

THE BOOK
OF THE DISCIPLINE

(VINAYA-PITAKA)

VOL. II
(SUTTAVIBHAṄGA)

TRANSLATED BY

I.B. HORNER, M.A.

FELLOW AND ASSOCIATE OF NEWNHAM COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

Published by
THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY
Oxford
2004

First published	1940
Reprinted	1969
Reprinted	1982
Reprinted	1993
Reprinted	1997
Reprinted	2004

This edition copyright Pali Text Society 2004

ISBN 0 86013 038 X

All rights reserved. Subject to statutory exceptions, no part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the Pali Text Society, 73 Lime Walk, Headington, Oxford, OX3 7AD, U.K.

Printed in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham, Wiltshire

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

THIS volume of the *Book of the Discipline* covers Oldenberg's edition of the *Vinaya-piṭaka*, vol. iii, p. 195, to vol. iv, p. 124, and thus comprises the thirty Nissaggiya rules and sixty of the ninety-two Pācittiya rules laid down for monks.

The actual rules, *sikkhāpada*, of the Pali Pātimokkha are accessible to English readers in Rhys Davids and Oldenberg's translation,¹ and translations even earlier.² They have also all been set out in full by B. C. Law,³ while E. J. Thomas⁴ has given some in their entirety and has summarised others, classifying these, under their appropriate sections, where affinities are visible. This is the first translation into English of these *sikkhāpadas* complete with their attendant material.

It has been truly and helpfully observed by the editors of *Vinaya Texts*⁵ that "inside each class (of offence) the sequence of the clauses⁶ follows no invariable rule. Sometimes offences of a related character are placed together in groups, but sometimes those which would naturally come together are found scattered in quite different parts of the same class." In addition, as Oldenberg has pointed out,⁷ "it not infrequently happens that a rule refers to the one immediately preceding it."

A considerable amount of work having been done on the Pātimokkha, it will be better in this Introduction

¹ *Vin. Texts* i. 1 ff., S.B.E. XIII.

² Dickson, *J.R.A.S.* 1876; Gogerly, *J.R.A.S.* 1862; R. Spence Hardy, *Eastern Monachism*, 1850, in various chapters.

³ *Hist. Pali Lit.* i. 50 ff., based on *Vin. Texts* i. 1 ff.

⁴ *Hist. Bud. Thought*, 16 ff.

⁵ *Vin. Texts* i. xiv.

⁶ I.e., rule, ordinance, *sutta*, *dhamma*, clause or article.

⁷ *Vinaya-piṭaka*, i. xvii.

not to enlarge upon rules, grouping of rules or sporadic appearance of rules, but to confine myself mainly to various findings arising from a study of the auxiliary material—stories, Old Commentary and *anāpatti* (no offence) clauses—surrounding each rule.

Some of these Pātimokkha rules, when read in conjunction with their attendant material, testify that, although the legal decree and the penalty for its infringement may be the culminating point, there was also a softening influence at work. For the not altogether infrequent *anujānāmi* ("I allow") allowances, always put into the mouth of Gotama, tend to counteract any too great stringency, inexpediency or lack of clarity on the side of which the *sikkhāpada*, as first framed, may have erred.

Doubtless the *sikkhāpadas*, if isolated from their surrounding matter and viewed either as extracts from this or as the foundations on which it was later reared,¹ may be said to amount to not much more than a series of prohibitions. But on those occasions when an *anujānāmi* is present in the auxiliary material, then *anujānāmi* and *sikkhāpada*, allowance and rule, taken in association as they are intended to be, produce a balance, a middle way between the two extremes of uncompromising legal ordinance and unchecked laxity of behaviour. On such occasions the *anujānāmi* pulls against the rule, and appears as an event potent in its effect on the character of the rule, no less than on the history of its formulation.

The Nissaggiyas and Pācittiyas are arranged on the same general plan that the Suttavibhaṅga follows throughout. This comprises a story leading up to the formulation of a rule, *sikkhāpada*, which is laid down together with the penalty for breaking it. In some cases there follow one or more other stories showing that it was advisable to remodel the rule, and at whose conclusion the amended version of the rule is given. Next comes the Old Commentary or Padabhājanīya,

¹ *B.D.* i. xiv f.

defining the words of the rule; then cases where the penalty for breaking the rule or some lighter (never heavier) penalty is incurred; and finally, a list of cases which entail no offence against the rule.

THE NISSAGGIYA GROUP

Each of the thirty Nissaggiya rules for monks has, as the penalty for breaking it, expiation of the offence, *pācittiya*, involving forfeiture, *nissaggiya*. This penalty is stated in the words *nissaggiyam pācittiyam*, "(an offence) involving forfeiture, to be expiated." The forfeiture enjoined is that in respect of which the offence had been committed, for example a robe or bowl or rug. These rules are concerned both with behaviour as such and with the wrongful acquisition or unsuitable usage of things.

The form of expiation enjoined by the Old Commentary is confession¹ of the offence of wrongful acquisition. From internal evidence, *pācittiya* is a (minor) offence to be confessed, *āpatti desetabbā*, a statement common to all the Nissaggiyas. But etymologically the word *pācittiya* has nothing to do with confession. I have therefore kept to the more literal translation,² and have rendered it "offence of expiation" throughout, and the two words *nissaggiya pācittiya* as "offence of expiation involving forfeiture." According to the Old Commentary, "having forfeited (the article), the offence should be confessed." Thus the act of forfeiture should precede the expiation or confession. I will say something more below about the method in which forfeiture should be made.³

In history, the place at which an event is said to have taken place is often of some importance. It is well known that Gotama spent the greater part of his teaching life at Sāvattihī and his last years at Vesālī. It is worth recalling, for the evidence contributed, that Sāvattihī,

¹ Cf. S. Dutt, *Early Bud. Monachism*, p. 104 ff.

² See below, p. 3, n. 4.

³ Below, p. xii.

with an overwhelming majority, is given as the locus of twenty-two Nissaggiyas, Rājagaha of three, Vesālī and Kapilavatthu each of two, Ālavī of one.

As many as sixteen Nissaggiya rules for monks are concerned with robes, and fall into two groups, Nos. I-X, XXIV-XXIX; five with rugs (*santhata*), Nos. XI-XV; two with sheep's wool, Nos. XVI, XVII; three with gold and silver and bartering, Nos. XVIII-XX; two with bowls, Nos. XXI, XXII; one with medicine, No. XXIII; and the last one, No. XXX, is against a monk appropriating for his own use benefits intended for the Order. There are, moreover, a few cross-sections. For example, in the matter of exchange of robes (No. V), in the matter of washing, dyeing and beating robes (No. IV), and in the matter of washing, dyeing and beating sheep's wool (No. XVII), the correct behaviour for a monk to observe towards a nun also comes under legislation; and in two of the rules connected with making rugs, sheep's wool is also the subject of legal attention.

Oddly, there is no Nissaggiya concerned with either lodgings or bedding, *senāsana*, or with almsfood, *pin-dapāta*, which with robes and medicine are regarded as a monk's four indispensable requisites. There are offences regarding these which had to be confessed, and which occur in the Pācittiya section of the Pātimokkha, but evidently there are no types of offences where lodgings and almsfood had to be forfeited, in addition to their wrongful acquisition or usage being confessed.

About half the rules were formulated because the monks acquired something by means considered unbecoming, tiresome or inconvenient: they asked for too much, they pressed potential donors, for example as to the quality of the robe-material they particularly desired. The remaining half were formulated because monks did various things or used various articles in ways thought unsuitable: they had an unnecessary amount of robes or bowls, they laid aside their robes for too long, they made nuns wash their robes or their sheep's wool for them, and they carried sheep's wool so far that the laity made fun of them.

The formulation of the majority, namely of sixteen Nissaggiya rules, resulted, so it is recorded, from criticisms made of a monk or monks by the laity; eight from criticisms made by modest monks, three from those made by nuns, two from those made by Ānanda, and one from those made by a wanderer. With the exception of Ānanda, who complained for the sake of the Order, and not because he himself had been specially inconvenienced, these various classes of critics put forward their complaints because they personally had been in some way adversely affected by the monks' behaviour. Thus there is a parallelism between the sources of criticism and the sections of society annoyed. Once Gotama is recorded to have heard of troublesome behaviour direct from Mahāpajāpatī while he was talking to her (No. XVII), and once he came upon signs of it himself (No. XV). Four times a new rule is framed in place of one already existing, for occasions afterwards arose which showed that its scrupulous observance resulted in unfair situations.

It will be seen that the number of Nissaggiya rules formulated according to this reckoning is thirty-six. This means that six times the rule as originally framed had to be altered: four times, as mentioned above, in accordance with circumstances that had not been foreseen when it was first set forth (Nos. I, II, XIV, XXI), and twice when close adherence to the rule as first drafted is shown to result in occurrences so unsuitable as to provoke complaints and criticism (Nos. V, VI).

These Nissaggiyas where the rule had to be altered, although never more than once, thus contain two stories, one leading up to the first, and the other to the second version of the rule. The second version must be taken to annul the validity of the first. This however had to remain in the text for the sake of historical interest, and as to some extent explanatory of the force and wisdom of the second version. Had it been omitted, the incidents showing its shortcomings and its need for revision could not have been used as testimony that

such shortcomings were remediable and such revision necessary and reasonable.

In these six Nissaggiyas where a rule is formulated twice, the first version is always followed by the phrase, "And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord." There is no instance of this phrase occurring either after the second formulation of the rule, or in any of the remaining twenty-four Nissaggiyas where the rule is framed once only.

Yet in the text of the *Vinaya* is every rule, whether it had to be revised or not, and every amended rule, ascribed to Gotama. The formula so very definitely attributing "to the lord" only those rules that had to be altered is to my mind somewhat inexplicable. It is not peculiar to the Nissaggiyas, but occurs throughout the *Vibhaṅga*. It is possible that the occurrence of this phrase points to some comparatively old stratum in the *Suttavibhaṅga*, where only those rules, so pointedly said to have been laid down "by the lord," were genuinely prescribed by him; but that then there came a case, perhaps before, perhaps after his death, which made it clear that a revision and a more exact delimitation of the rule already formulated was wanted in the interests of reason, decency or justice.

Such revision may then in fact have been made, not by the founder, but by one of his followers or by the *saṅgha*. Or a decision may have been taken at the final recension of the "texts" to attribute all rules to the lord, so as to invest them with his authority. Even so, the mystery remains why this phrase, "And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord," was appended only to those rules which, as the history of the Order shows, had to be altered, and not to those whose original version has been able to stand and operate down the centuries.

It is something more than coincidence, and looks like adherence to some thought-out pattern, that in the six Nissaggiyas where a rule is twice formulated there should occur, after its first formulation, this phrase ascribing its setting forth "to the lord," and before its second

formulation an *anujānāmi*, an "allowance." In each case the *anujānāmi* occurs in the talk which, before the rule was revised, is reputed to have been given by Gotama to monks. Its effect is not to tighten but to mitigate the force and application of the rule as first drawn up. An *anujānāmi* however also occurs in five of the remaining twenty-four Nissaggiyas (Nos. III, XV, XXII, XXVIII, XXIX), not immediately before, but some way before the rule, here of course formulated only once.

In the Nissaggiya group of rules, there occurs the formulation of four *dukkata* offences, those of wrongdoing. Each of these is ascribed to Gotama. Many others appear in the material placed after the Old Commentary, but it is not said of these that he was the author.

Most rare it is to find, as in Nissag. I and XXI, which have several other points in common, a short story leading up to the drafting of an offence of wrongdoing placed *after* the *anapātti* (no offence) clauses.¹ As would be expected, the story and the offence are pertinent to the matter in hand.

In Nissag. VI the *anujānāmi*, which is unusually long, ends, exceptionally for the Nissaggiya section, in the formulation of a *dukkata* offence. It immediately precedes the second drafting of the rule.

In Nissag. XXII, which because of some peculiarities that it contains I shall discuss more fully below, the first story introduces, not a *nissaggiya pācittiya* offence, but one of wrongdoing.

The occurrence of *dukkata* offences in Nis. VI and XXII before the final formulation of the rule, no less than their ascription to the lord, should correct the impression given at *Vinaya Texts* i. xxv that the term *dukkata* "occurs only in . . . the latest portion of the Piṭaka," that is in "the Notes giving the exceptions to, and the extensions of the Rule in the Pātimokkha" (*ibid.*, p. xix), which are always placed after the Old Commentary.

¹ Similarly at Bhikkhuni Nissaggiya I.

As a general rule, the Padabhājanīya states that forfeiture and confession were to be made to an Order, that is to any part of the whole Order, five monks or more,¹ living within one boundary, *sīmā*, or within one residence, *āvāsa*; or to a group, *gaṇa*,² of monks, that is to a group of from two to four monks; or to an individual monk. When the article had been forfeited and the offence confessed, the offence was to be acknowledged, in the first two instances, by "an experienced, competent monk"; in the third by the monk to whom the forfeiture and confession had been made. The forfeited article was then to be given back to the monk who, having acquired it wrongfully, had forfeited it.

The value of the *nissaggiya pācittiya* type of penalty was, I think, in the eyes of the framer or framers of the Pātimokkha rules, its deterrent effect on the commission of further similar offences, and its redemptive power for each particular offender. It was apparently held that an offence whose penalty was of this nature was annulled by confessing it and having it acknowledged, combined with this hardly more than symbolic act of forfeiting the article wrongfully acquired. This involved some formality, but evidently the offence was not considered bad enough to warrant the offender's permanent loss of the goods he had obtained improperly.

Thus it is only true that "rules were required to prevent his (*i.e.*, a monk's) acquiring a store of property,"³ on the assumption that these rules were deterrent and preventive and not retributive and revengeful. More important is it perhaps to realise that, behind this statutory limiting of possessions, there was the conviction that greed, craving, thirst, *taṇhā*, themselves undesirable, produced further undesirable states of mind.

It is true that any great emphasis on the monastic ideal, any clear expression of it, is lacking in the *Vinaya*, and is to be found almost exclusively in the *Suttapīṭaka*.

¹ Sizes of a *saṅgha*, order, are given at *Vin.* i. 319.

² In the Old Commentary, the phrase *sambahulā bhikkhū* also occurs, and appears often to be a synonym for *gaṇa*. See below, pp. 7, 8.

³ E. J. Thomas, *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 19.

The rules were probably, like the Rule of St. Benedict, to help the beginners, the backsliders, in their struggle towards "the lofty heights of virtue" and wisdom. Yet there is one notable occasion, in Nissaggiya XVII, when we are reminded of the end, the ideal, the thing sought, to which the *Vinaya* rules must be held to constitute a means of realisation. This is when the lord is shown as asking Mahāpajāpati whether the nuns are "zealous, ardent, with a self that is striving," a triad of words belonging to Sutta material. To which she answers that while monks make them wash their sheep's wool for them, it is impossible for nuns to attend to "the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher wisdom," also a Sutta triad.

Conquest in this age-old struggle on the part of certain women to escape the ties of domesticity so as to seek the "further shore" is happily expressed in verses ascribed to Sumangala's mother:¹

"O woman well set free! how free am I,
How thoroughly free from kitchen drudgery!
Me stained and squalid 'mong my cooking-pots,
My brutal husband ranked as even less
Than the sunshades he sits and weaves away."

Yet although references to the need for ideals and their value, and for man's inner spiritual and mental training and the means of attaining these, may be practically absent from the *Vinaya*, there is no doubt that its legal and somewhat austere character is based on a high and mature standard of morality, justice and commonsense.

There are three exceptions to the Nissaggiyas' customary insistence on the return of the forfeited article to the monk who had come by it unlawfully, and had forfeited it, only to be given it back again. And there are three exceptions to their usual instruction that forfeiture and confession are to be made to an Order or to a group or to an individual monk. The same three

¹ Thig. 23.

Nissaggiyas, Nos. XVIII, XIX, XXII, share both these irregularities.

Nissaggiyas XVIII and XIX are both concerned with gold and silver, called *jātarūparajata*¹ in the one case, and *rūpiya*¹ in the other. The Old Commentary on these Nissaggiyas requires a monk who has picked up gold and silver (No. XVIII), or who has entered into various transactions in which they are used (No. XIX), to make forfeiture in the midst of the Order, *saṅghamañjhe*. It does not give the usual alternatives of forfeiting to a group or an individual. That these commodities may not be forfeited to either of these parties is precluded by the rule of Nissaggiya XVIII itself, for this lays it down as an offence for a monk to have gold and silver in his possession. The *saṅgha* is more impersonal, and is, when need arises, a body of monks in their official character, with the functions of discharging legal and juridical business and of carrying out formal acts.

But although the *saṅgha* may receive the forfeited gold and silver, it may neither retain them nor return them to the monk who forfeited them. It must either hand them over to some lay person, asking him to bring medicines in exchange, or, failing this, the Order must appoint from among its number a "silver-remover," *rūpiyachaddaka*, whose office it is to dispose of whatever mediums of exchange *rūpiya* and *jātarūparajata* denote.

Of the various objects with which the rules of the Nissaggiyas are concerned, gold and silver are the only ones which a monk might in no circumstances have in his possession. Clearly he had access to them, for his association with the laity was but little restricted.

Similarly Nissaggiya XXII, besides precluding forfeiture and confession to either a group or an individual, also debars the return of the forfeited article, here a bowl, to the monk who forfeited it. But he is to be given another bowl in its place. This is unique in the Nissaggiyas. It is also unique to find given in the rule itself the method of forfeiture. This is otherwise in-

¹ On these terms see below, p. 100, n. 2.

variably, and solely, found in the Old Commentary. Here the method of forfeiture enjoined in the rule appears again, though in more detailed form, in the Old Commentary.

The *sikkhāpada* of Nissaggiya XXII, after stating that a monk who, getting another new bowl in exchange for a bowl mended in less than five places, incurs an offence, proceeds to say: "That bowl must be forfeited by that (offending) monk to a *bhikkhuparisā* (company, assembly, congregation of monks). And whatever is the last bowl (*pattapariyanta*) belonging to that company of monks, it should be given to that monk, with the words, 'Monk, this is a bowl for you; it should be kept until it breaks.'"

It is interesting to find that the new bowl got in exchange for the mended bowl is subject to forfeiture only to the Order. This suggests that bowls were regarded at some time as more especially communal property than were robes,¹ or the other objects in regard to which a monk might commit an offence involving forfeiture. Yet in Nissaggiya XXI, an extra bowl, if it had been used for more than ten days, might be forfeited either to an Order or to a group or to an individual. Nevertheless the injunction which occurs at the end of the *sikkhāpada* of Nissaggiya XXII reveals a closer concern for communal ownership and property than do the other Nissaggiya *sikkhāpadas*. In these others, although the Order, or a section of it, may receive the forfeited article, it also, with the exception of Nos. XVIII and XIX, returns it, the community as a whole assuming no further responsibility.

At the end of Nissaggiya XXI, it is said that failure to give back a bowl that had been forfeited entails a *dukkata* offence.² Yet in Nissaggiya XXII it appears

¹ On a monk's death, his robes did not necessarily return to the Order. He could bequeath them to the monk who had nursed him or to a pupil. Moreover, robe-material might be presented to individual monks, if the laity so wished. See Nissag. VIII, IX, X.

² Cf. end of Nis. I, where same offence incurred by failure to give back a robe.

that a bowl on being forfeited becomes an extra bowl for a company of monks and is absorbed into their stock of bowls. The result of an Order's obtaining an additional bowl in this way is that all its members are liable to profit. For their bowls, on the accretion of this extra one, may all be shuffled round. But this is not to be done haphazard. The rule has given concise directions for the right procedure, and these are followed and expanded at some length by the Old Commentary.

There is a still further way in which Nissaggiya XXII is unique among the Nissaggiyas. It contains three stories instead of, as is normal, one, or, as in six cases, two. This means that a chain of three connected circumstances have arisen, each of which demands jurisdiction. The curious thing is, that the first story does not end with the formulation of a *nissaggiya pācittiya* offence, but with that of an offence of wrongdoing. This is to the effect that a monk must not ask for a bowl. But monks observed this precept too scrupulously. Lay people complained that, by receiving almsfood into their hands, they resembled members of other sects. So Gotama, it is said, made an "allowance" moderating the *dukkata* rule, and permitting monks to ask for a bowl when theirs were broken or destroyed. But because the six monks abused this privilege, the *nissaggiya pācittiya* rule was formulated.

I have dwelt on Nissaggiya XXII at some length, for I think that, even as there are some grounds for holding that Saṅghādisesa XII may represent some specially ancient fragment of the Pātimokkha,¹ so likewise may this Nissaggiya.

In the first place, the term *bhikkhuparisā*, because it merely indicates an assembly, a company of monks, may belong to those earlier days before Gotama's followers were fully organised into a *saṅgha*, bound by the same observances and obligations, the same rules and (formal) acts, and living in the same communion.

¹ See *B.D.* i. xxviii f.

It is possible that, in such a context, *bhikkhu* did not mean all that at some time it came to mean. Secondly, the mention of this "company of monks" as the recipient body of a forfeited bowl may point to a time when communal ownership was more actual than nominal. Thirdly, the need for stating, in the *nissaggiya pācittiya* rule itself, that the article wrongfully acquired must be forfeited, suggests that this rule antedates the other Nissaggiyas, and belongs to a time when forfeiture was new as a penalty, and when therefore the method of carrying it out had to be plainly stated. Fourthly, one might suppose that the first story in this Nissaggiya purports to be recounting unsuitable behaviour in an early follower of Gotama. For the early followers, it may be presumed, entering from a more urgent sense of religion, committed less serious offences than the later, and hence incurred lighter penalties.

The appointment of two officials is mentioned in the Nissaggiyas, that of silver-remover (No. XVIII) and that of assigner of bowls (No. XXII). The duty of both is to deal with the results of offences, and not with the distribution of articles, such as robes and lodgings, lawfully acquired. Appointments of officials were not of one officer for the whole *saṅgha*, but of an officer for any of those lesser sections of it which, dwelling within one boundary or residence, were, to the not negligible confusion of later historians, also called *saṅgha*. Even so, we do not know whether each of these *saṅghas* always appointed every possible official, ready to function—and a not inconsiderable number are named throughout the *Vinaya*—or if only those were appointed when occasion demanded their service. Nor do we know whether an official, once appointed, held his post permanently or temporarily.

I think it fairly safe to presume the latter. Monks travelled a great deal on the one hand, and on the other had to spend the three or four months of the rains in one residence with other monks. Had two permanent office-bearers met, and a case within their orbit arisen, a ruling would have been necessary as to which one,

such as the senior or the one first arrived, was to deal with the situation. But there is no record of any such event.

It seems more likely, and the internal evidence, such as it is, points this way, that the authorised procedure for appointing the officials was prescribed as the need for this or that official was felt. Thus a similar appointment could be correctly made if and when future need arose. But if there was, for example, no occasion for a silver-remover or an assigner of bowls, which could only be because no monk had acquired gold and silver or a new bowl in exchange for one mended in less than five places, then there was no obligation to appoint a monk to fill either of these offices.

The procedure for the appointment of the officials is in each case much the same; and they have to be "agreed upon" by the entire Order affected. This well illustrates the democratic nature of the monastic institution. Two other "agreements of the monks," *bhikkhusammuti*, are described in the Nissaggiyas (Nos. II, XIV), and again the responsibility for making the required agreement is shown to be vested in the whole organism, and not in any one of its members.

Some English translations of Pali words and phrases appear to have become almost traditional by now, and hence attract little critical attention. Such a phrase is *pattacivaraṃ ādāya*, "taking the bowl and robe." It is the occurrence of this phrase in Nissaggiya V, together with the mention of various sorts of robes, that has raised the question of which robe it is that is here referred to in the phrase.

Dialogues ii. 162, n. 1, describes the three usual robes of a monk as the inner one worn in the residence, the upper robe put on before a monk left the monastery and went out to a village, and the outer cloak carried, and put on near the outskirts of the village. If this is a correct interpretation—and it is the one generally accepted—the phrase *pubbanhasamayam nivāsetvā* would appear to mean, "having dressed in the morning in the

upper robe." This implies that the monk will already have put on his inner robe to wear in the residence, if indeed he had not slept in it, but later put on his upper robe with a view to going on his almsround. Again, the phrase *pattacivaraṃ ādāya*, which as a rule immediately follows this other one, would in effect mean, "taking the outer cloak and the bowl." I think it possible however that if the *civara* of this phrase did at some time come to refer exclusively to the *saṅghāṭi*, the outer cloak, it may not always have done so. For it is hard to see the sense that such an interpretation could make in Nissaggiya V, as I hope to show. On the other hand, the occurrence of the phrase here may be due to some later editorial addition to the story.

The nun Uppalavaṇṇā is elsewhere in the *Vinaya*¹ the focus of an alteration in the rules on jungle-dwelling for nuns. Here too another episode in her life, as this is recorded in Nissaggiya V, is the centre round which turn some intricate questions with regard to robes.

According to this Nissaggiya, Uppalavaṇṇā, in the stereotyped phrase, "having dressed in the morning and taking her bowl and robe," *pubbanhasamayam nivāsetvā pattacivaraṃ ādāya*, had gone to Sāvattthī for almsfood. She had then used her upper robe, *uttarā-saṅga*, to tie up some meat. She next gave her inner robe, *antaravāsaka*, to the monk Udāyin, although protesting that it was her last, her fifth robe, *idaṅ ca me antimam pañcimam civaraṃ*. And finally it is said that on her return to the nunnery, the nuns receiving from her her bowl and robe, *pattacivaraṃ paṭiganhantiyo*, asked her where her inner robe was.

The question is, which of the five robes allowable to a nun did she set out "taking," and which did the nuns "receive" from her when she came back to the nunnery?

The five robes of a nun, mentioned also at *Vin.* iv. 218, 282, are named at *Vin.* ii. 272 as the three usual robes worn also by monks, with the addition of the vest or bodice, *samkacchika*, and the bathing-cloth, and

¹ *Vin.* iii. 35 ff.—*B.D.* i. 53 ff.

it is said that these should be pointed out to women wishing to receive the *upasampadā*. At *Vin.* iv. 345 it is laid down as an offence of expiation for a nun to enter a village without her bodice, that is without having this on under her inner robe. Bu. at *V.A.* 663 assumes that Uppalavanna had on her bodice, for he says, "dressed in (*nivattha*) her bodice, and showing only the palms of her hands . . . she went away," that is from Udāyin. We know that she had had her upper robe, and suspect that it was accounted for by the phrase, "having dressed in the morning." Likewise, on account of the phrase, "taking her bowl and robe," she should have had her outer cloak with her. But had she in fact had this, surely she would have put it on. Yet in the narrative of her meeting with Udāyin, there is no suggestion that she was either carrying it or wearing it.

Either therefore "having dressed in the morning" refers to putting on the *inner* robe, and "taking the bowl and robe" to the *upper* robe, and not to the *saṅghāṭi*, the outer cloak; or this latter phrase is some later interpolation.

Now at *Vin.* i. 298 it is a *dukkata* offence to enter a village wearing only the inner and the upper robes, that is without the outer cloak. This rule, be it noticed, was made in reference to monks, and I do not think that it applies to nuns.¹ For at *Vin.* iv. 281 it is a *pācittiya* offence for nuns, having laid aside the *cīvara*, here certainly the outer cloak, to go into the country for more than five days with only the inner and the upper robes. Therefore if, at the time to which Nissaggiya V purports to refer, a nun did *not* have to go into a village on her morning almsround taking her outer

¹ It is too facilely said by some writers that the *Vinaya* for nuns is a mere copy of that for monks—*e.g.*, H. Kern, *Man. Ind. Buddhism*, p. 86; though it is probable that the *Pātimokkha* of the nuns was "modelled on" that of the monks; *cf.* E. J. Thomas, *Hist. Ind. Thought*, 15, n. 1; M. Winternitz, *Hist. Ind. Lit.* ii. 24, speaking of it as "a similar code compiled later for the nuns"; Miss D. Bhagvat, *Early Bud. Jurisprudence*, p. 18, as a "mere imitation of the former"—*i.e.*, the *Bhikkhu-pātimokkha*.

cloak, Uppalavanna may have "taken" merely her upper robe. She would then have returned to the nunnery dressed only in her bodice, as Bu. seems to imply.

With the growing disparagement of nakedness in monks and nuns,¹ the robe the nuns "received" from her would hardly have been her bodice. Besides, this "receiving" of a bowl and robe from an incoming monk or nun came to be but a recognised, standardised act. It would thus appear possible that the discrepancy which exists may be attributable to a later interpolation of the phrase which denotes this act of respect done to a monk or nun on coming back to the residence.

If we allow that the phrase *pattacīvaraṃ ādāya*, of the beginning of the story, betrays neither the marks of interpolation nor of accredited meaning, but signifies taking the *upper* robe, then we are almost forced to see the phrase *pattacīvaraṃ paṭigaṇhantiyo*, towards the conclusion of the story, as some additional matter. For if the course of the story is carefully followed, it is impossible to identify these two *cīvara* the one with the other.

Thus an explanation of the discrepancy between whatever robes it was that these phrases are intended to signify is that this Nissaggiya has suffered some careless "editorial" gloss or glosses. The point itself may be small and of no particular importance. But every instance of perceptible "curling and combing"² of the texts must make us the more alive to the possibility of their patchwork nature, their composite "authorship," to their gradual alterations and additions, and probably to their losses too.

Having taken an instance of the translation of a frequent phrase, whose latent reference has been perhaps too little questioned, and hence too easily regarded as uniformly specific, I turn now to a word, *santhata*, and

¹ *Cf.* *Vin.* i. 292, 293, 305; iv. 278; and below, pp. 45, 134.

² A phrase I borrow from Mrs. Rhys Davids, "Poems by Monk and Nun," *Rev. of Religion*, January, 1940, p. 129.

the verb, *santharati* (= *saṃ + str*), of which it is the past participle. In this case it is owing to the comparative infrequency of these two words that their latent reference has been too little questioned on the one hand, but on the other not fully perceived to be specific.

In Nissaggiyas XI-XV, *santhata* occurs as a neuter noun,¹ meaning a rug or mat.² Because there are other words for rug, mat, carpet, ground-covering; sheet and so on, the problem before us is to find the differentiating feature peculiar to the kind of rug called *santhata*, the particular characteristic in virtue of which it was so named. For neither the Old Commentary nor Buddhaghosa describes the finished article; they concentrate instead on the process of making it. The result of the process is what in the text of the introductory stories and the *sikkhāpadas* is called a *santhata*.

The Old Commentary is very terse, but, by exclusion, informative: *santhata* means, what comes to be made having spread, not woven, *santharivā katam hoti avāyimaṃ*. Thus *santharivā* in this definition needs some word to be supplied as its object, such as one representing the material used in making the article by this process known as *santharati*. Bu., at V.A. 684, describes the technique of what the Old Commentary, in defining *santhata*, calls *santharivā*, by saying, "it is made having spread (*santharivā*) silk³ filaments (*aṃsu*) one upon the other on a level piece of ground, having poured boiled rice (or corn) and so on over the silk filaments."

This then is the kind of process meant by *santhata*,

¹ As p.p., see e.g. *D.* ii. 160, *Sn.* 401, 668; also the stock-phrase, *dhamani-santhata-gatta*, having the limbs strewn with veins. As a noun, *santhata* occurs only once elsewhere, *Vv.* 63, 5.

² *P.E.D.*, B. C. Law, *Hist. Pali Lit.* i. 53, "rug or mat"; E. J. Thomas, *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 19, "rug." *Vin. Texts* i. 24 translates "rug or mat" and "rug"; Huber, *J.As.*, 1913, p. 497, "couverture"; Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, p. 20, "mat."

³ "Silk" is not essential to the argument. This part of the Commentary is referring to Nissag. XI, where monks thought of making *santhata* mixed with silk. In Nissag. XII-XIV they were made of wool.

and it is the only one described. It seems that the basic material of which the article was being made was spread out in layers, in strata all running the same way, and not cross-wise so as to be woven, and that it was then somehow welded together by pouring boiling rice over it. The result of this operation was a *santhata*, a thing made by this process.

Childers defines the cognate noun, *santhāra*, as "layer, stratum"; and there are passages in the *Vinaya* and the Suttas¹ where *santharati*, used largely in connection with preparing a council-hall, must mean to spread or to strew most probably in layers, by a spreading method of layering. This, at all events, is the view held by the commentator² who describes the arrangement of covering the ground with cow-dung, scents, coloured mats, fleecy rugs, and skins of various animals, all one above (*upari*) the other. It is unfortunate that the commentator, in thus defining *santharivā*, more than once uses the word itself. In spite of this, the description is of inestimable help in arriving at a fuller understanding of what *santharati* implies.

If my hypothesis is correct, the cognate verb *attharati* (= *ā + str*) would denote the simpler act of spreading, covering, laying out, but not in layers, and as it were once only or one thing only, such as cloth (*Vin.* i. 254 ff.) or a bridge (*Jā.* i. 199). It would then follow that *santharati*, when used with reference to spreading a couch or chair or mattress or stool,³ must mean not simply the act of putting out the couch or chair unfurnished, but converting it into something fit to sit on or lie on. This could be done by spreading on it or under it different coverings, in layers: the sheet, *pac-cattharāna*, the ground-covering, *bhummattharāna*, for example. These coverings would in no way be held together as though woven, but would be spread one on top of the other.

For the translation of *santhata* in Nissaggiyas XI-XV

¹ *Vin.* i. 227; *D.* ii. 84, iii. 208; *Ud.* VIII. 6; *M.* i. 354.

² *MA.* iii. 18; *UdA.* 409.

³ See below, p. 238 f.

I have chosen "rug" in preference to "mat," because it seems desirable to convey the impression that a *santhata* was something that could both be sat on and also worn wrapped round the body. The Old Commentary on Nissaggiya XV defines *purāṇa-santhata*, an old, used or soiled *santhata*, in exactly the same terms as it uses to define *purāṇa-cīvara*, an old, used or soiled robe. Of both it says that they mean, "dressed in it once, put on once," using for this the words *nivāseti* and *pārupati*, which usually refer to the complete dressing in the monk's three robes. Bu. defines these words, "dressed in" and "put on," as "sat on" and "lain on" (VA. 687). Yet on the very same page he speaks of a *santhata* "counting as a fourth robe."

But for Bu. apparently these two definitions are not impossible of reconciliation. For in his exegesis on Nissaggiya IV he says (VA. 660) that a robe is called "old" (i.e., dressed in it once, put on once) if a monk lies on it, using it as a pillow. Thus a robe, meant to be worn, could also on occasion be used to lie on.

As the *Vinaya* itself provides no evidence as to what exactly *santhata* means, whether it is a rug or a mat, although it describes the process by which it is made, I have followed the commentator in regarding the article as something that could either be sat on or worn. "Rug" rather more accurately than "mat" seems to cover these two usages which, by the time of Buddhaghosa at any rate, appear to have grown into the meaning of *santhata*.

The *nisīdana-santhata* of Nissaggiya XV is not a species of *santhata*, but of *nisīdana*, and is a piece of cloth to sit upon (*nisīdana*) made with the addition of part of an old *santhata*. A *nisīdana* was so called if it had a border.¹ But the reason why a border came to be allowed, together with its correct measurements, is given at *Vin.* iv. 170 f., and has nothing to do with the need to add part of a *santhata* to a *nisīdana*.

¹ *Vin.* iii. 232, iv. 123, 171.

THE PĀCITTIYA GROUP (Nos. I-LX)

A curious feature of the Pācittiyas is that the Old Commentary on these rules nowhere explains what is meant by *pācittiya*, the offence which gives its name to this whole section. It is from the phrase *āpatti desetabbā*, occurring in the Vibhaṅga on each Nissaggiya, that we infer that *pācittiya* is an offence to be confessed; and even as forfeiture and confession are to be made to an Order or to a group or to an individual, so we may conclude that the same holds good when the offence is one whose penalty is merely that of expiation, of confession unaccompanied by forfeiture.

By and large each Pācittiya is composed on the same general lines as the other classes of rules in the Sutta-vibhaṅga: introductory story, rule, sometimes another story, even more than one, with the amended version or versions of the rule, Old Commentary, other exegetical material, and a list of no offences against the rule. There are, as in the Nissaggiyas, irregularities and variations from this customary pattern. These cannot be analysed until the translation of the ninety-two Pācittiyas is complete, and even then it will be doubtful whether they will throw any light on "the comparative age of any different parts of the Pātimokkha."¹

One thing however we can do now, and it is not altogether unimportant. We can correct the misapprehension into which the editors of *Vinaya Texts* fell, and which I,² among others,³ have hitherto followed too uncritically. For it is not quite the case that the Old Commentary is a "word for word commentary upon"⁴ each of these rules, although undoubtedly it is nearly so. Setting aside the occasions where words are defined by themselves, but nevertheless defined, there yet remain a few distinct but notable lapses and

¹ *Vin. Texts* i. xiv.

² *B.D.* i. xxxiii.

³ S. Dutt, *Early Bud. Monachism*, 91; M. Winternitz, *Hist. Ind. Lit.* ii. 24.

⁴ *Vin. Texts* i. xv.

omissions, some words of a rule not being commented upon at all. There is no attempt in the Old Commentary to explain "water (that) contains life" (Pāc. XX), "monk arrived first" (Pāc. XVI), or "in destruction of" (vegetable growth) (Pāc. XI), although in the last case the paragraph following the Old Commentary's definition of "vegetable growth" leads us to suppose that "destruction" means cutting, breaking and cooking.

Sāvathī, again with a large majority, is said to be the locus of thirty-nine of these sixty Pācittiyas, Rājagaha of six, Kosambī of five, Vesālī and Ālavī each of four, Kapilavatthu of two and Sumsumāragiri of one. The total of sixty-one is accounted for by the fact that, in Pāc. V, the first version of the rule is reputed to have been formulated when Gotama was at Ālavī, and the second when he had moved on from there to Kosambī.

The critics, as a result of whose complaints Pācittiya rules for monks were made or revised, are thirty-five times shown to have been the "modest monks," fifteen times "people," *manussa*, to which must be added the criticism of a lay-woman (Pāc. VII, both stories), of a man (Pāc. XLV), of a poor workman (Pāc. XXXIII), of Mahānāma Sakka (Pāc. XLVII), and of hirelings of the king (Pāc. LVIII). Four times the nuns complain, once the *titthiyas*, once a brahmin, once *upāsakā*, lay-followers.

These last, also, upon one occasion (Pāc. XLI) are recorded to have told Gotama how monks might avoid bringing discredit on themselves from members of other sects; he laid down a rule in accordance with their representations. Once King Pasenadi thought of a device by which Gotama might know that monks had been behaving indecorously (Pāc. LIII). Five times, it appears, Gotama discovered by direct observation or by questioning that legislation was required. By a too fastidious adherence to a rule, it is on several occasions demonstrated to be unsatisfactory, and is revised.

Thus the total number of rules appearing in these

Pācittiyas is greater than sixty. It is not uniformly the case, as in the Nissaggiya section, that when a rule is amended, it is amended once only. At least three of these sixty Pācittiyas provide evidence of a long struggle to get the rule right. In Pāc. XXXII the rule on a group-meal, *ganabhojana*, revised seven times, results finally in seven legalised exceptions being allowed to the offence, as it otherwise remains, of eating in a group. To the ruling on *paramparabhojana* (Pāc. XXXIII), eating meals out of the turns in which they have been offered, four exceptions are sanctioned. Thirdly, six exceptions are made to the rule that a monk should not bathe at intervals of less than half a month (Pāc. LVII).

A consideration of the reasons leading to the exceptions made to these, as to several other rules, reveals something of the care and vigilance needed for the smooth running of the Buddhist cenobium, impinging as it did on various elements and aspects of the society of the day. The laity were, on the one hand, not to be drained of their resources, on the other, not to be refused when they offered food, as this might result in wounding their spirit of generosity, in dashing their hope of merit, and in the loss to monks of the robe-material which the laity, at the right time of year, gave to members of the Orders with meals. Nor were the laity to be kept waiting. At least I think that that, as much as the discourtesy of refusing the offer, made to monks who were travelling, to "eat just here," and which looks as if the lay-people were willing to provide the meal, is at the root of two exceptions, made at Pāc. XXXIII. 5 and 6. For there are various times in Nissaggiya and Pācittiya when lay-people are recorded to be annoyed with monks for keeping them waiting.

At Pāc. XXXIII. 4 it is obvious that the assigning to another monk of a meal that is expected later is a device for overcoming the rudeness, otherwise involved, of refusing food that is actually being offered. Nor, so it emerges, is it polite to refuse an invitation given to

a meal by a wanderer, a *paribbājaka-samāpanna*. A naked ascetic, *ājīvaka*, had, as is stated, on Bimbisāra's advice, asked the monks to a meal with him, but they had refused (Pāc. XXXIII. 8).

Incidentally this story reveals the necessity for keeping the friendship of the kings, on whom the success of the Order largely depended. They did much to set the fashion in faith. I have mentioned Pasenadi's device for letting the lord know, but without himself speaking to him, that he had seen monks, *arahans* at that, sporting in the water. Mallikā, his queen, was of the opinion either that there was no rule against this, or that these monks did not know about it. Apparently her first surmise was right. The third mention of a king in these sixty Pācittiyas is again of Bimbisāra. Because monks, by bathing until after dark, kept him waiting his turn, for it appears that he did not wish to disturb them, a rule, severe compared with its cause, was formulated forbidding monks to bathe at intervals of less than half a month (Pāc. LVII). But this proved deleterious to robes and lodgings. For in the hot weather, the fever weather, at a time of wind and rain, when making repairs or going on a journey, monks lay down to rest with their limbs damp from rain or sweat. And the restriction on bathing was uncomfortable for those who were ill. This is a rule whose various adjustments are the direct outcome of a tropical climate.

I think that the growing needs of the monks, as expressed for example in the exceptions to Pāc. LVII, and also in the acquisition of more and more accessories, recounted principally in the *Mahāvagga*, does not necessarily indicate soft-living and greed on their part, but a desire to keep what they had properly and cleanly, to use it as efficiently as possible, and to keep themselves in a good state of health, for this was regarded as an essential basis for leading the higher life. Four great, perpetual and destructive enemies against which man has to fight in India are the heat of the sun, the damp of the rains, the strength of the winds blowing up dust and dirt, and the persistent ravages of insects. When

the *Vinaya* has been exhaustively studied, I believe it may as often as not be found that the desire and its sanction to acquire various objects in order to preserve others, or to lessen by making exceptions the constraint of some rules, will prove to be attributable to one or other of these forces of nature.

Illness, though not gone into in detail, is however kept in mind by the constant allusion to provisions made for the comfort of ill monks. Such provisions are usually contained in a *sikkhāpada*, or an *anujānāmi*, or both. The permission to bathe more often than once a fortnight is a case in point. Again, a monk, if ill, is allowed to eat more than one meal in succession at a public rest-house (Pāc. XXXI), to kindle a fire for warming himself (Pāc. LVI), and a nun who is ill may receive exhortation from a monk in the nunnery instead of going to the monk's quarters (Pāc. XXIII).

Of these sixty Pācittiya rules for monks, fifteen are devoted to rules for eating, Nos. XXIX, XXXI-XLIII, XLVI. None occur in Pāc. LXI-XCII. Since therefore all the Pācittiya ordinances falling under this head are contained in this volume, it is possible to allude to various points arising from them here; I have already drawn attention to some. Rules concerned with the exhortation of nuns are arranged exclusively in Pāc. XXI-XXIV, but as I have discussed these elsewhere,¹ I shall not do so again now. Rules regarding the army and, to all intents and purposes, robes come only within this volume. Other rules cannot be so profitably discussed until the Pācittiya translation is completed.

In these rules, which cannot always be fully understood unless read in conjunction alike with their introductory stories, the Old Commentary and the *anāpatti* clauses, much diverse and interesting material comes to light. It would be a long and delicate business to investigate all the ramifications, and to connect these with those other parts of the *Vinaya* to which they sometimes

¹ *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, p. 126 ff.

seem to refer. Merely to take two random examples from Pāc. XLVII. For understanding the definition of "time of giving robes" (=Pāc. XXXII), acquaintance with, for example, *MV.* vii is necessary. Again the fact that there is "no offence" if a monk is going to the nuns' quarters presupposes at least a knowledge of the Pācittiyas concerned with the exhortation of nuns.

The rules on eating are important for monks, for taking nothing but food given in alms involved a three-fold maintenance of a correct attitude: towards the laity, towards members of other sects, and towards fellow monks. The same applies to robes, where also a monk's behaviour towards a nun has to be taken into account. It might indeed be said that a monk's attitude towards eating and robes epitomises his whole attitude towards the society of the day.

The Pācittiyas on meals and eating would provide material for an extensive essay. I have already referred to the group-meal and the out-of-turn meal,¹ that is to two ways in which, leaving aside the exceptions, a meal might not be eaten. Here I shall do no more than note down some of the more outstanding words for various kinds of meals, that is for classes of food named. Notes will be found appended to these words where they appear in the text.

(1) The five kinds of meals, *pañca bhojanāni*, given in the Old Commentary on Pāc. XXXV as rice-gruel, food made with flour, barley, fish, meat, and mentioned in the *anāpatti* clauses of Pāc. XXIX, XXXI-XXXIII, are used in the Old Commentary on Pāc. XXXV to define "soft food," *bhojaniya*.

(2) "Solid food" is defined by exclusion. In Pāc. XXXV it is everything except the five soft foods and food that may be eaten during a watch of the night, during seven days and during life. These last three categories seem to refer solely to medicines. In Pāc. XLI solid food is everything but the five soft foods and water for cleansing the teeth.

¹ Above, p. xxvii.

(3) Five other classes of food are given in the *anāpatti* clauses of Pāc. XXXII, XXXIII, dependent on how and when given: the regular supply of food, that allowed by ticket, that given on a day of the waxing or waning of the moon, on an observance day, and on the day after this.

(4) Comparing the Old Commentary on Pāc. XXXV and XLII, it appears that *yāgu*, conje, ranks neither as a solid food nor as a soft food.

(5) In Pāc. XXXIX the five standard medicines, and meat and fish (two of the soft foods) with milk and curds are called "sumptuous foods," *panītabhojanāni*.

(6) Solid food or soft food that is not left over, *anatiritta*, and solid or soft food that is left over, *atiritta*, are mentioned in Pāc. XXXV.

There is nothing very special to say about the Pācittiya rules for robes. These receive a large share of legislation in the Nissaggiyas, and are given comparatively scant attention in the Pācittiyas. Their rules constitute two small groups: Nos. XXV, XXVI, LVIII-LX; again, but not in this volume, Nos. LXXIX and XCII.

A monk incurs an offence of expiation if he gives a robe to a nun who is not a relation, except in exchange (Pāc. XXV and *cf.* Nis. V). This rule was the outcome of generosity on a monk's part, not of greed. The first draft had to be revised because nuns were affronted that monks would not even exchange robes with them. Again, an offence is incurred (1) if a monk sews a robe for a nun who is not a relation (Pāc. XXVI)—the result of Udāyin's obscene design on a nun's robe; (2) if he does not use one of the three prescribed modes of disfiguring a new robe, apparently so as to be able to recognise it (Pāc. LVIII, and whose *anāpatti* clauses should be read in conjunction with *Vin.* i. 254, 255); (3) if he uses a robe after having assigned it to a member of any of the five classes of his co-religionists (Pāc. LIX), for clearly these must be able to rely on an assignment; and (4) if he hides a robe or a bowl or various other

specified requisites belonging to another monk (Pāc. LX). Pāc. LXXXI should be compared with Pāc. LIX. Pāc. XCII declares it an offence for a monk to have a robe made up to the measure of a Sugata's robe, or larger. It will be noticed that Pāc. XXV and LIX provide evidence that a monk had power to dispose of a robe in his possession, either by exchange or assignment, a point which wars against the view that the Order was the owner of the robes, even after they had been allotted or assigned to individual monks.

A set of three Pācittiya rules (Nos. XLVIII-L) came to be laid down for the conduct to be observed by monks in regard to an army. There is no blinking of facts, no pretence of ignoring the existence of armies as part of the structure of worldly life, either here or in various Sutta passages. Moreover, from the many military similes used to describe a man's (*puggala*, as at *A.* iii. 91 ff.) or a monk's (as at *A.* i. 184, ii. 116, 170, 202) successful mental purification and victorious spiritual battles, it is clear that fighting by kings, chieftains and soldiers, though never frankly condoned as in the *Gītā*, was yet on the whole not roundly censured. Two Sutta passages should however be specially remarked, the one in the *Samyutta*,¹ depicting the utter futility of war, for it settles nothing, does not stop the deed from rolling on; the other in the *Dhammapada*,² violently contrasting the use of force with the exercise of *dhamma*. *Dhamma*—conscience, duty, the moral "ought," the disciplinary rules, the body of teaching, and it has meant all of these—is arrayed against brute force. There is no doubt as to which is found the more fitting and the more admirable.

Even had not the intentional taking of life ranked as a Pārājika offence, there was yet the moral *sīla*, or principle, binding a monk to refrain from onslaught on creatures, and binding the laity too, but only on the fortnightly *uposatha* days. Thus, clearly, fighting by

¹ *S.* i. 85.

² *Dhp.* 256, 257.

monks was condemned, and Buddhist monks could not become soldiers. In this respect they differ widely from the Western monk of the Middle Ages, who saw nothing incongruous in taking up arms.

Further, as these Pācittiyas show, a monk's dealings with an army were, though not forbidden outright, reduced to the minimum. For, contrary to the view sometimes put forward that Gotama and his followers were breakers of homes, it is apparent here as elsewhere in the canon that his relations were by no means inaccessible to a man once he had turned monk.

In Pāc. XLVIII, a monk is allowed to go and see an army fighting, if there is sufficient reason. This exception is a generalisation from the particular instance of a monk's wish to visit a sick relation who was in the army. But, having gone to the army, a monk is not to stay there for more than three nights (Pāc. XLIX), nor while there to witness manœuvres: sham fights, troops in array, the massing of the army, reviews (Pāc. L). This is a group where the later "rule refers to the one immediately preceding it."¹

In all of these manœuvres the four "wings" of an army might participate: the elephants each requiring twelve men, the horses each with three men, the chariots each with four men, the infantry with (bows and) arrows.

In the *Jātaka* there is not infrequent reference to this fourfold composition of an army. But that it should be set down in considerable detail in the Old Commentary may be ascribed to the determination that, given lucid explanations, the monks should be in no doubt as to what was an army or part of one.

In each of these three monastic rules connected with an army, it is recorded that the laity, apparently a little stung by jealousy, complain of the monks' conduct. They realise that it is because of their own poor acquirement (*alābhā dulladdham* of good deeds) in the past that, in the present, they are brought into contact with fighting forces. The implication seems to be that for

¹ *Vin.* i. xvii.

a monk this should not be necessary or inevitable: being a monk he should be beyond the desire to witness fighting, real or sham, both because his *karma* in this respect should be worn away, and for fear lest he should engender a new bad *karma* for the future. In general terms it may be said that there is no offence if a monk sees an army or a conflict through no fault of his own, and not having gone of set purpose to see either the one or the other.

In their Introduction to *Vinaya Texts*,¹ Rhys Davids and Oldenberg have drawn attention to a curious irregularity in the method of framing some of the Pācittiya rules. In referring to the Pācittiyas and the apparent "effort to arrange the offences in groups (*vagga*) of ten," they raise the question of the three cases in which "we find regulations formulated with the utmost brevity (the offences being merely expressed by a locative case dependent upon *pācittiyam*) at the commencement of such a *vagga*." And they go on to say, "It seems to us, at least in the present state of our knowledge, quite impossible to draw any conclusions from such peculiarities as to the comparative age of any different parts of the Pātimokkha." Now since all the Pācittiyas referred to fall within this volume, I will attempt to discuss them, but without necessarily, since "the present state of our knowledge" is still defective, trying to arrive at any conclusion.²

They are Pāc. I-III, XI-XIII, LI-LIV. Any attempt to trace a cause for the peculiar way in which the rule in each of these Pācittiyas is framed must depend to some extent upon the nature of the material found within these same Pācittiyas. Nothing as yet can be suggested as to why they stand at the beginning of their respective *vaggas*. I would only point out,

¹ *Vin. Texts* i. xiv.

² There are also the seven concluding Pācittiyas, 86-92, where the offence of expiation involves, not *nissaggiya*, forfeiture, but some other penalty in respect of an article made of the wrong material or to the wrong measure.

first, that in the Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga there is one Pācittiya, No. IV, which is of this same brief type, but it does not head a *vagga*; and secondly, that the Bhikkhu-Pācittiyas Nos. LXXII, LXXIII, although not of the brief type yet conform to it to the extent that, after some introductory material included in the rule and leading up to the formulation of the offence, the offence itself is expressed by a locative case dependent on *pācittiyam*. These two rules do not head their division, and its first rule is framed in the normal manner.

Leaving Pācittiyas LXXII, LXXIII and Bhikkhunī-Pācittiya IV to one side, I will now summarise such outstanding features as are evinced by the three groups of rules which are "formulated with the utmost brevity," together with their attendant material.

(1) In Pāc. I, II, III (repeating II), XI, LIV, not only is the key-word or words (sometimes there are two) of the rule defined, but also the words used in such a definition are themselves defined. The definition of these words I believe not to belong to the original Old Commentary, but to a revised version of it. This is not however a point peculiar to these five Pācittiyas; for Pārājika IV and Pāc. X also define the words used in the definition of the words of the rule. To my mind such supplementary definitions portray a synthesis of thought, based on knowledge, which is far from primitive or tentative. Again, the very material of the rule of Pāc. XI, that it is an offence to destroy vegetable growth, may be compared with that of Pāc. X and XX, where it is an offence to dig the soil or to sprinkle water containing life. The sole purpose of all these three Pācittiyas is to preserve from harm creatures that are one-facultied. In this respect then Pāc. XI is not unique or peculiar. It may in addition be suitably compared with Pāc. X, as much for the similarity of guiding principle as for the defining of words used in definition.

The words used to define the definitions of the key-word of Pāc. II and III do not seem wholly contrived for monastic purposes. Why should "crafts," for example, be classified as "high and low" and then catalogued?

It was impossible for monks to follow any of the crafts mentioned. Such painstaking analysis of all the ten ways in which "insulting speech" and "slander" might be made seems to point to later days when classification and analysis had come to be in vogue.

(2) I suppose that in the introductory story of Pāc. II, the group of six monks when they jeered at the well-behaved monks about five out of ten things—birth, name, clan, work, craft—must have had in mind the social position and the occupation held by these while they were still "in the world." For all such considerations should count as nothing once a man had become a monk. The offence was summarised as one of "insulting speech," and not as one of probing into matters whose importance to monks should be infinitesimal. Nor can one say of Gotama's Order that, as time went on, such considerations came to be of account, or that the richer and better-born entrants came to hold the more influential positions. This has never been the case. The influence of the members has always depended on their mental and spiritual attainments alone, or on some gift of character. This backward view, if such it is meant to be, into a monk's past is unique in the Pācittiyas. But yet I cannot see that it affords any data for the comparative age of this Pācittiya.

(3) Pāc. II has a reference to *lekhā*. If this is writing, which, partly owing to the paucity of references alike to it and to writing-materials, is assumed to be an art of later discovery, then a clue is at once established for a comparatively late date of this Pācittiya, or at any rate of a portion of it; or to writing being less a "later discovery" than is hitherto assumed.

(4) Pāc. I contains a long and sophisticated analysis of the way in which an offence of expiation is incurred by the three and the seven ways of telling a conscious lie. This may be compared with the beginning of a similar analysis in Pārājika IV¹ of the incurment of an offence involving defeat by the three and the seven

¹ *Vin.* iii. 93 ff.=*B.D.* i. 162 ff.

ways of telling a conscious lie. The passage in Pārājika IV as it goes on is paralleled by a passage in Pāc. VIII. In both Pārājika IV on the one hand and Pāc. I and VIII on the other, this analysis with its very different style and terminology consorts strangely with the more archaic language and the more direct modes of thought that we usually associate with the *Vinaya*.

(5) Pāc. II and LI contain material belonging to *Jātaka* stories—but so does Pāc. V.

(6) As already noted, there is the failure of the Old Commentary on Pāc. XI to explain one of the two key-words of the rule: "in destruction of," *pātabyatāya*.

(7) Pāc. XII, with its mention in the introductory story of Channa, who, having indulged in bad habits, *anācāraṃ ācaritvā*, was being examined for an offence in the midst of the Order, to my mind brings the whole question of monastic disciplinary regulation a step later in time. For it points to a period when formal proceedings had been constituted, when faults were examined, not merely expiated by confession, and when there was an apparatus for dealing with, among many other transgressions, questions of failure in habit or conduct, *ācāravipatti*. These are set out in detail in *CV*, IV. This Pācittiya, in striking contrast to Saṅgh. XII, where again the same fault is imputed to Channa, seems to have been compiled in full cognisance of these later legal proceedings.

(8) Pāc. XIII appears to be recording an event later in time than that recorded in Saṅgh. VIII. In this latter, Dabba the Mallian is appointed, so it is said, to the double office of assigning lodgings and distributing meals. Between this and the compilation of the Pācittiya some time must have elapsed, since in the Pācittiya he is being accused of acting out of favouritism. The Old Commentary mentions a number of offices tenable by members of the Order, showing that it knew of the creation of these. It does not mention all. So far we know little of the chronology of these offices, but it is unlikely that they were formed during the earliest days of the Sakyan venture.

(9) Now, in Pārājika III, the gist of the offence lies in intentionally depriving a person of life. The case is cited, in the stories given *after* the formulation of the rule, of one monk tickling another, who laughed so much that he died. It is here not said openly that this constitutes an offence, merely that it is not one involving defeat, because his death was not caused intentionally. Either some need to clarify the nature of this offence must have grown up, for in Pāc. LII the same story is recounted and entails an offence of expiation; or the nature of the offence was decided contemporaneously with the Pārājika story, but, being *pācittiya*, was reserved for the Pācittiya group of rules and offences. If this is the case here, it is otherwise with Pārājika II. For this now and again states that an offence of deliberate lying may not be such as to constitute an offence of defeat, although it may be one involving expiation (*Vin.* iii. 59, 66).

(10) Pāc. LIII seems to offer little data as to its comparative age. It is unusual, however, in that no verbal reports of unsuitable behaviour are recorded to reach the lord. The framing of the rule is made to depend upon Pasenadi's belief that his "device" will arouse the required suspicions in Gotama's mind.

(11) The rule framed in Pāc. LIV, that "in disrespect there is an offence of expiation," is not unique. Three times a similar *pācittiya* offence is laid down at *Vin.* i. 176, in connection with the elaborate arrangements made there for holding the Pavāraṇā ceremony. Such Pācittiyas are therefore part and parcel of large-scale administration and regulation, such as could only be undertaken when the Order was comparatively advanced in age and stability. But who can say whether the rule at Pāc. LIV is based on these other *anādariye pācittiyas*, or they on it, or whether they are independent? All one can say is that it is not at all necessary to suppose that the bad habits that again Channa is recorded to have indulged in had anything to do with preparations for the Pavāraṇā.

For a long list of "bad habits," quite unconnected with this, is given at Saṅghādisesa XIII.

If the evidence of the Pācittiyas which are briefly stated and stand at the head of three only out of the eight divisions of which the Pācittiya section is composed, appears to be on the side of their comparative lateness, it must be not forgotten that the remaining Pācittiyas have never been subjected to any kind of critical examination. When this has been undertaken, it may be found that some of them also, although their rules are framed in the more normal manner, show similar or different signs of comparatively late construction. What I have done here is no more than to indicate possible lines which historical inquiry into the comparative age of different parts of the *Vinaya* might follow.

In discussing these "brief" Pācittiyas, I have had occasion to mention the overlapping of Pārājika and Pācittiya material. I have cited Pārājika IV and Pācittiya VIII, and these are also seen to work in with one another in a still further fashion. In the former it is an offence involving defeat for a monk, out of undue estimate for himself, to boast that he has attained some state of "further-men," when this is not a fact, *abhūta*. In the latter it is an offence of expiation for a monk to speak of attaining such a state to anyone not ordained, even though it be a fact, *bhūta*. In both cases the introductory story is identical up to this point, although Pār. IV, before the final draft of the rule, adds material not appearing in Pāc. VIII. This same long story with the two endings may in fact be the record of no more than one event, some monks averring that they had told a lie, others maintaining that they had told the truth. If so, Pār. IV and Pāc. VIII would belong to precisely the same date, suggesting that the two cases were legislated for simultaneously, although the two findings were relegated to different but appropriate parts of the Pātimokkha.

Judging by the great length of Pārājika IV, and the number of cases adduced and legislated for, the topic

was one that was at some time of immense importance.¹ It is not therefore surprising that it figures also in the Pācittiya section. It suggests, as does the substance of no other rules at all, the spiritual value attached to a man becoming something more and greater than he was before.

There are still further occasions when the contents of this volume refer to different portions of the *Vinaya* or are referred to by it. Under the latter heading come also certain allusions which are generally wrapped up in the phrase, *yathādhammo kāretabbo*, he should be dealt with according to the rule—that is, according to some Nissaggiya or Pācittiya rule. This indicates that such a rule had been formulated before that portion of the *Vinaya* referring to it had been compiled. I have drawn attention, in the notes, to any references that I have found in the contents of this volume to or from other parts of the *Vinaya*.

Another Pācittiya which betrays the marks of some later accretion is No. XXIX. In it there is a list of eleven persons who, for a householder, were elders, *therā*, and whom he invited to a meal. It is an interesting list. It contains the names of nine out of the ten to twelve men whom Mrs. Rhys Davids considers were at the beginning of his ministry “clustering about the Leader in the *Vinaya*.”² Two therefore look like intruders into this early company: Upāli, “the *Vinaya* expert”³—but expert only on the assumption that by his day the discipline had had time to grow into some coherent form; and Rāhula, the founder's son. He was probably not among his father's followers from the very beginning of his teaching, and was never a particularly satisfactory monk, although several earnest discourses were addressed to him.⁴

¹ *B.D.* i. xxiv f.

² *Sakya*, p. 127. For further information on these early followers see *Gotama the Man*, Ch. VI, and *Sakya*, Ch. VII.

³ *Sakya*, p. 352.

⁴ *M. Stas.* 61, 62, 147.

Members of Other Sects.—This volume contains some interesting details about the *titthiyas*, especially, as is natural, regarding ways in which their life and that of the Sakyā followers might overlap.

(1) In Nissaggiya XXII, people, jumping from the particular to the general, complained that the recluses, sons of the Sakyāns, went about for almsfood to be put into their hands, like members of other sects.

(2) In Nissaggiya VI, monks coming “naked as they were” to Sāvatti were mistaken by their co-religionists for *ājīvaka*, Naked Ascetics.¹

(3) In Pācittiya I, Hatthaka, a monk, having been outwitted in an argument by members of other sects, *titthiyas*, resorted to unworthy methods in order to confound them. The *titthiyas* complained, and not in vain, for the modest monks heard them and asked Hatthaka if there was truth in what they had been saying. He seems to have been very cross, saying that somehow the *titthiyas* should be worsted. But the modest monks were not impressed by this declaration, and told the incident to the lord. The result was what is now the first *pācittiya* rule. This story merely confirms what is well known: that monks and *titthiyas* debated together, and that, whatever individual monks might do or think, the considered opinion of the *saṅgha* was that *titthiyas* should not be treated contemptuously.

(4) Pācittiya XXXII. 8 supplies various items of interest. To begin with there is the *ājīvaka* who wanted to provide “a meal for all heretics,” *sabbapasāṇḍika-bhatta*. This shows that he thought of those who were not of his sect, although they were following a life of religion, as “heretics”; at the same time he wished to honour them by entertaining them. In accordance with this view, or so it seems, the *ājīvaka* was advised by King Bimbisāra, a relation of his, first of all to invite Gotama and his monks. He sent a messenger to the monks, but they refused the invitation, for at that time a group-meal of this nature had not been allowed. The

¹ Lit. Men of the Livelihood, *Bud. Ind.*, p. 143.

naked ascetic then approached Gotama, whom he greeted in an amicable and friendly way, and argued that one who is gone forth, *pabbajita*, is fit or worthy, *arahati*, to accept the alms of another who is gone forth. Gotama then, as recorded, accepted, and allowed the monks to eat a group-meal at the meal-time of recluses, *samana-bhatta-samaya*. Here, as not infrequently, the terms of the rule are wider than the terms used in the story leading up to its formulation. *Samana* was a word of very general application, covering *ājīvaka*, as well as members of all other diverse and "heretical" sects. In the Old Commentary, *samana* is defined as *paribbājaka-samāpanna*, lit. one who has attained to being a wanderer. *Paribbājaka*¹ was, like *samana*, a word of tremendous range, although it did not, for members of Gotama's Order themselves, include "monk" or "nun." For,

(5) In Pācittiya XLI (= *Vin.* iv. 285, and *cf.* iv. 224), wanderer and female wanderer are, taking their definitions in conjunction, explained as, "setting aside monk and novice, nun, female probationer and female novice, whoever (else) has attained to being a (male or female) wanderer." It is only regrettable that the definition contains the word to be defined. In this portion of the Old Commentary too, Naked Ascetic, here and also in the rule called *acelaka*,² although he figured in the story as an *ājīvaka*, is defined as "whoever, naked, has attained to being a wanderer." This definition should be compared with that of *samana* in Pācittiya XXXII.

Pācittiya XLI further tells that a monk gave almsfood,

¹ The account of *paribbājaka* at *Bud. Ind.*, p. 141, has not been superseded.

² He who is without a cloth, *cela*. Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras*, ii. xxx-xxxI, says that "the Buddhists denote by *acelaka* the followers of Makkhali Gosāla and his two predecessors, Kisa Saṃkicca and Nanda Vaccha, and have preserved an account of their religious practices in the Majjhima Nikāya, 36." Jacobi draws attention to the identity of the rules for the *acelakas* and the Jains. Gosāla's views are set forth at *D.* i. 53. *Dial.* i. 71, n. 1, calls his followers *ājīvaka*. B. M. Barua, *The Ājīvakas*, Pt. i., p. 13, summarises the position thus: "Both the Jaina and Buddhist records agree in speaking of Gosāla as a leader of the Ājīvaka sect. . . . They also agree in calling the Ājīvakas naked ascetics (*acelakas*)."

at a distribution of food, to an *ājīvaka*. All that the *ājīvaka* seems to have done by way of thanks was to tell his fellow sectarians that the food was obtained by him from a *mundagahapatika* belonging to Gotama, the recluse, *samana*. This curious term, possibly unique to this context, is clearly one of contempt. It means literally "little shaven householder", and would seem to imply that the *ājīvakas* despised the monks for their less austere way of living, and were not above having a sly dig at their more indulgent tendencies.

People who heard what the *ājīvaka* had said are recorded to advise the lord not to let monks, whom they call *ayya*, masters, give with their own hands to *tīthiyas*, since these want to bring discredit on the buddha, the dhamma and the Order.

Three points emerge from this episode with the lay-people. First, that *ājīvakas* did not live, any more than did monks, either in seclusion from the "world" or from members of other sects, including Gotama's. Secondly, that the lay-people appear to have come to the conclusion that their representations to the lord must include more than the one sect of the *ājīvakas*, and they therefore say *tīthiyas*, a term of broader application. Thirdly, that the odd intrusion of the later "triad of Buddhism" may suggest that this passage belongs to a comparatively late date, but that then, with the increasing popularity of Gotama's Order, relations between Sakyan monks and followers of other sects were becoming somewhat strained.

This Pācittiya, rich in its references to members of other sects, contains yet one more. Gotama is reputed to tell Ānanda to give what surplus there is of the Order's solid food to "those who eat scraps," broken meats, or remains of food, *vighāsāda*. Ānanda, always showing a touching regard for women, chose as the recipients some female wanderers, *paribbājikā*. Here then is contributory evidence that wanderers were eaters of scraps, of food not otherwise wanted, and that they did not object to receiving this from Gotama's religious followers.

(6) In Nissaggiya XX a wanderer, *paribbājaka*, is recorded to barter his costly cloth for Upananda's outer cloak, but when he wanted to exchange the articles again Upananda refused. The wanderer complained, basing his argument on the life of the world: because householders give out of compassion to another householder, should not one who has gone forth, *pabbajita*, give to one who has gone forth? The resemblance to the *ājīvaka*'s reasoning in Pāc. XXXII. 8 cited above is quite remarkable. Upananda is rebuked both by other monks and by Gotama for bartering with a wanderer. The wanderer's park or monastery, *ārāma*, is mentioned.¹

Sakyaputta.—In this volume there are two monks who have appended to their name the epithet Sakyaputta. These are Upananda Sakyaputta, to whom there are frequent references—*e.g.*, Nis. VI, VIII-X, XVIII, XX, XXV, XXVII, Pāc. IX, XLII-XLVI, LIX, and Hatthaka Sakyaputta, Pāc. I. This epithet, which I have translated as “son of the Sakyans,” was presumably given to distinguish these men from others bearing the same name. Neither Upananda nor Hatthaka was an ornament to the Order, and thus the epithet will not have been conferred in recognition of any special ability on his part. It indicated primarily that they were Sakyans, born into the Sakyan clan or tribe, *gotta*. But it did more than this. It implied, not only that the men so described were of Sakyan descent and themselves Sakyans, but that they were also members of the religious sect known by its contemporaries as the Sakyaputta sect, its adherents being called *sakyaputtiyas*.

For Sakyans who were not monks are called, when there was need to differentiate them from others of the same name, not Sakyaputta, but Sakka. A good example is Mahānāma Sakka (Pāc. XLVII and, *e.g.*, A. i. 26, 276), a brother of Anuruddha and cousin of

¹ See *Bud. India*, p. 142.

Gotama. There does not seem to have been any other notable Anuruddha contemporary with this brother of Mahānāma's, and so there was no occasion to append Sakka to his name. There were however other Mahānāmas,¹ hence the suffix Sakka for the one of Sakyan descent.

I hold it essential to translate the *putta* in Sakyaputta. Yet in saying that a Sakyan who had become a follower of Gotama's was called Sakyaputta if his own name was not sufficiently distinctive, I do not in the least wish to suggest anything mystical or comparable to the Hindu “twice born.” No more is meant than the recording of the case of a Sakyan who had become a follower of the Sakyaputta sect, or, after the Order had been fully constituted, a monk in Gotama's Order. In this way, the force of *putta* in *Sakyaputta* is double-edged. It indicates at one and the same time a man's birth as Sakyan and his calling as religious. Moreover, the fact is emphasised that the sectarian or monastic body which he has entered is one founded by his kinsman, a member of his own clan, Gotama Sakyaputta, as he is called by members of other sects,² and by Assaji, recently become a follower.³

In its beginnings, the sect founded by Gotama, and which afterwards turned into an “Order,”⁴ was largely entered and maintained by his relations. I therefore think it advisable, in order to keep before the mind the Sakyan and not merely Gotamic influences on the origin of the monastic institution, to translate the *Sakya* part of the compound *Sakyaputta* as “of the Sakyans,” using the plural. The same will apply to *Sakyaputtiyo*, “sons of the Sakyans,” a name frequently given to Gotama's followers, whether they were of the Sakyan clan or not. By their calling, and not on account of their birth, these had become “sons” of the Sakyan leader,

¹ See *D.P.P.N.*

² *E.g.*, *Vin.* iii. 1.

³ *Vin.* i. 41. Assaji is recorded to refer to Gotama as *mahāsamaṇo Sakyaputto Sakyakulā pabbajito*, the great recluse, the son of the Sakyans, gone forth from a Sakyan family.

⁴ See S. Dutt, *Early Bud. Monachism*, Ch. III.

Sakyamuni,¹ and of his Sakyan co-workers and co-founders.²

There is a commentarial support for taking the *Sakya* of the compound as a plural. For *V.A.* 735 defines *Sakya* as *Sakyānam putto*, "son of the Sakyans," *Sakyānam* being a genitive plural.

It is perhaps not always necessary, although I hold it to be correct, to insert "son," *putta*, in translations of various compounds, such as *devaputta* (e.g., *A.* i. 278, Hatthaka *devaputta*) and *Mallaputta* (e.g., *Dabba Mallaputta*, *Vin.* iii. 158, iv. 37), it being sufficient to read merely a, or the, *deva*, and a, or the, *Mallian*.

But when a person can only be distinguished from others bearing the same name by calling him "so and so, the son of so and so," as *Upasena Vaṅgantaputta*,³ then the *putta* part of the name must be translated. For he was not *Upasena Vaṅganta*, but *Upasena*, *Vaṅganta's* son. The great exception to this is *Sāriputta*, where, for English translators and readers, *putta* seems to have become an integral part of his name, since it is never translated as "the son of (*Rūpa*-)*Sāri*."

As *putta* sometimes forms part of a name, so also does *mātā*, *pitā*, *dhītā*, mother, father, daughter. For example, there are *Sigālamātā*, *Nakulamātā*, *Visākhā Migāramātā*, *Nakulapitā*, *Suppavāsā Koliyadhītā*. Now *Nakulamātā* and *Nakulapitā* have, in the Pali canon, no other names. They must therefore be translated as "Nakula's mother" and "Nakula's father." I think it as necessary to translate *putta* where it means a "son" in a life of religion, as it is to translate *mātā*, *pitā*, *dhītā* and again *putta* where no such reference is intended.

There are further the terms *ayya* and *ayyaputta*;

¹ E. J. Thomas, *Life of Buddha*, p. 1, n. 1, "Śākyamuni, 'the sage of the Śākyas'"; *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 150, "Śākyamuni, 'the recluse of the Śākyas'"; S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, i. 351, "Śākyamuni, the sage of the Śākyas."

² Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Gotama the Man*, p. 89 ff.; *Sakya*, p. 115 ff.; and cf. *Unknown Co-founders of Buddhism*, *J.R.A.S.*, 1927, p. 193 ff.

³ See below, p. 83.

these cannot mean exactly the same thing. The former is "master" and the latter "little master," something like our "son of the house," the young gentleman. Again there is *setthi* and *setthiputta*. The former is variously translated as banker, merchant, great merchant, treasurer. A difference in standing is, I hold, intended by *setthiputta* (see *Nissag.* VI), and should be shown in translations. A *setthiputta* is a young merchant, literally a son of a merchant, but he is not yet the head of the firm, for his description as *putta* means that his father is still alive. It would not be actually wrong to translate *setthiputta* as "merchant," since he is one by occupation, but the full significance implicit in *putta* can only be brought out by regarding the word as pithy, not as pleonastic. In the same way I think that the intended implication of *putta*, when the poor workman addresses *Kirapatika*, in *Pāc.* XXXIII, as *ayyaputta*, is that this employer, although paying the wages, was not the head of his business because his father was still living.

Dhammī kathā and *dhamma*.—I have translated *dhammī kathā* often as "reasoned talk," sometimes as "talk on dhamma." In so doing, I have been guided mainly by the context. I hold that in the phrase, "then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given *dhammī kathā*, addressed the monks, saying," the lord is not supposed to have given them talk on *dhamma*, on material now found chiefly in the *Suttas*. I think it more probable that he was engaged in explaining to the monks such circumstances as had arisen since the first framing of a rule, and telling them why he thought its alteration justifiable. He would thus have been reasoning out the situation with them, marshalling the arguments bearing on the case.

Similarly, *Gotama* is sometimes shown, for example in *Nis.* III and *Pāc.* LVIII, as questioning monks or hearing reports about their conduct. Then, it is said, "having given *dhammī kathā*," he framed a rule so that, given certain circumstances, they need not behave in

that particular way again. In this connection Pāc. LVIII is interesting, for it asserts that the *dhammī kathā* given was "on what is befitting, on what is suitable." These words, (*an-*)*anulomika* and (*an-*)*anucchavika*, do not properly belong to Sutta but to *Vinaya* material. When they occur in the Suttas,¹ it seems uniformly the case that they are used in connection with the discipline of monks or other *samaṇas*.

On the other hand, when it is said, for example in Pāc. VI, that Anuruddha roused and delighted the woman *dhammīyā kathāya*, it would be a mistake to think that he was explaining to her the need for making or altering a rule. The context in no way suggests this; it suggests that he had given her an inspiring talk in virtue of which she became a lay-adherent.

Again, to take from among many other instances of it, the phrase as it stands in Pāc. XXI. From the context it may be inferred that Gotama gave the nuns some lofty discourse to recompense their disappointment for "the merely inferior talk on dhamma," *parittaṅ ñeva dhammim katham katvā*, given them by the group of six monks in place of the exhortation.²

Lest it be thought that in the Nissaggiyas and these Pācittiyas the phrase *dhammī kathā* supplants *dhamma*, it will be wise to draw attention to some of the passages where this great word occurs. In Pāc. IV, the group of six monks are found making lay-followers speak *dhamma* line by line. This was made an offence. The Old Commentary on this Pācittiya, as well as that on Pāc. VII, by its choice of words for defining *dhamma*, makes it clear that *dhamma* as the teaching, as discourses, as great sayings, as connected with the goal, *attha*, was being considered; and neither *dhamma* as *dhammī kathā*, reasoned talk germane to the matter in hand, nor *dhamma* as *pāḷi*, the text, as it is explained

¹ *E.g.*, A. i. 106, ii. 27, iii. 116; M. i. 477; It. 103; Sn. 385.

² *Cf.* M. iii. 270, where Mahāpajāpatī is shown asking Gotama for exhortation, for instruction, for *dhammikathā*, "talk on dhamma," for the nuns.

in Bu.'s commentary.¹ Pāc. VII traces the evolution of the circumstances in which it became permissible for a monk to teach dhamma, *dhammam deseti*, to women. Pāc. V confines itself to mentioning that lay-followers listened to *dhamma* spoken by, *bhāsita*, monks who were elders. This would be in accordance with part of the definition given by the Old Commentary on Pāc. IV and VII, that *dhamma* is what is spoken by disciples.

Dhamma, for the reason stated in the Introduction to vol: i., I have left untranslated.²

Ārāma; *vihāra*.—I have usually translated *ārāma*, not as "park," but as "monastery"; and *vihāra* as "dwelling-place."³ The *Vinaya* depicts monastic life at a fairly advanced stage, and it is reasonable to assume that the many words connected with the monks' lodgings had attained definite meanings reflecting the habits and customs induced by their way of living.

Ārāmas were doubtless originally places for enjoyment, parks. Many were handed over by rich benefactors to the Order as it grew and its increasing numbers called for larger and more fixed settlements. *Ārāmas* thus became monasteries, places made use of by monks, and intended solely for this purpose.

Vihāras too, as the monks increased in number, changed their character. The word had at some time stood for something much like an isolated *pariveṇa*, or cell, but it came to imply a row of cells, or individual dwelling-places, connected by a verandah, *pamukha*.⁴

It is curious and disappointing that the definition of *vihāra* in Pāc. XIX and at *Vin.* iii. 156 is so unenlightening. Neither is the word explained where other comparable terms are briefly defined in Pārājika II.⁵

H. Kern⁶ has to my mind given an acceptable, though short, account of *ārāma*, *vihāra*, *pariveṇa* and *kuṭī* (hut);

¹ For Bu.'s interpretations of the words used in defining *dhamma*, see *V.A.* 742, and below, p. 191.

² *B.D.* i. lvi.

³ For notes on these terms, see below, pp. 2, 46.

⁴ *Cf.* Pāc. XVII. 2, 1.

⁵ See *B.D.* i. 83.

⁶ *Man. Ind. Buddhism*, p. 80 ff.

and S. Dutt has a learned and illuminating chapter¹ on the development, interrelation and use of these quarters for monks, together with the function and character of such other words denoting habitations for monks as *sīmā*, boundary, limit; *āvāsa*, residence, settlement, colony; and *senāsana*, lodgings, bedding, "seats." S. Dutt shows, in this chapter, that as "the communal life of the Bhikkhus came to gravitate more and more towards a cœnobium," largely "brought about by the institutions of Vassa," the rains-retreat, so there developed the means and the rules for communal, as against eremitical, dwelling.

Ekamantam.—The literal meaning of this is "at one side." The word constantly occurs in the phrases, "he, or she, stood, or sat down at one side." This implies respect accorded to a superior. In order to bring out this aspect of *ekamantam*, of the respectful attitude adopted by laity towards monks, by monks to senior monks or to wiser monks, I have translated the word as "at a respectful distance." In so doing, I am following the Commentaries. These enumerate six wrong ways of sitting, *nisajjadosa*,² such as would bring discomfort and inconvenience to a person worthy of consideration and honour. The only reason why I prefer my translation to the more literal one is that it better emphasises a particular point in the manners of the day; and also when we hear of lay-people sitting down or standing by monks "at a respectful distance," one more piece of evidence, however small, testifying to the esteem in which monks were held by the laity, is forced to contribute its weight.

Abbhantara.—This is a linear measure, mentioned below on pp. 20, 22, and which I have left untranslated for fear lest an English rendering should give a false impression.³

¹ *Early Bud. Monachism*, Ch. V.

² See below, p. 42, n. 5.

³ See *B.D.* i., p. lviii.

Bu.'s Commentary¹ remarks that "here one *abbhantara* is twenty-eight hands (*hattha*)"; the *C.P.D.* says no more than that it is "a certain measure of length." The *Vibhāṅga* Commentary does not include *abbhantara* among its graded linear measurements at all.² In Moggallāna's scheme of measures of length,³ although given at the very end of the scheme and looking like an afterthought, we find that twenty-eight *ratanas* equal one *abbhantara*. Rhys Davids,⁴ following this scheme, describes *ratana* as "(cubit, forearm)=hattha=kukku," and says that *hattha* "is the usual word."⁵ The *Samyutta* Commentary explains *kukku* by *hattha*.⁶ As it is very likely that these measurements varied with time and locality, in trying to establish the length of a *Vinaya abbhantara* it will be best to consider the *hattha*, twenty-eight of which were held to compose an *abbhantara*, according to *Vinaya* interpretations.

We find *hattha* defined in the Old Commentary⁷ as "from the elbow as far as the tip of the nail," which means that *hattha*, taken as a measure of length, would comprise the hand together with the forearm.⁸ Even so, there is yet some vagueness, for the tips of the nails are not all the same distance from the elbow. We are thus left with not an exact measurement. Rhys Davids however suggested that "to the end of the little finger only is meant,"⁹ apparently on the grounds that because the span, *vidatthi*, is the basis of computation for the *ratana*, two *vidatthi* making one *ratana*, and because *vidatthi* is "the name for the ordinary span to the end of the fourth or little finger" from the end of the thumb, therefore the *hattha*, which is equivalent to the *ratana* measure, would be from the elbow as far as the nail of the little finger. This provides a straight line for measurement, and the distance is about fifteen inches. One *abbhantara*, if taken as equal to twenty-eight *hatthas*, would therefore correspond to roughly

¹ *V.A.* 654.

² *Vbh.A.* 343.

³ *Abhp.* 194-7.

⁴ *Ancient Coins, etc.*, p. 15.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, n. 2.

⁶ *S.A.* iii. 300.

⁷ *Vin.* iii. 121, iv. 221.

⁸ *Cf. V.A.* 533.

⁹ *Ancient Coins, etc.*, pp. 15, 17.

thirty-five feet. The "staff" in Sekhiya 58 (*Vin.* iv. 200), that had to measure "four hands," would be about five feet in length.

In conclusion, I very gratefully acknowledge my debt to Mrs. Rhys Davids for her unflagging interest in the preparation of this volume, and for kindly reading the proofs. Two revered *theras* of Colombo, the Venerable Rambukwella Siddhartha and the Venerable S. P. Vajiranana, have given me much valuable assistance with monastic practice and *Vinaya* terminology.

To these in particular, and also to other friends and acquaintances in Ceylon, too numerous to mention, I would tender my warm thanks in recognition of conversations that were as instructive as they were stimulating. I am also indebted to the editor for his kind permission to reprint in this Introduction part of an article published in 1939 in the Vesak Number of the *Ceylon Daily News*.

I. B. HORNER.

MANCHESTER, 1940.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Translator's Introduction - - -	v
Forfeiture (Nissaggiya) I-XXX - - -	1-163
Expiation (Pācittiya) I-LX - - -	164-416
Indexes:	
1. Words and Subjects - - -	417
2. Names - - -	426
3. Some Pali Words discussed in the Notes - - -	428
4. Abbreviations used in the Notes - - -	429

Vinaya-piṭaka

SUTTAVIBHAṄGA (NISSAGGIYA)

[These thirty rules, venerable ones, for offences of expiation involving forfeiture, come up for recitation.]

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) I

At one time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Vesālī in the Gotamaka shrine.¹ At that time three robes were allowed to monks by the lord.² The

¹ *Gotamaka-cetiya*, one of the *cetiya*s or shrines of Vesālī, to the south (*D.* iii. 9). Mentioned, with the other shrines of Vesālī, as being pleasant (*D.* ii. 102-3, 118; *A.* iv. 309; *S.* v. 159; *Ud.* 62). *AA.* ii. 373 ascribes the Gotamaka-cetiya to a *yakkha* named Gotamaka. For further references to these shrines see *UdA.* 322-3; *Dial.* i. 220 ff.; *K.S.* v. 230, 231; Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Gotama the Man*, 193; E. J. Thomas, *Life of Buddha as Legend and History*, 137; B. C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, 46, and Appendix; and *D.P.P.N.*

² The three robes, *ticivara*, consisted of the inner robe or cloth, *antaravāsaka*, the upper robe or cloth, *uttarāsāṅga*, the outer cloak, *saṅghāṭi*. Permission to wear a double, *diguṇa*, outer cloak, a single, *ekacciya*, upper robe, and a single inner robe is given at *Vin.* i. 289, also at the Gotamaka shrine. At *Vin. Texts* ii. 212, n. 2, the three robes are described in detail, although there the *saṅghāṭi* is wrongly called the "waist cloth."

The *antaravāsaka* is put on at the waist, and hangs down to just above the ankles, being tied with the *kāyabandhana*, a strip of cloth made into a belt or girdle (allowed at *Vin.* ii. 136). The method of putting on the *antaravāsaka* is different from that adopted by laymen, *Vin.* ii. 137. Monks take the two ends together, fold them across together in front and then fold them back again; then the garment is held in position by the belt. The *uttarāsāṅga* is the upper robe worn when a monk is in a residence. It covers him from neck to ankle, leaving one shoulder bare; it should not be worn

group¹ of six monks, thinking: "Three robes are allowed by the lord," entered a village in one set of robes, remained in the monastery² in another set of three robes, went down to bathe in another set of three robes. Those who were modest monks looked down upon,³ criticised,⁴ spread it about,⁵ saying: "How can the group of six monks wear an extra robe?"⁶ Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that you wear an extra robe?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

in the same way as laymen wear their upper cloth, *Vin.* ii. 137. The *saṅghāṭi* is put on over this when the monk goes out. It may be exactly the same size as the *uttarāsaṅga*, but it consists of double cloth, since to make it two robes are woven together. It is a good protection against cold, and monks may wrap themselves in it to sleep. All these three robes are made in the patchwork fashion. Only the bathing-cloth is plain.

¹ To end of || 1 || below, cf. *Vin.* i. 289, where the sixfold group is again recorded as offending in this way. There a reference to this Nissag. rule is implied, for it is said that monks should not wear an extra robe, and whoever does so should be dealt with *yathādhammo*, according to the rule.

² *ārāma*, a park, a place where one enjoys oneself, *ā+ramati*. Cf. definition of *ārāma* at *Vin.* iii. 49 as *pupphārāma phalārāma*, flower-park, fruit-park (orchard). In Pali, however, the word has come to be used largely in connection with a residence for monks, hence a monastery.

³ *ujjhāyanti*. Expl. at *VA.* 296 as *avajjhāyanti avajānantā taṃ jhāyanti olokeṇti, lāmakato vā cintenti ti attho*, they censured, despising, they were angry, (and) looked down upon him, or the meaning is they thought (of him) as inferior. Cf. *VA.* 770 (*ujjhāpeti*) and *SA.* i. 349. *Ujjhāyati* therefore seems to mean to think poorly of, to look down upon, to belittle someone, rather than to be irritated, angry, or to grumble. Cf. *Pāc.* 13, *Vin.* iv. 38.

⁴ *khīyanti*. Expl. at *VA.* 296 as *tassa avañṇam kathenti pakāsentī*, they speak blame (dispraise) of him, they show him up. Cf. *SA.* i. 349. Hence to speak badly of someone, to criticise. Cf. *Pāc.* 13, *Vin.* iv. 38, *Pāc.* 79, *Vin.* iv. 152, *Pāc.* 81, *Vin.* iv. 154.

⁵ *vipācentī*. Expl. at *VA.* 296 as *viṭṭhārikam karonti sabbattha pattharanti*, they make wide-spread, they spread everywhere. Hence to speak disparagingly, to spread ill-fame. Cf. *SA.* i. 349. These three words occur frequently in *Vin.*, but only once I think otherwise in the Canon, at *S.* i. 232.

⁶ *atirekacivara*.

"How can you, foolish men, wear an extra robe? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased¹ . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training² should be set forth:

Whatever monk should wear an extra robe, there is an offence³ of expiation⁴ involving forfeiture."⁵

¹ *appasannānam pasādāya*. *Pasāda*, *prasāda* (Skr.) is "pleasing." Cf. *buddhe pasannā* of *S.* i. 34, pleased with the Buddha, and therefore become his followers, i.e. converted. Thus "pleasing" has the sense of "converting."

² *sikkhāpada*. *Pada* is a sentence, rule, regulation, ordinance, which indicates a training. Here *pada* is rule; *sikkhā* is training. Hence a rule of, or for, training.

³ Although no word for "offence" occurs in these rules, the terms themselves—e.g. *pācittiya*, *dukkata*—imply "offence."

⁴ *pācittiya*. E. J. Thomas, *Hist. Bud. Thought*, p. 18, n. 3, says that "this translation depends on the derivation of *pācittiya* from Sanskrit *prāyaścittika*, but this is not the term used in the Sanskrit versions of the Pātimokkha, which have *pātayantika* and *pāyantika*." *Vin. Texts* i. 32 and Geiger, *Pali Literatur und Sprache* § 27, incline to etymology *prāyaścittika*. Geiger points out that Sylvain Lévi derives it from *prāk-citta* which +*ika* is the derivation to which the P.E.D. inclines. *Pācittiya* as *prāyaścittika* means lit. "in repentance, in compensation, in expiation." Expiation is not, however, enjoined in these rules, but confession. Thus in reality *pācittiya* means a (minor) offence to be confessed. But since the term *pācittiya* has etymologically nothing to do with confession, I have kept to the more literal rendering of "expiation." B. C. Law, *Hist. Pali Lit.*, i. 46 ff., speaks of *Pācittiya* offences as those "for which some expiation was laid down . . . requiring repentance . . . requiring confession and absolution."

At *Vin.* i. 254 five things are allowed to the monks after the ceremonial making of the kaṭhina cloth, one being to have as many robes as are wanted. This appears to be a relaxation of the above rule.

⁵ *nissaggiya*. The thing to be forfeited or given up was that in respect of which the offence had been committed.

The name of this class of offence, *Nissaggiya Pācittiya*, means that, besides confessing the offence, there is an object wrongfully acquired which has to be forfeited. In the next class of offence, *Pācittiya*, there is no such object which needs to be forfeited. To mark the distinction between these two classes of offence (*Nissaggiya Pācittiya*, and *Pācittiya*), as also their connection, in translating *nissaggiya pācittiya* I have put *nissaggiya*, "involving forfeiture," in the secondary position, although in the Pali ft stands before *pācittiya*.

Thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down¹ by the lord. || 1 ||

At that time² an extra robe accrued to³ the venerable Ānanda; and the venerable Ānanda was desirous of giving that robe to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable Sāriputta was staying at Sāketa. Then it occurred to the venerable Ānanda: "A rule of training laid down by the lord is that an extra robe should not be worn. And this extra robe has accrued to me, and I am desirous of giving this robe to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable [195] Sāriputta is staying at Sāketa. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

"But, Ānanda, how long before Sāriputta will come (here)?"

"Lord, on the ninth or tenth day," he said.

Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk,⁴ addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, I allow you to wear an extra robe for at most ten days. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When the robe-material is settled,⁵ when a monk's⁶

¹ *paññatta*. The primary sense, "made known," is now lost. The word is now used in its secondary sense of established, given, passed, laid down.

² = *Vin.* i. 289. Also *cf.* below, Nissag. XXI, where the same story is told in the same words about an extra bowl.

³ *uppannam hoti*, lit. there came to be arisen to, produced for, or born to. *Cf.* below, pp. 24, 90, 99, 114.

⁴ *dharmā kathā*. In this and similar contexts this does not mean talk on *dhamma*, on the doctrine as expounded in the Suttas, so much as any good, reasonable talk relevant to the matter in hand. Thus here the lord, it may be supposed, would have reasoned with the monks and have explained to them the causes and conditions leading him to modify the rule as originally laid down. *Cf.* *VA.* 637.

⁵ *niṭṭhita*, established, closed, settled, finished, ready to wear, or "done for." For this last see *Vin. Texts* i. 19 in note. That *niṭṭhita* has the two meanings of "made" and "done for" is borne out by the Old Comy. Huber, *J.As.* 1913, Nov.-Dec., p. 490, has "si un bhikṣu a les trois robes au complet," and doubtless the meaning here is that the robes have been distributed and each monk has his set of three robes made up and ready to wear.

⁶ *bhikkhunā*, instrumental used for genitive.

kaṭhina¹ (privileges)² have been removed,³ an extra robe may be worn for at most ten days. For him who exceeds that (period), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 2 ||

¹ The kaṭhina cloth is the cotton cloth supplied annually, after the rains, by the laity to the monks for making robes. Kaṭhina refers to a specially ceremonial cloth, for it is made with special ceremony at the end of the rains. The kaṭhina cloth should be brought at dawn, offered to the Order, cut by the monks, sewn and dyed. All this must be done on the same day. Then it is taken to a *sīmā*, boundary, and with formulæ is offered by the Order to one monk. Ways in which kaṭhina comes to be made, *atthata*, and not made, *anathata*, are given at *Vin.* i. 254 f. The kaṭhina cloth brings certain privileges, which, however, last only four months. It loses its quality automatically at the end of the season, as well as in other ways. A monk can wear kaṭhina cloth for any length of days as long as the kaṭhina quality is there. If it is not kaṭhina cloth, he can wear an extra robe for only ten days. On *atthata* *cf.* also below, p. 26, n. 3.

² Five things were allowable to monks when the kaṭhina cloth had been (formally) made, *atthata*, *Vin.* i. 254.

³ *ubbhatasmim kathine*; sometimes *ubbhāra-* or *uddhāra-*. On these phrases see *Vin. Texts* i. 18, n., for a most interesting though tentative account of the usages connected with the robes. Also *Vin. Texts* ii. 148, n., 157, n. Huber, *J.As.*, 1913, Nov.-Dec., p. 490, renders "et qu'il ait pris le kaṭhina"; Gogerly, *J.R.A.S.*, 1862, p. 431, "and the kaṭhina (or cloth for the purpose) has been consecrated"; Dickson, *J.R.A.S.*, 1876, p. 105, "when the kaṭhina period has expired"; Rhys Davids, *Vin. Texts* i. 18, "when the kaṭhina has been taken up by the bhikkhu"; *Vin. Texts* ii. 157, "suspension of the kaṭhina privileges" (for *kathinubbhāra*); B. C. Law, *Hist. Pali Lit.* i. 52, "after the performance of the kaṭhina ceremony."

For the eight grounds for removing the five kaṭhina "privileges"—*i.e.*, the five things that are allowable after the kaṭhina cloth is made—see *Vin.* i. 255 ff. According to Old Comy., see below, they may also be removed before the time by the Order. The ceremony of making and distributing the kaṭhina cloth (see above, p. 5, n. 1) took place after the rains, *Vin.* i. 254, and it was seen to that each monk had three robes. These, though worn by him, were the property of the Order. He might not need three new ones every season. However, it might happen that, through dampness or other causes, his three robes were not ready to wear, or he might be going to another residence (see the *palibodha* and *apalibodha* at *Vin.* i. 265), and then he might take (temporarily) an extra robe. Thus for this period the rule as to the three robes was relaxed, and an extra robe might be worn, but not for more than ten days.

When the robe-material is settled means: the robe-material is made up¹ for a monk, or lost² or destroyed³ or burnt, or an expectation of robe-material is disappointed.⁴

When the *kāṭhina* (privileges) have been removed means: they come to be removed because of a certain one of eight grounds,⁵ or they come to be removed before the time by the Order.

For at most ten days means: it may be worn for ten days at the maximum.

When the *kāṭhina* privileges had been removed for one or other of the eight grounds for removing them, then the monk must assign his extra robe. At *Vin.* i. 289 monks are "allowed" to assign, *vikappeti*, an extra robe. Cf. *Vin.* i. 254 for the allowance to have as many robes as desired when the *kāṭhina* cloth has been made, and before the privileges, of which this is one, are removed.

¹ *kata*; cf. *katacīvara* at *Vin.* i. 256, a robe that is made up, finished, ready to wear, opposed to *cīvara*, robe-material, probably meaning not ready to wear, and *vippakatacīvara*, a robe or robe-material that is imperfectly executed, thus not ready to wear. *VA.* 638 says that *kata* means that it is finished by means of a needle.

² *VA.* 638, "carried off by thieves." On removal of *kāṭhina* privileges owing to loss of the robe-material, see *Vin.* i. 255 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, "destroyed by white ants."

⁴ *cīvarāsā upacchinnā*. On a monk going away with the expectation of a robe and the removal of his *kāṭhina* privileges on various grounds, see *Vin.* i. 259 ff. *VA.* 638 says that "longing for a robe arises and is cut off. These are impediments to getting robes settled." The last four cases mean that a monk's responsibility for a robe is gone.

⁵ Given at *Vin.* i. 255, also at *VA.* 638. See above, p. 5, n. 3, and *Vin. Texts* ii. 157 for a discussion of the validity of these grounds or reasons, *mātikā*, for removal. They are as follows: the ground depending on (the monk) having gone away, on (his robe being) settled, on his having resolved (not to have it finished), on (his robe) being lost, on his having heard (that the privileges are removed in a certain residence), on the lapse of an expectation (that a special gift of a robe would be made to him), on his having gone beyond the boundary (of the community to which the *kāṭhina* cloth was given), on the general removal (of the *kāṭhina* privileges of the whole Order). Removal means that the quality of *kāṭhina* will disappear (see above, p. 5, n. 1).

An extra robe means: one that is not allotted,¹ not assigned.²

Robe-material means: any one robe-material of the six (kinds of) robe-materials³ (including) the least one fit for assignment.⁴ || 1 ||

For him who exceeds that period there is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited on the eleventh day at sunrise; it should be forfeited to the Order,⁵ or to a group,⁶ or to an individual. And thus, monks, it should be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should

¹ *anadhīṭṭhita*. This means a robe used by a certain monk himself, rather than one not yet designated for a particular monk, and thus still at the disposal of the Order, not disposed of, not allotted. See *VA.* 642 ff. Cf. *nīṭṭhita* in connection with robes, translated above as "settled." Also see n. on *adhīṭṭhāna*, *B.D.* i. 128. *C.P.D.* gives *adhīṭṭhita* as "determined" for a similar *Vin.* passage.

² *avikappita*, possibly meaning kept and given to another monk. At *Vin.* i. 289 monks are allowed to assign an extra robe; then presumably it ceases to be "extra." On the allowance to allot, not to assign (*adhīṭṭhātum na vikappetum*) various articles, see *Vin.* i. 296 f.

³ At *Vin.* i. 281 six kinds of robes were permitted to the monks: made of linen, cotton, silk, wool, coarse hemp, canvas. At *Vin.* i. 58, 96 these six are called benefits extra to rag-robes. Cf. below, pp. 40, 48, and *Vin.* iv. 60.

⁴ *vikappanupagapacchima*. *P.E.D.* explains *vikappanupaga* as "according to option," under *upaga*. But *vikappana* is a technical term meaning the assignment of robes. The meaning of *pacchima*, according to the Commentary, is "the least"—i.e., the smallest in measurement according to the assignment or apportioning of the robes. For *VA.* 639 says, "having pointed out the kinds of robes (i.e., the six kinds, as in note above), now, in order to point out the measure, he says *vikap° pacchimaṃ*. Its measure is two spans in length, one span in width. Thus the text says, 'Monks, the least robe that I allow you to assign is one that is eight finger-breadths in length and four finger-breadths wide according to the finger-breadth of the accepted standard'" (*sugatāṅgula*, cf. *Vin.* iv. 168). The 'text' quoted by Bu. is *Vin.* i. 297. Cf. below, pp. 40, 48, 140.

⁵ *saṅgha*, five or more monks; see *Vin.* i. 319.

⁶ *gana*, two to four monks.

speaks¹ thus: 'Honoured sirs, this robe is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the Order.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed.² The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk; the robe forfeited³ should be given back⁴ (with the words): 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This robe of the monk so and so, which had to be forfeited, is forfeited (by him) to the Order. If it seems right⁵ to the Order, the Order should give back this robe to the monk so and so.'

That monk, approaching two or three⁶ monks, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder . . . joined palms, should speak thus: 'Honoured sirs, this robe [196] is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the venerable ones.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk; the robe forfeited should be given back (with the words): 'Let the venerable ones listen to me. This robe of the monk so and so, which had to be forfeited, is forfeited (by him) to the venerable ones. If it seems right to the venerable ones, let the

¹ passive construction, lit. "the Order should be spoken to."

² *āpatti desetabbā*. VA. 640, having greeted the Order (as above) the monk says, 'I, reverend sirs, having fallen into such and such an offence, that I confess. If there is one robe it constitutes one offence of expiation involving forfeiture; if there are two (robes) there are two (such offences); if there are many (robes) there is a multiplicity (of such offences).' He should forfeit his robe or robes saying, 'Here is a robe (are robes) to be forfeited for transgressing the ten days. I forfeit it (them) to the Order.' The same procedure is required if forfeiting them to a group or to one monk. The offending monk then says that he sees his offence, and is exhorted to restrain himself in the future.

³ *nissattha-civara*, *nissattha* being p.p. of *nissajjati*.

⁴ *dātabbam*.

⁵ *pattakalla*=*pattakāla*, having attained the (right) time.

⁶ *sambahulā bhikkhū* in *Vin.* almost always means a *gaṇa*—i.e., two to four monks. In the Suttapīṭaka the expression means "many monks." Yet at *Vin.* ii. 15 *sambahulā therā bhikkhū* apparently include eleven theras, and at *Vin.* i. 300 *sambahulā therā* include five elders; thus in these two passages *sambahulā* should be translated by "several, a number of."

venerable ones give back this robe to the monk so and so.'

That monk, approaching one monk, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus to him: 'Your reverence,¹ this robe is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the venerable one.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by this monk; the robe forfeited should be given back (with the words): 'I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 2 || 3 ||

If he² thinks³ that ten days have elapsed when they have done so, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether ten days have elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he does not think that ten days have elapsed when they have done so, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one⁴ is allotted⁵ when it is not allotted, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is assigned when it is not assigned, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is bestowed when it is not bestowed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is lost when it is not lost, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is burnt

¹ *āvuso*; in preceding cases *bhante*.

² i.e. a monk.

³ *saññā*, or "is aware." It has been suggested to me that the first two cases (excluding that of "is in doubt") are more definite in meaning than the later ones, and that therefore these first two might be translated by "is aware" and "is not aware," and the others by "thinks" and "does not think." But the Pali word is the same throughout.

⁴ i.e. an extra robe.

⁵ This and the next six cases=below, *Vin.* iii. 251 (without the "assigned" clause), 262.

when it is not burnt, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹ If he thinks that the ten days have elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether the ten days have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the ten days have not elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, within ten days, it is allotted,² assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt,³ if they tear it from him,⁴ if they take it on trust⁵; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.⁶ || 4 ||

Then⁷ the group of six monks did not give back a robe that had been forfeited. They told this matter to the lord. He said: "Monks, a robe that has been for-

¹ *dukkata*, also to be confessed.

² *adhitheti*, accord. to *C.P.D.* to employ, adopt, keep for oneself.

³ These clauses indicate that the monk has lost responsibility for the robe.

⁴ *acchinditvā ganhanti*. This phrase appears to be a substitute for *vilumpati*, to steal, which as *avilutte viluttasaññī* occurs immediately after "burnt" in the preceding paragraph.

⁵ *vissāsam ganhanti*. At *Vin.* i. 296 things are allowed to be taken on trust from a monk endowed with five qualities: he must be an acquaintance and a friend, alive, he must have spoken about the thing taken, and must know that he will be pleased with the monk for taking it. Cf. also *Vin.* i. 308 for various cases where a robe taken on trust is said to be rightly taken or wrongly taken.

⁶ Cf. *Nissag.* 2, 3, 28; and cf. *Bhikkhuni Nissag.* 1, where for "burnt" we get "broken" (of a bowl).

⁷ *tena kho pana samayena*, very likely equivalent here to *atha*, then, for in this and similar contexts it does not mean so much "at one time," as at the more definite "then"—i.e., at a time (shortly) after the rule had been laid down, but marking a continuation of the story which led up to and included the formulation of the rule.

feited is not not to be given back.¹ Whosoever should not give it back, there is an offence of wrong-doing." || 5 || [197]

¹ *na nisatthacivaram na dātabbam*; cf. below, p. 117, and *Vin.* iv. 245, where the same thing (using the double negative) is said of a bowl.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) II

At one time the enlightened one, the lord; was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time monks, entrusting robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe¹; these robes, deposited for a long time, became soiled²; the monks dried them in the sun. The venerable Ānanda, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw these monks drying these robes in the sun. Seeing these monks he came up to them, and having come up he said to these monks:

"Your reverences, whose are these robes that are soiled?" Then these monks told this matter to the venerable Ānanda. The venerable Ānanda looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the monks, entrusting robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe?"³ Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks, entrusting robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe?"

¹ That is with the *antaravāsaka*, the inner robe, and the *uttarāsaṅga*, the upper robe or garment. The two together are called *santaruttara*—i.e., *sa-antar-uttara*, the inner one with the upper one. They did not wear the outer cloak, *V.A.* 652. For notes on the three robes see above, p. 1, n. 2. This rule is in opposition to the previous one, where monks wore more than the prescribed number of robes; here they wear less than the right number. See also *Bhikkhunī Pāc.* 24.

² *V.A.* 651, "having black and white circles on the places which had been touched by the perspiration."

³ At *Vin.* i. 298 Ānanda himself, though through thoughtlessness, entered a village without his outer cloak.

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, having entrusted robes to the hands of (other) monks, set out on a tour of the country with (only) an inner and an upper robe? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When the robe-material is settled, when a monk's *kāṭhina* (privileges) have been removed, if this monk should be away, separated from his three robes,¹ even for one night, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."²

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 1 ||

At that time a certain monk became ill in Kosambī. Relations sent a messenger to this monk, saying: "Let the revered sir³ come, we will nurse (him)." The

¹ *ticivarena vippavaseyya*. Cf. *Vin.* ii. 123, where it is a *dukkāṭa* offence for a monk to be separated from his *nisīdana*, piece of cloth for sitting on, for four months.

² At *Vin.* i. 254 the five privileges allowable to monks after the ceremonial making of the *kāṭhina*-cloth, *atthakāṭhina*, include one called *asamādānacāra*, translated, at *Vin. Texts* ii. 151, in accordance with Bu.'s explanation, as "going for alms without wearing the usual set of three robes," a relaxation of the above rule. At *Vin.* i. 298 it is a *dukkāṭa* offence for a monk to enter a village wearing (only) his inner and upper robes. But because Ānanda thoughtlessly did so on one occasion, the lord is reputed to have put forward five reasons for laying aside the outer cloak, five (identical) reasons for laying aside the upper and inner robes, and five (partly identical and partly different) reasons for laying aside the cloth for the rains. It is not said which reason covered Ānanda's lapse. When monks are staying in lodgings in the jungles they are allowed to lay aside one of the three robes in a house; but then it came about that if they are away from that robe for more than six nights, there is an offence; see *Nissag.* 29.

³ *bhaddanto*, an honorific title. Cf. below, p. 80, where an ill monk is allowed to travel without a rug, *santhata*, if he has the agreement of the Order as to the rug.

monks said: "Go, your reverence, relations will nurse you." He said:

"Your reverences, a rule of training laid down by the lord is that one should not be away, separated from the three robes; but I am ill, I am not able to set out taking the three robes. I [198] will not go."

They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to give a monk who is ill the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes.¹ And thus, monks, should it be given: That monk who is ill, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs, am ill, I am not able to set out taking the three robes. Thus I, honoured sirs, request the Order for the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes.' A second time it should be requested, a third time it should be requested. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk so and so is ill, he is not able to set out taking the three robes. He requests the Order for the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order give this monk so and so the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to

¹ *ticivarena avippavāsasammutiṃ*. This means that by convention, by agreement among other monks, the one who is ill is regarded as *not* separated from his three robes, although in fact he is separated from them and goes away without them. On account of this agreement, *sammuti*, the separation, being regarded as no separation, does not count as an offence. Cf. also *sammuti* at, e.g., Nissag. 14; *Vin.* i. 283 f. The government is by democracy, for the monks agree among themselves. At *Vin.* i. 298 the illness of a monk is one of the reasons "allowed" for his laying aside his outer cloak. See *Vin.* i. 109 f. for agreement to, and removal of, *ticivarena avippavāsa* in connection with *sīmā*, boundary.

me . . . the three robes. The Order gives the monk so and so the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes. If the giving to the monk so and so of the agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes, is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. Agreement (to be regarded) as not away, separated from the three robes, is given by the Order to the monk so and so, and it is pleasing to the venerable ones; therefore they are silent. So do I understand this.' And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When the robe-material is settled, when a monk's *kāṭhina* (privileges) have been removed, if this monk should be away, separated from the three robes, even for one night, except on the agreement of the monks,¹ there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 2 ||

When the robe-material is settled means: the robe-material is made up for a monk, or lost or destroyed or burnt, or an expectation of robe-material is disappointed.²

When the kāṭhina (privileges) have been removed means: they come to be removed because of a certain one of eight grounds, or they come to be removed before the time by the Order.²

If this monk should be away, separated from the three robes, even for one night means: without the outer cloak, or without the upper robe, or without the inner robe.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks.

There is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited at sunrise; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited. . . . [199] 'Honoured sirs, these three robes were away, separated from me

¹ Cf. rule in Nissag. 29.

² Cf. Nissag. I. 3, 1.

for a night, without the agreement of the monks (and are to be forfeited. I forfeit them to the Order . . . ' . . . should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 1 ||

A village having one precinct,¹ various precincts; a dwelling having one precinct, various precincts; a stable² having one precinct, various precincts; a watch-tower³ having one precinct, various precincts; a quadrangular building⁴ having one precinct, various precincts; a long house⁵ having one precinct, various precincts; a mansion⁶ having one precinct, various precincts; a boat

¹ *ekupacāra*; cf. *Vin.* iii. 46, *gāmuṣpacāra*.

² *uddosita*; *VA.* 654 expl., *yānādīnaṃ bhaṇḍānaṃ sālā*, a room for such implements as waggons, etc.

³ *aṭṭa*; *VA.* 654 expl., "it is made with bricks for warding off hostile kings, and thick walls, and is four or five storeys high." Cf. *VbhA.* 366.

⁴ *māla* (or *māla*). Cf. *Vin.* i. 140; *D.* i. 2; *Sn.*, p. 104. *SnA.* 447 calls *maṇḍalamālaṃ*, a *mandapam*, or pavilion. At *Vbh.* 251 this and the preceding building (*aṭṭa*) and the following one (*pāsāda*) are included in the definition of *senāsana*, lodgings. *VA.* 654 says that *māla* is *ekakūṭasaṅgahīto caturassapāsādo*, a quadrangular building comprised under one roof. *VbhA.* 366 quotes this definition, while also saying that *māla* is like an eating-hall, a pavilion. This and the next two, *pāsāda* and *hammiya*, occur, as *māla*, *pāsāya*, *hammiya* at *Āyaramgasutta* II. 7, 1, and are translated by Jacobi in *Jaina Sūtras* i. 105 as loft, platform, roof. See his note on *māla*, *loc. cit.* But from the *Comy.* it seems that *māla* and *pāsāda* are two different styles of houses, the one square, the other long, while *hammiya* is a larger type of house.

⁵ *pāsādo ti dighapāsādo*, *VA.* 654. *Pāsāda* has also been defined as the big buildings of kings; cf. below, p. 130, the *pāsāda* of King Bimbisāra. If a *pāsāda* type of building is built by other people, then it is called a *hammiya*.

⁶ *hammiya*. See above, n. 4. *VA.* 654 calls it *muṇḍacchadana-pāsādo*, a "long house" under a bare roof. This appears to be a house with what we should nowadays call a "sun-roof"—i.e., all the rooms have ceilings, so that they are covered in; but over the whole or part of the uppermost rooms, although there are ceilings, there is no further outside roofing. This means that one can walk on the upper side of the ceiling with no roof over one. *Vin. Texts* i. 173, n. 1, says that *pāsāda* "is a long storeyed mansion (or, the whole of an upper storey). *Hammiya* is a *Pāsāda*, which has an upper chamber placed on the topmost storey."

having one precinct, various precincts; a caravan having one precinct, various precincts; a field having one precinct, various precincts; a threshing-floor¹ having one precinct, various precincts; a monastery² having one precinct, various precincts; a dwelling-place³ having one precinct, various precincts; the foot of a tree having one precinct, various precincts; an open space having one precinct, various precincts. || 2 ||

A village having one precinct means: a village comes to be for one family,⁴ and is enclosed⁵: laying aside the robe within the village, he should remain⁶ within the village. It is not enclosed⁷: he should remain in the same house⁸ as that in which the robe was laid aside,

At *Vin.* ii. 154 five kinds of roof (*chadana*) are given: of tiles (or bricks), stones, plaster, *tiṇa*-grass, palm-leaves. At *Vin.* ii. 146 *hammiya* is given with *vihāra*, *aḍḍhayoga*, *pāsāda* and *guhā* as the five *lenāni*, abodes, allowed to monks, while at *Vin.* i. 58, 96 these are called "extra allowances," to dwelling at the foot of a tree; *Vin.* i. 239 names these five abodes as *paccantima vihāra kappiya-bhūmi*, "outside building as a kappiyabhūmi" (*Vin. Texts* ii. 119) where the country people may keep and cook their stores; and at *Vin.* i. 284 the Order is allowed to agree upon any one of these that it desires as a storeroom for robe-material. At *Vin.* ii. 152 *hammiya* occurs as one of the three inner chambers, *gabbha*, allowed to monks. *Hammiya-gabbha* is translated at *Vin. Texts* iii. 173 as "chambers on an upper storey," with quote from the *Comy.* in n. 5: *hammiya-gabbho ti ākāsatale kuṭāgāragabbho muṇḍacchadanagabbho vā*. *Vin. Texts* i. 173, n. 1, quotes *Bu.*'s definition on *Vin.* i. 58: *hammiyan ti upariākāsatale patiṭṭhitakūṭāgāro pāsādo yeva*.

¹ *karāṇa*; here, in *dhaññakarāṇa*, seems to mean preparing the doing. *VA.* 654 explains by *khala*, corn ready for threshing, or the threshing-floor.

² *VA.* 654, "a flower-park or an orchard."

³ *vihāra*.

⁴ *VA.* 652, "it is the village of one ruler or headman."

⁵ *VA.* 652, "it is enclosed by a wall or by a fence or by a ditch."

⁶ *vathabbaṃ*. In this meaning cf. *Vin.* ii. 8. *VA.* 652, "he ought to wait in a place of his own choosing within the village until the sun rises."

⁷ *VA.* 652, "it is shown by this that there are various precincts to this same village."

⁸ *VA.* 652, "the definition of a house is that it is the dwelling of one family, etc."

or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.¹

A village comes to be for various families,² and is enclosed: he should remain in the same house as that in which the robe was laid aside—either in the hall or at the entrance³—or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. Or if, going to the hall, laying aside the robe within a reach of the hand, either he should remain in the hall or at the entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. The robe being laid aside in the hall, he should either remain in the hall or at the entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same house as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 3 ||

A dwelling comes to be for one family, and is enclosed; there are various rooms, various inner rooms⁴: laying aside the robe within the dwelling, he should remain within the dwelling. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same room as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.

A dwelling comes to be for various families, it is enclosed and there are various rooms, various inner rooms: he should remain in the same room as that in

¹ *hatthapāsa*. V.A. 652 says that the robe should not be moved for more than two and a half linear measures—i.e., *ratana*. Cf. *VbhA.* 343, *dve vidatthiyo ratanam*. A *vidatthi* is a span of twelve fingers' breadth. Cf. also *Vin.* iii. 149. V.A. 652 proceeds, "having gone beyond this measure, if the monk by psychic potency waits in the air until the sun rises, there is an offence involving forfeiture." *Hatthapāsa*, a reach of the hand, arm's length, is a technical term, always used in the *Vin.* to denote a distance of two and a half cubits around oneself.

² V.A. 652, "it is a village belonging to various rulers and headmen, like Vesālī and Kusināra, etc."

³ *dvāramūle*=*nagaradvārassa samāpe*, V.A. 652.

⁴ There is not much difference between *gabbha*, "room," and *ovāraka*, "inner room," but the latter is usually a bedroom, sleeping-apartment.

which the robe was laid aside, or at the main entrance,¹ or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same room as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 4 ||

A stable comes to be for one family, and is enclosed; there are various rooms, various inner rooms: [200] laying aside the robe within the stable, he should remain within the stable. It is not enclosed: . . . (See || 4 ||) . . . A stable comes to be for various families. . . . It is not enclosed . . . or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 5 ||

A watch-tower comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the watch-tower, he should remain within the watch-tower. A watch-tower comes to be for various families; there are various rooms, various inner rooms; he should remain in the same inner room as that in which the robe was laid aside or at the main entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 6 ||

A quadrangular building comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the quadrangular building (See || 6 ||) . . . A quadrangular building comes to be for various families . . . from the reach of the hand. || 7 ||

A long house comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the long house. . . . A long house comes to be for various families . . . from the reach of the hand. || 8 ||

A mansion comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the mansion. . . . A mansion comes to be for various families . . . from the reach of the hand. || 9 ||

¹ V.A. 654, *dvāramūle*=*gharadvāramūle*.

A boat comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe within the boat. . . . A boat comes to be for various families; there are various rooms, various inner rooms¹; he should remain in the same inner room as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 10 ||

A caravan comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe in the caravan, seven *abbhantaras*² should not be removed before or behind, an *abbhantara* should not be removed from the side. A caravan comes to be for various families: laying aside a robe in the caravan, it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 11 ||

A field comes to be for one family, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe within the field, he should remain within the field. It is not enclosed: it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.³ A field comes to be for various families, and is enclosed. Laying aside the robe within the field, he should either remain at the main entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand.⁴ It is not enclosed: it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 12 ||

A threshing-floor comes to be for one family, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe on the threshing-floor, he should remain on the threshing-floor. It is not enclosed: it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. A threshing-floor comes to be for various families, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe on the

¹ Cf. the "ocean-going ship" of *A.* iv. 127 = *S.* iii. 155, and the one at *Jā.* v. 75 which took five hundred passengers. Thus the Indians at the time of the compilation of these works were not apparently ignorant of quite large-scale shipbuilding.

² *abbhantara* also at *Vin.* i. 111. *V.A.* 654 says, "here one *abbhantara* is twenty-eight hands." See *Intr.*, p. 50.

³ *V.A.* 654, "of the field."

⁴ *v.ll.* at *Vin.* iii. 276 suggest some difficulty, even as though there were some omission.

threshing-floor, he should either remain at the gate, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 13 ||

A monastery comes to be for one family, and is enclosed.¹ . . . (See || 13 ||) . . . It is not enclosed. . . . A monastery comes to be for various families. . . . It is not enclosed; it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 14 || [201]

A dwelling-place comes to be for one family, and is enclosed: laying aside the robe within the dwelling-place, he should remain within the dwelling-place. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same dwelling-place as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. A dwelling-place comes to be for various families, and is enclosed: he should remain in the same dwelling-place as that in which the robe was laid aside or at the main entrance, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. It is not enclosed: he should remain in the same dwelling-place as that in which the robe was laid aside, or it should not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 15 ||

A foot of a tree comes to be for one family: laying aside the robe in the shade, if he spreads it entirely in the shade at the time of mid-day, he must remain in the shade.² A foot of a tree comes to be for various families; it must not be removed from the reach of the hand. || 16 ||

An open space having one precinct means: in a jungle where there are no villages,³ the same precinct is seven

¹ At *Vin.* ii. 154 monks were allowed to enclose their *ārāmas* (monasteries) with bamboo fences, thorn fences and ditches.

² The area is that to which the mid-day shadow spreads. People used to live at the foot of trees. *Mūla*, foot, is lit. root.

³ Cf. definition of "jungle" at *Vin.* iii. 46, 51.

abbhantaras all round¹; beyond that there are different precincts.² || 17 ||

If he thinks that he is away, separated when he is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether he is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that he is not away, separated, when he is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is taken away³ when it is not taken

¹ = *Vin.* i. 111. *VA.* 655 says, "standing in the middle there are seven *abbhantaras* extending to all quarters; sitting in the middle he guards the robe put down on the boundary of the eastern or western quarter. But if at the time of sunrise he goes as much as a hair's breadth to the eastern quarter, the robe is to be forfeited in the western quarter. But at the time of *uposatha*, beginning with the monks sitting at the outer circle of the congregation, the boundary of the seven *abbhantaras* should be removed, so that the boundary increases to the size to which the Order increases."

² Thus, in order to be in the same precinct as the robe, he has to be within seven *abbhantaras* of it.

³ Meaning doubtful. *Paccuddhata* seems = *pati* + *uddhata* or *uddhata*, from *uddharati*. Cf. above, pp. 5, 15, *ubbhata* *smim* *kathine*, and p. 6, n. 5. Cf. below, || 19 || *anto aruṇe paccuddharati*; also p. 159; and *Vin.* iv. 121 f., *apaccuddhāraka* (said of a robe).

If, in this clause, the noun that governs *paccuddhata* had been mentioned, the meaning of the verb would have been clearer. I think that it means "taken away" on the analogy of *ubbhata*, and that "robe" is the understood subject; see *VA.* 657. Thus *paccuddhata* comes into line with the other past participles, *vissajjita*, *nattha*, etc., whose subject here, as often elsewhere, is to be taken as "robe." A robe that is taken away means, as do these other verbs (see also "no offence" paragraph), that a monk is no longer responsible for it. Secondly, there is the suggestion that *a-paccuddhata* means "not (formally) given"; see *C.P.D.* In this context, the noun to be supplied could also be "the agreement," for *paccuddharati* does not appear to be a verb used for giving or distributing robes to monks; and in this case the monk had his robe and was asking permission to be away from it. But if we were to read "the agreement is taken away," we should still have to explain *paccuddharati* in the "no offence" paragraph, and the point would

away . . . If he thinks that it is bestowed when it is not bestowed . . . If he thinks that it is lost when it is not lost . . . If he thinks that it is destroyed when it is not destroyed . . . If he thinks that it is burnt when it is not burnt . . . If he thinks that it is stolen when it is not stolen, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is away, separated, when he is not away, separated, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not away, separated, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is not away, separated, when he is not away, separated, there is no offence. || 18 ||

There is no offence if before sunrise¹ it is taken away, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt; if they tear it from him; if they take it on trust²; if there is the agreement of the monks,³ if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.⁴ || 19 || 3 ||

then arise, Could monks, or did they, rescind an agreement once they had given it? Thirdly, the *kāṭhina* privileges might be the subject of *paccuddhata*, *paccuddharati*, for their removal has been mentioned as a condition in the rule: it is an offence to be absent from the robes if the privileges are removed. Hence there could only be "no offence" if they are *not* removed, whereas the reverse is stated to be the case. Moreover, *ubbhata*, not *paccuddhata*, is the normal way of speaking of the *kāṭhina* privileges that are removed.

¹ *anto aruṇe* = *anto aruṇagga*, "the time before sunset," so *C.P.D.*

² Cf. *Nissag.* 1, 3, 21 ("broken" = *Vin.* iv. 245), 27, 29.

³ All these clauses show that in some way the monk's responsibility for the robe had gone.

⁴ Cf. below, p. 159.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) III

. . . at Sāvattī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time a robe¹ accrued to² a certain monk not at the right time.³ The robe, as they made it, did not suffice for him. Then [202] that monk, pulling out that robe, smoothed it again and again.⁴ The lord, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw this monk pulling out this robe and smoothing it again and again, and seeing him he approached this monk, and having approached he said to this monk:

"Why, monk, do you, pulling out this robe, smooth it again and again?"

"Lord, this robe which accrued to me not at the right time, as they made it does not suffice for me, therefore do I, pulling out this robe, smooth it again and again."

"But, monk, is there for you an expectation of a robe?"⁵

"There is, lord," he said.

Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, I allow you, having accepted a robe not at the right time, to lay it aside in the expectation of a robe."⁶ || 1 ||

¹ *cīvara* means both the made-up robe and the robe-material or robe-cloth.

² *uppannaṃ hoti*. Cf. above, p. 4, n. 3; below, pp. 90, 99.

³ *akālacīvara*. Also at *Vin.* iv. 245, 246, 284, 287.

⁴ *V.A.* 658, "thinking, if one gets rid of the creases, it will be big (enough for me), sprinkling it with water, treading upon it with his feet, pulling it out with his hands and taking it up, he rubbed it across his back . . . but dried by the sun, it (*i.e.*, the robe-material) became as small as before, so he did this again."

⁵ *cīvarapaccāsā*. Cf. *cīvarāsā* at *Vin.* i. 259 ff., and *bhāttapaccāsā* at *Vin.* iv. 77.

⁶ Cf. *Nissag.* II, where monks are not allowed to wear extra robes.

Then monks said: "It is allowed by the lord, if a robe has been accepted not at the right time, to lay it aside in the expectation of a robe." These, accepting robes not at the right time, laid them aside for more than a month. These robes, tied up in bundles, remained on a bamboo for hanging up robes.¹ Then the venerable Ānanda, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw these robes tied up in bundles that remained on the bamboo for hanging up robes. Seeing them, he addressed the monks thus:

"Your reverences, whose are these robes, tied up in bundles, that remain on the bamboo for hanging up robes?"

"Your reverence, they are our robes, given not at the right time, that are laid aside in the expectation of robes."

"But for how long, your reverences, have these robes been laid aside?"

"For more than a month, your reverence," they said.

Then the venerable Ānanda looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these monks, having accepted robe-material not at the right time, lay it aside for more than a month?"

Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks having accepted robe-material not at the right time, laid it aside for more than a month?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, having accepted robe-material not at the right time, lay it aside for more than a month? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased. . . . And thus also, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When the robe-material is settled, when a monk's

¹ *cīvaravaṃsa*, with *cīvararajju* allowed at *Vin.* i. 286, ii. 121. Cf. below, p. 152.

kathina (privileges) have been removed, if robe-material should accrue to the monk not at the right time, it may be accepted by that monk if he so wish. Having accepted it, it should be made up quickly. But if it is not sufficient for him, that robe-material may be laid aside by that monk for a month at most, should he have any expectation that the deficiency may be supplied.¹ If he should lay it aside for longer than that, even with the expectation (of the deficiency being supplied), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 2 || 1 || [203]

When the robe-material is settled means: . . . (See Nissag. II. 3) . . . or they are removed before the time by the Order.

If robe-material (should accrue) not at the right time means: some that has accrued during the eleven months² when the kathina cloth is not (formally) made³; some that has accrued during the seven months when the kathina cloth is (formally) made, even a gift (of material) offered⁴ at the right time; this means robe-material (accruing) not at the right time.

¹ Lit. "for the completion of," *pāripūriyā*.

² VA. 658, "setting aside one last month of the rainy season (*kattika*), there remain eleven months."

³ *atthata*, from *attharati*, lit. "to spread out." Not, however, to be taken literally here, but as the ceremony of making the robes at the end of the rains. See *Vin. Texts* ii. 148 n. for very interesting remarks on distributing the robes, and above, p. 5, n. 1.

These curious expressions, "during the eleven, during the seven months," mean, I think, that, in the case of the eleven, the kathina cloth is only distributed in the month following the termination of the rains; therefore there would be eleven months when it is not made. In the case of the seven months, it is probably meant that no making of robes takes place during the rains, but that in unusual circumstances robe-material might be given to a monk during the remaining seven months of the year. VA. 658 says that the four months of the rainy season (*kattika*) are in the winter; thus setting aside five months (*i.e.*, these, with the one remaining over after "eleven months"), there remain seven. Cf. VA. 729. Cf. above, p. 5, n. 3; below, p. 154, n. 3.

⁴ *ādissa*; VA. 658, *uddisīvā*.

Should accrue means: should accrue from the Order or from a group or from a relation or from a friend, or as rag-robes, or by means of his own property.¹

If he so wish means: himself desiring, it may be accepted.

Having accepted it, it should be made up quickly means: it should be made up within ten days.

But if it is not sufficient for him means: if it is not enough to be worn.

*That robe-material may be laid aside by that monk for a month at most*² means: it may be laid aside for a month at the maximum.²

That the deficiency may be supplied means: for the sake of supplying the deficiency.

Any expectation means: there is expectation from the Order or from a group or from a relation or from a friend, or as to rag-robes, or by means of his own property.³ || 1 ||

If he should lay it aside for longer than that, even with the expectation (of the deficiency being supplied) means: if a robe that was expected accrues on the very day that the first robe⁴ accrues, he should have it made up within ten days. . . . If a robe that was expected accrues two days . . . three days . . . four days . . . five days . . . six days . . . seven days . . . eight days . . . nine days . . . ten days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within ten days. If a robe that was expected accrues eleven days . . . twelve days . . . thirteen days . . . fourteen days . . . fifteen days . . . sixteen days . . . seventeen days . . . eighteen

¹ Cf. below, p. 91.

² *paramam . . . paramatā*.

³ VA. 658, "on a certain day the Order or a group will receive robes, and there will be a robe for me; . . . a robe has been ordered for me by my relations, by a friend; when these come they will give the robes. . . . I will get a robe from the dust-heap, . . . by my own property, meaning cotton threads, etc." This last must mean that if he has the means of sewing the robes together, he may do so. Cf. below, p. 91.

⁴ *mūlacīvara*, as opposed to *paccāsā-cīvara*, the robe that was expected (VA. 659).

days . . . nineteen days . . . twenty days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within ten days . . . twenty-one days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within nine days . . . twenty-two . . . twenty-three . . . twenty-four . . . twenty-five . . . twenty-six days after the first robe accrues, he should have it made up within four days. If a robe that was expected accrues twenty-seven . . . twenty-eight . . . twenty-nine days . . . he should have it made up within one day. If a robe that was expected accrues thirty days after the first robe accrues, on that same day it should be allotted, assigned, bestowed. But should it not be allotted or assigned or bestowed, it is to be forfeited on the thirty-first day at sunrise; [204] it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: . . . 'This robe, honoured sirs, (given) not at the right time, is to be forfeited by me, the month having elapsed. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . 'The Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 2 ||

If the robe that was expected accrues but is different from the first robe that has accrued, and there are some nights over,¹ it should not be caused to be made up unwillingly.² If he thinks that a month has elapsed when it has elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether a month has elapsed . . . If he does not think that a month has elapsed when it has elapsed . . . If he thinks that one is allotted when it is not allotted . . . If he thinks that one is assigned when it is not assigned

¹ *I.e.*, the month not being finished (*VA.* 659).

² *akāma.* *VA.* 659, "if the first robe is soft and the robe that was expected is coarse and it is impossible to mix them, and there are nights, though not a month, remaining, the robe should not be caused to be made up unwillingly. But taking another robe that was expected, this should be made up after an interval, and the robe that was expected should be assigned as a cloth used for water-strainers."

. . . If he thinks that one is bestowed when it is not bestowed . . . If he thinks that one is lost when it is not lost . . . If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed . . . If he thinks that one is burnt when it is not burnt . . . If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a month has elapsed when it has not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a month has not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a month has not elapsed when it has not elapsed, there is no offence. || 3 ||

There is no offence if within a month it is allotted, assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear it from him, if they take it on trust; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹ || 4 || 2 ||

¹ *Cf.* *Nissag.* I, II, XXVIII, XXIX; and *Nissag.* XXI=*Vin.* (v. 245 ("broken" instead of "burnt")).

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) IV

. . . at Sāvattī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapindika's monastery. Now at that time¹ the former wife of the venerable Udāyin had gone forth among the nuns. She frequently came to the venerable Udāyin, and the venerable Udāyin frequently went to this nun. Now at that time the venerable Udāyin used to participate in a meal with this nun. Then the venerable Udāyin, dressing in the morning,² taking his bowl and robe, approached this nun, and having approached and disclosed his private parts in front of this nun, he sat down on a seat. And further, the nun having disclosed her private parts in front of the venerable Udāyin, sat down on a seat. Then the venerable Udāyin, impassioned, looked at and thought about³ this nun's private parts and emitted semen. Then the venerable Udāyin said to this nun:

"Go, sister, fetch water, I will wash the inner robe."
[205]

"Give⁴ it (to me), master, I will wash it myself," and she took hold of one part with her mouth and placed one part on her private parts. Because of this she conceived a child. The nuns spoke thus:

"This nun is one who does not lead the Brahma-life, (because) she is pregnant."

(She, saying,) "Ladies,⁵ I am not one who does not lead the Brahma-life," told this matter to the nuns.

¹ Opening phrases are the same as those of Pāc. 30.

² *pubbaṅha* and *aparaṅha* are the morning and the afternoon. Cf. *KhuA.* 105.

³ *upanijjhāyati* has sense of "to look at (eagerly)" and "to reflect on."

⁴ *āharati* has sense of "to give" here.

⁵ *ayye*.

The nuns looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can master Udāyin get a soiled robe¹ washed by a nun?" Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Udāyin get a soiled robe washed by a nun?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, got a soiled robe washed by a nun?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

"Was she a relation of yours, Udāyin, or not a relation?"

"She was not a relation, lord," he said.

"Foolish man,² one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is pleasant or what is unpleasant for a woman who is not a relation. Thus you, foolish man, will get a soiled robe washed by a nun who is not a relation. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should get a soiled robe washed or dyed³ or beaten⁴ by a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."⁵ || 1 ||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

(*A nun*) *who is not a relation* means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.⁶

¹ *purāṇa-cīvara*, lit. "old robe."

² Oldenberg's edn. has *moghapuriso*; but see Sinhalese edn., and also below, pp. 39, 44, where the voc., *moghapurisa*, occurs in similar contexts. ³ Six kinds of dyes allowed at *Vin.* i. 286.

⁴ At *Vin.* i. 286 monks are allowed to beat, *ākoṭeti*, with the hands robe-material that has become harsh.

⁵ Cf. Nissag. XVII for both "rule" and *Old Comy*.

⁶ Cf. below, Nissag. VI. 3, 1. This definition = *Vin.* iii. 212, 214, 216, 219, 235; *Vin.* iv. 60, 61.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.¹

A soiled robe means: dressed in² it once, put on³ once.

Wash means: he gives an order⁴—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If washed, it is to be forfeited.

Dye means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If dyed, it is to be forfeited.

Beat means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If once having given a blow with the palm (of the hand) or a blow with a club, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this soiled robe which I had washed by a nun who is not a relation, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back. . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 1 || [206]

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash (his) soiled robe,

¹ =below, pp. 40, 96, and *passim*. *VA.* 660, "she is ordained by a motion of the Order of nuns where the resolution is put three times and followed by the decision (as the fourth item, *nātticatuttha*), then she is ordained in the same way by the Order of monks. Therefore she is ordained by eight Vinaya acts."

² *nivāttha*, p.p. of *nivāseti*. It refers to the *antaravāsaka*, the inner or under robe that hangs down from the waist, and to the *uttarāsāṅga*, upper robe; also to the cloths for the rains (*Nissag.* XXIV), to garments worn by members of other sects (*Vin.* i. 305 f.), to garments called *akkanāla* and *pothaka* (*Vin.* i. 306 f.), to nuns' vests (*VA.* 663), to a laywoman's outer cloak, *sātaka*, *Vin.* iv. 18.

³ *pāruta*, p.p. of *pārupati*. It refers to the *saṅghāti*, outer cloak; also to a (costly) *paṭa*, or cloth (below, p. 109), and to *vihāracīvara*, and other things that a monk may put on, *pārupitum*, to cover the body if the robes are stolen or lost (*Nissag.* VI, p. 46, below). Thus, for a monk, both *nivāseti* and *pārupati* are required to indicate the putting on or dressing in the complete set of three robes. *Cf. Vin.* iv. 281 f., where the two words occur in connection with the five kinds of robes a nun should wear. See below, p. 88, where "old rug," *purāṇasanthata*, is defined as is "soiled robe," *purāṇacīvara*, above.

⁴ *VA.* 660, "the nun who was ordered prepares an oven, collects sticks, makes a fire, fetches water, until, having washed it, she holds it up: there is an offence of wrong-doing in each action for the monk."

there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.¹ If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye, makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her wash (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her beat, makes her wash (his) soiled robe, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat, makes her wash (his) soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat, makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there

¹ *nissaggiyena āpatti dukkaṭassa*; probably *pācittiya* omitted merely for the sake of brevity.

is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her beat, makes her wash, makes her dye (his) soiled robe, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he is in doubt as to whether she is not a relation . . . If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is not a relation . . . If he makes her wash another's soiled robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes her wash a sheet (used as) a piece of cloth for sitting on,¹ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes a woman who has been ordained by one (Order only) wash it,² there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that she is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence when a female relation is washing it if a woman assistant who is not a relation is (helping); if she washes it unasked³; if he makes her wash an unused

¹ A compound word in Pali, *nisīdana-paccattharaṇa*. *Nisīdana* is a piece of cloth for sitting on; *paccattharaṇa* is the bed-clothes, really a piece of cloth for covering a bed or chair, thus a sheet. Cf. below, p. 46, n. 3. At *Vin.* i. 295 a *nisīdana* was found to be too small to protect the whole lodging; to meet this difficulty the lord is reputed to have allowed a *paccattharaṇa*, made as large as one wishes. It looks therefore as if *nisīdana-paccattharaṇa* is either a sheet that is a piece of cloth to sit upon, although larger than a mere "piece of cloth to sit upon," the mere *nisīdana*; or that it is a sheet used as, or instead of, a piece of cloth for sitting on. Cf. *nisīdana-santhata*, in *Nissag.* XV, below, p. 87, and both in Introduction.

² *V.A.* 662, "causing it to be washed by one who was ordained (only) in the presence of the nuns is an offence of wrong-doing, and it is the same for one who has been ordained (only) in the presence of the monks; five hundred Sakyan women were ordained in the presence of the monks."

³ *V.A.* 662, "if she has come for the Exposition and the Exhortation, seeing the soiled robe and taking it from the place where it was put, she says: 'Give it, master, I will wash it,' and when it is brought

one; if he makes her wash another requisite,¹ except the robe; if it is (washed) by a female probationer, by a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.² || 3 || 2 ||

she washes it and moreover dyes it and beats it—this is called 'she washes it unasked' (*avuttā*). If she hears a monk ordering a youth or a novice to wash the robe, she says: 'Bring it, master, I will wash it,' and she washes it, or taking it for a time, having washed it and dyed it, she then gives it back—this is called 'she washes it unasked.'"

¹ *Ibid.*, "a sandal, bowl, shoulder-strap, girdle, couch, chair, straw mat."

² Cf. below, p. 97 f.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) V

... at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. At that time the nun Uppalavaṇṇā¹ was staying at Sāvattihī. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, dressing in the morning [207] and taking her bowl and robe, entered Sāvattihī for alms-food. Having wandered about Sāvattihī for alms-food, returning from her alms-gathering after her meal,² she approached the Blind Men's Grove³ for the mid-day rest; having plunged into the Blind Men's Grove she sat down at the foot of a tree for the mid-day rest. Now at that time some thieves, having done their deeds,⁴ having killed a cow⁵ and taken the flesh, entered the Blind Men's Grove. Then the robber-chief saw the nun Uppalavaṇṇā as she was sitting at the foot of the tree for the mid-day rest, and seeing her, it occurred to him:

¹ *Vin.* iii. 35 tells the story of the rape of Uppalavaṇṇā by a brahmin youth; see *B.D.* i. 53, n. 5.

² *pacchābhatta*; *bhatta* usually means cooked rice. As this is the main thing put into the bowl, it has come to mean the whole meal.

³ Malalasekera, *D.P.P.N.* i. 111, says, "'Blind,' usually, but wrongly, translated 'Dark'." He gives the story accounting for the name of this Grove, an episode that must have taken place before the rape of Uppalavaṇṇā, as it is said (*DhA.* ii. 49, 52) that after that time nuns were not to stay in this Grove. *VA.* 662 also says that Uppalavaṇṇā entered the Blind Men's Grove, because the rule of training had not then been laid down. Those who translate *andhavana* as "Dark Grove" think of it, rightly or wrongly, as a Grove where, because it is so dark, it is impossible to see anything.

⁴ *kata-kammā*—i.e., committed thefts. Said of *māṇava* (*Comy. cora*, thief) at *A.* iii. 102, and of *cora* at *Vism.* 180, *Jā.* iii. 34.

⁵ The cow was probably not so sacred then as now, and the cattle-thief common in those days.

"If my sons and brothers see this nun they will trouble her," and he went by a different way.¹

Then that robber-chief, taking the best meats of the cooked meat, tying (them up) in a leaf-packet, and hanging it up on a tree near the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, said: "Whatever recluse or brahmin sees it, it is given (to him), let him take it,"² and having spoken thus, he departed. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, arising from contemplation,³ heard these words of that robber-chief as he was speaking.⁴ Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, taking that meat, went to the nunnery. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, having prepared⁵ that meat at the end of that night, tying it up into a bundle with her upper robe,⁶ rising in the air,⁷ reappeared in the Bamboo Grove. || 1 ||

Now at that time the lord was visiting the village for alms-food, and the venerable Udāyin came to be the one left behind as guardian of the dwelling. Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā approached the venerable Udāyin, and having approached, she said to the venerable Udāyin:

"Where, honoured sir, is the lord?"

¹ *VA.* 662, "It is said that formerly the robber-chief knew the *therī*, therefore seeing her as he went in front of the robbers, he said: 'Do not go there, all come here,' and taking them he went by another way."

² By these words the meat was made *kappiya*, allowable, and became a gift that might be taken.

³ On *samādhi* as a term in Hindu philosophy, see Radhakrishnan, *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, 49-52. It is there rendered as "unification," "identification," "ecstatic consciousness." It is possible that the "sense of immediate contact with ultimate reality, of the unification of the different sides of our nature," was not absent from the Early Buddhist conception of *samādhi*.

⁴ *VA.* 663, "It is said that the *therī* arose from contemplation at the appointed time: he spoke (the words reported above) at that very moment, and she heard and thought, 'There is no other *samaṇa* or brahmin here but me.'"

⁵ *sampādetvā*, possibly "roasted."

⁶ = *Vin.* iv. 162.

⁷ On *vehāsa* as "above the ground" see *B.D.* i. 79, n. 6.

He said, "Sister, the lord has entered the village for alms-food."

"Give this meat to the lord, honoured sir," she said.

"You, sister, have pleased the lord with this meat; if you were to give me your inner robe, likewise would I become pleased with the inner robe."¹

"But we women, honoured sir, get things with difficulty. This is my last, (my) fifth robe.² I shall not give it to you," she said.

"It is as if, sister, a man giving an elephant should caparison³ its girth,⁴ yet even so do you, sister, (though) giving meat to the lord, not give³ me your inner robe."⁵

Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, being pressed by the venerable Udāyin, giving him her inner robe, went to the nunnery. The nuns, taking the nun Uppalavaṇṇā's bowl and robe, said to the nun Uppalavaṇṇā:

"Lady, where is your inner robe?"

The nun Uppalavaṇṇā told this matter to the nuns. The nuns [208] looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Udāyin accept a robe from a nun? Women come by things with difficulty." And

¹ VA. 663, Udāyin is filled with lust and greed.

² *Ibid.*, she did not speak from greed, for "in those who have destroyed the cankers there is no greed"; but there was no robe left over of the five that were to be worn by nuns. These five, as *pañca cīvarāni*, are referred to at *Vin.* iv. 281 f. At *Vin.* ii. 272 it is said that the three usual robes, the vest, *samkacchika*, and the bathing-cloth, should be pointed out to women who wish to receive the upasampadā ordination. Nuns were also allowed indoors robes or cloths, *āvasathacīvara* (*Vin.* ii. 217), but apparently such things were handed from nun to nun as need arose (*Vin.* iv. 303).

³ *sajjeyya*. *Sajjeti* is to send out, to prepare, equip, fit up, decorate, deck out, and came to mean to give.

⁴ *kaccha*, here acc. pl. It is the girth or middle of an animal. If a present of an elephant is being made, a decorated cloth to be tied round his middle should also be given.

⁵ Here there is a parallelism between *kaccha*, an accessory of the elephant, and *antaravāsaka*, the inner robe, which Udāyin thought might accompany the gift of meat. The meat had been wrapped up in the nun's upper robe, and it is to be presumed that she was in consequence going about in her inner robe; see *Intr.*, p. xviii.

then these nuns told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the venerable Udāyin accept a robe from a nun?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Udāyin, accepted a robe from a nun?"

"It is true, lord."

"Is she a relation of yours, Udāyin, or not a relation?"

"She is not a relation, lord," he said.

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right¹ or what is wrong for a woman who is not a relation.² Thus you, foolish man, will accept a robe from the hand of a nun who is not a relation. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should accept a robe from the hand of a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 2 || 1 ||

Then scrupulous monks did not accept exchange of robes³ with nuns. The nuns . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the masters not accept exchange of robes with us?"

Monks heard these nuns who looked down upon, criticised, spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, I allow you to accept exchange among these

¹ *santa*, meaning "right" or "existent."

² Cf. below, p. 44, and *Vin.* iv. 59. Also above, p. 31, where, however, we get *pāsādika* and *apāsādika*, pleasant and unpleasant, instead of *santa* and *asanta*, right and wrong.

³ *pārivattakācīvara*. Cf. *parivatteti*, to barter, p. 55, below.

five (classes of people)¹: a monk, a nun, a female probationer, a male novice, a female novice. I allow you, monks, to accept exchange among these five (classes of people). And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should accept a robe from the hand of a nun who is not a relation, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."² || 2 ||

Whatever means: . . . (See Nissag. IV. 2, 1) . . .

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.³ [209]

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.⁴

Except in exchange means: without an exchange.

He accepts: in the action there is an offence of wrong-doing; it should be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe, accepted from the hand of a nun who is not a relation, is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 1 ||

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation, (and) accepts a robe, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether the woman is not a relation, (and) accepts a robe, except in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is not a relation, (and) accepts a robe, except

¹ VA. 663, "among these five (kinds of) co-religionists having the same faith, the same morality, the same views."

² At *Vin.* iv. 60 it is a *pācittiya* to give (*dātuṃ*) a robe to a nun who is not related, except in exchange.

³ =above, p. 32, below, p. 96, and *Vin.* iv. 52, 55, 57, 60, *passim*.

⁴ =above, p. 7, and see there n. 4; see also below, pp. 48, 140.

in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he accepts a robe, except in exchange, from the hand of a woman ordained by one (Order only),¹ there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a woman is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is a relation, there is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if she is a relation; if there is an exchange; if there is a large thing for a small thing, or a small thing for a large thing²; if a monk takes it on trust³; if he takes it for the time being; if he takes another requisite, except the robe; if she is a female probationer, a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || 3 ||

¹ VA. 664, "taking from the hand of a woman ordained in the presence of nuns (only), is an offence of wrong-doing; but from one ordained in the presence of monks (only), is an offence of expiation."

² VA. 664, "if bartering a precious sandal, a robe, shoulder-strap, waist-band, for a robe of little value, he accepts that robe, there is no offence."

³ At *Vin.* iv. 60 it is the nun who may take on trust, the monk giving.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) VI

. . . at Sāvattthi in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans,¹ came to be skilled² in giving dhamma-talk.³ Now at that time a certain son of a (great) merchant⁴ approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached and greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance.⁵ As he was sitting at a respectful distance, the venerable Upananda, the

¹ He had a novice, Kaṇḍaka, who behaved badly, *Vin.* i. 79, 85. At *Vin.* i. 153, having promised Pasenadi to spend the rains with him, he went to another place; and at *Vin.* i. 300, having spent the rains at one place, he accepted a share of robes at others. At *Vin.* ii. 165, coming late to a meal, he made a monk get up and give him his place. At *Vin.* ii. 168 he took two lodgings, and is also called a "maker of strife, quarrelsome." He is mentioned in *Nissag.* 8, 9, 10, 18, 20, 25, 27, and in various Pācittiya.

² *paṭṭho*, probably for *paddho*. *VA.* 665 says, *paṭṭho ti cheko samattho paṭibalo*.

³ *dhammī kathā*. Here, more a talk on religious or philosophical matters than the "reasoned talk" given by the lord before modifying one of the rules. See above, pp. 4, 14.

⁴ *setthiputta*. *Setthi* is a banker and a trader combined, hence a merchant, head of a guild. He is primarily a merchant, and a banker only because a merchant, and because there were no banks in those days. *Setthi-putta* indicates that the father was still alive, so that his son, the *setthiputta*, is not yet head of the firm, but will be on the death of his father. He would then become a *setthi*.

⁵ *ekamantaṃ nisīdi*, lit. sat down to one side, or end. In sitting down in the presence of an honoured person, care should be taken not to sit down in any of the six wrong ways, or *nisajjadosa*. These are *atidūra*, *accāsanna*, *uparivāta*, *unnatappadesa*, *atisammukha*, *atipacchā*, too far, too near, to windward, on a higher seat, too much in front, too much behind; see *VA.* 129=*MA.* i. 110; *UdA.* 53 (abbreviated); *SA.* i. 16 for similar six wrong ways of standing; and *cf.* *SA.* ii. 86 for a different set of six *nisajjadosa*. To consider all these difficulties, and to sit down so as to cause no discomfort to the honoured person, is *ekamantaṃ nisīdi*.

son of the Sakyans, gladdened . . . and delighted that son of a (great) merchant with dhamma-talk. And then the son of the (great) merchant, having been gladdened . . . and delighted by the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with dhamma-talk, said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"Honoured sir, do let me know what will be of use.¹ We are able to [210] give to the master, that is to say of the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings and medicine for the sick."²

"If you, sir, are desirous of giving something to me, give (me) one cloth from these,"³ he said.

"Wait, honoured sir, until I go to the house; having gone to the house I will send either one cloth from these or something better than these."

A second time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to the son of the (great) merchant . . . A third time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to the son of the (great) merchant: "If you, sir, are desirous of giving something to me, give (me) one cloth from these."

"Now, honoured sir, for us who are sons of respectable families, it is awkward⁴ to go out with (only) one piece of cloth. Wait, honoured sir, until I go to the house; having gone to the house I will send either one cloth from these or something better than these."

¹ *yena attho*. *Cf.* *B.D.* i. 222 for same expression.

² Gen. or dat. pl. used here instead of acc. pl., which usually goes with *dātum*, to give.

³ *ito*. This refers to the two pieces of cloth that a man would ordinarily wear, as is done today in India, except in the Punjab: the *dhoti* and the *chaddar*, the one put on at the waist, and the other to cover the top part of the body. The son of the merchant, in this story, presumably had on no more than the customary two pieces of cloth, so that if he gave one away, he would have to go partially naked. So he said, "Wait."

⁴ *kismiṃ viya=kim viya*, it is what? it is like what? There is no English expression to render this exactly, but in most Indian languages there is something of the sort. The origin of the expression is obscure. *Cf.* "it is awkward to go empty-handed," *kismiṃ viya rittahattham gantum*, below, p. 321, and n. 4.

“What is the good, sir, of your offering without desire to give, because even after you have offered you do not give?”

Then that son of the (great) merchant, being pressed by the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, giving one cloth, went away. || 1 ||

People, seeing the son of a (great) merchant, spoke thus:

“Why do you, master, come with (only) one cloth?” Then this son of a (great) merchant told this matter to these people. The people looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented; among them it is not easy to make reasonable requests.¹ How can they take a cloth when a reasonable request was made by the son of a (great) merchant?”

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

“How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, ask the son of a (great) merchant for a robe?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, asked the son of the (great) merchant for a robe?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

“Is he a relation of yours, Upananda, or not a relation?”

“He is not a relation, lord,” he said.

“Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for one who is not a relation.² Thus you, foolish man, will ask a son of a (great) merchant for a robe. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing

¹ *dhammanimantana*, a request such as could reasonably be made by a pious man to a good monk, a request made to religious people in a suitable way. Here the monk presumed on the request made him by the merchant's son.

² Cf. above, p. 39.

those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should ask a man or a woman householder who is not a relation (of his) for a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.”

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 2 || 1 ||

Now at that time several monks¹ [211] were going along the high-road from Sāketa to Sāvattthī. Midway on the road, thieves issuing forth, plundered these monks.² Then these monks said:

“It is forbidden by the lord to ask a man or woman householder who is not a relation for a robe.” And being scrupulous, they did not ask, (but) going naked as they were to Sāvattthī, they saluted the monks respectfully. The monks said:

“Your reverences, these Naked Ascetics³ are very good because they respectfully salute these monks.”⁴

They said: “Your reverences, we are not Naked Ascetics, we are monks.”

The monks said to the venerable Upāli: “If so,⁵ reverend Upāli, question these.”⁶

Then the venerable Upāli, having questioned these monks,⁷ said to the monks: “These are monks, your reverences; give them robes.”

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: “How can monks come naked? Should they not come covered up with grass or leaves?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on

¹ *sambahulā bhikkhū*, or “two or three” or “many monks”; see above, p. 8, n. 6.

² *V.A.* 665, “they stole their bowls and robes.” *ājīvaka*.

⁴ Or, “these Naked Ascetics who respectfully salute these monks are very good.” ⁵ *ingha*.

⁶ *V.A.* 665, “ask them for the sake of knowing their status as monks.”

⁷ *Ibid.*, “he asked them about the pabajjā and the upasampadā ordinations, and about bowls and robes.”

that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow, monks, one whose robe is stolen or one whose robe is destroyed, to ask a man or woman householder who is not a relation (of his) for a robe. If there is for the Order at the first residence¹ which he approaches either a robe in the dwelling-place² or a bed-cover³ or a ground-covering⁴ or a mattress-

¹ *āvāsa*. Cf. B.D. i. 314, n. 3. *Āvāsa* appears to be largely a monastic term, *nivesana* being a layman's dwelling. I think that the arrangement was as follows: *ārāma* was a whole monastery, consisting of the grounds and the buildings; *āvāsa* was the "colony" or place in which the monks lived. In general, the larger *āvāsa* may be said to have contained, besides such "rooms" as the uposatha hall, the refectory, the warming-room and so on, a number of *vihāras*. These were the separate rooms or dwelling-places, each given over to one monk, or if he had a *saddhivihārin* to two, to live in and use as his quarters, while staying at that particular *ārāma*.

The so-called "temples," the *ārāmas*, of Ceylon today contain five buildings on the "temple" or monastery site: the *thūpa*, the shrine-room, the hall of residence for monks (containing separate rooms for each monk), the teaching-hall (school) and the preaching hall. Several cells or rooms, *pariveṇa* or *vihāra*, suitable for not more than one monk to sleep in, lead off some of the large caves at Ellora and Ajanta.

² *vihāracīvara*. As far as I know the word occurs only here. V.A. 666 says, "people having had a residence erected, thinking, 'Let the four requisites belonging to us be of use (to the monks), making ready sets of three robes and depositing them in the residence that they have erected—this is what is called a *vihāracīvara*.'" It thus seems to be a robe put by in case of need in a residence, and more specifically in the *vihāra*, or dwelling-place portion of it—i.e., not in the refectory or any of the other rooms used together by the community.

³ *uttaratharaṇa*. This is a cover for a bed or chair, used out of respect for the person who uses the bed or chair, so as to prevent his clothes from being soiled. V.A. 666 says that it is called a sheet for spreading on or over a couch, *uttaratharaṇan ti mañcakassa upari attharaṇakam paccatharaṇam vuccati*. At V.A. 776 *uttaratharaṇa* is called a sheet that may be spread over couches and chairs, *uttaratharaṇan ti nāma mañcapūthānam upari attharitaḥḥakam paccatharaṇam*. On *paccatharaṇa* see above, p. 34, n. 1.

⁴ *bhummattharaṇa*. V.A. 666, "when the earth is prepared, they cover it for the sake of preserving its texture with carpets; spreading out a straw mat above this they walk up and down." At V.A. 776 *bhummattharaṇa* is called a mat for sitting or lying on, *kaṭasāraka*, that may be spread on the ground. Cf. below, p. 73.

cover,¹ (I allow) him to take it to put on, if he says, 'Getting (a robe), I will replace² it.' But if there is not for the Order either a robe in the dwelling-place or a bed-cover or a ground-covering or a mattress-cover, then he should come covered up with grass or leaves; but he should not come naked. Who should so come, there is an offence of wrong-doing.³ And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should ask a man or woman householder who is not a relation (of his) for a robe, except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. This is the right time in this case: if a monk becomes one whose robe is stolen or whose robe is destroyed; in this case this is the right time."

|| 2 ||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.⁴

A householder means: he who lives in a house.⁵

A woman householder means: she who lives in a house.⁵ [212]

¹ *bhisicchavi*. V.A. 666, "the outer skin (*chavi*) of a mattress for a couch or a mattress for a chair." *Bhisi*, a mattress, may mean a door-rug, something thick for wiping the feet, or a cushion. In fact, anything like a mattress afterwards came to be called *bhisi*. At *Vin.* iv. 40 (=below, p. 240) five materials are given of which a *bhisi* might lawfully be made. See also *Vin. Texts* ii. 210, n.

² *odahissāmi*. V.A. 667 explains by *puna thapessāmi*, "I will deposit again."

³ Cf. *Vin.* i. 305: whatever monk adopts nakedness, the adoption of members of other sects, there is a grave offence; Visākha's strictures on nakedness for monks and nuns, *Vin.* i. 292, 293; and Nissag. XXIV. below. At the root of the desire that monks should be clothed was the need, lay and monastic, to differentiate between *bhikkhus* and *tīthiyas*, or those of them who were Naked Ascetics.

⁴ Cf. above, p. 31; below, p. 55.

⁵ Cf. below, p. 55. *Ajjhāvasati* is, according to C.P.D., "to dwell in (as an owner)."

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.¹

Except at the right time means: setting the right time to one side.

One whose robe is stolen means: a monk's robe becomes stolen² by kings or by thieves or by rogues, or it becomes stolen by anyone whatsoever.

One whose robe is destroyed means: a monk's robe becomes burnt by fire, or it becomes carried away by water,³ or it becomes eaten by rats and white ants, or it becomes worn by use. || 1 ||

If he asks, except at the right time, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action; it is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'This robe, honoured sirs, asked for by me from a householder who is not a relation, except at the right time, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 2 ||

If he thinks that a man (or woman) is not a relation when he is not a relation, (and) asks for a robe except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether a man is not a relation (and) asks for a robe except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is not a relation, (and) asks for a robe except at the right time, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is not a relation when he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a man is a relation,

¹ Cf. above, p. 7, and n. 4; p. 40, and below, p. 140.

² Here presumably with the sense of "taken forcibly."

³ *udakena vūḥam*; cf. *Vin.* i. 32. Sinhalese edn. has *vūḥam*, which I understand to be the correct form.

there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is a relation, there is no offence. || 3 ||

There is no offence if it is at the right time; if they belong to relations; if they are invited¹; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property²; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 4 || 3 ||

¹ *VA.* 667 seems to take *nātakānaṃ pavāritānaṃ* together—i.e., without the comma of the text. *Comy.* says "if they are for relations who are invited"; and later *pavāritānaṃ* is taken up again, "whoever having invited, but who owing to foolishness or forgetfulness, does not give, should be asked. . . . If he says, 'I invite you to my house,' going to his house you should sit down for as long as desirable, or lie down, but take nothing. If he says, 'I invite you to whatever is in my house,' you should ask for what is allowable there." Cf. below, pp. 52, 57.

² *VA.* 667, "if he asks for a robe by means of utensils allowable to monks (*kappiyabhaṇḍa*), if it is by an allowable procedure (*kappiyavohārena*)." Cf. above, p. 27, n. 3.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) VII

. . . at Sāvattthi in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapindika's monastery. At that time the group of six monks having come up to monks whose robes had been stolen, said: "Your reverences, one whose robe has been stolen or one whose robe has been destroyed is allowed by the lord to ask for a robe from a man or woman householder who is not a relation¹; your reverences, ask (them) for a robe."

They said: "No, we don't want² (one), your reverences, a robe has been obtained by us."

"We are asking for the venerable ones," they said.

"Do ask (them), your reverences."

Then the group of six monks, having approached householders, said:

"Sirs, monks are coming whose robes have been stolen; give them robes," (and) they asked for many robes. At that [213] time a certain man who was sitting in a village assembly hall³ said to another man:

"Master,⁴ monks are coming whose robes have been stolen; I gave them a robe."

Then he said: "I also gave (to them)."

Then another man said: "I also gave (to them)."

These men . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation,⁵ ask for many robes? Will the recluses, sons of the Sakyans, deal in the cloth trade⁶ or will they set up a shop⁷?"

The monks heard these men who . . . spread it about.

¹ Nissag. VI. ² *alam*. ³ *sabhāyaṃ nisīnno*.

⁴ *ayyo*, not *ayye*, indicates affection and familiarity along with respect.

⁵ They do not care for moderation, do not think of it, or have forgotten it.

⁶ This is simply a rebuke.

⁷ Cf. below, p. 113, and *Vin.* ii. 291.

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the group of six monks, not knowing moderation, ask for many robes?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, not knowing moderation, asked for many robes?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, not knowing moderation, ask for many robes? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

If a man or a woman householder who is not a relation, asking (a monk), should invite¹ him (to take material for) many robes, then at most (material for) an inner and an upper robe² should be accepted as robe-material by that monk; if he should accept more than that, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

Him means: the monk whose robe has been stolen.

A man who is not a relation means: . . . (See Nissag. VI. 3, 1) . . . she who lives in a house.

(For) many robes³ means: (for) abundant robes.³

Asking, should invite means: he says, "Take just as much as you want."

At most (material for) an inner and an upper robe

¹ *abhihatthum pavāreyya*. See *Vin. Texts* ii. 440 for note on this phrase. It is there found that *abhihatthum* (in spite of the spelling with *-th-*) is a gerund from *abhi-har*, like Prakrit *abhihattum*. This is confirmed by *VA.* 668, *MA.* ii. 264 (on *M.* i. 222)=*AA.* (on *A.* v. 350)=*SA.* iii. 54 (on *S.* iv. 190) which explain *abhihatthum* by *abhiharitvā*. The phrase *abhihatthum pavāreti* is followed by the instrumental, the sense of *pavāreti* being to "present with, to supply with, to invite with." Here "to invite" seems the best translation, as the choice of the amount is made to rest with the monk. Also *VA.* 668 says that the term means "to make to like," as well as *nimanteti*, to request, or invite. *C.P.D.* suggests that *abhiharati*+*pavāreti* means to bring out and offer (food, etc.).

² *santaruttara*; see above, p. 12, n. 1.

³ *bahūhi* . . . *bahukehi*.

should be accepted as robe-material by that monk means: If the three (robes) come to be destroyed, two may be accepted; if two are destroyed, one may be accepted; if one is destroyed nothing may be accepted.

If he should accept more than that means: if he asks for more than that there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, having gone up to a householder who is not a relation, this robe material asked for by me more than that (which I should ask for), [214] is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 1 ||

If he thinks that a man is not a relation when is he not a relation (and) asks for robe-material more than that (which he should ask for), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether he is not a relation . . . (See Nissag. VI. 3, 3) . . . is no offence. || 2 ||

There is no offence if, saying: 'I will take the remainder,' taking it he goes away; if they give the remainder, saying: 'Let it be only for you'; if they do not give because (a robe was) stolen¹; if they do not give because (a robe was) destroyed; if they belong to relations²; if they are invited; if it is by means of his own property³; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 3 || 2 ||

¹ VA. 669, "they give on account of his being learned and so on" (and not because he was robbed).

² Cf. above, p. 49.

³ Cf. above, pp. 27, 49.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) VIII

. . . at Sāvattī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time¹ a certain man said to his wife: "I will present² master Upananda³ with a robe." A certain monk who was going for alms heard the words of this man as he was speaking. Then this monk approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"You, reverend Upananda, are of great merit⁴; on a certain occasion a certain man said to his wife: 'I will present master Upananda with a robe.'"

"Your reverence, he is my supporter," he said.

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached this man, and having approached he said to this man:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, sir, desire to present me with a robe?"

"Did I not also think, master: I will present master Upananda with a robe?"

"If you, sir, desire to present me with a robe, present me with a robe like this. What shall I do with one presented that I cannot make use of?"

Then that man . . . spread it about, saying: "These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented. It is not easy to present them with a robe. How can master Upananda, before being invited by me, approaching me, put forward a consideration⁵ with regard to a robe?"

¹ Cf. Nissag. IX.

² *acchādeti* has sense of to give so as to clothe or cover.

³ See also Nissag. VI.

⁴ Same thing said to Upananda at *Vin.* i. 300, and iii. 217, 257 (pp. 58, 145, below).

⁵ *vikappam āpajjissati*. Cf. below, p. 145, where again Upananda is greedy about robes.

Monks heard that man who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, before being invited, approaching a householder, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. [215] He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, before being invited, approaching a householder, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

"Is he a relation of yours, Upananda, or not a relation?"

"He is not a relation, lord," he said.

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation¹ does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for one who is not a relation.² Thus you, foolish man, before being invited, approaching a householder who is not a relation, will put forward a consideration with regard to a robe. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In case a robe-fund³ comes to be laid by for a monk by a man or a woman householder who is not a relation (of his), thinking: 'I will present the monk so and so with a robe, having got the robe in exchange for this robe-fund'—then if that monk, out of desire for something fine, approaching before being invited, should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe, saying: 'Indeed it would be well; do let the venerable one,⁴

¹ Cf. below, p. 147.

² Cf. above, pp. 39, 44, and below, pp. 59, 147.

³ *cīvaracetāpana*. A robe-fund consisted of things for barter. This passage is complicated by the various meanings, brought out by the old *Comy.* (see below), which appear to be attached to the cognate forms, °*cetāpana*, °*cetāpanena*, and °*cetāpetvā*. VA. 670, *cīvaracetāpanan ti cīvaramūlaṃ*.

⁴ *āyasmā*, perhaps here "gentleman"—or "lady"; certainly it is an honorific title. Cf. below, p. 148.

having got a robe like this or like that in exchange for this robe-fund, present it to me,' there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

*For a monk*¹ means: for the good of a monk, making a monk an object, being desirous of presenting to a monk.

A man who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.²

A householder means: he who lives in a house.³

A woman householder means: she who lives in a house.³

Robe-fund means: gold or a gold coin⁴ or a pearl or a jewel or a coral or a ploughshare⁵ or a (piece of) cloth⁶ or thread or cotton.

For this robe-fund means: for what is present.⁷

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.⁸

I will present means: I will give.

Then if that monk means: that monk for whom the robe-fund comes to be laid by.

Before being invited means: before it was said (to him): 'What kind of robe do you want, honoured sir? What kind of robe shall I get in exchange for you?'

Approaching means: going to the house, approaching (him) anywhere.

Should put forward a consideration with regard to a

¹ Cf. this portion of the *Old Comy.* with that on Nissag. IX. and XXVII.

² See above, pp. 31, 47.

³ Cf. above, p. 47.

⁴ For note on *hirañña*, unwrought gold, and *suvaṇṇa*, wrought gold, see B.D. i., p. 28.

⁵ *phāla*. At S. i. 169, Sn., p. 13 and ver. 77, this means "ploughshare." Cf. Vin. i. 225.

⁶ *paṭaka* seems connected with *paṭa*.

⁷ *paccupaṭṭhita*, present, ready, at hand.

⁸ *parivatteti*; also means to turn over, to deal with, to change. Cf. *parivattakacīvara*, exchange of robes, at p. 39, above. At Vin. ii. 174 monks are allowed to barter valuable woollen garments and valuable cotton garments, or cloths, *kambala* and *dussa*, for increasing (the accessories of lodgings).

robe means: 'Let it be long or wide or rough¹ or soft.'
[216]

For this robe-fund means: for what is present.

Like this or like that means: long or wide or rough or soft.

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.

Present (it) means: give (it).

Out of desire for something fine means: wanting what is good, wanting what is costly.

If according to what he says, he gets in exchange one that is long or wide or rough or soft, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, before I was invited (to take) this robe, approaching a householder who was not a relation, I put forward a consideration with regard to a robe; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.' || 1 ||

If he thinks that a man is not a relation when he is not a relation, (and) before being invited, approaching a householder, puts forward a consideration regarding a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether the man is not a relation, (and) before being invited, approaching a householder, puts forward a consideration with regard to a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is not a relation, (and) before being invited, approaching a householder, puts forward a consideration with regard to a robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a man is not a relation when he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a man is a relation, there

¹ *appitam*, of a close weave, solid. But, as opposed to "soft," it must here mean harsh or rough. VA. 727 explains it by *ghana*, solid, compact, massive. Cf. below, p. 145.

is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a man is a relation when he is a relation, there is no offence.
|| 2 ||

There is no offence if they belong to relations,¹ if they are invited; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property; if he gets something of small value in exchange while he desires to get something costly in exchange; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.
|| 3 || 2 ||

¹ Cf. pp. 49, 52.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) IX

. . . at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time¹ a certain man said to another man: "I will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with a robe." Then he² said: "I also will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with a robe." A certain monk who was going for alms heard this conversation of these men. Then this monk approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"You, reverend Upananda, are of great merit; on a certain occasion a [217] certain man said to another man: 'I will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, with a robe.' Then he² said: 'I also will present master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans with a robe.'"

'Your reverence, these (men) are my supporters.'

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached these men, and having approached, he said to these men:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, sirs, desire to present me with robes?"

"Did we not think, master: 'We will present master Upananda with robes?'"

"If you, sirs, desire to present me with robes, present me with a robe like this. What shall I do with ones presented that I cannot make use of?"

Then these men . . . spread it about, saying:

"These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented. It is not easy to present them with robes. How can master Upananda, before being invited by us, approaching, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?"

¹ Cf. Nissag. VIII.

² The other man.

Monks heard these men who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, before being invited, approaching householders, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, before being invited, approaching householders, put forward a consideration with regard to a robe?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

"Are they relations of yours, Upananda, or not relations?"

"They are not relations, lord," he said.

"Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for those who are not relations.¹ Thus you, foolish man, before being invited, approaching householders who are not relations, will put forward a consideration with regard to a robe. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

In case various robe-funds come to be laid by for a monk by two men householders or by (two) women householders who are not relations (of his), thinking: 'We will present the monk so and so with robes, having got various robes in exchange for the various robe-funds.' Then if that monk, out of desire for something fine, approaching before being invited, should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe, saying: 'Indeed it would be well; do let the venerable ones, having got a robe like this or like that in exchange for the various robe-funds, present it to me, the two together with one,'² there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 || [218]

¹ Cf. above, pp. 39, 44, 59.

² *ubho'va santā ekenā ti.* . V.A. says nothing, but see *Old Comy.* below. It means that the two men should combine and put their funds together so that there should be two funds which could then be exchanged for one (good) cloth or robe, and the two men present the monk with one robe.

*For a monk*¹ means: . . . (See Nissag. VIII. 2, 2) . . . being desirous of presenting to a monk.

*By two*² means: by two.²

Men who are not relations means: . . . back through seven generations.³

Men householders mean: they who live in a house.

Women householders mean: they who live in a house.

Robe-funds mean: gold or gold coins or pearls or jewels or corals or ploughshares or cloths or threads or cottons.⁴

For these various robe-funds means: for these (things) that are present.

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.

We will present means: we will give.

Then if that monk means: that monk for whom the robe-funds have come to be laid by.

Before being invited means: . . . ' . . . what kind of robe shall we get in exchange for you ?'

Approaching . . . should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe means: ' Let it be long . . . '

For these various robe-funds means: for these (things) that are present.

Like this . . . present (it) means: give (it).

The two together with one means: two people for one (robe).⁵

Out of desire for something fine means: wanting what is good, wanting what is costly.

If, according to what he says, they get in exchange one that is long or wide or rough or soft, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action . . . (See Nissag. VIII. 2, 1-3; *instead of* a householder who is not a

¹ Cf. this portion of the *Old Comy.* with that on previous Nissag.

² *ubhinnaṃ*, (more properly ' both ') . . . *dvinnaṃ*.

³ Cf. above, pp. 39, 44, 54.

⁴ Cf. above, p. 55, where these items are given in the singular, since only one robe-fund is being defined.

⁵ *dve pi janā ekena*, two people with one (fine robe instead of with two more ordinary ones).

relation, . . . a householder *read* householders who are not relations . . . householders) . . . if he gets something of small value in exchange while they desire to get something costly in exchange; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) X

. . . at Sāvattthi in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a chief minister,¹ the supporter of the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, sent a robe-fund² by a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, saying: "Having got a robe in exchange for this robe-fund, present master Upananda with a robe."

Then that messenger approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans: "Honoured sir, this robe-fund was brought for the venerable one; let the venerable one accept this robe-fund." [219]

When he had spoken thus, the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to that messenger: "Sir, we do not accept a robe-fund; but we accept a robe if it is at the right time and if it is allowable."³

When he had spoken thus, that messenger said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans: "But is there someone who is the venerable one's attendant⁴?"

At that time a certain lay-follower went to the monastery on some business or other. Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to that messenger: "Sir, this lay-follower is the monks' attendant."

Then that messenger, informing⁵ that lay-follower,

¹ *mahāmatta* is at *B.D.* i. 74 included in definition of "kings."

² See *Nissag.* VIII. and IX.

³ *kappiya*—*i.e.*, something that is made allowable for the monks to take because it has been given, and so made legally acceptable. See *Vin.* i. 206.

⁴ *veyyāvaccakara*, usually a lay-attendant in little better position than a servant. *VA.* 672 explains by *kiccakaro kappiyakārako*, one who makes something legally allowable (to the monks by offering it to them).

⁵ *saññāpetvā=jānāpetvā*, *VA.* 672.

approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached, he said to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"Honoured sir, the person whom the venerable one has pointed out as an attendant has been instructed¹ by me; let the venerable one approach (him) at the right time (and) he will present you with a robe."

Then the chief minister sent a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to say: "Let the master make use of this robe; we want this robe made use of by the master."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, did not say anything to that lay-follower. A second time the chief minister sent a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to say: "Let the master make use of . . . by the master." A second time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, did not say anything to that lay-follower. A third time the chief minister sent a messenger to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, to say: "Let the master make use of . . . by the master." || 1 ||

Now at that time there came to be a meeting-day for the townspeople,² and an agreement was made by the townspeople that: Whoever comes the last pays fifty.³

¹ *saññatto=āṇatto*, *VA.* 672.

² *negamassa samayo hoti*. *Negama* also occurs at *Vin.* i. 268. The word comes from *nigama*, which is from *nadī-gāma*. Originally things were sent by water rather than by land, so that villages on rivers (*nadī-gāma*) would become the centres of trade. In India all important cities are on a river. Thus *nadī-gāma* is an important place, a town even, which may or may not be the seat of a king (*rājadhāni*). If a *gāma*, village, becomes very big, it is called *nagara*, town. If not so big, then it is a *pura*. This is usually a fortified town. Villages and towns run in this order: *gāma*, village; *nigama*, a river-side and hence important village or little town; *pura*, a fortified town, in which kings may live; *nagara*, a town (this may contain a fortified portion, but may spread outside it); *rājadhāni*, seat of a king.

³ *paññāsam bandho*. *Bu.* is doubtful of the reading; there is also the *v.l. baddho*, which is synonymous with *jīto* or *jīno* below. *VA.* 672 says "the fine (or punishment, *daṇḍa*) is fifty *kahapaṇas*."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached that lay-follower, and having approached, he said to that lay-follower:

“Sir, I want the robe.”

“Honoured sir, wait this day¹ (only). Today there comes to be a meeting-day for the townspeople, and an agreement was made by the townspeople that: Whoever comes last pays fifty.”

“Sir, give me the robe this very day,”² he said, and he took hold of his waist-band.³ Then that lay-follower, being pressed by the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, having got a robe in exchange for the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, went the last. People said to this lay-follower: “Why do you, master, come the last? You have lost fifty.”⁴ Then that lay-follower told this matter to those people. The people . . . spread it about, saying:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented; [220] amongst them it is not easy to render a service. How can they, being told by a lay-follower: ‘Honoured sir, wait this day (only),’ not wait?” Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, being told by a lay-follower: ‘Honoured sir, wait this day (only),’ not wait?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, being

¹ *ajjunho*. VA. 672 explains by *ajja ekam divasam*. It is therefore more likely to mean “(only) this day (the rest of the present day-and-night)” as given in the C.P.D., than “this moonlight night” of the P.E.D. ² *ajj’eva*.

³ *ovattikāya parāmasi*. *Ovattikā* can also mean a bracelet and a patch. See *Vin. Texts* ii. 153, n. 3; Morris, *J.P.T.S.*, 1887, p. 156. *Parāmasi*, transl. at B.D. i. 203 as “rubs up against” is here explained by VA. 672 as *gaṇhi*, took hold.

⁴ *paññāsam jīno’si*. Oldenberg, *Vin. Texts* iii. 277 says, “Probably we ought to read *jīno’si*.” VA. 672 has the reading *jīto’si*. *Jīyati*, one of whose meanings is “to lose,” is in Pali both the passive of $\sqrt{jī}$ and the prs. middle of $\sqrt{jyā}$ (*jī*), therefore it can have *jīta* or *jīna* as past participles.

told by a lay-follower: ‘Honoured sir, wait this day (only),’ did not wait?”

“It is true, lord.”

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

“How can you, foolish man, being told by a lay-follower: ‘Honoured sir, wait this day (only),’ not wait? Foolish man, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth: || 2 ||

In case a king or one in the service of a king¹ or a brahmin or a householder should send a robe-fund for a monk by a messenger, saying: ‘Having got a robe in exchange for this robe-fund, present the monk so and so with a robe’; then if this messenger, approaching that monk, should say: ‘Honoured sir, this robe-fund was brought for the venerable one; let the venerable one accept this robe-fund,’ then the messenger should be spoken to thus by this monk: ‘Sir, we do not accept a robe-fund, but we accept a robe if it is at the right time and if it is allowable.’ If this messenger should say to the monk: ‘But is there someone who is the venerable one’s attendant?’, then, monks,² an attendant should be pointed out by the monk in need of a robe—either one who is engaged in the monastery³ or a lay-follower—saying: ‘This is the monks’ attendant.’ If this messenger, instructing this attendant, approaching that monk, should speak thus: ‘Honoured

¹ *rājabhogga*. P.E.D. seems to see in this the meaning of “Of royal power, entitled to the throne, as a designation of class.” It says, under art. *bhogga*, and quoting this passage, that *rājabhogga* “takes the place of the usual *khattiya*.” I think, however, that the reference is back to the chief minister, who has already appeared in this episode. Cf. also below, *Old Comy.*, p. 67.

² *Vin. Texts* i. 23, n. 1, “this word of address is most noteworthy. . . . It must be meant as an address by the Buddha himself to the brethren.” Cf. also *Pāc.* 71, where *bhikkhave* again occurs in the *sikkhāpada*, rule.

³ *ārāmika*, one who is employed in petty or menial works in a monastery, an attendant in a monastery. Nowadays such a man receives food there.

sir, I have instructed the person whom the venerable one pointed out as an attendant; let the venerable one approach at the right time, (and) he will present you with a robe'; then, monks, if that monk is in need of a robe, approaching that attendant, he should state¹ and remind him two or three times, saying: 'Sir, I am in need of a robe.' If while stating and reminding two or three times, he succeeds in obtaining² that robe, that is good. If he does not succeed in obtaining it, he should stand silently³ for it four times, five times, six times at the utmost. If he succeeds in obtaining that robe, standing silently for it, four times, five times, six times at the utmost, [221] that is good. If he, exerting himself⁴ further than that, succeeds in obtaining that robe, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he does not succeed in obtaining it, he should either go himself to where the robe-fund was brought from for him,⁵ or a messenger should be sent to say: 'That robe-fund which you, sirs, sent for a monk, is not of any use to that monk.⁶ Let the gentlemen make use of their own,⁷ let your own things be not lost.'⁸ This is the proper course in this case." || 3 || 1 ||

For a monk means: for the good of a monk, making a monk his object, being desirous of presenting to a monk.

A king means: he who rules a kingdom.

¹ *codetabbo*, here to request or state, but "state" is chosen for the translation, since monks were not allowed to make a request.

² *abhinipphādeti*.

³ The silent mode of asking came to be the only one allowed to the monks. But here they are permitted to express their wants in words before they begin their silent standing.

⁴ *vāyamamāna*.

⁵ According to *VA.* 674 if a monk neither goes himself nor sends a messenger, he falls into an offence of wrong-doing for breaking a custom (*vattabheda*).

⁶ *na taṃ tassa bhikkhuno kiñci atthaṃ anubhoti*.

⁷ *yuñjant' āyasmanto sakaṃ*, or "let the gentlemen have the benefit of their own things."

⁸ *mā vo sakaṃ vinas(s)ā ti*.

One in the king's service means: whoever is in the king's pay.¹

A brahmin means: a brahmin by birth.

A householder means: excepting the king and he who is in the king's service and the brahmin, he who remains is called a householder.²

A robe-fund means: gold or a gold coin or a pearl or a jewel.³

For this robe-fund means: for what is present.

Having got in exchange means: having bartered.

Present means: give.

If that messenger, approaching that monk, should say: 'Honoured sir, this robe-fund was brought for the venerable one, let the venerable one accept this robe-fund,' then this messenger should be spoken to thus by this monk: . . . ' . . . is the monks' attendant.' He should not say: 'Give it to him,' or 'He will deposit it,' or 'He will barter it,' or 'He will get it in exchange.'

If this messenger, instructing this attendant, approaching that monk, should speak thus: 'Honoured sir, I have instructed the person whom the venerable one pointed out as an attendant; let the venerable one approach at the right time (and) he will present you with a robe'; then, monks, if that monk is in need of a robe, approaching that attendant, he should state and remind him two or three times, saying: 'Sir, I am in need of a robe.' He should not say: 'Give me a robe,' 'Fetch me a robe,' 'Barter a robe for me,' 'Get a robe in exchange for me.' A second time he should say . . . A third time he should say . . .

If . . . he succeeds in obtaining (that robe), that is good. If he does not succeed in obtaining it, going there, he should stand silently for it; he should not sit down on a seat, he should not accept food, he should not

¹ *rañño bhattavetanāhāro*, living on a salary and food from a king.

² Cf. earlier definitions of a "householder" as "he who lives in a house," above, pp. 47, 55, 60.

³ Cf. earlier and longer definitions of "robe-fund" at pp. 55, 60.

teach dhamma¹; being asked, 'Why did you come?' he should say: 'You know it, sir.' If he either sits down on a seat [222] or accepts food or teaches dhamma, he loses an opportunity.² A second time he may stand. A third time he may stand. Having stated four times, he may stand four times. Having stated five times, he may stand twice. Having stated six times, he may not stand.³ || 1 ||

If he, exerting himself further than that, succeeds in obtaining that robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an

¹ *na dhammo bhāsitaḥ*. V.A. 673 says that if asked to recite a piece of the text (or a blessing, at the beginning of a ceremony) or a grace (at the end of a meal), he should not say anything.

² *thānaṃ bhanjati*—i.e., to go and stand. V.A. 673 *thānaṃ = āgatakāraṇaṃ*—i.e., the reason or occasion for which he came (namely, to acquire a robe).

³ The method of reckoning the stating and standing is complicated. In the first place it is curious that here the monk seems able to state up to six times, while above, p. 66, it was said that he may state up to two or three times. According to V.A. 674 there are three statings and three standings, and an increase in the one means a decrease in the other so far as asking for it four times goes. Here it means (so V.A.) that if there is a decrease of one stating there is an increase of two standings. Therefore a double standing is shown to be the sign (*lakkhana*) of one stating. So, by this reckoning, stating up to three times, there may be standing up to six times. Stating twice, there may be standing up to eight times. (This must be because there might have been one more stating, three statings allowing six standings, but because there are here only two statings, two more standings may be added, making eight.) Stating once, there may be standing up to ten times. (Here there might have been two more statings=eight standings. This, with the one more stating that was legal and its two standings, makes altogether ten standings.) Inasmuch as stating up to six times there should be no standing, so standing up to twelve times there should be no stating. Therefore if he states but does not stand, six statings are required. If he stands but does not state, twelve standings are required. If he stands and asks, for each stating two standings should be omitted. This is Bu.'s contribution to the subject. It seems that if a monk stands and speaks, saying that he wants a robe, he must lose two "standings"—i.e., two opportunities to stand for a robe.

individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe obtained by me, by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the monk so and so.'

If he does not succeed in obtaining it, he should either go himself to where the robe-fund was brought from for him, or a messenger should be sent to say: 'That robe-fund which you, sirs, sent for a monk, is not of any use to that monk. Let the gentlemen make use of their own, let your own things be not lost.' This is the proper course¹ in this case means: this is the appropriate course¹ in this case. || 2 ||

If he succeeds in obtaining it by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, thinking that they are more, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he succeeds in obtaining it by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, but is in doubt (as to the number of times), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he succeeds in obtaining it by stating more than three times, by standing more than six times, thinking them to be less, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, stating less than three times, standing less than six times, he thinks them to be more, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If stating less than three times, standing less than six times, he is in doubt (as to the number), there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, stating less than three times, standing less than six times, he thinks them to be less, there is no offence. || 3 ||

There is no offence in stating three times, in standing six times; in stating less than three times, in standing

¹ "proper course" is *sāmīci*, etiquette, courtesy; "appropriate course" is *anudhammatā*, custom; used with regard to the monks. *Dhamma* here means good social manners and customs. *Anudhammatā* is a synonym for *sāmīci*.

less than six times; if himself not stating, he gives; if stating, the owners give; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 4 || 2 ||

The First Division: that on Kathina-cloth¹

This is its key²:

Ten (nights), one night, and a month, and washing,
acceptance,

Three about those who are not relations, of two,
and by means of a messenger. [223]

¹ *kathinavagga*. Cf. the *Kathinakkhandhaka*, *Vin.* i. 253-265.

² *uddāna*, something like a mnemonic verse, an abbreviation, in which only a leading word of each rule is given, and simply to help the memory of the monk who is reciting the rules. All the teaching was oral.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XI

. . . at Ālavī in the chief shrine at Ālavī.¹ At that time the group of six monks, approaching silk-makers,² said: "Sirs, hatch³ many silk-worms, and give them to us, for we want to make a rug⁴ mixed with silk." These looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, approaching us, speak thus: 'Sirs, hatch . . . mixed with silk' ? It is a loss for us, it is ill-gotten for us that we, for the sake of livelihood, for the sake of wife and children, are bringing (these) many small creatures into destruction."

Monks heard these men who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks, approaching silk-makers, say: 'Sirs, hatch . . . a rug mixed with silk' ?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, approaching silk-makers, spoke thus: 'Sirs, hatch . . . a rug mixed with silk' ?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, approaching silk-makers, speak thus: 'Sirs, hatch . . . a rug mixed with silk' ? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those

¹ Cf. *B.D.* i. 247.

² *kosiyakāraka*, those preparing the raw silk, raising silk-worms (*kosakāraka*), rather than silk-weavers.

³ *pacatha*, lit. boil or cook.

⁴ *santhata*, something that is spread: a rug, mat or a sheet. See *Intr.*, p. xxii.

who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monks should cause a rug to be made mixed with silk, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

Whatever means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

A rug means: it is made "having spread," not woven.¹

Should cause to be made means: if he makes it or causes it to be made mixing it with one silken filament,² there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: . . . 'Honoured sirs, this rug, which I had made mixed with silk, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this rug to the venerable one.' || 1 || [224]

If what was incompletely executed by himself, he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If what was incompletely executed by others, he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by others, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, acquiring what was made for another, he

¹ *I.e.*, having spread out the material, or by the spreading method; see *Intr.*, p. xxii.

² *amsu* is really the technical name of those small particles of which a thread is composed, not the thread itself.

makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if he makes a canopy² or a ground-covering³ or a screen-wall⁴ or a mattress⁵ or a squatting mat⁶; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 || 2 ||

¹ =below, *Vin.* iii. 227, 229, 233, and *Vin.* iv. 167, 171.

² Nowadays a canopy would be used for putting over shrines.

³ *Cf.* p. 46, above.

⁴ Such as a wall made up of cloth. Word occurs at *Vin.* iii. 189, iv. 269, *Jā.* ii. 88.

⁵ *bhisi*; see above, p. 47.

⁶ *bimbohana*, such as monks in Ceylon use nowadays in the hall where the *uposatha* is held and the *upasampadā* conferred. They are usually padded. These items recur below at pp. 78, 82, 89, and *Vin.* iv. 171, 279.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XII

. . . at Vesāli in the Great Grove in the Hall of the Peaked Roof. At that time the group of six monks had a rug¹ made of pure black sheep's² wool. People, engaged in touring the dwelling-place, seeing them . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool, like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, had a rug made of pure black sheep's wool?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should cause a rug to be made of pure black sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

¹ *santhata*, see above, p. 71, n. 4.

² *elaka*, a ram, a wild goat, according to *P.E.D* and Childers. *Eḍaka* (Skt.) is a kind of sheep, a ram, a wild goat, according to Monier-Williams. *Aja* is certainly a goat. The compound *aj-elaka* sometimes occurs, as at *D. i. 5*, seeming to mean the goats and the sheep. In India, the goat and the sheep closely resemble one another: the tails of the former stick up, those of the latter hang down; but the colour and texture of their hair, or wool (*loma*), are similar.

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Black means: there are two (kinds of) black: black by nature or dyed black.

A rug means: it is made "having spread," not woven. [225]

Should cause to be made means: if he makes it or causes it to be made, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited . . . to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: . . . ' . . . this rug which I, honoured sirs, had made of pure black sheep's wool . . . ' . . . if he is the first wrong-doer.¹
|| 2 ||

¹ Cf. Nissag. XI.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XIII

. . . at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time the group of six monks said: "It is forbidden by the lord to have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool."¹ And these, taking only a little white for the seam,² all the same³ had a rug made of pure black sheep's wool. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks, taking only a little white for the seam, all the same have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, taking only a little white for the seam, all the same had a rug made of pure black sheep's wool?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, taking . . . pure black sheep's wool? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When a new rug is being made for a monk, two portions of pure black sheep's wool may be taken, the third of white, the fourth of reddish brown colours.⁴

¹ Nissag. XII.

² *anta*. VA. 684, "applying (or bringing) white to it, making as it were a border at the edge (*anta*) of the sheet."

³ *tath' eva*, or "as before."

⁴ *gocariyānan ti kapilavaṇṇānam*, VA. 684, which seems to indicate "the colour of oxen," although *cariya* does not mean *vaṇṇa*, colour. *Vin. Texts* i. 25, n. 2, says, "This is deliberately chosen as an ugly mixture, which would lessen the commercial value of the rug." It might also be a preventive of unsuitable pride in a fine article. But I think that this rule should be regarded as a continuation of the previous one (Nissag XII), expanding it, and

If a monk should cause a new rug to be made not taking two portions of pure black sheep's wool, the third of white, the fourth of reddish brown colours, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

New means: it is so called with reference to the making.

A rug means: it is made "having spread," not woven.¹

Is being made means: making or causing to be made.

Two portions of pure black sheep's wool may be taken means: being brought, two *tulā* weights² may be taken.

The third of white means: a *tulā* weight of white.

The fourth of reddish brown colours means: a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours. [226]

If a monk . . . not taking two portions of pure black sheep's wool, the third of white, the fourth of reddish brown colours means: if he makes or causes a new rug to be made not taking a *tulā* weight of white, a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours, there is an offence of wrongdoing in the action; it should be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this rug which I caused to be made not taking a *tulā* weight of white, a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let them give back . . . I will give back this rug to the venerable one.'

If what was incompletely executed by himself, he has finished by himself . . . (See Nissag. XI. 2, 2) . . . he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrongdoing.

There is no offence if he makes it taking a *tulā* weight of white, a *tulā* weight of reddish brown colours; if he

giving the detail necessary for carrying it out properly. The monks had nothing to do with the "commercial value" of things, but it was important that they should not behave like those leading the household life.

¹ See above, p. 72, n., and p. 75.

² *tulā*, lit. balance, a measure of weight.

makes it taking more of white, more of reddish brown colours; if he makes it taking only of white, only of reddish brown colours; if he makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat¹; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

¹ Cf. above, p. 73, and notes.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XIV

. . . at Sāvattī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time monks had a rug made every year. They were intent on begging, intent on hinting,¹ saying: "Give sheep's wool, we want sheep's wool." People . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a rug made every year? How can they be intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: 'Give sheep's wool, we want sheep's wool'?" For, (although) our children soil and wet them² and they are eaten by rats, our rugs once made last for five or six years. But these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have a rug made every year; they are intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: 'Give sheep's wool, we want sheep's wool.'

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can monks have a rug made every year? How can they be intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: '. . . we want sheep's wool'?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. [227] He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, have a rug made every year, that you are intent on begging, intent on hinting, saying: '. . . we want sheep's wool'?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men have a rug made every year? How can they be intent on begging, intent on hinting . . . ' . . . we want sheep's wool'?" It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

A new rug which a monk has had made should be

¹ =B.D. i. 246.

² Cf. Vin. iv. 129.

used for six years. If, within the six years, whether he has got rid of or has not got rid of that (former) rug, he should have a new rug made, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 1 ||

Now at that time a certain monk became ill in Kosambī. Relations sent a messenger to this monk, saying: "Let the revered sir¹ come, we will nurse (him)." Monks spoke thus: "Go, your reverence, relations will nurse you." He said:

"Your reverences, a rule of training laid down by the lord is that a new rug which a monk has had made should be used for six years; but I am ill, I am not able to set out taking a rug, and without a rug there comes to be no comfort for me. I will not go."

They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to give a monk who is ill the agreement as to a rug.² And thus, monks, should it be given: That monk who is ill, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs, am ill; I am not able to set out taking a rug. Thus I, honoured sirs, request the Order for the agreement as to a rug.' A second time it should be requested, a third time it should be requested. The Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This monk so and so is ill. He is not able to set

¹ *bhaddanto*. Cf. above, p. 13 ff., where an ill monk is allowed to travel without his three robes, if he has the formal agreement of the Order to be regarded as not away, separated from them.

² *santhata-sammuti*. VA. 685 says that he may have a new rug made at the place to which he goes (thereby not waiting for the six years to elapse). Cf. Nissag. II.

out taking a rug. He requests the Order for the agreement as to a rug. If it seems right to the Order, let the Order give this monk so and so the agreement as to a rug. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. [228] This monk . . . requests the Order for the agreement as to a rug. The Order gives to the monk so and so the agreement as to a rug. If the giving to the monk so and so of the agreement as to a rug is pleasing to the venerable ones, let them be silent; if it does not seem right, they should speak. Agreement as to a rug is given by the Order to the monk so and so; it is pleasing . . . So do I understand this.' And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

A new rug which a monk has had made should last for six years. If, within the six years, whether he has got rid of or has not got rid of that (former) rug, he should have a new rug made, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 2 ||

New means: . . . not woven.

Has had made means: making or causing to be made.

Should be used for six years means: it should be used for six years at the minimum.

If within six years means: in less than six years.

Getting rid of . . . that (former) rug means: giving it to others.

Not getting rid of means: not giving it to anyone.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks, if he makes or causes another new rug to be made, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to the Order, or to a group, or to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this rug, which I had made for me less than six years ago without the agreement of the monks, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . should give back . . . let the

venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this rug to the venerable one.'

If what was incompletely executed by himself, he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture . . . if he makes others finish what was incompletely executed by others, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.¹

There is no offence if he makes one after six years; if he makes one after more than six years; if he makes it or causes it to be made for another; if, acquiring what was made for another, he makes use of it; if he makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat²; if there is the agreement of the monks; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.

|| 3 || [229]

¹ Cf. above, p. 72.

² Cf. above, p. 73.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XV

. . . at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Then the lord addressed the monks, saying: "Monks, I want to go into solitary retreat for three months. I am not to be approached by anyone except the one who brings the alms-food."¹

"Very well, lord," these monks answered the lord, and accordingly no one here went up to the lord except the one who brought the alms-food. Now at that time an agreement was made by the Order at Sāvattthī, saying: "Your reverences, the lord wishes to go into solitary retreat for three months. The lord should not be approached by anyone except the one who brings the alms-food. Whoever approaches the lord should be made to confess² an offence of expiation."

Then the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta,³ approached the lord together with his followers, and having approached and greeted the lord, he sat down at a respectful distance. Now it is the custom for enlightened ones, for lords, to exchange friendly greetings with in-coming monks. The lord said to the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, as he was sitting at a respectful distance:

"Upasena, I hope things go well with you, I hope

¹ At *S.* v. 325 the lord dwelt in solitude for three months; at *Vin.* iii. 68, *S.* v. 12, 320 for two weeks. ² *desāpetabbo*.

³ Referred to at *Vin.* i. 59, *Jā.* ii. 449 for ordaining his *saddhī-vihārika* only a year after his own ordination. At *A.* i. 24 he is called chief among those who are altogether charming (*samanta-pāsādika*, also title of *VA.*). Both these points are referred to at *Pss. Breth.* 261 f. He was younger brother to Sāriputta, and had three sisters, Cālā, Upacālā, Sīsupacālā, their mother being Rūpasārī, and his father Vaṅganta; cf. *DhA.* ii. 84, where Sāriputta's father is also said to be Vaṅganta; and *Pss. Sisters*, p. 96, where the three sisters are said to be junior to Sāriputta. See also *Thag.* 576, *Ap.* i. 62 for his verses; *Ud.* 46, where he says that he is of great psychic power and majesty; and see *D.P.P.N.*

you are keeping going, I hope you have come here with but little fatigue on the journey?"

"Lord, things go well with us, lord, we keep ourselves going, we have come here with but little fatigue on the journey, lord."

Now at that time the monk who was the fellow-resident of the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, was sitting not far from the lord. Then the lord said to this monk: "Monk, are rag-robcs pleasing to you?"

"Rag-robcs are not pleasing to me, lord," he said.

"Then how is it, monk, that you are one who wears rag-robcs?"

"Lord, my preceptor is one who wears rag-robcs, therefore am I also one who wears rag-robcs." Then the lord said to the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta:

"And is this crowd¹ agreeable to you, Upasena? How is it that you lead² the crowd, Upasena?"

He said: "Lord, I say to whoever asks me for the upasampadā ordination: 'Your reverence, I am a jungle-dweller, an almsman,³ one who wears rag-robcs.⁴ If you also will become a jungle-dweller, an almsman, one who wears rag-robcs, then will I confer the upasampadā ordination upon you.' If he promises me, I confer the upasampadā ordination, but if he does not promise me I do not confer the upasampadā ordination. [230] I say to whoever asks me for help⁵: 'Your reverence, I am a jungle-dweller, an almsman, one who wears rag-robcs. If you also will become a jungle-dweller, an almsman, one who wears rag-robcs, then I will give you help.' If he promises me, I give help; but if he does not promise me, I do not give help. Thus do I, lord, lead the crowd." || 1 ||

¹ *parisā*.

² *vīnesi*.

³ *piṇḍapātika*. This I think is a word that may be correctly rendered by "almsman," "beggar for alms." See *B.D.* i., Intr. xli, and *Vism.* 66.

⁴ These three *aṅga* (practices) are explained in detail at *Vism.* 59 ff. Sometimes combined with *tecīvarika*, a wearer of the three robes, as, e.g., at *Vin.* i. 253, *M.* i. 214.

⁵ *nissaya*.

"Good, Upasena, good; it is good, Upasena, that you lead the crowd. But do you know, Upasena, of the Order's agreement at Sāvattthī?"

"Lord, I do not know the Order's agreement at Sāvattthī."

"At Sāvattthī, Upasena, an agreement was made by the Order: 'Your reverences, the lord wishes to go into solitary retreat for three months. The lord should not be approached by anyone except the one who brings the alms-food. Whoever approaches the lord should be made to confess an offence of expiation.'"

"Lord, the Order at Sāvattthī will be well known for its own agreement; we will not lay down what is not (yet) laid down, nor will we abolish what has been laid down, but we will dwell in conformity with and according to the rules of training which have been laid down."

"That is very good, Upasena; what is not (yet) laid down should not be laid down, nor should what is laid down be abolished, but one should dwell in conformity with and according to the rules of training which have been laid down. Upasena, I allow those monks who are jungle-dwellers, who are almsmen, who wear rag-robcs to come up for the sake of seeing me, if they wish to."

At that time several monks¹ who came to be standing outside the gateway,² said: "We will make the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, confess to an offence of expiation." Then the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta, rising up from his seat with his followers, greeting the lord, departed keeping his right side towards him. Then those monks said to the venerable Upasena, the son of Vaṅganta: "Do you, reverend Upasena, know of the Order's agreement at Sāvattthī?"

"But, your reverences, the lord said to me: 'But do you know of the Order's agreement at Sāvattthī? . . . according to the rules of training which have been laid

¹ *sambahulā bhikkhū*, see above, p. 8, n. 6.

² *dvārakoṭṭhaka*, or the (store-)room over or by the gate.

down.' Your reverences, it is allowed by the lord, who said: 'Those monks who are jungle-dwellers, who are almsmen, who wear rag-robcs may come up for the sake of seeing me, if they wish to.'"

Then these monks said: "What the venerable Upasena says is true; what has not yet been laid down should not be laid down, nor should what has been laid down be abolished, but one should dwell in conformity with and according to the rules of training that have been laid down." || 2 ||

Then monks heard: "They say it was allowed by the lord, saying: 'Those monks who are jungle-dwellers, who are almsmen, who wear rag-robcs may come up for the sake of seeing me, if they wish to.'" These, longing for a sight of the lord, discarding their rugs,¹ [231] took upon themselves the practice of jungle-dwellers, the practice of those who are almsmen, the practice of those who wear rag-robcs.² Then the lord as he was engaged in touring the lodgings together with several monks,³ saw here and there discarded rugs, and seeing them, he addressed the monks, saying:

"How is it, monks, that there are these discarded rugs here and there?"

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then

¹ See above, p. 71, n. 4. It is on this passage that VA. 687 says "their *santhata* (rugs) counting as a fourth robe." Reference to a fourth robe, *catutthaka cīvara*, is made at *Vism.* 65, to be worn principally apparently for the purpose of washing and dyeing the three usual robes, and as either an inner or an outer robe.

² These three *aṅgas* appear as *dhūtaguṇa* (together with that of *sapadānacārika*, continuous alms-begging) at *Vin.* iii. 15 (=B.D. i. 26), and together with others at *Vism.* 59 ff. Cf. also *Vin.* i. 253, ii. 299 (with *tecīvarika*) and *Vin.* ii. 32. At *A.* iii. 391 the three ways of living given in *Vin.* above occur with *gāmantavīhārī*, one who dwells in village-outskirts, *nemantanika*, the guest, and *gahapati-cīvaradhara*, the wearer of robes given by a householder. If any one of these does not behave suitably he is *ten'aṅgena gārayho*, blameworthy as to that attribute (which he has taken on himself)—*aṅga* being a technical term covering these various modes of scrupulous living.

³ See above, p. 8, n. 6.

the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"On account of this, monks, I will lay down a rule of training for monks based on ten grounds: for the excellence of the Order, for the comfort of the Order . . .¹ . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

When, (with the addition of part of) a rug, (a piece of) cloth to sit upon² is being made for a monk, (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span³ must be taken from all round an old rug in order to disfigure⁴ it. If a monk should have made (with the addition of part of) a rug, a new (piece of) cloth to sit upon without taking (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 3 || 1 ||

A (piece of) cloth to sit upon means: it is so called if it has a border.⁵

¹ = *Vin.* iii. 21 (B.D. i. 37 f.); *A.* i. 98, 100; v. 70.

² "Rug" and "piece of cloth to sit upon" are *nisīdana-santhata*; transl. at *Vin. Texts* i. 25 as "a rug to sit upon," and at i. 26 as "seat-rug," as though only one article were meant, which was probably the case, although two were involved in the making. For *Old Comy.* defines *nisīdana* and *santhata* separately below; also *santhata* has occurred alone in *Nissag.* XI-XIV. At *Vin.* iv. 123 *nisīdana* appears among other requisites, while at *Vin.* iv. 170-171 directions are given as to the size a *nisīdana* is to be made; at *Vin.* i. 295 a *nisīdana* is allowed as a protection for body, robes and lodgings; at *Vin.* i. 297 it is one of the things allowed to be allotted but not assigned. At *Vin.* ii. 123 the six monks were separated from their *nisīdana* for four months, which led to a prohibition. It thus seems to be the thing sat upon and not the occasion of sitting upon something. Huber, *J.As.* 1913, p. 37 (=497) translates *nisīdanasamstara* as "tapis," while for *santhata*, alone, he has "couverture." Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana, *So-sor-thar-pa*, p. 21, has "piece of carpet made into a seat," while for the Tibetan equivalent for *santhata* alone, he gives "mat." On *santhata*, see *Intr.*, p. xxii, and cf. *nisīdana-paccattharaṇa*, above, p. 34, and *Vin.* i. 295.

³ *sugatavidatthī*, see B.D. i. 253.

⁴ *dubbannakaraṇāya*, occurring also below, p. 407, in Pāc. LVIII.

⁵ *sadasam vuccati*. Cf. *Vin.* iv. 123, 171. *Sadasa*=*sa*+*dasā*. At *Vin.* ii. 301-307 we get the opposite (adj.), *adasaka*, again qualifying *nisīdana*, and where an unbordered, *adasaka, nisīdana* is not

A rug means: it is made "having spread," not woven.¹

Is being made means: making or causing to be made.

Old rug means: dressed in it once, put on once.²

(*A piece*) *the breadth of the accepted span must be taken from all round in order to disfigure it* means: cutting a circle or square so that it may become firm,³ it should be "spread" in one quarter or it should be "spread" having been unravelled.

If a monk . . . without taking (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug means: if without having taken (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug, he makes or has made, (with the addition of part of) a rug, a new (piece of) cloth to sit upon, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action; it should be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this (piece of) cloth to sit upon having been made (with the addition of part of) a rug, (but) without having taken (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back to the venerable one.'

allowed (even if it is of the right size). At *Vin.* iv. 170, 171 the right size is prescribed for the *nisīdana*, a border is allowed, and it is said that this border should be a span; if these measurements are exceeded the *nisīdana* should be cut down (to the proper size) on acquisition. At the Council of Vesālī, *Vin.* ii. 294 ff., it is said that a piece of cloth to sit upon that has no border is not allowable, because a monk who had one of this nature would incur the *pācittiya* offence involving cutting down (*i.e.*, *Pāc.* LXXXIX), *Vin.* ii. 307. All the ten matters, *vatthu*, whose allowability is being questioned at the Council are explained, see *Vin.* ii. 300 f., except this one and the one concerning gold and silver (*Nissag.* XVIII).

¹ Cf. above, pp. 72, 75, 77.

² =definition of soiled, or old, robe, above, p. 32. Thus the words used are those which usually refer to the putting on of the set of three robes: *nivatta* and *pāruta*. But Bu. at *V.A.* 687, in explaining their meaning in the above passage, defines them as *nisinna* and *nipanna* respectively, sat on and lain on. See *Intr.*, p. xxiv.

³ *thirabhāvāya*.

If what was incompletely executed by himself he has finished by himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. . . . (See *Nissag.* XI. 2, 2). . . . if he makes it or causes it to be made for another, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

There is no offence if he makes it having taken (a piece) the breadth of the accepted span from all round an old rug; [232] if, failing to get it, he makes it having taken a smaller (piece)¹; if, failing to get it, he makes it not having taken (any portion)²; if acquiring what was made for another, he makes use of it; if he makes a canopy or a ground-covering or a screen-wall or a mattress or a squatting-mat³; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

¹ *alabhanto thokataram ādiyivā karoti*. Bu. is silent.

² *alabhanto anādiyivā karoti*.

³ Cf. above, pp. 73, 75, 78, 82; and *Vin.* iv. 171 ff.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XVI

. . . at Sāvattī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time as a certain monk was in the country of the Kosalas¹ going to Sāvattī, (some) sheep's wool² accrued³ (to him) on the way. Then that monk went along tying up that sheep's wool into a bundle with his upper robe.⁴ People, seeing this monk, made fun of him, saying: "For how much have you bought (it), honoured sir, how great will the profit become?"

This monk, being made fun of by these people, became ashamed.⁵ Then that monk, going to Sāvattī, threw down⁶ the sheep's wool even as he was standing.⁷ Monks said to this monk: "Why do you, your reverence, throw down this sheep's wool even as you are standing?"

"Because I, your reverences, was made fun of by (some) people on account of this sheep's wool."

"But from how far have you, your reverence, conveyed this sheep's wool?"

"For more than three yojanas,⁸ your reverences," he

¹ Sāvattī was the capital of the Kosala country.

² *elakalomāni*.

³ *uppajjimsu*; *uppajjati* is usually "arises, is produced, is born"; cf. above, pp. 4, 24, below, pp. 99, 153.

⁴ Cf. above, p. 37.

⁵ *maṅku*, lit. staggered or shocked. See *A.* v., p. v.

⁶ *āsumbhi*.

⁷ *thitako 'va*. *VA.* 687 says, "as men bringing a large burden of wood from the jungle, being weary, let it drop (*pāṭenti*) even as they are standing (*thitakā 'va*), so he let it drop."

⁸ See Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins, etc.*, p. 16, for "Tabulated Statement of Passages on the length of the Yojana." His tentative conclusion is that in fifth-century Pali literature the yojana means between seven and eight miles. Childers reckoned twelve miles to a yojana. See also E. J. Thomas, *Life of Buddha as Legend . . .*, 1927, p. 17. An ascending scale of measures of length is given at *VbhA.* 343.

said. Then those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can this monk convey sheep's wool for more than three yojanas?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monk, conveyed sheep's wool for more than three yojanas?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, convey sheep's wool for more than three yojanas? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Sheep's wool may accrue to a monk as he is going along a road. It may be accepted by that monk, if he likes; but having accepted it, it should be conveyed in his (own) hands for three yojanas at the utmost, if there are no carriers. If he should convey it further than that, even if there are no carriers, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 || [233]

To a monk as he is going along a road means: as he is going on a roadway.¹

Sheep's wool may accrue means: it may accrue from the Order or from a group or from a relation or from a friend or as rag-ropes or by means of his own property.²

If he likes means: if he wishes.

It may be accepted . . . but having accepted it, it should be conveyed in his (own) hands for three yojanas at the utmost means: it should be conveyed in his (own) hands for three yojanas at the maximum.

If there are no carriers means: if there is no one who is a carrier, neither a woman nor a man, nor a householder nor one who has gone forth.

If he should convey it further than that, even if there are no carriers means: if he makes the first foot go beyond three yojanas, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes the second foot go beyond, there is an

¹ *pantha*.

² Cf. above, p. 27.

offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If standing within three yojanas he lets it drop beyond the three yojanas, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes it go beyond three yojanas, placing it in a vehicle or a bundle of another (person) without (his) knowing it, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited . . . to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this sheep's wool, made by me to go beyond three yojanas, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this sheep's wool to the venerable one.'

If he makes it go beyond more than three yojanas thinking them to be more, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, being in doubt, he makes it go beyond more than three yojanas, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he makes it go beyond more than three yojanas thinking them to be less, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is less than three yojanas when it is more, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than three yojanas, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is less than three yojanas when it is less, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he conveys it for three yojanas; if he conveys it for less than three yojanas; if he conveys it for three yojanas and conveys it back; if desiring a habitation, going three yojanas, he conveys it beyond that¹; if he conveys something stolen that he has got back²; if he conveys something destroyed that he has

¹ VA. 688 says, "going where he is unable to receive the recitation and interrogation (of the Pātimokkha) or necessities and so on, he goes elsewhere beyond that. Elsewhere beyond that means, there is no offence in so conveying it for a hundred yojanas."

² VA. 688, "thieves stealing it (from him), knowing its uselessness give it back." This means that thieves took his sheep's wool when he had done perhaps two and a half yojanas; he retraces his steps and they return him the wool as it is of no value for them;

got back; if he makes another convey goods tied up in a bundle¹; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

he goes a yojana in order to reach his vihāra. Thus he would have done three and a half yojanas, but the part of the journey due to the robbing incident does not count.

¹ *katabhaṇḍa*; cf. below, p. 98. VA. 689 says "goods tied up (*katam bhaṇḍam*) in a blanket, fleecy cover, sheet and so on, anything even if it is tied up only with a thread."

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XVII

... among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery.¹ At that time the group of six monks had sheep's wool [234] washed and dyed and combed by nuns. The nuns, through washing, dyeing, combing the sheep's wool, neglected² the exposition, the interrogation, the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher insight.³ Then Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid approached the lord, and having approached, greeting the lord, she stood at a respectful distance. As she was standing at a respectful distance, the lord spoke thus to Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid:

"Gotami, I hope that the nuns are zealous, ardent, (with) a self that is striving?"⁴

¹ Besides the Nigrodhārāma at Kapilavatthu, there was another at Rājagaha, mentioned, *e.g.*, at *D.* ii. 116. *D.P.P.N.* says that the one at Kapilavatthu was given to the Order by a Sakyan named Nigrodha. If the evidence for this were stronger, it would have to be translated "Nigrodha's monastery."

² *Cf.* *Vin.* i. 190, where these same five items are again connected with *rīncatī*, to neglect.

³ *adhisīla*, *adhicitta*, *adhipaññā*, given at *D.* iii. 219 as the "three trainings." The descriptions given at *A.* i. 235 and of *adhicittam-anuyutta* at *A.* i. 254 ff. to my mind make it quite clear that *adhi*-points to the higher states of morality, thought and insight, and therefore should not be translated, as would also be possible, by "as to" morality, etc. E. M. Hare, at *G.S.* iii. 310, translates "further virtue, further thought, further insight." Moreover the exposition and the interrogation were not "as to" morality, thought and insight. The exposition (*uddesa*) was the recital of the Pātimokkha rules, and the interrogation (*paripucchā*) was the asking of all present at the fortnightly recitals if they had seen, heard or suspected any offence.

⁴ *pahitatta*. I take this translation from Mrs. Rhys Davids's *Birth of Indian Psychology, etc.*, p. 347, "the self bedriven"; p. 350, "the man who is *pahitatto*, he who has the self that has striven." The commentarial exegesis is usually, if not always, *pesitatta*, the self

"Whence, lord, is there zeal in the nuns? The masters, the group of six monks, have sheep's wool washed and dyed and combed by nuns. The nuns . . . neglect the exposition, the interrogation, the higher morality, the higher thought, the higher insight."

Then the lord . . . gladdened Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid with dhamma-talk. Then Mahāpajāpatī the Gotamid . . . gladdened by the lord with dhamma-talk, greeting the lord, departed keeping her right side towards him. Then the lord, in this connection, on this occasion, having had the Order of monks convened, asked the group of six monks:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, had sheep's wool washed and dyed and combed by nuns?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

"Were they relations of yours, monks, or not relations?"

"They were not relations, lord," they said.

"Foolish men, those who are not relations do not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is pleasant or what is unpleasant to those who are not relations. Thus you, foolish men, will have sheep's wool washed and dyed and combed by nuns who are not relations? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should have sheep's wool washed or dyed or combed by a nun who is not a relation, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."¹ || 1 ||

*Whatever*² means: he who . . .

Monk means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

expunged, an exegesis in line with the editors' desire for cessation and waning of the individual self. They were wrongly, though possibly deliberately, deriving *pahitatta* from *pahīṇati*, to send, instead of from *padahati*, to strive.

¹ *Cf.* Nissag. IV, which is referred to under the name of *purāṇa-cīvarasikkhāpada* at *V.A.* 689.

² From here to end of this Nissag., *cf.* Nissag. IV. 2, 2.

(*A nun*) who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.

Nun means: one ordained by both Orders.

Wash means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If washed, it is to be forfeited.¹

Dye means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If dyed, it is to be forfeited.

Comb means: he gives an order—there is an offence of wrong-doing. If combed [235] it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited . . . to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this sheep's wool, caused by me to be washed by a nun who is not a relation, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this sheep's wool to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her comb sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash, makes her dye, makes her comb sheep's wool, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he

¹ In the plural, since animals' hair or wool, *lomāni*, is thought of as a plural in Pali.

thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her comb sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her wash sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her dye, makes her comb, makes her wash sheep's wool, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb sheep's wool, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her wash sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb, makes her dye sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is not a relation and makes her comb, makes her wash, makes her dye sheep's wool, there are two offences of wrong-doing together with an offence involving forfeiture.

If he is in doubt as to whether a woman is not a relation . . . If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is not a relation . . . If he makes her wash another's sheep's wool, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he makes a woman who has been ordained by one (Order only) wash it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is not a relation when she is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether a woman is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that a woman is a relation when she is a relation. there is no offence.

There is no offence if a female relation is washing it

when a woman assistant who is not a relation is (helping); if she washes it unasked; if he makes her wash unused goods tied up in a bundle¹; if it is (washed) by a female probationer, by a female novice; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.² || 2 ||

¹ Cf. above, p. 93, on *katabhaṇḍa*.

² Cf. above, p. 34.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XVIII

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. Now at that time [236] the venerable Upananda,¹ the son of the Sakyans, was dependent as a regular diner on a certain family in Rājagaha. When solid food or soft food came to² that family, a portion from that was set aside for the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. Now at that time meat came one evening to that family, a portion from that was set aside for the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. A young boy belonging to that family, getting up in the night towards morning, cried: "Give me meat." Then the man spoke thus to his wife:

"Give the boy the master's portion, having got another (portion) in exchange, we will give that to the master."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, dressing in the morning and taking his bowl and robe, approached the family, and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. Then that man approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans; having approached, having greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting at a respectful distance, that man spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"Yesterday evening, honoured sir, (some) meat came, a portion from that was set aside for the master. This young boy, honoured sir, got up in the night towards morning and cried: 'Give me meat,' and the master's

¹ See above, p. 42, below, p. 109.

² *uppajjati*, cf. above, pp. 4, 24, 90, below, p. 153.

portion was given to the boy. What could you get with a *kahāpaṇa*,¹ honoured sir?"

"(The use of) *kahāpaṇas* is given up by me, sir," he said.

"Yes, honoured sir, it is given up."

"Nevertheless give me a *kahāpaṇa*, sir," he said.

Then that man having given the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, a *kahāpaṇa*, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"As we accept gold and silver,² so do these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, accept gold and silver."

¹ The monetary unit in Pali literature. It is one of the items in the *Old Comy.*'s definition of *rajata*, silver, below, and of *rūpiya*, perhaps gold and silver, or perhaps another word for silver, in the next Nissag. Since the word *rūpiya* is used in this story, presumably the *kahāpaṇa* of *rūpiya* is meant above. See next notes. *VA.* 689 says that the *kahāpaṇa* is *suvaṇṇamayo vā rūpiyamayo vā pākāṭiko vā*, made of gold or made of silver (or gold and silver), or the ordinary one. This last was probably usually made of copper. *VA.* 297 says that in Rājagaha a *kahāpaṇa* was (worth) twenty *māsakas* (beans), therefore a *pāda* was worth five *māsakas*, and in all districts a *pāda* was a quarter of a *kahāpaṇa*. This passage opposes the old black *kahāpaṇa* (*porāṇa nīlakahāpaṇa*) to others, presumably more modern ones, such as those of Rudradāmaka, which, according to the *Tikā*, were worth a third of the *nīlakahāpaṇa*. In one of the *Comys.* Bu. calls the *kahāpaṇa* four-sided, thus not circular.

On *kahāpaṇa* see Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins, etc.*, pp. 3, 13; *Buddhist India*, p. 100; *B.D.* i. 29, 71, n. 2; and on *pāda*, *māsaka*, see *B.D.* i. 71, n. 2; 72, n. 1. The late Professor E. J. Rapson kindly told me that *coins* were certainly known at the time of the *Commentaries*, but it is doubtful whether they were known at the date of the text. Cf. A. A. Macdonell, *India's Past*, 262 f.; Rapson, *Ancient India*, 13-4, 151-2, 173; *C.H.I.* i. 61, 217. Here we have to bear in mind a distinction between the text (*sikkhāpada*), the *Old Comy.* (*Padabhājanīya*) and the *Commentary* (*Buddhaghosa*). The two former may have sustained several redactions.

² *rūpiya*, silver, or gold and silver. In the "rule" *rūpiya* disappears and is supplanted by the compound, *jātarūparajata*. It is not unusual for a "rule" to be more precise in its reference than the story that led up to it, so that here, had only "silver" been intended in the story, it would not have been surprising to find the rule improving on the story, and alluding to "gold and silver." But both the *Old Comy.* and *VA.* appear to equate *rūpiya* with *jātarūparajata*, as though at all events at their date the two meant the same thing.

Jātarūpa is a word for gold, perhaps meaning lit. a form, *rūpa*,

Monks heard that man who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, accept gold and silver?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, accepted gold and silver?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, accept gold and silver?"

(stamped) on what is good and sound. The *Old Comy.* below defines it as *sathvaṇṇa*, the colour of the teacher (cf. *D.* ii. 17, iii. 143); *VA.* 689 as *suvaṇṇassa nāma*, and says that it is like the colour of the tathāgata (cf. *DA.* i. 78, *suvaṇṇa*). Thus *jātarūpa* seems to be called *suvaṇṇa* on account of its lovely colour.

Rajata is defined in the *Old Comy.* below (also at *DA.* 78) as "*kahāpaṇa*, the *māsaka* of copper, of wood, of lac, used in business"; at *VA.* 689 as "mother-of-pearl, precious stone, coral, silver (*rajata*), gold (*jātarūpa*).

Rūpiya is defined in the *Old Comy.* on the next Nissag. as "the colour of the teacher, the *kahāpaṇa*, the *māsaka* of copper, of wood, of lac, used in business." This definition therefore combines those of *jātarūpa* and of *rajata* under the one heading, as though *rūpiya* were a generic term for these two precious metals. Cf. *VA.* 696, where *jātarūparajata* seems identified with *rūpiya*, and where also Bu. defines *rūpiyasamvohāraṃ* as *jātarūparajataparivattanaṃ*, the *rūpiya* used in business in exchange of gold and silver.

I have, in view of these definitions, translated both *rūpiya* and *jātarūparajata* (of the "rule") as "gold and silver." Whether all or any of these were simply pieces of metal, or coins as we know them, stamped and engraved with a figure or form, *rūpa*, as in Bu.'s days seems at least to have been the case with some of the *māsakas* (see below, p. 102, nn. 9, 10), we cannot, for the time to which the text and *Old Comy.* purport to refer, determine with any certainty. *Rūpiya* certainly signifies a medium of exchange, but yet it would be a mistake to translate it by "money." See Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins, etc.*, p. 7, where he seems to reject the idea that *rūpiya* means money. The bowls that were *rūpiyamaya*, used by the group of six monks, could not have been "made of money." On the other hand, they also had bowls that were *suvaṇṇamaya*, made of gold, gold of the kind that is *suvaṇṇa*. It therefore looks as if in this passage *rūpiya* does not stand for silver as well as for gold, nor for "silver" as a medium of exchange. Again, taking *A.* i. 253 to show how far from fixed were the meanings attached to these names for precious metals, *jātarūpa* clearly represents unworked, sterling gold that a goldsmith can work into ornaments.

It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should take gold and silver,¹ or should get another to take it (for him), or should consent to its being kept in deposit² (for him), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 || [237]

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

*Gold*³ means: it is called the colour of the teacher.⁴

*Silver*⁵ means: the *kahāpaṇa*,⁶ the *māsaka*⁷ of copper,⁸ the *māsaka* of wood,⁹ the *māsaka* of lac,¹⁰ used in business.¹¹

¹ *jātarūparajata*. Cf. next note above. At *Vin.* i. 245 the lord is recorded to say, "I do not say, monks, that in any way may gold and silver be consented to, may be looked about for." The *Cūḷavagga*, in the account of the Council of Vesālī, *Vin.* ii. 294 ff., includes the acceptance of gold and silver (*jātarūparajata*) by monks as the last of the ten matters questioned, but ruled not to be permissible. At *D.* i. 5 an ordinary man might say of Gotama that he is one who refrains from accepting *jātarūparajata*.

² *upanikkhittam vā sādīyeyya*. See Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins*, etc., p. 7, and *Vin. Texts* i. 26, n. 4.

³ *jātarūpa*. ⁴ *satthuvaṇṇa*. ⁵ *rajata*.

⁶ See *B.D.* i. 28, n. 1; 71, n. 2; and above, p. 100, n. 1.

⁷ See *B.D.* i. 71, n. 2, and p. 72.

⁸ *lohamāsaka*. *V.A.* 689 says that it is a *māsaka* (bean) made up of copper and bronze (*tamba*), etc.

⁹ *dārumāsaka*. *V.A.* 689 says that this is a *māsaka* made up of strong, durable wood, or of a piece of bamboo, or even of palm leaves, cutting a figure or engraving into it (*rūpaṃ chinditvā*).

¹⁰ *jatumāśaka*. *V.A.* 690 says that this is a *māsaka* made with lac or with resin, on to which a figure has been embossed or introduced (lit. caused to be raised up *samutthāpetvā*).

It is interesting to note the present-day usage in force in some parts of Tibet: J. Hanbury-Tracy, *Black River of Tibet*, p. 73, "a collection of shells, short lengths of polished wood with curious markings, bean-pods and round discs. These were the tallies used in tax-collecting." And p. 74, "in some parts of Tibet lumps of silver, in the shape of ponies' hooves, are used for money."

¹¹ *ye vohāraṃ gacchanti*. *V.A.* 690 says that in all districts where there is business every kind is included, even if made of bone, of hide, of fruit, of seeds of trees, or whether a figure has been raised

Should take means: if he himself takes, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Should get another to take it (for him) means: if he causes another to take it, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Should consent to its being kept in deposit means: if he says: 'Let this come to be for the master,' or consents to its being kept in deposit, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited in the midst of the Order. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs, accepted gold and silver,¹ this is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.'² Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk. If an attendant of a monastery or a lay-follower comes there, he should be told: 'Sir, find out about this.' If he says: 'What could be got with this?' he should not be told: 'Bring this or that'; oil or ghee or honey or molasses may be mentioned as allowable. If he brings what is allowable, having got it in exchange for this, it may be made use of by all except the one who accepted the gold and silver. If he can undertake to do this in this way,³ it is well. But if he cannot undertake to do it, he

up on it or not. This passage goes on to say that the things which involve forfeiture are silver, gold, a gold *māsaka*, a silver *māsaka*; the things that involve an offence of wrong-doing are pearls and other gems, the seven sorts of grain, slaves, fields, flower-parks and orchards; the things that are allowable include thread, a plough-share, cloth, cotton, cooked pulses, and oil, ghee, butter, honey, molasses as medicine.

¹ *rūpiya*.

² *V.A.* 691 points out that as *rūpiya* is not legally allowed (*akappiya*), neither a group nor an individual may possess it, but only the Order. Therefore it can only be forfeited to the Order.

³ *evaṃ ce taṃ labhetha*—i.e., to procure what is allowable. This comprises the four medicines (oil, ghee, etc.) mentioned above. Note that the fifth medicine, butter, is absent here.

should be told: 'Sir, remove this.'¹ If he removes it, it is well. But if he does not remove it, a monk endowed with five qualities² should be agreed upon as silver-remover³: one who would not follow a wrong course through desire, one who would not follow a wrong course through hatred, one who would not follow a wrong course through stupidity, one who would not follow a wrong course through fear,⁴ and one who would know what is removed and what is not removed. And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon: First, the monk is to be requested. Having been requested, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon the monk so and so as silver-remover. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order agrees upon the monk so and so as silver-remover. If it is pleasing to the venerable ones to agree upon the monk so and so as silver-remover, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. The monk so and so is agreed upon by the Order as silver-remover, and it is right . . . Thus do I understand this.' It is to be removed by the monk agreed upon making no sign.⁵ If, making a sign, he lets it drop, there is an offence of wrong-doing. [238]

¹ *imam chaddēhi*. If he cannot go and exchange the *rūpiya* for something allowable, the *rūpiya* should be removed, since it is not allowable.

² *pañcah' aṅgehi samannāgato*. Here the qualities are as follows in the text. Another group of qualities are detailed at *A. i. 162= S. i. 99*; these are the constituents of morality, of concentration, of wisdom, of freedom, of freedom by knowledge and insight that are possessed by the adept (*asekha*)—i.e., the arahān. Cf. below, p. 122.

³ *rūpiya-chaddāka*. I think that to translate this term as "bullion-remover," as at *Vin. Texts i. 26, n. 4*, gives a false notion of the extent of any largesse that a monk might have received. Cf. *Thag. 620 pupphacchaddāka*, a scavenger of flowers, and *Vin. iv. 6*, where this is given as one of the low types of work.

⁴ These are the four *agatis*, see *B.D. i. 323, n. 7*.

⁵ The silver-remover must avoid drawing attention to the place where he throws down the *rūpiya*.

If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is gold and silver, (and) accepts gold and silver, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is gold and silver, (and) accepts gold and silver, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is gold and silver, (and) accepts gold and silver, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, taking¹ it or causing (another) to take it within a monastery or within a house,² he lays it aside, thinking, 'It will be for him who will take it'³; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

¹ *uggahetvā*.

² *ajjha-āvasatha*. At *Vin. iv. 69 ff. āvasatha* is a "public rest-house." But cf. *ajjhāvasati*, to inhabit, to dwell in a house, above, p. 47, n. 5.

³ *yassa bhavissati so harissati*. Probably a monk, whether accepting *rūpiya* from a lay-person visiting a monastery, or from a lay person whose house he is visiting, should lay it aside at once, so that either the owner may take it again, or someone else may pick it up. Cf. *Vin. iv. 162 ff.* in reference to a jewel—not given to a monk but picked up by a monk. At all events, in laying it aside, the monk's responsibility ceases, and he cannot be accused of committing an offence. To be allowed to accept *rūpiya* at all must be attributed to the courtesy that the monks must display towards the laity: by accepting gifts they confer a boon upon the donors. In view of the *anāpatti* (no offence) clause, the *sikkhāpada* (rule) clause even more strongly suggests not that a monk must not take or cause *rūpiya* to be taken at all, but that he must not take it or cause it to be taken for him with a view to keeping and using it or putting it by in deposit.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XIX

. . . at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks engaged in¹ various transactions in which gold and silver was used.² People . . . spread it about saying:

"How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used, like householders who enjoy pleasures of the senses?" Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, engaged in various transactions in which gold and silver is used?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

¹ *samāpajjati*, or "came into," see *B.D.* i. 201, n. 3.

² *rūpiya-samvohāra*, which *V.A.* 696 explains as *jātarūparajata-parivattana*, (involving) the exchange of gold and silver. On *rūpiya*, *jātarūpa* and *rajata*, see above, p. 100, n. 2.

Various means: shaped¹ and unshaped and (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped. *Shaped* means: intended (as an ornament) for the head, intended (as an ornament) for the neck, intended (as an ornament) for the hand, intended (as an ornament) for the foot, intended (as an ornament) for the hips. *Unshaped* means: it is called shaped in a mass.² (*Partly*) *shaped*, (*partly*) *unshaped* means: both of these. [239]

*Gold and silver*³ means: what is the colour of the teacher,⁴ the *kahāpaṇa*, the *māsaka* of copper, the *māsaka* of wood, the *māsaka* of lac, used in business.⁵

Should engage in means: if he gets shaped in exchange for shaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets unshaped in exchange for shaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped in exchange for shaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets shaped in exchange for unshaped . . . If he gets unshaped in exchange for unshaped . . . If he gets (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped in exchange for unshaped . . . If he gets shaped in exchange for (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped . . . If he gets unshaped in exchange for (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped . . . If he gets (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped in exchange for (partly) shaped, (partly) unshaped, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. It is to be forfeited in the midst of the Order. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should speak thus: 'I, honoured sirs,

¹ *kata*. This means made up into some definite object, an earring or another ornament, for instance, as opposed to *akata*, unshaped—*i.e.*, still a *ghana*, a (shapeless) mass.

² *ghanakata*.

³ *rūpiya*.

⁴ *satthuvanna*, see above, p. 100, n. 2.

⁵ This definition of *rūpiya* covers those of *jātarūpa* and *rajata* at *Vin.* iii. 238, thus giving the impression that *rūpiya* is a generic term for *jātarūpa* and *rajata*. See above, p. 100, n. 2.

engaged in various transactions in which gold and silver are used; this is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk. If an attendant of a monastery or a lay-follower comes there . . . (see Nissag. XVIII. 2; *instead of*: except by the one who accepted gold and silver . . . and accepts gold and silver *read*: except by the one who got gold and silver in exchange . . . and gets gold and silver in exchange) . . . If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, (and) gets gold and silver in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not gold and silver, (and) gets gold and silver in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, (and) gets gold and silver in exchange, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not gold and silver, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not gold and silver when it is not gold and silver, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹ || 2 ||

¹ This is the only *anāpatti* paragraph in the thirty Nissaggiyas where nothing more than these two invariable exemptions are given.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XX

. . . at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at the time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, came to be skilled¹ in robe-making. He, making an outer cloak of cloth rags,² making it well-dyed, well-worked, clothed himself in it. Then a certain wandering student,³ having clothed himself in a costly cloth,⁴ approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he said: [240]

"Your reverence, this outer cloak of yours is beautiful, give it to me for (this) cloth."

"Find out about it,⁵ your reverence," he said.

"Yes, your reverence, I know (about it)."

"Very well, then, your reverence," he said and gave (it to him).

Then that wandering student, clothing himself in that outer cloak, went to the wandering students' monastery.⁶ The wandering students spoke thus to

¹ *pattho*, to be read throughout as *paddha*, also said of Upananda at *Vin.* iii. 210, of Udāyin at *Vin.* iv. 60. See *VA.* 665.

² *paṭa-pilotikā*, cf. *S.* ii. 219.

³ *paribbājaka*, a wanderer, wandering student, wandering teacher. See Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 141 ff.; B. M. Barua, *Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy*, p. 192, and *D.P.P.N.*

⁴ *paṭa*, or cloak or garment.

⁵ *jānāhi*. I think that the point of this injunction must be that when the wandering student wished to exchange the garments again (see just below), Upananda refused to do so because he was not going to be "taken in," and get back the outer cloak which he had managed to barter with the student. For, according to Bu. (*VA.* 699), his outer cloak was *dubbala* (worn).

⁶ Special places were given for the accommodation of the wanderers, where they could meet with one another and enter into discussions during their travels. Also, like the Sakyaputtiyas, they did not go on tour during the three months of the rains.

this wandering student: "This outer cloak of yours is beautiful, your reverence. Where did you get it?"

"It was in exchange for my cloth, your reverences."

"But, your reverence, this outer cloak will do¹ for you for some time (only). That cloth was better for you."

Then that wandering student, thinking: "What the wandering students said is true. This outer cloak will do for me for some time (only). That cloth was better for me," approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached he spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans: "Your reverence, here is your outer cloak, give the cloth to me."

"But, your reverence, did I not say to you, 'Find out about it'? I will not give it," he said.

Then that wandering student . . . spread it about, saying: "Even householders give back to a householder if he regrets²; but why will one who has gone forth not give back to one who has gone forth?"

Monks heard that wandering student who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, engage in bartering³ together with a wandering student?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, engaged in bartering together with a wandering student?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, engage in bartering together with a wandering student? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . .

¹ *bhavissati*.

² *vippatisāri*. Here it means if he regrets what he has bartered and wants it back again.

³ *kayavikkaya*, or "buying and selling." *Cetāpeti*, to get in exchange, and *parivatteti*, to exchange or barter (cf. above, pp. 60, 67, where the one is defined by the other), also imply a bartering. Here there was no buying and selling, only an exchange of articles.

And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should engage in various kinds of bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."¹ || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Various means: the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicine for the sick, and even a lump of chunam and a toothpick and unwoven thread.²

Should engage in . . . bartering means: if he transgresses,³ saying: 'Give this for that, take this for that, barter this for that, get this in exchange for that,'⁴ there is an offence of wrong-doing. Inasmuch as it is bartered—one's own goods gone to the hands of another, another's goods gone to one's own hands—it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited . . . [241] to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'I, honoured sirs, engaged in various kinds of bartering; this is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back (these goods) to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it is bartering when it is bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.⁵ If he is in doubt as to whether it is bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not bartering when it is bartering, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is bartering when it is not bartering, there

¹ At *D. i. 5* it is said that an ordinary man might say of Gotama, in speaking praise of him, that he refrains from *kayavikkaya*, bartering.

² =below, p. 161=*Vin. iv. 154* in definition of *lābho*. The last three items occur again below, p. 149.

³ *ajjhācarati*; cf. *B.D. i. 202*, n. 3.

⁴ Cf. below, p. 135.

⁵ There must, I think, be a clause omitted: 'and engages in bartering.' Otherwise there is no sense in the offence.

is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not bartering, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not bartering when it is not bartering, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he asks the value, points it out to one who makes it legally allowable,¹ saying: 'This is ours, and we want this and that'; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

The Second Division: that on Silk

This is its key:

Two portions on silk and pure, for six years, a rug,
And two on (sheep's) wool, on taking, both the
various kinds.²

¹ A *kappiyakāraka* makes a thing allowable by giving it. *V.A.* 701, "saying, 'my utensils are valuable, give your bowl to another.'"

² *I.e.*, *rūpiyasamvohāra* (Nissag. XIX), and *kayavikkaya* (Nissag. XX). In the former there was not bartering, but payment in some kind of medium of exchange; in the latter there was exchange and barter, giving and taking.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXI

. . . at Sāvattī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six monks made a hoard of many bowls.¹ People, engaged in touring the dwelling-place² and seeing (this hoard), looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

"How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, make a hoard of many bowls? Will these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, do a trade in bowls or will they set up an earthenware shop?" Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can this group of six monks keep an extra bowl?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, keep an extra bowl?"

"It is true, lord." The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, keep an extra bowl? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . [242] And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should keep an extra bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

And thus this rule of training for monks came to be laid down by the lord. || 1 ||

¹ *Cf. Vin.* iv. 243.

² *vihāra*. The laity visited the special *vihāras* which they themselves supported. This form of interest in the Order's well-being must have given an added reason for visiting *vihāras*, like our own way of visiting some charitable or other institution in which we are interested.

³ *Cf.* above, p. 50.

Now at that time¹ an extra bowl had accrued to² the venerable Ānanda, and the venerable Ānanda became desirous of giving this bowl to the venerable Sāriputta; but the venerable Sāriputta was staying at Sāketa. Then it occurred to the venerable Ānanda: "A rule of training laid down by the lord is that an extra bowl should not be kept. And this extra bowl has accrued to me, and I am desirous of giving this bowl to the venerable Sāriputta, but the venerable Sāriputta is staying at Sāketa. Now what line of conduct should be followed by me?" Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

"But, how long, Ānanda, before Sāriputta will come (here)?"

"On the ninth or tenth day, lord," he said.

Then the lord, on that occasion, in that connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, to keep an extra bowl for at most ten days. And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

An extra bowl may be kept for at most ten days. For him who exceeds that (period), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."³ || 2 ||

For at most ten days means: it may be kept for ten days at the maximum.⁴

An extra bowl means: one that is not allotted, not assigned.⁵

¹ Cf. Nissag. I, where the same story is told in the same words about keeping an extra robe. See above, p. 4.

² *uppanno hoti*.

³ At *Vin.* iv. 243 the rule is that a hoard of bowls should not be made. There the group of six nuns, as here the group of six monks, are recorded to have made a hoard. There seems some discrepancy between a hoard and an extra bowl. The rule in this Nissag. XXI may have been altered from "a hoard" to "an extra bowl" to balance that against wearing an extra robe, Nissag. I.

⁴ Cf. above, p. 6.

⁵ =definition of "extra robe" at p. 7 above, and of *sannicayaṃ kareyya* at *Vin.* iv. 244.

*A bowl*¹ means: there are two kinds of bowls: an iron bowl, a clay bowl.² There are three sizes³ for a bowl: a large bowl, a medium-sized bowl, a small⁴ bowl. A large bowl means that it takes half an *āḷhaka* measure⁵ of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry.⁶ A medium-sized bowl means that it takes a *nāḷika* measure of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry. A small bowl means that it takes a *pattha* measure of boiled rice, a quarter of that quantity of uncooked rice, a suitable curry. (A bowl) greater than that⁷ is not a bowl, (a bowl) smaller (than that) is not a bowl.⁷

For him who exceeds (that period), there is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited on the eleventh day at sunrise. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with

¹ This definition of *patta*=*Vin.* iv. 123, 243.

² At *Vin.* ii. 112 these two kinds of bowls are "allowed" (*anujānāmi*). Whoever uses a wooden bowl, a golden or a silver one or one of eight other kinds mentioned there, commits a *dukkata* offence.

³ *vannaṃ ti pamāṇāni*, *VA.* 702.

⁴ *omaka*, inferior, insignificant. Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins*, etc., p. 19, calls these "high, middle and low bowls."

⁵ For these measures, *āḷhaka*, *nāḷika* and *pattha*, see Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins*, etc., pp. 18-20, and *B.D.* i. 12, n. 2; 103, n. 1.

⁶ *tadupiya vyañjana*. On *tadupiya* see Trenckner, *J.P.T.S.* 1908, p. 131 ff., *Comy.* on *Miln.* 9. He says it is "perhaps properly a *Vinaya* word." But it occurs, as he mentions, at *S.* iii. 146, *tadupiyañca sūpeyyam*, translated *K.S.* iii. 124 "broth for seasoning thereto." At *M.* ii. 54 we get the same phrase, translated *Fur. Dial.* ii. 28 "with curry-stuffs to match." *MA.* iii. 287 explains it as *tadanurūpa-telaphāṇitadāni*, while *VA.* 703 says: *tassa odanassa anurūpaṃ maccha-mamsa-saka-phala-kaḷirādi byañjanaṃ*, curry of fish, meat, vegetables, fruits, bamboo-tips suitable to this boiled rice. At *Jā.* ii. 160 there is the expression *na ca paññā tadupikā*, which is explained to mean, 'But your wisdom does not match (*tadupikā*), does not correspond to (*anucchavikā*) your body' (which was large).

⁷ *tato ukkattho apatto, omako apatto*. On *apattaka*, see below, p. 123.

joined palms, should speak thus: 'Honoured sirs, [243] this bowl is to be forfeited by me, the ten days having elapsed. I forfeit it to the Order.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk; the bowl forfeited should be given (back with the words): 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. This bowl of the monk so and so, which had to be forfeited, is forfeited (by him) to the Order. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should give back this bowl to the monk so and so.'

That monk, approaching two or three monks . . . (See Nissag. I. 3-4) . . . ' . . . I will give back this bowl to the venerable one.' . . .

. . . If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is broken¹ when it is not broken, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the bowl which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the ten days have elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether the ten days have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the ten days have not elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is no offence.

There is no offence if within ten days it is allotted, assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, broken, if they tear it from him, if they take it on trust; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.² || 3 ||

Then the group of six monks did not give back a bowl that had been forfeited. They told this matter

¹ In Nissag. I, II, III, XXVIII we get "burnt," of a robe.

² Cf. Nissag. I, II, III, XXVIII ("burnt"), and *Vin.* iv. 245 ("broken").

to the lord. He said: "Monks, a bowl that has been forfeited is not not to be given back. Whosoever should not give it back, there is an offence of wrong-doing."¹
|| 4 ||

¹ See Nissag. I, where a similar story is told of a robe that had been forfeited; and *Vin.* iv. 245, again a bowl.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXII

. . . among the Sakyans at Kapilavatthu in the Banyan monastery.¹ Now at that time monks were invited by a certain potter who said: "If these masters need a bowl, I (can supply them) with a bowl."² Now at that time monks, not knowing moderation, asked for many bowls. They asked for large bowls for those who had small bowls, they asked for small bowls for those who had large bowls. Then that potter, making many bowls for the monks, could not make other goods for sale,³ and he could not keep himself going and his wife and children suffered. People . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls? This (man), making many bowls for these (monks), [244] is not able to make other goods for sale, and he cannot keep himself going and his wife and children suffer."

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these monks, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Monks, is it true, as is said, that monks, not knowing moderation, asked for many bowls?"

"It is true, lord."

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . ."

¹ See above, p. 94.

² *yesam ayyānaṃ pattaṇa attho ahaṃ pattaṇā ti*. For rest of this par. cf. *Pāc.* 86.

³ *vikkāyikam*, or "for giving away"—i.e., in exchange or barter; see above, p. 110. Cf. *Jā.* i. 201.

And having rebuked them and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:

"Monks, a bowl is not to be asked for. Whoever should ask (for one), there is an offence of wrongdoing."¹ || 1 ||

Now at that time a certain monk's bowl became broken.² Then it occurred to that monk: "Asking for a bowl is forbidden by the lord," and being scrupulous, he did not ask (for one); he went about for alms-food (to be put) into his hands.³ People . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, go about for alms-food (to be put) into their hands, like followers of other sects?"⁴ Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: "I allow you, monks, when a bowl is destroyed or when a bowl is broken, to ask for a bowl." || 2 ||

Now at that time the group of six monks said: "It is allowed by the lord to ask for a bowl when a bowl is destroyed or when a bowl is broken"; and these, because (their bowls) were a little broken and a little

¹ Note that Gotama is not here laying down a nissaggiya pācittiya but a dukkaṭa rule. Because of it a monk, following the injunction scrupulously, arouses the criticism of the laity, and an "allowance," an *anujānāmi*, is given (in || 2 ||). Then the group of six monks transgress the allowance; this leads to the formulation of the nissaggiya pācittiya (in || 3 ||).

² Examples of ways in which bowls got broken given at *Vin.* ii. 113 f.

³ *hatthesu piṇḍāya carati*. See *Vin.* i. 90, where this expression occurs again, and again people complain that those ordained as monks are like *titthiyas*. Cf. also *Vin.* ii. 114, *tumbakāṭāhe piṇḍāya caranti*, they went for alms-food (to be put) into a gourd; and *Vin.* ii. 115, *ghaṭikāṭāhe*, into a water-pot (or skull).

⁴ This wish to differentiate between *Sakyaputtiyas* and *titthiyas* shows the interest taken by lay people in the former, according to the texts, and a certain desire that their behaviour should be suit-

chipped¹ and a little scratched,² asked for many bowls. Then that potter, making many bowls, as before,³ for the monks, was not able to make other goods for sale, and he did not keep himself going and his wife and children suffered. As before,³ people . . . spread it about, saying: "How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, not knowing moderation, ask for many bowls? This (man) making many bowls for these (monks), is not able to make other goods for sale, and he does not keep himself going and his wife and children suffer." Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks, when their bowls are a little broken and [245] a little chipped and a little scratched, ask for many bowls?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, when your bowls were a little broken . . . asked for many bowls?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, when your bowls are a little broken . . . ask for many bowls? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not yet pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should get another new bowl in exchange for a bowl mended⁴ in less than five places, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. That bowl is to be forfeited by that monk to the company of monks, and whatever is the last bowl⁵ belonging

able. Monks were not to ape householders on the one hand—*e.g.*, above, pp. 74, 106; now and at *Vin.* i. 90, ii. 114, 115, they are not to look like *tiṭṭhiyas*.

¹ *appamattakena khaṇḍena.*

² *vilikkhitamattena.*

³ *tath'eva*, "in that very way," thus "as before."

⁴ *bandhanena*, from *bandhati*, to tie together, to unite; and not from *bhīdati*, to break, as appears to have been thought at *Vin. Texts* i. 27. *C.P.D.* says, "without bands, esp. not riveted (said of alms-bowls)."

⁵ *pattapariyanta*. *V.A.* 708 says, "the bowl that remains at the end (*pariyante*) after this handing over."

to that company of monks, that should be given to this monk with the words: 'Monk, this is a bowl for you; it should be kept until it breaks.'¹ That is the proper course in this case." || 3 || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

A bowl mended in less than five places means: it is not mended, or it is mended in one (place), or it is mended in two (places), or it is mended in three (places), or it is mended in four (places). A bowl with no room for mends means: its rim is not two finger-lengths² (in breadth). A bowl with room for mends means: its rim is two finger-lengths (in breadth).

New bowl means: it is so called with reference to the asking for (it).³

Should get in exchange means: he asks for (it). There is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited in the midst of the Order. All should come together taking each the bowl in his keeping.⁴ An inferior bowl should not be in his keeping if he hopes, 'I shall receive a costly bowl.' If an inferior bowl is in his keeping, and he hopes, 'I shall receive a costly bowl,' there is an

¹ *bhedanāya*, $\sqrt{bhīd}$. Cf. phrase *kāyassa bheda*, on the breaking up of the body.

² *dvaṅgulā*, as at *Vin.* ii. 294, *Thig.* 60. *V.A.* 708, commenting upon *dvaṅgulā rāḍi na hoti*, says that there is not a rim measuring two finger-lengths below the upper circumference. Cf. *Vbh.A.* 343, *sattadhaññamāsappamāṇam ekam angulam*.

³ Cf. above, p. 77, for definition of "new *santhata*."

⁴ *adhittṭhita-patta*. *Adhittṭhita*, from *adhittṭhati* (or *adhittṭhahati* or *adhittṭheti*). This variety of spelling is paralleled by variety of meaning. *C.P.D.*, referring to the above passage, says that *adhittṭhitapatta* is "the obligatory alms-bowl." *Adhittṭhita*, besides meaning "allotted," as hitherto rendered, also means "taken in use, taken in possession." "Allotted bowl" would not be right here, since the "assigner of bowls" is yet to be agreed upon or appointed, which occurs just below. And he is appointed precisely to remedy any tendency of monks to carry an inferior bowl to the meeting of the Order, as though it were his usual one, hoping to get a costly one in its place.

offence of wrong-doing. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited. That monk, approaching the Order, arranging his upper robe over one shoulder, honouring the feet of the senior monks, sitting down on his haunches, saluting with joined palms, should say: 'Honoured sirs, this bowl, got in exchange by me for a bowl mended in less than five places, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' Having forfeited it, the offence should be confessed. The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk. A monk endowed with five qualities should be agreed upon as assigner of bowls¹: one who would not follow a wrong course through desire, one who would not follow a wrong course through hatred, one who would not follow a wrong course through stupidity, one who would not follow a wrong course through fear,² and one who would know what is taken and what is not taken. [246] And thus, monks, should he be agreed upon. First, the monk is to be requested. Having been requested, the Order should be informed by an experienced, competent monk, saying: 'Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. If it seems right to the Order, the Order should agree upon the monk so and so as assigner of bowls. This is the motion. Honoured sirs, let the Order listen to me. The Order agrees upon the monk so and so as assigner of bowls. If it is pleasing to the venerable ones to agree upon the monk so and so as assigner of bowls, let them be silent; if it is not pleasing, they should speak. The monk so and so is agreed upon by the Order as assigner of

¹ *pattaḡāhāpaka*, agent noun from causative *ḡāhāpeti*=to make to take, but here "to invite to take," to say: "be so good as to receive," "to make the bowl pass from one monk to another." Cf. *Vin.* ii. 177, where it is said that there was no *pattaḡā* at that time; and *A.* iii. 275, where many of the officials of the Order are mentioned, and are recommended not to be appointed if they follow the four *agatis*, and cannot make a proper discrimination in their province.

² On the *agatis* see *B.D.* i. 323, n. 7, and cf. above, p. 104. Also cf. *Vin.* i. 283 for "receiver of robes" and *Vin.* ii. 167 for "assigner of lodgings," and above, p. 104, for "silver-remover."

bowls, and it is right. . . . So do I understand.' The monk agreed upon should make the bowl pass. He should say to an elder¹: 'Honoured sir, let the elder take the bowl.'² If the elder takes it, the elder's bowl should be passed to a second.³ He should not take it out of regard⁴ for him.⁵ For whoever should not take it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. It should not be made to pass to one who has what is not a bowl.⁶ In this way the bowl should be made to pass down to the youngest member of the Order.⁷

Whatever is the last bowl belonging to that company of monks, that should be given to this monk⁸ with the words⁹: 'Monk, this is a bowl for you; it should be kept until it breaks.' This bowl should not be laid aside by that monk in what is not the right place¹⁰; it should not be used for improper purposes¹¹; it should not be given

¹ *VA.* 708, "pointing out what is commendable in the bowl, he should say, 'This bowl is of the right measure, it is nice and it is suitable for an elder. Take it.'"

² *I.e.*, the new bowl just put at the disposal of the Order.

³ To a second elder, according to age.

⁴ *anuddayatāya*, explained as *anukampāya* (pity, compassion) at *VA.* 708. But for whoever is contented and says, 'What good is another bowl to me?' and does not take it, there is no offence.

⁵ *I.e.*, the elder.

⁶ *apattaka*. See *Nissag.* XXI. 3, above, p. 115, on *apatta*. At *Vin.* i. 90 it is said that one who is *apattako* is not to be ordained. *Apattaka* means either one who uses what is not a bowl—*e.g.*, gourds and water-pots—or one who has not a bowl—*e.g.*, a *titthiya* who uses his hands to receive alms-food (*Vin.* ii. 114, 115). Cf. *acivaraka* at *Vin.* i. 90, which seems to mean one who has not a robe and who therefore went naked. At *Vin.* i. 93 monks are to be asked at the ordination ceremony whether they are complete as to bowl and robes.

⁷ Everyone receives another bowl, so that the former bowl of the youngest member of the community remains free.

⁸ *I.e.*, the one who had to forfeit his bowl.

⁹ Doubtless spoken by the "assigner of bowls."

¹⁰ *adese*, on a bed or couch or peg to hang a sunshade on. It is to be laid aside on a stand or stool, *VA.* 709. *Dukkaṭa* offences for putting bowls away in various wrong ways and places are given at *Vin.* ii. 113 f.

¹¹ *I.e.*, for cooking, colouring or boiling rice-gruel.

away¹ with the words: 'How can this bowl be lost or destroyed or broken?' If it is laid aside in the wrong place or used for improper purposes or given away, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

This is the proper course in this case means: this is the appropriate course in this case. || 1 ||

If he gets an unmended bowl in exchange for an unmended bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets a bowl that is mended in one place . . . in two places . . . in three places . . . in four places in exchange for an unmended bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets an unmended bowl . . . a bowl that is mended in one place . . . in two places . . . in three places . . . in four places in exchange for a bowl that is mended in one place, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets an unmended bowl . . . a bowl that is mended in one place . . . in two places . . . in three places . . . in four places in exchange for a bowl that is mended in two places . . . in three places . . . in four places, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

If he gets a bowl with no room for mends in exchange for an unmended bowl, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he gets a bowl that has room for one mend in exchange for an unmended bowl . . . If he gets a bowl that has room for four mends in exchange for a bowl that is mended in four places, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. [247]

If he gets an unmended bowl in exchange for a bowl that has no room for mends, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. . . . If he gets a bowl mended in four places in exchange for a bowl that has room for four mends, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

If he gets a bowl with no room for mends in exchange for a bowl that has no room for mends . . . If he gets

¹ *na vissajjetabbo ti aññassa na dātabbo, V.A. 709.*

a bowl that has room for four mends in exchange for a bowl that has room for four mends, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

There is no offence if the bowl is destroyed, if the bowl is broken, if they belong to relations, if they are invited, if it is for another, if it is by means of his own property; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.¹
|| 2 || 2 ||

¹ Cf. above, pp. 49, 52, 57.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXIII

. . . at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery.¹ Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha,² desiring to make a cave,³ had a (mountain) slope cleared near Rājagaha. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the venerable Pilindavaccha, and having approached and greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the venerable Pilindavaccha:

"What, honoured sir, is the elder having made?"

"Sire, desiring to make a cave, I am having a (mountain) slope cleared," he said.

"Honoured sir, does the master require an attendant for the monastery?"

"Sire, an attendant for a monastery is not prescribed by the lord."

"Well, honoured sir, asking the lord, you must tell him of me."

"Very well, Sire," the venerable Pilindavaccha answered King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha.

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha taught, roused and gladdened King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha with dhamma-talk. And when King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha had been taught, roused and gladdened with dhamma-talk by the venerable Pilindavaccha, rising up from his seat, greeting the venerable Pilindavaccha, he departed, keeping his right side towards him.

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha sent a messenger to the lord, to say: "Lord, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha desires to present an attendant for a monas-

tery. Now, lord, what line of conduct is to be followed?"

Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: "Monks, I allow an attendant for a monastery."

Then a second time did King [248] Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approach the venerable Pilindavaccha, and having approached and greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha spoke thus to the venerable Pilindavaccha:

"Honoured sir, has the lord prescribed an attendant for a monastery?"

"Yes, Sire," he said.

"Well, honoured sir, I will give the master an attendant for the monastery."

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, promising the venerable Pilindavaccha an attendant for the monastery, forgetting (but) remembering after a time, addressed a chief minister who was concerned with all the affairs,¹ saying: "My good man,² has that attendant for the monastery whom I promised, been given to the master?"

"Your Majesty,³ an attendant for the monastery has not been given to the master."

"My good man, how long is it since it was considered?"

Then that chief minister, counting up the days, spoke thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: "It is five hundred days,⁴ your Majesty."

"Well then, give five hundred attendants for the monastery to the master."

"Very well, your Majesty," and the chief minister, replying thus to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, made over to the venerable Pilindavaccha five hundred attendants for the monastery, and a distinct village

¹ = *Vin.* i. 206-9.

² Cf. *B.D.* i. 112.

³ *leṇa*.

¹ *sabbatthaka mahāmatta*.

² *bhāṇe*.

³ *deva*.

⁴ "five hundred," of course, only means "many, several."

established itself. They even called it "The Village of the Monastery Attendants,"¹ and they called it Pilinda Village.² || 1 ||

Now at that time the venerable Pilindavaccha came to be dependent (for alms) on the families in this village. Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, entered Pilinda Village for alms-food. Now at that time there came to be a festival in this village; young girls³ wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, were celebrating it. Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, as he was going about in Pilinda Village on continuous alms-begging, came up to the dwelling of a certain attendant of the monastery, and having come up he sat down on the appointed seat. Now at that time, the daughter of the monastery attendant's wife, seeing other little girls wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, cried and said: "Give me a garland, give me an ornament."

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha said to that monastery attendant's wife: "Why is this little girl crying?"

"Honoured sir, this little girl is crying because, having seen other little girls wearing ornaments, adorned with garlands, she says: 'Give me a garland, give me an ornament.' Whence is there a garland for us who are poor, whence is there an ornament?"

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha, taking a roll of grass,⁴ said to that monastery attendant's wife: "Now

¹ *Ārāmikagāmaka*.

² *Pilindagāmaka*.

³ *dārikā*, with *v.l. dārakā*. Oldenberg at *Vin.* iii. 278, referring to this passage and to the one immediately following, says, 'I think we ought to read *dārakā*, *dārake*.' See also his notes at *Vin.* iii. 382. I think, however, that it is not necessary to take the reading *dārakā*. The point probably is that the daughter of the monastery attendant's wife was jealous of "other little girls," rather than of the children in general.

⁴ *tiṇaṇḍupakan ti tiṇacumbatakam*, *VA.* 709. This is the circular roll or coil of grass (or cloth) which Indians put on the head when they are carrying baskets, water-vessels, etc., on the head. One type of wife, *Vin.* iii. 139, is called *obhatacumbata*, one from whom

set¹ this roll of grass on this little girl's head." Then that monastery attendant's wife, taking that roll of grass, set it on the little girl's head; it became a golden chaplet,² beautiful, [249] good to look upon, charming; there was no golden chaplet like it in the women's quarters of the king. People said to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha:

"Your Majesty, in the house of a certain monastery attendant there is a golden chaplet, beautiful, good to look upon, charming; there is no golden chaplet like it in the women's quarters of your Majesty. As he is poor, where (could he have got it) from? Undoubtedly it was taken by theft."

Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha had that monastery attendant's family imprisoned. A second time did the venerable Pilindavaccha, dressing in the morning, taking his bowl and robe, enter Pilinda Village for alms-food. As he was going about in Pilinda Village on continuous alms-begging, he came up to that monastery attendant's dwelling, and having come up, he asked the neighbours: "Where has this monastery attendant's family gone?"

"Honoured sir, they have been imprisoned by the king on account of that golden chaplet," they said. || 2 ||

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha went up to the residence of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, and having gone up he sat down on the appointed seat. Then King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha approached the venerable Pilindavaccha, and having approached and greeted the venerable Pilindavaccha, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, the venerable Pilindavaccha said to King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha: "How is it,

the pad (for the burdens she carries on her head) is taken. At *Jā.* i. 208 we get the word *cumbatakalaha*, a quarrel about a head-pad.

¹ *paṭimuñca*. Bu. at *VA.* 709 says *paṭimuñcī ti thapesi*.

² *swaṇṇamālā*; *VA.* 709 says a chaplet of golden lotuses.

Sire, that the monastery attendant's family is imprisoned?"

"Honoured sir, in that monastery attendant's house there was a golden chaplet, beautiful, good to look upon, charming; there is no golden chaplet like it in our women's quarters. Where (could he have got it) from, as he is poor? Undoubtedly it was taken by theft."

Then the venerable Pilindavaccha exercised volitional force,¹ and said: "The palace² of King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha is golden," and it became made all of gold.³ He said: "Now, Sire, from where have you got so much gold?"

Saying, "I understand, honoured sir, this is the master's majesty of psychic potency," he set free the monastery attendant's family. People, delighted, full of satisfaction because they heard that a state of furthermen, a wonder of psychic potency had been shown by master Pilindavaccha to the king and his retinue, presented the five kinds of medicine to the venerable Pilindavaccha, that is to say ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses. Now the venerable Pilindavaccha was customarily a receiver,⁴ so when he received the five kinds of medicine he gave them away among his company. And his company came to live in abundance; whatever they received, filling pots and pitchers, they put them away, and filling water-strainers and bags, they hung them up⁵ in the windows. These (pots, etc.) were leaking,⁶ and the dwelling-places became beset and

¹ *adhimucci*=*adhittāsi*, VA. 709. C.P.D., under both *adhimuccati* and *adhittāsi* gives "to make a (magical) act of volition." Lit. hyper-released, hyper-persisted. Cf. B.D. i. 128, n. 3.

² *pāsāda*, see above, p. 16, n. 5. ³ Mentioned at Kvu. 608.

⁴ *lābhin*. He usually got plenty of alms-food, etc., and so did not need the extra amount.

⁵ *laggeti*, or perhaps "packed." Cf. Vin. ii. 152, where monks *lhavikāyo laggenti*, hung up or packed up their bags at the foot of beds and chairs.

⁶ *olīnavilīnāni tittanti*, were sticking and melting, hence they let through their contents, and hence there came to be rats. The Colombo and Siamese edns. of VA. read *hetthā ca ubhato-passesu ca galitāni*, leaking through the bottom and the sides.

overrun¹ by rats. [250] People seeing (this) as they were engaged in touring the dwelling-places, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: "These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are storing up goods indoors,² like King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha." Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can monks strive after abundance such as this?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks strive after abundance such as this?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"Monks, how can these foolish men strive after abundance such as this? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:³

Those medicines which may be partaken of⁴ by ill monks, that is to say, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses: accepting these, they may be used as a store for at most seven days. For him who exceeds that (period), there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."⁵ || 3 || 1 ||

Those medicines which are partaken of by ill monks means: *ghee*⁶ is called ghee from cows or ghee from she-

¹ *okīṇṇavikīṇṇā*.

² *antokothhāgarikā*. At Jā. iii. 364, *mahicchā ime samaṇā anto*.

³ At Vin. i. 209 instead of this paragraph read, "having rebuked them and given reasoned talk, he addressed the monks, saying:"

⁴ *paṭisāyaniyāni ti paṭisāyitabbāni paribhuñjītabbāni ti attho*, VA. 710.

⁵ Vin. i. 209, "exceeding that (time) is a matter to be dealt with according to the rule." From beginning of Nissag. XXIII to here=Vin. i. 206-9. Cf. Pāc. 38 for rule against eating food that has been stored. The Gandharajātaka (Jā. iii. 363) was told in reference to this rule.

Beginning with the above rule, the order of the Nissaggiyas which follow is different in the Pali, Sanskrit and Chinese texts. See *Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādīns*, ed. Finot, J. As. Nov.-Dec., 1913, p. 39 (=499). ⁶ =Vin. iv. 88, to "sugar-cane," below.

goats or ghee from buffaloes; ghee from those whose meat is suitable. *Fresh butter* means: fresh butter from just these. *Oil* means: sesamum oil, oil of mustard seeds, oil containing honey,¹ oil of the castor-oil plant, oil from tallow.² *Honey* means: honey of bees.³ *Molasses* means: what is produced from sugar-cane.

Accepting these, they may be used as a store for at most seven days means: they may be used for seven days at the maximum.

For him who exceeds that (period) there is an offence involving forfeiture means: it is to be forfeited on the eighth day at sunrise. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, seven days having elapsed, this medicine of mine is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . May I give back this medicine to the venerable one?'

If he thinks that seven days have elapsed when they have elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether the seven days have elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that the seven days have elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is allotted⁴ when it is not allotted, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is bestowed when it is not bestowed . . . If he thinks that it is lost when it is not lost . . . If he thinks that it is destroyed when it is not destroyed . . . [251] If he thinks that it is burnt when it is not burnt, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If

¹ *madhukatela*, or "of the honey-tree," *madhuka* being the tree *Bassia latifolia*. *Madhukapuppharasa*, not allowed at *Vin.* i. 246; translated at *Vin. Texts* ii. 133 "liquorice-juice."

² *vasā*. At *VA.* 714 five kinds of *vasā* are given: that from bears, fish, alligators, pigs, donkeys.

³ *makkhikāmadhu*. The bee is called *madhumakkhikā*.

⁴ This and the next five cases=*Vin.* iii. 197, 262, except that *avikappita*, assigned, does not occur above. For *adhittā* see above, p. 7, n. 1.

he thinks that it is stolen when it is not stolen, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Acquiring something that has been forfeited,¹ it must not be made use of for bodily enjoyment,² it must not be consumed, it may be done into³ a lamp or black colour,⁴ it may be made use of by another monk for bodily enjoyment, it must not be consumed (by him). If he thinks that the seven days have not elapsed when they have elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether the seven days have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that the seven days have not elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is no offence.

There is no offence if within seven days it is allotted, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt; if they tear it from them; if they take it on trust; if it is sacrificed, renounced, given up⁵ to one who is not ordained; if one devoid of longing,⁶ giving (and) acquiring, makes use of it; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

¹ *nissatṭha*, cf. above, p. 8. ² Such as anointing the limbs.

³ *upanetabbam*, from *upa* + \sqrt{ni} , to bring to.

⁴ *kālavāṇṇe*. Exact significance unknown, but with *padīpa* (lamp) is another use for oil, since *VA.* 718 uses the verb *makkheti*.

⁵ At *Vin.* iii. 96 and *M.* i. 37 *catto vanto mutto + pahīno*. *VA.* 719, "if the medicine is sacrificed, renounced, given up for the sake of one's mind, the mind is sacrificed, renounced, given up, then the man is called devoid of longing as to his mind; it means, thus being devoid of longing, giving to a *sāmaṇera* (novice)."

⁶ *anapekkha*.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXIV

. . . at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a cloth for the rains¹ came to be allowed to monks by the lord.² The group of six monks, saying: "A cloth for the rains is allowed by the lord," looked about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand, they put them on, (but going) naked because the cloths for the rains were old, they let their bodies get wet with the rain. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can this group of six monks look about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand put them on, (but) because the cloths for the rains are old, (going) naked,³ let their bodies get wet with the rain?"

¹ *vassikasāṭikā*. These are cloth garments used instead of the robes, for these had been found to become wet and heavy during the rains, *Vin.* i. 253. At *Vin.* ii. 177 we get *sāṭiya-* (= *sāṭika-*) *gāhāpaka*, translated at *Vin. Texts* iii. 223 "receiver of undergarments." But *gāhāpaka* is "assigner," see above, p. 122, n. 1. *Udakasāṭikā* occurs at *e.g. Vin.* i. 294, iv. 278-9, meaning bathing-cloths (for nuns). This was not a cloth that was put on on top of or under the robes, but was worn instead of them. In the same way the *vassikasāṭikā* were worn by monks to save the robes and the discomfort of wearing wet robes. At *Vin.* iv. 172 the group of six monks had their *vassikasāṭikā* made to an unsuitable measure. The right measure was therefore prescribed, and was to be in length six spans of the accepted length, in breadth two and a half spans. As editor of *Vin. Texts* ii. 225, n. (*q.v.*) observes: "this is just enough to go round the loins from the waist half down to the knee." At *Vin.* iv. 173 *vassikasāṭikā* are defined as "for the four months of the rains," while at *Vin.* i. 297 it is allowed to allot cloths for the rains during the four months of the rains, after that time to assign them.

² *Vin.* i. 294; the giving of *vassikasāṭikā* was one of the eight boons conferred upon Visākhā.

³ Cf. above, p. 45, where monks complained of monks going naked.

Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, looking about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand put them on, (but) because the cloths for the rains were old, (going) naked, you let your bodies get wet with the rain?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, looking about beforehand for robe-material as cloths for the rains, (and) making them beforehand put them on, (but) because the cloths for the rains were old, (going) naked, let your bodies get wet with the rain? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

If he thinks, 'A month of the hot weather remains,' robe-material as a cloth for the rains should be looked about for by that monk. If he thinks, 'Half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it, [252] it should be put on. If he thinks, 'More than a month of the hot weather remains,' and should look about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains; if he thinks, 'More than half a month of the hot weather remains,' and making it, should put it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

If he thinks, 'A month of the hot weather remains,' robe-material as a cloth for the rains should be looked about for by that monk means: having approached those people who formerly gave robe-material as cloths for the rains, he may speak to them thus: 'It is the time for robe-material as cloths for the rains, it is the season for robe-material as cloths for the rains, and other people are giving robe-material as cloths for the rains.' He should not say, 'Give me robe-material as a cloth for the rains, bring me robe-material as a cloth for the rains, barter¹ robe-material for me as a cloth for the

¹ *parivattetha*. Cf. above, pp. 60, 67, 111.

rains, get in exchange robe-material for me as a cloth for the rains.'

If he thinks, 'Half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it, it should be put on means: making it in the half month of the hot weather remaining, it should be put on.

If he thinks, 'More than a month of the hot weather remains' means: if he looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains while over a month of the hot weather remains,¹ there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

If he thinks, 'More than half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it he puts it on while more than half a month of the hot weather remains, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe-material as a cloth for the rains was looked about for by me while more than a month of the hot weather remained; making it, it was put on² while more than half a month of the hot weather remained; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this cloth for the rains to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that more than a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, and looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether more than a month of the hot weather remains, and looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that less than a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, and looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that more than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, (and) making it,

¹ *atirekamāse sese gimhāne.*

² *paridahita* here replaces a past participle of *nivāseti*, otherwise used in this story.

puts it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether more than half a month of the hot weather remains, (and) making it, puts it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that less than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is more, (and) making it, puts it on, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If (going) naked, although there is a cloth for the rains, he lets his body get wet with the rain, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹ If he thinks that more than a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether less than a month of the hot weather remains, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that less than a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is no offence. If he thinks that more than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether less than half a month of the hot weather remains, [253] there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that less than half a month of the hot weather remains when there is less, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, thinking, 'A month of the hot weather remains,' he looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains; if, thinking, 'Half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it, he puts it on; if, thinking, 'Less than a month of the hot weather remains,' he looks about for robe-material as a cloth for the rains; if, thinking, 'Less than half a month of the hot weather remains,' making it, he puts it on; if the cloth for the rains that has been looked for is worn out during the rains²; if the cloth for the rains that has

¹ Cf. above, p. 45, n. 3.

² *vassam ukkaḍḍhiyyati.* VA. 721 gives *khepetvā—khepeti* perhaps meaning "to cause to waste." *Ukkaḍḍhiyyati* is perhaps "worn out," cf. *karṣita*, from $\sqrt{krṣ}$, one of whose meanings is given as "worn out" in Monier-Williams' *Dictionary*. *Avakarṣati* (*ava-krṣ*) can also mean "to take off." *Kshāpayati* given by Monier-Williams as "to destroy, ruin, make an end of, finish."

been put on is worn out during the rains; washing them, they should be laid aside, they should be put on (again) at the right season. (There is no offence) if the robe-material is stolen,¹ if the robe-material is destroyed,² if there are accidents; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

¹ *acchinnacīvarassā ti etam vassikasāṭikam sandhāya vuttam, V.A. 723.* It might be stolen by thieves when the monks were bathing.

² *natthacīvara*, see above, pp. 47, 48.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXV

. . . at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans,¹ said to the monk who shared his brother's cell: "Come, your reverence, we will set out on a tour of the country."

"I will not go, honoured sir," he said, "my robe is worn thin."²

"Come, your reverence, I will give you a robe," he said and he gave him a robe. Then that monk heard: "It is said that the lord will set out on a tour of the country." Then it occurred to that monk: "I will not set out on a tour of the country with the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans; I will set out on a tour of the country with the lord."

Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to that monk: "Come now, your reverence, we will set out on a tour of the country."

"I will not set out on a tour of the country with you, honoured sir, I will set out on a tour of the country with the lord."

"But that robe, your reverence, which I gave you, that will set out on a tour of the country with me," he said, and angry and displeased,³ he tore it away.⁴ Then that monk told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: "How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, himself having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, tear it away?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, yourself

¹ See above, Nissag. VI, XVIII, XX.

² *dubbala.*

³ *kupito anattamano*, said of Devadattā at *Vin.* ii. 189.

⁴ *V.A. 723*, by force, *balakkārena aggahesi.*

having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, tore it away?"

"It is true, lord," he said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked him, saying:

"How can you, foolish man, [254] yourself having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, tear it away? It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, himself having given a robe to a monk, angry and displeased, should tear it away or should cause it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."¹ || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

To a monk means: to another monk.

Himself means: himself² having given.

A robe means: any one robe of the six (kinds of) robes (including) the least one fit for assignment.³

Angry, displeased means: dissatisfied, the mind worsened, stubborn.⁴

Should tear it away means: if he tears it away himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture.

Should cause it to be torn away means: if he commands another, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If having commanded once, he then tears many away,⁵ it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, having myself given this robe to a monk, it was

¹ Cf. Pāc. 81.

² *sāmaṃ* explained by *sayam*.

³ Cf. above, pp. 7, 40, 48.

⁴ Cf. B.D. i. 281; Vin. iv. 236; M. i. 101.

⁵ V.A. 723, "if he commands, 'take robe-material,' there is an offence of wrong-doing; if, having commanded, he says, 'take many,' there is an offence of expiation. If he says, 'take the outer cloak, the inner and the upper robes,' for each speech there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he says, 'take everything given by me,' for one speech made there are many offences."

torn away by me; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

Having given a robe to one who is ordained thinking that he is ordained, if angry and displeased, he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether one is ordained, (then if) angry and displeased he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Having given a robe to one who is ordained thinking that he is not ordained, if angry and displeased, he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Having given another requisite, if angry and displeased, he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Having given a robe or another requisite to one who is not ordained, (then if) angry and displeased he tears it away or causes it to be torn away, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether one is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that one is not ordained when he is not ordained, there is an offence of wrong-doing.¹

There is no offence if he gives it or takes (from him) in a friendly manner²; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 || [255]

¹ Here text is surely corrupt, for instead of *āpatti dukkaṭassa* it should read *anāpatti*. Oldenberg gives no variant reading.

² *vissasanto*, putting his trust in him. Text reads *vissāsanto*; Sinhalese edn. *vissasanto*, which is rather more correct, being from *viśvasiti*.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXVI

. . . at Rājagaha in the Bamboo Grove at the squirrels' feeding-place. At that time the group of six monks, at the time of robe-making, asked for much yarn,¹ so that when the robe-material was made much yarn came to be over. Then it occurred to the group of six monks: "Now then, your reverences, let us, asking for more yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers." Then the group of six monks, asking for more yarn, had robe-material woven by weavers, but when the robe-material was woven much yarn came to be over. A second time did the group of six monks, asking for more yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers, but when the robe-material was woven much yarn came to be over. A third time did the group of six monks, asking for more yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers. People . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, themselves asking for yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers?"

Monks heard these people who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks, themselves asking for yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, yourselves asking for yarn, had robe-material woven by weavers?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, yourselves asking for

yarn, have robe-material woven by weavers? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk, himself asking for yarn, should have robe-material woven by weavers, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

Himself means: himself asking.

Yarn means: the six (kinds of) yarn¹: linen, cotton, silk, wool,² coarse hempen cloth,³ canvas.⁴

*By weavers*⁵ means: if he has it woven by weavers⁶ there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is

¹ These are the six kinds of thread for making the six kinds of robe-materials that are allowable to monks. These latter are given in this order at e.g. *Vin.* i. 58=96, and especially see *Vin.* i. 281, where they are allowed. The six kinds of robe-materials or robes are referred to at e.g. *Vin.* iii. 210, 213.

² *VA.* 724, yarn of sheep's wool.

³ The wearing of *sāna* was one of the practices adopted by wanderers belonging to other sects, *D.* i. 166, iii. 41, *A.* i. 240, *M.* i. 78, *Pugg.* 55. The *Comys.* explain *sāna* by using the word itself, as either *sānavākasutta* (*VA.* 724, yarn of the bark of *sāna*), *sānavākacelāni* (*DA.* 356=*AA.* ii. 354, garments of . . .), *sānavākamayam* (*SA.* i. 159, made of . . .). *Sāna* was probably a plant, see next note below. At *S.* ii. 202 Kassapa insisted on wearing, and at *S.* ii. 222 accepted from the lord his own, *sānāni paṃsukūlāni*, coarse hempen rag-ropes.

⁴ *bhaṅga*. *VA.* 724, 1119 give two meanings: (1) thread made of bark, (2) thread mixed with these five other threads. See Joges Chandra Ray, *IHQ.* xv. 2, 1939, p. 197, "the inner bark of the plant yields a strong fibre, fit for strings and ropes, and a coarse cloth, canvas, is woven." In identifying *Bhaṅgā* with *Soma*, the relation of *bhaṅga* to *sāna* is also brought out, for, according to the lexicographers quoted by Chandra Ray, they also are identical; and the commentarial explanations, that *sānāni* are said to be of bark, are illuminated. I am indebted to this article for the suggestion that "canvas" is a possible translation of *bhaṅga*.

⁵ *tantavāya*.

⁶ *pesakāra*. Cf. *Vin.* iv. 7. Monier-Williams: "*peśaskārī*, f., Ved. a woman who weaves artistically or embroiders."

¹ *sutta*, yarn or thread.

to be forfeited on acquisition; it should be forfeited to . . . an individual. [256] And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this robe caused by me to be woven by weavers, having myself asked for the yarn, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it was caused to be woven when it was caused to be woven, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it was caused to be woven, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it was not caused to be woven when it was caused to be woven, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it was caused to be woven when it was not caused to be woven, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it was not caused to be woven, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was not caused to be woven when it was not caused to be woven, there is no offence.

It is no offence to sew a robe¹ to a binding,² to a belt,³ to a shoulder-strap,⁴ to a bag for carrying the bowl in,⁵ to a water-strainer⁶; if it belongs to relations; if they are invited; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property⁷; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

¹ *VA.* 727 says that there is no offence in asking for thread (or yarn) to sew a robe.

² *Āyoga*. At *Vin.* ii. 135 the use of *āyoga* is allowed to monks. The word is translated at *Vin. Texts* iii. 141 as "handicraft." But I think that because the monks ask how an *āyoga* should be made (omitted at *Vin. Texts* iii. 141), and are allowed the apparatus belonging to a loom, *āyoga* should be rendered "bandage" or "binding" in that passage. Cf. *Vv.* 33 (p. 30), where *āyogapatta* (preceded by *aṃsavattāka* and that by *kāyabandhana*) means "strip, bandage."

³ *kāyabandhana*. At *Vin.* ii. 136 belts or waist-bands were allowed to monks.

⁴ *aṃsabandhaka*. At *Vin.* i. 204, ii. 114 shoulder-straps are allowed to monks. ⁵ *pattatthavikā*; allowed at *Vin.* ii. 114.

⁶ Allowed at *Vin.* ii. 118. These five articles are mentioned together again as not giving rise to an offence at *Vin.* iv. 170.

⁷ Cf. above, pp. 27, 49, 52, 57, 125.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXVII

. . . at Sāvattī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. At that time a certain man, going off on a journey,¹ said to his wife:

"Weighing² yarn, give it to a certain weaver; getting him to weave robe-material, take care of it; when I come back I will present³ master Upananda⁴ with robe-material."

A certain monk, as he was going for alms, heard this man as he was speaking thus. Then this monk approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached he spoke thus to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans:

"You, reverend Upananda, are of great merit,⁵ for at a certain place a certain man, going off on a journey, said to his wife: 'Weighing yarn . . . I will present master Upananda with robe-material.'"

"Sir, he is my supporter," he said. For this very weaver was the supporter of the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans. Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached this weaver, and having approached he spoke thus to the weaver:

"Sir, this robe-material is being specially woven for me; make it long and wide and rough,⁶ make it evenly

¹ *pavāsam gacchanto*.

² *dhārayitvā ti tuletvā*, *VA.* 727. *Tuleti* is to weigh.

³ *acchādeti*, see above, p. 53, n. 2.

⁴ Cf. *Nissag.* VI, XVIII, XX, XXV.

⁵ Same thing said to Upananda at *Vin.* i. 300 and iii. 215, 217 (pp. 53, 58, above).

⁶ Here "soft," the opposite of "rough," is omitted. Cf. above, p. 56.

woven¹ and well woven² and well scraped³ and well combed.”⁴

“Honoured sir, having weighed this yarn, they gave it to me, saying, ‘Weave robe-material with this yarn.’ Honoured sir, I am not able to make it long or wide or rough, [257] but I am able, honoured sir, to make it evenly woven and well woven and well scraped and well combed.”

“You, if you please, sir, make it long and wide and rough; there will not come to be a shortage⁵ of this yarn.”

Then that weaver, as soon as the yarn had been brought,⁶ setting it up on the loom, went up to that woman, and having gone up he said to that woman: “The master wants yarn.”

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

“It is true that I, lady, was told by you: ‘Weave robe-material with this yarn’; but master Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, said to me: ‘You, if you please, sir, make it long and wide and rough; there will not come to be a shortage of this yarn.’”

Then that woman gave a second time⁷ just as much yarn as she had given at first. Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, heard it said that “The man is come back from his journey.” Then the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, approached

¹ *suṅvīta*. VA. 727, *sabbatthānesu samam katvā*, making it level (or even) everywhere.

² *suppavāyīta*. VA. 727, *sabbatthānesu samam katvā tante pasāritam*, making it level everywhere, it is stretched on a loom. Really *suppavāyīta* is a synonym for *suṅvīta*.

³ *suṅvīlekhitā*. VA. 727 says *lekhaniyā sutthū vilikkhitam*. Perhaps it means that the yarn is well scraped so as to remove any rough bits, but the meaning of *lekhani* is doubtful.

⁴ *suṅvitacchīta*. VA. 727 says, *kocchena sutthū vitacchitam suviniddhotan ti attho*. P.E.D. gives “well-carded” for *suṅvitacchīta*. *Koccha* is a comb.

⁵ *paṭibaddhan ti vekallam*. VA. 727-8, perhaps “a refusal, a holding back, an obstruction with regard to.”

⁶ *yathābhatam suttham*. See meanings of *yathābhatam* in P.E.D.

⁷ *pacchā*, afterwards.

that man’s dwelling and having approached he sat down on the appointed seat. Then that man approached the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, and having approached and greeted the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, he sat down at a respectful distance. As he was sitting down at a respectful distance, that man said to his wife: “Is that robe-material woven?”

“Yes, master, that robe-material is woven.”

“Bring it, I will present master Upananda with robe-material.” Then that woman bringing that robe-material and giving it to her husband, told him this matter. Then that man, giving that robe-material to the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying:

“These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, have great desires, they are not contented; it is not easy to present them with robe-material. How can master Upananda, before being invited by me, going up to a householder’s weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material?”¹

Monks heard that man who . . . spread it about. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying: “How can the venerable Upananda, the son of the Sakyans, before being invited, going up to a householder’s weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material?” Then these monks told this matter to the lord.

“Is it true, as is said, that you, Upananda, before being invited, going up to a householder’s weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material?”

“It is true, lord,” he said.

“Is he a relation of yours, Upananda, or not a relation?”

“He is not a relation, lord.”

“Foolish man, one who is not a relation does not know what is suitable or what is unsuitable, or what is right or what is wrong for one who is not a relation. Thus will you, foolish man, before being invited, [258]

¹ Cf. above, p. 53.

going up to a householder's weavers, put forward a consideration with regard to robe-material. It is not, foolish man, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

A man or a woman householder who is not a relation may cause robe-material to be woven by weavers for a monk. Then if that monk, before being invited, going up to the weavers, should put forward a consideration with regard to the robe-material, saying: 'Now sirs, this robe-material is being specially woven for me. Make it long and wide and rough, and make it evenly woven and well woven and well scraped and well combed. If you do so we could give the venerable ones¹ something or other in addition.'² And if the monk, speaking thus, should give something or other in addition, even as little as the contents of a begging-bowl,³ there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."⁴ || 1 ||

*For a monk*⁴ means: for the good of a monk, making a monk an object, being desirous of presenting to a monk.

A man who is not a relation means: one who is not related on the mother's side or on the father's side back through seven generations.

A householder means: he who lives in a house.

A woman householder means: she who lives in a house.

By weavers means: by weavers.⁵

Robe-material means: any one robe-material of the six (kinds of) robe-material including the least one fit for assignment.⁶

¹ *āyasmantānaṃ*. Polite, perhaps here cajoling, form of address. Cf. above, p. 54.

² *anupadaḥḥeyyāma*.

³ *piṇḍapātamaṭṭam*; *piṇḍapāta* is the alms-food, but enough was usually received for the daily meal to fill a begging-bowl. See *Old Comy.* below.

⁴ For the remainder of this Nissag. cf. Nissag. VIII. 2.

⁵ *tantavāyehi ti pesakārehi*, cf. above, p. 143.

⁶ Cf. above, pp. 40, 48, 140.

May cause to be woven means: causes to be woven.

If that monk means: the particular monk for whom the robe-material is being woven.

Before being invited means: before it was said (to him): 'What kind of robe-material do you want, honoured sir? What kind of robe-material shall I have woven for you?'

Going up to the weavers means: going to the house, approaching (them) anywhere.

Should put forward a consideration with regard to the robe-material means: he says: 'Now sirs, this robe-material is being specially woven for me. Make it long and wide and rough, and make it evenly woven and well woven and well scraped and well combed. If you do so we could give the venerable ones something or other in addition.' And if the monk, speaking thus, should give something or other in addition, even as little as the contents of a begging-bowl means: the contents of a begging-bowl are called conje and rice¹ and [259] solid food and a lump of chunam² and a tooth-pick and unwoven thread, and he even speaks dhamma.³

If according to what he says, he makes it long or wide or rough, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the action. It is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, before I was invited (to take) this robe-material, approaching the weavers of a householder who is not a relation, I put forward a consideration with regard to the robe-material; it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

¹ *bhatta*; cf. *Vin.* iv. 129. More usually *bhojaniya* is combined with the next, *khādaniya*.

² This and the next two occur together at *Vin.* iii. 241, 266; iv. 154.

³ *VA.* 728, "he gives dhamma-talk"—i.e., perhaps a blessing, good words—for as the text shows, a monk can give things of the mind (*dhamma-dāna*, the best of gifts, *A.* i. 91) besides material things.

If, before being invited, going up to the weavers of a householder, thinking that he is not a relation when he is not a relation, he puts forward a consideration with regard to robe-material, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, being in doubt as to whether he is not a relation, before being invited, going up to the weavers of a householder, he puts forward a consideration with regard to robe-material, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If, before being invited, going up to the weavers of a householder, thinking that he is a relation when he is not a relation, he puts forward a consideration with regard to robe-material, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that he is not a relation when he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether he is a relation, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that he is a relation when he is a relation, there is no offence.

There is no offence if it belongs to relations; if they are invited; if it is for another; if it is by means of his own property; if desirous of having costly (robe-material) woven he has (robe-material) costing little woven; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXVIII

. . . at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time a certain chief minister, going on a journey, sent a messenger to the monks, saying: "Let the revered sirs come, I will give a rains-residence (gift)."¹ The monks, thinking: "A rains-residence (gift) at the end of the rains is allowed by the lord,"² being scrupulous, did not go.³ The chief minister . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the revered ones not come⁴ when a messenger was sent by me? Well, I am going with the army, life is uncertain, death is uncertain."⁵

Monks heard that chief minister who . . . spread it about. Then these monks told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying:

"I allow you, monks, having accepted a special robe,⁶ to lay it aside." || 1 ||

¹ *vassāvāsika*. Burlingame, *Buddhist Legends*, i. 228, renders, "food of the season of the rains"; *ibid.* ii. 8, "lodging during the season of the rains," but neither of these can be meant here, since the rule is concerned with robes. It means rather something connected with the rains-(*vassa*)-residence (*āvāsa*), which may be food, clothing or lodgings, as the story demands. *Vassāvāsa* occurs at *Vin.* i. 153. ² Cf. *Vin.* i. 153 ff.

³ It seems that the minister must have been offering his gift during the rains—*i.e.*, at a time when the monks must travel as little as possible—and not at the end of the rains. Otherwise the scrupulous monks could have gone, and no complaints would have been raised.

⁴ Cf. above, p. 64, where Upananda did not wait when bidden by a layman to do so.

⁵ *dujjanam jīvitam dujjanam maraṇam*.

⁶ *acceka-cīvara*, expl. at *VĀ.* 729 as *accāyika-cīvara*. Cf. *Vin.* iv. 166, *accāyike karaṇīye*, "if there is something urgent (special) to be done" See *Vin. Texts* i. 29, n. 3, where it is said "special

Now at that time monks said: "It is allowed by the lord, accepting a special robe, to lay it aside." [260] These accepting special robes, let the robe-season¹ pass. These robes tied up in bundles, remained on a bamboo for hanging up robes.² Then the venerable Ānanda, as he was engaged in touring the lodgings, saw these robes tied up in bundles, that remained on the bamboo for hanging up robes; seeing them he said to the monks:

"Your reverences, whose are these robes, tied up in bundles, that remain on the bamboo for hanging up robes?"

"Your reverence, they are our special robes," they said.

"But for how long, your reverences, have these robes been laid aside?"

Then these monks told the venerable Ānanda when they had been laid aside. The venerable Ānanda . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can these monks, having accepted a special robe, let the robe-season pass?" Then the venerable Ānanda told this matter to the lord. He said:

robe' is no doubt an inadequate rendering; but we have chosen it in reference to the special circumstances in which the donation is made, and in default of a better translation." *C.P.D.* says of *accekaṭvāra* that it is "a robe presented to a priest [*sic*] not at the usual time," and of *accāyika* (Skt. *ātyayika*) that it is "not suffering delay, urgent, pressing." An "exceptional" or "emergency" robe might be a suitable translation, if it is remembered that it is the donor who is in an emergency, who is pressed for time, and who because of some exceptional or unusual circumstances, wants to make his gift without delay, and so gain the "merit" for his act of giving. Here the chief minister wanted to make his gift before he went into the army and faced the uncertainties of life and death. See *Old Comy.* below and *VA.* 729 which correlate *accekaṭvāra* with *vassāvāsika*, as though a robe given to meet some emergency implies a robe given at an unusual time—*i.e.*, here during the rains. The robe therefore is "special," both in regard to the reason for giving it, and in regard to the time at which it was given.

¹ *cīvarakālasamaya*, see *Old Comy.* below. This robe-season is the usual time for accepting, distributing and settling robe-material. Cf. also *Nissag.* I and *Vin. Texts* i. 18, n. The word occurs again at *Vin.* iv. 286.

² Cf. above, p. 25.

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks, having accepted a special robe, let the robe-season pass?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, having accepted a special robe, let the robe-season pass? Monks, it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

"If a special robe should accrue¹ to a monk ten days before the full moon of the (first) Kattika, three months (of the rains having passed),² it may be accepted by that monk if he thinks of it (as something) special³; having accepted it, it should be laid aside until the robe-season. But if he should lay it aside for longer than that, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 2 || 1 ||

Ten days before means: ten days before the ceremony held at the end of the rains.⁴

The full moon of Kattika, three months (of the rains having passed) means: the ceremony held at the end of the rains is called Kattika.

A special robe means: one is desirous of going with

¹ *uppajjeyya*, lit. should arise, should be produced for. See above, pp. 4, 24, 90, 99, 114.

² *kattikatemāsipunṇamā*. *Kattika* (Skt. *kārttika*) is the month Oct.-Nov., when the full moon (*puṇṇamā*) is near the Pleiades. This month is the last of the five months of the rains. The full moon of Assayaṇa is called *kattikatemāsini*; the full moon of Kattika (the last month of the rains) is called *kattikacātumāsini*. Thus there were two full moons in Kattika. *Kattikatemāsipunṇamā* might be translated: "The full moon of Kattika, three months (of the rains having passed"; or even "three months of the year having passed," if the year were reckoned to begin at the first month of the rains, Āsāḷha). Cf. *Nissag.* XXIX below, p. 157, for *kattikacātumāsini*.

³ *accekaṃ maññamānena*.

⁴ *paṅvāraṇā*, held to inquire whether any fault can be laid to the charge of any monk or nun in respect of what has been seen, heard, or suspected. Cf. *Vin.* i. 160, ii. 32; *B.D.* i. 283, 292; and Horner, *Women under Primitive Buddhism*, pp. 133 ff.

the army, or one comes to be going on a journey, or one comes to be ill, or a woman becomes pregnant, or faith comes to be arisen in one who was without faith, or pleasing comes to be arisen for one who was not pleased.¹ If such a one should send a messenger to the monks saying: 'Let the revered sirs come, I will give a rains-residence (gift),' this means a special robe.

It may be accepted by that monk if he thinks of it (as something) special; having accepted it, it should be laid aside until the robe-season means: making a sign,² it must be laid aside; this is a special robe.

The robe-season means: if the kaṭhina cloth has not been (formally) made then the last month of the rains; if it has been (formally) made, it is five months.³ [261]

If he should lay it aside for longer than that means: if the kaṭhina cloth has not been (formally) made, and he lets the last day of the rains pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If the kaṭhina cloth has been (formally) made and he lets the day for removing the kaṭhina (privileges)⁴ pass, it is to be forfeited. It should be forfeited . . . to an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, letting pass the robe-season, this special robe of mine is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this special robe to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it is a special robe when it is a special robe, and lets the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is a special robe and lets the robe season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is not a special robe when it is a

¹ *appasannassa vā pasādo uppanno hoti.* Cf. above, p. 3, n1., on the recurring expression: *n' etaṃ bhikkhave appasannānaṃ vā pasādāya*, "it is not for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased."

² *saññānaṃ katvā.* *V.A.* 729, *kiñci nimittaṃ katvā*, "making some mark," presumably on the robe.

³ = *Vin.* iv. 286 f. Cf. p. 5, n. 1, p. 26, n. 3 above on *atthata*, formally made. ⁴ *kaṭhinuddhāradivasa*, cf. above, p. 5, n. 3.

special robe and lets the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is allotted when it is not allotted,¹ there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that one is assigned when it is not assigned . . . If he thinks that one is bestowed when it is not bestowed . . . If he thinks that one is lost when it is not lost . . . If he thinks that one is destroyed when it is not destroyed . . . If he thinks that one is burnt when it is not burnt . . . If he thinks that one is stolen when it is not stolen and lets the robe-season pass, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is a special robe when it is not a special robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is not a special robe, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is not a special robe when it is not a special robe, there is no offence.

There is no offence if, within the season, it is allotted, assigned, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear it (from him), if they take it on trust; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.² || 2 ||

¹ This and the next six cases = *Vin.* iii. 197, 251, see above.

² Cf. *Nissag.* I, II, III, XXI, XXIX.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXIX

. . . at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time monks who had finished keeping the rains were staying in lodgings in the jungles. Thieves (of the kind who attack monks in the month) of Kattika¹ attacked them, saying: "The monks have received possessions."² They told this matter to the lord. Then the lord, on this occasion, in this connection, having given reasoned talk, addressed the monks, saying: "I allow you, monks, when staying in lodgings in the jungles, to lay aside one of the three robes inside a house."³ || 1 ||

Now at that time monks thought: "It is allowed by the lord when staying in lodgings in the jungles [262] to lay aside one of the three robes inside a house." These, laying aside one of the three robes inside a house, were away for more than six nights. These robes were lost and destroyed and burnt and eaten by rats. The monks became badly dressed, wearing shabby robes. (Other) monks spoke thus:

"How is it that you, your reverences, are badly dressed, wearing shabby robes?" Then these monks told this matter to the monks. Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can these monks, laying aside one of the three robes inside a house, be away for more than six nights?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, monks, that monks laying aside

¹ *kattikacorakā*. VA. 730, *kattikamāse corā*—i.e., after the distribution of the robes.

² *laddhalābhā*.

³ So as to be guarded, VA. 730. Cf. Nissag. II above, and notes, where an ill monk may be away without his set of three robes for more than a night, if he has the agreement of the monks.

one of the three robes inside a house were away for more than six nights?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How, monks, can these foolish men, laying aside one of the three robes inside a house, be away for more than six nights? It is not, monks, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Having spent the rains up to the full moon of Kattika,¹ in case a monk who is staying in such lodgings as those jungle lodgings which are held to be dangerous and frightening, so desires, he may lay aside one of his three robes inside a house; and should there be any reason for that monk to be away, separated from that robe, that monk may be away, separated from that robe for at most six nights. Should he be away, separated (from it) for longer than that, except on the agreement of the monks,² there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture." || 2 || 1 ||

Having spent the rains means: when they have finished (keeping) the rains.

The full moon of Kattika means: it is called the (night of) Kattika-cātumāsini.³

Those jungle lodgings means: the last lodging called "jungle" is five hundred *dhanus* measures⁴ (away from the village).⁵

¹ *Kattikapuṇṇamā*, see *Old Comy.* below. This is the next full moon to that meant in the last Nissaggiya—i.e., it is the last full moon of Kattika (and of the rains); see VA. 658, 730 and above, p. 153, n. 2.

² Probably the same kind of agreement as in Nissag. II—i.e., the agreement to be regarded as *not* away, separated from the robe, although in fact the monk was away from it.

³ See above, p. 153, n. 2. *Vin. Texts* i. 324 says: "the epithet *cātumāsini* refers to the Vedic Cāturmāsya festival, which falls upon that day" (i.e., the full moon day in the month of Kattika). This day, or night, "is called *Komudī* (from *kumuda*, a white water-lily), because that flower is supposed to bloom then," *Dial.* i. 66, n.

⁴ *dhanus* is a measure of length; according to Monier-Williams it is equivalent to four hastas, or $\frac{1}{2000}$ *gavyūti*.

⁵ So VA. 731.

*Dangerous*¹ means: if, in a monastery, in the precincts of a monastery, a place where thieves are halting is seen, a place where they are resting² is seen, a place where they are sitting down is seen, a place where they are lying down is seen.

*Frightening*³ means: if, in a monastery, in the precincts of a monastery, people injured by thieves are seen, (people) plundered are seen, (people) beaten down are seen.

In case a monk is staying in such lodgings means: a monk staying in lodgings like these. [263]

Desires means: wanting.

One of his three robes means: the outer cloak or the upper robe or the inner robe.⁴

May lay aside inside a house means: he may lay it aside in the neighbourhood in a food-village.⁵

And should there be any reason for that monk to be away, separated from that robe means: should there be a reason, should there be (something) to be done.⁶

That monk may be away, separated from that robe for at most six nights means: he may be away, separated (from it) for six nights at the maximum.

Except on the agreement of the monks means: setting aside the agreement of the monks.

Should he be away, separated (from it) for longer than that means: it is to be forfeited at sunrise on the seventh day. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, having been away, separated from this robe of mine, for more than six nights, except on the agreement of the monks, it is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this robe to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it is more when it is more than six

¹ Cf. below, p. 290, and *MA.* ii. 109.

² *thitokāsa.*

³ Cf. below, p. 290, and *MA.* ii. 109.

⁴ See above, p. 1, n. 2.

⁵ *gocara-gāma*, *VA.* 731 says: "in the neighbourhood of his jungle lodging." Cf. *PvA.* 12, 42. It is a village where food is given to monks; *gocara* meaning pasturage or grazing.

⁶ *karaṇīya.*

nights, (and) is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it is more than six nights, and is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it is less when it is more than six nights, (and) is away, separated, except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that (the robe) is taken away when it is not taken away¹ . . . If he thinks that it is bestowed when it is not bestowed . . . If he thinks that it is lost when it is not lost . . . If he thinks that it is destroyed when it is not destroyed . . . If he thinks that it is burnt when it is not burnt . . . If he thinks that it is stolen when it is not stolen, (and) is away except on the agreement of the monks, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. Not forfeiting the robe which had to be forfeited, if he makes use of it, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is more when it is less than six nights, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it is less than six nights, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it is less when it is less than six nights, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he is away, separated for six nights; if he is away, separated for less than six nights; if, being away, separated for six nights, entering the village-boundary and staying (there) he departs again; if, within six nights, the (robe) is taken away, bestowed, lost, destroyed, burnt, if they tear it from him, if they take it on trust; if there is the agreement of the monks; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer.² || 2 || [264]

¹ Cf. above, p. 22, n. 3.

² Cf. above, p. 23.

FORFEITURE (NISSAGGIYA) XXX

. . . at Sāvattī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery.¹ Now at that time at Sāvattī robes and food were prepared for² the Order by a certain guild,³ saying: "Having offered them food,⁴ we will present them with robe-material." Then the group of six monks approached that guild, and having approached they said to that guild: "Sirs, give these robes to us."

"Honoured sirs, we will not give; alms-food with robes are got ready by us every year for the Order."

"Sirs, many are the Order's benefactors, many are the Order's devotees.⁵ We are here, depending on you, looking to you, but if you will not give to us, then who is there⁶ who will give to us? Sirs, give these robes to us."

Then that guild, being pressed by the group of six monks, giving the group of six monks as much robe-material as was prepared, served the Order with a meal. Those monks who knew that robe-material and a meal were prepared for the Order, and did not know that (it) was given to the group of six monks, spoke thus:

"Sirs, dedicate⁷ robe-material to the Order."

¹ =Pāc. 82, Vin. iv. 155, except that there the offence is procuring something for another person, and not, as here, for oneself. Cf. Pāc. 81.

² *paṭiyattam*.

³ *pūja*, or group.

⁴ *bhojetvā*.

⁵ *bhattā*, with *v.l. kattā* (see Vin. iii. 279), and Sinhalese edn. *bhaddā*. VA. 732 reads *bhadrā*, taking it=*bhadrāni*=*lābhamukhāni* (with *v.l. bhaddā, bhattā . . . bhattāni*). It therefore looks more as if a "devotee" were meant than a "meal," especially in conjunction with *dāyaka*, benefactors.

⁶ *ko carahi*.

⁷ *oṇojethā ti detha*, VA. 732; cf. Vin. i. 39, A. iv. 210, Miln. 236, where *oṇojeti* seems to imply a rite of cleansing by water (*udakam oṇojetvā*) and also a ceremonial giving, implied by the presence of *bhīnkāra*, a ceremonial vessel used in donations.

"Honoured sirs, there is none; the masters, the group of six monks, appropriated¹ to themselves as much robe-material as was prepared."

Those who were modest monks . . . spread it about, saying:

"How can the group of six monks knowingly² appropriate to themselves an apportioned³ benefit belonging to the Order?" Then these monks told this matter to the lord. He said:

"Is it true, as is said, that you, monks, knowingly appropriated to yourselves an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order?"

"It is true, lord," they said.

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying:

"How can you, foolish men, knowingly appropriate to yourselves an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order? It is not, foolish men, for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased . . . And thus, monks, this rule of training should be set forth:

Whatever monk should knowingly appropriate to himself an apportioned benefit belonging to the Order, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture."

|| 1 ||

Whatever means: . . . is monk to be understood in this case.

*He knows*⁴ means: either he knows by himself or others tell him or (someone) tells (him). [265]

Belonging to the Order means: it comes to be given to the Order, handed over to (it).⁵

A benefit means: the requisites of robes, alms-food, lodgings, medicine for the sick, and even a lump of chunam and a toothpick and unwoven thread.⁶

¹ *pariṇāmesum*, causative of *pariṇamati*.

² *jānam*.

³ *pariṇata*. This is derived from the same root as *pariṇāmeti*; its indicative is *pariṇamati*. VA. 733 says *ninna poṇa pabbhāra*, bending to, leading to, sloping to.

⁴ *jānāti*, indicative, instead of the *jānam*, participle, of the Rule.

⁵ Cf. Vin. iv. 43. ⁶ Cf. above, pp. 111, 149, and Vin. iv. 154.

Apportioned means: it has been expressly said,¹ "we will give, we will make."

If he appropriates to himself, in the action there is an offence of wrong-doing; it is to be forfeited on acquisition. It should be forfeited to . . . an individual. And thus, monks, should it be forfeited: 'Honoured sirs, this apportioned benefit belonging to the Order, knowingly appropriated by me to myself, is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Order.' . . . ' . . . the Order should give back . . . let the venerable ones give back . . . I will give back this benefit to the venerable one.'

If he thinks that it was apportioned when it was apportioned (and) appropriates it to himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he is in doubt as to whether it was apportioned (and) appropriates it to himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he thinks that it was not apportioned when it was apportioned (and) appropriates it to himself, there is an offence of expiation involving forfeiture. If he appropriates what was apportioned to the Order for another (part of the) Order² or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to a shrine for another shrine or for an Order or for an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to an individual for another individual or for an Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was apportioned when it was not apportioned, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he is in doubt as to whether it was not apportioned, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he thinks that it was not apportioned when it was not apportioned, there is no offence.

There is no offence if he himself being asked, 'Where

¹ *vācā bhinnā hoti*; cf. *vācam bhindeyya* at *Vin.* i. 157, "uttering a word," *Vin. Texts* i. 326.

² *V.A.* 733, for the Order in one *vihāra*. *Saṅgha* means, not the whole Order, but five or more monks (see above, p. 7, n. 5) staying in various districts and *vihāras*.

do we give?' says, 'Give wherever your gift would be used¹ or could be mended² or should be for a long time or when for you the mind is peaceful'³; if he is mad, if he is the first wrong-doer. || 2 ||

The third Division: that on Bowls

This is its key:

Two on bowls, and on medicine, for the rains, the fifth on a gift,
Oneself, causing to be woven, a special robe, dangerous, and for the Order.

Venerable ones, recited are the thirty rules for offences of expiation involving forfeiture. Concerning them, I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure in this matter? The venerable ones are quite pure in this matter, therefore they are silent, thus do I understand this.

Told are the Offences of Expiation involving Forfeiture⁴ [266]

¹ *paribhogam labheyya*, lit. might receive use.

² *patisaṃkhāram labheyya*.

³ *tumhākam cittaṃ paśīdati*.

⁴ Here ends Oldenberg's *Vinayapīṭaka*, vol. iii.