

A Patimokkha Manual

including Notes on Rule Translations and Commentary on Rule Factors

By Ajahn Brahmali

Contents

[Introduction](#)

[Parajika 1](#) [Parajika 2](#) [Parajika 3](#) [Parajika 4](#)

[Sanghadisesa 1](#) [Sanghadisesa 2](#) [Sanghadisesa 3](#) [Sanghadisesa 4](#) [Sanghadisesa 5](#)

[Sanghadisesa 6](#) [Sanghadisesa 7](#) [Sanghadisesa 8](#) [Sanghadisesa 9](#) [Sanghadisesa 10](#)

[Sanghadisesa 11](#) [Sanghadisesa 12](#) [Sanghadisesa 13](#)

[Aniyata 1](#) [Aniyata 2](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 1](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 2](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 3](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 4](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 5](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 6](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 7](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 8](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 9](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 10](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 11](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 12](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 13](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 14](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 15](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 16](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 17](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 18](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 19](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 20](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 21](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 22](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 23](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 24](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 25](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 26](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 27](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 28](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 29](#) [Nissaggiya Pacittiya 30](#)

[Pacittiya 1](#) [Pacittiya 11](#) [Pacittiya 21](#) [Pacittiya 31](#) [Pacittiya 41](#) [Pacittiya 51](#) [Pacittiya 61](#)
[Pacittiya 71](#) [Pacittiya 83](#)

INTRODUCTION

The present text is a rendering of the patimokkha rules into English, followed by a summary of the sutta-vibhanga material and occasionally a few points from the commentaries. The purpose of the text is to give monastics, and others who are interested, an easy to read yet accurate understanding of the bhikkhu patimokkha. The material is meant to give a sufficient explanation of the rules to enable any bhikkhu to properly practice them.

The short explanations of this manual are obviously not meant to be comprehensive. The point of this manual, rather, is to cover the situations that a bhikkhu is likely to come across in his daily life. When unusual situations arise, one should consult a detailed vinaya manual, a person with special expertise in the vinaya or, preferrably, the vinaya pitaka itself.

To keep the text simple, I have not mentioned any derived offences. The vast majority of derived offences are actions that come close to being a full offence but fall short due to one factor not being fulfilled or only partially fulfilled. Keeping this in mind, one can generally know with a fair amount of certainty whether one's conduct has been inappropriate. In any case, I believe the derived offences belong to a later period in the evolution of the vinaya than the patimokkha (see e.g. Oskar von Hinuber's *A Handbook of Pali Literature*, SS23, 24, 37, and 39; and Herman Oldenburg's introduction to the PTS edition of the vinaya pitaka, p. xv-xxiii). As such, the derived offences are of secondary importance compared with the patimokkha rules.

The main bullet points for each rule constitute the factors that have to be fulfilled for a bhikkhu to have fallen into an offence. The main bullets also cover important exceptions. A bullet point that is indented under another shows a further explanation or comment on the factor under which it is placed. Personal comments and opinions are enclosed in square brackets.

When a factor of any rule begins with an asterisk (as in “*Including ‘self-intercourse’” in parajika 1), it means I think there are good grounds for seeing that particular factor as invalid. Despite my doubts about their validity, I have included these factors because they seem to be

generally accepted among bhikkhus. My reasons for disagreeing, as well as discussions of other controversial points of vinaya, are found in the notes and commentary after each rule.

The references at the end of each factor refer to volume number (roman numeral), page number and line number of the PTS edition of the Vinaya Pitaka.

Abbreviations used: Kkh: Kankhavitarani; Sp: Samantapasadika; Sp-t: Saratthadipani-tika; Sg: sanghadisesa; Aniy: aniyata; NP: Nissaggiya Pacittiya; Pc: Pacittiya; Pd: Patidesaniya

Parajika 1

If a bhikkhu takes part in sexual intercourse, even with an animal, he incurs a parajika.

Takes part in:

- 1) Requires mental consent (III 33,32)
 - a) No physical or verbal effort required (III 36,21-26)

Sexual intercourse:

- 2) Genital, oral, or anal (III 28,29)
- 3) Penetrating to the depth of a sesame seed or more (III 28,11-12)

Even with an animal:

4) With any being, male (active or passive), female, or otherwise (III 28,23-28)

5) Dead or alive (III 29,35-36f)

6) *Including “self-intercourse” (III 35,33-38)

Note on Rule Translation

I have left out the part that defines a bhikkhu and the part that explains the abandoning of the training. Neither of these is intrinsic to this particular rule, and they are both normally covered under other aspects of the vinaya, such as the ordination and disrobal procedures.

The usual translation of tiracchanagata is “female animal, but the parajika offence holds for animals of either gender. The feminine gender ending -aya on tiracchanagataya, I believe, is due to the fact that this word must either be masculine or feminine; it does not seem to exist in the neuter. I take it that the feminine ending is used here because a bhikkhu is more likely to engage in this way with a female animal, not because it is meant to exclude male animals. Thus I translate simply as “animal”.

Commentary on Rule Factors

6) The word methuna quite literally means “pair” or “couple” and is thus closely related to the word “intercourse”, which always refers to an action between two people or beings. That this is the correct understanding of methuna is reinforced by the Vibhanga’s definition: “Methunadhammo nama ... dvayam dvayasamapatti”, “attained to this or that pair ... is called methunadhamma” (III 28,9). The vinita vatthu’s judgement, therefore, that ‘self-intercourse’ constitutes a parajika seems to conflict with the rule and the padabhajaniya. When such conflict is apparent, we should go with the rule, rather than the Vibhanga. As pointed out in the introduction, this is in accordance with the findings of modern Pali scholars that the patimokkha rules are more ancient than the surrounding Vibhanga material.

Parajika 2

If a bhikkhu steals something, a theft that by law is punishable by imprisonment, he incurs a parajika.

Steals:

- 1) One intends to steal (III 46,34)
- 2) One perceives the object as owned by someone else (III 54,15f)
- 3) The stealing can happen in a number of ways, especially the following:
 - a) One moves the object (III 46,36)
 - b) Or, one causes the owner to give up ownership (III 50,5-7)
 - c) Or, one evades tax or custom duty (III 52,5-13)
 - d) Or, one incites someone else to steal (III 53,19f)

Something:

- 4) An object owned by someone else (III 46,32-33)

A theft that by law is punishable by imprisonment:

- 5) Punishable by imprisonment according to the society in which the theft took place (Sp 309,3-5)
 - a) [According to the Western Australian Criminal Code (section 426 (4)), theft of up to

\$1,000 is punishable by fining, and thus not a parajika.]

b) [*The Uttaravinicchaya-tika suggests that a parajika is incurred when the value of the theft exceeds the value of 20 rice grains of gold. Some vinaya teachers who follow this standard calculate that 20 rice grains of gold is equivalent to 1/24 ounce troy of gold or ~\$70 (Nov. 2011)]

Note on Rule Translation

The rule distinguishes between village and wilderness, but this does not seem required in English, since the word “theft” encompasses any sort of stealing.

The word rajano, “kings”, I have rendered as “law”. At the time this rule was laid down it was the kings who meted out punishment, whereas now it is judges, basing themselves on the legal code.

I have reduced the expression haneyyum va bandheyum va pabhajeyyum va to “punishable by imprisonment”. In contemporary Australian society people are not physically punished, nor are they banished, and thus imprisonment is the only type of punishment relevant for our society. (In countries where physical punishment still persists, this rule may have to be phrased differently.)

The phrase “you are a thief, you are a fool, you are deluded, you are a robber” seems redundant in English.

Commentary on Rule Factors

5b) The Uttaravinicchaya-tika (part of the Vinayavinicchaya-tika on the CSCD) suggestion is found in section 7 of the subchapter titled Mahavibhangasangahakathavannana.

The tika, quoting an ancient Sinhala commentary, says: “samaneranam dasikasuttenapi parajiko hoti, upasampannam pana suvannassa visativihimattena”, “for samaneras there is a parajika even through (the theft of) a piece of string, but for those fully ordained there is a parajika through (the theft of) twenty rice grains of gold”. This quote, however, is hardly as significant for our understanding of parajika 2 as it is sometimes made out. The quote is found at the end of a long sub-commentary, and it is not a comment on parajika 2 but on the training of samaneras. Moreover, the source of this quote is obscure and the original context in which it was spoken is unknown. It may well be that it was meant simply to help determine what constituted a parajika in the society in which the tika was produced. We may thus question the relevance of this passage in explaining parajika 2.

Further, the Mulasikkha-tika, commenting on this, states: “yam pana samanerasikkhayam ”visativihi”ti vuttam, tam neva paliyam, na atthakathayam atthi, vimamsitabbametam”, “but what in the training of a samanera is called ‘twenty rice (grains)’, that is not in the canon, nor in the commentary; it is to be investigated” (Parajikaniddesavannana, section 7). The point seems to be that the tika’s point of view is not to be accepted uncritically, but only after careful consideration.

Despite the obscurity and questionable relevance of this passage from the Uttaravinicchaya-tika (which both Ajahn Thanissaro and Ajahn Brahm erroneously refer to as the Vimativinodani-tika), Ajahn Thanissaro and Ajahn Brahm argue that it is useful for the following reasons. (1) It gives a high value for what constitutes a parajika; and (2) it gives a clear point for when a parajika is incurred. The validity of the first reason depends on what are the alternative interpretations. When the cut-off for a parajika instead is based on what constitutes an offence punishable by prison, one actually comes to the opposite conclusion: the tika interpretation gives a low value for what constitutes a parajika. In Western Australia, only thefts of at least \$1,000 are punishable by prison, which is far higher than the \$70 otherwise arrived at. Since one should avoid imposing questionable parajika offences, as well as always give the monastic the benefit of the doubt, the \$1,000 limit seems much more appropriate.

The second reason, that the standard of 20 rice grains of gold gives a clear cut-off point, is

valid but not sufficient in itself. Clarity on its own is not useful criterion if the cut-off point is unrealistic. That is, any arbitrary monetary figure would give a clear cut-off point, but that does not in itself mean the figure is reasonable. There are indeed a number of reasons for thinking that the 20 rice grain limit is not suitable. Firstly, it is impossible to establish whether the weight of a rice grain at the time this sub-commentary was written bears any relationship to the precious metal weight today known as a 'grain'. To simply assume that they are the same, as Ajahn Thanissaro and Ajahn Brahm have done, could lead to a large error in what constitutes a parajika. Secondly, the sub-commentary must itself have arrived at its judgement by considering what constituted a punishable (including imprisonable) offence at the time it was written. But there is no reason to think that the sub-commentary's judgement is relevant for our own society. Cultures so far removed both in time and space are likely to have very different views on what is the appropriate punishment for theft. Thus for us to employ an estimate arrived at by the sub-commentary is likely to misrepresent the Vibhanga's intention.

It also needs to be considered whether in fact the least kind of theft that constitutes a parajika would have led to physical punishment rather than imprisonment at the time of the Buddha. If this can be established, then using an imprisonable offence as a modern standard may be inappropriate. The evidence from the suttas, however, does seem to confirm that imprisonment was used as punishment even for the least kind of theft that would have constituted a parajika. According to AN3:100/AN I 251,5, at the time of the Buddha an ordinary person might be imprisoned for stealing half a kahapana, which is equal to 2 padas or 10 masakas. This is quite close to the Vibhanga's judgement that a bhikkhu who steals incurs a parajika when he steals something valued at one pada or more (III 46,37 + III 47,3), that is, half the value mentioned at AN3:100. This is close enough to suggest that a theft that constituted a parajika according to the vinaya quite possibly would have landed an ordinary person in prison. It thus seems reasonable to take an imprisonable theft as the standard for what constitutes a parajika in any particular society.

Parajika 3

If a bhikkhu intentionally causes the death of a human being, he incurs a parajika.

Intentionally:

- 1) One is aiming to cause death (III 73,19)
- 2) One perceives the victim as a human being (III 73,10)
 - a) *According to the commentary it is sufficient to perceive the victim as a living being (Kkh 52,12)

Causes:

- 3) Any act of one's own, including speech (III 74,34)
 - a) Including commanding someone else (III 74,36)
 - b) And inciting someone (III 73,29+31)

The death of:

- 4) That causes the person to die (III 73,24)

A human being:

- 5) From the first arising of consciousness in the mother's womb until death (III 73,21-23)

Note on Rule Translation

This rule lists four ways in which a monk may kill or cause the death of another human. I have tried to catch all four by the single phrase "cause the death of".

Commentary on Rule Factors

2a) This commentarial understanding would mean that if you kill a being that you think is an animal, but you misperceived and the being actually was a human, you commit a parajika. This seems unreasonable on the face of it, and also seems to contradict the phrasing of the rule. The rule says: “sanicca manussaviggaham jivita voropeyya”, “if one should intentionally deprive a human being of life”. It seems to me that the intention here is the specific intention to kill “a human”, not just any being. If one perceives the being to be an animal, then one does not have the intention to kill a human, even if one’s perception turns out to be wrong.

Parajika 4

If a bhikkhu falsely claims a superhuman state, except through overestimation, he incurs a parajika.

Falsely:

1) Deliberately lying, aiming to deceive (III 91,27)

Claims:

2) One announces an achievement to another human, verbally or otherwise (III 92,1)

3) In a direct manner (III 102,5-15 + III 103,20-23)

4) Referring to oneself (III 91,33)

5) *According to the commentarial interpretation the listener must immediately understand (Sp II 501,7-13)

Superhuman state:

6) Jhana, sunnato samadhi, animitto samadhi, and appanihito samadhi (III 92,35-36 + 93,1-2); any of the three higher knowledges (vijja, III 93,5); or any of the four stages of awakening (III 93, 9-11)

Except through overestimation:

7) Unless one mistakenly perceives that one has achieved such a superhuman state (III 92,23)

Note on Rule Translation

Despite the length of this rule, its essence is simply that a bhikkhu who falsely claims a superhuman state incurs a parajika.

Commentary on Rule Factors

2) I think Ajahn Thanissaro is right when he says that understanding on the part of the listener is not an issue. Bhanantassa (“for the one who is speaking”) and pativijanantassa (“for the one who understands”; see III 97,29-30) are more likely to refer to the same person than to different people. Moreover, the natural meaning of na pativijanantassa apatti thullaccayassa (III 97,30-31) is “there is an offence of thullaccaya for one who does not recognize/understand”. Since the offence mentioned here refers to the person making the claim, this cannot refer to the listener.

Sanghadisesa 1

If a bhikkhu intentionally ejaculates, except in a dream, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

Intentionally:

- 1) Deliberately, aiming at emission (III 112,19)
- 2) One exerts oneself physically, in whatever way (III 116,1)
- 3) Or one gets someone else to apply the effort (III 117,32)

Ejaculates:

- 4) At orgasm (Sp III 520,4)

Except in a dream:

- 5) No offence if one is asleep (III 112,25)

Sanghadisesa 2

If a bhikkhu, motivated by lust, makes physical contact with a woman, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

Motivated by lust:

- 1) Because of lust (III 121,1-4)
- 2) One aims for physical contact (III 125,6)

Makes:

- 3) One makes any sort of effort (III 125,34)

Physical contact with:

- 4) One is aware of physical contact (III 125,31)
 - a) Either direct bodily contact (III 121,8)
 - b) Or one feels the body through the clothes (III 127,3-5)
 - c) *According to the commentary the contact has to be direct: skin to skin, skin to hair, or hair to hair (Sp III 537,21-24)

A woman:

- 5) Any human female, even if just born (III 121,5)
- 6) That one perceives as a woman (III 121,27)

Commentary on Rule Factors

4a-c The commentarial idea (4c) is not directly traceable to the Vibhanga. Here I agree with Ajahn Thanissaro's conclusion that the Vibhanga seems to concern all kinds of physical contact, whether direct or indirect (4a+b). Further, if the woman is clothed, I suggest there is a sanghadisesa only if one feels the body under the clothes (4b). With this interpretation, the

whole technical and rather pedantic issue of whether one touches body hairs or not falls away. If one simply touches the clothing, without actually feeling the body underneath, including feeling body hairs, then it is irrelevant if one unknowingly has made contact with such hairs. If, however, one does feel the body (assuming that one is aiming at physical contact), then one incurs the full offence.

Sanghadisesa 3

If a bhikkhu, motivated by lust, speaks lewd words to a woman, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

Motivated by lust:

1) Because of lust (III 128,26-29)

Speaks lewd words:

2) One speaks words connected with her genitals, her anus or sexual intercourse (III 128,33)

a) Whether the words are direct or indirect (III 129,11-26)

3) She immediately understands the meaning (III 130,20++)

A woman:

4) A human female capable of distinguishing between lewd and non-lewd words (III 128,30)

5) One perceives her as a woman (III 129,27)

Sanghadisesa 4

If a bhikkhu, motivated by lust, recommends sexual intercourse with himself to a woman, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

Recommends sexual intercourse with himself:

1) In contrast to sanghadisesa 3, this sanghadisesa is limited to sexual intercourse (III 133,35)

“Motivated by lust” + “a woman” as in Sg.3.

Sanghadisesa 5

If a bhikkhu, acts as a go-between for a sexual relationship between a man and a woman, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

Acts as a go-between:

1) Takes, or gets someone to take, a message from one party to another (III 142,36)

2) Then reports the reaction back, or gets someone to report it back, to the first party (III 142,36)

a) In addition to the man and the woman involved, the two parties can be anyone who are in a position to arrange such a relationship, e.g. parents or a pimp (III 141,33++)

For a sexual relationship between a man and a woman:

3) Including a one-off encounter (III 139,18)

a) Whether a relationship actually materializes is irrelevant (Sp 556,20)

Note on Rule Translation

Three types of relationship (or two types plus one subtype) are mentioned in the rule, but they all reduce to sexual relationships.

Sanghadisesa 6

When a bhikkhu, by means of begging, builds for himself a kuti without a sponsoring owner, if he does not get bhikkhus to approve the site, or the kuti exceeds 3 metres by 1.75, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

By means of begging:

1) Asking for materials or other support (III 149,19)

Builds:

2) He builds it himself or gets someone else to build it (III 149,24)

For himself:

3) For his own use (III 149, 27)

A kuti:

4) A kuti equivalent to, or better than, one made of wattle and daub (III 149,23)

5) It is for living in (III 155,21-22)

6) It is not a cave (III 155,21)

Without a sponsoring owner:

7) Either owned by himself or ownerless (III 149,25)

He does not get bhikkhus to approve the site:

8) Bhikkhus do not inspect the site (III 152,1)

9) And it is not approved through sanghakamma (III 150,26 - 151,5)

Or the kuti exceeds 3 metres by 1.75:

10) Or the kuti is more than 3 m long externally OR more than 1.75 wide internally (III 149,28 + III 152,15)

He incurs a sanghadisesa:

11) If either point 8 and 9 OR point 10 is fulfilled, then the offence is incurred when the kuti

is finished (III 151,36)

Note on Rule Translation

I have left out the parts about impediments and sufficient space from the rule itself, since they are not decisive for whether the bhikkhu has incurred a sanghadisesa or not.

Commentary on Rule Factors

5) I do not believe the idea (advanced by both Ajahn Brahm and Ajahn Thanissaro) that *assamika* in this rule means “without sponsor” is supported by either the Vibhanga or the commentary. *Samika* means “owner” and the definition in the Vibhanga in no way suggests otherwise. (Even the commentarial statement - which in any case is irrelevant if it contradicts the Vibhanga - that *assamika* here refers to *dayakena virahitam* (“without donor”; Kkh 67,2) does not necessarily contradict the idea that *assamika* means “without owner”, since it is possible to be both owner and donor. (For example, one could donate the use of the *kuti* while retaining the ownership.))

Further, the translation “sponsor” for *samika* does not provide a clear-cut distinction between sanghadisesa 6 and 7. In sanghadisesa 6, being *assamika* means begging for support. In sanghadisesa 7, having a *samika* means that one does not beg for support. Since there is no contradiction between having a sponsor and begging for support - e.g. a sponsor may come forward as the result of one’s asking - the translation “sponsor” does not provide a clear distinction between sanghadisesa 6 and 7. It could even be argued that begging from several people means having several sponsors. Again, there is no clear boundary between sanghadisesa 6 and 7. In fact, sanghadisesa 6 virtually becomes redundant if one can legitimately consider one’s donors as sponsors.

A more clear-cut distinction between the two rules comes about by understanding *samika* as

“owner”, which is also the general meaning of the word. Sanghadisesa 6 then concerns the case where the kuti is not owned by anyone apart from the bhikkhu building it, whereas in sanghadisesa 7 the building being built is the property of someone else. Here the distinction is clear-cut and the ambiguity that arises by translating with “sponsor” is avoided. Moreover, the strict size limitation in sanghadisesa 6 makes eminent sense given that one is begging from people who are literally handing over their property, whereas the lack of such a limit in sanghadisesa 7 is understandable if the donor retains ownership of the building.

If sanghadisesa 7, then, concerns the case where the donor retains ownership of the building, it is natural to ask how long the ownership needs to last. It seems unnatural to place any upper limit on the timeframe (and indeed the vinaya says nothing about this), but the minimum time would clearly be until the building is completed. This is so since otherwise the monk might incur a sanghadisesa under sanghadisesa 6 (for building an oversize dwelling). When Ajahn Thanissaro questions the rendering of samika as “owner” (BMC I 153,30-32), saying, “If samika under this rule were confined to the restrictive sense of ‘owner’ given above, the case would not be covered by this rule, either”, he is setting an arbitrary limit on the meaning of samika. The example cited by Ajahn Thanissaro, I would argue, is clearly covered by sanghadisesa 7.

Ajahn Thanissaro argues that the word samika need not mean “owner” and he claims support from the use of the word in the non-offence clause to nissaggiya pacittiya 10. The reading there is samika codetva denti. The verb codeti is used throughout nissaggiya pacittiya 10 to mean “exhort to action”. It refers to the case where a steward who is holding money on behalf of a donor refuses to get a new robe for a bhikkhu, and he is consequently exhorted to action by the bhikkhu. In this case the original donor remains the owner of the money until the steward has bought the robe for the bhikkhu. In the case of samika codetva denti, “the owners having exhorted to action, they give”, “the owners” would refer to the owners of the robe fund (i.e. the original donors, not the steward), which the steward is refusing to spend. Thus “owner” would seem to be the appropriate translation of samika also in the phrase from nissaggiya pacittiya 10 quoted by Ajahn Thanissaro.

The case of building a kuti, or other monastic residence, that is meant for oneself but owned by others - i.e. not covered by sanghadisesa 6 - is very pertinent for how most monasteries are built and run in Western countries. Because of legal requirements, most monasteries in the West are owned by some sort of legal entity, such as a charitable organisation. In such cases any kuti or dwelling built for a particular monk will be subject to sanghadisesa 7.

I have still opted to keep the idea of sponsor in the translation of *assamika*, thus rendering it “sponsoring owner”; that is, a person who sponsors a dwelling for the *bhikkhu*, but who retains ownership of it. The addition of “sponsoring” makes the expression more graspable in English. This is especially so in *sanghadisesa* 7 where building a large dwelling “for oneself” but “with an owner” might seem contradictory, whereas building it “for oneself” but “with a sponsoring owner” would seem to make better sense.

6) If a *sangha*, through *sanghakamma*, approves a site that is not free of impediments or does not have adequate space, the *sanghakamma* is invalid. It could then be argued that the *bhikkhu* who is building the *kuti* strictly speaking has not obtained approval and therefore would incur a *sanghadisesa* when the *kuti* is completed. However, considering that the *Vibhanga* only specifies a *dukkata* offence for building at an unsuitable site, this would seem too strict a judgement.

Sanghadisesa 7

When a *bhikkhu* builds for himself a large dwelling with a sponsoring owner, if he does not get *bhikkhus* to approve the site, he incurs a *sanghadisesa*.

A large dwelling:

- 1) A dwelling equivalent to, or better than, one made of wattle and daub (III 156,22)
- 2) There is no lower or upper limit to the size (Sp III 575,10-11)
- 3) It is for living in (III 157,34)
- 4) It is not a grass *kuti* or a cave (III 157,34)

With a sponsoring owner:

5) Sponsored and owned by anyone except himself, including the sangha or a monastery (III 156,24)

If he does not get bhikkhus to approve the site:

6) If bhikkhus do not inspect the site, and it is not approved through sanghakamma (III 157,5-9)

He incurs a sanghadisesa:

7) The offence is incurred when the kuti is finished (III 157,2)

“Builds” + “for himself” as in Sg.6.

Sanghadisesa 8

If a bhikkhu, motivated by anger, falsely accuses another bhikkhu of a parajika, aiming to make him fall away from the monastic life, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

Motivated by anger:

1) Because of anger (III 163,30)

Falsely:

2) Having no reason to think or suspect that the other bhikkhu has committed a parajika (III 163,34)

Accuses:

3) He does it himself or gets someone else to do it (III 163,36)

4) The other bhikkhu is accused face to face (III 164,17-19)

5) And he immediately understands the meaning (Kkh 73,19)

Of a parajika:

6) Of having committed any of the four parajika offences (III 163,35)

Aiming to make him fall away from the monastic life:

7) Intending for the monk to disrobe or get expelled (III 164,1)

Commentary on Rule Factors

1) “Anger” is mentioned in the rule, and it is directly linked to the offence. Although Ajahn Thanissaro argues from the Vibhanga that it is not a factor for an offence, the Vibhanga does not in fact give any clear decision on the matter. Given the Vibhanga’s ambiguity, the fact that it is so clearly part of the rule must take precedence.

4+5) Whether the accusation has to be done directly to the person and whether he has to immediately understand, depend on how the Pali words anuddhamseti, codeti and codapeti are understood. If, as I believe, these words refer to admonishing someone, then I would

argue that both the presence of the person and their immediate understanding are required. Admonishing is by definition done face to face, and it is only accomplished when the other person understands. If one simply puts about a rumour, one cannot be certain the other person will ever hear it, and even if he is confronted, it may be more by way of puzzled inquiry than by way of accusation.

Further, factor 5 is useful to help distinguish between something said under one's breath or perhaps to let off steam, not really intending to be heard, and a real accusation.

Sanghadisesa 9

If a bhikkhu, motivated by anger and using a ploy, falsely accuses a bhikkhu of a parajika, aiming to make him fall away from the monastic life, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

And using a ploy:

1) Making a literally true statement designed to mislead the listener (III 169,11-170,2)

“Motivated by anger” + “falsely” + “accuses a bhikkhu” + “of a parajika” + “aiming to make him fall away from the monastic life” as in Sg.8.

Sanghadisesa 10

If a bhikkhu is acting to divide the sangha, he should be admonished up to three times to make him stop. If he does not, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

Is acting to divide the sangha:

- 1) He is deliberately seeking schism by forming a faction (III 173,9)
- 2) Or he is unyielding in a dispute that is moving towards schism (III 173,11)

He should be admonished up to three times to make him stop:

- 3) The sangha should perform a sanghakamma of one motion and three announcements to try to stop him (III 173,30-174,8)

If he does not:

- 4) Unless he renounces his divisive actions, he incurs a sanghadisesa at the end of the sanghakamma (III 174,9-10)

Note on Rule Translation

This is another long rule whose essence can be captured quite succinctly in English. The same is true of sanghadisesas 11-13, nissaggiya pacittiya 10 and pacittiyas 68 and 70.

Commentary on Rule Factors

- 2) The Vibhanga defines “dispute” as the “eighteen grounds for schism”. It seems to me that this should not be regarded as a strict limitation on what can be grounds for a schism. Any

dispute that may result in schism should be included here. Normally lesser disputes would not arouse sufficient emotion to lead to schism, but if they do they would not seem to be materially different from the types listed in the Vibhanga.

3) The Vibhanga contains a long procedure for how to deal with a schismatic monk. First he should be admonished informally up to three times and then up to three more times in the middle of the sangha. Only then should the sanghakamma be performed. But since the formal sanghakamma is the crucial element for the monk to incur the offence (III 174,22: asamanubhasantassa means there is no offence), I have not mentioned the other parts of the procedure. This is meant as a manual for bhikkhus who want to understand the patimokkha, not as a manual for a sangha on how to admonish a bhikkhu.

Sanghadisesa 11

If that bhikkhu has one, two or three supporters, they should be admonished up to three times to make them stop. If they do not, they incur a sanghadisesa.

One, two or three supporters :

1) They are siding with a monk who is acting to divide the sangha as in sanghadisesa 10 (III 175,16-19)

They should be admonished up to three times to make them stop:

2) The sangha should then perform a sanghakamma of one motion and three announcements to try to stop them (III 176,15-31)

If they do not:

3) Unless they renounce their divisive actions, they incur a sanghadisesa at the end of the sanghakamma (III 176,32-33)

Sanghadisesa 12

If a bhikkhu is difficult to correct, he should be admonished up to three times to make him stop. If he does not, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

Is difficult to correct:

1) He refuses to accept admonishment in regard to breaches of the patimokkha rules (III 178,22)

“He should be admonished up to three times to make him stop” + “If he does not” as in Sg.10.

Sanghadisesa 13

If a bhikkhu has corrupted the lay people in a certain place, he should be told to leave. If he criticizes this act of banishment, he should be admonished up to three times to make him stop. If he does not, he incurs a sanghadisesa.

Has corrupted the lay people in a certain place:

1) He has corrupted lay people by giving them inappropriate gifts or by performing inappropriate services for them (III 185,1-6)

a) They are corrupted when they have lost faith (III 185,9)

He should be told to leave:

2) The sangha should perform a sanghakamma of one motion and three announcements to banish him from that place (III 185,31)

If he criticizes this act of banishment:

3) If without good reason he criticizes the bhikkhus who performed the sanghakamma of banishment (III 185,30-32)

“He should be admonished up to three times to make him stop” + “If he does not” as in Sg.10.

Note on Rule Translation

The rule says that the bhikkhu is a corrupter of families, that his conduct is bad, and that corrupted families are seen. It is the fact that people have been corrupted that seems to be crucial, thus “has corrupted.”

I have rendered kula (“clan”) simply as lay people, and annataram gamam va nigamam va (“a certain village or town”) as “a certain place”. In this way I have tried to take account of changes in society without changing the meaning of the rule.

Sanghadisesa Conclusion

Venerables, the thirteen sanghadisesa rules have been recited. If a bhikkhu commits any one of them and he conceals his offence, he must undergo parivasa for as many days as he concealed the offence. He must then undergo manatta for a further six days. He should then get rehabilitation from a sangha of at least twenty bhikkhus. If the sangha is less than twenty, that monk is not rehabilitated and those monks are at fault. This is the proper procedure.

Note on Translation

I have left out the phrase about nine rules being immediate offences and four being third occasion offences. This appears to be a memorization device that does not add anything new.

Aniyata 1

If a bhikkhu sits alone on a secluded seat in private with a woman, and a trustworthy female lay disciple sees him and accuses him of a parajika, a sanghadisesa, or a pacittiya, and the bhikkhu admits the charge, he should be dealt with accordingly.

Sits:

- 1) The bhikkhu and the woman sit or lie down at the same time (III 189,5)

On a secluded seat:

2) In a place concealed by a physical barrier (III 188,37)

3) And suitable for sexual intercourse (III 189,3)

Alone:

4) Just the bhikkhu and the woman (III 188,32)

In private:

5) Out of sight and out of earshot (III 188,33)

A trustworthy female lay disciple:

6) A female lay disciple who has attained to any of the stages of awakening (III 189,9)

The bhikkhu admits the charge:

7) The bhikkhu is to be dealt with only in accordance with what he admits (III 189,19-191,4)

He should be dealt with accordingly:

8) The sangha should ensure the bhikkhu makes amends according to the offence he has committed (III 189,19-191,5)

“A woman” as in Sg.2 (factor 5 only)

(3) According to the Kankhavitani (Kkh 89,23) and the Samantapasadika (III 632,16-17) the presence of other women does not absolve one from an offence under this rule. This, however, seems to be in direct conflict with the wording of the rule and the subsequent explanation in the Vibhanga. The rule specifically says eko ekaya (“one with one”) and this is explained as “just a bhikkhu and a woman”. It seems, therefore, that the commentarial explanation must be rejected.

Aniyata 2

If a bhikkhu sits in private with a woman, and a trustworthy female lay disciple sees him and accuses him of a sanghadisesa or a pacittiya, and the bhikkhu admits the charge, he should be dealt with accordingly.

“A woman” as in Sg.3 (factor 4 only); “sits” + “in private” + “a trustworthy female lay disciple” + “the bhikkhu admits the charge” + “he should be dealt with accordingly” as in aniy.1.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 1

When a bhikkhu does not have robe season privileges, if he keeps an extra robe for more than ten days, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Does not have robe season privileges:

1) He does not have end of rainy season privileges nor kathina privileges (III 196,12-17)

a) End of rainy season privileges are in force during the last month of the rains retreat (III 261,36)

b) Kathina privileges, which are obtained by properly partaking in the kathina ceremony, are in force during the entire cold season (III 261,37), unless:

i) The sangha decides to forgo the kathina privileges through a sanghakamma (III 196,16 + IV 287,23-31)

ii) Or, one leaves the monastery where one stayed during the rains retreat with no intention to return AND one gives up any desire to make a robe before the end of the cold season (III 196,15 + I 265,7-25)

Keeps:

2) Keeps ownership of (Kkh 99,19)

An extra robe:

3) Any allowable robe material (Kkh 94,2)

4) Of minimum size 8 x 16 cm (Kkh 94,4-6)

For more than ten days:

5) The offence is incurred on the tenth dawn after the robe was received (III 196,22 + Sp 639,27-30)

Note on Rule Translation

I translate civara as robe, although it is regularly defined in the Vibhanga as any piece of cloth larger than a minimum size. Occasionally the context is such that I translate with “robe cloth”.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(3) Here and elsewhere I follow Ajahn Thanissaro’s calculation of the sugata measures; see BMC I, p.565-66.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 2

When a bhikkhu does not have robe season privileges, if he stays apart from his three robes even for a single day, except with the sangha’s agreement, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

If he stays apart from:

1) One is not apart from a robe if -

a) When a robe is kept indoors, one is in the same room as the robe (III 200,29ff)

b) When a robe is kept outdoors, one is within hatthapasa of the robe (III 201,28f)

His three robes:

2) The antaravasaka, the uttarasanga or the sanghati (III 199,31)

Even for a single day:

3) Even for a single 24-hour period, beginning and ending at dawn (III 199,35)

a) *According to the commentary this means at dawn (Kkh 100,19)

Except with the sangha's agreement:

4) Unless the local sangha gives its approval through sanghakamma (III 199,3-22)

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

5) If he has stayed apart from a robe during the entire preceding 24-hour period, the offence is incurred at dawn (III 199,35)

a) [Thus if he has been in the presence of his three robes during the preceding 24-hour period, even if only briefly, he does not fall into an offence.]

“Does not have robe season privileges” as in NP1.

Note on Rule Translation

I have translated ekaratta as “one day”, in the sense of one 24-hour period. This is a common meaning of the word ratta in the suttas and vinaya.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1a+b) The purpose of these two sub-paragraphs (a and b) is to create a simple system, using which one cannot fall into this offence. To include the entire explanation from the Vibhanga is too much for this sort of manual.

This simplified system is strict, and if one knows the Vibhanga content in detail one will be able to keep a less exacting standard. However, if one follows the system suggested here, one can be sure of never falling into an offence - and it is simple to remember.

(3a) This commentarial interpretation essentially equates ratta (“night” or “24-hour period”) with dawn. However, this is an entirely artificial and unpersuasive interpretation. “Night” and “dawn” are just not the same thing.

The Vibhanga (III 199,25) states that the offence is incurred at dawn. This is understood by the commentary (Kkh 100,16-19) to mean that one commits the offence by being apart from a robe at dawn. It is because of this commentarial interpretation that ratta artificially becomes understood as dawn. Given that at the time of the Buddha a “day” was considered to begin and end at dawn, I believe it is more likely that the Vibhanga’s statement should be understood to mean that the offence is incurred at dawn only if one has been away from one’s robe for the ratta, that is, during the preceding 24-hour period.

The Pali word vippavasati means “stays apart from”, which to me suggests an extended period of time, not just at dawn. Understanding vippavasati in this way gives a much more reasonable interpretation of this rule. Interpreting ratta in the narrow sense of dawn often leads to monks focusing exclusively on the period around dawn and going to great lengths to make sure they are with the robes at this time. For example, if they leave their kuti to urinate

around dawn, they would take all their robes with them to make sure they do not breach this rule. Just going out to urinate, however, is clearly not the same as “staying apart for a night”. Thus the artificial “dawn” interpretation often leads to silly and impractical practices.

A more reasonable interpretation, therefore, is that one should spend some time with one’s robe during any 24-hour period from dawn to dawn. Since no particular length of time is mentioned anywhere, it would seem sufficient to be with one’s robes even very briefly.

(4) According to the origin story this approval by the sangha can be given to an ill bhikkhu (but it is not said that it cannot be given in other circumstances). The actual patimokkha rule does not limit this approval to cases of illness, and I therefore conclude that the sangha has the discretion to give approval when it sees fit.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 3

When a bhikkhu does not have robe season privileges, if he becomes the owner of insufficient robe cloth but is expecting more, he may put it aside for at most one month. If he exceeds that, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

If he becomes the owner of insufficient robe cloth:

1) He comes to possess cloth that is suitable but insufficient for making a robe (III 204,10)

But is expecting more:

2) He is expecting more from whatever source, including discarded cloth and his own resources (III 204,14)

He may put it aside for at most one month:

3) He may keep it as an extra robe (see NP1) until at most the thirtieth dawn after the cloth was obtained (III 204,38)

a) If at any time during this 30-day period he obtains sufficient cloth, he has to make the robe within 30 days of receiving the first portion of cloth or within 10 days of receiving the subsequent portion, whichever comes first (III 204,16-37)

“Does not have robe season privileges” as in NP1.

Note on Rule Translation

In this rule I translate civara as “robe cloth”; cf. note to NP1.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 4

If a bhikkhu asks an unrelated bhikkhuni to wash, dye, or beat an old robe, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Asks:

1) No offence if she acts on her own initiative (III 207,27-28)

Unrelated:

2) Not known to be a blood relation (III 206,25)

Bhikkhuni:

3) Fully ordained by both sanghas (III 206,27)

To wash, dye, or beat:

4) Any one or more of these three (III 207,1-19)

An old robe:

5) Any wearable robe (III 207,28)

6) Of his own (III 207,21)

7) Even if used only once (III 206,28)

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

8) The offence is incurred when the bhikkhuni has fulfilled the request (III 206,29-32)

Note on Rule Translation

The Pali uses the causative: causes to wash, die, or beat. The non-offence clause says that if the bhikkhuni washes, etc., without having been spoken to there is no offence. I therefore consider the “causing” to be fulfilled simply by asking.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) The Vibhanga says relations related back through seven generations, which means anyone up to one’s sixth cousin, including their descendants and forebears. (Forebears here means only blood relations, not those married into one’s family.) It does not include in-laws. Since people rarely have information about such distant relations, it seems reasonable to assume that if one is not aware of being a blood relation of a bhikkhuni, then one is not. The Vibhanga says that if one has doubts about whether a bhikkhuni is a relation one commits a dukkata in asking her to wash etc. Thus if one has any doubt, one should in any case avoid asking for such things from a bhikkhuni.

(4) The Vibhanga says there is a dukkata in getting a bhikkhuni to do any of these things for someone else. This implies that the nissaggiya pacittiya is incurred only with respect to one’s own robe(s). I use the term “wearable robe” to distinguish this from “robe cloth” or “robe material”.

That this refers to any wearable robe is implied by the anapatti clause where only “other requisites” are exempt from an offence.

If a bhikkhu receives a robe directly from an unrelated bhikkhuni, except if he gives something in return, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Receives:

1) Does not include borrowing or taking on trust (III 210,20)

A robe:

2) Any allowable robe material of minimum size 8 x 16 cm (III 210,1-2 + Kkh 94,2-6)

Directly from:

3) Without an intermediary (Kkh 109,15)

Except if he gives something in return:

4) The exchange does not have to be between goods of equal value (III 210,19)

“Unrelated” + “bhikkhuni” as in NP4.

(2) See comment to factor (3) at NP1.

(3) The Kankhavitarani states that giving through an intermediary is allowable (Kkh 109,15).

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 6

If a bhikkhu asks for a robe from an unrelated householder, except if his robe is stolen or destroyed, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Asks for:

- 1) For his own use (III 213,22)
- 2) Except from relatives or from those who have given invitation to ask (III 213,22)

Householder:

- 3) A male or female non-monastic (III 212,36)

His robe:

- 4) Any of his three basic robes (III 214,30)

Is stolen or destroyed:

5) Stolen or destroyed includes lost and worn out (III 213,8-9)

a) [See NP7 for what he may ask for in this case.]

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

6) The offence is incurred when he receives the robe cloth he has asked for (III 213,10)

“Unrelated” as in NP4; “a robe” as in NP5.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) The non-offence clause includes asking “for another’s benefit”. Thus it is only asking for oneself that carries an offence.

(2) The vinaya normally divides people into householders and monastics (gahattha and pabbajita, e.g. at III 149,26). A householder is therefore defined as someone who is not a monastic.

(3) That this only concerns the three basic robes follows from the phrasing of nissaggiya pacittiya 7, which is a continuation of this rule. According to nissaggiya pacittiya 7 he may ask for two robes if all three are destroyed, which must be a reference to the three basic robes. This seems to be supported by the commentary (Kkh 111,27).

The Vibhanga's udakena vulham ("carried away by water") essentially amounts to the robe being lost.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 7

If that bhikkhu is offered much robe cloth by an unrelated householder, he should accept cloth for at most two robes. If he accepts more than that, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

That bhikkhu:

- 1) Any bhikkhu whose robe is stolen, destroyed, or lost (III 214,23)
- 2) Who has asked for robe cloth from an unrelated householder (III 215,7)

Is offered much robe cloth:

- 3) Is invited to take as much robe cloth as he likes (III 214,27)

He should accept cloth for at most two robes:

- 4) He may accept robe cloth, including finished robes, for one robe less than the number of robes stolen or destroyed (III 214,30)

If he accepts more than that, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

5) The offence is incurred when he receives the robe cloth (III 214,34)

“Unrelated” as in NP4; “householder” as in NP6.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) “That bhikkhu” refers back to nissaggiya pacittiya 6. The point, then, seems to be that the bhikkhu falls under the exemption to that rule, which means he may ask for robe cloth. Thus the asking is a necessary factor also for this rule.

If one is invited by a householder without first having asked, or one has a standing invitation, then this rule does not apply.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 8

If an unrelated householder has decided to buy a robe for a bhikkhu and that bhikkhu, without prior invitation, asks that householder for a fine robe, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Has decided to buy a robe for a bhikkhu:

- 1) He or she intends to buy a robe (III 216,13)
- 2) And intends to give it to a particular bhikkhu (III 216,13-14)

Without prior invitation:

- 3) That bhikkhu has not been given invitation to ask for the sort of robe he desires (III 217,22)

Asks that householder for a fine robe:

- 4) That bhikkhu, desiring a good quality or expensive robe, asks that householder to use their robe fund to buy such a robe (III 216,14-18)
- 5) The bhikkhu intends the robe for himself (III 217,22)

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya

- 6) The offence is incurred when he receives the robe (III 217,7)

“Unrelated” as in NP4; “householder” as in NP6.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) In this rule, as well as in nissaggiya pacittiya 9 and 10, robe (civara) seems to refer to a finished robe, of whatever kind.

(4) The point here is simply that the bhikkhu is acting in this way because he wants a fine robe. Whether in fact the robe he asks for is better or more expensive than what the householder intended to buy seems irrelevant. That is, if contrary to the bhikkhu's expectations the householder already intended to buy a fine robe, the bhikkhu still commits the offence.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 9

If two householders have each decided to buy a robe for a unrelated bhikkhu and that bhikkhu, without prior invitation, asks those householders to put their funds together because he wants a fine robe, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Have each decided to buy a robe for an unrelated bhikkhu:

- 1) Each intends to buy a robe (III 218,32-33)
- 2) They both intend to give it to the same bhikkhu (III 218,33-34)

Asks those householders to put their funds together:

- 3) That bhikkhu asks those householders to put their robe funds together to buy a single robe of high quality (III 218,35-38)

4) The bhikkhu intends the robe for himself (III 219,20)

Because he wants a fine robe:

5) Because he wants a good quality or expensive robe (III 219,18)

“Householders” + “unrelated” + “without prior invitation” + “he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya” as in NP8.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 10

If a robe fund has been deposited with a steward to provide a bhikkhu with a robe, the bhikkhu may prompt the steward verbally up to three times and up to a further six times by standing in silence. If in this way he does not obtain a robe and then makes further effort to obtain one from that steward, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya. If he does not obtain a robe, he should alert the donor that their fund is not being used as intended.

If a robe fund has been deposited with a steward to provide a bhikkhu with a robe:

1) When a donor has deposited funds with a steward to supply a particular bhikkhu with a robe (III 221,24-31)

2) Or any other requisite (Sp III 677,6-7)

The bhikkhu may prompt that steward verbally:

- 3) The bhikkhu may tell the steward that he is in need of a robe (III 221,33)
 - a) But he cannot order the steward to get a robe (III 222,31)

Standing in silence:

- 4) Going to the steward and standing silently in his presence (III 222,34)

“He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya” as in NP8.

Note on Rule Translation

The first part of nissaggiya pacittiya 10 (III 221,15-31) explains how a robe fund comes to be properly established. Since this really is background material for the rule, it does not seem necessary to bring it into the translation. The initial phrase “if a robe fund has been deposited with a steward” assumes that the fund has been properly established.

The rule says that the bhikkhu can ask for a robe when he needs one. However, since the word “needs” is not defined, it is at the bhikkhu’s discretion to decide. In other words, in practice the stipulation of “need” does not put any limit on the bhikkhu’s ability to ask. Thus I have left this out of my rule translation.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) This is assuming the fund has been properly established. An improperly established fund is usually one where the bhikkhu has accepted the fund in such a way that he has become the owner of the money. If this is the case, he has breached nissaggiya pacittiya 18.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 11

If a bhikkhu has a felt blanket made that contains silk, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Felt blanket:

1) Any type of unwoven cloth similar to felt and similar to a blanket in size would thus be include here, because:

a) According to the method of manufacture, a santhata would seem to be roughly equivalent to felt (Sp III 684,5-6)

b) According to the usage, a santhata would seem to be roughly equivalent to a blanket (III 228,20-22)

That contains silk:

2) Even a single thread (III 224,28)

Has made:

3) Making it himself or getting someone else to make it (III 224,28-29)

For his own use (III 225,5)

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

4) The offence is incurred when he receives the blanket (III 224,29)

Note on Rule Translation

I do not think a santhata is a rug, in a general sense, since there is an established word in the vinaya for a rug: bhummatharana.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) The santhata is a cloth requisite that is used as an underlay for sitting or lying on (III 232,17 + Sp III 687,9), as a blanket to keep one warm (III 228,20-22), or as a spare robe (III 232,20 + Sp III 687,3-4). Further information is found in the commentaries. The santhata is for instance called a fourth robe (Sp III 687,3-4).

The commentarial explanation on how a santhata is made seems to suggest it was quite thick: same bhumibhage kosiyamsuni uparupari santharitva kanjikadihi sincitva katam hoti, “it is made (katam) by spreading (santharitva) layer upon layer (uparupari) of silk thread (kosiyamsuni) on an even (same) stretch of ground (bhumibhage), and sprinkling (sincitva) with rice water etc. (kanjikadihi)” (Sp III 684,5-6)

In the vinaya there is no limit to the thickness or material quality of a civara. This means that all types of woven cloth can be classified under civara. The reason for the separate category of a santhata, then, would seem to be that it is somehow other than ordinary woven cloth, and that it is really a name for a particular type of unwoven cloth, as defined in the commentary. I thus translate santhata as a felt blanket to show that there is a difference in material from ordinary woven cloth.

In my opinion, it makes better sense to classify santhatas according to their usage rather than according to the way they were made. The specific way a santhata was made (see above), does not seem to be in use in modern societies. Thus defining a santhata strictly according to the way it is manufactured would make nissaggiya pacittiyas 11-15 defunct. However, if a santhata is instead classified according to its usage - which to me seems more reasonable - then these rules are still relevant.

(2) Contrary to the commentary (Sp III 684,8-9), I understand from the way the rule is phrased (“getting to make a santhata containing silk”) that the silk has to be deliberately added at the monk’s request. The Vibhanga specifically states: ekena pi kosiyamsuna missitva karoti va karapeti va, “(the bhikkhu) makes or causes to make (a blanket) after mixing in even one thread of silk”.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 12

If a bhikkhu has a felt blanket made entirely of black wool, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Entirely of black wool:

1) Naturally black or dyed black (III 225,32)

“Felt blanket” + “has made” + “he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya” as in NP11.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 13

If a bhikkhu has a felt blanket made, it should contain two parts black wool, one part white and one brown. If it doesn't, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

It should contain two parts black wool, one part white and one brown:

1) It should contain at least 25% white wool and at least 25% brown wool (III 227,12-13)

“Felt blanket” + “has made” + “he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya” as in NP11.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 14

If a bhikkhu has a felt blanket made, he must wait six years before he makes another. If he does not, except with the sangha's agreement, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

He must wait six years:

1) He must wait at least six years (III 229,15)

“Felt blanket” + “has made” + “he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya” as in NP11; “except with the sangha’s agreement” as in NP2.

Note on Rule Translation

The aspect of whether the old santhata has been discarded or not does not make any difference for whether an offence is incurred, and I have therefore left it out of the translation.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 15

When a bhikkhu has a new sitting felt made, if he does not incorporate a 25 cm piece from an old felt blanket, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

A new sitting felt:

- 1) A sitting cloth (III 232,17)
- 2) Made of felt material (III 232,18)

If he does not incorporate:

- 3) Incorporate in whatever way, such as by adding it to a corner or by pulling it apart and mixing it in (III 232,23-24)

A 25 cm piece:

- 4) A piece equivalent in area to a circle 25 cm in diameter, or larger (III 232,22-23)
- a) Unless there is not enough old felt blanket material available, in which case he should use whatever there is (III 233,1-2)

From an old felt blanket:

- 5) From a felt blanket worn at least once (III 232,20)

“Has made” + “he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya” as in NP11.

Note on Rule Translation

Here I translate santhata simply as “felt”, since it is used as a mat to sit on rather than as a blanket.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(3) The Vibhanga says a circular piece 25 cm in diameter or a square with sides of 25 cm. Since the circle is the smaller of the two, it constitutes the minimum size allowable. I am again using Ajahn Thanissaro's estimate of the sugata measures.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 16

If a bhikkhu receives wool while travelling and he carries it more than 50 km, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Wool:

- 1) Unwoven wool, not made into a requisite (III 234,30)
 - a) Even the smallest amount (Sp III 689,6)

While travelling:

- 2) If he received it before setting out, there is no offence (III 234,1-2)

He carries it:

3) He carries it himself (III 234,9-10)

Note on Rule Translation

The length of a yojana has not been precisely established (perhaps it never was a precise distance), but a common estimate (e.g. in the Vinaya-mukha) is 10 miles. Thus 3 yojanas is close to 50 km, which seems like a suitably round number given the uncertainty in the estimate.

Commentary on Rule Factors

That the wool is unwoven seems to follow from the use of the word *elakalomani*, “goat hairs”.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 17

If a bhikkhu asks an unrelated bhikkhuni to wash, dye, or comb wool, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

To wash, dye, or comb:

1) Any one or more of these three actions (III 236,6-24)

“Asks” + “unrelated” + “bhikkhuni” + “he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya” as in NP4; “wool” as in NP16.

Note on Rule Translation

As for nissaggiya pacittiya 4, the non-offence clause says that there is no offence if the bhikkhuni does the washing, dying, or combing without being spoken to. Thus any verbal request would seem to be sufficient to fulfil the aspect of “causing to wash, etc.” I have therefore translated with “asks”.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 18

If a bhikkhu becomes the owner of money or gold, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Becomes the owner:

1) He becomes the owner by receiving it himself (III 238,4)

2) Or by getting someone else to receive it on his behalf (III 238,5)

Money:

3) Anything used as a direct means of payment (III 238,2-3)

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

4) After forfeiture to the Sangha, the money is to be given to a lay person (III 238,16+22)

5) Or discarded by a bhikkhu chosen by the sangha through sanghakamma (III 238,23-38)

Note on Rule Translation

The three verbs in nissaggiya pacittiya 18 denote three different ways in which a bhikkhu becomes the owner of money. Thus I combine the three verbs of the Pali into “becomes the owner of”.

Commentary on Rule Factors

1) That this rule concerns “becoming the owner” is clear from the fact that the rule is a nissaggiya pacittiya. That is, one would not be able to relinquish and then give away or discard money belonging to someone else. Indeed, the Kankhavitarani gives attuddesikata, “intended for oneself,” as one of the factors for the offence.

It is not clear to me that unintentionally receiving money is an offence. A bhikkhu who practices the vinaya properly would not receive a parcel, or other enclosed container, if he knew it contained money. It makes little sense that such a scrupulous bhikkhu should fall into an offence for receiving a parcel assuming it does not contain money. It almost makes a mockery of the rule, for clearly it is intentionally receiving money that is wrong.

It seems to me that the natural meaning of “receiving money” (ugganhati) is that one intentionally accepts it. Unknowingly receiving money, for example in an unopened parcel or envelope, is equivalent to someone putting money in one’s bowl on pindapata against one’s wishes. In either case you are not consciously accepting the money; in the latter case you are probably actively refusing it. It is only when you deliberately (mentally) accept the money as yours that the offence is incurred, in my opinion. I would suggest, then, that one only becomes the owner of the contents of the parcel once one knows what the contents are. (If one has any doubt about the contents, one should ask the “donor” if at all possible.) Once the parcel is opened and one sees the content, if one then accepts whatever money might be there, at that point one incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 19

If a bhikkhu engages in various types of trade involving money, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Various types of trade:

1) Any sort of trade where the bhikkhu becomes the owner of money (III 240,20-22)

Money:

2) Gold or money (III 240,1-2)

a) Money is anything used as a direct means of payment (III 240,2)

“He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya” as in NP18.

Commentary on Rule Factors

1) The bhikkhu must end up as the owner of the money; otherwise he would not be able to forfeit it, as is required under this rule. That is, one can only forfeit that which one owns oneself.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 20

If a bhikkhu engages in various types of buying and selling, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Engages in:

1) One does the trade oneself or gets someone else to do it (III 241,33-34)

a) One is allowed to hint that one is in need of something and to point out what one will give in return (III 242,11-13)

Various types of buying and selling:

2) Anything belonging to oneself going to another and anything belonging to another going to oneself (III 241,35-37)

a) “Anything belonging to oneself” includes one’s own money (III 241,33-34)

3) Except exchanges with bhikkhus, bhikkhunis, sikkhamanas, samaneras and samaneris (III 209,27-29)

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

4) The offence is incurred when the bhikkhu’s possession is received by the “seller” and the “seller’s” possession is received by the bhikkhu (III 241,35-37)

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 21

If a bhikkhu keeps an extra bowl for more than ten days, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

An extra bowl:

1) Any allowable alms bowl apart from his one determined bowl (III 243,24)

“Keeps” + “for more than ten days” as in NP1.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 22

If a bhikkhu asks for a new bowl when his existing bowl has less than five mends, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya. He should relinquish the bowl to the sangha and he should be given the sangha's last bowl.

A new bowl:

1) Any bowl he receives due to his asking, whether previously used or not (III 246,20-21)

Mends:

2) Repairs to cracks or holes (III 246,17-29 + Kkh 130,1)

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

3) The offence is incurred when he receives the bowl he has asked for (III 246,22-23)

The sangha's last bowl:

4) The relinquished bowl should be presented to the most senior monk who may exchange it for his own if he so desires. The bowl he rejects is presented to the second monk who then chooses in the same way. This procedure is followed until the last monk is reached. Whatever bowl he rejects is then given to the offending monk (III 246,23 - 247,18)

“Asks for” as in NP6.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 23

If a bhikkhu keeps ghee, butter, oil, honey, or sugar for more than seven days, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Keeps:

1) Keeps ownership of for the purpose of eating (III 251,16)

Ghee, butter, oil, honey, or sugar:

2) Any edible substance that would naturally be called by these names (I 210,9-12)

a) Including combinations of them and combinations with lifetime medicines (I 251,23-24)

For more than seven days:

3) The offence is incurred on the seventh dawn after the tonic was received (III 251,27 + Sp 639,27-20)

Note on Rule Translation

I accept Ajahn Thanissaro's argument that navanitam is more likely to be similar to butter than to cheese. At the same time, it is likely that navanitam is not exactly the same as what we call "butter" today. Considering the uncertainties involved, both butter and cheese may be similar enough to navanitam to be accepted as such.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) That this rule refers to ownership is clear from the fact that the tonic is first received (patiggahetva), then stored (sannidhikarakam), and finally eaten (paribhunjatibbani). Receiving normally means becoming the owner and storing would also seem to imply ownership. Finally, the fact that one consumes these products must mean that one owns them; otherwise one would be committing theft.

(2) Both butter and cheese may be similar enough to navanitam to be accepted as such.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 24

If a bhikkhu seeks a rainy season robe when there is more than a month left of the hot season, or he wears one when there is more than half a month left, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Seeks:

- 1) Even giving a hint that he needs a rainy season robe (III 253,5-11)
 - a) Including asking from a relation or anyone who has given an invitation (Kkh 133,15-16)
- 2) He incurs the offence when he receives the cloth (Kkh 134,29-135,1)

A rainy season robe:

- 3) A robe used only during the four months of the rainy season (IV 173,1)
- 4) And the last fortnight of the hot season (III 253,12-13)

Wears one:

- 5) The offence is incurred in the wearing (Kkh 135,2)
- 6) Except if one's normal robes are lost or destroyed or there are dangers (III 254,9-10)

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

- 7) This rule thus includes two distinct nissaggiya pacittiya offences (Kkh 135,1-3)

Note on Rule Translation

The katva (“having made”) seems to be included simply to show that the bhikkhu has a completed rainy season robe. It does not seem to affect the incurring of an offence in any way, see Kkh 135,1-3. Since the wearing implies that the robe is complete, I have not included katva in the translation.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 25

If a bhikkhu gives a robe to another bhikkhu and then angry and displeased takes it back, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Angry and displeased:

1) Motivated by anger (Kkh 135,24)

Takes it back:

2) Takes it oneself or gets someone else to take it (III 255,14-16)

3) Perceiving it to be one’s own (Kkh 135,12)

“A robe” as in NP5.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 26

If a bhikkhu asks for thread and then gets a robe woven, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Asks for:

- 1) He himself asks (III 256,30)
- 2) Except from relatives or anyone who has given invitation (III 257,11-12)

Thread:

- 3) Thread of any material allowable for robe cloth (III 256,31-32)

A robe:

- 4) For himself (III 257,12)

Gets ... woven

- 5) Except by relatives or anyone who has given invitation (III 257,11-12)

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

- 6) The offence is incurred when he receives the robe (III 256,33-34)

Note on Rule Translation

The Pali of the rule says the robe is woven by “weavers” (tantavayehi). But the incurring of an offence is independent of who weaves the robe. I have therefore left this out of the translation.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 27

When a householder is getting a robe woven for an unrelated bhikkhu, if that bhikkhu without being invited asks the weavers for an expensive robe, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Without being invited:

1) Without being invited to specify what sort of robe he wants (III 259,27-28)

An expensive robe:

2) A robe that is better or larger than it would have been without his asking (III 259,9-10)

“Householder” + “asks ... for” + “he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya” as in NP6; “a robe” as in NP5; “unrelated” as in NP4.

Note on Rule Translation

I have contracted *gahapati va gahapatani va* (“a male householder or a female householder”) into “householder”.

I have omitted *tantavaye upsankamitva*, “having approached the weavers”, since this clause makes no difference for the offence.

The rule lists seven ways in which the *bhikkhu* may ask for the cloth to be improved/enlarged: *ayatan ca karotha vitthatan ca appitan ca suvitan ca suppavayitan ca suvilekhitan ca suvitacchitan ca karotha*, “make it long, wide, thick, well-woven, well-stretched, well-scraped, and well-combed.” From the *anapatti* clause (*mahaggham vayapetukamassa appaggham vayapeti*, “he makes someone who had desired to make something of great value weave something of little value”; III 260,18) it seems that the concern here is with asking for cloth that is more expensive than what the weavers had intended to make. I take it, therefore, that any request that results in the cloth becoming more expensive would be subject to this rule. I thus render these seven terms simply as “expensive”.

I have left out the sentence in which the *bhikkhu* says he will give something in return and the sentence in which he is said to do so. Neither of these seems to affect whether or not an

offence is committed.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(2) Strictly speaking it does not seem required that he asks for a robe that actually is superior to the one the weavers would have been weaving without his asking. He may not know exactly what sort of robe the weavers are weaving and may simply want to ensure that the quality is good enough. Even if the quality is not better than what the weavers were going to weave anyway, it would seem he still commits the offence.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 28

During the last ten days before the pavarana ceremony, a bhikkhu may receive an urgent robe. If he then stores it beyond the robe season, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

During the last ten days:

1) There are less than ten full days until dawn on the day of the pavarana ceremony (Kkh 139,8-10)

Before the pavarana ceremony:

2) Before the maha-pavarana ceremony, held on the third full moon of the rainy season (III

261,26)

An urgent robe:

3) A robe offering from anyone who is about to travel, whose life may be in danger, or who has recently acquired faith (III 261,27-29)

4) The bhikkhu perceives it as an urgent robe (III 261,33-35)

Stores:

5) Keeps ownership of it without determining it or placing it under dual ownership (III 262,22)

Beyond the robe season:

6) Beyond the dawn that marks the end of the rainy season, if one does not have kathina privileges (III 261,36-37)

7) Beyond the dawn that marks the end of the cold season, if one does have kathina privileges (III 261,37)

Note on Rule Translation

I have not included a rendering of bhikkhuno pan'eva accekacivaram uppajjeyya in my translation, since this phrase is of no consequence for the offence. I have also left out accekam mannamanena (“by (a bhikkhu) who thinks (of it) as urgent”), since this is already implied in “receive an urgent robe”.

(1) According to Ajahn Brahm a monk may incur a nissaggiya pacittiya under nissaggiya pacittiya 1 if he receives an urgent robe on the first day this is allowable and then keeps it past dawn on the pavarana day. This happens because the ten day limit imposed by nissaggiya pacittiya 1 is reached before the robe season starts on the dawn immediately following the pavarana ceremony. However, the rule in the Pali specifically states that the monk may store the robe until the end of the robe season. This would seem to mean that nissaggiya pacittiya 1 does not apply in this instance or perhaps that the ten day allowance under this rule is to be counted backwards from the dawn immediately following pavarana rather than from the dawn of the pavarana itself.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 29

Having observed the third full moon of the rainy season, a bhikkhu may store one of his three robes in an inhabited area. If he then stays apart from his robe for more than six days, except with the sangha's agreement, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Having observed the third full moon of the rainy season:

- 1) He has completed the first rains retreat (III 263,28 + Sp 731,21-22)
- 2) And it is the last month of the rainy season (Sp 731,24)

For more than six days:

- 3) The offence is incurred on the sixth dawn counting from when he was last in the presence

of his robe (III 264,11-12 + Sp 639,27-30)

“His three robes” + “if he stays apart from” + “except with the sangha’s agreement” as in NP2.

Note on Rule Translation

It is not clear to me how upavassam kho pana kattikapunnamam should be understood. I have taken upavassam to be an absolutive (following the commentary), “having dwelt” or “having observed”. I have then regarded kattikapunnamam as the object of this absolutive: “having observed the kattika full moon”. (Upavassam is used at A I 215,19 in this sense.) This, unfortunately, does not seem to fit with the Vibhanga, which defines kattikapunnamam as kattikacatumasini, “the fourth (full) moon of Kattika”. But it does fit with the commentarial explanation: kattika maso yeva hoti (Sp 731,24), “it is the Kattika month”. I have chosen to follow the commentarial explanation because it seems more coherent to me.

Given the exemptions in NP2 to staying apart from one’s robes, the fact that the monk is staying in the wilderness does not impact on the allowance (or the offence) given by this rule. I have therefore left this aspect out of my translation.

The same argument can be used for the clause siya ca tassa bhikkhuno kocideva paccayo tena civarena vippavasaya (“should there be any reason for that bhikkhu to dwell apart from that robe”), which simply refers back to the dwelling being dangerous. Given the exemptions in NP2, this clause, too, is effectively redundant.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(3) This rule then places a constraint on the exemption given in NP2. This constraint is effective during the last month of the rainy season.

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 30

If a bhikkhu diverts to himself an offering that he knows was intended for the sangha, he incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya.

Diverts to himself:

1) Whatever he does that causes the donor to give the offering to him instead of to the sangha (Kkh 141,23-24)

An offering:

2) Any material gift (III 266,2-4)

He incurs a nissaggiya pacittiya:

3) The offence is incurred when he receives the gift (III 266,6-7)

Pacittiya 1

Lying in full awareness is a pacittiya.

Lying:

- 1) One intends to deceive (IV 2,15 + Kkh 143,22)
 - a) Joking or misspeech through haste are therefore excluded (IV 4,22-23)

Full awareness:

- 2) One is aware of lying before, while and after speaking (IV 2,20f)

Commentary on Rule Factors:

(1a) There is some uncertainty here as to the exact meaning of *dava* and *rava*. *Rava* would clearly seem to mean “haste” and is explained in the *Vibhanga* as saying one thing while meaning to say another. *Dava* could mean either “haste” or “fun”, but since “haste” is already covered, I assume *dava* here means “fun”. Further, *dava*, as it is used in *pacittiya* 2 (IV 11,4), clearly means “fun”. That it should have a different meaning in *pacittiya* 1 seems unlikely. Finally, the explanation of *dava* as *sahasa* does not have to mean “hurriedly” (as per Ajahn Thanissaro), but can mean “with fun”, *sa* + *hasa*. I therefore prefer to understand these terms as “fun” and “haste” respectively.

But the exact meaning of these words is not important for the interpretation of this rule. Whether the words mean “haste” + “slip of the tongue” (as Ajahn Thanissaro maintains) or “haste” + “fun” (as I prefer), the main point is that speech that is not based on the intention to deceive is not covered by this rule. Since neither a slip of the tongue nor intending fun come under “intending to deceive”, neither fall under this rule.

Pacittiya 2

Speaking abusively is a pacittiya.

Speaking:

1) To a fully ordained person (IV 7,24)

Abusively:

2) Intending to insult, treat with contempt or humiliate (IV 7,24-25)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) Contrary to the commentarial assertion (Kkh 144,13) this would seem to include bhikkhunis. The word upasampannam refers to any ordained person, irrespective of gender. The idea that abusing bhikkhunis should be treated differently from abusing bhikkhus does not seem reasonable.

Pacittiya 3

Talebearing about a bhikkhu is a pacittiya.

Talebearing about a bhikkhu:

- 1) Having heard a bhikkhu speak abusively about another bhikkhu (IV 13,4-17 + Kkh 144,24-25)
- 2) One brings it to the attention of the victim of the abuse (IV 13,4-17 + Kkh 144,26 - 145,1)
- 3) Intending to ingratiate oneself or cause division (IV 12,24-25)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(2) Ajahn Brahm and Ajahn Thanissaro argue that this rule also concerns cases where the bhikkhu who hears the abuse brings the abuse to the attention of someone other than the victim. This, however, would seem to be less fitting, since this rule concerns ingratiation and causing division. That is, a bhikkhu who is not the victim of the abuse is unlikely to care much about what someone has said about someone else. According to the Kankhavitarani it is the akkuddha bhikkhu who is informed of the abusive speech. The akkuddha bhikkhu would seem to be precisely the one who has been abused.

For the akkuddha bhikkhu to clearly refer to the one who was abused, akkuddha would have to be the past participle of akkosati. At first sight akkuddha seems more likely to be the negative past participle of kujjhati, and its meaning would then be “the one who is not angered” or simply “he who is not angry”. This meaning, however, does not make good sense in the context, and we may therefore ask whether akkuddha might be the past participle of akkosati instead, since this would certainly fit the context very well.

DOP lists akuttha as the past participle of akkosati, but the manuscript tradition gives other possibilities. At MN3,33 the alternative reading akkuddha is given, with reference to two separate Sinhala manuscripts, and at Sn366 the same alternative reading is given, referring to two Burmese manuscripts. At AN IV 93,16 the main reading is akkuddhasanta. Given the common occurrence in the manuscript tradition of akkuddha as the past participle of akkosati, it is reasonable to understand akkuddha in the same way also in the present context.

Pacittiya 4

If a bhikkhu teaches an unordained person to memorize the Dhamma, he incurs a pacittiya.

Teaches:

1) Teaches through oral instruction to recite by rote (IV 15,1-8)

An unordained person:

2) Anyone except a bhikkhu or a bhikkhuni (IV 14,34-35)

Dhamma:

3) Passages from the four main Nikayas and the four main books of the Vinaya Pitaka (IV 15,9-10)

Commentary on Rule Factors:

(3) This is a rough estimate of what the Dhamma would have consisted of at the time of the Buddha. The commentarial ideas are not reasonable, in particular the idea that *atthupasanhita* means connected with the commentaries (*atthakatha*). Even the commentarial idea that only Pali texts are included in Dhamma seems strange, since the Buddha clearly said the Dhamma should be spoken in the local language.

Pacittiya 5

If a bhikkhu lies down with an unordained person for more than three nights, he incurs a pacittiya.

Lies down with:

1) They are both lying down at the same time (Iv 17.4-7 + 20-21)

2) In the same room (IV 17,1-2)

a) This includes any sleeping place that is more than 50% walled in and more than 50% roofed (IV 17,2)

An unordained person:

3) Anyone who is not a bhikkhu (IV 16,34-35)

For more than three nights:

4) For more than three nights in as row (IV 17,17-18)

He incurs a pacittiya:

5) The offence is incurred on the fourth consecutive night if, at any time between sunset and dawn, one is lying down at the same time as the unordained person (IV 17,3-7)

Commentary on Rule Factors:

(1) The crucial terms for deciding the meaning of this factor are channa and paricchanna. Channa quite clearly means walled, and this, in my opinion, shows that what is meant is the same room: if one is not in the same room, then one is not sleeping together within the same walled area. It follows from this that paricchanna should be read as “ceiling”, since a ceiling normally extends for one room.

(3) The idea from the anapatti clause that one “breaks” the night by getting up before dawn seems unreasonable to me. A night is not the same as dawn. I would argue that “lying down with” (that is, “sleeping in the same room with”) should be understood in its normal sense that one takes one’s night-time rest in the same room. Whether one actually gets up before dawn (which many bhikkhus would) seems irrelevant.

(4) The fourth day ends at dawn. Thus if the lying down happens at any time after dawn, it is already the fifth day, and thus no offence.

Pacittiya 6

If a bhikkhu lies down with a woman, he incurs a pacittiya.

He incurs a pacittiya:

1) The offence is incurred if, at any time between sunset and dawn, one is lying down at the same time as a woman (IV 20,1-5)

“Lies down with” as in Pc.5; “a woman” as in Sg.2 (factor 5 only)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) That the period concerned is from sunset to dawn seems to follow from Pc.5. In that rule, the time after dawn is not considered part of the night.

Pacittiya 7

If a bhikkhu teaches more than six sentences of Dhamma to a woman, except if a knowledgeable man is present, he incurs a pacittiya.

A knowledgeable man:

1) A human male capable of distinguishing between what is and what is not lewd (IV 22,29-31)

Teaches:

2) Speaks (Kkh 148,8)

More than six sentences:

3) In one and the same sitting (IV 23,7-9)

4) Except if he is replying to a question (IV 23,10)

“Dhamma” as in Pc.4; “a woman” as in Sg.3 (factor 4 only)

Note on Rule Translation

According to the Kankhavitarani a vaca is equivalent to a line of verse (Kkh 148,5). A line of

verse may or may not consist of a full sentence, but for the sake of precision it seems reasonable to define it as such.

Pacittiya 8

If a bhikkhu tells an unordained person of a real superhuman achievement, he incurs a pacittiya.

Tells:

1) Tells of his own attainment (IV 26,15-21)

2) In a direct manner (IV 29,31 - 30,19)

Real:

3) He really has, or thinks he has, achieved such a superhuman state (Kkh 149,8)

“An unordained person” as in Pc.4; “superhuman achievement” as in Pr.4

Commentary on Rule Factors

(3) Whether “or he thinks he has” should be included is debatable. The rule says bhutasmim, which seems to imply that the bhikkhu actually has attained what he states he has attained. Yet it is rarely, if ever, possible to ascertain whether a particular individual has achieved a particular state. It therefore seems that for all practical purposes it is necessary to assume that bhutasmim refers to the bhikkhu’s subjective experience, that is, that he thinks he has the attainment, regardless of whether this is actually the case or not.

Pacittiya 9

If a bhikkhu tells an unordained person of another bhikkhu’s serious offence, except with the sangha’s agreement, he incurs a pacittiya.

Serious offence:

1) A parajika offence or a sanghadisesa offence (IV 31,17-18)

“An unordained person” as in Pc.4; “except with the sangha’s agreement” as in NP2.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) According to the anapatti clause one may inform an unordained person of the action of the serious offence, if one does not mention the class of offence, or of the class, if one does not mention the action. This would seem to refer to cases where the lay person concerned is not well-versed in the Vinaya. In the present day, when the vinaya is generally available to

anyone, many lay people may know the class of offence as soon as they hear about the action. Thus by mentioning the action, one effectively reveals the class as well.

The word apatti is used to mean both a specific offence and also a class of offence.

Pacittiya 10

If a bhikkhu causes the earth to be dug, he incurs a pacittiya.

Causes ... to be dug:

- 1) He either digs himself or gets someone else to do it (IV 33,19-21)
- 2) Except through hinting (IV 33,29-30)
- 3) The digging is intentional (IV 33,30-31)

Earth:

- 4) Soil consisting of more than 50% loam and/or clay (IV 33,10)
 - a) Soil consisting of more than 50% sand, pebbles, gravel, and/or rock is thus excluded (IV 33,15-16)
- 5) That one perceives as such (IV 33,22-26)

6) Except if it has been previously dug into a pile and rained upon for less than four months (IV 33,17-18)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) The Vibhanga lists a number of actions that it says fulfil the factor of effort: to dig, to cause to dig, to break, to cause to break, to burn, to cause to burn (khanati va khanapeti va, bhindati va bhedapeti va, dahati va dahapeti va; IV 33,22-23). The rule itself only mentions the first two of these six actions, and it is not clear why the Vibhanga adds another four. In my opinion, the Vibhanga is here unreasonably extending the rule and it is therefore not binding to consider these additional actions as constituting breaches of this rule.

Pacittiya 11

Destroying vegetation is a pacittiya.

Destroying:

1) Killing or causing to kill (IV 35,14-15)

2) One does it intentionally (IV 35,21-22)

3) Except through hinting (IV 35,20-21)

Vegetation:

4) Any plant or living part of a plant, including seeds (IV 35,1-15)

5) One perceives it as such (IV 35,14-17)

6) Except seeds that are eaten as part of eating fruit or vegetables (IV 35,21)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(4) That seeds are included in bhutagama seems clear from the use of the word bija in the Vibhanga. The Vibhanga (IV 35,14-19) uses the word bija where one would expect to find bhutagama: Bije bijasanni chindati va chedapeti va, bhindati va bhedapeti va, pacati va pacapeti va, apatti pacittiyassa. It is clear from the context that bija cannot here mean “seed”, but must stand for bhutagama. The CPD suggest the meaning “(having) germinating power” for bija in this context. I would perhaps amend this to “having capacity for growth”. Regardless of the translation, it is difficult to avoid the feeling that seeds are included in this rule when bija is specifically used in place of bhutagama. That this is the correct interpretation is reinforced by the fact that most of the other schools whose Vinaya is still extant include bijagama in the rule formulation (6 out of 10; see W. Pachow, A Comparative Study of the Pratimoksa).

It seems to me, however, that the destruction of seeds as a consequence of eating fruit or vegetables is not included under this rule. This is so because the factor of intention is not fulfilled. When you eat a fruit or vegetable that contains seeds, your intention is to eat the fruit, not to destroy the seeds. There is no separate action apart from the eating that constitutes the destruction of seeds. This contrasts with e.g. cutting a branch off a tree because the branch may possibly damage a building. In this case, although the final intention is to save the building, not to damage the tree, there is a sub-intention directly linked to the

action of cutting the branch. That intention is to cut the branch. With the eating of fruit there is no such sub-intention.

I conclude that the destruction of seeds through eating fruit or vegetables is no offence according to the Vinaya. (The passage at Cv V 5.2 that gives five ways of eating fruit allowably, gives no penalty for not following any of these five ways.)

There is also the question of whether eating seeds on their own is an offence. I would argue it is not, for two reasons. (1) Seeds that are served as food are not capable of growing in that state. That is, they normally require water, or even earth, to actualize their growth potential. (2) One is not actually intending to destroy the seed but rather just to eat it. There is only one intention involved in the eating of seeds and that is the intention to eat them.

Pacittiya 12

Evasive speech and uncooperativeness is a pacittiya.

Evasive speech:

1) One leads the talk aside (IV 37,3-5)

Uncooperativeness:

2) One remains silent (IV 37,8)

Is a pacittiya:

- 3) One has been questioned by the sangha about an offence (IV 37,1-2)
- 4) One has either replied evasively or remained silent (IV 37,3-5 + 8)
- 5) With the intention to avoid talking about the offence (IV 37,2)
- 6) One has been charged by the sangha, through sanghakamma, either of evasive speech or of being uncooperative (IV 37,14+15 + 36,4-14 + 33-35)
- 7) The offence is incurred if one continues the evasion or uncooperativeness after the completion of the sanghakamma (IV 37,14-15 + Kkh 154,20-22)

Pacittiya 13

Criticizing and denouncing is a pacittiya.

Criticizing and denouncing:

- 1) Criticizing and denouncing without a reason (IV 39,8-9)
- 2) A bhikkhu or bhikkhuni who has been appointed as a sangha officer through sanghakamma (IV 38,24-26)

3) To another bhikkhu or bhikkhuni (IV 38,28)

4) Intending to discredit, to bring into disrepute, and/or to humiliate (IV 38,27-28)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(2+3) In this rule, too, the Vibhanga uses upasampanno/anupasampanno in deciding the severity of the offence. As with pacittiya 2, it seems reasonable to take upasampanno to include bhikkhunis. There is nothing to contradict this either in the Vibhanga or the commentaries.

Pacittiya 14

If a bhikkhu causes a bed, bench, cushion, or stool belonging to the sangha to be put out in the open and then departs without having it put away, he incurs a pacittiya.

Causes ... to be put out:

1) He either puts it out himself or gets someone else to put it out (IV 40,13-14)

Bench:

2) A bench of any length, including a chair (I 180,12 + II 169,13+16)

Cushion:

3) A cushion of any size and shape, including mattresses (Kkh 156,16)

Departs:

4) He leaves the immediate vicinity (IV 40,20-21)

Without having it put away:

5) Not having put it away himself, nor having got someone else to put it away, nor having asked someone to put it away (IV 40,17-21)

Note on Rule Translation

I translate pitha as “bench”, rather than “chair”, since it was used for sleeping on, as well as sitting on.

I render bhisi as “cushion”, although “mattress” might be an equally apt translation.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(2) Since the pitha was used for both sitting on and lying on, it would seem to include both chairs and benches. According to the upajjhaya vatta (II 225,2+21), a vihara would have both a manca and a pitha as standard equipment. It seems likely that, since manca is a bed, a pitha must be a type of furniture for sitting. At I 180,12 the Buddha uses a pitha for his asana, which makes it clear that it was for sitting. Moreover, since this was used by the Buddha, it seems likely that it was a chair for one person only, rather than a bench. At II 169,13+16, however, it is clear that a pitha could also be used as a bench, seating two or three people. A pitha, then, must have been the standard furniture for sitting on in monastic dwellings.

(3) According to the Kankhavitarani a bhisi can either be lain down on or sat on (Kkh 156,16), and thus it may include anything called a cushion or mattress.

(4) According to the Vibhanga, the distance by which he must depart is one leddupata or more. This is, apparently, the distance an average man can throw a clod of earth underarm, and it is perhaps roughly equal to 20m. But since the rule itself is less specific, simply saying “departs” (pakkamanto), I feel “leaves the immediate vicinity” leaves room for an intelligent application of the rule.

Pacittiya 15

If a bhikkhu causes bedding to be put out in a dwelling belonging to the sangha and then departs without having it put away, he incurs a pacittiya.

Bedding:

1) Any bed related articles, apart from the bed itself (IV 41,27-29)

Departs:

2) Leaves the monastery (IV 42,1-3)

3) With no intention to return (IV 42,19-20 + Kkh 159,22-25)

“Causes ... to be put out” + “without having it put away” as in Pc.14.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) The Vibhanga gives a list of such articles. However, it is not clear that this is meant to be exhaustive, particularly considering the changes in bedding equipment that have taken place since the time of the Buddha. I therefore prefer to regard this as any article used for sleeping on or under, apart from the bed itself.

(2) “Depart”, pakkamanto, is defined in the Vibhanga as leaving the monastery boundary (where a monastery has a boundary) or leaving the vicinity of the monastery (where a monastery has no boundary). But it seems to me that for most practical purposes “leaves the monastery” is clear enough.

Pacittiya 16

If a bhikkhu lies down in a dwelling belonging to the sangha, knowingly encroaching on a bhikkhu and aiming to make him depart, he incurs a pacittiya.

Knowingly:

1) He knows the dwelling is being used by a bhikkhu who is senior, ill, or has been given it by the sangha (IV 43,13-14)

Encroaching:

2) He lies down next to the bed, bench, entry-way, or exit-path (IV 43,16-19)

Aiming to make him depart:

3) No offence if one is ill, suffering due to heat or cold, or there are dangers (IV 43,35-36)

Note on Rule Translation

“Aiming tort make him depart” is my rendering of yassa sambadho bhavissati so pakkamissati, lit. “for whom there will be confinement, he will depart”.

“Encroaching on a bhikkhu” is my rendering of pubbupagatam bhikkhum anupakhajja, lit. “encroaching on a bhikkhu previously arrived”. I have left out “previously arrived” since this is implied in “encroaching”.

Pacittiya 17

If a bhikkhu, angry and displeased, causes a bhikkhu to be thrown out of a dwelling belonging to the sangha, he incurs a pacittiya.

Angry and displeased:

1) No offence if the ejected bhikkhu is shameless; insane; a maker of strife, quarrels, and disputes; or a misbehaving disciple (IV 45,25-30)

Causes ... to be thrown out:

2) He either throws the bhikkhu out himself or gets someone else to do it (IV 45,4-9)

a) Either physically or verbally (Kkh 161,22-23)

Pacittiya 18

If a bhikkhu sits or lies down on a bed or bench with unfastened legs in the upper storey of a kuti belonging to the sangha, he incurs a pacittiya.

Unfastened legs:

1) Legs that fall off when the bed or bench is lifted off the ground (IV 46,22-23 + Kkh 162,25)

Upper storey of a kuti:

2) The second or third level in a dwelling where the floor is incomplete and objects may fall down to the lower storey (IV 46,35 + Kkh 162,22-24 + 163,13-14)

He incurs a pacittiya:

3) Except if the lower storey is not occupied or it is too low for an average man to stand up (IV 46,34-35)

“Bench” as in Pc.14.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(2) Although the rule says kuti, I understand this to apply to any dwelling belonging to the sangha. This understanding seems necessary because the limits of what constitutes a kuti are not clearly specified.

The phrase padarasancitam hoti in the anapatti clause seems to refer to the floor being planked or otherwise “covered” (Sp 783,6-8).

Pacittiya 19

When a bhikkhu is building a large dwelling, if he applies more than three layers of building material, he incurs a pacittiya.

Applies:

1) He applies it himself or gets someone else to do it (IV 47,29)

Building material:

2) Any sort of building material (IV 48,8-13)

He incurs a pacittiya:

3) Except if the dwelling is for someone else (IV 48,21)

“Builds” as in Sg.6; “large dwelling” as in Sg.7.

Note on Rule Translation

Chadana means “covering”, but here seems to refer to the material used for covering the roof and walls. The Vibhanga speaks of covering with different types of building materials: itthakaya chadentassa, etc. (IV 48,9-13). Thus I translate as “building material”.

The rule seems to disallow applying more than three layers of material to the area surrounding the windows and the door. However, no exception is mentioned for any other area of the kuti walls, including the roof, and thus I take it that three layers of material is the maximum allowable limit anywhere. In fact, the Pali of the rule can be read in this way. The rule does not explicitly state that applying three layers only refers to these areas, only that these areas are what require strengthening (“one may apply a maximum of three layers for the purpose of the areas around the windows and the door”). To me it seems reasonable to assume that one should not use more than three layers anywhere, if the purpose of the rule, at least in part, is to avoid being a burden on lay supporters. That the rule is to avoid overburdening lay supporters seems implied by the anapatti clause.

I have also left out appaharite thitena (“by one standing where there is little greenery”), since this clause does not affect whether or not one incurs a pacittiya offence.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) That the application is either by the bhikkhu himself or by someone he gets to do it follows from the fact that the building process is defined in this way (IV 47,29).

If a bhikkhu pours onto the ground water that he knows contains living beings, he incurs a pacittiya.

Pours:

1) He either pours it out himself or gets someone else to do it (IV 49,7-9)

2) The pouring is intentional (IV 49,16)

Living beings:

3) Beings visible to the naked eye (Kkh 165,25)

Ground :

4) Anywhere where he knows the beings will die when the water is poured out (Kkh 166,16)

Note on Rule Translation

I render tinam va mattikam va simply as “on the ground”. I take the two Pali words to express any place where the living beings would die if the water were to be poured out. This also seems to be the commentarial position: sincanena panaka marissanti ti jananam, “knowing

means ‘beings will die through the pouring’.”

Commentary on Rule Factors

(4) That the beings must be visible to the naked eye follows from the commentarial disva (Kkh 165,25), “having seen”, and the fact that seeing would have been the only way of ascertaining the presence of beings at the time of the Buddha.

Pacittiya 21

If a bhikkhu teaches the bhikkhunis without the sangha’s agreement, he incurs a pacittiya.

Teaches:

1) He gives a teaching on any aspect of the Dhamma (IV 52,13-14)

a) * According to the Vibhanga definition of ovadati this only refers to reciting the eight garudhammas (IV 52,4)

2) Except giving a summary teaching, questioning, teaching when asked, or allowing bhikkhunis to listen while teaching others (IV 53,34-36)

Bhikkhunis:

3) One or more bhikkhunis (Kkh 167,2-3)

Without the sangha's agreement:

4) Without the sangha having given its approval through a sanghakamma of one motion and three announcements (IV 52,2 + 50,25-37)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) The meaning of the word *ovadati*, “teaches”, in the present context is not clear. The Vibhanga's word definition defines it as “teaches the eight garudhammas”, but this definition is contradicted by the meaning of the word elsewhere.

In the Nikayas, the word *ovadati* and its cognate forms has no special relation to the eight garudhammas but rather refers to teaching in general. That this is the case is clear from a quick perusal of the usage of the word in any good dictionary, such as DOP. It follows that since *ovadati* is used in the rule formulation, it is likely that this rule originally referred to any teaching of the bhikkhunis. The Vibhanga's narrowing down of what constitutes an *ovada* does not seem to have been the original intent of the rule.

But even the Vibhanga contradicts itself as to what *ovada* means in the context of the present rule. After the word definition for *ovadati* has been given, the Vibhanga shows in detail how the *ovada* is to be done. When the bhikkhunis arrive for the *ovada*, they are first to be asked if they are all present (*samaggattha bhaginiyo*, IV 52,11). If they say yes, they are to be asked if they are keeping the garudhammas (*vattanti bhaginiyo attha garudhamma*, lit. “sisters, are the eight garudhammas proceeding”, IV 52,12). If they again say yes, the *ovada* is to be given. At this point nothing is said about the garudhammas, just that the *ovada* is to be given. If, however, the bhikkhunis say that they are not keeping the garudhammas, then it is specifically said that the monk should recite (*osaretabba*) them. The obvious implication is that the monk should only recite the garudhammas if the bhikkhunis are not keeping them, otherwise there would be no need to make the present distinction.

I conclude that ovadati in the present rule most likely refers to any teaching of the Dhamma.

(2) This is a summary of the anapatti (non-offence) clause. I have combined paripuccham dento and panham pucchati into “to question”. Osarehi ayya ti vuccamano osareti and panham puttho katheti are combined in “to teach when asked”.

Pacittiya 22

If a bhikkhu teaches the bhikkhunis after sunset, he incurs a pacittiya.

“Teaches” + “bhikkhunis” as in Pc.21.

Note on Rule Translation

I have left out sammato ce pi, “even if agreed upon (by the sangha)”, since this does not affect the incurring of an offence. That is, whether the bhikkhu has been agreed upon or not, he incurs the pacittiya under this rule for teaching bhikkhunis after sunset. The only difference between the two is that a bhikkhu also incurs a pacittiya under pacittiya 21 if he has not been agreed upon.

Pacittiya 23

If a bhikkhu teaches the bhikkhunis at their dwelling place, except if a bhikkhuni is ill, he incurs a pacittiya.

Dwelling place:

- 1) Wherever one or more bhikkhunis are staying (Kkh 168,21)
 - a) For at least one night (IV 57,6-7)

A bhikkhuni is ill:

- 2) The bhikkhuni is unable to go to the ovada or other meeting of the sangha (IV 57,10-11)

“Teaches” as in Pc.21.

Note on Rule Translation

I have left out “having approached” (upasankamitva), since this is obviously implied.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) The Kankhavitarani (Kkh 168,21) uses the singular (bhikkhuniya), whereas the Vibhanga uses the plural (bhikkhuniyo, IV 57,6). I take this to mean that this rule refers to one or more bhikkhunis.

(2) “Other meeting of the sangha” presumably refers to any meeting where the bhikkhunis are meeting with the bhikkhus, such as the pavarana ceremony.

Pacittiya 24

If a bhikkhu says that bhikkhus are teaching the bhikkhunis for the sake of worldly gain, he incurs a pacittiya.

Says:

1) Intending to discredit, to bring into disrepute, and/or to humiliate (IV 58,17-18)

Except if the charge is true (IV 58,32-33)

Bhikkhus:

2) Bhikkhus that have been agreed upon by the sangha to teach the bhikkhunis (IV 58,16-17)

For the sake of worldly gain:

3) For the sake of material gain or for the sake of respect and honour (IV 58,13-15)

Pacittiya 25

If a bhikkhu gives a robe to an unrelated bhikkhuni, except if she gives something in return, he incurs a pacittiya.

Gives:

1) Does not include the bhikkhuni borrowing a robe or taking one on trust (IV 60,27-28)

“Unrelated” + “bhikkhuni” as in NP4; “a robe” + “except if she gives something in return” as in NP5.

Pacittiya 26

If a bhikkhu causes a robe to be sewn for an unrelated bhikkhuni, he incurs a pacittiya.

Causes ... to be sewn:

1) He either sews it himself or gets someone else to do it (IV 62,1-3)

A robe:

2) Any wearable robe (IV 61,37)

“Unrelated” + “bhikkhuni” as in NP4.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(2) This rule does not include vikappanupagapacchimam in its definition of civara, “robe”, (IV 61,37). Moreover, since this rule concerns sewing, it seems natural to think that it refers to a complete robe rather than robe cloth.

Pacittiya 27

If a bhikkhu, by appointment, travels on a country road with a bhikkhuni, even if just between villages, except with a company of travellers on a dangerous road, he incurs a pacittiya.

By appointment:

1) Having made an arrangement with the bhikkhuni prior to departure (IV 63,25-27)

Travels:

2) They travel together in accordance with the appointment (Sp 807,24-28)

3) Except if there are dangers (IV 64,12-13)

A country road:

4) Any road outside of inhabited areas (IV 63,28-30)

Even if just between villages:

5) Between inhabited areas or more than 8 km, whichever comes first (IV 63,28-30)

A dangerous road:

6) A road known to be used by robbers or violent people (IV 63,31-36)

“Bhikkhuni” as in NP4.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(3) “A country road” (addhanamagga, lit. “long road”) seems to refer to major thoroughfares that were used for travel between built-up areas. But since no clear definition is given, it seems reasonable to include any sort of “country road”.

None of the texts seems to define “company of travellers” (sattha), but it seems the main point here is that company is required because the road is dangerous. The minimum requirement would thus seem to be one other person of each gender, apart from the bhikkhu and the bhikkhuni.

(4) The Vibhanga states that an offence is incurred for every half-yojana travelled where there are no villages. It may be, however, that the point of the phrase in the Pali rule, antamaso gamantaram pi, is that even a short distance of travelling together involves an offence, regardless of whether there are any villages en route or not.

(5) None of the texts seem to define “caravan”, but it seems the main point here is that company is required because the road is dangerous. The minimum requirement would then seem to be one other person, apart from the bhikkhu and the bhikkhuni.

Pacittiya 28

If a bhikkhu, by appointment, travels by boat with a bhikkhuni, except for the purpose of crossing, he incurs a pacittiya.

Except for the purpose of crossing:

1) Except for the purpose of getting across any body of water (IV 65,32 + Sp 808,18-21)

“Bhikkhuni” as in NP4; “by appointment” + “travels” as in Pc.27.

Note on Rule Translation

I have left out “going upstream” and “going downstream” since neither of these affect the incurring of an offence.

Pacittiya 29

If a bhikkhu eats almsfood knowing that a bhikkhuni has had it prepared, except if he had a prior arrangement with the donors, he incurs a pacittiya.

Almsfood:

1) Any staple food (IV 67,30-31)

a) [This is defined in Pc.35 (IV 83,3-4; cf. BMC I, p. 370-72), but I feel it is more appropriate

to use current standards for what constitutes staple food.]

Knowing:

2) He knows that a bhikkhuni has caused the food to be prepared (IV 67,23-24 + 68,1-2)

Has had it prepared:

3) The bhikkhuni has got householders to prepare food they would not have prepared without her intervention (IV 67,26-29)

Except if he had a prior arrangement with the donor:

4) Except if the householders are relatives, have given invitation, or are regular donors (IV 67,32-34)

He incurs a pacittiya:

5) The offence is incurred in the eating (IV 67,35-36)

“Bhikkhuni” as in NP4.

Note on Rule Translation

I follow Bhikkhu Nanatusita in understanding paripacita as “caused to prepare” (see A

Commentary on Rule Factors

(4) In other words, in these cases an intervention by a bhikkhuni would not be grounds for an offence.

Pakatipatiyatta, which I have rendered “regular donors”, is translated by Ajahn Thanissaro as “[the lay person] has already prepared [the food in question for X]”, X being the bhikkhu. But the word pakati normally means “usual” and pakatipatiyatta would therefore seem to mean “those who are usual-cooking”, thus “regular donors”. The point would seem to be that a bhikkhuni cannot instigate someone to prepare food they otherwise would not have prepared.

Pacittiya 30

If a bhikkhu sits down in private with a bhikkhuni, he incurs a pacittiya.

Sits down ... with:

- 1) Both sit or lie down at the same time (IV 69,5-9)
- 2) He is aiming at privacy (IV 69,15)

In private:

3) Just the bhikkhu and the bhikkhuni together (IV 68,33)

a) Others are not able to see their facial expressions or hear them speak normally (IV 69,1-4)

“Bhikkhuni” as in NP4.

Note on Rule Translation

“In private” is a rendering of eko ekaya raho, lit. “one with one, in private”. I have left out “one with one” since this would seem to be included in “in private”.

Commentary on Rule Factors

“He is aiming at privacy” is meant to take account of both arahopekkho and annavihito nisidati.

Pacittiya 31

If a bhikkhu who is not ill eats more than one meal at a public alms centre, he incurs a pacittiya.

III:

1) One stays at the alms centre due to illness or weakness (Sp 810,30-31)

Meal:

2) Any staple food (IV 71,1-2)

a) [See comment at Pc.29.]

A public alms centre:

3) Anywhere, indoors or outdoors (IV 71,2)

4) Where food is distributed to the general public (IV 71,3)

5) And where one can eat as much as one likes (IV 71,3)

He incurs a pacittiya:

6) The offence is incurred in the eating (IV 71,5-6)

7) Except if one is invited by the owners (IV 71,13)

8) Except if one is coming and going each day (IV 71,12-13 + Kkh 175,18)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) “Illness” (gilana) is elsewhere defined very broadly, and it often includes weakness.

(8) The exact meaning of “coming and going” is not clear. According to the Kankhavitarani one of the factors of this rule is anuvasitva paribhojanam, “having stayed he eats”. This would seem to mean that if one leaves the alms centre after having eaten there on a particular day, one may return on the following day. However, this contradicts the interpretation of the Samantapasadika.

Pacittiya 32

Eating in a group is a pacittiya, except at a time of illness, of robe-giving, of robe-making, of going on a journey, of travelling by boat, at a great occasion, or at a meal from ascetics.

Eating:

1) Any meal that includes staple food (IV 74,28-29)

a) [See comment at Pc.29.]

In a group:

2) Four or more bhikkhus together at an invitational meal (IV 74,28)

a) They have been specified by the donors and do not constitute the complete sangha (IV

75,19-21)

Is a pacittiya:

3) The offence is incurred in the eating (IV 75,12)

4) Except food received on the uposatha, on the day after the uposatha, or on the eighth day of the fortnight (IV 75,19-21)

Illness:

5) Even just split feet (IV 74,32)

Robe-giving:

6) The robe season (IV 74,34)

Robe-making:

7) Any time one is making a robe (IV 74,37)

Going on a journey:

8) Before, during, or after a trip of more than 8 km (IV 75,1-3)

Travelling by boat:

9) Before, during, or after a trip of any length (IV 75,4-5)

A great occasion:

10) Four or more bhikkhus are not able to receive sufficient food on alms round (IV 75,6-8)

A meal from ascetics:

11) Any meal not made by lay people (IV 75,9-10)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(3) I follow Ajahn Thanissaro in limiting the sort of meal that comes under this rule to meals where specific bhikkhus have been invited directly by the donors or the donor have asked the sangha or the sangha official for a specific group of monks. Thus any meal where the participating bhikkhus are designated by a sangha official does not fall under this rule.

Pacittiya 33

Eating one meal after another is a pacittiya, except at a time of illness, of robe-giving, or of robe-making.

One meal after another:

1) One has been invited to a meal but then eats other staple food beforehand (IV 78,12-15)

a) The invitation is a personal one, where one has been specifically named by the donors (IV 78,28)

Is a pacittiya:

2) The offence is incurred in the eating (IV 78,21)

3) Except if one gives the prior meal invitation to someone else (IV 78,23)

4) Except if one eats a number of invitational meals in the order in which the invitations were received (IV 78,24)

5) Except if one has been invited by a large group, such as a whole village, in which case one may eat anywhere among them (IV 78,24-27)

6) Except if one informs the donors that one will go on alms round beforehand (IV 78,27)

7) Except on the uposatha, the day after the uposatha, and the eighth day of the fortnight (IV 78,28-29)

Illness:

8) One is not able to eat as much as one needs in one session (IV 79,17-18)

“Eating” + “robe-giving” + “robe-making” + “is a pacittiya” as in Pc.32.

Commentary on Rule Translation

The Pali word bhojana can mean both “food” and “eating”. For the translation to make good sense I have translated “eating [a] meal”.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(2) It seems to me that “designated meals” (uddesabhatta) and lot meals (salakabhatta) may originally have been one and the same thing. They are not mentioned separately in the Vibhanga and they only occur as separate items at Cv VI 21.1. This may mean that what was originally just called salakabhatta later was divided into uddesabhatta and salakabhatta.

This would presumably mean that designated meals originally were distributed by drawing lots and thus would be included under salakabhatta for the purposes of this rule and Pc.32. This is speculation, but it makes some sense of what otherwise is difficult to make sense of. The alternative would be that both this rule and Pc.32 include designated meals as grounds for an offence. However, this would not make much sense in the context of Pc.32, as Ajahn Thanissaro points out.

In the end one has to realize that most donors will be disappointed if one eats elsewhere and thus eats little of the food that they have prepared. One should therefore be careful not to disappoint donors regardless of the sort of meal they are offering.

Pacittiya 34

If a bhikkhu approaches a family and receives more than three full bowls of cakes, he incurs a pacittiya.

Cakes:

1) Cakes prepared for giving away or for provisions for a journey (IV 80,25-26)

He incurs a pacittiya:

2) Except if he receives the cakes from relatives, from those who have previously invited, or for the sake of another (IV 81,12-13)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) The Vibhanga defines “cakes” (puva and mantha) as what has been prepared for giving away or for provisions for a journey. To me this seems to be an explanation for why the householders made such a large quantity of cakes, not a suggestion that all types of food are included in the rule. If all types of food were intended, the rule would not have used the words puva and mantha.

Pacittiya 35

If a bhikkhu who has eaten and been invited eats food that is not leftover, he incurs a pacittiya.

Has eaten:

- 1) He has finished his meal (Sp-t)
- 2) Of any staple food (IV 82,25-26)
 - a) [See comment at Pc.29.]

Has ... been invited:

- 3) While still eating, he has refused an invitation of more food made by someone within arms reach (IV 82,27-28)

Food:

- 4) Any food except the seven day tonics, juice, and medicine (IV 83,1-4)

Not leftover:

- 5) Not left over from an ill bhikkhu (IV 82,32-33)
- 6) And not made leftover through the appropriate procedure (IV 82,26-30)

Commentary on Rule Translation

I have translated khadaniya and bhojaniya together as “food” and khadeyya and bhunjeyya as “eats”.

Pacittiya 36

If a bhikkhu invites a bhikkhu to eat food that is not leftover, knowing that he has eaten and been invited and aiming to criticize, then when he has eaten, he incurs a pacittiya.

Aiming to criticize:

1) Aiming to admonish him for having committed an offence or to humiliate (IV 84,26-27)

When he has eaten:

2) When the invited bhikkhu has finished his meal (IV 84,30)

“Food” + “has eaten” + “has ... been invited” + “not leftover” as in Pc.35.

Pacittiya 37

If a bhikkhu eats at the wrong time, he incurs a pacittiya.

The wrong time:

1) From solar noon to the following dawn (IV 86,2)

Eats:

2) Any food except the seven day tonics, juice, and medicines (IV 86,3)

Pacittiya 38

If a bhikkhu eats stored food, he incurs a pacittiya.

Stored:

1) Received on one day and eaten on another (IV 87,5-6)

“Eats” as in Pc.37.

Pacittiya 39

If a bhikkhu who is not ill asks for ghee, butter, oil, honey, sugar, fish, meat, milk, or curd, and then eats it, he incurs a pacittiya.

III:

1) Not comfortable without these foods (IV 89,4)

Meat, milk, or curd:

2) From animals whose flesh is allowable (IV 88,33-36)

He incurs a pacittiya:

3) Except if he asks from relatives or those who have given invitation (IV 89,14)

“Ghee, butter, oil, honey, sugar” as in NP23.

Pacittiya 40

If a bhikkhu eats ungiven food, except water, he incurs a pacittiya.

Ungiven:

- 1) Not given by body, by something connected to the body, or by dropping (IV 90,12-13)
- 2) By someone standing within reach (IV 90,13-14)
- 3) Not received by body, or something connected to the body (IV 90,14)

Food:

- 4) Any food or drink, except water (IV 90,16-17)

Commentary on Rule Translation

I have left out tooth-wood since it is generally not in use anymore.

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) The rule itself just says that there is an offence if the food is not given. The Vibhanga then adds a whole list of factors (factors 1 to 3 given above) explaining what this means. Whether these factors were originally the intent behind the rule is unclear and it is not obvious that they were. AS comparative study of this rule with other Vinaya recensions might shed some light on this issue.

Pacittiya 41

If a bhikkhu gives food directly to a non-Buddhist mendicant, he incurs a pacittiya.

Directly:

1) Directly from person to person (IV 92,24)

A non-Buddhist mendicant:

2) Anyone ordained in any religion who is not a lay person and not a Buddhist (IV 92,8-12)

“Food” as in Pc.40.

Pacittiya 42

If a bhikkhu takes a bhikkhu on almsround but then dismisses him only because he wants to be by himself, he incurs a pacittiya.

Takes a bhikkhu:

1) Asks him to come along (IV 93,22)

On almsround:

2) In an inhabited area (IV 93,22-23)

Dismisses him only because he wants to be by himself:

3) He desires to indulge in inappropriate association with women (IV 93,26-27)

4) He has no other reason for wanting to be alone (IV 93,31-32)

He incurs a pacittiya:

5) The offence is incurred when the other monk goes outside of hearing range or sight range (IV 93,29-30)

Note on Rule Translation

I have not included *dapetva va adapetva va* (“having had anything given or not having had anything given”), since this makes no difference for the offence. “Only” is a translation of *etadeva paccayam karitva anannam*, and “only because he wants to be by himself” renders *na me taya saddhim katha va nisajja va phasu hoti, ekakassa me katha va nisajja va phasu hoti’ti*.

Pacittiya 43

If a bhikkhu sits down intruding on a lustful couple, he incurs a pacittiya.

Sits down intruding:

1) Sits down in their presence in their bedroom (IV 95,12-16)

A lustful couple:

2) At least one of them is present (IV 95,10-11)

3) At least one of them has lust (IV 95,11)

He incurs a pacittiya:

4) Except if there is anyone else present apart from the couple and the monk (IV 95,10 + 25)

Note on Rule Translation

“A lustful couple” renders sabhojane kule, lit. “a family with its meal”. Sabhojane is defined in the Vibhanga as “both not without lust”, and I use this definition in the translation since this seems to be the implied meaning. Kule, which normally means “family” or “clan”, here refers to “a woman and a man”, that is, “a couple”.

Commentary on Rule Factors

The Pali phrase *itthi ceva hoti puriso ca* indicates that only one woman and one man is present, the *eva* meaning “just”. The phrase *bhikkhu dutiyo hoti* does not seem to mean “there is a second bhikkhu” but that “the bhikkhu has a second”, that is, he has someone else with him.

Pacittiya 44

If a bhikkhu sits on a secluded seat in private with a woman, he incurs a pacittiya.

A woman:

1) One or more human females, even if just born (IV 96,17-18)

He incurs a pacittiya:

2) Except if another knowledgeable man is present (IV 97,3)

3) Except if he is not aiming for privacy (IV 97,4)

“Sits” + “in private” as in Aniy.1; “on a secluded seat” as in Aniy.1 (factor 2 only)

Pacittiya 45

If a bhikkhu sits alone in private with a woman, he incurs a pacittiya.

He incurs a pacittiya:

- 1) Except if another knowledgeable person is present (Kkh 198,12-13 + 91,15-17)
- 2) And except if he is not aiming for privacy (IV 97,32-33)

“Sits” + “alone” + “in private” as in Aniy.1; “a woman” as in Sg.2

Commentary on Rule Factors

(1) The Vibhanga abbreviates the anapatti clause, giving the impression that it is identical to the one in Pc.44. However, the present rule includes the phrase eko ekaya and this is in turn specifically defined in the Vibhanga as just the bhikkhu and the woman together (bhikkhu ceva hoti matugamo ca). This indicates that the presence of another woman is sufficient to absolve one from an offence under this rule. (This compares with the requirement for the presence of a man under the previous rule, Pc.44.)

Pacittiya 46

If a bhikkhu who has been invited to a meal visits families beforehand or afterwards, without

having informed an available bhikkhu, except at a time of robe-giving or robe-making, he incurs a pacittiya.

A meal:

1) Any meal that includes staple food (IV 100,15-17)

An available bhikkhu:

2) Any bhikkhu one is able to inform before going (IV 100,18)

“Robe-giving” + “robe-making” as in Pc.32.

Pacittiya 47

If a bhikkhu who is not ill makes use of an invitation to ask for medicinal requisites for more than four months, except if the invitation is renewed or permanent, he incurs a pacittiya.

To ask for medicinal requisites:

1) Except from relatives (IV 104,4-5)

2) And except if it is for someone else (IV 104,4-5)

Makes use of ... for more than four months:

3) Exceed the time limit of the invitation and/or goes beyond the specified requisites (IV 103,8-27)

Commentary on Rule Translation:

The verb *sadiyati* can be rendered “enjoys” or “consents to”, etc. “Enjoys” includes “makes use of”, which is the implied meaning of the term in this rule. I translate accordingly.

Pacittiya 48

If a bhikkhu goes to see an army in action, except if there is a suitable reason, he incurs a pacittiya.

Goes to see:

1) Purposefully goes to where the army is (IV 105,32-34)

An army:

2) Any large military force (IV 105,16-18)

In action:

3) Includes an army in camp (IV 105,15)

A suitable reason:

4) Any suitable reason, such as visiting an ill relative (IV 105,1-10)

He incurs a pacittiya:

5) The offence is incurred in the seeing (IV 105,19-20)

Pacittiya 49

If a bhikkhu stays with an army for more than three nights, even for a suitable reason, he incurs a pacittiya.

More than three nights:

1) More than three consecutive nights (IV 106,33-34)

He incurs a pacittiya:

2) The offence is incurred at sunset on the fourth night (IV 106,24-26)

3) Except if there are dangers (IV 107,2)

“Army” + “a suitable reason” as in Pc.48.

Pacittiya 50

If a bhikkhu, while staying with an army, goes to see a battlefield, a troop review, a massing of troops, or a troop inspection, he incurs a pacittiya.

“Army” + “goes to see” + “he incurs a pacittiya” as in Pc.48.

Pacittiya 51

Drinking alcoholic drinks is a pacittiya.

Pacittiya 52

Tickling with the fingers is a pacittiya.

Tickling:

- 1) Touching another bhikkhu with the intention to make him laugh (IV 111,8-9)

Pacittiya 53

Playing in water is a pacittiya.

Water:

- 1) Ankle depth or deeper (IV 112,23)

Playing:

- 2) Partly or fully immersing the body for fun (IV 112,23-25)

Pacittiya 54

Being disrespectful is a pacittiya.

Disrespectful:

1) One is corrected by a bhikkhu in regards to a rule laid down by the Buddha and one responds by being disrespectful to the person or to the Dhamma (IV 113,18-25)

Pacittiya 55

If a bhikkhu frightens another bhikkhu, he incurs a pacittiya.

Frightens:

1) He intentionally tries to frighten the bhikkhu (IV 115,3-5)

a) Whether the bhikkhu is frightened or not is irrelevant (IV 114,23+25)

Pacittiya 56

If a bhikkhu who is not ill causes a fire to be lit to warm himself, except if there is an appropriate reason, he incurs a pacittiya.

III:

1) He is not comfortable without the heat from the fire (IV 116,11-12)

Causes a fire to be lit:

2) He either lights it himself or gets someone else to do it (IV 116,15-16)

An appropriate reason:

3) Any suitable reason, except warming oneself when not ill (IV 116,25-27)

Pacittiya 57

If a bhikkhu bathes more than once a fortnight, except during the last month-and-a-half of the hot season, or the first month of the rainy season, or at a time of illness, work, travel, or wind or rain, he incurs a pacittiya.

Bathes:

1) A bath that includes the use of a cleaning agent (IV 119,12)

Illness:

2) He is not comfortable without a bath (IV 119,17-18)

Work:

3) Even just sweeping (IV 119,19)

Travel:

4) Before, during, or after a trip of a least 8 kilometres (IV 119,20-22)

Wind:

5) A dusty wind (IV 119,22-23)

Rain:

6) Even just two drops hitting his body (IV 119,23-24)

He incurs a pacittiya:

7) Except in any area outside the Ganges plain (IV 119,33-34)

Note on Rule Translation

I have rendered gilana-samayo simply as “illness”; samayo does not seem to add anything not already captured by just “illness”.

Pacittiya 58

If a bhikkhu acquires a new robe and then wears it without first staining it with either green, blue, brown, grey, or black, he incurs a pacittiya.

New:

1) Previously unmarked (IV 120,26)

Staining:

2) Even with a stain as small as the tip of a blade of grass (IV 120,29)

Green, blue, brown, grey, or black:

3) Includes all shades (???)

He incurs a pacittiya:

4) Except if the mark has worn away (IV 121,8)

“Robe” as in Pc.26.

Note on Rule Translation

The colour nila includes both blue and green. Kaddama is mud and would thus seem to include grey and brown.

Pacittiya 59

If a bhikkhu places a robe under shared ownership with a fellow monastic, and then uses it without it being relinquished, he incurs a pacittiya.

Places ... under shared ownership:

1) Asks a fellow monastic to share the ownership of the robe (IV 122,9-16)

A fellow monastic:

2) A bhikkhu, a bhikkhuni, a sikkhamana, a samanera, or a samaneri (IV 122,1-5)

Without it being relinquished:

3) He has not been given the robe nor been told he can take it on trust (IV 122,17-18)

“Robe” as in NP5.

Pacittiya 60

If a bhikkhu hides another bhikkhu’s bowl, robe, sitting-cloth, needle-case, or belt, even if just for fun, he incurs a pacittiya.

Hides:

1) He either hides it himself or gets someone else to do it (IV 123,25-27)

He incurs a pacittiya:

2) Except if he puts away a bowl that has not been properly put away (IV 122,3)

Pacittiya 61

If a bhikkhu intentionally kills a living being, he incurs a pacittiya.

Intentionally:

- 1) He is aiming to kill (IV 124,29 + 125,5-6)
- 2) He perceives it as a living being (IV 125,1)
- 3) It is a living being (IV 125,1)

A living being:

- 4) Any animal, excluding humans (IV 124,31)
 - a) At least large enough to be visible to the naked eye (Sp IV 864,31)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(5) Anything down to a bed-bug's egg (mankunabijake), according to the Samantapasadika. I understand this to mean any visible animal/insect.

Pacittiya 62

If a bhikkhu uses water that he knows contains living beings, he incurs a pacittiya.

Uses water that he knows contains living beings:

- 1) He uses the water knowing that the beings will die (IV 125,24-25)
- 2) The water actually contains living beings (IV 125,31)

“Living beings” as in Pc.20.

Pacittiya 63

If a bhikkhu pursues the reopening of a vinaya issue that he knows has been properly settled, he incurs a pacittiya.

Vinaya issue:

- 1) Any issue to be dealt with according to a procedure laid down by the Buddha (IV 126,22-23)

Properly settled:

- 2) Settled according to the procedure laid down by the Buddha (IV 126,20-21)

Pacittiya 64

If a bhikkhu conceals another bhikkhu's serious offence, he incurs a pacittiya.

Conceals:

- 1) He knows of another bhikkhu's serious offence and decides not to inform other bhikkhus (IV 128,3-5)
- 2) His aim is to protect the bhikkhu from being corrected by other bhikkhus (IV 128,3-5)

Serious offence:

- 3) The four parajikas and the thirteen sanghadisesas (IV 128,1-2)

Note on Rule Translation

I have not translated janam since this seems implied in "conceals"; that is, you can only conceal something that you know about.

Pacittiya 65

If a bhikkhu gives upasampada to a person that he knows is less than twenty years old, he incurs a pacittiya.

A bhikkhu:

1) The upajjhaya (IV 130,24)

Twenty years old:

2) From the time of the appearance of the rebirth-linking consciousness (Kkh 214,25)

He incurs a pacittiya:

3) He incurs the offence at the completion of the upasampada sanghakamma (IV 130,23-24)

Note on Rule Translation

I have not translated so ca puggalo anupasampanno te ca bhikkhu garayha, “that person is not admitted and those bhikkhus are blameworthy”. The latter half would seem to refer to the other monks that partake in the sanghakamma apart from the upajjhaya, and so says the Kankhavitarani. This is therefore not relevant for the pacittiya offence. The initial phrase, too, is not relevant to the incurring of a pacittiya, but relates to broader vinaya issues.

Pacittiya 66

If a bhikkhu, by appointment, travels on a country road with a company of travellers that he knows includes criminals, even if just between villages, he incurs a pacittiya.

By appointment:

1) Having made an arrangement with a fellow traveller prior to departure (IV 131,30-32)

“Travels” + “a country road” + “even if just between villages” as in Pc.27.

Pacittiya 67

If a bhikkhu, by appointment, travels on a country road with a woman, even if just between villages, he incurs a pacittiya.

By appointment:

1) Having made an arrangement with the woman prior to departure (IV 133,14-15)

“Travels” + “a country road” + “even if just between villages” as in Pc.27; “woman” as in Sg.3 (factor 4 only).

Pacittiya 68

If a bhikkhu says that those things declared as obstructions by the Blessed One are not actually obstructive, he should be admonished up to three times to make him give up that view. If he does not, he incurs a pacittiya.

Obstructions:

1) Sexual intercourse (Kkh 217,8-11)

If he does not:

2) If he does not give up his view before the end of the sanghakamma (IV 136,32)

He incurs a pacittiya:

3) He incurs a pacittiya at the end of the sanghakamma (IV 136,24-25)

“He should be admonished up to three times to make him stop” as in Sg.10.

Note on Rule Translation

The essence of this long rule can be captured quite succinctly in English. I therefore do not translate literally.

Commentary on Rule Factors

See comment on “He should be admonished up to three times to make him stop” at Sg.10.

Pacittiya 69

If a bhikkhu eats with, lives with, or shares accommodation with a bhikkhu that he knows holds such a view, he incurs a pacittiya.

Eats with:

1) Includes teaching the Dhamma to (IV 137,28-29)

Lives with:

2) Doing any sanghakamma with (IV 138,1-2)

Shares accommodation with:

3) Lies down at the same time in the same room with or, if there are no walls, under the same roof (IV 138,3-7)

Holds:

4) He has not relinquished the view (IV 137,28-29)

5) And he has been suspended by the sangha through sanghakamma (IV 137,27)

Such a view:

6) The view that those things declared as obstructions by the Buddha are not actually obstructive (IV 137,24-26)

Commentary on Rule Factors

The Pali word ekacchanna means “one cover”, and could in principle refer to either ceiling or roof. It seems more natural to me to understand it as “one ceiling”; otherwise one is not really sleeping together and one might not even know whether such a monk is sleeping under the same roof.

Pacittiya 70

If a bhikkhu supports, is attended on by, eats with, or shares accommodation with a novice that he knows has been expelled for saying that those things declared as obstructions by the Blessed One are not actually obstructive, he incurs a pacittiya.

Supports:

1) Gives him something or teaches him Dhamma (IV 140,13-14)

Is attended on by:

2) Accepts services from (IV 140,15-16)

Has been expelled:

3) Has been told to go away by at least two bhikkhus (IV 140,2-7)

a) In accordance with the procedure laid down in the Vibhanga (IV 140,11 + 139,21-31)

“Obstructions” as in Pc.68; “eats with” + “shares accommodation with” as in Pc.69.

Commentary on Rule Factors

It is not clear from either the Vibhanga or the commentaries how the expulsion is to be done. However, since the plural is consistently used, it seems that at least two bhikkhus together must perform it. This gives novices a certain level of protection in case of erratic behaviour by individual bhikkhus.

Pacittiya 71

If a bhikkhu, when legitimately corrected by bhikkhus, says that he will not train in that rule until he has consulted an experienced bhikkhu, he incurs a pacittiya.

Legitimately corrected:

1) Being rightly admonished in regard to a rule laid down by the Buddha (IV 141,27-28)

Says that he will not train in that rule until he has consulted an experienced bhikkhu:

2) He says this as a ploy to avoid having to keep the rule (IV 140,15-16)

Note on Rule Translation

“Legitimately” renders *sahadhammena*, which literally means “with the Dhamma” or “according to the Dhamma”. “Experienced” renders *byattam vinayadharam*, literally “a learned bearer of the Vinaya”. I have left out the last sentence, which is an admonition to bhikkhus in training to inquire into the training rules, since this does not have a direct bearing on the incurring of an offence.

Pacittiya 72

If a bhikkhu disparages the training rules, he incurs a pacittiya.

Disparages:

1) For example, by saying something to the effect that one or more rules are not worth keeping, or discouraging their study (IV 143,23-31)

The training rules:

2) Any rule in the patimokkha (IV 143,16-19)

Note on Rule Translation

The phrasing in the rule of how the disparaging takes place seems to be an example only. The incurring of the offence seems to be indicated by the last part of the rule, *sikkhapadavivannake*. I thus leave out the actual phrasing of the disparagement from the translation. This also means that the phrase “when the patimokkha is recited” (*patimokkhe uddisamane*) is irrelevant for the offence, and I have therefore left this out too.

Commentary on Rule Factors

That “training rule” (*sikkhapada*) is limited to the rules of the *patimokkha* seems clear from the phrasing of the rule itself. The rule states that, while the *patimokkha* is recited, one asks why the minor training rules are recited, thereby disparaging them. Thus “training rule” must refer specifically to the *patimokkha* rules.

Pacittiya 73

If a *bhikkhu* says that he did not know of a certain *patimokkha* rule, but other *bhikkhus* know that he has previously heard the *patimokkha* at least three times, they should charge him with deception, and that *bhikkhu* then incurs a *pacittiya*.

Says that he did not know of a certain *patimokkha* rule:

1) Having breached a rule, he desires to deceive others about it (IV 145,4-7 + 29)

They should charge him with deception:

2) They should charge him through a sanghakamma of one motion and one announcement (IV 145,9-19)

That bhikkhu then incurs a pacittiya:

3) Unless he gives up his deception before the end of the sanghakamma (IV 145,20-21)

Note on Rule Translation

Moha is often rendered “delusion”, but in the present context the offending bhikkhu is said “to desire to delude/deceive” (moHetukama), in which case “deception” seems more appropriate than “delusion”.

Also, in this rule the phrase anvaddhamasam patimokkhe uddissamane (“when the fortnightly patimokkha is being recited”) does not seem to affect the incurring of an offence and I have therefore left it out of the rule formulation in English. I have also left out the part of the rule that says the offending bhikkhu is not exempt from the rule he deceptively pleads ignorance about. This is certainly an important point of vinaya - i.e. that once one is a bhikkhu, one falls into an offence immediately upon breaking a rule, whether one knows about that rule or not, and regardless of any deception - but it does not affect the incurring of an offence under this rule.

The rule says “two or three times”, which I interpret to mean three, so as to give the offender the maximum benefit of the doubt.

Pacittiya 74

If a bhikkhu, out of anger, strikes another bhikkhu, he incurs a pacittiya.

Strikes another bhikkhu:

- 1) With any part of the body, with anything connected to the body, or by throwing (IV 146,18-19)
 - a) Even if just with a lotus leaf (IV 146,19)
- 2) Except with the purpose of freeing oneself when oppressed (IV 146,28)

Pacittiya 75

If a bhikkhu, out of anger, raises a hand against another bhikkhu, he incurs a pacittiya.

Raises a hand against:

- 1) Raises any part of the body or anything connected to the body (IV 147,19)
 - a) Even if just with a lotus leaf (IV 147,20)
- 2) Except with the purpose of freeing oneself when oppressed (IV 147,22-23)

Pacittiya 76

If a bhikkhu falsely accuses another bhikkhu of a sanghadisesa, he incurs a pacittiya.

Falsely:

- 1) Having no reason to think or suspect that the other bhikkhu has committed a sanghadisesa (IV 148,9)

Accuses:

- 2) He does it himself or gets someone else to do it (IV 148,11)
- 3) The other bhikkhu is accused face to face (III 164,17-19)
- 4) And he immediately understands the meaning (Kkh 225,1)

Commentary on Rule Factors

(2) This factor is imported from Sg.8, where the factor is explained in more detail.

(3) See explanation of Sg.3.

Pacittiya 77

If a bhikkhu intentionally makes another bhikkhu anxious, solely to make him uncomfortable, he incurs a pacittiya.

Solely to make him uncomfortable:

1) He has no other reason for making him anxious (IV 149,20-21)

Pacittiya 78

If a bhikkhu eavesdrops on bhikkhus who are disputing, he incurs a pacittiya.

Eavesdrops:

1) Listens in with the intention of rebuking or humiliating (IV 150,25-26)

Who are disputing:

2) Who are arguing about the Dhamma or in relation to Vinaya issues (IV 150,25-26)

Pacittiya 79

If a bhikkhu has given his consent for the sangha to perform legitimate sanghakamma, but he then criticizes the act, he incurs a pacittiya.

Legitimate sanghakamma:

1) Sanghakamma performed in accordance with the rules and procedures laid down in the vinaya (IV 152,9-12)

He incurs a pacittiya:

2) Except if the sanghakamma was invalid (IV 152,18 + 19-20)

3) Or he perceives it as invalid (IV 152,15-16)

Pacittiya 80

When a discussion is going on in the sangha, if a bhikkhu departs without first giving his consent, he incurs a pacittiya.

A discussion is going on in the sangha:

1) Either a discussion leading up to a sanghakamma or the sanghakamma itself (IV 153,12-14)

Departs:

2) He goes further than 1.25 meters from the assembly of bhikkhus (IV 153,17-18)

Without first giving his consent:

3) With the intention of invalidating or stopping a legitimate sanghakamma (IV 153,15-16)

“He incurs a pacittiya” as in Pc.79.

Pacittiya 81

If a bhikkhu, as part of a united sangha, gives away a robe, but then criticizes the act, he incurs a pacittiya.

A united sangha:

1) All the bhikkhus within the same sima that are of the same samvasa (IV 154,23-24)

He incurs a pacittiya:

2) Except if the sanghakamma was invalid (IV 155,18)

3) And he perceives it as invalid (IV 155,18)

“A robe” as in NP5.

Pacittiya 82

If a bhikkhu diverts to an individual an offering that he knows was intended for the sangha, he incurs a pacittiya.

Diverts to an individual:

1) Whatever he does that causes the donor to give the offering to an individual instead of the sangha (Kkh 239,1-2 + 141,23-24)

“An offering” as in NP30.

Pacittiya 83

If a bhikkhu, without first being announced, enters the room of a head-anointed khattiya king, when both the king and queen are present, he incurs a pacittiya.

Room:

1) Any room where a bed is prepared for the king (IV 160,27-28)

a) Including any outside sleeping place screened by a curtain or portable wall (IV 160,28)

Pacittiya 84

If a bhikkhu picks up, or gets someone to pick up, anything considered valuable, except in a monastery or a house, he incurs a pacittiya. In the case of the exception, he should put the valuable item aside for the owner to collect.

Picks up, or gets someone to pick up:

- 1) Except if the item is allowable (III 164,7)
- 2) And he takes it on trust, borrows it, or perceives it as abandoned (IV 164,7-8)

Anything considered valuable:

- 3) A possession generally considered valuable at that time and place (IV 163,20-23)

This is subdivided into unallowable and allowable valuables:

- a) Unallowable items are money, gold, silver and any kind of precious stone (IV 163,20-21)
- b) An allowable valuable is any valuable item that is not unallowable (IV 163,21-23)

In the case of the exception:

- 4) In the case of a bhikkhu picking up or having someone pick up a valuable in a monastery or a house for safekeeping (IV 163,15-17)

Commentary on Rule Factors:

- (2) It is clear from the non-offence clause in the Vibhanga that ratanasammata may be taken

on trust, borrowed or taken if discarded. It follows that ratanasammata is not by its nature unallowable for a bhikkhu.

(3) Since only ratanasammata may be taken on trust, borrowed or taken if discarded (and it is thus allowable for bhikkhus), it follows that ratana by its nature is allowable. Thus the distinction between allowable and unallowable valuables made here.

(3b) The Vibhanga definition of ratanasammata (paribhoga upabhoga) may give the impression that any type of goods is included here. But the word ratanasammata (“considered a jewel”) makes it quite clear that only valuable goods are meant.

Pacittiya 85

If a bhikkhu, without first taking leave of an available bhikkhu, enters an inhabited area at the wrong time, except due to urgency, he incurs a pacittiya.

The wrong time:

1) From midday to the following dawn (IV 166,17)

Except due to urgency:

2) Even the threat of rain (Sp 883,19-21)

He incurs a pacittiya:

3) Except if he is going to a monastery, to the residence of bhikkhunis, or to where sectarians are staying, or he is coming back from any of these (IV 166,30-31)

4) Or if the road he is travelling on happens to pass through an inhabited area (IV 166,31-32)

Pacittiya 86

If a bhikkhu makes a needle-case of bone, ivory, or horn, it is to be destroyed and he incurs a pacittiya.

Makes:

1) He either makes it himself or gets someone else to make it (IV 167,30)

2) For his own use (IV 167,31 + 168,2)

He incurs a pacittiya:

3) The offence is incurred when he receives the needle-case (IV 167,31)

Pacittiya 87

If a bhikkhu makes a bed or bench with legs longer than 16 cm, excluding the frame, then the legs are to be cut down and he incurs a pacittiya.

Makes:

- 1) He either makes it himself or gets someone else to make it (IV 168,32)
- 2) For his own use (IV 169,2-3 + 6)

Excluding the frame:

- 3) The height of the bed or bench can be no more than 16 cm from the floor to the bottom of the bed's frame (IV 168,33 - 169,1)

The legs are to be cut:

- 4) The legs are to be cut to the allowable length (IV 169,10)

He incurs a pacittiya:

- 5) The offence is incurred when he receives the bed or bench (IV 169,2-3)

Note on Rule Translation

“16 cm” is my rendering of atthangula(padakam) ... sugatangulena, lit. “(feet that are) eight

fingers ... of the sugata finger”. I here follow Ajahn Thanissaro who calculates the sugata finger as being just of 2 cm (see BMC I).

Commentary on Rule Factors

(4) The way chinditva is used in the anapatti clause shows that what is meant by this verb is the cutting of the legs. This seems to contradict the Kankhavitarani, which defines chedanakam as “destroyed”.

Pacittiya 88

If a bhikkhu makes a bed or bench with cotton-down upholstery, the upholstery is to be removed and he incurs a pacittiya.

Makes:

- 1) He either makes it himself or gets someone else to make it (IV 170,3)
- 2) For his own use (IV 170,4 + 6-7)

He incurs a pacittiya:

- 3) The offence is incurred when he receives the finished article (IV 170,4)

Pacittiya 89

If a bhikkhu makes a sitting-cloth that is larger than 87.5 cm by 75 cm, including a 25 cm border, it is to be cut down to size and he incurs a pacittiya.

“Makes” + “he incurs a pacittiya” as in Pc.88.

Note on Rule Translation

“87.5 cm by 75 cm” renders *dighaso dve vidatthiyo sugatavidatthiya tiriyaṃ diyaddham dasa vidatthi*, lit. “two hand-spans in length of the sugata hand-span, one-and-a-half across, (and) the border is a span”. Again, following Ajahn Thanissaro, I take the hand-span to be 25 cm. This means the core cloth is 50 cm by 37.5 cm and the border 25 cm wide. According to the *Kankhavitarani* there can be three borders (Kkh 245,14). If these borders are attached to make the cloth as square as possible, the size of the resulting sitting-cloth is 87.5 cm by 75 cm. Alternatively, if one disregards the commentary, one could argue from the *Vibhanga* that a border is allowed on each of the four sides. But this would be limited to one on each side since *dasa*, “border”, is in the singular. This interpretation would give a maximum size for the sitting cloth of 1 m by 87.5 cm.

Pacittiya 90

If a bhikkhu makes a cloth wound cover that is larger than 1 m by 50 cm, it is to be cut down to size and he incurs a pacittiya.

“Makes” + “he incurs a pacittiya” as in Pc.88.

Pacittiya 91

If a bhikkhu makes a rains cloth that is larger than 1.5 m by 62.5 cm, it is to be cut down to size and he incurs a pacittiya.

A rains cloth:

1) A cloth used for bathing in the rain during the rainy season (IV 173,1)

“Makes” + “he incurs a pacittiya” as in Pc.88.

Pacittiya 92

If a bhikkhu makes a robe that is larger than 2.25 m by 1.5 m, it is to be cut down to size and

he incurs a pacittiya.

“Makes” + “he incurs a pacittiya” as in Pc.88.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Parajika 1

Parajika 2

Parajika 3

Parajika 4

Sanghadisesa 1

Sanghadisesa 2

Sanghadisesa 3

Sanghadisesa 4

Sanghadisesa 5

Sanghadisesa 6

Sanghadisesa 7

Sanghadisesa 8

Sanghadisesa 9

Sanghadisesa 10

Sanghadisesa 11

Sanghadisesa 12

Sanghadisesa 13

Aniyata 1

Aniyata 2

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 1

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 2

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 3

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 4

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 5

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 6

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 7

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 8

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 9

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 10

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 11

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 12

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 13

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 14

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 15

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 16

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 17

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 18

Nissaggiya Pacittiya 19

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 20](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 21](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 22](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 23](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 24](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 25](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 26](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 27](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 28](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 29](#)

[Nissaggiya Pacittiya 30](#)

[Pacittiya 1](#)

[Pacittiya 11](#)

[Pacittiya 21](#)

[Pacittiya 31](#)

[Pacittiya 41](#)

[Pacittiya 51](#)

[Pacittiya 61](#)

[Pacittiya 71](#)

[Pacittiya 83](#)