by fire
each eighth [turn] is by water:
when the one final [turn] by wind is counted
the sixty-four [destructions] are complete.

2. *Abhidhammatthavinī*

In this manner the world is destroyed seven turns by fire,
and the eighth turn by water; then again seven turns by fire,
and the eighth turn by water: in this manner eight groups of
eight are completed when [the world] is destroyed for a final
turn by water. ... Further, this is stated:

Seven times seven turns by fire
each eighth [turn] by water:
the sixty-four [destructions] are complete
when there is one final [turn] by wind. \textsuperscript{2}

3. *Visuddhimagga*\textsuperscript{3}

[The world] is destroyed for seven turns in succession by
fire and the eighth turn by water; then again seven turns by
fire and the eighth by water, and when it has been seven
times destroyed by water at each eighth turn, it is again
destroyed for seven turns by fire. Sixty-three àëons pass in
this way. And now the air takes the opportunity to usurp
the water’s turn for destruction, and in destroying the world it
demolishes the Subhakṣṇa Brahmā World where the life-
span is the full sixty-four àëons.

4. *Lokaprajñāpti*

There are three destructions: destruction by fire, destruction
by water, and destruction by wind. ... There are seven
destructions by fire, and one by water; there are seven
destructions by water, and one by wind.

5. *Abhidharmakosabhāṣya*

In what sequence do these destructions occur? In suc-
cession, “Seven by fire”: there are seven destructions by fire.
Then, “One by water”: immediately after seven destructions
by fire, there is one destruction by water. “When seven
[destructions] by water have occurred in this manner, again
seven by fire”: when seven destructions by water have
occurred in this sequence, then there are seven destructions
by fire. “After which there is the destruction by wind”: after
that there is one destruction by wind. ... There are fifty-six
destructions by fire, seven destructions by water, one
destruction by wind: thus the *Prajñāptibhāṣya* statement that
“the life-span of the Subhakṣṇa gods is sixty-four àëons” is
correctly interpreted.\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{1}Cf. *Dighanikāya-aṭṭhakathā* (Nālandā ed.) I 183,15, ekāsmin kappe
 catusaṭṭhi antarakappā nāma honti.

\textsuperscript{2}The translation by Coedès and Archaibault changes the number in the
Pāli from sixty-three to sixty-four: “Sept fois [vient] le feu, la huitième
fois c’est l’eau. [Ainsi] jusqu’à soixante-quatre fois ; le vent vient
seulement une fois.”

\textsuperscript{3}Translation from Bhikkhu Ñānamoli, *The Path of Purification (Visuddhi-
magga)* by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa, 3rd ed. (Kandy, 1975).
Chapter XIII §65 (p. 463).

\textsuperscript{1}Lokaprajñāpti, Q5597, Vol. 115, mhton pa kha 1923 dge rgyas kyi lha
mams kyi ishe’i tshad kyi mtha’ ni bskal pa drug cu rtsa bëi ste. Cf.
Sārasamuccaya, thu 354b7 de ltar byas na gdags pa bṣad pa las dge
rgyas kyi lha mams kyi ishe bskal pa drug cu rtsa bëi thub bo ḅes bya ba
legs par bṣad pa yin no.
satta sattagginā vārā āṭhame aṭṭhamodakā
catusāṭhī yadā puṇṇā eko vāyuvaram siyā.

3. Visuddhimagga

evaṁ vinassanto pi ca nirantaram eva satta vāre aṣṭina
vinassati (Mm: nassati HOS) āṭhame vāre udakena, pūna
satta vāre aṣṭina, āṭhame vāre udakena tī evaṁ āṭhame
āṭhame vāre vinassanto sattakkhatthu udakena vinassesī
pūna satta vāre aṣṭina vinassati (Mm: nassati HOS). ettaṁ
āṭṭhatthi kappā atīṭa honti. etṭhī atante udakena nassanavārah
sampaṭṭam pi paṭibāḥṣivā laddhokāso vāto paripuṇnakacatu-saṭṭhikappayakhe subhakāhe viddhamṇeto lokamm vināseti.

4. Lokaprajñapti

jīg pa ni rnam pa gsum ste, mes 'jīg pa dañ, chus 'jīg pa
dañ, rūṇ gis 'jīg pa 'o ... mes 'jīg pa lan bdun zīn chus 'jīg
pa lan cīg, chus 'jīg pa lan bdun zīn rūṇ gis 'jīg pa lan cīg
byun ūnō.

5. Abhidharmakośabhāṣya

kena punaḥ kramenāyaśām varṇatvanyo bhavanti? niranta-
ram tavihat saptāṅginā sapta sāṃvartanyak tejasā bhavanti.

1Henry Clarke Warren and Dharmamānako Kosambi (eds.), Visuddhimagga
of Buddhaghoṣa (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 41. 1950; reprint
Delhi, 1989), Chap. XIII, ¶65, p. 356.8-14 (= HOS); Thai script edition,
Visuddhimagga nāma pakaranavisesassā dutiyā bhāgo, 5th ed.,
Mahāmakarājāvyādīyālaya, Bangkok, b.e. 2515 [1972], p. 269.7-14 (=
Mm). The prose is incorporated into the Sārasangaha (p. 314.8-16) and
Lokadipakāsa (p. 512.25-13.3).

2Jīg rten bṣag pa, Q5597, Vol. 115. mjon pa khu, 54b4-7.

3P. Pradhan (ed.), Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu, (revised 2nd ed.)
Patna, 1975, 191.6-18; Swami Dwarikadas Shastri (ed.), Abhi-
dharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Acharya Vasubandhu with Śputārtha
Commentary of Ācārya Yasomitra, Part II, Varanasi, 1971, pp. 565.4-
566. See also Louis de la Vallée Poussin, L'Abhidharmakośa de
Vasubandhu, tome II, reprinted Brussels, 1971, pp. 216-17. The text of
Kośakārikā III, 102 is given in bold type.
Intermediate Existence and the Higher Fetters in the Pāli Nikāyas

This article concerns what the Pāli Nikāyas have to say about the antarāparinibbāyin non-returners and their desire for existence and the life in an intermediate existence.¹ I shall argue that this material casts doubt on a major point of Theravāda orthodoxy.

The following are the four noble persons presented in Pali Buddhism:

1. The stream-enterer (sotāpanno)
2. The once-returner (sakadāgāmi)
3. The non-returner (anāgāmi)
4. The arahant (arahāṇ) (S V 200).

The Buddha stated that it was only in his teaching that one could find these four noble persons.² The meanings of

¹I am grateful to Professor Richard F. Gombrich (University of Oxford) for his suggestions which helped me to improve the content of this article. I also appreciate the help given by Professor George D. Bond and the late Professor Edmund F. Perry (Northwestern University) in articulating my initial thoughts into an article.

²It is not difficult to understand why Buddhist teaching was so appealing to many sorts of people. It seems Buddhism’s diverse ways of presenting many noble stages and persons could embrace a variety of spiritual needs and levels of spiritual development. Buddhism could introduce arahantship here and now for those who came to it seeking no more rebirths. It could offer the stage of non-return for those who came with the aspiration to have an experience in a higher world before attaining the final goal. It could offer the stage of once-return for those who would like to come back to this world one more time to have more experiences as humans before attaining the supreme goal. Finally, it could offer the stage of stream-entry for those who are not really tired of either world but would like to have an assurance of attaining the supreme goal one day. This is also evident from the fact that all the arahants that we find in the Nikāyas are either monks or nuns. There is no reference to living lay
the Pāli names given to identify these four — one who has entered the stream, one who returns once, one who never returns, and the worthy one — also highlight that their spiritual statuses form a hierarchy on a gradual path. They are explained as having achieved these statuses by gradually giving up “ten fetters” (dasa-samyojana). This hierarchical order is also referred to by naming them the first recluse (stream-enterer), the second recluse (once-returner), the third recluse (non-returner), and the fourth recluse (arahan) respectively (A II 238). Of the four, the arahant is the highest as he is the only fully perfected one, requiring no further instruction (asekha); he has achieved the supreme goal, nibbāna. The rest are still seekers, requiring instruction (sekha), who are advancing towards their final goal.

These four categories of noble person are expanded in the Pāli texts in many different ways. One common expansion can be seen in the following list, where each category is divided into two stages: the path and the fruition.

1a. The one who is in the process of realizing the fruition of stream-entry (sotāpattiphasacchi-kiriya paṭipanno)
1b. The stream-enterer
2a. The one who is in the process of realizing the fruition of once-returning (sakadāgāmiphasacchi-kiriya paṭipanno)
2b. The once-returner
3a. The one who is in the process of realizing the fruition of non-returning (anāgāmiphasacchi-kiriya paṭipanno)
3b. The non-returner
4a. The one who is in the process of realizing the fruition of arahantship (arahattiphasacchi-kiriya paṭipanno)
4b. The arahant

In addition to this there are many other lists, and they demonstrate the multiplication of noble persons according to slight differences in attainments. Even though in many ways these other lists are expansions of the one above, an investigation into them will not only enlarge our understanding of Buddhist soteriology proper but also demonstrate the difficulty in understanding them in terms of the traditional list of ten fetters. The category of non-returners is a case in point. In the Pāli Nikāyas this noble person is expounded in various ways. The following ten non-returners can be named as an example:

1. The first antarāparinibbāyin
2. The second antarāparinibbāyin
3. The third antarāparinibbāyin
4. The upahaccaparinibbāyin
5. The asankhāraparinibbāyin
6. The sasankhāraparinibbāyin
7. The uddhamasota-akamiṭṭhagāmin
8. The kāyasakkhin
9. The diṭṭhipatta
10. The saddhāvimutta.

In this study, my main aim is to consider the non-returner type called antarā-parinibbāyins and the fetters of existence with which they are said still to be tied. By doing so, I will show how problematic it is to understand the various types of non-returners taking the traditional list of ten fetters as a
basis. I will point out not only the weakness of the traditional list but also why it does not include the “desire for existence”, a fetter that can be found in some other lists and which is essential in describing some of the Buddhist noble persons. A possible reason for its non-inclusion seems to be the Theravâda refusal to accept an intermediate existence. My examination of the antarāparinibbāyins and the fetter of existence leads me to conclude that, in spite of the Theravâda refusal, some Pâli texts assume the existence of an intermediate state for the antarāparinibbāyins, for they cannot be born again.

I

Both Buddhist and non-Buddhist sources show that the idea of a non-returner was a commonly understood concept in the Indian religious world at the time of the Buddha. The Buddhist definition of a non-returner in the Nikāyas, according to the Critical Pâli Dictionary, is that a non-returner (anāgâmin) is “a person who does not return (to this world), i.e. who has attained the third stage of sanctification and only is born again in the Brahma world before his entrance into Nibbâna.”¹ This means that, after his death, he will not come to the sensual realm to be born again (D III 237). The prototype of this very idea of not returning to this world is found in the following passage of the Brhad-āranyaka-upaniṣad:

Where one’s mind is attached, the subtle self goes thereto with action, being attached to it alone. Obtaining the end of his action, whatever he does in this world he comes again from that world, to this world of action. This [is for] the man who desires. But the man who does not desire, he who is without desire, who is freed from desire, whose desire is satisfied, whose desire is the Soul; his breaths do not depart. Being Brahmā he goes to Brahmā.²

Nevertheless, when these concepts of returner and non-returner came to Buddhism, they took on new interpretations. The Buddhist categorization of noble persons into returner (āgāmi), non-returner (anāgāmi), and arahant that we find at Itivuttaka 96 is a good example to illustrate this. The returner, as explained there, is tied with the bonds of sensual pleasure and existence; the non-returner, on the other hand, is free from the bond of sensual pleasure, but has the bond of existence; the arahant is free from both bonds.² The word yoga or bond in that text is equivalent to the word samyojana or fetter found elsewhere.

The traditional list of ten fetters is often divided into two sections. Thus, orambahâgiya-samyojana (“the lower fetters”) and uddambhâgiya-samyojana (“the higher fetters”) make up the list of ten. The following five form the group of lower-fetters:

1. personality belief,
2. sceptical doubts,
3. attachment to rules and rituals,
4. sensual desire,


²It 96: kāmayogayutto bhikkhave bhavayogayutto āgāmi hoti āgantā itthattaṁ; kāmayogavisaññutto bhikkhave bhavayogayutto anāgāmi hoti anāgantā itthattaṁ; kāmayogavisaññutto bhikkhave bhavayogavis-aññutto arahā hoti kihīnasavo ti.

¹Vin III 87, Vin II 161, Ud 56: anāvattidhammo tasmā lokā.
fetters (sāmyojana) and the arahant in relation to his destruction of cankers (āsava). The passage reads:

Monks, who is the first recluse [= stream-enterer]? Here a monk after the vanishing of the three fetters has entered the stream, has forever escaped the woe, is affirmed, assured of final enlightenment.

Then, who is the second recluse [= once-returner]? After the vanishing of the three fetters and the attenuation of passion, hatred, and delusion, the monk returns only once more to this world. And only once more returning to this world, he puts an end to suffering.

Who is the third recluse [= non-returner]? After the vanishing of the five lower fetters, however, the monk becomes one who is spontaneously born (opapātika) [as a being in a Brahmā world] and there he reaches complete nibbāna without ever returning from that world.

Who is the fourth recluse [= arahant]? But after the vanishing of cankers (āsava), being cankercless, he reaches already in this world, the freedom which is concentration, the freedom which is understanding, after personally experiencing and comprehending that state.¹

As this passage conveys, one becomes a stream-enterer by eradicating three fetters; a once-returner by weakening passion, hatred, and delusion in addition to the first three; and a non-returner by eradicating all of the five lower fetters.

¹A II 238: idha bhikkhave bhikkhu tiṇṇam sāmyojananānaṃ parikkhayā sotāpanno hoti avinipātadhammo niyato sambodhiparāyano. ayam bhikkhave samano; idha bhikkhave bhikkhu tiṇṇam sāmyojananānaṃ parikkhayā rāgadosamohanānaṃ tanuttā lakāraṃ hoti sakid eva imaṃ lokam āgantvā dikkhasi' antam karoti. ayam bhikkhave dutiyo samano; idha bhikkhave bhikkhu pañcannam oramabhāgiyānānaṃ sāmyojananānaṃ parikkhayā opapātiko hoti tattha parinibbāyati anāvattidhammo tasmai lokā. ayam bhikkhave tatiyo samano; idha bhikkhave bhikkhu āsāvam khaya anāsāvam cetovimuttim pahāvivimuttim dīttī eva dhamme sayaṃ abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajja viharati. ayam bhikkhave catutho samano.

5. ill-will (S V 60).

The five that form the higher fetters consist of:

6. desire for form,
7. desire for the formless,
8. pride,
9. restlessness,
10. ignorance (S V 61, D III 234).

The Pāli word orambhāgiya means “connected with the lower [worlds]”, and the word uddhambhāgiya means “connected with the upper [worlds]”.¹ The first five of the ten fetters are called lower fetters because they tie the individual to the lower realms, also known as the sensual realms. The other five are called higher fetters because they tie the individual to the higher realms which consists of the realms of both form and the formless. By getting rid of the five lower fetters, one becomes free from the sensual realm only, and by getting rid of the five higher fetters, one becomes free from both form and formless realms.

In the Theravāda tradition, this concept of fetters is taken for granted and it is assumed that it is possible to understand the Buddhist noble persons entirely in terms of their giving up of fetters (see, for example, under sāmyojana in Nyanatiloka’s Buddhist Dictionary [NBD]). However, there are many examples in the Pāli Nikāyas themselves where this interpretation becomes problematic.

One problem of the fetters in relation to noble persons can be seen in the following well-known Nikāya passage. The stream-enterer, the once-returner, and the non-returner are defined in relation to their giving up a certain number of
conclude that cankers and fetters are more or less the same. Therefore, the difference, it seems, lies mostly in the terms used rather than in the meaning.

However, there are many other problems with this grading of noble persons according to their destruction of fetters. The various types of non-returners are a case in point. For instance, it is difficult to judge the difference between the first \textit{antarāparinibbāyaṁ} and the second \textit{antarāparinibbāyaṁ} in terms of fetters. It seems, however, that there was a common belief among the early Buddhists that one becomes a non-returner by getting rid of the five lower fetters. For instance, a householder once came to the Buddha and said that he did not see any one of the five lower fetters in himself. The immediate reply that the Buddha gave to this person was: “You have declared the fruit of non-returning” (S V 117). This means that in general one can be certain of being a non-returner when one knows that one is completely free from those five lower fetters.

After looking at various descriptions of the noble persons, however, it is difficult to think that the destruction of the five lower fetters is the only means of identifying a non-returner. Moreover, it is difficult to conclude that the five fetters are the only fetters that the non-returner has broken. Many stock passages in the Nikāyas do not name the individual fetters. A reason for this might be that when the Buddha used the terms “lower fetters” and “higher fetters” his listeners easily understood what he meant. Perhaps the Buddha did not want to create a fixed list of fetters because his original idea was to convey the nature of one’s spiritual attainment by using a popular concept.

The following stereotypical passage on non-returners is an example: \textit{idha bhikkhave bhikkhu pañcannam orambahāgīyānam samyojanānaṁ parikkhayā opapātiyo hoti tattha parinibbāyī anāvattidhammo tasmā lokā. ayaṁ bhikkhave tatiyo samanō (A II 238). “Through the disappearance of the five lower fetters a monk becomes an \textit{opapāti} and reaches
complete nibbāna without ever returning from that world.”¹ As is evident from this passage and its context, the disappearance of the five lower fetters is given as the key to becoming a non-returner but they are not further identified.

It seems that the standardization of noble persons in relation to fetters took place early in Buddhist history as a response to the need for classifying and describing the differences between Buddhist noble persons. However, the Nikāyas themselves show the fallibility of such attempts. For example, texts say that the difference between the once-returner and the non-returner lies in the fact that sensual desire and ill-will have partially vanished in the former, while they have completely vanished in the latter.

According to the stock passage on the once-returner (A IV 380), however, once-returners, in addition to their loss of the first three fetters, are also partially free from passion, hatred, and delusion (rāgadosamohānam tanuttā). Accordingly, the fourth and the fifth lower fetters should be passion and hatred or a combination of passion, hatred, and delusion. But in the list of the five lower fetters, the fourth and the fifth are named as sensual desire (kāmarāga) and ill-will (vyāpāda). It is likely that passion and hatred correspond to sensual desire and ill-will respectively. Although delusion (moha) is mentioned above as a third factor that one lessens with the attainment of once-returning, in the list of the five higher fetters, ignorance (avijjā), which tallies with delusion, is given as the last, a factor that should be got rid of with the attainment of arahantship.

This means, no doubt, that both the once-returner and the non-returner have also attenuated their ignorance to a certain level together with the rest of the fetters which are not in the list of five higher fetters. It also shows that linking this classification of noble persons to a fixed list of fetters was the result of a deliberate attempt by early Buddhists to seek consistency in the Buddha’s sporadic contextual teachings.

II

Two lists of non-returners are found in the Nikāyas. One list consists of five non-returners and the other of seven. It is interesting to note that the texts giving these lists often avoid discussing the noble persons in relation to fetters. In the following pages, I will briefly discuss several of these lists in relation to textual sources. By doing so, I intend to bring out the dilemma caused by the idea of the ten fetters in categorizing Buddhist noble persons.

List A (S V 201)

1. The arahant
2. [non-returners]
   i. The antarāparinibbāyin
   ii. The upahaccaparinibbāyin
   iii. The asankhāraparinibbāyin
   iv. The sasankhāraparinibbāyin
   v. The uddhamsoto akaniṭṭhagāmin
3. The once-returner
4. [stream-enterers]
   i. The dhamma-follower (who is on the path to stream-entry)

¹The term opapātiko is noteworthy. According to the PED, it means: “arisen or reborn without visible cause (i.e. without parents), spontaneous rebirth, ... apparitional rebirth”. According to NBD the term means “accidental, ... spontaneously born, i.e. born without the instrumentality of parents.” BD says further that opapātika “applies to all heavenly and infernal beings.” The Mahāśāhanāsutta names four opapātika-yonis: heavenly beings, hell beings, some human beings, and some purgatory beings (M I 73). Among these opapātika-yonis, where can the non-returner be born? Since the non-returner has already transcended the sensual realm, his becoming an opapātiko cannot be in any of the six heavenly worlds, the human world, or any lower world. Since the beings in the Brahmā worlds are also born as opapātika, that is, without parents, the phrase opapātiko hoti in the cited non-returner formula must refer to one’s becoming an inhabitant in a Brahmā world. On the term opapātika, see also Joy Manné (1995). JPTS XXI, pp. 78–80.
ii. The faith-follower (who is on the path to stream-entry)

In this list, the five non-returners are placed after the arahant. According to the text, the arahant has perfected the five spiritual faculties, namely:

1. faith,
2. energy,
3. mindfulness,
4. concentration,
5. wisdom.

The non-returners are inferior to the arahant because they have not perfected the five spiritual faculties. The differences among the five non-returners also lie in the degree of development of those five spiritual faculties. Among the non-returners, the antarāparinibbāyin is the highest in rank and the uddhamsotha-akanīṭṭhagāmin is the lowest.

At A IV 380, we find another description of noble persons with no reference to fetters, where it states that as far as the threefold categorization of morality, concentration, and wisdom is concerned, all these non-returners have the same standing: they have all perfected morality and concentration, and they have all yet to perfect wisdom. This does not imply that the non-returners have not developed the faculty of wisdom at all. All the non-returners have developed the five spiritual faculties, though less so than the arahant, so we can assume that they have developed the faculty of wisdom to a high level.

Moreover, according to A II 183, one experiences the destruction of cankers through wisdom. This means that in order to become a non-returner, one must destroy some cankers and attenuate others, sensual desire in particular; and to do so one should possess a high level of wisdom. The textual statement that one becomes a once-returner after attenuating lust, hatred and delusion (rāgadosamohānaṁ
tanuttā) also supports this view, though it contradicts the traditional understanding in terms of the five fetters.

List B (A IV 379–81)

1. [non-returners]
   i. The antarāparinibbāyin
   ii. The upahaccaparinibbāyin
   iii. The asankhāraparinibbāyin
   iv. The sasankhāraparinibbāyin
   v. The uddhamsotha-akanīṭṭhagāmin

2. The once-returner

3. [stream-enterers]
   i. The ekabījī
   ii. The kolamkolo
   iii. The sattakkhattuparamo

In this list all the noble persons are described as having residues of attachment (saupādisesa) but being no longer liable to birth in such unpleasant conditions as the hells, the animal world, the ghost world, or the demon world. In addition, the five non-returners are described as those who have perfected both morality and concentration; as those who must still perfect wisdom; and as those who have destroyed the five lower fetters. The once-returner, on the other hand, has perfected morality but not concentration and wisdom and is free from the three fetters and partially free from lust, hatred, and delusion. The three stream-enterers, as described here, have perfected morality only and have got rid of the first three fetters. We summarize this in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Returners</th>
<th>Once-Returners</th>
<th>Stream-Enterers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>morality</td>
<td>perfected</td>
<td>perfected</td>
<td>perfected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentration</td>
<td>perfected</td>
<td>not perfected</td>
<td>not perfected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wisdom</td>
<td>not perfected</td>
<td>not perfected</td>
<td>not perfected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first three</td>
<td>destroyed</td>
<td>destroyed</td>
<td>destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower fetters</td>
<td></td>
<td>partially</td>
<td>not destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next two</td>
<td>destroyed</td>
<td>destroyed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower fetters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the above three lists, there are five kinds of non-returner. It is interesting to note that all of the non-returners in these lists are described without reference to the ten fetters. As seen above, they are defined in relation to either the five spiritual faculties, the perfection of morality, concentration and wisdom, or the way they achieve their final nibbāna.

List D (A I 70-74)

1. [non-returners]
   i. The first antarāparinibbāyin
   ii. The second antarāparinibbāyin
   iii. The third antarāparinibbāyin
   iv. The upahaccaparinibbāyin
   v. The asankhāraparinibbāyin
   vi. The sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin
   vii. The uddhamsotha akaniṭṭhagāmin

2. The arahant (so āsāvāṇam khaya...)

This list has seven types of non-returners because it divides the antarāparinibbāyin into three. The seven non-returners are named in this list as human destinies (purisagatiyo) and the arahant as one who attained complete nibbāna without any residue of attachment (anupādā ca parinibbānam). All of the seven destinies are ways in which the non-returners attain complete nibbāna.

These five or seven non-returners are listed in order based on the level of each non-returner’s progress on the path through developing spiritual qualities and breaking fetters. A textual passage (A I 234–35) that names the five types of non-returner states that one who perfects morality, concentration, and wisdom is most likely to become an arahant; otherwise, he is likely to become one of the five non-returners.

---

1 See also, S V 69-70.
The person who trains himself in perfecting morality, concentration, and wisdom is able to accomplish, with the destruction of all cankers, the freedom which is concentration, the freedom which is insight here and now, within this life. If he fails to do so, with the destruction of the five lower fetters, he will be an antarāparinibbāyin; if he fails to be an antarāparinibbāyin, he will be an upahaccaparinibbāyin; if he fails to be an upahaccaparinibbāyin, he will be an asankhāraparinibbāyin; if he fails to be an asankhāraparinibbāyin, he will be a sasankhāraparinibbāyin; if he fails to be a sasankhāraparinibbāyin, he will be an akaniṭṭhiparinibbāyin, a person who is in the upper stream, heading towards Akaniṭṭha.

These non-returners are rated according to when, where, and how they achieve final nibbāna. Considering this hierarchy in relation to one's perfecting of the Buddhist path, we can conjecture that in the sevenfold classification of the non-returner too, if he who has perfected morality, concentration, and wisdom fails to become an arahant, he is likely to become an antarāparinibbāyin of the first level; if he fails the first level, then he will attain the second level; if he fails the second level, then he will attain the third level. If he fails to achieve all these, then, as in the list of five, the next highest level he can achieve is to become an upahaccaparinibbāyin.

In both the sevenfold and the fivefold classification, the differences among these non-returners are often given by referring not only to the fetters that they break but also to other forms of spiritual progress that they make. In one text, the differences between them are shown by similes. These similes convey to us what will happen to these non-returners after their physical death and when and how they will attain their complete nibbāna. According to that metaphorical description,

(1) the first antarāparinibbāyin attains complete nibbāna "just as from an iron slab, heated and beaten all day, a bit may come off and cool down";¹

(2) the second antarāparinibbāyin attains complete nibbāna "just as from an iron slab, heated and beaten all day, a bit may come off, fly up and cool down";² and

(3) the third antarāparinibbāyin attains complete nibbāna "just as the bit may come off, fly up, and before touching the ground cool down."³

The three sparks of these three similes cool down before touching the ground, in other words, while they are in the air. From this we can assume that these three types of antarāparinibbāyins attain complete nibbāna while they are in antarā, an intermediate state, without being born to another life.

The similes that are given with reference to the other five types of non-returner, namely, the upahaccaparinibbāyin, asankhāraparinibbāyin, sasankhāraparinibbāyin, and the uddhaṃsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin, bear a common characteristic. There the sparks cool down after touching the ground. Thus,

(4) the upahaccaparinibbāyin attains complete nibbāna "just as from an iron slab, heated and beaten all day, a bit may come off, fly up, and after touching the ground cool down";⁴

(5) the asankhāraparinibbāyin attains complete nibbāna "just as from an iron slab, heated and beaten all day, a bit may come off, fly up, and fall on some small heap of grass or sticks, kindle fire, kindle smoke, and consume that small heap and cool down from want of fuel";⁵

¹ A IV 70–71: papaṭīkā nibbattiṭvā nibbāyeyya.
² A IV 71: papaṭīkā nibbattiṭvā uppatiṭvā nibbāyeyya.
³ A IV 71: papaṭīkā nibbattiṭvā uppatiṭvā anupahaccalam nibbāyeyya.
⁴ A IV 72: papaṭīkā nibbattiṭvā uppatiṭvā upahaccalam nibbāyeyya.
⁵ A IV 72: papaṭīkā nibbattiṭvā uppatiṭvā parite tīnapiṭṭhe vā kaṭṭhapuṭṭhe vā nipateyya sa tathā aggim pi janeyya dhūmam pi janeyya aggim pi...
struck, and reach. Accordingly, *upahaccaparinibbanayin* means the one who attains complete nibbana after reaching, or touching, as in the spark simile, the ground. This means he attains complete nibbana after being born into a next life.

As a non-returner, a *upahaccaparinibbanayin* is free from the five lower fetters (S V 69-70), but he still possesses both the rebirth fetters and the existence fetters that I think are the higher fetters. Therefore, on his death, the *upahaccaparinibbanayin* will be born in a pure Brahma world, and attain complete nibbana while living in that world. This is because, though both the rebirth and existence fetters bind him, they are so weak that they could produce only one more life span. Buddhaghosa in his *Visuddhimagga* says that the *antaraparinibbanayin* attains nibbana after reappearing anywhere in the Pure Abodes, before reaching the middle of his life span there, while the *upahaccaparinibbanayin* attains nibbana after reaching the middle of his life span there (Vism 710, Mp II 330). In our view, there is no evidence in the Nikayas to prove either that the *antaraparinibbanayin* is reborn in a new life or that the *upahaccaparinibbanayin* has to live pass the middle of his life span. However, it is clear that the *upahaccaparinibbanayin* attains complete nibbana after being born in another life in the pure abodes.

---

1 A set of five Brahma worlds named as Aviha, Atappa, Sudassa, Sudassi, and Akanitha, are collectively called “pure abodes” (D III 237). In them only non-returners are born, and there they attain their complete nibbana without ever returning to the sensual realm. Vism 710 classifies twenty-four types of non-returner who could live in these pure abodes. Since the inhabitants of those pure abodes are not liable to return to the sensual realm, Bodhisattas are never born in them. To become a Buddha one has to be born in the human world of the sensual realm (Spk I 50; Bu-a 224). The Mahasimhanadasutta (M I 82) states that the Buddha, in his former lives as a Bodhisatta, had experienced almost all forms of birth except the birth in those “pure-abodes”, because if he had been born in them he would not have come back to this world again. However, there are stories which relate that the Buddha sometimes visited the inhabitants of these pure abodes (suddhavas), and vice versa (D II 50).
The next two non-returners are the *asankhāraparinibbāyin* and the *sasankhāraparinibbāyin*. The word *asankhāra* has two meanings. One, found in the Samyutta-nikāya (III, 112), is “devoid of formation aggregate”. The other, found in later texts, is “unprompted” (Vism 452-53). According to the latter meaning, *asankhāra* means automatic, unprompted, done by oneself without any encouragement, and *sasankhāra* means prompted, encouraged by others.¹ Buddhaghosa in his Visuddhimagga says that the *asankhāraparinibbāyin* reaches the highest path (nibbāna) without prompting, with little effort, while the *sasankhāraparinibbāyin* reaches the highest path with prompting, with effort (Vism 710). In the Anguttara-nikāya (II 156), where we find four types of non-returners, the *asankhāra* and the *sasankhāraparinibbāyins* are further classified into two types. The four are:

1. the *sasankhāraparinibbāyin*, who attains complete nibbāna here and now (*diṭṭheva dhamme sasan-khāraparinibbāyī hoti*);
2. the *sasankhāraparinibbāyin*, who attains complete nibbāna after his physical death (*kāyassa bheda sasan-khāraparinibbāyī hoti*);
3. the *asankhāraparinibbāyin*, who attains complete nibbāna here and now; and
4. the *asankhāraparinibbāyin*, who attains complete nibbāna after his physical death.

This fourfold classification shows that both the *asankhāra* and the *sasankhāra-parinibbāyins* may attain complete nibbāna here and now in this world. However, this seems to contradict the passage at A IV 119-20 which describes both these non-returners as attaining perfection after leaving this world.

¹See also CPD on these terms; also see Edgerton’s BHSD on: anabhisaṅkhāra-parinivāyin.
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The last non-returner in the lists of five and seven is called *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin*. The literal meaning of the word *uddhamsota* (Skt ārdhva-srotas) is “going upstream.” Thus the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin* means “the person who goes upstream to Akaniṭṭha.” In Dhammapada 218 the *uddhamsota* is described as “One should be eager, determined, and suffused with thought; [such a] one, whose thought is not attached to sensual pleasures, is called an ‘upstreamer’.”¹

The idea that the *uddhamsota* non-returner goes upstream conveys that he is to be reborn in any of the five pure Brahmi worlds, from Avihya to Akaniṭṭha. He goes up from Avihya to Atappa, from Atappa to Sudassa, from Sudassa to Sudassi, from Sudassi to Akaniṭṭha, without turning back to be born in a lower world (see Pp 17; Pp-a 199). This means that those non-returners who are born in Atappa will never be born in Avihya, but may be born in Sudassa or Sudassi or Akaniṭṭha. Those five Brahmi worlds, which are known as the Pure Abodes, are the only places where the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin* can be born. The *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin* is born in those pure dwellings because he still possesses both the rebirth and existence fetters.

III

How do fetters relate to non-returners? A II 133–34 names four types of people in relation to their having, partially having, or not having three types of fetters. The once-returner is explained in this context as someone who has yet to eliminate

1. the fetters that lead to lower realms (*orambhāgiya-samyojana*),
2. the fetters that bring birth (*uppattipāṭilābhika-samyojana*), and

¹See also Dhp-a III, 289-290; Thī 12.
3. the fetters that bring existence (bhava-patilabhika-samyojana).

This text does not refer to higher fetters but instead introduces rebirth and fetters.\(^1\) It may be that both the rebirth fetters and the existence fetters constitute the higher fetters.

The text then goes on to explain the difference between the uddhaṃsota-akanīṭṭhagāmin and the antarāparinibbāyin. Both are non-returners. For the uddhaṃsota-akanīṭṭhagāmin, although the five lower fetters have vanished, the rebirth and existence fetters still exist. For the antarāparinibbāyin, on the other hand, there exist neither the lower fetters nor the rebirth fetters; yet he still has the existence fetters. And for the arahant all these three types of fetters have vanished completely. Though this text elucidates the difference between these three categories of noble persons, it does not identify what these rebirth fetters and existence fetters are. We note, however, that this threefold classification tallies with I 96, where we find the categorization of noble persons into once-returner, non-returner, and arahant.

The once-returner, according to A II 133-34, comes back and is reborn in the lower realm because in him even the five lower fetters have not completely vanished. This means that the once-returner has still to eliminate all three types of fetter in order to attain complete nibbāna. On the other hand, the arahant has completely eliminated all three types: the lower fetters, rebirth fetters, and existence fetters. In this context, this text names only two types of non-returners: the first and the last of the list of five, namely, the antarāparinibbāyin and the uddhaṃsota-akanīṭṭhagāmin.

Since all types of non-returners have eradicated the five lower fetters, they differ from each other only according to whether they have eliminated the rebirth fetters and the existence fetters (in other words, the five higher fetters?). For instance, those non-returners who are known as the uddhaṃsota-akanīṭṭhagāmins have yet to eradicate both the rebirth fetters and the existence fetters. Those non-returners who are known as the antarāparinibbāyins have already eradicated the rebirth fetters, and they still eradicate the existence fetters, which is why they are still only non-returners. Then the other three types of non-returners that should come between the uddhaṃsota-akanīṭṭhagāmin, the last, and the antarāparinibbāyins, the first, could differ from each other with regard to their level of destruction and attenuation of the rebirth fetters and the existence fetters.

In this regard too, the traditional list of ten fetters is problematic and elusive.

If the non-returners have further to eradicate the five higher fetters, those fetters, according to the list of the ten, should be

1. the desire for form,
2. desire for formless,
3. pride,
4. restlessness,
5. ignorance.

If we assume that the desire for form and the desire for formless states constitute the rebirth fetters, then there still remains the problem of identifying the existence fetters. Conversely, if we were to understand existence fetters to be the desire for form and the desire for formless, then the problem of identifying the rebirth fetters would remain unsolved. We have seen that A II 133-34 states that for non-returners there still remain the fetters that bring existence

\(^1\) The commentary on this passage seems very unclear. It says: uppatti-patilabhīyāni ti yehi antarāra uppattiṃ patilabhāti. bhava-patilabhīyāni ti uppatti-bhavassa patilabhāya paccayā: Mp III, 130–31. Then it says: sakadāgāmissā ti idāṃ appahinasaṃyojanesu ariyesu uttamaikoṭiyā gahitaṃ; yasmā pana antarā-parinibbāyissassa antarāra uppatti n’ aṭṭhi — yam pana so tattha jhānaṃ samāpajjati. taṃ kusalaattussa patilabhavassa paccayo t’ eva samkham gacchati — tasmā ñsa uppatti-patilabhīyāni samyojanāni pahināni bhava-patilabhīyāni samyojanāni appahināni ti vuttam.
(bhavapatilābhikasamyojana); again, It 96 states that for non-returners there still remains the bond of existence (bhavayoga). Considering these references to a fetter called the desire for existence, it is puzzling to find no such fetter in the traditional list of ten fetters, more specifically among the five higher fetters.

It seems to me that the listing of “restlessness” (uddhacca) among the five higher fetters was first a textual corruption and then slipped into the tradition to become part of the standard list. In the place of “restlessness”, it is better to read the fetter called “desire for existence”. It is also possible that in the original list there were three fetters, (desire for form, desire for formless, and desire for existence), and then the early redactors or copyers who understood the first two fetters as a division or expansion of the last deliberately replaced the last with restlessness. Here restlessness seems out of place. Restlessness, for instance, comes also among the five hindrances:

1. sensuous desire (kāmacchanda),
2. ill-will (vyāpāda),
3. sloth and torpor (thīnamiddha),
4. restlessness and scruples (uddhaccakukkucca),
5. sceptical doubts (vicikicchā).

Since one gets rid of sensuous desire and ill-will before becoming a non-returner, one should also get rid of “restlessness” while in the first two noble stages, namely, stream-entry and once-return.

To support my view that the five higher fetters should include a fetter called desire for existence, I present two lists of fetters that we find somewhat hidden in the Nikāyas. Each list contains seven items. They are named “latencies” (anusaya) in one context and “fetters” (samyojana) in another.\(^1\) The list of seven latencies contains:

1. sensual lust
2. repugnance
3. views
4. sceptical doubts
5. pride
6. desire for existence,
7. ignorance.\(^2\)

The list of seven fetters contains:

1. latencies (a corruption for sensual lust?)
2. repugnance
3. views
4. sceptical doubts
5. pride
6. desire for existence,
7. ignorance.\(^3\)

\(^1\) The difference between “fetters” and “latencies”, the titles given to the two canonical lists above, is important. A passage in the Majjhimanikāya says that personality beliefs arise with regard to one’s own personality, sakkāye sakkāyasiddhi; sceptical doubts arise with regard to the Buddha’s teachings, dharmmesu vicikicchā; attachment to rules and rituals arises with regard to moral practices, sīlesu sīlabbataparamāsā; sensual desire arises with regard to sensual pleasures, kāmesu kāmacchando; and ill-will arises with regard to living beings, sattesu byāpādo. For a child, these fetters exist at a latent level (anusetī, -anusayo), and so must be called personality beliefs at a latent level, sakkāyasiddhi, sceptical doubts at a latent level, vicikicchānusayo, etc. On the other hand, mature people, because they do not know good people and their teachings, are not only obsessed by these fetters but do not understand how to eliminate them.

\(^2\) S V 6o, A IV 9 : sat’ ime bhikkhave anusaya. kāmate satta. kāmarāgānusayo paṭighānusayo diṭṭhānusayo vicikicchānusayo mānānusayo bhavārāgānusayo avijjānusayo.

\(^3\) A IV 7 : sat’ imāni bhikkhave saññojanañi. katamāni satta. anusayasaññojanaṃ paṭighasaññojanaṃ diṭṭhisaññojanaṃ vicikicchāsaññojanaṃ mānāsaññojanaṃ bhavārāgasaññojanaṃ avijjāsaññojanaṃ.
Yet another related list is found in the Majjhima-nikāya commentary, and its title, the fetters of existence (bhavasamyojana), has some bearing. This same list also appears in the Vibhaṅga (p. 391). The list includes:

1. sensual desire
2. repugnance
3. pride
4. views
5. sceptical doubts
6. attachment to rules and rituals
7. desire for existence
8. jealousy
9. avarice,
10. ignorance. ¹

In these three lists, the desire for existence is named before the fetter of ignorance, which comes last. In addition, it is important to recall the statement at A II 133-34, that for non-returners there are still the fetters of pride, desire for existence, and ignorance. We recall that this sutta mentions only these three types of fetter. Let us now take into account A IV 70-74. In explaining the seven non-returners, it says that the monk who considers:

“If it were not, it would not be mine; if it shall not become, it shall not become for me; what is, what has become, that I abandon” — acquires a state of equanimity. Then he finds pleasure neither in existence nor in a life to come, but sees with true wisdom that there is beyond a goal, a peace; yet not all in all is the goal

¹Ps I, 43: bhavasamyojanāti dasasamyojanāti, kāmakārasamyojanāti, pañña-māna-diṭṭhi-viccikicchā-sīlabbataparamāsa-bhavāga-issāmaccharīyasamyojanāmi avijjasamyojanāmi. Vibhanga 391: tathā kata-
māṇi dasa samyojanāti? kāmakārasamyojanāti ... avijjasamyojana. It is interesting to note here that in Vibhanga 377, we find lower fetters and higher fetters named as in the traditional lists.

realized by him, nor all in all is the latent pride got rid of, nor that latent desire for existence, nor that latent ignorance. He, with the vanishing of the five lower fetters, becomes one of the three types of antarāparinibbāyin, an upahaccaparinibbāyin, an asankhāparinibbāyin, a sasankhāparinibbāyin or an uddhamsota-akāniṭṭhagāmin. According to this text, all the seven non-returners still possess at a latent level three types of defilement, namely:

1. pride,
2. desire for existence,
3. ignorance.

With these supporting sources, it is justifiable to conclude that either we should list the higher fetters as consisting of

1. desire for form,
2. desire for formless,
3. pride,
4. desire for existence,
5. ignorance.

Or we should not take the list of the five higher fetters so rigidly and literally, since the listing of fetters varies from context to context. In my opinion, among the higher fetters, the desire for form and the desire for the formless can be regarded as the rebirth fetters for non-returners, and the rest of the fetters, the desire for existence in particular, must be the existence fetters. This is a reasonable conclusion because the non-returners will never come back to be born in the sensual realm, and the only possibility for their rebirth is either in the form realm or in the formless realm. Moreover, those who are born anywhere are in existence, subject to birth and death.
A discussion of the concept of antarā-bhava is crucial to an explanation of both the antarāparinibbāyins and the fetter of existence that we have just introduced into the traditional list of ten fetters. As seen earlier, the Anguttara-nikāya (A II 133-34) recognizes a clear difference between rebirth (upatti) and existence (bhava), the rebirth fetters (upatti-patiḷabhika-sāmyojana) and the existence fetters (bhava-patiḷabhika-sāmyojana). In addition, It 96, by stating that for non-returners there exists only the bond of existence, identifies a division between the bond of sensual pleasure (kāmayoga) and the bond of existence (bhavayoga). This division between birth and existence can also be seen from the paṭicca-samuppāda formula, which states: "Conditioned by clinging, existence comes to be; conditioned by existence, birth comes to be."\(^1\)

The antarāparinibbāyins non-returners will not be born again, but they are still subject to existence or becoming (bhava). This means that they are still in the realm of saṃsāra. For instance, a type of antarāparinibbāyin attains complete nibbāna after their physical death in this world but before being born into a next life. This is exemplified in the spark simile where a spark of a heated and beaten iron slab comes off, goes up into the air and cools down before touching the ground. What happens to the antarāparinibbāyins who are not liable to be born again? Where are they living when they attain final nibbāna?

To answer these questions, there is no alternative but to assume the existence of an intermediate state for these non-returners. The antarāparinibbāyins cannot be born again since they do not have the rebirth fetters; and yet they should continue to exist after their physical death because they still possess the existence fetters. Then, where do they attain final nibbāna, unless it be in an intermediate state? This makes us believe that these non-returners survive their physical death and continue to exist in some form without being born into another life. They will not be born into another life because in them the rebirth fetters which cause one to be reborn exist no more.

This existence of life in between (antarā), that is, after one’s death and before birth into a next life, is called the antarābhava, the intermediate existence. Although this idea of the intermediate existence cannot be viewed through our limited evidence as somewhere for all sorts of beings to linger until they find a proper place to be reborn, in the case of the antarāparinibbāyins that is the only possibility.

Though the idea of antarābhava entered Buddhism in its developmental period, some evidence in the Nikāyas shows that it must have been a concept familiar to the earliest Buddhist communities. The idea of the gandhabba’s coming into the mother’s womb for a new conception is a case in point.\(^1\) It is not clear from where the gandhabba comes to the mother’s womb or what this gandhabba means. Sutta-nipāta 147 names two types of sentient beings: bhūtā “beings who already exist” and sambhavesī “beings waiting to be born.” Again, it is not clear who and where these beings are. Some may also question the meaning of antarā in Dhp 237. The verse reads:

\[
\text{upanītavayo va dāni si sāmpayāto si Yamassa santike, vāso pi ca te n’ atthi antarā pātheyyam pi ca te na vijjati.}
\]

The meaning of this verse is, “Your life has come near to an end; you have arrived in the presence of Yama (the king of Death); there is no resting place for you in-between; you do

---

\(^1\) See M I 265-266: yato ca kho bhikkhave māttāpitaro ca sannipatitā hoti, mātā ca utāni hoti, gandhabbo ca paccaṭṭhito hoti, evam tiṇṇām sannipatā gabbhassāvakkanti hoti.
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not even have what is necessary for the road.” The word antarā might in this context refer to an intermediate state of existence.

The word antarā in the following passage of the S IV 59 is also controversial. Venerable Cunda is explaining to Channa some teachings of the Buddha:

nissitassa caliṭaṃ. anissitassa caliṭaṃ natthi. calite asati passaddhi hoti. passaddhiyā satī nati na hoti. natīyā asati agatigati na hoti. agatigatiyā asati cutupapāto na hoti. cutupapāte asati nevidha na huraṃ na ubhayam antarena. esevanto dukkhassā ti.

In him who clings, there is wavering. In him who clings not, there is no wavering. Where there is no wavering, there is calm. Where there is calm, there is no inclination. Where there is no inclination, there is no wrongdoing. Where there is no wrongdoing, there is no vanishing and reappearing. If there be no vanishing and reappearing, there is no here nor yonder nor yet between the two. That is the end of suffering.

What does the phrase na ubhayam antarena mean here except an intermediate state of existence? It is true that the commentaries on such passages often try to deny the idea of an intermediate state of existence. The commentary on the passage just cited says, “This is the only meaning here. Some, taking the words ubhayam antarena, tend to think of an intermediate existence. They talk nonsense. The existence of an intermediate existence has indeed been denied in the Abhidhamma. The word antarena here is to show an alternate view. Therefore, the meaning should be: not here, not yonder, not both, the other alternative.”

No matter how slight these pieces of evidence are, they cannot be disregarded. The Theravādins, however, denied the existence of an intermediate existence even for the antarāparinibbāyins. This denial is evident not only from the discussion in the Points of Controversy (Kathavatthupakaraṇa) on the disputed point: “that there is an intermediate state of existence”, but also from the commentarial explanations of the antarāparinibbāyins. According to these sources, the Pubbaseliyas and the Sammitiyas, on the one hand, accepted an antarā-bhava, and the Theravādins, on the other hand, denied it.2 The Theravāda argument was, “If there be such a state, you must identify it with the sensual realm, or form realm, or formless realm, which you refuse to do.” This unconvincing argument is repeated at Points of Controversy, pp. 212-13.

Because of this denial, Theravādins have to interpret the antarāparinibbāyins in a way that goes against the Nikāya explanations of the rebirth and existence fetters and the implications of the sparks similes applied to non-returners. In its commentary on the sparks similes, the commentary of the Anguttara-nikāya (Mp IV 39), for instance, says that the antarāparinibbāya in attains complete nibbāna by the extinction of all defilements during the period from his arisings but before the middle of his life span in that realm. In other words, the commentary says that the antarāparinibbāya

1Spk II, 373: ayam eva hi ettha attho. ye pana ubhayam antareṇā ti vacanaṃ gahetvā antarā bhavaṃ icchanti. tesāṃ vacanaṃ nirattahām. antarābhavassā hi bhāvo Abhidhamme pāṭikkhitto yeva. antareṇā ti vacanaṃ pana viκapp’antarādipanaṃ. tasmā etha attho: n’ eva idha na huraṃ aparā viκappo na ubhayam ti.

2“The Sarvāstivādins, the Sammatiyas, and Pūrvasaṅghas firmly believed in an ‘intermediate existence’ (antarābhava) that linked death and rebirth. This concept was rejected by the Theravādins and the Mahāsāṅghikas.” Encyclopedia of Religion Vol. II, p. 449.
attains complete nibbāna after being born into a next life in a Brahmā world.

This interpretation not only contradicts the implications of the sparks simile of the Aṅguttara-nikāya but is also unfounded. It is certain that the main aim of this commentarial interpretation of the Theravādins is to avoid the notion of an intermediate existence. It contradicts the Nikāya explanation which clearly points out the non-existence of the rebirth fetters for the antarāparinibbāyins. If rebirth fetters are non-existent, how can they be born into a next life? The view of the Nikāyas seems to be that to be born again, one must have rebirth fetters.

The rejection of an intermediate existence continues even in modern Buddhist scholarship. Interestingly, but surprisingly, these rejections are made on the basis of commentaries and some purely Theravādin texts. Kalupahana and Tamura, for instance, in their article on antarābhava in The Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, say:

**Antarābhava**, intermediate existence or existence between death in one life and rebirth in the other, is a philosophical concept belonging to the later schools of Buddhist thought and is foreign to early Buddhism. The belief in a “being” connecting two actualised individualities (attabhāva) and bridging the gulf between death in one life and birth in the next, a belief influenced by the animistic association of the soul-theories of earlier Brahmanism, is quite inconsistent with the basic teachings of early Buddhism.\(^1\)

Kalupahana and Tamura simply show us the traditional Theravādin view of antarā-bhava, but to our surprise they make no inquiry into the concepts of antarāparinibbāyin non-returners, the bhava-paṭilābhika fetters, or any other relevant sources in the Nikāyas. There is no doubt that the

---


Theravādins are compelled to reject the concept of antarā-bhava because of their fear of soul (atta). That is to say, Theravādins always make some attempts to avoid those concepts which, according to them, may affirm or imply the existence of a soul.

The issue that we are raising here is not whether the affirmation of antarā-bhava compromises the non-self theory of Buddhism or whether it is inconsistent with other Buddhist teachings. Our concern is simply to point out that the Theravāda view which says that the antarāparinibbāyins will be born again is wrong, contrary to the teaching of the Pali Nikāyas.\(^1\) Kalupahana and Tamura, who completely neglected those Nikāya references, should not have made the generalization that the concept of “antarā-bhava... is foreign to early Buddhism”, if by “early Buddhism” they mean the teachings of the Pāli Nikāyas.

\[\text{V}\]

In conclusion, let us check our emended list of ten fetters against the antarāparinibbāyin non-returners and the non-returners in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emended list of ten fetters</th>
<th>Antarāparinibbāyin Non-Returners</th>
<th>Non-Returners in general</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The five lower fetters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. personality belief</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sceptical doubts</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. attachment to rules and rituals</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. sensual desire</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ill will</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks on the Rasavāhinī and the Related Literature

In 1992, I published the edited text of the Migapotaka-vagga and the Uttaroliya-vagga of Vedeha’s Rasavāhinī (Ras), which is based upon my doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Göttingen1. As Telwatte Rahula had completed the romanized edition of the first four vaggas from manuscripts as his doctoral thesis submitted to the Australian National University in 1978, I edited the fifth and the sixth vaggas, that is to say, the first two vaggas of the Laṅkādī-puppattivatthūni, with the intention of continuing his work. Although my thesis was written in English, it seems that it has remained unknown on an international basis to most scholars of Pāli Buddhism and its literature because it was published in Japan. It was Prof. Oskar von Hinüber who suggested that I write a short article summarizing the contents of my book for those who are interested in this field in order to acquaint them with an idea of my work. It will be a great pleasure for me if this small contribution stimulates scholarly interest in Ras, one of the most popular post-canonical literatures in all Theravāda Buddhist countries.

Since a very good, compact explanation of Ras and its relation to other Pāli works, namely Sahassavatthupakaraṇa (Sah), the Sahassavatthaṭṭhakathā (Sah-a) and the Rasavāhinī-ṭikā (Ras-t) is found in Prof. Oskar von Hinüber’s A Handbook of Pāli Literature (§§ 410–415),2 it seems unnecessary to repeat it here. In my edition, preceding the intro-

---


duction, I have given a bibliography of all printed editions and translations of the Ras and relevant literature. That bibliography also includes much information about Sinhalese editions with paraphrases called *sannaya*, and editions and translations in other oriental languages such as Burmese and Thai.

I have also made a complete bibliography of the printed editions of the Saddharmālaṅkāraya (Sdhlk), a Sinhalese version of Ras written by Devarakṣita Jayabhū Dhammakīrti (Dhammakittī) around the end of the fourteenth or at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and its commentaries. Prof. Heinz Bechert of the University of Göttingen spent a great deal of time and effort collecting the greater part of the books that are given in this bibliography for the Institute of Indology and Buddhist Studies (Seminar für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde). I will show later how this Sinhalese text, Sdhlk, is important in editing Ras. And his collection of these old Sinhalese printed books has become an invaluable treasure trove for us today, since these books may be very difficult to obtain outside of Sri Lanka.

In the introduction to the text I have dealt with the history of research covering the further elucidation of Ras (§ 1), discussion about the question of authorship (§ 2), the source of the stories in Ras (§ 3), the relation of Ras and Sdhlk (§ 4), Ras in South-East Asian countries (§§ 5-6), the relation of Ras to the Saddharmmasaṅgaha (§ 7), commentaries on Ras, such as Ras-ṭ, the Rasavāhinī-gāthāsannaya, and the Rasavāhinī-gātāpadaya (or -gaṇṭhipada) (§ 8), a description of the manuscripts of Ras I made use of (§ 9), problems of orthography (§ 10), editorial principles (§ 11), metrical analysis (§ 12), summaries of stories and their parallels (§ 13), and a table of verse parallels (§ 14).

I have given a transliteration of the text of Ras-ṭ in an appendix dealing with Ras V and VI, and of the colophon of Ras-ṭ from MS Or 6601 (90) in the British Library, to show evidence that this commentary is closely related to the South-East Asian Ras tradition. I also give evidence to show that it was most probably composed not in Sri Lanka but somewhere in one of the other Theravāda Buddhist countries, and consequently, I conclude that the Sinhalese printed text is unreliable because the Sinhalese editors in those days had a strong tendency to change the readings in manuscripts to conform with other printed texts. Besides this transliteration, I added a concordance of verses in my edited text, the Sinhalese edition (C), Sdhlk, Ras-gāthāsannaya and the Madhura-rasavāhinīvatthu (the Burmese version of Ras), a concordance of stories in Ras, Sdhlk and Sah, and indices of words and phrases discussed in the notes to the text and of proper names in the text.

One focus of my work is to attempt to settle the dates for Vedeha, the author of Ras. Two of the most learned scholars of Pāli literature, S. Paranavitana and G. P. Malalasekera, held totally different views, the former ascribing Vedeha to the eleventh or to the twelfth century, and the latter placing him in the fourteenth century. How can such a difference of opinion have occurred? It seems it was because the early Pāli philologists were not careful enough in identifying authors of many literary works. Authors of post-canonical Pāli literature were usually Buddhist monks, and they very often had the same, quite common name of Ānanda, or Dhammakitti, etc. The different views of the two scholars also came about due to the careless identification of Vedeha’s teacher, Ānanda.

According to the colophon of Ras, his teacher (guru) Ānanda was called Araññaratan’-Ānanda, “Ānanda, whose abode is the Forest”. In the colophon to another of his works, the Samantakūṭavanaṇṇa, Vedeha praises his teacher as Araññaratan’-Ānanda, “The Forest Jewel, Ānanda”, and Vedeha called himself araññavāsī, which means that Vedeha and his teacher belonged to the Forest Fraternity (called vanavāsī or araññavāsī). Malalasekera rightly identified this
Ananda with the author of the Padasādhana-sannaya, Ānanda Vanaratana, “Ānanda, the Jewel of the Forest”.

On the other hand, Paranavitana noticed the fact that the author of the Pajjamadhu, Buddhappiya, also called his teacher Ānand’-Araññaratana. So far there was no problem. However, he further identified this Ānanda with the Ānanda Tambapanniddhaja, “Ānanda of the banner of Tambapanṇi” (= Laṅkā), who was the teacher of the author of the Rūpasiddhi, since the latter was also called Buddhappiya. This unjustified identification of the two Ānandas and the two Buddhappiyas seems to have become one of the reasons for much of the confusion that we confront when we try to establish teacher-pupil inheritance in the Sri Lanka mediæval Buddhist schools.

The Ānanda who is entitled Tambapanniddhaja is quite safely identified with the therī named Ānanda who was praised in the inscription of Sundaramahādevi, the queen of Vikkamabāhu II (1116–37), as “a banner raised aloft in the land of Laṅkā”. And this is the main reason why Paranavitana ascribed Vedeha to the eleventh to twelfth century, since he was a co-pupil with Buddhappiya of this “Ānanda”.

Buddhappiya as the author of the Rūpasiddhi was, however, referred to in the Padasādhana written by Piyadassi, to which Vedeha’s teacher, Ānanda of Araññaratana, wrote a sannaya. This fact obviously contradicts the above-mentioned fact that Pajjamadhu’s author, Buddhappiya, was a pupil of Ānand’-Araññaratana. The contradiction is, however, very simply resolved if we suppose that two different Ānandas and two different Buddhappiyas existed: namely, Ānanda of Tambapanniddhaja and his pupil Buddhappiya who was also called Coliya-Dīpaṅkara (the name suggests that he was an Indian native) and whose dates are quite clearly settled in the twelfth century; and Ānanda of the Forest Fraternity (with the title of Araññaratana, Vanaratana, or Araññīyatana as in Ras), one of whose pupils was Buddhappiya, the author of the Pajjamadhu.

Now according to the Padasādhana-sannaya, Ānanda’s teacher was Medhaṅkara of Udumbaragiri who lived during the reign of Vijayabāhu III (1232–36). On the other hand, we know from the Sāratthasamuccaya that its author, whose name seems to be unknown, also had Ānanda of Araññaratana as his teacher, and besides this that he was a contemporary of Anomadassi, whose date was clearly settled around the reign of Parakkamabāhu II (1236–71) based upon Mhv LXXXVI, 36–39.

The above is a very condensed outline of my discussion of the evidence of the Vedeha’s date. In short, Buddhappiya, the author of the Pajjamadhu; Anomadassi, the author of the Sāratthasamuccaya; and Vedeha were all pupils of Ānanda, belonged to the Forest Fraternity, and were more or less contemporary. And so we may be allowed to ascribe Vedeha’s date to the latter half of the thirteenth century. I examined this puzzle by closely comparing the colophons of each relevant work. And through this procedure I discovered a very important fact: the titles or sobriquets given to the distinguished monks were not mere casual fancies, but important marks or signs by which Sinhalese Buddhists of the middle ages recognized those bearing the same names. I would like to emphasize here the necessity of this kind of detailed historical examination of post-canonical Pāli literature with more attention to author identification.

The second major theme of my research is to identify the source of Ras. According to the opening verses of Ras, Vedeha states that his work is a revision of a previous work by Rāṭhapāla of Guttavamkaparivena at the Mahāvihāra, which is, in its turn, a Pāli translation of the ancient collection of stories transmitted in the language of the island (dīpabhāsā), i.e. the Sinhalese language. Walpola Rāhula identified Rāṭhapāla’s work with Sah, which was published in 1959 by A.P. Buddhadatta. W. Rāhula’s argument concerning the identification of Sah as Rāṭhapāla’s work is sound, and more evidence for this identification can be
added, especially the fact that the order of stories in Sah and Ras is not arbitrary, but that the order of stories in Sah is clearly reflected in Ras, as though Vedeha sorted the stories in Sah into two parts almost automatically: those stories related to India (Jambudīpa) and those related to Sri Lanka (Lankādīpa).

Problems remain, however. The stories in Sah are usually quite simple, and contain few verses. On the other hand, in Ras the stories are more elaborately related and sometimes contain information not found in Sah. The most conspicuous difference is that Ras contains many verses, some of which are quoted from Mhv and the Apadāna, and in those cases Vedeha himself makes definite statements, such as tena vuttaṃ Mahāvamsa, etc. It is interesting that he also mentions porānā as the source of verses. Although I could identify some of these porānā verses as coming from the Saddhammapayaṇa, it does not seem that Saddh is the direct source for these verses. Both Ras and Saddh rather owe them to a common source. However, verses introduced with definite source names are very limited in number. In most cases, verses are only introduced with phrases like tena vuttaṃ, tathā hi, vuttaṃ hi, or gāthāyo bhavanti, etc. Although these expressions indicate that those verses also have their own source, it is very difficult to find parallels of them in other Pāli literature. It is noteworthy that some verses are found to have their parallels in the Rājārathnākaraya, a Sinhalese historiographical work, in which verses are in Pāli, which is usual for similar Sinhalese literature of around that time.

From the above discussion we can already understand that Sah alone cannot be the single source of Ras. Moreover, Ras contains stories not found in Sah in the form we have it today. The question then arises: where did Ras adopt these stories that are missing in Sah from? At this point the relation of Sah and the Sahassaṇvattathāhakathā (Sah-a), which is quoted or mentioned four times in Mhv-ṭ, comes into dispute. W. Rāhula mistakenly seems to regard Sah and Sah-a as one and the same work. S. Mori compared the Sah-_LOWER quotations in Mhv-ṭ with Sah and Ras more carefully and concluded that Sah-a represents the earlier stage of the Sah transmission and that Sah and Sah-a are essentially one and the same work. However, Mori, a priori, thought Sah-a was written in Pāli and did not pay attention to Malalasekera's suggestion that "Rāṭṭhapāla's translation is drawn from the ancient Sahassasa-vattuṭṭhakahathā ... quoted four times in Mahā-vamṣa-ṭīkā." He suggested that Sah-a is the original Sinhalese work (sihasāṭṭhakahathā) from which Rāṭṭhapāla made a translation into Pāli. And I have come to be of the same opinion in the course of my research, although it is very difficult to draw a definitive conclusion.

The place showing most conclusive evidence in favour of Malalasekera's idea is, however, the last reference of Sah-a in Mhv-ṭ 607,8-9 in the romantic story of King Duṭṭha-gamani's son Prince Sāli and his candāla wife (Mhv-ṭ 605,1-608,8). Sah gives the title of the Śālīrājakumāravatthu, but omits the whole story, advising the readers to refer to the "Mahāvamsa" for the story (Śālīrājakumārassa vattuṭṭhu Mahāvamsa vutthayena veditabbam. Śālīrājakumāravatthu dutiyam.). It is obvious that the "Mahāvamsa" mentioned in the passage cannot be the Mahānāma's metrical work, Mhv, since Mhv reports the story with only three verses (Mhv XXXIII 1-3). We may think that it refers to the story in Mhv-ṭ. However, the story in Mhv-ṭ reports the miracles

---

1. O. von Hinüber’s explanation that “The latter text is quoted three times in Mhv-ṭ [sic.]” (op. cit., p. 190), is not quite correct. He does not count the passage, Mhv-ṭ 453,31 (eso pi kihirasalākabhattadāyako tattth’ eva vuttaṃ.), as a reference to Sah-a. It is evident that tattth’ eva indicates the work mentioned in the immediately preceding quotation, i.e. Mhv-ṭ 452,27-28 (so pi Kassapassamassambuddhakāle kihirasalākabhattadāyako t sahasaṇavatthāhakathāyam vuttaṃ.).

which happened at the birth of Prince Sāli, and following this
description, Mv-ṭ 607.8–9 reports: “it is said in the
Sahassavatthaṭhakathā that the same [miracles] also hap-
pened on the occasion of [each of] the seven celebrations”
(sattasā pi ‘ssa maṅgalesu tath’ eva ahosī ti Sahassavattha-
ṭhakathāyaṃ vuttāṃ). From this it is obvious that the author
of Mv-ṭ relates the story based upon a source other than
Sah-a, and he here compares the two versions found in the
two different sources.

We cannot know whether it was the author of Sah who
omits the story, or if it was already omitted in the original
Sinhalese work upon which Sah is based. However, Ras
relates the Prince Sāli’s story in full, and we find in it the
passage whose content corresponds exactly to the statement
in Mv-ṭ:

Tassa mātukucchito nikkhamanakālasamanantarāṃ eva
sakala-Lankādīpe sāli vassaṃ vassi. Antamaso uddhane
ṭhapitakangū-ādinām bhattaṃ pariavattetvā sāli bhattaṃ
eva ahosī. Kangavaḍaparipūritakoṭṭhāgarāṇī pi pari-
vattetvā sālim eva ahosūm. Tuccchakoṭṭhāgarāṇī pi tath’
eva pariṇūṇāni ahesuṃ. Na kevalam jātadivase yeva,
tassa temāsa-sattamāsa-namamāsā-maṅgalesu ca sittha-
pavesana-kannavedhana-uparājāṭhānādī-maṅgal-
divase ca tath’ eva Sihaladipe sāli vassattī vassi.¹

At the very moment after he [Prince Sāli] came out of his
mother’s womb, sāli rice fell like rain on the whole Lankā
island. Even millet or other grains to be cooked as a meal
on fireplaces changed into sāli rice. In granaries fully
filled with millet, beans and other [cereals], all [of the
grains] changed into sāli rice. Empty storehouses were in
the same way filled with [sāli rice]. This miracle
happened not only on the day of his birth, but also on the
days of his attaining the ages of three, seven, and nine
months. It also rained sāli rice in exactly the same way on
Sihala island on ceremonial days such as the day of his
weaning, the day of his ear-piercing, and on the day of his
coronation as viceroy.

This correspondence does not seem unlikely, if we suppose
that Sah-a was still available to Vedeha, or at least that the
tradition of Sihalāṭṭhakathā was not totally lost at his time.¹

Another important point is the basis for principles of text
editing methods. Since Ras is a very popular book with both
monks and lay people, not only in Sri Lanka but in all other
Theravāda Buddhist countries (where Ras is usually called
Madhurasavāhinī or Madhurarasavāhinī), over the centuries,
countless manuscripts have been made. It is therefore im-
possible to establish a relationship among the limited number
of manuscripts which we have access to. Moreover, manu-
crists themselves usually give us scant information about
their date, place, or scribe. So, my greatest concern is how
we can treat the readings in the manuscripts logically and
consistently. The following is a summary of my research,
covering eighteen pages of the introduction of my thesis
(§ 11).

In order to edit the text I used eight Sinhalese manu-
crists (S1–S8), two Khmer manuscripts from Bangkok
National Library (K1 and K2) and one modern Laotian
manuscript (L). In addition, I used the oldest Sinhalese

¹Saranatissa (ed.), Rasavāhinī, (Colombo: 1891–93; 2nd impression,

¹Cf. J. Matsumura, “Sahassavatthuppakaranā wo meguru shomondai”
[“On the Sahassavatthuppakaranā”], Journal of Indian and Buddhist
Studies, Vol. XLI. No. 1 (Dec. 1992), pp. 479–75; J. Matsumura,
“Shihara attakata bunkenru ni kansuru ichikousatu, sari oji monogatari
wo daizai toshite” [“An Investigation of the So-called Sihala-Āṭṭhakathā
Literature: Comparing Three Versions of the Sāliρājakumāra Tale”],
editions of Ras by Sāranātissa (C)\(^1\) as a basis for collation. In the
course of my work, I have found that the manuscripts are
largely divided in two: one group which is almost identical
with C (S\(^3\)–S\(^8\)), and another group which sometimes has
very different readings from C (S\(^1\), S\(^2\), K\(^1\), K\(^2\) and L). Now
the question is which group of manuscripts may be supposed
to reflect more exactly the original form of Ras. To solve the
question, I compared the readings with Sdhkl, which contains
the Sinhalese translation of all the stories in Ras.

As I mentioned above, Sdhkl was written at the turn of
the fourteenth to the fifteenth century by Dhammadikī, the
abbot of the Forest Fraternity at Gadalādēni. Since the author
of Ras, Vedeha, also belonged to the Forest Fraternity, we
may be allowed to form the hypothesis that the Ras text
which Dhammadikī made use of was very close to the original
form of Ras. And as we may also suppose that because
Sdhkl was transmitted separately from Ras, Sdhkl would
serve as a criterion to judge which group of manuscripts
more closely reflects the original form of Ras. The result was
that Sdhkl proved to reflect exactly the readings of the latter
group of manuscripts. So I called the recension represented
by the latter group of manuscripts “recension X”, and the one
represented by the former group manuscripts “recension Y”.

We find the most striking differences between the two
revisions at the beginning of Ras V.2, where recension Y
and C omit a long description of the prosperity of Mahā-
gāma, the capital of Rohana; and Ras VI.10, where they both
omit the ten verses describing the beauty of Anurādhapura
(VI.10); while recension X shares word-for-word correspon-
dence with these two places in Sdhkl. For this reason, I chose
as the first and most important principle that the text of my
edition of Ras would be based upon the group of manuscripts

designated recension X. As a result I believe I identified the
Ras text belonging to recension X, which is sometimes quite
different from the popular Sinhalese editions of Ras.

The last point I would like to emphasize is the problem
of Sinhalese printed editions of Ras. Complete editions of
Ras have been published only in Sri Lanka up to now, and
they seem to be derived from the th edition by Sāranātissa,\(^1\)
which is the oldest edition and which I designated C. So we
may suppose that C represents all the Sinhalese printed
editions. In the course of my work, I found a very curious
problem in C: the readings of the prose part coincide with
the recension Y manuscripts, with some emendations;\(^2\) but a
larger number of verses in C are not found in that form in
any manuscripts of Ras, or some verses in C coincide with
the recension X manuscripts.

For example, a most striking difference can be found in
V.7 (Samañagāma-vatthu). Verse 13 of this vagga consists of
five pādas: four Triṣṭubh-Jagati pādas followed by one
Vasantaṭilaka pāda according to the manuscripts:

\begin{quote}
Visādhike sattasate samantā
adhihehi chabbīsasatehi satta,
parivenapantihi ca dasaniyo
tath’ avasanti yatirājaputta,
kāyādisaṅga-m-aratā paripuṇṇasīlā.
\end{quote}

C makes two verses of four pādas each, discarding the
most unpleasant Vasantaṭilaka pāda, and this reading is
attested only by the Gāthāsannaya and Sdhkl:

\begin{quote}
Visādhike sattasate samantā
adhihehi chabbīsasatehi satta,
\end{quote}

---

\(^{1}\)See note 5. I actually made use of the second impression of Sāranātissa’s
edition, because it was the oldest of all the Sinhalese editions to which I
had access.

\(^{2}\)There is also an edition in Roman script by S. Gandhi (Delhi, 1988), but
it is merely a careless transcription from a Sinhalese edition. Cf. Von
Hinüber, op.cit., p. 191, n. 684.

\(^{2}\)For example, the singular nominative of mātugāma- appears in our
manuscripts always as a feminine (mātugāmā), which C usually reads as
a masculine (mātugāmo).
parivenapanihi sudassaniyo
pūṭhī pavaśdheti sadā janānam.
Tahīṃ vasantā yatirājaputtā
supesalānekagunādhivāsā,
katādarā sabhajanēhi sammā
karonti attathparathasiddhiṃ.¹

In C we often find “improved” verses like these which are not attested to by any of our manuscripts, and in such cases C’s readings are usually attested to by the Gāthāsannaya and Sdhlk, especially by the Gāthāsannaya. From this and other observations I surmise that the one who introduced such improvements to the verses is Dhammakitti, the author of Sdhlk, and that the compiler of the Gāthāsannaya made use of Sdhlk along with Ras transmitted in the form of manuscripts. There is a good reason for the compiler of the Gāthāsannaya to use Sdhlk. Although Dhammakitti did not adopt all the verses of Ras in the original Pāli into Sdhlk, he gave a Sinhalese paraphrase of all the verses of Ras, even of those whose original Pāli text he omitted, and this Sinhalese paraphrase of verses, I suppose, may have been of great use for the compilation of the Gāthāsannaya.

From the circumstances discussed above, we may conclude that the editor of C adopted its verses not directly from Ras manuscripts but most probably from the Gāthāsannaya, which had been transmitted separately from the Ras text. Therefore we must say that the Ras text of the Sinhalese editions cannot be consistent. They are artificially made from the Ras manuscripts and the Gāthāsannaya, and probably also using Sdhlk.

Ras has been a very popular and widely read collection of religious narratives among Buddhists not only in Sri Lanka but also in other Theravāda Buddhist countries, and there still exist innumerable manuscripts kept in temples and libraries. Nevertheless, we do not have a critically edited text of Ras, despite the obvious need of one for the reasons discussed above. Although my contribution may be small, I hope that it will stimulate scholars who are interested in the post-canonical Pāli literature to continue the attempt to publish a critical edition of the entire text of Ras,¹ for I believe that Ras itself is not only very important as historiography but also as one of the most sophisticated works in literature produced in mediaeval Sri Lanka, supplying us with much information about the lively culture of Theravāda Buddhists.

Junko Matsumura

¹According to a letter from Mr Sven Bretfeld of the University of Göttingen which I received in May 1997, he intends to edit Ras VII.3–VIII.3, the vaggas which narrate the story of King Duṭṭhagāmanī and his ten worriers.
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