

THE PALIVERSE PROJECT

The Universe of Buddha's Wisdom

Commentaries (Aṭṭhakathā)

2. The Canon of Discipline - Commentaries (2. Vinaya Piṭaka - Aṭṭhakathā)

1. Commentary on the Expulsion (1. Pārājikakaṇḍa-aṭṭhakathā)

1. The Section on Expulsion (1. Pārājikakaṇḍam)



PaliVerse

1. Commentary on the Expulsion

1. The Section on Expulsion

1. The First Expulsion

Exposition on the Recitation Section of Sudinna

24. Hereafter, "Now at that time, not far from Vesālī" and so forth is for the most part clear in meaning. Therefore, setting aside a word-by-word explanation, we shall explain only whatever needs to be commented upon. "Kalandagāma": kalandakā are called squirrels; the village obtained its name on account of them. "Kalandaputta": the son of the merchant Kalanda, who obtained his name on account of the village, who was approved by the king, and who had a fortune of four hundred million. Since, however, there were also other people named Kalanda in that village, therefore, having said "Kalandaputta," it was further stated "merchant's son." "With many" means with numerous. "Sahāyakehi": those who come together sharing happiness and suffering are sahāyā (friends); sahāyā themselves are sahāyakā; with those friends. "Together" means as one. "Kenacideva karaṇīyena" means on some business such as the disposal of merchandise, collection, or reminding; some say it was on the business of the Kattika star festival. For the Blessed One arrived at Vesālī during the bright fortnight of Kattika. And the Kattika star festival there is a grand occasion. It should be understood that he went for that purpose.

"Addasa kho": how did he see? It is said that he saw a great crowd of people coming out from the city, having eaten their morning meal, wearing clean upper garments, with garlands, perfumes, and ointments in hand, going for the purpose of seeing the Buddha and hearing the Teaching, and he asked: "Where are you going?" "For the purpose of seeing the Buddha and hearing the Teaching." Then, saying "I too shall go," he went and saw the Blessed One, surrounded by the fourfold assembly, expounding the Teaching with a divine voice. Therefore it was said - "Sudinna the Kalanda's son saw" etc. "teaching." "Disvānassa" means disvāna assa (having seen him). "Etadahosi": this occurred to a capable young man of good family who was being urged by the merit he had previously made. What occurred? "What if I too were to listen to the Teaching." Therein, "yaṃnūna" is an indication of deliberation. Thus, it is said, this deliberation arose in him: "This assembly listens to the Teaching with one-pointed mind; oh, would that I too might listen to it."

"Then Sudinna the Kalanda's son approached that assembly": here, if one asks why it was said "towards that assembly" rather than "towards the Blessed One": For a great assembly of distinguished people was seated surrounding the Blessed One, and it was not possible for this one, having come later, to approach the Blessed One and sit down. But it was possible at a certain place in the assembly, so he was approaching that very assembly. Therefore it was said - "Then Sudinna the Kalanda's son approached that assembly." "To Sudinna the Kalanda's son seated to one side, this occurred": it did not occur to him merely upon sitting down, but rather after hearing a brief talk on the Teaching connected with the three trainings from the Blessed One;

but since that occurred to him while he was seated to one side. Therefore it was said - "To Sudinna the Kalanda's son seated to one side, this occurred." What occurred? "In whatever way indeed" and so on.

Herein this is the meaning in brief - In whatever way I understand the Teaching taught by the Blessed One, when I examine it in each of those ways, it occurs to me thus: this holy life pertaining to the three trainings should be lived as completely perfect, by making it unbroken even for a single day so as to reach the final moment of consciousness, and completely pure, by making it unstained by the defilement of mental impurities even for a single day so as to reach the final moment of consciousness. It should be lived as polished like a conch shell - resembling a polished conch, comparable to a washed conch. This is not easy for one dwelling in a house, for one living in the midst of a house, completely perfect, etc. to live. "What if I were to shave off my hair and beard, and having put on and dressed in ochre robes - which are suitable garments for those living the holy life because of being dyed with astringent dye - having gone out from the house, I should go forth into homelessness." And here, since the work of farming, trading, and the like, which is beneficial for the household, is called "household life," and that does not exist in the going forth; therefore the going forth should be understood as "homelessness." That homelessness is the going forth. "I should go forth" means "I should wander forth."

25. "When the assembly had recently risen, he approached the Blessed One" - Sudinna did not ask the Blessed One for the going forth while the assembly had not yet risen. Why? There were many of his relatives and blood-relations, friends and companions, who might have seized him even by the arm and dragged him away, saying 'You are the only son of your mother and father, it is not possible for you to go forth,' and thereby there would have been an obstacle to the going forth. Therefore, having risen together with the assembly and gone a short distance, he turned back on the pretext of some bodily necessity, approached the Blessed One, and asked for the going forth. Therefore it was said - "Then Sudinna the Kalanda's son, when the assembly had recently risen, etc. May the Blessed One give me the going forth."

But since the Blessed One, from the time of Prince Rāhula's going forth onwards, does not give the going forth to a son who has not been permitted by his mother and father, therefore he asked him - "But have you, Sudinna, been permitted by your mother and father, etc. for the going forth?"

26. Henceforth, proceeding according to the sequence of the text, the meaning here of "having finished that business" should be understood thus: "having completed that business by simply discharging the duty"; for the mind of one with intense desire for the going forth does not incline towards the preparation of goods, settling of disputes, reminding, and so forth, or towards festival celebrations. Regarding "mother and father" here, "amma" is an address to the mother; "tāta" is to the father. "Tvam khosi" means "you indeed are." "Ekaputtako" means "the only son"; you have no other, whether elder or younger. And here, where "ekaputto" could have been said, "ekaputtako" was said out of compassion. "Piyo" means one who generates joy. "Agreeable" means one who increases the mind. "Sukhedhito" means nurtured in comfort; the meaning is "raised in happiness." "Sukhaparihato" means brought up in comfort; from the time of birth onwards, being carried from lap to lap by nurses, playing with children's toys such as toy horses and chariots, being fed food of

delicious flavour - brought up in comfort.

"Na tvam, tātā sudinna, kiñci dukkhassa jānāsi" means "you, dear Sudinna, do not know even a small fraction of suffering"; or alternatively, the meaning is "you have not experienced anything through suffering." The genitive case is used in the instrumental sense, and "knowing" is used in the sense of experiencing; or alternatively, the meaning is "you do not remember any suffering." The genitive case is used in the accusative sense, and "knowing" is used in the sense of remembering. In both alternatives, the elision of the case ending of the first word, being the same as that of the latter word, should be noted. All of that should be understood according to the science of grammar. "Maraṇenapi mayaṃ te akāmakā vinā bhavissāma" means: even if death were to occur to you while we are still living, even by that death of yours, we, unwillingly, not desiring, not by our own wish, would be separated; the meaning is "we would reach separation from you." "Kiṃ pana mayaṃ taṃ" means: this being so, what then is that reason by which we would allow you while living to go forth; or alternatively, "kiṃ pana mayaṃ taṃ" - the meaning here should be understood thus: "for what reason then would we allow you while living to go forth?"

27. "Right there" means in the very place where his mother and father did not allow him as he stood. "On the bare ground" means on ground not covered with any covering.

28. "Amuse yourself" means having arranged musicians, dancers, actors and the like, therein together with friends, direct and move the sense faculties about as one pleases; it is said to mean "bring them here and there." Alternatively, "amuse yourself" means having arranged musicians, dancers, actors and the like, therein together with friends, sport, dally, delight, play - this too is what is said. "Enjoying sensual pleasures" means enjoying wealth together with one's own children and wife. "Performing meritorious deeds" means performing wholesome deeds such as giving and bestowing gifts and so forth, which purify the path to a good destination, with reference to the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Community. "Remained silent" means he was without talk or conversation for the purpose of cutting off the continuation of the discussion. Then his mother and father, having spoken thrice and not obtaining even a reply, having summoned his friends, said "This friend of yours wishes to go forth; prevent him." They too, having approached him, spoke thrice; to them also he remained silent. Therefore it was said - "Then the friends of Sudinna the Kalanda's son, etc. remained silent."

29. Then this occurred to his friends - "If this one dies without obtaining the going forth, there will be no benefit whatsoever. But when he has gone forth, his mother and father too will see him from time to time. We too will see him. And indeed this going forth is burdensome - day after day one must take a clay bowl and wander for alms food. Sleeping alone, eating one meal, living the holy life - it is exceedingly difficult to do. And this one is delicate, of city birth; being unable to practise that, he will come back right here again. Come, let us have his mother and father give permission." They did so. The mother and father too gave him permission. Therefore it was said - "Then the friends of Sudinna the Kalanda's son approached the mother and father of Sudinna the Kalanda's son... etc. you have been permitted by your mother and father for the going forth from home into homelessness."

30. "Joyful" means satisfied. "Elated" means with body and mind uplifted through rapture. "A few days" means several days. "Having gained strength" means eating suitable foods, and looking after the body with anointing, bathing and so forth, having generated bodily strength, having paid respect to his mother and father, having left behind the tearful-faced circle of relatives, he approached the Blessed One etc. "May the Blessed One give me the going forth, venerable sir." The Blessed One addressed a certain almsfood-collecting monk standing nearby - "Well then, monk, give Sudinna both the going forth and the full ordination." "Very well, venerable sir," that monk, having assented to the Blessed One, having obtained Sudinna the Kalanda's son as a pupil under Jinadattī, gave him both the going forth and the full ordination. Therefore it was said - "Sudinna the Kalanda's son received the going forth in the presence of the Blessed One, he received full ordination."

Standing at this point, the going forth and the full ordination have been discussed in all the commentaries. We, however, shall discuss them in the Khandhaka according to the sequence of the canonical text itself. And not only this, but whatever else should be discussed in the Khandhaka or the Parivāra that has been discussed by the commentary teachers in the Vibhaṅga, all of that we shall discuss in those respective places. For when it is discussed in this way, the explanation is made following the sequence of the canonical text itself. Thereby, for those who need this or that determination, by looking at this Vinaya commentary following the sequence of the canonical text itself, each determination will be easily understood.

"Not long after being fully ordained" means having been fully ordained not long before; the meaning stated is "not long after the full ordination." "Such" means of such a kind, of such a nature. "Virtues of ascetic practice" means virtues that shake off defilements. "Lives having undertaken" means having undertaken and taken up, he lives, conducts himself, and dwells. "He is a forest-dweller" means having rejected a lodging at the edge of a village, he is a forest-dweller by the power of the forest-dweller's ascetic practice. "An almsfood eater" means by rejecting extra gains, having rejected the fourteen kinds of meals, he is an almsfood eater by the power of the almsfood eater's ascetic practice. "A wearer of rag-robles" means having rejected householder-given robes, he is a wearer of rag-robles by the power of the rag-robe wearer's ascetic practice. "A successive house-to-house alms goer" means having rejected wandering about with greed, he is a successive house-to-house alms goer by the power of the successive house-to-house alms goer's ascetic practice; he enters for alms following the sequence of houses. "A Vajjian village" means a village of the Vajjians, or a village among the Vajjians.

Regarding "wealthy, of great riches" and so forth: "wealthy" is due to the greatness of the equipment for enjoyment and use; for their enjoyments and the equipment for enjoyment are great, abundant, and substantial - this is what is stated. "Of great riches" is due to the greatness of wealth stored away and deposited. "Of great possessions" means of great possessions due to the greatness of possessions reckoned as daily expenditure. "With abundant gold and silver" is due to the abundance of gold and silver apart from other enjoyable goods. "With abundant wealth and provisions" is due to the abundance of wealth-provisions that serve as

ornaments and that produce joy and gladness. "With abundant riches and grain" should be understood as due to the abundance of riches and grain that circulate by way of commerce.

"Having set in order his lodging" means having put away his lodging; the meaning is having properly stored it so that it would not be damaged. "About sixty dishes of boiled rice" means sixty dishes of boiled rice by way of numerical determination. And here each single dish of boiled rice holds the meal for ten monks. All of that amounts to the meal for six hundred monks. In "brought a food offering," here, "that which is brought" is an "offering." What is brought? Food. The offering that is food itself is a "food offering"; that food offering. "They brought" means they carried it towards him. The meaning is they took it and came into his presence. What is the measure of this? Sixty dishes of boiled rice. Therefore it was said - "They brought about sixty dishes of boiled rice as a food offering." "Having given up to the monks" means being himself one who practises the superior ascetic practice of almsfood eating, wishing to walk on successive alms round, he relinquished and gave them for the monks' use. For this venerable one had come precisely for this purpose: "Monks will obtain material gain, and I will not be troubled about almsfood." Therefore, acting in accordance with the purpose of his coming, having given up the food to the monks, he himself entered for almsfood.

31. "Female slave of relatives" means a female slave of the relatives. "From the previous evening" means kept overnight, having passed one night, become putrid. Herein this is the meaning of the terms - That which is overcome by the fault of staleness is "abhidosā"; "abhidosā" itself is "ābhidosika"; or this is the designation for that which has passed one night, namely "ābhidosika"; that is "ābhidosikaṃ." "Kummāsa" means barley food made with flour. "Was about to throw away" means because it was not fit for consumption even by slaves and labourers or even by cattle, she was about to throw it away outside like rubbish. "Saceta" means "if that." "Sister" - he addresses the female slave of his relatives using the noble form of address. "Having the nature of being thrown away" means having the intrinsic nature of what should be discarded. This is what is meant - "Sister, if that is to be thrown away outside, an abandoned possession, pour it here into my bowl."

But can it be proper to speak thus - does it not constitute a request or a prompted speech? It is not. Why? Because of its being relinquished of possession. For whatever is to be thrown away, an abandoned possession, in which the owners have no attachment, all of that it is proper to say "give, bring, pour it here." For thus the Venerable Raṭṭhapāla too, the foremost practiser of the noble lineage, said "Pour the porridge that is to be thrown away here into my bowl." Therefore, whatever is of such a nature to be thrown away, or other unowned things such as forest roots, fruits, medicines and the like, all of that may be had brought and consumed as one pleases; one should not have scruples about it. "Of the hands" means of both hands from the wrists onwards, as he held out the bowl for the purpose of receiving almsfood. "Of the feet" means of both feet beginning from the edge of the inner robe. "Of the voice" means and of the voice as he uttered the words "If that, sister." "Recognised the sign" means she grasped, recognised, and discerned the appearance previously observed during his lay life. For Sudinna went forth in the twelfth year of the Blessed One and

entered the relatives' household for alms in the twentieth year, being himself eight years in the going forth; therefore that female slave of his relatives did not recognise him merely by seeing him, but she recognised the sign.

"Said this to Sudinna's mother" - being unable to speak such words as "Are you, venerable sir, the master's son Sudinna?" to the master's son who had gone forth, being greatly revered, she quickly entered the house and said this to Sudinna's mother. "Yagghe" is an indeclinable particle used in the sense of announcement. In "sace je saccan," here "je" is an indeclinable particle used in the vocative. For thus in that region they address slave women, therefore the meaning here should be understood as "You, good slave woman, if you speak the truth."

32. "Leaning against a certain wall" - in that region, it is said, in the houses of donors there are halls, and seats are prepared there, and water and rice gruel are provided; there, those who have gone forth, having walked for alms, sit down and eat. If they wish, they take even the property of the masters of giving. Therefore that too should be understood as "a certain wall" in such a hall of a certain family. For those gone forth do not sit down and eat in an unsuitable place like destitute human beings.

In "Is it really so, dear" - here "atthi" is in the sense of existing; "nāma" is a particle in the sense of questioning and in the sense of supposing. For this is what is meant - "Is there really, dear Sudinna, our wealth - are we not to be called destitute - that you, our son, sitting in such a place, will eat food made with flour from the previous evening?" Likewise, "Is there really, dear Sudinna, our life - are we not to be called dead - that you, our son, sitting in such a place, will eat food made with flour from the previous evening?" Likewise, "There is, I suppose, dear Sudinna, within you a quality of a recluse obtained through dependence on the teaching, that you, though nourished on the taste of fine food, will eat this disgusting food made with flour from the previous evening, unmoved, as if it were the deathless."

But that householder, being overwhelmed by grief, unable to express this meaning in full, said only this much: "Is it really so, dear Sudinna, that you will eat food made with flour from the previous evening!" The grammarians here state this characteristic - by reason of disbelief and indignation, with the words "atthi nāma" as the subordinate clause, the future tense "paribhuñjissasī" is used. The meaning of that is as follows - "Is it really so" etc. "you will eat - even though I see this before my eyes, I do not believe it, I cannot bear it." "This food made with flour from the previous evening is from there" means "this food made with flour from the previous evening was obtained from there, from your house." "Tatoyaṃ" is also a reading. Some also read "tadāyaṃ"; that is not good. "To his own father's dwelling" means "to his own father's, to one's own father's dwelling" is the meaning; the Elder, being obedient through affection for his father, went. "He consented" - the Elder, although being one who practises the strict form of alms-food eating, consented out of compassion for his relatives, thinking "if I do not accept even one meal, their grief will be excessive."

33. "Opuñjāpetvā" means having had it smeared. "Ekaṃ hirañña" - here "hirañña" should be understood as kaṭṭhapaṇa coins. "Puriso" should be understood as neither too tall nor too short, of medium stature. "Tirokaraṇīyaṃ" - the locative is used in the sense of the instrumental; the meaning is having surrounded it with a screen-wall. Alternatively, that by which they conceal is a tirokaraṇīya, having surrounded that;

the meaning is having set it up all around. "Tena hi" means because Sudinna will come today, for that reason. "Hi" is a particle used merely as an expletive. "Tena" - or this too is simply a particle used in the sense of urging.

34. "In the earlier period of the day" - here, although the announcement of the time is not stated in the canonical text, it should be understood that he went at the time when it had indeed been announced. "This, dear" - he said this while showing the two heaps. "Mother's" means of the mother. "Maternal" means coming from the mother; the meaning is: this is the wealth given by your maternal grandmother when she came to this house of your mother. "A woman's wealth for a woman" - he said this disparagingly. How much could the wealth obtained by a woman solely for the purpose of bathing powder and such items for a woman's use amount to? Just look at the measure of even that. Alternatively, it is said thus: "This, dear Sudinna, is your mother's wealth, and that is maternal, not given by me, it belongs to your mother alone." Moreover, this was not produced by farming or by trade, but rather it is a woman's wealth for a woman. The meaning here should be understood thus: the woman's wealth that is to be received by a woman going from her relatives' family to her husband's family for the purpose of bathing powder and such items - that much is just this amount.

"Another is paternal, another is from the grandfather" - but that which belongs to your father and grandfathers, that is yet another. Both stored and invested, it is exceedingly great; and here "pitāmahaṃ" should be understood as having been formed by dropping the taddhita suffix. Or the reading is "petāmahaṃ." "It is possible, dear Sudinna, having returned to the lower life" - dear Sudinna, having abandoned the supreme noble banner, the mark of one gone forth, and having returned to the lower state of household life, it is possible to enjoy wealth; it is not impossible to enjoy it; you did not go forth out of fear of the king, nor were you obstructed by creditors. "Father, I am not able" - here, however, the word "father" he said out of affection rooted in household life, not out of the authority of a recluse. "I am not able" means I am not able. "I am not capable" means I am not competent, I am not able.

"I would tell you, householder" - but this statement he said with the authority of a recluse. "Would not pull too hard" - the affection that is established in you towards me, you should not pull that too hard through the force of anger; it is said to mean: if you would not become angry. Then the banker, elated in mind, thinking "My son wishes to make a reconciliation, I suppose," said - "Speak, dear Sudinna." "If so" - this is an indeclinable particle resembling a case ending, used in the sense of urging on. "On that account" - "tatonidānaṃ" means "taṃnidānaṃ," "having that as cause"; the replacement of the accusative case ending with "to" should be understood; and in the compound, there is no elision of it. "Fear or" - this refers to fear of kings and so forth, stated in the manner of "lest kings should take away my wealth" and so on; the meaning is mental terror. "Trepidation" means the trembling of the body, the shaking of the body, the quivering of the heart-flesh, of one who is being subjected to punishment by kings or thieves demanding "Give your wealth." "Terror" means the bristling of the body hair, the state of standing on end, when fear has arisen. "Safeguarding" means guarding within and without, by night and by day.

35. "If so, daughter-in-law" - the wealthy householder, having shown his wealth and being unable himself to entice his son towards the household life, thinking "there is

now no bond for men like a woman," addressed his former wife - "If so, daughter-in-law." "Former wife" means the former companion, the companion during the earlier household life, the partner in the enjoyment of happiness based on the home, meaning the wife of the past. "If so" means for the reason that there is no bond like a woman. "Having taken hold at the feet" means having taken hold of the feet; the locative case is used in the accusative sense, or having taken hold of him at the feet. "What are they like, master's son, those nymphs" - why did she say this? At that time, it is said, seeing many warrior princes, brahmin youths, and merchants' sons going forth having abandoned great fortunes, those not understanding the virtues of the going forth raised a discussion - "Why do these go forth?" Then others said - "For the sake of celestial nymphs and celestial dancers." That talk became widespread. Taking that up, she spoke thus. The Elder, rejecting that, said "I do not, sister." "Addresses" means speaks, says. "Fainted and fell down right there" - seeing him addressing her with the term "sister," thinking "this one now has no need of me, who regards me, though being his wife, as if a girl who had lain in the same mother's womb with him," having arisen strong grief, she fainted and fell down in that very spot; the meaning is "she fell."

"Do not harass us" means do not harass us by showing wealth and sending a woman; for this is harassment of those gone forth. "If so, dear Sudinna, give at least a seed" - here "if so" urges him in his delight. If you are delighted and live the holy life, having practised, sit in the sky and attain final nibbāna, but give us one son as a seed for the family lineage. "Do not let the Licchavis have our heirless property conveyed away" - for we live in the realm of the Licchavi republican kings; upon your father's passing, they would have this property, this great wealth of ours, heirless, bereft of a son to guard the family wealth, conveyed away to their own royal inner quarters; do not let them have it conveyed away, let them not have it conveyed away.

"This indeed, mother, I am able to do" - why did he say this? It is said that he thought - "I alone am the owner of their property, there is no other. They will constantly follow me for the purpose of guarding the property; therefore I shall not be able to practise the ascetic's duty without concern, but having obtained a son they will desist, and then I shall practise the ascetic's duty at my ease" - seeing this reasoning, he spoke thus.

36. "Menstrual flux" is the name for the blood that arises at the time of the menstrual season. For at the time of the menstrual season, blood-coloured pustules form at the place where the embryo is established in a woman, and having grown for seven days they burst, then blood flows; this is its name, "menstrual flux." However, as long as it is strong and flows abundantly, even if relinking is given, it does not remain, but flows away together with the impurity; but when the impurity has flowed away and the base is pure, relinking that is given quickly becomes established. "Her menstrual flux arose" means the menstrual flux of hers arose; the junction is by elision of the vowel. "Having taken his former wife by the arm" means the arm which belonged to his former wife, having taken her there - this is the meaning.

"When the training rule had not been laid down" means when the first pārājika training rule had not yet been established. For it is said that during the first twenty years after the Blessed One's enlightenment, the monks pleased his mind and did not commit such a transgression. Referring to that very thing, this sutta states - "Monks,

the monks at one time indeed pleased my mind." Then the Blessed One, not seeing any transgression, did not lay down either a pārajika or a saṅghādisesa rule. But in each and every case, he laid down only the remaining five minor offence categories. Therefore it was said - "When the training rule had not been laid down."

"Not seeing the danger" means not seeing the danger that the Blessed One would now show when laying down the training rule, he had the perception of blamelessness. For if he had known "this should not be done" or "this leads to cutting off at the root," a clansman gone forth out of faith would not have done it even if it meant the loss of his life on that account. But here, not seeing the danger, he had the perception of faultlessness. Therefore it was said - "Not seeing the danger." "With his former wife" is in the locative case. "He engaged in" means he performed; for even performing is called "making known" because it proceeds by way of bodily intimation. And it should be understood that he engaged three times for the purpose of ascertaining the formation of the embryo.

"She conceived an embryo by him" means she conceived an embryo by that very act of sexual intercourse, not otherwise. But does conception also occur otherwise? It does. How? By bodily contact, by grasping a cloth, by drinking semen, by touching the navel, by seeing a form, by sound, by smell. For certain women at the time of the menstrual season, dyed with desire and lust, conceive an embryo even while consenting to men's grasping of hands, grasping of braids, and touching of various limbs. Thus conception occurs by bodily contact.

Now the former wife of the Elder Udāyī, a nun, took one portion of that semen into her mouth, and inserted another portion together with a cloth into her genital organ. She conceived an embryo by him. Thus conception occurs through taking up with a cloth.

The mother of the ascetic Migasiṅga, a doe, having come to the ascetic's urinating place during her fertile season, drank the urine containing seminal fluid. She, having conceived an embryo by that, gave birth to Migasiṅga. Thus conception occurs through drinking of semen.

Now, Sakka, knowing of the deterioration of eyesight of the parents of the Bodhisatta Sāma, wishing to give them a son, said to the wise Dukūla - "Is sexual intercourse suitable for you?" "We have no desire for that; we have gone forth into the going forth of seers." "Then, during her fertile season, you should touch her navel with your thumb." He did so. She, having conceived an embryo by that, gave birth to Sāma, the ascetic boy. Thus conception occurs through touching the navel. By this same method, the cases of Maṇḍabya and Caṇḍapajjota should be understood.

How does it occur through seeing a form? Here a certain woman, during her fertile season, not obtaining association with a man, under the power of desire and lust, while still within the house, gazes upon a man, like a royal consort; she conceives an embryo by that. Thus conception occurs through seeing a form.

Among cranes, however, there is no male; they, having heard the sound of thunder during their fertile season, conceive an embryo. Hens too sometimes, having heard the sound of a single cock, even many of them conceive an embryo. Likewise a cow, of a bull. Thus conception occurs through sound.

Cows too sometimes conceive an embryo through the scent of a bull. Thus conception occurs through scent.

But here, she conceived an embryo through sexual transgression. With reference to which it was said - "The mother and father come together, and the mother is menstruating, and the being to be reborn is present; thus through the conjunction of these three, there is the descent into the womb."

"The terrestrial gods proclaimed" - because there is no such thing in the world as secrecy for one committing an evil deed. First of all, he himself knows that evil deed, then the guardian deities, and then also other deities who know the minds of others. Therefore the terrestrial gods who know the minds of others, dwelling throughout the entire forest grove, having seen that transgression, proclaimed it aloud. They uttered it in such a way that other gods too could hear. How? "Free from trouble indeed, sirs, etc. danger has been produced." The meaning of that should be understood in the same way as stated in the Verañja Section.

"Having heard the sound of the terrestrial gods, the gods ruled by the four great kings" - here, however, the space-dwelling deities heard the sound of the terrestrial gods; from the space-dwelling deities, the gods ruled by the four great kings - this sequence should be understood. "The gods of Brahmā's company" - excluding the non-percipient beings and the formless-realm beings, all the Brahmās heard; and having heard, they proclaimed the sound - this should be understood. "Thus in that moment" means thus in that moment of Sudinna's transgression. "In that instant" means in the very instant of the transgression. "As far as the Brahma world" means as far as the Akaniṭṭha Brahma world. "Rose up" means it ascended, it arose, there was one great uproar.

"Gave birth to a son" means she bore a being in his final existence, resembling a golden image. "They gave the name 'Bījaka'" means they did not give any other name; because it was well known that the grandmother had said "give at least a seed," thinking "let 'Bījaka' indeed be his name," they gave the name "Bījaka." And based on the son's name, they also gave names to his mother and father. "At a later time, both of them" - this is said referring to Bījaka and Bījaka's mother. When Bījaka was about seven or eight years old, it is said, his mother went forth among the nuns and he went forth among the bhikkhus, and relying on good friends, they became established in arahantship. Therefore it was said - "Both of them, having gone forth from home into homelessness, realised arahantship."

37. Thus the going forth of mother and son was fruitful. But the father lived overwhelmed by regret. Therefore it was said - "Then for the Venerable Sudinna there was indeed remorse" etc. Therein, "ahudeva" means "ahu eva"; the letter "d" is a euphonic conjunction. The meaning is "there was indeed." "Remorse" means subsequent regret caused by transgression. "Regret" is also a name for that very same thing. For that is called remorse by the wise because of the state of being a despicable action that ought not to have been done. It is called regret because, due to the inability to reverse the transgression that was committed, there is, on account of that, a state of distressing recollection. "It is a loss for me indeed" means indeed it is a loss for me; the meaning is: those which are called non-attainments of qualities such as meditative absorption and so forth, those are mine, not another's. "It is not a

gain for me indeed" means even those qualities of going forth, taking refuge, and undertaking the training that I had obtained are not gains for me, because of being defiled by transgression. "It is ill-gained for me indeed" means even though this dispensation was obtained by me, it is ill-gained. "It is not well-gained for me indeed" means it is not well-gained for me as it is for other sons of good families. Why? "That I, in such a well-proclaimed Teaching and Discipline" etc. "to live the holy life." "Holy life" means the holy life of the path, comprised in the three trainings. "He became lean" means being unable to chew or eat, he became thin, with little flesh and blood. "Become quite pale" means having become of a quite pale complexion, resembling a withered leaf. "With veins showing all over the body" means having his body covered as if with a network of veins, due to the exhaustion of flesh and blood. "Inwardly minded" means his mind remained turned inward by way of grieving. However, by way of occurring dependent upon the heart-base, all minds are indeed inwardly minded. "With shrunk mind" means one whose mind was shrunk and contracted, having abandoned his duties in recitation, questioning, meditation practice, higher virtue, higher mind, higher wisdom, and the fulfilment of duties and practice, being inactive, being nothing but sluggish through indolence - thus he was one with shrunk mind. "Afflicted" means afflicted by mental suffering. "Unhappy" means one whose mind is corrupted by aversion, or one whose mind is distressed due to being overcome by displeasure. "He brooded" means by way of regret, like a donkey with a broken back, he pondered upon this and that.

38. "Monks who were friends" means those monks who were his trusted ones, comfortable in conversation, having seen him in such a state, spending his time with the impediment of socialising in groups, said this to him. "With full faculties" means with complete faculties of the eye and so forth, due to the fullness of the basis for clarity. In "so dāni tvaṃ," here "dāni" is a particle; the meaning expressed is "so pana tvaṃ" (but you now). "Kaccino tvaṃ" means "kacci nu tvaṃ" (are you perhaps). "Without delight" means discontented; the meaning is desiring the state of a householder. Therefore, rejecting that very discontent, he said: "No indeed, friends, I am not without delight." Rather, I am delighted in the cultivation of higher wholesome states. "There is an evil deed done by me" means there is, there exists, there is found one evil deed done by me; it stands as though constantly facing me. Then, making it known, he said beginning with "with my former wife."

"Indeed it is fitting for you, friend Sudinna, to have remorse" means friend Sudinna, this evil deed of yours is fitting, sufficient for remorse; the meaning expressed is that it is capable of producing remorse. In the beginning with "yaṃ tvaṃ," the connection should be understood thus: by which evil deed you will not be able to live the holy life, that evil deed of yours is fitting for remorse. Then, admonishing him, they said beginning with "has not, friend, the Blessed One." Therein, "nanu" is a particle in the sense of seeking agreement. "In many ways" means for many reasons. "For dispassion" means for the purpose of dispassion. "Not for lust" means not for the purpose of being lustful through lust. The intention is that the Blessed One taught the Dhamma for this purpose: "Having heard this Dhamma of mine, beings will become dispassionate towards all existential enjoyments, they will not become lustful." This same method applies in all terms. But here this is merely a statement by way of explanation. "For separation from bondage" means for the purpose of being released

from defilements. "Not for bondage" means not for the purpose of being bound. "For non-clinging" means for the purpose of not grasping. "Not for clinging" means not for the purpose of holding on.

"Therein indeed you" means in that, indeed, you. "You will intend for lust" means you will intend, you will plan, you will devise for sexual intercourse which occurs with lust; the meaning is you will strive for that purpose. This same method applies everywhere. Furthermore, the nine terms beginning with "dispassion towards lust" are spoken with reference to the produced supramundane Nibbāna itself. Therefore, even when it is said "for dispassion towards lust" or "for the subduing of intoxication," the meaning should be understood simply as "for the purpose of Nibbāna." For since, having arrived at, having undertaken, having depended upon that Nibbāna, lust fades away and ceases to exist, therefore it is called "dispassion towards lust." And since, having arrived at that, the intoxications such as the intoxication of conceit, the intoxication of manhood and so forth become subdued, become free from intoxication, and are destroyed, therefore it is called "the subduing of intoxication." And since, having arrived at that, all thirst for sensual pleasures goes to removal and disappearance, therefore it is called "the removal of thirst." And since, having arrived at that, the attachments to the five strands of sensual pleasure go to uprooting, therefore it is called "the uprooting of attachment." And since, having arrived at that, the round of the three planes of existence is cut off, therefore it is called "the cutting off of the round." And since, having arrived at that, craving in every way goes to exhaustion, fades away, and ceases, therefore it is called "the elimination of craving, dispassion, cessation." And since this is departed from, released from, disjoined from craving - which has obtained the designation "weaving" because of its weaving, binding, and stitching together for the purpose of renewed existence in the four modes of birth, the five destinations, the seven stations of consciousness, and the nine abodes of beings - therefore it is called "Nibbāna."

"The abandoning of sensual pleasures has been declared" means the abandoning of sensual pleasures as objects and sensual pleasures as defilements has been stated. "The full understanding of perceptions of sensuality" means the threefold full understanding of all perceptions of sensuality by way of the known, the scrutinised, and the abandoned has been declared. "Of thirst for sensuality" means of the desire to drink in sensual pleasures, or of the wish to drink in sensuality. "Of sensual thoughts" means of thoughts connected with sensuality. "Of the fever of sensuality" means of the burning within, the fever arisen by the power of lust for the five strands of sensual pleasure. In these five instances, only the supramundane path that brings about the destruction of defilements has been spoken of. But in the first three instances, it should be understood that a path mixed of mundane and supramundane has been spoken of.

"This, friend" means "not this, friend" - your evil deed is not for the confidence of those without confidence, nor for the purpose of confidence of such people. "Atha khvetaṃ" means "atha kho etaṃ" (rather, this). "Atha kho taṃ" is also a reading. "For the alteration" means it is for the alteration of confidence, for regret. For those whose faith has not arrived by the path, it produces regret - "We are indeed confident in such a Teaching and Discipline, where there are monks who practise wrongly." But for

those whose faith has arrived by the path, their confidence is unshakeable by such matters or even more terrible ones, like Sineru by the winds. Therefore it was said - "For the alteration of some."

39. "They reported this matter to the Blessed One" means they told, they made known this matter to the Blessed One. And in reporting, they did not report out of desire for his affection, nor with the intention of causing a rift, nor for the purpose of making known the disrepute of that venerable one, nor for the purpose of laying a charge of wrongdoing, nor thinking "Having heard this, the Blessed One will not give him a footing in the dispensation, he will have him expelled." Rather, they reported thinking "Having known this tumour arisen in the dispensation, the Blessed One will lay down a training rule, he will establish a boundary, a limit, a command."

"On this occasion, in this connection" - here it should be understood that Sudinna's transgression of misconduct is said to be both the occasion and the connection, because it is the cause for the laying down of the training rule. For since a cause sends forth its own result as if showing "Take it," and initiates it, begins to produce it, or simply produces it; therefore it is called both the occasion and the connection. "The Buddha, the Blessed One, rebuked" means the Buddha, the Blessed One, rebuked, censured; as is fitting for the foremost person among those who speak praise and blame to those deserving of praise and blame. For in the Blessed One, upon seeing a person who has transgressed virtue, the thought does not arise "This person is known and famous by birth, or by clan, or by noble family, or by learning, or by ascetic practices - it is fitting to protect such a person"; nor upon seeing a well-behaved and virtuous person does the thought arise to conceal his virtues. Rather, he simply rebukes what is to be rebuked, and praises what is to be praised, and this one was to be rebuked; therefore, established in the characteristic of steadfastness, with an unwavering mind, the Buddha, the Blessed One, rebuked him with words beginning with "unsuitable."

Herein is the explanation of the meaning - This deed done by you, foolish man, worthless man, is not suitable for the qualities that make one a recluse, nor for the path, fruition, Nibbāna, and the dispensation; it does not follow their lustre, their radiance, their beauty, nor does it conform to them; rather, it is far removed from those qualities. And precisely because it is unsuitable, it is not becoming; it does not conform to them; rather, it is contrary, standing in opposition. And precisely because it is not becoming, it is not proper; it is not similar, not comparable; rather, it is dissimilar, without comparison. And precisely because it is not proper, it is unbecoming of a recluse; it is not the deed of recluses. Because it is unbecoming of a recluse, it is not allowable. For what is not the deed of recluses is not allowable for them. Because it is not allowable, it is not to be done. For recluses do not do what is not allowable. Yet this was done by you; therefore, what was done by you, foolish man, is unsuitable, etc. not to be done. "How indeed" means for what reason, what reason does one see - this is what is meant. Then, showing the absence of any reason, he said further "Have I not, foolish man" and so forth. All that is self-evident in meaning.

Now, since the evil deed done by him, when ripening, has exceedingly painful results, therefore, in order to show him that result, like compassionate parents rebuking with a caring mind a son who has committed an offence, he rebuked Sudinna saying

"Better for you, foolish man" and so forth. Herein, "venomous snake" (āsīvisa) means one whose poison comes quickly (āsu sīghaṃ). "Terrible poison" (ghoravisa) means its poison is fierce and deadly; of that venomous snake with terrible poison. The word "put into" is connected with the word "better." It would be better to have one's genitals put into the mouth of such a venomous snake with terrible poison; if they were to be put in, it would be better; the meaning is: it would be good, proper, well. "Not rather" (na tveva) means not better, not good, not proper, not well. This same method applies everywhere. "Of a black snake" (kaṇhasappaṣṣa) means of a dark serpent. "In a charcoal pit" (aṅgārakāsuya) means in a pit filled with charcoal, or in a heap of charcoal. "Blazing" (ādittāya) means burning, having taken on the appearance of fire. "In flames" (sampaḷalitāya) means blazing all around, emitting flames. "Aglow" (sajotibhūtāya) means radiant. It is meant that it has become a single mass of radiance through the flames risen up all around.

"What is the reason for this?" means: that which was said by me as "better" - what is the reason for that, by which cause? "One might undergo death" means: whoever would put his genitals therein, he might undergo death or suffering equal to death. "But on this account" etc. "Would be reborn" means: this putting of genitals into the genitals of a woman - on this account, the person who does it would be reborn in hell; thus seeing the great blameworthiness of the deed, he rebuked him, not wishing suffering to come upon him. "Yet there, you" means: in such a deed, even though it is so greatly blameworthy, you. "That you" - here "yaṃ" is a particle in the sense of contempt. "Tvaṃ" is a synonym of the word "taṃ"; by both "yaṃ" or "taṃ," what is said is that he is despised and scorned. "What is not the Good Teaching" means: the practice of bad and low people; the meaning is: to be practised by them. The meaning is: to be practised by them. "The practice of villagers" means: the practice of villages; what is said is: the practice of people dwelling in villages. What is said is: the practice of people dwelling in villages. "The practice of outcasts" means: those in whom evil qualities flow and drip are outcasts; the practice of those outcasts, those low persons; or a practice that causes the dripping of defilements. "Inertia" means: corrupted, defiled by defilements, and gross, not subtle; what is said is: not refined. "Ending in water" means: that which has the water-act as its end, its conclusion, is "ending in water"; that is "ending in water." "Secret" means: occurring in private, arising in a concealed place. For this practice, because of its loathsomeness, cannot be done openly within the range of others' sight; therefore it is said: "secret." "The attainment of two by two" means: to be engaged in by two and two; "dvayaṃ dvayaṃ samāpattiṃ" is also a reading. Some also read "dayaṃ dayaṃ samāpattiṃ"; that is not correct. "You will engage in" - this should be connected with the word "nāma" stated in "yet there, you" thus: "you will indeed engage in." "Of many" etc.

"The forerunner, the first doer" - he speaks with reference to the Dispensation. In this Dispensation, you are the first doer of many unwholesome mental states for many persons, because of doing it first of all; the forerunner, because of being the very first to follow this path; what is said is: the opener of the door, the shower of the way. For having obtained this pretext, many persons following your example will perform various kinds of unwholesome mental states such as the practice of sexual intercourse like a monkey - this is the intention here. "In many ways" means: by the many reasons stated in the manner beginning with "unsuitable."

"Being difficult to support" etc. "Having spoken dispraise of idleness" means: having spoken dispraise, blame, and censure of non-restraint, which is the basis of being difficult to support and so forth. Because for a person established in non-restraint, oneself becomes difficult to support and difficult to maintain, therefore non-restraint is also called "being difficult to support, being difficult to maintain." Because for one established in non-restraint, oneself incurs great desire regarding the four requisites and discontent even when obtaining requisites the size of Mount Sineru, therefore non-restraint is also called "great desire, discontent." Because for one established in non-restraint, oneself tends towards socialising with groups and socialising with defilements, and being given to idleness tends towards the fulfilment of the eight bases of laziness, therefore non-restraint is called "company and idleness." And since the mind of one standing in non-restraint tends towards association with groups and association with defilements, and is given to indolence, tending towards the fulfilment of the eight bases of laziness, therefore non-restraint is called "company and idleness."

"Easy to support etc. having spoken praise of the arousal of energy" means having spoken praise of restraint, which is the basis of easy supportability and so forth. This is the meaning. Because when one has abandoned non-restraint and is established in restraint, oneself becomes easy to support and easy to maintain, and in the four requisites one attains fewness of wishes, the state of being free from craving, and in each requisite it leads to contentment of three kinds according to what is obtained, according to one's strength, and according to what is suitable - therefore restraint is called "easy to support, easy to maintain, having few wishes, and contented."

Because when one has abandoned non-restraint and is established in restraint, oneself leads to the effacement of defilements and to the shaking off of defilements - therefore restraint is called "detachment and austerity."

Because when one has abandoned non-restraint and is established in restraint, oneself, without resorting to bodily and verbal misconduct that is unpleasing, uninspiring, unwholesome, and unsuitable for body and speech, and without resorting to the triad of unwholesome thoughts that is unpleasing, uninspiring, unwholesome, and unsuitable for the mind, leads to the fulfilment of the opposite - namely, good conduct of body and speech and the triad of wholesome thoughts that is pleasing, inspiring, wholesome, and suitable - therefore restraint is called "gracious."

Because when one has abandoned non-restraint and is established in restraint, oneself leads to the unmaking that consists in the diminishing of all defilements, to the turning away from the round of rebirths, and to the fulfilment of the eight bases for the arousal of energy - therefore restraint is called "unmaking and arousal of energy."

"Suitable and appropriate for the monks" means suitable and appropriate for the monks assembled there, in relation to the training rule that he will now lay down. Or it means having given a teaching on the Dhamma that is suitable and appropriate for the restraint spoken of by means of easy supportability and so forth, connected with restraint and abandoning, not bound to the discourses, free from the canonical texts, and penetrative. This is the meaning. It is said that the Blessed One, on such occasions, as if making a garland of five-coloured flowers, as if arranging a string of

jewels, threatening with the fear of the round of rebirths in future lives those who are intent on rejection and who delight in non-restraint, showing dangers of many kinds, establishing some of those who are desirous of training and established in restraint in arahantship, and establishing some in the path to heaven even when lacking the supporting conditions for the fruits of non-returning, once-returning, and stream-entry, gives a teaching on the Dhamma equal in extent to the Long Collection or equal in extent to the Middle Collection. With reference to that, this was said - "having given a suitable and appropriate talk on the Teaching to the monks."

"If so" means by that transgression of Sudinna, which was the cause. "Training rule" - herein, what is to be trained in is the training; that by which one proceeds is the step; the step of the training is the training rule; the means of attaining the training is the meaning. Or alternatively, it means a root, a support, a foundation. This is a designation for the restraint from sexual intercourse, the restraint regarding sexual intercourse. For the restraint regarding sexual intercourse, being the foundation in the sense stated for the other qualities reckoned as training - namely, virtue, insight, absorption, and path - is here intended as "training rule." And this meaning should be understood according to the method stated in the analysis of the training rule. Moreover, even the word that illuminates that meaning should be understood as "training rule." And this too was said - "'Training rule' means whatever group of names, group of words, group of expressions, and group of syllables there are therein." Or just as when it is said "non-covetousness is a dhamma-portion," the meaning is that non-covetousness is one portion of dhammas, so too here "training rule" should be understood as meaning a portion of training, one part of the training.

"Dependent on ten reasons" means dependent on, relying on, with reference to ten special reasons that are the causes for the laying down of the training rule and that are attainable special benefits; it is said to mean seeing the accomplishment of the ten special benefits. Now, showing those ten reasons, he said "for the excellence of the Community" and so forth. Therein, "excellence of the Community" means the state of excellence of the Community, the state of accepting the word saying "Excellent, Venerable Sir," just as in the passage where "Excellent, O devas" occurs. And whoever accepts the word of the Truth-finder, for him that is for his welfare and happiness for a long time; therefore, "I will lay down for the Community's acceptance of my word saying 'Excellent, Venerable Sir,' having shown the danger in non-acceptance and the benefit in acceptance, not by overpowering with force" - making this meaning clear, he said - "for the excellence of the Community." "For the comfort of the Community" means for the state of comfort of the Community; for the purpose of comfortable living in communal life. This is the meaning.

"For the refutation of obstinate persons" - obstinate persons means persons of bad conduct; those who, even when being brought to a state of humiliation, arrive at it with difficulty, or who, while committing or having committed a transgression, are not ashamed - for the purpose of their refutation; for indeed, in the absence of a training rule, they will harass the Community saying "What have you seen? What have you heard? What have we done? On what ground, having charged us with what offence, do you refute us?" But when there is a training rule, the Community, having pointed out the training rule, will refute them by the Dhamma, by the Discipline, and by the Teacher's instruction. Therefore it was said - "For the refutation of obstinate persons."

"For the comfortable abiding of well-behaved monks" means for the purpose of comfortable abiding of well-behaved monks who are of amiable disposition. For monks of amiable disposition, not knowing what should be done and what should not be done, what is blameworthy and what is blameless, the boundary and the limit, become weary while striving for the fulfilment of the threefold training, and become troubled when doubts arise. But knowing what should be done and what should not be done, what is blameworthy and what is blameless, the boundary and the limit, while striving for the fulfilment of the threefold training, they do not become weary, and when doubts arise, they are not troubled. Therefore, the laying down of the training rule for them conduces to comfortable abiding. Or alternatively, the refutation of obstinate persons is itself the comfortable abiding of these monks. For depending on persons of bad conduct, the Uposatha does not stand, the Pavāraṇā does not stand, Community acts do not proceed, harmony does not exist, and monks, being distracted, are unable to pursue recitation, questioning, meditation subjects, and so forth. But when those of bad conduct are refuted, all this trouble does not arise. Thereupon, well-behaved monks abide comfortably. Thus, the meaning of "for the comfortable abiding of well-behaved monks" should be understood in two ways.

"For the restraint of mental corruptions pertaining to the present life" means: mental corruptions pertaining to the present life are particular kinds of suffering to be experienced in that very existence by one who stands in non-restraint, such as blows by hand, blows by stick, cutting off of hands, cutting off of feet, disrepute, dishonour, remorse, and so forth. Thus, the meaning is: for the restraint, for the closing off, for the blocking of the path of approach of these mental corruptions pertaining to the present life.

"For the warding off of mental corruptions pertaining to the future life" means: mental corruptions pertaining to the future life are particular kinds of suffering to be experienced in hell and other realms in the future life, rooted in evil deeds done by one who stands in non-restraint; it is said: for the purpose of warding them off, for the purpose of calming them, for the purpose of stilling them.

"For the confidence of those without confidence" means: when there is the laying down of the training rule, having learnt of the laying down of the training rule, or having seen monks practising in accordance with what has been laid down, even wise people who are without confidence gain confidence, thinking: "Indeed, those things in the world that are occasions for the great multitude to be attracted, to be repelled, and to be deluded - from these, these recluses, sons of the Sakyans, dwell far removed and abstaining. Indeed, they do what is difficult to do; indeed, they do what is burdensome" - like the brahmin of wrong view who knew the three Vedas upon seeing a book of the Vinaya Piṭaka. Therefore it was said - "For the confidence of those without confidence."

"For the increase of those with confidence" means: even those sons of good families who have confidence in the Dispensation, having learnt of the laying down of the training rule, or having seen monks practising in accordance with what has been laid down, gain ever more confidence, thinking: "Oh, the venerable ones do what is difficult to do, who for as long as life lasts maintain the one meal, the holy life, and the discipline of restraint." Therefore it was said - "For the increase of those with confidence."

"For the duration of the Good Teaching" means: the Good Teaching is threefold -the Good Teaching of learning, the Good Teaching of practice, and the Good Teaching of realisation. Therein, all the word of the Buddha included in the three Piṭakas is called "the Good Teaching of learning." The thirteen ascetic qualities, the fourteen Khandhaka duties, the eighty-two great duties, and morality, concentration, and insight - this is called "the Good Teaching of practice." The four noble paths, the four fruits of recluseship, and Nibbāna - this is called "the Good Teaching of realisation." Since all of that, when there is the laying down of the training rule, monks learn the training rule, its analysis, and other words of the Buddha for the purpose of elucidating its meaning, and practising in accordance with what has been laid down, having fulfilled the practice, they attain the supramundane states to be attained through practice, therefore through the laying down of the training rule it becomes long-lasting. Therefore it was said - "For the duration of the Good Teaching."

"For the support of the monastic discipline" means: when there is the laying down of the training rule, the fourfold discipline - the discipline of restraint, the discipline of abandoning, the discipline of settlement, and the discipline of regulation - is supported, upheld, and well upheld. Therefore it was said - "For the support of the monastic discipline."

All these terms should be connected with the statement "I will lay down a training rule." Herein, this is the connection of the first and last terms: "For the excellence of the Community I will lay down a training rule; for the support of the monastic discipline I will lay down a training rule."

Moreover, here, "what is for the excellence of the Community is for the comfort of the Community, what is for the comfort of the Community is for the refutation of obstinate persons" - thus is the chain method; "what is for the excellence of the Community is for the comfort of the Community, what is for the excellence of the Community is for the refutation of obstinate persons" - and thus, having made a connection ten times with each single term as the root, what was stated in the Parivāra -

"A hundred meanings, a hundred teachings, and two hundred expressions;
Four hundred knowledges, regarding the reasons in the subject matter."

All of that should be understood. But since that will become evident in the Parivāra itself, it is not explained here.

Having thus shown the benefit of laying down the training rule, indicating the duty to be performed by monks regarding that training rule, he said: "And thus, monks, you should recite this training rule." What is meant? "Monks, you should recite this training rule whose benefit has been thus demonstrated by me in the Pātimokkha recitation, and you should learn it, and you should retain it, and you should teach it to others." For here the word "and" has the purpose of bringing in additional meaning, and by it this meaning has been brought in.

Now, showing what was stated as "this training rule," he said: "Whatever monk should engage in sexual intercourse, he is expelled, not in communion." Having thus made it firm by way of cutting off at the root, when the first pārājika had been laid down, the incident of the female monkey arose for the purpose of further

supplementary laying down. This was stated for the purpose of illustrating the arising of that: "And thus this training rule was laid down by the Blessed One for the monks." Its meaning is - This training rule was laid down thus by the Blessed One for the monks, and another matter arose.

The discourse on the first laying down is finished.

The recitation section on Sudinna is finished.

Discussion on the Story of the Female Monkey

40. Now, in order to show that other case which had arisen, he said "Now at that time" and so forth. Herein this is the explanation of obscure terms - "A female monkey with food" means: in the Great Wood, through the power of the monks' virtues such as patience and friendliness, many animals such as deer, peacocks, fowl, monkeys and so forth, with minds free from apprehension, wander about in the places of the meditation dwellings. Therein, having enticed one female monkey with food such as gruel, rice, hard food and so forth - this is said to mean "having won her over." "Tassā" is in the locative case. "Engages in" means he is one who engages frequently; for the present tense is used in the sense of frequency. "That monk" means that monk who engages in sexual intercourse. "Wandering on a lodging tour" means those monks were visitors who had come to see the Buddha, and having received the visitors' meals early in the morning and having completed their meal duties, they wandered about thinking "We shall inspect the dwelling places of the monks." Therefore it was said - "Wandering on a lodging tour." "She approached those monks" means: animals, having become familiar with one monk, generate the same kind of attitude towards others as well. Therefore that female monkey approached those monks; and having approached, she displayed to them the same behaviour as to her own familiar monk.

"Tail" means the tail. "Presented" means she placed it facing towards them. "Made a sign" means: by whatever manner, by whatever action they would know her intention for sexual intercourse - that she did; this is the meaning. "That monk" means the one whose dwelling this was. "They hid themselves to one side" means they remained concealed in one place.

41. "True, friend": like a thief caught red-handed with the goods, having been confronted after being seen directly, being unable to say such things as "what have I done?", he said "True, friend." "Is it not, friend, just the same in that case": friend, just as with a human woman, does not that training rule apply in the same way also with an animal female? For even with a human woman, looking, grasping, touching, making contact, and pressing against are all indeed gross offences. With an animal female too, all of that is indeed a gross offence. What difference is there in this? You have cast a pretext where there is no ground for a pretext.

42. "Even with an animal, he is expelled, not in communion" means that even having engaged in sexual intercourse with an animal, he is indeed expelled - thus he made the training rule firmer. For the training rule is of two kinds - a worldly offence and an offence by regulation. Therein, that whose consciousness on the side of intentionality is solely unwholesome, that is called a worldly offence. The remainder is an offence by regulation. Therein, in the case of a worldly offence, a supplementary rule arising

arises obstructing, closing the door, cutting off the stream, making it firmer; but "except for one with over-estimation" and "except for one who is dreaming" - this, however, was stated because of the absence of transgression and because of being negligible. In the case of an offence by regulation, arising when transgression has not been committed, it arises making it looser, releasing, giving a door, making non-offence again and again, like the supplementary rules regarding group meals, successive meals, and so forth. "Even with one for a moment" - but such a one, having arisen when transgression has been committed, simply follows the original enactment. But since this first training rule is a worldly offence, not an offence by regulation, therefore this supplementary rule arose obstructing, closing the door, cutting off the stream, making it firmer.

Thus, having combined both cases and having made it firmer by way of cutting off at the root, when the first expulsion offence had been laid down, the case of the Vajjiputtaka arose for the purpose of a further supplementary enactment. For the purpose of showing its arising, this was stated - "And thus this training rule was laid down by the Blessed One for the monks." Its meaning is - this training rule was thus laid down by the Blessed One for the monks, and another case also arose.

The discourse on the story of the female monkey is finished.

The Rug Recitation Section

Commentary on the Account of the Vajjiputtaka

43-44. Now, in order to show that other incident which had arisen, he said "Now at that time" and so forth. Herein too, this is the explanation of obscure terms - "Vesālian" means residents of Vesālī. "Vajjiputtaka" means sons of families in Vesālī in the Vajji country. Indeed, whatever calamity, danger, or tumour arose in the Dispensation, all of that was on account of the Vajjiputtakas. For thus, even Devadatta, having gained the Vajjiputtakas as his faction, split the Community. And it was the Vajjiputtakas themselves who, when the Blessed One had attained final Nibbāna a hundred years earlier, proclaimed the Teacher's Dispensation as contrary to the Teaching and contrary to the Discipline. These too were certain ones among them who, even when the training rule had been thus laid down, ate as much as they liked, etc. they engaged in sexual intercourse.

"By disaster of relatives too" - herein, loss, disaster, scattering, destruction, and ruin all have the same meaning. The disaster of relatives is disaster-of-relatives; by that disaster of relatives - the meaning is: by the ruin of relatives occasioned by royal punishment, disease, death, or separation. This same method applies to the second term as well. But in the third term, it is illness itself, the destroyer of health, that is disaster of illness. For it destroys, scatters, and ruins health - thus it is disaster. Illness itself is disaster, thus disaster of illness; by that disaster of illness. "Touched" means afflicted, overcome, beset - this is the meaning.

"We, Venerable Ānanda, are not blamers of the Buddha" means: Venerable Ānanda, we do not blame the Buddha, we do not find fault with the Buddha. Not blamers of the Teaching, not blamers of the Community. "We are blamers of ourselves" means: we blame only ourselves, we find fault with ourselves. "Unlucky" means unfortunate. "Of little merit" means of slight merit. "Gifted with introspection regarding wholesome

mental states" means those wholesome mental states that are classified among the thirty-eight objects of meditation, gifted with introspection regarding those; the meaning is: having emerged from each of those objects of meditation, practising insight into those very mental states. "In the first and last watches of the night" means: the first part of the night is the first watch, the latter part of the night is the last watch; what is stated is the first watch and the last watch. "Conducive to enlightenment" means being on the side of enlightenment; the meaning is: being supportive of the knowledge of the path of Arahantship. "Pursuit of meditation" means pursuit of development. "Would dwell devoted" means: having abandoned the hindrance of household life and the hindrance of dwelling, we would dwell properly engaged and occupied with no other duties in secluded lodgings.

"Yes, friends" - the Elder, not knowing their disposition, having heard this great declaration of theirs, thinking "If they will be like this, it is good," accepted saying "Yes, friends." "This is impossible, there is no chance" - both of these are words rejecting the reason. For since a result stands in dependence upon a cause by being dependent upon it. And since that is an occasion for it by being dependent upon it, therefore it is called "a ground and an occasion"; rejecting that, he said - "This is impossible, Ānanda, there is no chance." There is neither this ground nor occasion. "That a Truth-finder" means that by which a Truth-finder, on account of the Vajjis or etc. should abolish - the meaning is: that reason does not exist. For if the Blessed One were to grant full ordination to those who request saying "May we receive full ordination," that being so, he would abolish what was laid down as "He is defeated, he is not in communion." But since he does not abolish this, therefore he said "This is impossible" and so forth.

"He, having come back, should not be given full ordination" means: "If one who has come back thus were to receive full ordination, he would become disrespectful towards the dispensation. But standing on the level of a novice, he will be respectful and will accomplish his own welfare" - knowing this, the Blessed One, out of compassion, said - "He, having come back, should not be given full ordination." "He, having come back, should be given full ordination" means: one who has come back thus, standing in the state of a monk, through his unimpaired virtue, will be respectful towards the dispensation; knowing that he, when the supporting condition exists, will before long attain the highest goal - he said "should be given full ordination."

Thus, having shown who should not be given full ordination and who should be given full ordination among those who have come back after engaging in sexual intercourse, wishing to lay down the training rule by combining all three cases and making it complete, having said "And thus, monks, you should recite this training rule," "Whatever monk etc. is not in communion" - he laid down the complete training rule.

The commentary on the story of the Vajjiputtaka is finished.

Discussion on the Fourfold Vinaya

45. Now, analysing its meaning, he said "whoever" means "whoever, of whatever kind" and so forth. However, by one who desires proficiency in that training rule, in the analysis of the training rule, and in the entire adjudication of the Vinaya, the

fourfold Vinaya should be known -

For the fourfold Vinaya, the great elders of great power,
Having extracted it, made it known - the compilers of the Dhamma of old.

What is the fourfold? The text, conformity with the text, the teachers' doctrine, and one's own judgement. With reference to which it was said - "By the direct statement, by the essence, by the lineage of teachers, and by the intention." Herein, "by the direct statement" means the text is intended, "by the essence" means conformity with the text, "by the lineage of teachers" means the teachers' doctrine, "by the intention" means one's own judgement.

Therein, "the text" means the canonical text in the entire Vinaya Piṭaka.

"Conformity with the text" means the four great authorities; which were thus spoken by the Blessed One - "Whatever, monks, has not been rejected by me saying 'this is not allowable,' if that conforms with what is not allowable, and excludes what is allowable, that is not allowable for you. Whatever, monks, has not been rejected by me saying 'this is not allowable,' if that conforms with what is allowable, and excludes what is not allowable, that is allowable for you. Whatever, monks, has not been permitted by me saying 'this is allowable,' if that conforms with what is not allowable, and excludes what is allowable, that is not allowable for you. Whatever, monks, has not been permitted by me saying 'this is allowable,' if that conforms with what is allowable, and excludes what is not allowable, that is allowable for you."

"The teachers' doctrine" means the commentaries that were established by the five hundred arahants who were the compilers of the Dhamma, that are separate from the canonical text, and that proceed with adjudication of cases that have arisen.

"One's own judgement" means, setting aside the text, conformity with the text, and the teachers' doctrine, a statement of what appears through inference, by one's own understanding, and by grasping the method.

Furthermore, all the doctrine of the Elders that has come down in the commentaries on the Suttas, Abhidhamma, and Vinaya is called "one's own judgement." However, one who takes up that personal judgement and speaks should not speak holding it with a firm grip. Having examined the reason, one should speak by comparing the meaning with the canonical text and the canonical text with the meaning. One's own judgement should be brought down into the teachers' doctrine. If it fits therein and agrees, it should be accepted. If it neither fits nor agrees, it should not be accepted. For this personal judgement is the weakest of all. The teachers' doctrine is stronger than one's own judgement.

The teachers' tradition should also be tested against what is in conformity with the discourses. Therein, only what fits and accords should be accepted; the other should not be accepted. For what is in conformity with the discourses is stronger than the teachers' tradition.

What is in conformity with the discourses should also be tested against the discourses. Therein, only what fits and accords should be accepted; the other should not be accepted. For the discourse itself is stronger than what is in conformity with the discourses. For the discourse is irrefutable, like the community that performed

the recitation, like the time when the Buddhas were still present. Therefore, when two monks discuss, one advocate takes up the discourse and speaks, the other advocate takes up what is in conformity with the discourses. Without either of them making contempt or reproach towards each other, what is in conformity with the discourses should be tested against the discourse. If it fits and accords, it should be accepted. If not, it should not be accepted; one should stand by the discourse itself. Then this one speaks taking up the discourse, the other takes up the teachers' tradition. Without either of them making contempt or reproach towards each other, the teachers' tradition should be tested against the discourse. If it fits and accords, it should be accepted. If it does not fit and does not accord, the blameworthy teachers' tradition should not be accepted; one should stand by the discourse itself.

Then this one speaks taking up the discourse, the other takes up personal opinion. Without either of them making contempt or reproach towards each other, the personal opinion should be tested against the discourse. If it fits and accords, it should be accepted. If not, it should not be accepted. One should stand by the discourse itself.

Then this one speaks taking up what is in conformity with the discourses, the other takes up the discourse. The discourse should be tested against what is in conformity with the discourses. If it fits and accords, and it is recognised as having been included in the three councils and as having come in the canonical text, it should be accepted. If it is not so recognised, does not fit and does not accord, or it is an external discourse, or a verse, or another blameworthy discourse coming from one or another of the Hidden Vessantara, Hidden Vinaya, Vedalla, and so forth, it should not be accepted. One should stand by what is in conformity with the discourses itself.

Then this one speaks taking up what is in conformity with the discourses, the other takes up the teachers' tradition. The teachers' tradition should be tested against what is in conformity with the discourses. If it fits and accords, it should be accepted. If not, it should not be accepted. One should stand by what is in conformity with the discourses itself.

Then this one, taking what is in conformity with the texts, argues, and the other takes personal opinion. The personal opinion should be subsumed under what is in conformity with the texts. If it fits and accords, it should be accepted. If not, it should not be accepted. One should stand by what is in conformity with the discourses itself.

Then this one, taking the teachers' tradition, argues, and the other takes the text. The text should be subsumed under the teachers' tradition. If it fits and accords, it should be accepted. The other, being a blameworthy text, should not be accepted. One should stand by the teachers' tradition alone.

Then this one, taking the teachers' tradition, argues, and the other takes what is in conformity with the texts. What is in conformity with the texts should be subsumed under the teachers' tradition. Only what fits and accords should be accepted; the other should not be accepted. One should stand by the teachers' tradition alone.

Then this one, taking the teachers' tradition, argues, and the other takes personal opinion. One's own judgement should be brought down into the teachers' doctrine. If it fits and accords, it should be accepted. If not, it should not be accepted. One

should stand by the teachers' tradition alone.

Then this one, taking personal opinion, argues, and the other takes the text. The text should be subsumed under the personal opinion. If it fits and accords, it should be accepted. The other, being a blameworthy text, should not be accepted. One should stand by the personal opinion alone.

Then this one, taking personal opinion, argues, and the other takes what is in conformity with the texts. What is in conformity with the texts should be subsumed under the personal opinion. Only what fits and accords should be accepted; the other should not be accepted. One should stand by the personal opinion alone.

Then this one, taking personal opinion, argues, and the other takes the teachers' tradition. The teachers' tradition should be subsumed under the personal opinion. If it fits and accords, it should be accepted; the other, being a blameworthy teachers' tradition, should not be accepted. One should stand by the personal opinion alone. One's own position should be made strong. And in all cases, neither dismissal nor reproach should be made.

But then this one takes up "allowable" and argues, while the other says "not allowable". It should be tested against the discourse and what is in conformity with the discourse. If it is allowable, one should stand by the allowable. If it is not allowable, one should stand by the not allowable.

Then if this one shows from the discourse many reasons and judgements establishing its allowable nature, and the other finds no reason - One should stand by the allowable alone. Then if the other shows from the discourse many reasons and judgements establishing its not allowable nature, this one should not make it his own position and stand firmly holding on to it. Having accepted with "Good", one should stand by the not allowable alone. Then if the semblance of reason appears for both, the state of being prohibited alone is good; one should stand by the not allowable. For having reached the Vinaya and come to the investigation of allowable and not allowable, it should be blocked, it should be made firm, the stream should be cut off, and one should stand by the weighty state alone.

But then this one takes up "not allowable" and argues, while the other says "allowable". It should be tested against the discourse and what is in conformity with the discourse. If it is allowable, one should stand by the allowable. If it is not allowable, one should stand by the not allowable.

Then if this one shows the not allowable nature with many reasons of discourse-judgement, and the other finds no reason, one should stand by the not allowable. Then if the other shows the allowable nature with many reasons of discourse-judgement, and this one finds no reason, one should stand by the allowable. Then if the semblance of reason appears for both, one's own position should not be relinquished. And just as this judgement has been stated regarding allowable-not allowable and not allowable-allowable; so too should the judgement be understood regarding the claim of non-offence-offence and the claim of offence-non-offence, and regarding the claim of light-heavy offence and the claim of heavy-light offence as well. For herein the difference is merely in name; there is no difference in the method of application, therefore it has not been elaborated.

Thus, when a judgement regarding allowable-not allowable and so forth has arisen, whoever obtains the superior reason among the discourse, what is in conformity with the discourse, the teachers' tradition, and one's own opinion - one should stand by his position. But one who obtains no reason or judgement at all should not abandon the discourse; one should stand by the discourse alone. Thus, by one desiring skill in that training rule, in the analysis of the training rule, and in the entire Vinaya judgement, this fourfold Vinaya should be known.

Moreover, even having known this fourfold Vinaya, a person who upholds the Vinaya should be endowed with the three characteristics. For three characteristics of one who upholds the Vinaya should be desired. What three? "The discourse is well-learnt by him, well-practised, well-determined from the discourse and from the detailed exposition" - this is the first characteristic. "He stands firm in the Vinaya, unshakeable" - this is the second. "The succession of teachers has been well-grasped by him, well-attended to, well-considered" - this is the third.

Therein, "discourse" means the entire Vinaya Piṭaka. "It is well-learnt by him" means well-acquired. "Well-practised" means well-exercised, mastered, learnt by heart, well-determined. "From the discourse and from the detailed exposition" means it is well-determined from the canonical text, from the oral tradition, and from the commentary; it has been learnt having cut through doubt.

"He stands firm in the Discipline" means he is established in the Discipline through conscientiousness. For one who is shameless, even though learned, out of regard for gain, misrepresents the canonical text and expounds what is contrary to the Dhamma and contrary to the Vinaya as the Teacher's instruction, causing great danger to the dispensation. He even brings about a schism in the Community or a dispute in the Community. But one who is conscientious, scrupulous, and desirous of training, even for the sake of his life does not misrepresent the canonical text, but expounds only the Dhamma and only the Vinaya, treating the Teacher's instruction with respect and upholding it. For thus in the past the great elders uttered this declaration three times: "In the future the conscientious one will protect it, the conscientious one will protect it, the conscientious one will protect it." Thus one who is conscientious, not abandoning the Vinaya, not deviating from it, stands firm in the Discipline through conscientiousness - this is what "well established" means. "Unshakeable" means: one who is "shakeable" is one who, when questioned on the canonical text or the commentary, from below or from above, or in the sequence of words, falters, wavers, and is unable to stand firm; whatever is said by another, he assents to each and every point; he abandons his own position and adopts the position of another. But one who, when questioned on the canonical text or the commentary, from below or above, or in the sequence of words, does not falter, does not waver, but like one pulling out hairs one by one with tweezers, answers: "Thus do we say; thus do our teachers say"; in whom the canonical text and the determination of the canonical text, like lion's fat placed in a golden vessel, stand without diminishing or being exhausted - this one is called "unshakeable".

"The lineage of teachers has been well learnt by him" means the succession of elders and the lineage succession have been well learnt by him. "Well attended to" means thoroughly attended to; it is like a lamp that is lit at the mere moment of adverting. "Well retained" means thoroughly retained, retained with regard to the connection of

what precedes and follows, with regard to the meaning and with regard to the reasoning; abandoning his own opinion, he speaks according to the purity of the teachers, saying "My teacher learnt in the presence of such-and-such a teacher, and he from such-and-such," thus bringing the entire lineage of teachers, the component of the Elders' Doctrine, tracing it back until the Elder Upāli learnt in the presence of the Perfectly Enlightened One. And bringing it from there too: the Elder Upāli learnt in the presence of the Perfectly Enlightened One, the Elder Dāsaka from his preceptor the Elder Upāli, the Elder Soṇaka from his preceptor the Elder Dāsaka, the Elder Siggava from his preceptor the Elder Soṇaka, the Elder Moggaliputta Tissa from his preceptors the Elder Siggava and the Elder Caṇḍavajji. Thus, having brought the entire lineage of teachers, the component of the Elders' Doctrine, he traces it back to his own teacher and establishes it. For the lineage of teachers learnt in this way is well learnt. But one who is unable to do so must at least learn two or three rounds of succession. For at the very least, it is fitting to know how one's teacher and one's teacher's teacher state the canonical text and the explanatory discussions.

Moreover, a bearer of the Vinaya endowed with these three characteristics, when the Community has assembled for the purpose of deciding a case, when a case has arisen, when the accuser and the accused have spoken what is to be spoken, should not hastily make a decision but should examine six grounds. What are the six? The subject matter should be examined, the matrix should be examined, the word analysis should be examined, the classification by triads should be examined, the intermediate offence should be examined, and the non-offence should be examined.

For even when examining the subject matter, he sees a certain offence thus: "One should come having covered oneself with grass or leaves, but one should certainly not come naked; whoever should come thus, there is an offence of wrong-doing." He, having brought that canonical text, will settle that legal issue.

Even when examining the matrix, he sees one or another of the five offences by the method beginning with "for deliberate lying, an offence entailing expiation"; he, having brought that canonical text, will settle that legal issue.

When examining the word-analysis too, he sees one or another of the seven offences according to the method: "When the body is not destroyed, he engages in sexual intercourse, there is an offence of defeat. When the body is mostly destroyed, he engages in sexual intercourse, there is an offence of grave transgression" - and so forth. He brings the rule from the word-analysis and settles that legal issue.

When examining the classification of triads too, he sees in the classification of triads either a triad-saṅghādisesa, or a triad-pācittiya, or a triad-dukkāṭa, or one or another offence. He brings the rule from there and settles that legal issue.

When examining the intermediate offence too, he sees whatever intermediate offence there is between training rules, thus: "He lifts up what has been received, there is an offence of wrong-doing." He brings that rule and settles that legal issue.

When examining non-offence too, he sees the non-offence indicated in each respective training rule, thus: "There is no offence for a monk who does not consent, who has no intention to steal, who has no intention of killing, who has the intention of

admonishing, who has no intention of releasing, who acts unintentionally, who acts without mindfulness, who does not know." He brings that rule and settles that legal issue.

For whatever monk, skilled in the fourfold Vinaya, endowed with the three characteristics, having examined these six grounds, settles a legal issue, his judgement is irreversible, and is like one adjudicated by the Buddha himself sitting in person. If any monk who has committed a transgression of a training rule were to approach that monk skilled in judgement and ask about his own scruple; having carefully considered, if there is no offence, he should say "there is no offence." But if there is an offence, he should say "there is an offence." If it is one remediable by confession, he should say "it is remediable by confession." If it is one remediable by rehabilitation, he should say "it is remediable by rehabilitation." But if the semblance of a defeat appears to him, he should not yet say "it is a defeat offence." Why? For the transgression regarding sexual intercourse and the transgression regarding claims of superhuman states are gross. But transgressions regarding taking what is not given and regarding the destruction of a human being are subtle and light as thought. One commits them subtly and guards against them subtly; therefore, when being asked about a scruple based on such a matter, without saying "it is an offence," if his teacher is available, that monk should be sent to him with the words "go and ask our teacher." If he comes back again and says "your teacher, having examined it according to the rule and the method, told me 'there is a remedy,'" then he should be told by him "good, very well, do what the teacher says." But if he has no teacher, yet there is an elder who studied together with him, he should be sent to his presence - "The elder who studied together with us is a leader of the group; go to him and ask." When he too has determined "there is a remedy," he should be told "good, very well, do as he says." But if there is no elder who studied together with him either, yet there is a wise pupil, he should be sent to his presence - "Go to such-and-such a junior and ask." When he too has determined "there is a remedy," he should be told "good, very well, do as he says." But if even for the junior the semblance of a defeat appears, even by him it should not be said "you are defeated." For the arising of a Buddha is rare, and rarer still are the going forth and the full ordination. Rather, he should be told thus - "Having swept a secluded place, having sat down for the day's abiding, having purified your morality, attend for now to the thirty-two aspects." If his morality is sound and the meditation subject engages him, activities become manifest and present themselves, the mind too becomes unified as if having attained access or absorption, and he does not even know that the day has passed. When he comes to attend upon him after the day has passed, he should be told thus - "What was the course of your mind like?" When the course of the mind has been reported, he should be told - "The going forth is for the purpose of purification of mind; be diligent and practise the ascetic's duty."

But for one whose morality is broken, the meditation subject does not succeed; his mind wavers like one struck by a goad, he is burnt by the fire of remorse, and he rises up immediately like one seated on a heated stone. When he comes, he should be asked: "What is the course of your mind?" When the course of his mind has been reported, he should be told: "There is no such thing as secrecy in the world for one

who commits evil deeds. For first of all, one committing evil knows it himself, then his guardian deities, recluses and brahmins who know others' minds, and other deities know it. Now you yourself should seek your own welfare."

The discourse on the fourfold Vinaya is finished,

and the discourse on the characteristics and so forth of one who bears the Vinaya.

Commentary on the Word-Analysis for Monks

Now we shall explain the meaning of the analysis of the training rule. What was stated as "whoever" means "whoever, of whatever kind" and so on. Herein, "whoever" is the term to be analysed; "whoever, of whatever kind" and so on are the terms of its analysis. And herein, since "pana" is merely a particle; "yo" is the term of meaning; and since it indicates a person in an indefinite way, therefore, showing its meaning, he stated just the word "yo" which indicates a person indefinitely. Therefore here the meaning should be understood thus: "whoever" means "whoever, anyone at all" is what is stated. Since whoever is anyone at all, he is necessarily recognised by one or another aspect among physical characteristics, engagement, birth, name, clan, morality, dwelling, resort, and age, therefore, in order to make that known accordingly, revealing that classification, he said "of whatever kind" and so on. Therein, "of whatever kind" means of whatever kind or of such a kind by way of physical characteristics, let him be; the meaning is: whether tall or short, dark or fair, of golden complexion, thin or stout. "However engaged" means by way of engagement, let him be engaged in this or that; the meaning is: whether engaged in building work, engaged in recitation, or engaged in the duty of dwelling. "Of whatever birth" means by way of birth, let him be of this birth or that birth; the meaning is: whether a noble warrior, a brahmin, a merchant, or a worker. "Of whatever name" means by way of name, let him be of this name or that name; the meaning is: whether Buddhārakkhita, Dhammārakkhita, or Saṅghārakkhita. "Of whatever clan" means by way of clan, let him be of this clan or that clan, or of whatever clan; the meaning is: whether Kaccāyana, Vāsiṭṭha, or Kosiya. "Of whatever morality" means among practices, let him be of this morality or that morality; the meaning is: whether of the practice of building work, the practice of recitation, or the practice of the duty of dwelling. "Of whatever dwelling" means among dwellings too, let him be of this dwelling or that dwelling; the meaning is: whether dwelling in building work, dwelling in recitation, or dwelling in the duty of dwelling. "Of whatever resort" means among resorts too, let him be of this resort or that resort; the meaning is: whether resorting to building work, resorting to recitation, or resorting to the duty of dwelling. In "whether an elder" and so on, among those advanced in age and so on, let him be whoever he may be; the meaning is: whether an elder by having completed ten rains, or newly ordained by having less than five rains, or of middle standing by having more than five rains. Then indeed, every such one in this meaning is called "whoever".

In the explanation of "monk", "he begs" means he is a beggar; the meaning is that whether receiving or not receiving, he asks by means of the noble way of asking. Because he has entered upon the practice of going for alms that was undertaken by the Buddha and others, he is called "one who has entered upon the practice of going for alms". For whoever, having abandoned a small or great mass of wealth, has gone

forth from the household life into homelessness, having given up making a livelihood by farming, cattle-herding, and so forth, by merely taking on the outward appearance, has entered upon the practice of going for alms - thus he is a monk. Or because his livelihood is dependent on others, even though eating food brought by attendants within the monastery, he has entered upon the practice of going for alms - thus he is a monk; or because enthusiasm for the going forth arose on account of the eating of almsfood, he has entered upon the practice of going for alms - thus he is a monk. "One who wears torn robes" means one who wears cloth that is broken by the breaking of its value, touch, and colour. Therein, the breaking of value should be understood as cutting with a blade. For even cloth worth a thousand, when cut into pieces with a blade, becomes broken in value. It is not worth even half of its former value. The breaking of touch should be understood as the stitching together with thread. For even cloth that is pleasant to touch, when stitched together with threads, becomes broken in touch. It reaches a state of rough touch. The breaking of colour should be understood as being due to needle-stains and the like. For even very clean cloth, starting from the needlework, becomes broken in colour through needle-stains, through the dirt of hand-sweat and grime, and at the end through dyeing and making allowable; it loses its natural colour. Thus, because of wearing cloth broken in these three ways, he is called "one who wears torn robes" - thus he is a monk. Or merely by wearing ochre robes that are dissimilar to the clothes of householders, he is called "one who wears torn robes" - thus he is a monk.

"By convention" means the meaning is: by the designation of common usage. For by convention alone a certain person is known as "a monk". For thus, when monks are being counted for an invitation and so forth, even novices are included and they say "a hundred monks" or "a thousand monks". "By acknowledgment" means by one's own declaration; for by acknowledgment too a certain person is known as "a monk". The occurrence of this should be seen in such instances as "Who is there?" "I, friend, am a monk." This, however, is the rightful acknowledgment spoken by the Elder Ānanda. But at night-time, even those of bad conduct, coming along the road, when asked "Who is there?", by an unrightful acknowledgment, an untrue one, say "We are monks."

"A 'come monk'" means a "come monk" is one who attained the state of monkhood, the "come monk" full ordination, merely by the Blessed One's words "Come, monk." For the Blessed One, having seen a person endowed with the supporting conditions for the "come monk" status, extending his golden-hued right hand from within the dyed rag-robes, uttering the sublime voice, says: "Come, monk, live the holy life for the complete ending of suffering." Simultaneously with the Blessed One's words, his household appearance disappears, and the going forth and full ordination take effect. He becomes shaven-headed and clothed in ochre robes. Having put on one as a lower garment, having wrapped one as an upper garment, having placed one on the shoulder, with a bowl the colour of a blue lotus hanging from the left shoulder-joint -

"The three robes and a bowl, an adze, a needle, and a waistband;
With a water strainer these are eight, for a monk devoted to exertion."

Thus, equipped with the eight requisites as described, appearing on his body as if attached, he stands like an elder of sixty years, complete in deportment, with the Buddha as his teacher, with the Buddha as his preceptor, paying homage to the Perfectly Enlightened One. For the Blessed One, during the first period after his enlightenment, at one time conferred full ordination only through the "Come, monk" ordination. And those thus fully ordained numbered three hundred and forty-one above a thousand; as follows - the five elders of the group of five, Yasa the clansman, his retinue of fifty-four companions, the thirty of the fortunate group, the thousand former matted-hair ascetics, two hundred and fifty wandering ascetics together with the two chief disciples, and the one Elder Aṅgulimāla. For this was said in the commentary -

"Three hundred and a thousand, and forty more besides;
And one wise elder - all of them were 'Come, monk' ordained."

And not only these alone, there are many others as well. That is: the brahmin Sela with a retinue of three hundred, Mahākappina with a retinue of a thousand, ten thousand clansmen dwelling in Kapilavatthu, sixteen thousand brahmins of the Pārāyana - and so forth. But they were not mentioned because they are not indicated in the Pāli text of the Vinaya Piṭaka. These were mentioned because they are indicated therein.

"Twenty-seven thousand, and just three hundred too;
All these are reckoned, all of them were 'Come, monk' ordained."

"One fully ordained by the three goings for refuge" means one fully ordained by the three goings for refuge spoken by uttering the words three times in the manner beginning with "I go to the Buddha for refuge." For this full ordination is of eight kinds - the "Come, monk" ordination, the going for refuge ordination, the ordination by acceptance of exhortation, the ordination by answering questions, the ordination by acceptance of the weighty rules, the ordination by messenger, the ordination by eight proclamations, and the ordination by a legal act with a motion and three proclamations. Therein, the "Come, monk" ordination and the going for refuge ordination have already been described.

The ordination by acceptance of exhortation is as follows: "Therefore, Kassapa, you should train thus - 'Strong moral shame and moral dread will be established in me towards elders, newly ordained, and those of middle standing.' Thus indeed, Kassapa, should you train. Therefore, Kassapa, you should train thus: 'Whatever teaching I shall hear that is connected with the wholesome, all that I shall attend to with earnestness, bear in mind, gather together with my whole heart, and listen to the teaching with attentive ear.' Thus indeed, Kassapa, you should train. Therefore, Kassapa, you should train thus: 'Mindfulness of the body accompanied by comfort will not be abandoned by me.' Thus indeed, Kassapa, you should train." By this acceptance of exhortation was the permitted ordination of the Elder Mahākassapa.

The full ordination by answering questions is the ordination granted to Sopāka. It is said that the Blessed One asked the novice Sopāka, who was walking up and down at the Eastern Monastery, ten questions based on the foul: "Sopāka, are these states - 'perception of a bloated corpse' and 'perception of form' - different in meaning and

different in expression, or are they one in meaning, differing only in expression?" He answered them. The Blessed One, having given him approval, asked: "How many years old are you, Sopāka?" "I am seven years old, Blessed One." "Sopāka, you have answered the questions in accordance with my omniscient knowledge" - and with a pleased mind, he granted the full ordination. This is the full ordination by answering questions.

The full ordination by acceptance of the weighty rules is the ordination granted to Mahāpajāpatī through her acceptance of the eight weighty rules.

The full ordination by messenger is the ordination granted to the courtesan of Aḍḍhakāṣī.

The full ordination by eight proclamations is the full ordination through these two acts: a motion followed by three proclamations from the nun community and a motion followed by three proclamations from the bhikkhu community.

The full ordination by a motion followed by three proclamations is the present-day full ordination of monks. Among these eight kinds of full ordination, "Monks, whatever full ordination was granted by me through the three goings for refuge, that I reject from this day forth. I allow, monks, that one should be fully ordained by a motion followed by three proclamations" - thus it is said that one is fully ordained through this ordination so granted.

"Good" means not evil. For from virtuous ordinary persons up to arahants, because they are endowed with good morality, concentration, wisdom, liberation, and the knowledge and vision of liberation, they are reckoned as "a good monk." "Substantial" should be understood as being like a cloth that is blue through being endowed with blue colour, so too because of being endowed with the substance of morality and so forth, he should be understood as "a substantial monk." Or because of the absence of the sapwood of defilements, only one with taints destroyed should be understood as "substantial." "A trainee": together with a virtuous ordinary person, seven noble ones train in the three trainings, thus they are trainees. Among them, any one should be understood as "a trainee monk." "One who does not train" is one beyond training. Having surpassed the states of a trainee and being established in the highest fruit, because there is nothing further to be trained in, one with taints destroyed is called "one beyond training." "By a complete community" means by one that has attained the state of unanimity in a single act, in the last resort, in an act requiring a group of five, as many monks as are eligible for the act having come, the consent of those eligible for consent having been brought, and those present not objecting. "By a motion followed by three proclamations" means by one that is to be performed with three proclamations and one motion. "By an act" means by a lawful act of the Vinaya. "Unshakable" means one that has attained the state of being unable to be overturned and unable to be objected to, because of being complete in the validity of the basis, the motion, the proclamations, the boundary, and the assembly. "Worthy of standing" means worthy of reason, worthy of the Teacher's instruction. "Fully ordained" means one who has attained the higher state; the meaning is "one who has reached it." For the state of a monk is the higher state, and because he has attained that through the act as described, he is called "fully ordained." Here, only the motion followed by three proclamations has been mentioned. But it is stated in all the commentaries that,

standing at this point, the four acts of the community should be drawn out and explained in detail. And those have been explained by setting them out in order as "the act by announcement, the act with one motion, the act with a motion followed by one proclamation, the act with a motion followed by three proclamations," and by bringing in the canonical text in detail from the Khandhakas and from the Analysis of Acts at the end of the Parivāra. We shall explain those in the Analysis of Acts at the end of the Parivāra itself. For in this way, the commentary on the first defeat will not be burdensome; and the commentary following the canonical text as it stands will be easy to understand. And those sections will not be empty; therefore we shall proceed with the word-by-word commentary only.

"Therein" means among those monks spoken of by way of "one who begs" and so forth. "Whatever monk" means whatever this monk. "By a complete community" etc. "Fully ordained" means fully ordained by a legal act with a motion and three proclamations alone, among the eight kinds of full ordination. "This monk is intended in this meaning" means this one is intended as "monk" in the meaning "one who has engaged in sexual intercourse becomes defeated." The others, however, beginning with "one who begs," are stated by way of extracting the meaning. Among those, those beginning with "one who begs" are stated by way of etymology, the two "a monk by convention, a monk by acknowledgment" are stated by way of designation, "come monk" is stated by way of full ordination received with the Buddha as preceptor. The monk by going for refuge is stated by way of full ordination when the formal act of ordination had not yet arisen, and those beginning with "good" should be understood as stated by way of qualities.

The word-analysis concerning monks is finished.

Commentary on the Word-Analysis of the Training and Livelihood

Now, without analysing the word "of monks" since it has no special meaning, showing that because he has entered upon the training and the way of life, he is one who has entered upon the training and way of life of monks, he said "training" and so forth. Therein, "what should be trained in" is training. "Three" is a delimitation by counting. "Training in higher morality" means: that which is superior and supreme morality is higher morality; and that higher morality, because it is to be trained in, is also a training - thus it is the training in higher morality. The same method applies to the training in higher consciousness and the training in higher wisdom.

But what here is morality, what is higher morality, what is consciousness, what is higher consciousness, what is wisdom, what is higher wisdom? It is said - The five-factored and ten-factored morality is, to begin with, merely morality. For that is practised in the world whether a Buddha has arisen or has not arisen. When a Buddha has arisen, both Buddhas and disciples encourage the great multitude in that morality. When no Buddha has arisen, paccekabuddhas, those who hold the doctrine of kamma, righteous recluses and brahmins, wheel-turning monarchs, great kings, and great bodhisattas encourage it. Wise recluses and brahmins also undertake it themselves. They, having fulfilled that wholesome mental state, experience success among gods and human beings. But the morality of Pātimokkha restraint is called "higher morality," for like the sun among lights, like Sineru among mountains, it is both superior to and supreme among all worldly moralities, and it exists only with the

arising of a Buddha, not without the arising of a Buddha. For no other being is able to extract that regulation and establish it; only Buddhas, having completely cut off the stream of transgression through the doors of body and speech, lay down that moral restraint appropriate to each and every transgression. And even beyond the morality of Pātimokkha restraint, only the morality associated with the path and fruit is higher morality, but that is not intended here. For a monk who has attained that does not engage in sexual intercourse.

But the eight sense-sphere wholesome consciousnesses and the eight mundane attainment consciousnesses, taken together, should be understood as just consciousness. And its occurrence whether a Buddha has arisen or not, the encouraging and the undertaking, should be understood by the very method stated regarding morality. But the consciousness of the eight attainments that serves as the foundation for insight is called "higher consciousness." For that, like higher morality among moralities, is both superior to and supreme among all mundane consciousnesses, and it exists only with the arising of a Buddha, not without the arising of a Buddha. And even beyond that, only the consciousness of the path and fruit is higher consciousness, but that is not intended here. For a monk who has attained that does not engage in sexual intercourse.

The wisdom that operates in the manner beginning with "there is what is given, there is what is offered" is the knowledge of the ownership of one's actions. For that operates in the world whether a Buddha has arisen or not. When a Buddha has arisen, both Buddhas and disciples of Buddhas encourage the great multitude in that wisdom. When no Buddha has arisen, paccekabuddhas, those who hold the doctrine of kamma, righteous recluses and brahmins, wheel-turning monarchs, great kings, and great bodhisattas encourage it. Wise beings also undertake it themselves. For thus Aṅkura gave a great gift for ten thousand years. Velāma, Vessantara, and many other wise men gave great offerings. They, having fulfilled that wholesome mental state, experienced success among gods and human beings. However, insight knowledge that delimits the aspects of the three characteristics is called "higher wisdom." For, just like higher morality and higher consciousness in relation to morality and consciousness, it is both superior to and higher than all worldly wisdom, and it does not operate in the world without the arising of a Buddha. And even beyond that, only the wisdom associated with the path and fruit is higher wisdom, but that is not intended here. For a monk who has attained that does not engage in sexual intercourse.

"Therein" means in those three trainings. "Whatever is this training in higher morality" means whatever is this training in higher morality reckoned as the Pātimokkha morality. "This is called the way of life" means this is every training rule established by the Blessed One in the Vinaya. Since herein monks of different countries, births, clans, and other distinctions live together, having one livelihood, a shared livelihood, and a shared way of conduct, therefore it is called "way of life". "He trains in that" means he trains by making that training rule the basis for his mind, examining with his mind thus: "Am I training in accordance with the training rule or am I not training?" And not only does he train in this training rule reckoned as the way of life, he also trains in the training. However, "he trains in that" is stated by virtue of the immediately following phrase "this is called the way of life". Although it is stated

thus, yet the meaning here should be understood as follows: He trains by fulfilling the training in that training, and he trains by not transgressing that training rule. Therefore it is said "one who has entered upon the way of life" - this too is stated by virtue of the immediately following phrase "way of life". But since he has also entered upon the training, he should be understood in meaning as "one who has entered upon the training" as well. For when it is so, the word-analysis of the phrase "one who has entered upon the training and the way of life" is also complete.

The word-analysis concerning the training and livelihood is finished.

Commentary on the Analysis of Renunciation of the Training

"Without rejecting the training, without declaring weakness" means without repudiating the training and without making known the state of weakness. And because even when weakness has been declared, the training remains unrejected, but when the training has been rejected, weakness has indeed been declared. Therefore, by this phrase "without declaring weakness", no distinct meaning is obtained. Just as when it is said "should share a sleeping place for two or three nights", no distinct meaning is obtained by the expression "two nights" - it is said merely for the smoothness of expression and common usage in worldly parlance. Likewise, this too should be understood as said for the smoothness of expression and common usage in parlance.

Or because the Blessed One teaches the Dhamma with both meaning and phrasing, therefore by "without rejecting the training" he accomplishes the meaning, and by "without declaring weakness" he accomplishes the phrasing. For a single meaning-word stated without an accompanying word does not shine, like a king without a retinue, or like a man without garments and ornaments; but together with an accompanying word that follows the meaning, it shines.

Or because a certain declaration of weakness is the meaning of the rejection of the training, therefore, with reference to that, while elucidating the meaning of the phrase "without rejecting the training", he said "without declaring weakness".

Therein, one might say: since not all declaration of weakness is a rejection of the training, therefore one should first say "without declaring weakness" and then, for the purpose of delimiting its meaning, say "without rejecting the training" - but that is not so; Why? Because of the absence of a sequence of meaning. For since it has been said "one who has entered upon the training and the way of life," when it is said "without rejecting" that training which one has entered upon, the meaning is stated in proper sequence, not otherwise. Therefore this itself was stated first.

Moreover, the meaning here should also be understood in reverse order. How? In "one who has entered upon the training and the way of life," without rejecting that training which one has entered upon, and without declaring weakness in that way of life which one has entered upon.

Now, showing the distinction and non-distinction between rejection of the training and declaration of weakness, and the characteristic of rejection of the training, he said "there is, monks" and so forth. Therein, "there is, monks" and so forth are two matrix terms; analysing them, he said "and how, monks" and so forth. Herein this is the

explanation of obscure terms - "How" means in what manner. "And a declaration of weakness" means and a making manifest of weakness. "Here" means in this Dispensation. "Dissatisfied" means one who has come to a state of difficult livelihood through lack of delight in this dispensation. Or alternatively, it means one who dwells with neck craned upward, thinking "today I shall go, tomorrow I shall go, from here I shall go, there I shall go" - distracted and without concentration. "Without delight" means devoid of delight in the dispensation.

"Wishing to fall away from asceticism" means wishing to depart from the state of a recluse. "Monkhood" means by monkhood. The accusative case is used in the sense of the instrumental. But in such passages as "would be troubled by something hanging around the neck," it is expressed by the instrumental case in its proper characteristic. "Troubled" means conducting oneself as though one were afflicted, oppressed, and suffering; or the meaning is: being afflicted and oppressed by that state of monkhood. "Being ashamed" means being abashed. "Disgusted" means loathing it as though it were something impure. "Desiring the state of a householder" and so forth are clear in meaning. In "what if I were to reject the Buddha," herein "what if" is a particle indicating deliberation. This is what is meant - "If I were to reject the Buddha, that would indeed be good for me." "Says and intimates" means he speaks by making a verbal utterance with these or other expressions, and he intimates to, that is, makes known to, the one to whom he speaks. "Thus also" - the particle "pi" is for the purpose of summarising the meaning stated above. Thus also there is both a declaration of weakness and the training not rejected, and in other ways too.

Now, showing that declaration of weakness and non-rejection of the training in another way as well, he said "or else" and so forth. All of that is clear in meaning. However, regarding the words, from the beginning here, these fourteen terms - "I would reject the Buddha, the Dhamma, the Community, the training, the discipline, the Pātimokkha, the recitation, the preceptor, the teacher, the co-resident pupil, the pupil, one with the same preceptor, one with the same teacher, a fellow in the holy life - I would reject" - are stated in the manner of rejection.

"I would be a householder" and so forth - these eight terms, "a householder, a lay follower, a monastery attendant, a novice, a heretical teacher, a disciple of a heretical teacher, not a recluse, not a disciple of the son of the Sakyan - I would be" - are stated in the manner of an alternative state of being by means of "I would be". Thus there are twenty-two terms connected with "what if I".

46. And just as these, so too connected with each one of "if I were to," "let me," "come, let me," "it occurs to me" - there are twenty-two each, thus altogether there are one hundred and ten terms.

47. Next, there are seventeen terms beginning with "I remember my mother," which proceed by way of showing the objects to be remembered. Therein, "field" means a rice field and so forth. "Site" means a place where grass, leaves, vegetables, fruits, and non-fruits grow. "Craft" means the craft of pottery, weaving, and so forth.

48. Thereafter, the nine phrases beginning with "I have a mother, she must be supported by me" are set forth by way of showing the state of having possessions and having impediments.

49. Next, the sixteen terms beginning with "I have a mother, she will support me" are set forth by way of showing the state of having support and having an established basis.

50. Thereafter, the eight terms beginning with "difficult to do" are set forth by way of showing the difficult nature of eating one meal, sleeping alone, and celibacy.

Therein, "difficult to do" shows the difficulty in the practice of eating one meal and so forth. "Not easy to do" rejects the state of being easy to do. Similarly here with "difficult to practise" and "not easy to practise." "I do not endeavour" shows the absence of endeavour therein and the inability to do so. "I cannot endure" shows the state of being unbearable. "I do not delight" shows the absence of delight. "I do not find pleasure" shows the absence of pleasure. Thus it should be understood that these fifty terms and the previous one hundred and ten, making one hundred and sixty terms, are stated in the section on the declaration of weakness.

51. In the section on the rejection of the training also, everything beginning with "And how, monks" is clear in meaning. With regard to the terms here also, these fourteen terms - "I reject the Buddha, the Dhamma, the Community, the training, the discipline, the Pātimokkha, the recitation, the preceptor, the teacher, the co-resident pupil, the pupil, one with the same preceptor, one with the same teacher, the fellow in the holy life - I reject" - occur in connection with the statement of rejection of the training. And in all the terms, the meaning of the statement "says and intimates" is this: Having made a verbal declaration, he says; and the one to whom he says, by that very verbal declaration he intimates, announces, and makes known that "this one wishes to abandon the dispensation, wishes to be released from the dispensation, wishes to relinquish monkhood, and makes this verbal declaration."

If, however, this one, wishing to say "I reject the Buddha," were to reverse the word order and say "reject I the Buddha." Or were to say that meaning in one of the non-Aryan languages. Wishing to say "I reject the Buddha," were to say out of sequence "I reject the Dhamma" or "I reject the fellow in the holy life" - just as in the analysis of the superhuman states, one wishing to say "I attain the first meditative absorption" says "the second meditative absorption" - if the one to whom he says knows even this much, that "this one wishes to relinquish monkhood and says this meaning," there is no failure; The field itself has been entered, and the training is indeed rejected. Just as a being who has passed away from the state of Sakka or from the state of Brahmā has indeed passed away, so too he has indeed fallen away from the dispensation.

If, however, he says with expressions referring to the past or future or conditional, such as "I rejected the Buddha," or "I shall reject the Buddha," or "one should reject the Buddha," or sends a messenger, or sends a letter, or carves letters, or communicates that meaning by hand gestures, the training is not rejected. However, the declaration of superhuman states reaches completion even through hand gestures. The rejection of the training reaches completion only for one who makes a verbal declaration accompanied by intention in the presence of a being of human birth. Even when intimating by making a verbal declaration, if he specifies one person, saying "let this one alone know," and announces it, and that very person knows it, the training is rejected. But if that person does not know, and another standing nearby knows, the training is not rejected. But if, at a place where two are

standing, having specified both of them, he says "I announce to these," whether one of them knows or both of them know, the training is indeed rejected. The same should be understood in the case of many persons also.

If, however, being oppressed by discontent, while walking among fellow monks, calling out loudly "let anyone know," he says "I reject the Buddha," and a construction worker standing not far away or another person knowledgeable of conventions, having heard, knows that "this recluse is dissatisfied and desires the state of a householder, he has fallen away from the dispensation," the training is indeed rejected. But at that very moment, neither before nor after, it is difficult to discern; if he knows at the time of adverting - just as ordinarily in the world people know upon hearing a statement, the training is rejected. But if at a later time, doubting "what was said by this one," he knows after a long time, the training is not rejected. For this rejection of the training and the training rules above concerning false declaration, coarse speech, self-praise and disparagement of others, and declaration of truth are of one category. They reach completion only when known at the time of adverting; when known after a long time by one who doubts "what is this one saying," they do not reach completion. And just as this has been stated in the determination regarding the term "I reject the Buddha," So it should be understood in regard to all the terms.

And because when the training is rejected, even without having said such things as "let me reject the Buddha," the weakness is already made manifest; Therefore at the end of all the terms it is said: "Thus also, monks, there is both a declaration of weakness and the training rejected."

Next, regarding "remember me as a layman" - here, even if he says "I shall be a layman," or "I am a layman," or "I have become a layman," or "I am a layman," the training is not rejected. But if he says "from today onwards, remember me as a layman," or "know me," or "recognise me," or "bear me in mind," whether he says it in the Aryan language or in a non-Aryan language; When this meaning is thus stated, if the one to whom he says knows it, the training is rejected. This same method applies to the remaining seven terms beginning with "a lay follower." Thus these eight and the previous fourteen make twenty-two terms.

52. Hereafter, the same previous fourteen terms, combined with these four - "enough for me," "what use is it to me," "I have no need," "I am well released" - amount to fifty-six. Therein, "alaṃ" means "let it be, it is sufficient" - this is the meaning. "Kiṃ nu me" means "what is my duty, what is to be done, what is to be accomplished" - this is the meaning. "Na mamattho" means "there is no need for me." "Sumuttāhaṃ" means "I am well released." The remainder here is the same as the method already stated. Thus these fifty-six and the previous twenty-two make seventy-eight terms stated in their own form.

53. Since, however, the rejection of the training also occurs through synonyms for these, he therefore stated "or whatever other there are" and so forth. Therein, "or whatever other there are" means whatever others there are apart from the terms such as "Buddha" and so forth that have come in the canonical text. "Or synonyms for the Buddha" means alternative names for the Buddha, etc. or for one who is not a disciple of the son of the Sakyan. Therein, the thousand names that have come in the Vaṇṇapaṭṭhāna, the hundred names in the Upāli Verses, and other names obtainable

through qualities should be understood as "synonyms for the Buddha." All names for the Dhamma should also be understood as "synonyms for the Dhamma." This same method applies everywhere.

Now here this is the connection - "I reject the Buddha" - the rejection is not by a synonym; it is just as stated. "I reject the Perfectly Enlightened One, the One of Boundless Wisdom, the One of Excellent Wisdom, the One Whose Mark is Enlightenment, the Wise One, the One Free from Delusion, the One Who Has Broken Through the Impediment, the One Who Has Won the Victory" - thus by such synonyms for the Buddha there is rejection of the training.

"I reject the Dhamma" - the rejection is not by a synonym; it is just as stated. "I reject the well-expounded Dhamma, the directly visible, the timeless, the inviting one to come and see, the leading onward, the Dhamma to be personally known by the wise. I reject the unconditioned Dhamma; I reject the Dhamma of dispassion, of cessation, the deathless Dhamma; I reject the Dīgha Nikāya, the Brahmajāla, the Majjhima Nikāya, the Mūlapariyāya, the Saṃyutta Nikāya, the Oghatarāṇa, the Aṅguttara Nikāya, the Cittapariyādāna, the Khuddaka Nikāya, the Jātaka, the Abhidhamma, wholesome dhamma, unwholesome dhamma, indeterminate dhamma, the foundations of mindfulness, the right strivings, the bases of spiritual power, the faculties, the powers, the factors of enlightenment, the path, the fruit, nibbāna" - even the name of a single aggregate of Dhamma among the eighty-four thousand aggregates of Dhamma is itself a synonym for the Dhamma. Thus, through a synonym for the Dhamma, there is rejection of the training.

"I reject the Community" - the rejection is not by a synonym. "I reject the Community that has practised well, that has practised uprightly, that has practised correctly, that has practised properly; the Community of the four pairs of persons, the Community of the eight types of individuals, the Community worthy of offerings, worthy of hospitality, worthy of gifts, worthy of reverential salutation, the unsurpassed field of merit" - thus through a synonym for the Community there is rejection of the training.

"I reject the training" - the rejection is not by a synonym. "I reject the monks' training, the nuns' training, the training in higher virtue, the training in higher mind, the training in higher wisdom" - thus through a synonym for the training there is rejection of the training.

"I reject the monastic discipline" - the rejection is not by a synonym. "I reject the monks' monastic discipline, the nuns' monastic discipline, the first pārājika, the second, the third, the fourth pārājika, the saṅghādisesa, the thullaccaya, the pācittiya, the pāṭidesanīya, the dukkaṭa, the dubbhāsita" - thus through such synonyms for the monastic discipline there is rejection of the training.

"I reject the Pātimokkha" - the rejection is not by a synonym. "I reject the monks' Pātimokkha, the nuns' Pātimokkha" - thus through a synonym for the Pātimokkha there is rejection of the training.

"I reject the recitation" - the rejection is not by a synonym. "I reject the recitation of the monks' Pātimokkha, the recitation of the nuns' Pātimokkha, the first recitation of the Pātimokkha, the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth recitation of the Pātimokkha, the recitation of the Perfectly Enlightened One, the recitation of the One

of Boundless Wisdom, the recitation of the One of Excellent Wisdom, the recitation of the One Whose Mark is Enlightenment, the recitation of the Wise One, the recitation of the One Free from Delusion, the recitation of the One Who Has Broken Through the Impediment, the recitation of the One Who Has Won the Victory" - thus through such synonyms for the recitation there is rejection of the training.

"I reject the preceptor" - the rejection is not by a synonym. "He who gave me the going forth, he who gave me the full ordination, he by whose authority I went forth, he by whose authority I was fully ordained, she whose authority was the basis for my going forth, she whose authority was the basis for my full ordination - that one I reject" - thus through a synonym for the preceptor there is rejection of the training.

"I reject the teacher" - the rejection is not by a synonym. "He who gave me the going forth, he who made the announcement for me, he in dependence on whom I dwell, he from whom I have texts recited, he whom I question, he who recites texts for me, he who makes me answer questions - that one I reject" - thus through a synonym for the teacher there is rejection of the training.

"I reject the co-resident pupil" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "The one whom I gave the going forth to, the one whom I gave the full ordination to, the one who went forth under me, the one who received full ordination under me, the one whose going forth has me as its basis, the one whose full ordination has me as its basis - him I reject." Thus, by a synonym for the co-resident pupil, there is rejection of the training.

"I reject the pupil" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "The one whom I gave the going forth to, the one whom I proclaimed, the one who dwells depending on me, the one who has me recite to him, the one who questions me, the one to whom I recite, the one whom I have questioned - him I reject." Thus, by a synonym for the pupil, there is rejection of the training.

"I reject one with the same preceptor" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "The one whom my preceptor gave the going forth to, the one whom he gave the full ordination to, the one who went forth under him, the one who received full ordination under him, the one whose going forth has him as its basis, the one whose full ordination has him as its basis - him I reject." Thus, by a synonym for one with the same preceptor, there is rejection of the training.

"I reject one with the same teacher" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "The one whom my teacher gave the going forth to, the one whom he proclaimed, the one who dwells depending on him, the one who has him recite to him and questions him, the one to whom my teacher recites, the one whom he has questioned - him I reject." Thus, by a synonym for one with the same teacher, there is rejection of the training.

"I reject a fellow in the holy life" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "The one with whom I train in the higher virtue, the one with whom I train in the higher mind and higher wisdom - him I reject." Thus, by a synonym for a fellow in the holy life, there is rejection of the training.

"Consider me a layman" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "Consider me a householder, a farmer, a merchant, a cowherd, a destitute person, one with a topknot, one devoted to sensual pleasures." Thus, by a synonym for a layman, there

is rejection of the training.

"Consider me a lay follower" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "Consider me a two-word lay follower, a three-word lay follower, one who goes for refuge to the Buddha, one who goes for refuge to the Dhamma and the Community, a lay follower who observes the five precepts, a lay follower who observes the ten precepts." Thus, by a synonym for a lay follower, there is rejection of the training.

"Consider me a monastery attendant" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "Consider me one who makes things allowable, one who renders services, one who tends the greens, one who distributes gruel, one who distributes fruit, one who distributes hard food." Thus, by a synonym for a monastery attendant, there is rejection of the training.

"Consider me a novice" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "Consider me a boy, a young lad, a servant boy, a topknot youth, a candidate for the recluse's life." Thus, by a synonym for a novice, there is rejection of the training.

"Consider me a heretical teacher" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "Consider me a Nigaṇṭha, an Ājīvaka, an ascetic, a wandering ascetic, a white-clad ascetic." Thus, by a synonym for a heretical teacher, there is rejection of the training.

"Consider me a follower of a heretical teacher" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "Consider me a follower of the Nigaṇṭhas, a follower of the Ājīvakas, a follower of the ascetics, a follower of the wandering ascetics, a follower of the white-clad ascetics." Thus, by a synonym for a follower of a heretical teacher, there is rejection of the training.

"Consider me not a recluse" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "Consider me one of bad virtue, one of evil nature, one of impure and suspect conduct, one of concealed actions, not a recluse though claiming to be a recluse, not living the holy life though claiming to live the holy life, inwardly rotten, oozing with defilements, one born of rubbish, a hollow one." Thus, by a synonym for not a recluse, there is rejection of the training.

"Consider me not a disciple of the son of the Sakyan" - the rejection is not by the synonym itself. "Consider me not a son of the Perfectly Enlightened by himself, not a son of the one of boundless wisdom, not a son of the one of supreme wisdom, not a son of the one whose mark is enlightenment, not a son of the wise one, not a son of the one free from delusion, not a son of the one who has broken through the stake, not a son of the one who has conquered in victory." Thus, by such synonyms for not a disciple of the son of the Sakyan, there is rejection of the training.

"By those characteristics, by those signs, by those marks" means by those synonyms for the Buddha and so forth, stated in the manner beginning with "synonyms for the Buddha." For the synonyms are called "characteristics" because they are the reason for the rejection of the training; they are called "signs" because they indicate the nature of the Buddha and so forth, or because they constitute the nature of the rejection of the training; and they are called "marks" because they are the cause of recognising the rejection of the training, just as moles and the like are marks for people. "Thus, monks" - he spoke this as a delimitation because there is no other

reason for the rejection of the training beyond this. For the meaning here is this: in just this way there is both a declaration of weakness and a rejection of the training; there is no reason beyond this.

54. Having thus shown the characteristic of rejection of the training, for the purpose of avoiding confusion regarding non-rejection, and for the purpose of showing the failure of that very characteristic of rejection of the training by way of persons and so forth, he stated "And how, monks, is the training not rejected" etc. Therein, "by whatever characteristics" etc. is according to the method already stated. "A mad man" means one maddened by a yakkha, or one maddened by bile, or anyone with distorted perception; if he rejects, the training is not rejected. "Of a mad man" means of just such a mad man. For if in the presence of such a one, a person of normal mind rejects the training, the mad man does not understand, and the training is simply not rejected. "One who is mentally deranged" refers to one maddened by a yakkha. But in the former term, by the general designation "mad man," both "one maddened by a yakkha and one maddened by bile" were stated. The distinction between the two will become evident in the section on non-offence. Thus, one who is mentally deranged rejects the training, it is simply not rejected. Even when rejected in his presence, since he does not understand, it is simply not rejected.

"One afflicted by pain" means one struck by intense painful feeling, overcome by fainting. Even when rejected by him while delirious, it is simply not rejected. Even when rejected in his presence, since he does not understand, it is not rejected.

"In the presence of a deity" means even when rejected in the presence of any deity from an earth-bound deity up to a deity of the Akanitṭha realm, it is simply not rejected. "Of an animal" means even when rejected in the presence of a nāga youth, or a supaṇṇa youth, or any among kinnara, elephants, monkeys and the like, it is simply not rejected. In that regard, he stated that in the presence of mad men and the like, it is not rejected because of their inability to understand. In the presence of a deity, because of their ability to understand too quickly. Deities are of great wisdom, having taken rebirth with three root causes, and they understand too quickly, and this mind is indeed of rapid change. Therefore, for a person whose mind is swift, considering that "let there not be destruction too quickly" merely by the mind's inclination, the rejection of the training in the presence of a deity was disallowed.

But among human beings there is no fixed rule. When rejected in the presence of any intelligent person, whether of the same kind or of a different kind, whether a householder or one gone forth, it is indeed rejected. But if he does not understand, it is simply not rejected - showing this meaning, he stated "in the noble language" etc. Therein, "the noble language" means the noble mode of expression, the Māgadhī language. "Barbarian language" means any non-noble language such as that of the Andhra-Dravidians and the like. "And he does not understand" means that due to unfamiliarity with a different language, or due to being unskilled in the conventions of the Buddha's time, he does not understand "this is the meaning that he is speaking." "In jest" means that, wishing to say something else hastily, he hastily says "I reject the Buddha." "In fun" means by mistaken utterance, saying something else while intending "I shall say something else." If one asks, what is the difference from the former? The former is the saying of something else even by a wise person due to haste. But this is the saying of something else by one who stumbles due to dullness,

due to confusion, due to lack of skill, while intending "I shall say something else."

"Not wishing to announce, he announces" means he recites the text of this training rule, inquires about it, learns it, chants it, or praises it - this is called "not wishing to announce, he announces." "Wishing to announce, he does not announce" means that while rejecting the training by making his weakness known, he does not make a verbal utterance - this is called "wishing to announce, he does not announce." "He announces to one who is not intelligent" means he announces to one who is elderly and resembling a clay figure, or to one of heavy intellect who is not skilled in the matter, or to village children who have not reached the age of discernment. "He does not announce to one who is intelligent" means he does not announce to a wise person who is capable of understanding. "Or else at all" means that by whatever manner the training is rejected through such expressions as "I reject the Buddha," he does not announce by making even a single verbal utterance from among them. "Thus" defines the characteristic of non-rejection. For here the meaning is this: "In just this way the training is not rejected, and not for any other reason."

The analysis of the renunciation of the training is finished.

Commentary on the Original Enactment

55. Now, in order to show the meaning of "should engage in sexual intercourse" and so forth, he said "sexual intercourse means" and so forth. Therein, "sexual intercourse means" - this is the heading term for the sexual intercourse that is to be explained. "Bad teaching" means the practice of the bad, of low people. "Village practice" means the practice indulged in by those who dwell in villages. "Outcast practice" means the practice of outcasts; or because of the raining down of defilements, it is itself an outcast practice, thus "outcast practice". "Gross" means it is corrupt because of being corrupted by defilements, and coarse because of being unrefined, thus "gross". And from this point onwards, in the three terms, "yo so" should be converted and made into "yaṃ taṃ" and construed thus - "that which is gross, that which ends in water, that which is secret." And here, since even the seeing, the grasping, the touching, the contact, and the rubbing that are accessories of that act are gross, therefore that act too is gross. That which is gross - that is sexual intercourse. "Water is taken at its end for the purpose of cleansing" - thus "ending in water"; ending in water itself is "that which ends in water"; that which ends in water - that is sexual intercourse. "Secret" because it is to be done in a concealed, hidden place. That which is secret - that is sexual intercourse. Thus the construction should be understood.

Because it is to be entered upon by two with two, it is the attainment of two by two. Therein the explanation is - "that which is the attainment of two by two - that is sexual intercourse." But here, concluding all that together, he said "this is sexual intercourse." For what reason is it called sexual intercourse? Because it is the practice of both who are lustful, deeply attached, oozing with desire, and obsessed - of both who are alike - for that reason it is called sexual intercourse.

"Engages in means" - this is the matrix term for the purpose of showing the manner in which it is said "should engage in" - in what manner one engages. In "whoever inserts genitals into genitals" and so forth - whatever monk inserts his own genitals

into the genitals of a woman, his own organ into the organ of a woman, even to the smallest extent of a single sesame seed, into a moist space untouched by wind, he engages in; by this much he reaches a breach of virtue and is expelled.

And here, in the female genital, there are four sides and the middle - thus five positions are obtained. In the male genital, there are four sides, the middle, and the upper part - thus six. Therefore, one who inserts from below into the female genital is also expelled. One who inserts from above, one who inserts from both sides, and one who inserts through the middle having released the four positions - he is also expelled. But one who inserts the male genital touching the lower part is also expelled. One who inserts touching the upper part, one who inserts touching both sides, one who inserts touching just the middle, and one who inserts touching the upper part having contracted it like a bent finger at the back of the middle joint - he is also expelled. Therein, for one inserting it straight like a balance beam, there are four sides and the middle - thus five positions; for one inserting it having contracted it, there are four sides, and the upper part and the middle - thus five positions - thus in all, there are ten positions in the male genital.

If one inserts into the genital a skin-callus or a blister that has arisen there but whose bodily sensitivity is not destroyed, there is an offence of expulsion. If one inserts dead skin or a dried blister whose bodily sensitivity is destroyed, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Even for one who inserts hair or fingers, toes, seeds and so forth with the enjoyment of sexual intercourse, it is only an offence of wrong-doing. And since this discussion of sexual intercourse is a gross discussion, an improper discussion, therefore one who discusses this or any other such matter in the Vinaya should do so having established attention to repulsiveness, the perception of being a recluse, and moral shame and moral dread, having aroused reverence towards the Perfectly Enlightened One, and having reflected upon the quality of compassion of the Protector of the World whose compassion is unequalled. For that Blessed One, even though he himself had entirely turned away from sensual pleasures, out of sympathy for beings, out of compassion for the world, on account of his compassion towards beings, spoke such a discussion for the purpose of laying down training rules. One should discuss it having reflected upon the quality of compassion of the Protector of the World thus: "Oh, the quality of compassion of the Teacher!"

Moreover, if the Blessed One were not to speak such a discourse in every respect, who would know "in so many

In such cases there is expulsion, in so many cases a grave offence, in so many cases a wrong-doing. Therefore, neither one who listens nor one who discusses should sit laughing with teeth bared, covering the mouth with a fan. Having reflected that "Even the Perfectly Enlightened One discussed such matters," one should discuss it being bold, endowed with moral shame and moral dread, and being like the Teacher.

The original laying down is finished.

In the section on supplementary rules - "Even to the extent of" means by the very lowest limit. "Even with an animal" means even with one gone to the animal realm by way of rebirth-linking. "How much more with a human woman" means first and

foremost with a woman of human birth. And here, only those animal females that constitute a basis for expulsion should be understood as "animal females," not all of them. Herein, this is the delimitation -

Among the footless, the snake and the fish; among the two-footed, the hen;
Among the four-footed, the cat - these are the bases for this expulsion.

Therein, by the mention of the snake, all long-bodied species such as pythons, rat-snakes and the like are included. Therefore, among the long-bodied species, wherever it is possible to insert even to the extent of a sesame seed into any one of the three passages, that is a basis for expulsion. The remainder should be understood as a basis for wrong-doing. By the mention of the fish, all aquatic species such as fish, turtles, frogs and the like are included. Therein too, among the long-bodied species, the basis for expulsion and the basis for wrong-doing should be understood in the same manner as stated. But this is the distinction - There are frogs called moth-mouthed frogs; their mouth formation is large, but the opening is small, and insertion there is not possible; However, the mouth formation falls under the category of a wound, therefore that should be understood as a basis for a grave offence. By the mention of the hen, all winged species such as crows, pigeons and the like are included. Therein too, the basis for expulsion and the basis for wrong-doing should be understood in the same manner as stated. By the mention of the cat, all four-footed species such as tree-dogs, mongooses, monitor lizards and the like are included. Therein too, the basis for expulsion and the basis for wrong-doing should be understood in the same manner as stated.

"Expelled" means defeated, having incurred defeat. For this word "expelled" applies to training rules, offences, and persons. Therein, it should be understood as applying to a training rule thus: "It is impossible, Ānanda, it cannot happen that the Truth-finder would abolish a training rule of expulsion laid down for disciples on account of the Vajjians or the sons of the Vajjians." "You, monk, have committed an offence of expulsion" - thus it applies to an offence. "We are not expelled; he who stole is the one who is expelled" - thus it should be understood as applying to a person. But in passages such as "one should accuse with an offence of expulsion," they say it applies to a dhamma. But since therein "dhamma" is intended in some places as an offence and in some places as a training rule itself, therefore it should not be stated separately. Therein, the training rule defeats whoever transgresses it, therefore it is called "expulsion." But the offence defeats whoever commits it, therefore it is called "expulsion." A person, since he is defeated, having incurred defeat, therefore is called "expelled." For it is with reference to this very meaning that in the Parivāra too -

"That which is called 'expelled', hear it as it truly is;
Fallen, defeated, and dropped, indeed repudiated from the Good Teaching;
Communion too therein exists not, therefore it is thus said" - this was stated.

For the meaning here is this: "The person who transgresses that training rule and has incurred the offence is fallen - all should be connected thus. 'Therefore it is said' means for the reason that he is not a recluse, not a disciple of the son of the Sakyan, fallen away, cut off, defeated from the dispensation, therefore it is said. How? 'He is expelled.'

'They dwell together herein' is communion; to show that, having said 'communion means', he stated 'common legal act' and so forth. Therein, this is the explanation together with the syntactical construction: The fourfold act of the Community, because it is to be performed together by monks of regular standing within the boundary delimited by the *sīmā*, is called common legal act. Likewise, the fivefold recitation of the *Pātimokkha*, because it is to be recited together, is called common recitation. The training rule that has been laid down, because it is to be trained in equally by all conscientious persons, is called same training. Herein, since all conscientious persons dwell together in these acts and so forth, and not a single one is seen outside of them, therefore, taking all of these together, he said 'this is communion'. And that communion of the aforesaid kind does not exist together with that person; for that reason that expelled person is said to be 'not in communion'.

56. Having thus analysed the training rule as stated in the order of its terms, now, in order to show the manner in which it is said "should engage in" in the phrase "should engage in," the matrix term "one is said to engage in" was established, and then "with the sexual organ into the sexual organ, with the genital into the genital" was stated. Therein, since it is not merely the sexual organ of a woman alone that constitutes the basis for a defeat offence, nor only that of a human woman, and since the sexual organs of women made of gold, silver, and the like do not constitute a basis at all; therefore, in order to show whatever constitutes a basis, by the method beginning with "three women," having stated the beings whose sexual organs constitute bases, he stated those bases by the method beginning with "with a human woman in three passages."

Therein, three women, three hermaphrodites, three eunuchs, and three men - there are twelve beings as the supports of the sexual organs that constitute the bases for defeat offences. Among these, women and men are well known. The classification of eunuchs and hermaphrodites will be made clear in the commentary on the Ordination Chapter.

In the phrase "for one engaging in sexual intercourse with a human woman in three passages," the meaning should be understood as "in three passages of a human woman." Thus everywhere. All these together are: three passages of a human woman, three of a non-human woman, and three of an animal woman - making nine; nine for human hermaphrodites and the rest; two each for human eunuchs and the rest, making six; likewise for human men and the rest - there are thirty passages in all. In any one of these, which are reckoned as sexual organs, one who inserts one's own genital even to the extent of a sesame seed and engages in sexual intercourse commits a defeat offence.

Commentary on the First Tetrad Discussion

57. However, one who commits an offence does so only with the intention for intercourse, not without it; therefore, showing that characteristic, the Blessed One stated beginning with "when a monk has the intention for intercourse present." Therein, "of a monk" means of a monk who engages in sexual intercourse. "The intention for intercourse present" is a nominative case used in the locative sense; the meaning is "when the intention for intercourse has arisen." "For one inserting his

genitals into the anus" means for one inserting into that passage through which excrement passes, one's own genitals, the male organ, even to the extent of a sesame fruit. "There is an offence entailing defeat" means the meaning is that there is an offence of defeat for him. Alternatively, "offence" means there is a committing of an offence. "Entailing defeat" means of a matter entailing defeat. This same method applies everywhere.

58. Having thus shown the offence for one who enters with the intention of sexual intercourse itself, now, because that entering is not only by one's own initiative, but also occurs by the initiative of others. And therein too, the offence is only for one who consents, one who possesses the intention of sexual intercourse, not for the other. Therefore, for the protection of those sons of good families who have gone forth out of faith, who are rightly practising, and who do not consent even when there is entering by the initiative of others, he stated the passage beginning with "enemies of a monk, a human woman."

Therein, "enemies" means those who seek, who desire the opposite side; enemies who are monks themselves are "enemies of a monk"; this is a designation for hostile monks who are of dissimilar conduct. "Having brought a human woman near the monk" means: overcome by jealousy, wishing to destroy that monk, having enticed her with material gifts or through the bond of friendship, having said "do this task for us," having brought some human woman during the night-time to the dwelling place of that monk. "They sit down on his genitals with the anus" means: having seized that monk firmly by the hands, feet, head and so forth, holding him motionless, they sit down with the woman's anus upon that monk's genitals; the meaning is "they join together."

In the passage beginning with "if he": if that monk consents to, acquiesces in, the entering of his own genitals inside the anus, at that moment he gives rise to the intention of sexual intercourse. "Consents to the entered" means he acquiesces; at the time of having entered, he gives rise to the intention of sexual intercourse. "Consents to the remaining" means he acquiesces; at the time of reaching the state of remaining, at the time of the emission of semen, he gives rise to the intention of sexual intercourse. "Consents to the withdrawal" means he acquiesces; at the time of removal, he gives rise to the intention of re-engaging in sexual intercourse. Thus, one who consents at these four stages is not able to say "this was done by my enemy ascetics," and he incurs precisely an offence entailing defeat. And just as one who consents to these four incurs the offence; so too, one who does not consent to the first one but consents to the remaining three, or one who does not consent to the first two but consents to the remaining two, or one who does not consent to the first three but consents to the remaining one, also incurs the offence. But one who does not consent at all, regarding the entered genitals as though entered into the mouth of a venomous serpent or into a pit of burning coals, does not incur an offence. Therefore it was said - "He does not consent to the entering, etc. he does not consent to the withdrawal, there is no offence." For, protecting such a person who has undertaken insight meditation, who has no regard for body or life, who sees all sense bases as blazing with the eleven fires, and who sees the five strands of sensual pleasure as

executioners with raised swords, and frustrating the desires of his enemies, the Blessed One extracted and established this set of four beginning with "he does not consent to the entering."

The discourse on the first group of four is finished.

Discussion on the Sixty-Nine and Two Hundred Tetrads

59-60. Having thus shown the first set of four, now because enemies of a monk, having brought a woman, sit down not only with the anus, but also with the urinary passage and with the mouth. And having brought a woman, some bring one who is awake, some one who is asleep, some one who is intoxicated, some one who is mad, some one who is heedless - the meaning is one who is otherwise engaged, with a distracted mind. Some bring one who is dead and not eaten - the meaning is one whose orifice has not been eaten by dogs, jackals and the like. Some bring one who is dead and mostly not eaten - "mostly not eaten" means one in whose orifice, whether the anus, the urinary passage, or the mouth, the greater portion has not been eaten. Some bring one who is dead and mostly eaten - "mostly eaten" means one in whose orifice such as the anus and so forth, much has been eaten and little has not been eaten. And they bring not only a human woman, but also a non-human woman and an animal woman. And they bring not only a woman of the aforementioned kind, but also a hermaphrodite, a eunuch, and a man. Therefore, showing further sets of four by way of these, he said beginning with "enemies of a monk, a human woman who is awake."

Therein, for the purpose of avoiding confusion regarding the text, the stated sets of four should be understood by enumeration thus: In the case of a human woman, by way of the three passages, there are three plain sets of four, three awake-sets of four, three asleep-sets of four, three intoxicated-sets of four, three mad-sets of four, three heedless-sets of four, three dead-and-not-eaten-sets of four, three mostly-not-eaten-sets of four, and three mostly-eaten-sets of four - thus twenty-seven sets of four. Likewise for a non-human woman; likewise for an animal woman - thus in the woman section there are eighty-one sets of four. And just as in the woman section, so too in the hermaphrodite section. But in the eunuch and man sections, by way of two passages, there are fifty-four each. Thus altogether there are two hundred and seventy sets of four, and they are clear in meaning.

But here in all the sections, regarding the passage "dead and mostly not eaten, eaten," this is the determination: In the island of Tambapaṇṇi, it is said, there were two elders who were bearers of the Vinaya and had the same teacher - the Elder Upatissa and the Elder Phussadeva. When the great peril arose, they preserved and protected the Vinaya Piṭaka. Of them, the Elder Upatissa was the more learned. He too had two pupils - the Elder Mahāpaduma and the Elder Mahāsuma. Of them, the Elder Mahāsuma heard the Vinaya Piṭaka nine times, and the Elder Mahāpaduma heard it nine times together with him, and separately nine times alone - thus eighteen times; he was the more learned of them. Of them, the Elder Mahāsuma, having heard the Vinaya Piṭaka nine times, left his teacher and went to the far side of the Ganges. Then the Elder Mahāpaduma said: "Bold indeed is this bearer of the Vinaya who thinks he should go and dwell elsewhere, leaving his teacher while he is

still alive. Is it not the case that while the teacher is alive, even having learnt the Vinaya Piṭaka and the Commentary many times, one should not let them go, but should listen constantly and recite them year after year?"

At the time of such monks who held the Vinaya in high regard, one day the Elder Upatissa was seated expounding this passage in the first Pārājika training rule to five hundred pupils headed by the Elder Mahāpaduma. His pupils asked him - "Venerable sir, when mostly not eaten there is an offence entailing defeat, when mostly eaten there is a grave offence - when half eaten, what should it be?" The elder said - "Friends, when Buddhas lay down an offence entailing defeat, they do not lay it down leaving a remainder; rather, making it without remainder, encompassing everything, cutting off the stream, they lay down an offence entailing defeat only for a matter entailing defeat. For this training rule concerns what is blameworthy in the world, not what is blameworthy by regulation. Therefore, if there were an offence entailing defeat when half eaten, the Perfectly Enlightened One would have laid it down. But here no semblance of an offence entailing defeat is seen; only a grave offence is seen."

Furthermore, when laying down the offence entailing defeat regarding a dead body, the Blessed One established it at "mostly not eaten" to show that "beyond that there is no offence entailing defeat." When laying down the grave offence, he established it at "mostly eaten" to show that "beyond that there is no grave offence" - this should be understood thus. And this matter of "eaten" and "not eaten" should be understood only in regard to a dead body, not in regard to a living one. For in the case of a living body, even if there remains only a fingernail's breadth of skin and flesh or a sinew, it is still an offence entailing defeat. Even if the organ has been entirely eaten and there is no skin or hide, if the shape of the organ is discernible and penetration occurs, it is still an offence entailing defeat. But when the shape of the organ has been completely removed, the entire organ cut away, pared all around and torn off, there is a grave offence on account of the wound. For one who makes an attempt upon a piece of flesh that has fallen from the organ, there is an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of a dead body, however, even if the entire body has been eaten, even if it has not been eaten, but the three passages have not been eaten, for one who makes an attempt upon them, there is an offence entailing defeat. When mostly not eaten, it is still an offence entailing defeat. When half-eaten and when mostly eaten, there is a grave offence.

In the case of a living body of humans, for one who inserts even a sesame-seed's worth of his genital into wounds made by knives and such in the eyes, nose, ear-holes, or bladder sheaths, with lust for sexual intercourse, there is only a grave offence. In the rest of the body, in the armpits and such, there is an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of a dead body that is still fresh, in a field of defeat there is an offence entailing defeat, in a field of grave offence there is a grave offence, in a field of wrong-doing there is an offence of wrong-doing. But when the body has become bloated, putrid, swarming with blue flies, infested with colonies of worms, and impossible to approach due to the state of a corpse with pus oozing from the nine wound-openings, then it relinquishes the basis for an offence entailing defeat and the basis for a grave offence; in such a body, for any attempt anywhere, there is only an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of animals - elephants, horses, bulls, donkeys,

camels, buffaloes and such - in the nostril, there is a grave offence. In the bladder sheath, there is only a grave offence. For all animals, in wounds of the eyes and ears, there is an offence of wrong-doing, and in the rest of the body too, there is only an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of dead ones, in a fresh body, in a field of defeat there is an offence entailing defeat, in a field of grave offence there is a grave offence, in a field of wrong-doing there is an offence of wrong-doing.

But in a putrid corpse, in the manner stated above, everywhere there is an offence of wrong-doing. With lust for bodily contact or with lust for sexual intercourse, without inserting into the bladder sheath of a living man, one touches organ with organ - there is an offence of wrong-doing. With lust for sexual intercourse, without inserting into a woman, one touches organ with organ - there is a grave offence. But in the Great Commentary it is stated: "One who touches a woman's organ with lust for sexual intercourse with the mouth - there is a grave offence." In the Leather Chapter, based on the originating incident that "the group-of-six monks, in the river Aciravatī, seized cows that were crossing by the horns, seized them by the ears, seized them by the neck, seized them by the tail, mounted their backs, and with lustful minds touched their genitals," it was stated without distinction: "Monks, one should not touch the genitals with a lustful mind. Whoever should touch them, there is a grave offence." All of that should be reconciled and understood in a way that is not contradictory. And how is it not contradictory? As for what is stated in the Great Commentary: "One touches with lust for sexual intercourse with the mouth." Therein, "mouth" is intended to mean the mouth of the organ. And because it is stated "with lust for sexual intercourse," this very meaning should be understood as the intention there. For there is no attempt at sexual intercourse upon a woman's organ with the ordinary mouth. In the Chapter too, it should be understood that the grave offence was stated with reference to those who, mounting the backs, touched organ with organ with lust for sexual intercourse. For otherwise it would be an offence of wrong-doing. But some say: "In the Chapter too, the grave offence was stated with reference to touching with the mouth, because of the grossness of the act. In the Commentary too, it was stated 'one who touches a woman's organ with lust for sexual intercourse with the mouth - there is a grave offence,' having taken it as spoken with reference to that." Therefore, having carefully considered, whichever of the two judgements is more fitting should be adopted. But those who know the Vinaya commend the former. However, for one who touches a woman's organ with the ordinary mouth or with the mouth of the organ, with lust for bodily contact, there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Community. For one who touches the vagina of an animal female with the mouth of the organ, in the manner stated, there is a grave offence. With lust for bodily contact, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

The discourse on the sixty-nine and two hundred groups of four is finished.

Discussion on the Classification of the Stuffed Tetrad

61-62. Thus the Blessed One, having extracted the seven hundred and twenty-four sets of four for the purpose of protecting a monk who is practising, seeing that "now in the future, evil monks who will deliberately raise the pretext 'this is covered, nothing sentient touches the sentient, what fault is there in this?' - for them there will be no foothold in the dispensation," and dividing each set of four among those seven

hundred and twenty-four sets of four by the four distinctions beginning with covered, etc., showing this, he spoke beginning with "Enemies of a monk, having brought a human woman near the monk, with the anus, with the vagina, with the mouth, sit down on his genitals - of one covered on one uncovered."

Therein, in the passages beginning with "of one covered on one uncovered," the construction should be understood in this manner: "of a covered woman, with the anus, with the vagina, with the mouth, they sit down on the genitals of an uncovered monk." Therein, "covered" means one whose any passage among the three passages is concealed by wrapping around or by inserting inside, with any cloth, or leaf, or bark strip, or leather, or a strip of lead, etc. "Covered" means one whose genitals are concealed by any of those same cloths, etc. Therein, whether the sentient touches the non-sentient, or the non-sentient touches the sentient, or the non-sentient touches the non-sentient, or the sentient touches the sentient, if it has been stated that there is an offence entailing defeat when a certain amount has entered, and that much enters, in all cases for one who consents, in the domain of an offence entailing defeat there is an offence entailing defeat; in the domain of a grave offence there is a grave offence, and in the domain of a wrong-doing there is only a wrong-doing. If the female organ is made into a stump and covered, for one who touches the stump there is a wrong-doing. If the male organ is made into a stump and covered, for one who inserts into the stump there is a wrong-doing. If both are made into stumps and covered, for one who touches a stump with a stump there is a wrong-doing. If something such as a bamboo joint or the like has been inserted into the female organ, and one touching its lower part inserts even to the extent of a sesame fruit, there is an offence entailing defeat. Even if touching the upper part, or on both sides, or even on one side, one inserts, there is an offence entailing defeat. Even if without touching all four sides, having inserted, one touches even its base, there is an offence entailing defeat. But if without touching the sides or the base, having inserted by making it go only through space, one withdraws, there is a wrong-doing. If one touches the stump on the outside, there is only a wrong-doing. And as has been stated regarding the female organ, so should the characteristic be understood everywhere.

The discourse on the classification of the group of four concerning stuffed articles is finished.

Commentary on the Classification of the Tetrad Concerning a Monk's Adversary

63-64. Having thus stated the classification of the sets of four regarding the one who is spread out, now, because they not only bring human women and so forth near the monk himself, but also bring the monk near them, therefore, showing that classification, he set forth all those sets of four once again by the method beginning with "enemies of a monk, having brought a monk near a human woman." The determination regarding those should be understood in the manner already stated.

The commentary on the classification of the group of four in terms of the monk's adversary is finished.

Discussion on the Classification of the Tetrad Concerning a King's Adversary and Others

65. However, since it is not only enemies of a monk who act thus, but enemies of a king and so forth also act thus, therefore, showing that classification as well, he

stated "enemies of a king" and so forth. Therein, kings themselves being enemies means enemies of a king. And it should be understood that they bring whether bringing themselves or having others bring. Thieves themselves being enemies means enemies of a thief. "Cheats" means urbane, deceitful men devoted to amusements connected with sexual intercourse, or those addicted to women, those addicted to liquor, and so forth; cheats themselves being enemies means enemies of a cheat. "Gandha" means the heart is referred to; those who extract it are "heart-extractors" (uppalagandhā); heart-extractors themselves being enemies means enemies of heart-extractors. These, it is said, do not live by farming, trade, and so forth, but support their wives and children by committing highway robbery, village raids, and the like. They, aspiring for the success of their undertaking, having invoked the deities, extract the hearts of humans for the purpose of making offerings to them. And at all times humans are difficult to obtain. But monks dwelling in the forest are easy to obtain. They, having seized a virtuous monk, thinking "the killing of a virtuous one is indeed a serious matter," bring human women and the like for the purpose of destroying his virtue; or they lead him there. This here is the distinction. The remainder should be understood by the method already stated. And in these four cases as well, the sets of four should be understood in the manner stated in the case of enemies of a monk. But in the canonical text they are stated in brief.

The discourse on the classification of the group of four in every respect is finished.

Commentary on the Section on Offences and Non-Offences

66. Now, regarding what was stated as "for one who engages in sexual intercourse through the three passages of a human woman" and so forth, for the purpose of removing confusion, he stated "a passage into a passage" and so forth. Therein, "a passage into a passage" means he inserts his male organ into one of the three passages of a woman, or alternatively, when two passages are conjoined, he inserts through the urinary passage into the excretory passage, or through the excretory passage into the urinary passage. "A passage into a non-passage" means having inserted through the urinary passage and so forth, he withdraws through a wound adjacent to it. "A non-passage into a passage" means having inserted through a wound adjacent to a passage, he withdraws through the passage. "A non-passage into a non-passage" means having inserted through one of two conjoined wounds, he withdraws through the second. In accordance with this discourse, wherever wounds are summarised, a grave offence should be understood.

Now, regarding what will be stated further on as "there is no offence for one who does not know, for one who does not consent," for the purpose of removing confusion, he stated "a monk against a sleeping monk" and so forth. Therein this is the intention - One who, having awakened, consents - he is not freed by saying "he transgressed against me while I was asleep; I did not know." "Both should be removed" means here that both should be removed by the removal of their status. In that case, there is no need for a formal admission from the defiler; the one defiled should be questioned and removed upon his admission. If he does not consent, he should not be removed. This same method applies also in the case of novices.

Having thus shown the respective offences and non-offences in each case, now showing only the non-offence, he stated "there is no offence for one who does not know" and so forth. Therein, "one who does not know" means one who has fallen into deep sleep and does not know even the attempt made by another, like the monk who had gone for his day's abiding in the Great Wood at Vesālī. For one of such nature, there is no offence. And this too was said - "I did not know, Blessed One." "There is no offence, monk, for one who does not know." "One who does not consent" means one who, even though knowing, does not consent, like the monk who immediately rose up right there. And this too was said - "I did not consent, Blessed One." "There is no offence, monk, for one who does not consent."

"A mad man" means one maddened by bile. For bile is of two kinds: Bound bile and unbound bile. Therein, unbound bile pervades the entire body like blood; when it is disturbed, beings experience itching, scabies, trembling of the body, and so forth. These subside through medical treatment. Bound bile, however, is situated in the bile sac. When it is disturbed, beings become mad, with distorted perception; having abandoned moral shame and moral dread, they engage in improper conduct. Even while transgressing minor and major training rules, they do not know it. They are incurable even through medical treatment. For a mad man of such nature, there is no offence.

"Mentally deranged" means one whose mind is unhinged, and is called one maddened by spirits. Spirits, it is said, by showing terrifying objects, or by inserting their hand through the mouth and crushing the heart-materiality, make beings mentally deranged and with distorted perception. For one of such a nature who is mentally deranged, there is no offence. However, the distinction between these two is as follows: One maddened by bile is perpetually mad and does not regain normal perception. One maddened by spirits regains normal perception from time to time. But here, whether one is maddened by bile or maddened by spirits, whoever has entirely lost mindfulness and knows nothing, who goes about trampling fire, gold, excrement, and sandalwood alike - for one of such a nature, there is no offence. But for one who, having regained perception from time to time, acts knowingly, there is indeed an offence.

"One afflicted by pain" means one who, being afflicted by intense painful feeling, knows nothing; for one of such a nature, there is no offence.

"The first offender" means one who is the first in each respective act. But here the Elder Sudinna is the first offender; for him there is no offence. For the remaining cases involving the female monkey, the novice, the Vajjian sons, etc., there is indeed an offence.

The commentary on the word-analysis is finished.

Miscellaneous Discussion

For the purpose of skill in this training rule, this miscellaneous section should be understood:

"Origin and action, then perception and with consciousness;
Worldly wrong and deed, wholesome and with feeling."

Therein, "origin" means, in the sense of including all, the six origins of training rules. These will become clear in the Parivāra. In brief, a training rule: there is one with six origins, there is one with four origins, there is one with three origins, there is one with the kathina-origin, there is one with the sheep's wool-origin, there is one with the setting aside of responsibility-origin, etc.

Therein also, some arise from action, some arise from non-action, some arise from action and non-action, some may arise from action or may arise from non-action, some may arise from action or may arise from action and non-action.

Therein also, there is release through perception, and there is no release through perception. Therein, that which invariably obtains the mind-factor, that has release through perception; the other has no release through perception.

Again, there is that which is with consciousness, and there is that which is without consciousness. That which one commits only together with consciousness, that is with consciousness; that which one commits even without consciousness, that is without consciousness. All of that is twofold: worldly wrong and conventional wrong. Their characteristic has already been stated.

Also here, in terms of deed, wholesome, and feeling, there is a training rule that is bodily action, and there is verbal action. Therein, that which is through the body-door, that is bodily action; that which is through the verbal-door, that is verbal action - so it should be understood. Moreover, there is a training rule that is wholesome, there is one that is unwholesome, and there is one that is indeterminate. For there are exactly thirty-two consciousness-states that give rise to offences: eight sense-sphere wholesome, twelve unwholesome, ten sense-sphere functional consciousness-states, and two super-knowledge consciousness-states from the wholesome and the functional. Among these, that which one commits with wholesome consciousness, that is wholesome; with the others, the other. And there is a training rule with three feelings, there is one with two feelings, and there is one with one feeling. Therein, that which one commits while being possessed of any one of the three feelings, that has three feelings; that which one commits while being possessed of either pleasant feeling or equanimous feeling, that has two feelings; that which one commits while being possessed only of painful feeling, that has one feeling - so it should be understood. Thus:

"Origin and action, then perception and with consciousness;
Worldly wrong and deed, wholesome and with feeling."

Having understood this miscellaneous section, among those origins and so forth, this training rule, in terms of origin, has a single origin. In terms of factors, it has a dual origin; it arises from body and mind. It is an origin through action, for one commits this offence only by doing it. It is releasable through perception, because one is released through the absence of sensual perception connected with sexual intercourse. For it has been said: "There is no offence for one who does not know, for one who does not consent." One commits it only with a mind intent on sexual intercourse, not without consciousness - thus it is with consciousness. Because it is committed only through the power of lust, it is a worldly wrong. Because it arises only through the body-door, it is bodily action. However, consciousness here is merely a

factor; the nature of the deed is not determined by its power. Because it is committed with a mind of greed, it is unwholesome consciousness. One commits it either accompanied by pleasant feeling or accompanied by equanimous feeling - thus it should be understood as having two feelings. All of this applies to the offence. However, the exposition in all the commentaries has been set forth under the heading of the training rule; therefore it has been stated thus.

The miscellaneous talk is completed.

Commentary on the Precedent Cases

The female monkey and the Vajjian sons, etc. The one gone forth in old age, and the deer - what is this? These are called the summary verses of the various cases that were adjudicated by the Blessed One himself. Those cases were established by the elders who compiled the Dhamma, thinking: "The bearers of the Vinaya will learn them easily." The case verses, however, were established by the Elder Upāli while the Blessed One was still living, thinking: "By these characteristics, the bearers of the Vinaya will adjudicate the Vinaya in the future." Therefore, having carefully examined the characteristics stated herein, the first training rule should be adjudicated. And the second and so forth should be adjudicated by the characteristics stated in the adjudicated cases of the second and so forth. For the adjudicated cases are for the bearers of the Vinaya like model patterns for craftsmen.

67. Therein, the first two cases have their meaning stated in the supplementary rule itself. In the third case, "in the guise of a householder" means having become one dressed in white clothes, in the appearance of a householder. In the fourth, there is nothing to be said. In the seven cases following that, "a garment of kusa-grass" means a garment made by tying together kusa-grass. "A bark garment" is the bark-cloth of ascetics. "A garment of wooden strips" means a garment made by sewing together strips shaped like planks. "A blanket of human hair" means a blanket made by weaving threads from human hair. "A blanket of horse-hair" means a blanket made by weaving from the tail-hair of the yak. "A garment of owl's feathers" means a lower garment made from the feathers of the owl bird. "A cheetah-hide cloak" means the skin of a cheetah-deer, with its fur and hooves intact. In the twelfth case, "filled with lust" means filled with lust for bodily contact; knowing that lust, the Blessed One said: "There is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community."

68. In the thirteenth case, "Uppalavaṇṇā" refers to that elder nun who was a merchant's daughter in Sāvattthī, one who had fulfilled her aspiration over a hundred thousand aeons. Her bodily complexion was naturally exceedingly beautiful, the colour of a blue lotus, and it shone forth exceedingly due to the absence of the burning of defilements within. She received the name "Uppalavaṇṇā" on account of that very beauty of complexion. "Enamoured" means one whose mind was infatuated from the time of lay life onwards; he was, it is said, a young man related to her. "Then" is a particle used in the sense of immediately following; what is meant is "immediately after she had sat down on the small bed." For when one comes from outside during the day and sits down having closed the door, at first there is darkness. The meaning is that he did so just while that darkness had not yet disappeared for her. "Violated" means defiled. The elder nun, however, being

blameless, having established the perception of her being a recluse, sat not consenting - though touched with the intention of sexual misconduct, she was like a mass of fire, a stone pillar, or a heartwood stake of acacia. He too, having fulfilled his desire, departed. Even as he was leaving the sight of that elder nun, this great earth, though capable of supporting Mount Sineru, as if unable to support that evil man's body of a mere fathom, split open and gave way. At that very moment he became fuel for the flames of Avīci. The Blessed One, having heard this, having said "There is no offence, monks, for one who does not consent," spoke this verse in the Dhammapada with reference to the elder nun:

Like water on a lotus leaf, like a mustard seed on a needle's tip;
Whoever does not cling to sensual pleasures, him I call a brahmin."

69. In the fourteenth case, "the female organ became manifest" means that while he had fallen asleep during the night, the male form - beard, moustache, and all the rest - disappeared, and the female form arose. "That very same preceptor, that very same full ordination" means I allow that very same preceptor taken previously, that very same full ordination performed previously. A preceptor need not be taken again; the meaning is that full ordination need not be performed again. "Those very same rains retreats" means I allow that very same counting of rains retreats, from the time of full ordination as a monk up to however many rains retreats have been counted. The meaning is that the counting of rains retreats need not be made anew from this point onwards. "To associate with nuns" means the meaning is I allow her to associate with nuns, to join together with them, to be united with them. This is what is meant - it is not proper for her to dwell in the midst of monks; having gone to the nuns' quarters, let her dwell together with nuns. "Whatever offences are common to monks with nuns" means whatever offences requiring confession or requiring rehabilitation are common to monks together with nuns. "Those offences are to be emerged from in the presence of nuns" means the meaning is I allow her to emerge from those offences, all of them, by performing the disciplinary procedure that should be done by nuns, in the presence of nuns. "For those offences there is no offence" means whatever offences such as emission of semen and so forth that are not common to monks with nuns, for those there is no offence. Through the change of sex, those offences are already emerged from. Even if the original sex should arise again, for those offences there is still no offence for that person - this is the determination according to the canonical text here.

But this is the determination beyond the canonical text, based on investigation: of these two sexes, the male sex is superior, the female sex is inferior; therefore the male sex disappears through powerful unwholesome kamma. The female sex becomes established through weak wholesome kamma. But the female sex, when it disappears, disappears through weak unwholesome kamma. The male sex becomes established through powerful wholesome kamma. Thus both disappear through unwholesome kamma and are regained through wholesome kamma.

Therein, if two monks, having done recitation or discussion of the Dhamma together, lie down in one room and fall asleep, and the female organ becomes manifest in one of them, there is an offence of sleeping together for both of them. If that one, having awakened and seen that transformation in himself, being distressed and

disheartened, should inform the other during the night itself, the other should console him: "Let it be, do not worry. This is merely a fault of the round of existence. The door has been opened by the Perfectly Enlightened One; whether one be a monk or a nun, the Dhamma is unobstructed, the path to heaven is unbarred." And having consoled, one should say thus: "It is fitting for you to go to the nuns' quarters. Are there any nuns who are acquainted with you?" If she has such nuns, she should say "there are"; if she does not have them, she should say "there are not," and that monk should be told: "Please look after me; now take me first to the nuns' quarters." That monk, having taken her, should go to the presence of nuns who are either acquainted with her or acquainted with himself. And when going, one should not go alone. Together with four or five monks, having taken a torch and a walking stick, having avoided making an arrangement, one should go saying "we are going to such and such a place." If the monastery is far outside the village, there is no offence regarding the offences of travelling between villages, crossing a river, spending the night away, and falling behind the group on the way. Having gone to the nuns' quarters, those nuns should be told: "Do you know the monk named so-and-so?" "Yes, sirs." "The female organ has become manifest in him; please look after her." If they say "Very well, venerable sir, now we too shall recite, we shall listen to the Dhamma, you may go," and they look after her, and they are agreeable, supportive, and conscientious, one should not leave them and go elsewhere. If one does go, one is not freed from the offences of travelling between villages, crossing a river, spending the night away, and falling behind the group. But if they are conscientious but not supportive, it is permissible to go elsewhere. Even if they are unconscientious but do provide support, it is permissible to leave them and go elsewhere. If they are conscientious and supportive but are not relatives, and in a nearby village there are other relatives who can attend to her, they say it is fitting to go to the presence of those as well. Having gone, if she was still under dependence even as a monk, dependence should be taken in the presence of a suitable nun. If the *mātikā* or the Vinaya has been learned and well learned, there is no need to learn it again. If as a monk he was one who served the community, those fully ordained in his presence are well ordained. Dependence should be taken in the presence of another. Even those who previously dwelt in dependence on him should take dependence in the presence of another. Even a novice who has completed the required rains retreats should take a preceptor in the presence of another.

Whatever triple robe and bowl had been determined by him during his state as a monk, that determination lapses; it must be determined again. A bodice and a bathing cloth must be obtained. Whatever extra robe or extra bowl had been kept after performing a disciplinary act, all that disciplinary act lapses; it must be done again. Even the acceptance of received oil, honey, sugar and so forth lapses. If the sex changes on the seventh day from the acceptance, after accepting again, it is allowable for seven days. But whatever belonging of another monk was accepted during the time as a monk, that acceptance does not lapse. Whatever was kept undivided as common to both, the one whose sex has not changed guards that. But whatever was divided and belongs to that very one, that acceptance lapses. And this has been stated in the Parivāra:

"Oil, honey, sugar and also ghee;
Having taken it oneself, one might deposit it;

When seven days have not passed;
For one who uses when there is a reason, there is an offence;
This is a question considered by the skilful."

For this was stated with reference to the change of sex. Acceptance lapses through change of sex, through death, through renouncing the training, through reverting to the lower life, through giving to one who is not fully ordained, through relinquishing without concern, and through seizing by force. Therefore, even if just a piece of myrobalan has been accepted and kept, all his acceptance lapses. But whatever of hers has been kept in the monks' monastery, whether accepted or not accepted, she herself is the owner of all of it; it should be fetched and taken. But whatever immovable property here belongs to her, whether lodgings or trees planted by her, those should be given to whomever she wishes. Among the thirteen appointments, whatever appointment was obtained during the time as a monk, all of that ceases. The allocation of lodgings by the former ceases. If the sex changes when lodgings have been allocated by the latter, and the community of nuns wishes to give her the gain that has arisen, it should be given after making an announcement. If the sex changes for one who is undergoing probation for a concealed offence common to nuns, only the half-month penance should be given. If it changes for one who is undergoing penance, only the half-month penance should be given again. If it changes for one who has completed penance, the act of rehabilitation should be performed by the nuns. If, when the unwholesome result is exhausted, the sex changes again during the period of the half-month penance, only the six-day penance should be given. If it changes when the half-month penance has been completed, the act of rehabilitation should be performed by the monks.

In the immediately following case of the change of sex of a nun, the entire adjudication should be understood in the same manner as stated here. But this is the distinction - Even if an offence of acting as a go-between committed during the time as a nun is concealed, there is no giving of probation; only the six-day penance should be given. If the sex changes for one who is undergoing the half-month penance, there is no need for that; only the six-day penance should be given. If it changes for one who has completed penance, he should be rehabilitated by the monks without giving penance again. Then if, when penance has not been given by the monks, the sex changes again, only the half-month penance should be given by the nuns. Then if it changes again for one who is undergoing the six-day penance, only the half-month penance should be given. But when a change of sex has occurred for one who has completed penance, the act of rehabilitation should be performed by the nuns. And when the sex changes again, even for one established in the state of a nun, whatever offences were previously settled, those are well settled indeed.

70. The four cases beginning with "engaged in sexual intercourse with his mother" and so on that follow from here are clear in meaning.

71. In the case of the one with a soft back, that monk was formerly a dancer, it is said. His back was supple, having been trained for the purpose of skill in his craft. Therefore he was able to do thus.

In the case of the well-endowed one, that monk's genitals were long and hung down; therefore he was called "the well-endowed one."

The two cases involving wounds that follow from here are self-evident. In the case of the plastered picture, a plastered picture means a figure made by the art of painting.

In the case of the wooden doll, a wooden doll means a figure made of wood. And just as in these two cases, so too with other non-attached female figures such as those made of ivory, those made of cloth, those made of metal, and so forth - for one who makes an attempt upon the sign with lust for sexual intercourse, whether or not impurity is released, it is only an offence of wrong-doing. For one who makes an attempt with lust for bodily contact also, likewise it is only an offence of wrong-doing. But for one who makes an attempt with lust for release, if released it is a saṅghādisesa offence, and if not released it is a grave offence.

72. In the case of Sundara, this Sundara was a young man of good family in Rājagaha who went forth out of faith; he received the name "Sundara" because of the beauty of his person. Having seen him going along the road, that woman, in whom desire and lust had arisen, committed this misdeed. The elder, however, was a non-returner. Therefore he did not consent. But this is beyond the scope of others.

In the four cases that follow from here, those monks, being foolish and unwise, having accepted the word of the woman and having acted accordingly, afterwards had remorse.

73. The three cases beginning with "not eaten" are clear in meaning. In the two cases of the severed head, this is the determination: When inserting the genitals into the rounded, open mouth, if he inserts it touching below or above or on both sides, it is an offence involving expulsion. Even if he inserts it without touching on all four sides, if it touches the palate inside, it is indeed an offence involving expulsion. If without touching the four sides and the palate, he inserts and withdraws it keeping it only in open space, it is an offence of wrong-doing. But if the teeth are tightly closed, there is no space inside the mouth, and the teeth are covered externally by the flesh of the lips, for one inserting even as much as a sesame seed into the moist space not touched by air there, it is indeed an offence involving expulsion. But when the lip flesh has been torn away, for one making an attempt upon the teeth themselves, it is a grave offence. Also a tooth that protrudes outward and stands forth cannot be closed by the lips. For one making an attempt there, or for one making an attempt upon a tongue protruding outward, it is only a grave offence. Even in the case of a living body, for a tongue protruding outward, it is only a grave offence. But if, having wrapped around the protruding tongue, he inserts it into the mouth, it is indeed an offence involving expulsion. Even for a severed head from the upper neck, for one who inserts the genitals from the lower part and touches the palate, it is indeed an offence involving expulsion.

In the case of the bones, even for one going to the cemetery, it is an offence of wrong-doing. Even for one collecting the bones, even for one making an attempt upon the sign with lust for sexual intercourse, even for one making an attempt with lust for bodily contact, whether there is emission or not, it is only an offence of wrong-doing. But for one making an attempt with lust for emission, if there is emission it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community; if there is no emission, it is only a grave offence.

In the case of the female nāga, whether it be a young female nāga or any one among

female kinnarīs and the like, in all cases it is an offence involving expulsion.

In the case of the female yakkha, all deities are indeed female yakkhas.

In the case of the female ghost, ghosts such as those consumed by thirst cannot even be clung to. But there are mansion ghosts; for whom unwholesome results ripen during the dark fortnight, and during the bright fortnight they enjoy prosperity like deities. In the case of such a female ghost or female yakkha, if seeing, grasping, touching, contact, and pressing are discernible, it is an offence involving expulsion. Even if there is no seeing, if the others are discernible, it is indeed an offence involving expulsion. But if seeing and grasping are not discernible, while touching, contact, and pressing are discernible, she renders that person unconscious, fulfils her own desire, and departs - this is called "beyond the scope." Therefore here, because it is beyond the scope, there is no offence. The case of the eunuch is well known.

In the case of impaired faculties, "one with impaired faculties" means one whose bodily sensitivity is impaired, who, like a stump or a thorn, does not feel either pleasure or pain. Even for one who does not feel, there is an offence by reason of the intention to engage in sexual intercourse.

In the case of mere touching, one who, thinking "I will engage in sexual intercourse," takes hold of a woman and then becomes disenchanted with sexual intercourse and becomes remorseful, for him there is only an offence of wrong-doing. For the preliminary efforts of sexual intercourse, such as grasping by the hand and so forth, as long as they do not reach the culmination, they remain at the level of wrong-doing. When the culmination is reached, it is an offence involving expulsion. For the first offence involving expulsion, indeed only wrong-doing is proximate. For the other three, it is a grave offence. But this monk should be understood as having become disenchanted with sexual intercourse and then consenting to bodily contact. Therefore the Blessed One said - "There is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community."

74. In the case of Bhaddiya, that city is called Bhaddiya. The Jātiyā grove is so named because of the abundance of jasmine flower bushes; that grove is in the vicinity of that city. He, lying down there, fell into a deep sleep due to that stiffening by wind. Only the life-continuum flows as a single stream. "Having seen the wetness" means having seen it soiled with impurity.

75. The five cases hereafter - the four cases connected with consenting, and the case of not knowing - are clear in meaning.

76. Regarding the two cases of not consenting, "suddenly rose up" means he rose up quickly, as if bitten by a venomous snake or as if burnt by fire. "Having stepped on her, rolled her off" means the diligent monk, who had undertaken insight meditation and established mindfulness, rising up quickly, having stepped on her, rolling, turning over, and pushing her down to the ground, he threw her off. For a virtuous worldling, the mind should be guarded in such situations. And this monk was one of those warriors at the head of the battlefield.

77. Regarding the matter of one lying down having opened the door: "by one going into seclusion during the day" means by one lying down during the day. "To go into seclusion having closed the door" means to lie down having shut the door. And here, although in the canonical text no offence as such is stated, yet since, when the matter arose through the fault of lying down with the door open, it was said "I allow, monks, for one going into seclusion during the day, to go into seclusion having closed the door," a wrong-doing is stated for one who goes into seclusion without closing the door. For the commentary was established by the Elder Upāli and others, having understood the Blessed One's intention. And this is also established by the statement "there is an offence during the day, not at night."

But what kind of door should be closed, and what kind need not be closed? A revolving door made by fashioning a door-panel from any material such as wooden planks, bamboo planks, reed mats, leaves, and the like, and inserting it below into a socket and above into an upper pivot - only such a door should be closed. Other types of doors need not be closed: a wooden-peg-and-thorn door such as those in cattle pens; a village-bolt wheel-fitted door; a sliding-panel door made by fitting two or three wheels to planks or panels; a lifting-panel door such as those made in shops; a bolt-handle door made in leaf huts by tying bamboo rods at two or three places; and a cloth-screen door - doors of such kinds need not be closed. However, in the case of pushing aside a door-panel with the palm of the hand, only a cloth-screen door does not constitute an offence; pushing aside the others constitutes an offence. But for one going into seclusion during the day, only a revolving door constitutes an offence; for the remaining types, whether closed or not closed, there is no offence for one lying down. However, one should lie down having closed the door; this is the proper practice.

But to what extent is a revolving door considered closed? When the bolt and latch and so forth are fastened, it is indeed closed. Moreover, even when just the bolt is fastened, it is permissible. Even when just the latch is fastened, it is permissible. Even when it is merely shut by touching the door-post, it is permissible. Even when it is slightly not touching, it is permissible. By the most minimal method, even when not touching to the extent that a head cannot enter, it is permissible. If it is a place frequented by many, having said to a monk or a novice "Friend, please watch the door," it is permissible to lie down. Then if monks are sitting doing robe-work or some other task, having given attention thinking "these will watch the door," it is also permissible to lie down. In the Kurundi Commentary, however, it is said: "Having asked even a lay follower, or having given attention thinking 'he will watch,' it is permissible to lie down. Only it is not permissible to ask a nun or a woman." Then if the socket or the upper pivot of the door is broken or displaced, and it cannot be closed; or if a heap of bricks or a pile of clay and the like has been placed inside the doorway for building work, or scaffolding is being erected, such that it cannot be closed - when such an obstacle exists, it is permissible to lie down even without closing the door. If, however, there is no door-panel, it is simply allowable. One sleeping upstairs should lie down having pulled up the ladder. If there is a cover at the top of the ladder, one should lie down having covered it. For one lying down in an inner room, it is permissible to lie down having closed either the room door or the front door - whichever one. If in a single-walled house they use doors made on two sides, both doors should be watched.

Even in a three-storeyed mansion, the door must be watched over. If many monks, having returned from the alms round, enter a mansion similar to the Brazen Palace for the purpose of day residence, the senior monk of the community should either tell the door-keeper "Watch over the door, friend," or, having given attention thus "Watching over the door is this one's responsibility," enter and lie down. Even the most junior monk of the community should do likewise. It is also allowable for those entering first to give attention thus "Watching over the door is indeed the responsibility of those who come after." For those who lie down inside the room or outside with the door unclosed, without having asked or without having given attention, there is an offence. Even when lying down either inside the room or outside, it is indeed allowable to lie down having given attention thus "Watching over the door at the main entrance is indeed the responsibility of the door-keeper." Even for one lying down on the open terrace in the Brazen Palace and such places, the door must indeed be closed.

For here this is the summary - This rule about daytime seclusion is stated regarding a place enclosed by whatever means and having a door-fastening. Therefore, whether in the open air, at the foot of a tree, in a pavilion, or wherever there is a door-fastening, one lying down should lie down only having closed the door. If there is a large compound, similar to the courtyard of the Great Bodhi Tree or the courtyard of the Brazen Palace, a place where many people come and go, where even a closed door does not remain in the closed position, and where people, not finding the door, climb over the wall and move about, there is no duty of closing. If one lies down at night having opened the door and rises when dawn has arisen, there is no offence. If, having awakened, one sleeps again, there is an offence. But whoever, having determined "I shall rise when dawn has arisen," lies down at night without closing the door, and does not rise according to that determination, for him there is indeed an offence. In the Mahāpaccarī, however, it is said "One lying down in this way is not freed even from the offence of wrong-doing due to disrespect."

But whoever, having stayed awake for much of the night or having gone on a journey, being weary during the day, while sitting on a bed, without lifting his feet from the ground, lies down through the force of drowsiness, for him there is no offence. If, having fallen into sleep, even unknowingly he lifts his feet onto the bed, there is indeed an offence. For one who, having sat down, sleeps leaning against a support, there is no offence. And also for one who, while walking up and down thinking "I shall dispel drowsiness," falls and immediately gets up, for him too there is no offence. But whoever, having fallen, lies right there and does not get up, for him there is an offence.

Who is freed, who is not freed? In the Mahāpaccarī, firstly, it is said "Only one who has lain down by bending one side is freed. But one who has lain down having lifted his feet from the ground, even if seized by a yakkha or having become unconscious, is not freed." In the Kurundī Commentary, however, it is said "Only one who has been tied up and made to lie down is freed." In the Great Commentary, however, "For one who, while walking up and down, having fainted and fallen, sleeps right there, because it is outside his control, no offence is seen. The teachers, however, do not

say so. Therefore, it is indeed an offence" - this was said by the Elder Mahāpaduma. "But two persons are indeed freed from the offence: one who is seized by a yakkha and one who has been tied up and made to lie down."

78. In the case of the Bhārukaccha incident, "there is no offence in a dream" - since in a dream this is so because it is not within one's domain, therefore the Elder Upāli adjudicated this case by inference, even though it had not been previously adjudicated by the Blessed One. And the Blessed One, having heard, said: "Well spoken, monks, by Upāli; as if making a footstep where there is no footstep, as if showing a footstep in the sky, Upāli has expounded this question," and established the Elder in the foremost position - "This is the foremost, monks, of my disciples who are monks who are experts in monastic discipline, namely Upāli." The cases beginning with Supabbā and so forth that follow from here are of clear meaning.

80. In the sections beginning with the coupling with a nun, those Licchavi youths, being devoted to amusement, did thus through their own misconduct. And from that point onwards, only destruction arose for the Licchavis.

82. In the case of the one who went forth in old age, "went to see" means out of compassion, thinking "I shall see her," he went to the house. Then she described to him the state of helplessness of herself and the children in various ways. And knowing him to be indifferent, she became angry and forcibly grabbed him, saying "Come, let us leave the monastic life." He, stepping back to free himself, fell down on his back due to the weakness of old age. Then she fulfilled her own desire. But that monk was a non-returner with sensual desire completely cut off, therefore he did not consent.

83. The account of the young deer is clear in meaning.

The decided case is finished.

In the Samantapāsādikā, the commentary on the Vinaya,

the commentary on the first Pārājika is finished.

Herein, in the Samantapāsādikā, regarding the quality of being pleasing on all sides -

Because of the lineage of teachers, because of the elucidation of the classification of the introduction and the subject matter;
Because of the rejection of other doctrines, and because of the purification of one's own doctrine.

Because of the refinement of the letter, because of the meaning of the words, because of the order of connecting the text;
Because of the determination of the training rules, because of the showing of the different methods of analysis.

For those who examine, nothing uninspiring is seen herein;
Therefore, for the wise, this is indeed entirely inspiring.

The commentary has proceeded regarding the Discipline, by one skilled in taming those to be tamed;

Spoken by the Lord of the World, who had compassion for the world.

the commentary on the first Pārājika is finished.

2. The Second Expulsion

The second Pārājika, which was made known by the Conqueror who is without a second;

The order of commentary on that has now been reached.

Since therefore what has been explained before is easy to understand;
Having set aside all of that, this commentary proceeds.

Commentary on the Account of Dhaniya

84. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One, was dwelling at Rājagaha on the Vulture's Peak mountain": herein, "at Rājagaha" means in the city of that name, for it is called "Rājagaha" because it was possessed by Mandhātu, Mahāgovinda, and others. Others too explain various derivations here. What need of those! This is the name of that city. Now this becomes a city in the time of a Buddha and in the time of a wheel-turning monarch. At other times it is empty, possessed by yakkhas, and remains as a pleasure grove for them. Having thus indicated the resort village, he stated the place of dwelling - "on the Vulture's Peak mountain." And that is because vultures dwelt on its peaks, or because its peaks resemble vultures; therefore it should be understood that it is called "Vulture's Peak."

"Several" means: according to the Vinaya method, three persons are called "several," and beyond that is a Community. According to the Suttanta method, three are just three, and from that number onwards they are "several." Here, however, they should be understood as "several" according to the Suttanta method. "Acquaintances" means not very intimate, not firm friends; for because they had been seen by meeting here and there, they are called "acquaintances." "Companions" means very intimate, firm friends; for because they were well associated, keeping company, sharing the same enjoyments and requisites, they are called "companions." "On the slope of Isigili" means: there is a mountain called Isigili, on its slope. Formerly, it is said, about five hundred paccekabuddhas, having wandered for almsfood in the countries of Kāśi, Kosala, and others, would assemble on that mountain after the meal and pass the time in attainment. People saw them only entering but not coming out. Thereupon they said: "This mountain swallows these seers." From that arose the designation "Isigili" for it; "on its slope" means at the foot of the mountain.

"Having built grass huts" means having made huts with grass roofing and with proper door-frames. For even one who is practising the Nālaka practice, when entering the rains retreat, should enter upon a dwelling that is roofed with one of the five types of roofing and has a proper door-frame. For this was said: "Monks, one who is without a dwelling should not enter the rains retreat. Should one enter, there is an offence of wrong-doing." Therefore, during the rainy season, if one obtains a dwelling, that is good; if one does not obtain one, it should be made even after seeking manual labour. By one who cannot obtain manual labour, it should be made even by oneself. But one should certainly not enter the rains retreat without a dwelling. This is the

conformity with the Teaching. Therefore those monks, having built grass huts, having designated the night quarters, day quarters, and so forth, having undertaken the agreed observances and the chapter observances, training in the three trainings, entered the rains retreat.

"The Venerable Dhaniya also" means that not only those elders but the Venerable Dhaniya too is the originator of this training rule. "The potter's son" means the son of a potter; for his name was Dhaniya, his father was a potter, therefore it is said - "Dhaniya the potter's son." "Entered the rains retreat" means having built a grass hut in the very same place together with those elders, he entered the rains retreat. "Having completed the rains retreat" means those who entered the earlier rains retreat, having performed the pavāraṇā at the great pavāraṇā, are called "those who have completed the rains retreat" from the first day of the following fortnight onwards. Having thus completed the rains retreat.

"Having dismantled the grass huts" means not having crushed them to pieces with sticks and hammers and the like, but rather having removed the grass and wooden creepers and so forth in an orderly manner - this is the meaning. For one who has built a hut on the outskirts of a monastery, if there are resident monks, they should be consulted. Having said "If anyone is willing to look after this hut and dwell in it, give it to him," one should depart. One who has built it in the forest, or who does not find a caretaker, should store it away thinking "It will be for the use of others too" and then go. But those monks, having built huts in the forest and not finding a caretaker, stored away and preserved the grass and wood - this is the meaning. Having placed it in such a way that what is stored is not eaten by termites and is not exposed to rain, and having fulfilled the duty of departure thinking "This place will be of benefit to fellow practitioners in the holy life who come wishing to dwell here."

"Set out on a journey through the country" means they went to the countryside agreeable to each one's own mind. "But the Venerable Dhaniya the potter's son dwelt right there for the rains" etc. is clear in meaning. "Up to the third time" means up to the third occasion. "Anavaya" means anu + avaya, with the elision of the vowel 'u' by sandhi. Anu anu avaya means whatever work is to be done by potters, in all of it he was without deficiency, one of complete skill - this is the meaning. "One's own" means in what belongs to oneself. "In the teacher's doctrine" means in the teacher's craft. "In the potter's craft" means in the craft of potters; the work to be done by potters - this is the meaning. By this, his own teacher's doctrine is shown in its true nature. "With purified skill" means one of pure skill. Even though being complete, it is said that his skill was unlike that of others.

"Entirely of clay" means except for the door-frame, door-panel, bolt, latch, and window-shutter, all the remaining building materials comprising walls, roofing, bricks, pillars and so forth were made entirely of clay - this is the meaning. "Having collected grass and wood and cow-dung, he fired that hut" means having made it entirely of clay, having smoothed it with a trowel, having dried it, having polished it with oil-mixed red clay, having filled it inside and outside with grass and the like, he fired it so that it was well-fired. And thus fired was that hut. "Lovely" means of beautiful form. "Pleasing" means inspiring confidence. "Red" means of red colour. "The sound of small bells" means the sound of a network of small bells. Just as there is a sound of a network of small bells made of various gems, so there was a sound of that hut when

struck by wind entering through the windows and gaps. By this, the state of being well-fired both inside and outside is shown. But in the Great Commentary, "kiṅkaṇikā" means a bronze vessel, therefore it is said "just as the sound of a bronze vessel when struck, so was the sound of that hut when struck by the wind."

85. "What is this, monks" - here the Blessed One, though already knowing, asked for the purpose of initiating a discussion. "They reported this matter to the Blessed One" means they reported to the Blessed One from the beginning the fact of making a hut entirely of clay. "How indeed could that foolish man, monks" etc. "will make a hut" - this is a future tense expression used for a past meaning; it means "he made." The characteristic of this should be sought from the science of grammar. "Indeed, monks, that foolish man will have no sympathy, no compassion, no non-harming towards living beings" - here "sympathy" means protection; by this he shows the preliminary stage of friendliness. "Compassion" means the trembling of the mind due to the suffering of others. "Non-harming" means non-injury; by these he shows the preliminary stage of compassion. This is what is meant - "Monks, that foolish man, in digging the earth, kneading the clay, and offering fire, afflicting and destroying many small and minute living beings - indeed there will be no sympathy, no compassion, no non-harming towards those living beings, not even the slightest measure of the preliminary stage of friendliness and compassion, indeed there will not be even the smallest amount." "Let not future generations commit to gulping down living beings" means let not the later community of people engage in the state of gulping down living beings. This is what is meant - "Even in the time of the Buddha, monks did thus; for those committing the destruction of living beings in such situations, there is no fault" - thinking thus, future generations following the example of this one should not think thus regarding living beings that are to be gulped down and crushed.

Having thus rebuked Dhaniya, "And, monks, a hut entirely of clay should not be made" - he prohibited the making of such a hut in the future; and having prohibited it, "Whoever should make one, there is an offence of wrong-doing" - he established an offence for making a hut entirely of clay. Therefore, even one who makes such a hut without committing to gulping down living beings through digging the earth and so forth, he too commits an offence of wrong-doing. But one who, through digging the earth and so forth, commits to gulping down living beings, whatever rule he transgresses, in each case he commits the very offence stated therein. For the Elder Dhaniya, there is no offence because he was the original doer. For the rest, even for those who make one transgressing the training rule, and even for those who, having obtained one already made, dwell therein, it is an offence of wrong-doing. But one mixed with timber materials, however it may be mixed, is allowable. Only one made entirely of clay is not allowable. Even that, if made with bricks in the manner of a brick dwelling, is allowable. "Yes, venerable sir" etc. "they broke down that hut" means having accepted the Blessed One's word, they broke down that hut by demolishing it with sticks and stones.

In the passage beginning with "Then the Venerable Dhaniya," this is the summary meaning - Dhaniya, who was sitting on one side for his daytime rest, having come upon hearing that sound, asked those monks "Why, friends, are you breaking down my hut?" and having heard "The Blessed One is having it broken down," he accepted it through being easy to speak to.

But why did the Blessed One have the hut, which was made for his own dwelling, broken down with such great effort - does it not have some expenditure of labour involved? Although there is, nevertheless the Blessed One had it broken down because it was not allowable, and had it broken down because it was a banner of sectarians. This is the determination here. But in the Commentary, other reasons too are stated - for sympathy towards beings, for the purpose of protecting bowl and robes, for the prevention of excess of dwellings, and so forth. Therefore, even now, if a monk who is learned and knowledgeable in the Vinaya, seeing another monk going about having taken an unallowable requisite, should have it cut or broken, he is blameless; he should neither be charged nor reminded; it is not possible to say "My requisite was destroyed by you, give it to me."

Determination Beyond the Canonical Text

Herein, this is the determination regarding allowable and non-allowable requisites that is not found in the canonical text - Some, when sewing a palmyra-leaf parasol, inside or outside, with five-coloured thread, make it decorative; that is not allowable. However, to sew inside or outside with thread of a single colour, whether blue or yellow or any other, or to bind the rod-holder frame of the parasol handle, is allowable. And that is for the purpose of making it firm, not for the purpose of decoration. To cut a saw-tooth pattern or a half-moon pattern on the parasol leaves is not allowable. On the parasol handle, a knob or an animal figure, as on house pillars, is not allowable. Even if an engraved line has been made everywhere with a pointed instrument, that too is not allowable. Both the knob and the animal figure should be broken off and then it may be used. The engraved lines too should be removed by rubbing, or the handle should be wrapped with thread. However, at the base of the handle, a cobra-hood shape is allowable. For the purpose of preventing movement by wind-blows, they fasten the small inner circle of the parasol with cords and bind it to the handle; at that binding place they raise up a ring-like marking and place a line - that is allowable.

For the purpose of adorning the robe, sewing with multi-coloured threads a centipede-like pattern, they place an additional strip, and make any other kind of needlework variation, whether a braid or a chain-pattern at the edge of the strip or at the border - all such things are not allowable; only plain needlework is allowable. They make the button-strip and the loop-strip with eight corners or even sixteen corners; therein they display shrine-shapes, club-shapes, mace-shapes and the like, and raise up crab-eye patterns - all this is not allowable; only four-cornered is allowable. Corner-thread knots in a form difficult to recognise are allowable on a dyed robe. To immerse a robe in rice-gruel, flour-paste, oil-cake residue and the like is not allowable. However, at the time of robe-making, for the purpose of washing off hand-dirt, needle-dirt and the like, and at the time when it is soiled, for the purpose of washing, it is allowable. To add fragrance, lac, or oil to the dye is not allowable.

After dyeing a robe, it should not be rubbed with a conch-shell, a gem-stone, or anything whatsoever. Kneeling on the ground, holding it with the hands, it should not be rubbed even in a trough. However, placing it in a trough or on a board, having someone hold the ends, it is allowable to beat it with the hands; but even that should not be done with the fist. The elders of old, however, did not even place it in a trough. One person holds it; another, having spread it on the hands, beats it with the hand.A

corner-thread on the robe is not allowable; at the time of dyeing it should be cut off. However, that which has been permitted thus: "I allow, monks, a corner-thread" - that should be made into a loop and tied to the secondary border for the purpose of fastening at the time of dyeing. Even on buttons, lines or knots for the purpose of beautification are not allowable; they should be removed and then used.

They make engraved lines on bowls or dishes with a pointed instrument, whether inside or outside - that is not allowable. They place the bowl on a lathe, polish it, and fire it - saying "We shall make it gem-coloured" - that is not allowable; however, an oil-colour is allowable. On the bowl-stand, painted decoration is not allowable, but a saw-tooth pattern is allowable.

On the top or bottom of the water-strainer's umbrella, or on the belly of the water-strainer, lines are not allowable, but on the circular rim of the umbrella's opening, lines are allowable.

For the purpose of beautifying the waist-belt, they beat the thread double here and there, and raise up crab-eye patterns - this is not allowable. However, at both ends, beating double for the purpose of making the fringe-edge firm is allowable. But at the fringe-edge, making a knob, or a crocodile-mouth shape, or a water-serpent's head, or any decorative form whatsoever is not allowable. Displaying elephant-eye patterns here and there, or making garland-work, creeper-work, and the like on a beaten waist-belt is also not allowable. However, making it straight only - in a fish-bone pattern, or a date-palm leaf pattern, or a smooth strip pattern - and beating it is allowable. One fringe on the waist-belt is allowable; two, three, or even four are allowable; beyond that, they are not allowable. A cord waist-belt of a single strand only is allowable. However, even a single one in the shape of a five-strand braid is not allowable. But a fringe in the shape of a five-strand braid is allowable. Bringing together many cords and winding them continuously with one cord - this should not be called "many-corded"; it is allowable.

On the waist-belt buckle, any decorative form whatsoever such as the eight auspicious symbols and the like is not allowable; only a mere dividing line is allowable. They make a knob at both ends of the buckle for the purpose of making it firm; this too is allowable.

On the collyrium box, forms of women, men, quadrupeds, or birds, or decorative forms of the types such as garland-work, creeper-work, crocodile-tooth pattern, cow-urine pattern, half-moon pattern, and the like are not allowable. It should be used after rubbing off or cutting off, or wrapping with thread in such a way that it is not visible. However, only a straight collyrium box - four-sided, or eight-sided, or sixteen-sided - is allowable. At its bottom, two or three circular lines are allowable. At its neck, one circular line for the purpose of fastening the lid is allowable.

On the collyrium stick also, decorative beautification work is not allowable. On the collyrium box lid also, any decorative beautification work with multi-coloured thread is not allowable. The same principle applies to the key-case as well. Decorative beautification work on the key is not allowable; likewise on the razor-case. However, in this case, sewing with any single-coloured thread is allowable.

On the awl also, a round bead or any other decorative beautification is not allowable. But at the neck, a dividing line is allowable. On the pepper-corn container also, raising up any bead, or blister, or anything whatsoever is not allowable. But on the handle, a dividing line is allowable. They make the nail-cutter only in a curved form; therefore that is allowable. On the upper fire-stick, or the lower fire-stick, or the fire-stick bow, or the upper turning stick, any decorative beautification whatsoever such as garland-work and the like is not allowable; but in the middle of the turning stick there is a disc, and there only a mere dividing line is allowable. They make a needle-clamp, with which they grip and rub the needle; therein any decorative beautification whatsoever such as a crocodile-mouth shape and the like is not allowable; but there is just an opening for the purpose of gripping the needle, and that is allowable.

Any decorative work on a tooth-stick cutting knife is not allowable, but it is allowable to bind it straight with allowable metal on both sides, or in a four-cornered or eight-cornered manner. Any decorative work on a walking stick is also not allowable, but one or two circular lines at the bottom and a mere snake-hood bud at the top are allowable.

Regarding oil vessels - whether made of horn, or of bamboo tube, or of gourd, or of emblic myrobalan wood - apart from the figures of women and men, all other decorative work is allowable.

On beds and chairs, pillows and cushions, floor coverings, foot-wipers, walking-path coverings, brooms, rubbish receptacles, dyeing troughs, drinking-water strainers, drinking-water pots, foot-washing boards, plank seats, ring-stands, staff-stands, bowl covers, palm-leaf fans, and fans - on all of these, all decorative work such as garland-work and the like is allowable. Regarding dwellings, on door panels, window shutters, and the like, decorative work even made of all kinds of precious materials is allowable.

There is nothing to be prohibited regarding dwellings, except for hostile dwellings. A hostile dwelling is said to be a dwelling built by royal favourites within the boundary of others; therefore, those who build such a dwelling should be told - "Do not build a dwelling within our boundary." If they disregard this and continue building, they should be told again - "Do not do this, do not create an obstacle to our observance and invitation ceremonies, do not break the harmony; your dwelling, even though built, will not stand in the place where it was built." If they continue building by force, when their conscientious assembly has become predominant and a rightful decision can be obtained, then a message should be sent to them - "Remove your dwelling." If they remove it when sent up to a third time, that is good; if they do not remove it, except for the Bodhi tree and the shrine, the remaining dwellings should be broken down - but not by those who would render them unusable; rather, by removing in order the roofing, rafters, bricks, and the like, a message should be sent to them - "Remove your building materials." If they remove them, that is good; if they do not remove them, then when those building materials become rotten through snow, rain, wind, sun, and the like, or are carried off by thieves, or are burnt by fire, the monks who own the boundary are blameless; it is not possible to accuse them saying "You have destroyed our building materials" or "It is upon your necks." Whatever, however, has been done by the monks who own the boundary, that is indeed well done.

86. Now, in order to show Dhaniya's reflection when the hut was thus broken up, and his effort to make a hut again, "Then the Venerable" and so forth was stated. Therein, "accountant at the timber storehouse" means the timber keeper at the king's timber storehouse. "Timber belonging to the king" means timber taken by the king. The meaning is timber that had become the king's possession. "For the repair of the city" means materials for the restoration of the city. "Stored for times of emergency" - the destruction of gate-towers, watchtowers, the inner palace, elephant stables and so forth, whether by fire, by decay, or by siege of a rival king and so forth, is called an emergency. It is said that they were stored for that purpose. "Having had it cut into fragments" means having determined the measurements for his own hut, he had it cut into pieces, some at the top, some in the middle, some at the base.

87. "Vassakāra" is the name of that brahmin. "The chief minister of Magadha" means a chief minister in the kingdom of Magadha, endowed with a great degree of authority, or the chief minister of the king of Magadha; it is said to mean "the great minister." "Inspecting" means going here and there and examining. "My good man" is the form of address used by those in authority towards men of lower rank. "Ordered to be bound" - the brahmin was by nature already disposed to jealousy towards him. Having heard the king's words "have him summoned," since the king did not say "have him called," he therefore ordered him to be bound, thinking "I shall have him bound hand and foot and then summoned." "The Venerable Dhaniya saw" - how did he see? It is said that he, having known by his own inference that the timbers had been taken, thinking "Without doubt, this one will receive punishment or imprisonment from the royal court on account of the timbers; at that time I myself shall free him," went about constantly listening for news of him. Therefore, having gone at that very moment, he saw him. Therefore it was said - "The Venerable Dhaniya saw." "Because of the timbers" means on account of the timbers. "Before I am killed" means "I shall be killed before long"; the meaning is "you should come while I have not yet been killed."

88. In "Come now, venerable sir, remind me," here "iñgha" is a particle used in the sense of urging. "When first consecrated" means having been consecrated, at the very first. "Having spoken such words" means "Let ascetics and brahmins consume only what is given - grass, wood, and water" - this is the meaning of what is stated: having been consecrated, at the very first, that which you yourself spoke, having spoken it yourself, do you now remember or do you not remember? It is said that kings, as soon as they are consecrated, have the drum of righteousness sounded - "Let ascetics and brahmins consume only what is given - grass, wood, and water" - with reference to that, he speaks. "It was said by me with reference to them" means: with reference to the taking of grass, wood, and water by those ascetics and brahmins who feel remorse even over a trifle, who have calmed and removed evil, this was said by me; not with reference to those like you - this is the intended meaning. "And that which is unclaimed in the forest" means that grass, wood, and water which is unclaimed in the forest; he clarifies that "it was said by me with reference to that."

In "You are released by a hair's breadth," here "hair" is like a hair, but what is it? The mark of going forth. What is meant? Just as rogues, thinking "We shall eat meat," might seize a ram with expensive wool. Another wise man, seeing it, thinking "The meat of this ram is worth only a kahāpaṇa. But the wool, at each shearing, is worth many kahāpaṇas," might give two woolless rams and take it. Thus that ram, having encountered a wise man, would be released on account of its wool. In the same way, you, because of having done this deed, are deserving of execution or imprisonment. But since the banner of an arahant is not to be struck by the virtuous, and since you, having gone forth in the dispensation, bear the banner of an arahant which constitutes the mark of going forth. Therefore you, by this wool which is the mark of going forth, like a ram having encountered a wise man, are released.

"People grumbled" means: having heard, both in the presence and in the absence of the king speaking in his assembly, people here and there grumbled, looked down upon, looking down upon him they brooded over, looked at, or thought of him as inferior - this is the meaning. "Criticised" means they spoke of and made known his faults. "Complained" means they made it widely known, they spread it everywhere; and this meaning should be understood according to the science of grammar. Now here this is the connection - Thinking such things as "These ascetics, disciples of the Sakyan, are shameless," they grumbled. Saying such things as "There is no asceticism in them," they criticised. Elaborating here and there such things as "They have departed from asceticism," they complained. By this method, the construal of these terms should be understood hereafter as well, in accordance with the terms occurring in each place. "Practitioners of the holy life" means those of the highest conduct. "Asceticism" means the state of being an ascetic. "Commitment to holy life" means the state of being supreme. The remainder is of clear meaning.

In the passage beginning with "the king's timbers," the meaning of the grumbling is "he will take what is not given." But to show what was not given that he took, "the king's timbers" was stated. Thus the meaning should be understood by those who are not confused by the variation in grammatical number. "A former judge who was a chief minister" means a great minister who came to be designated as "judge" because in his former lay life, prior to his state as a monk, he was appointed to the administration of judicial proceedings.

"Then the Blessed One said this to that monk" - the Blessed One himself knows worldly conventions and also knows the enactments of past Buddhas - "Past Buddhas too enacted a pārājika offence for this much, a grave offence for this much, a wrongdoing for this much." Even this being so, if without consulting with others who are experts in worldly conventions he were to enact a pārājika offence for merely a pāda, there would be those who would say: "The restraint of virtue is indeed immeasurable and incalculable even for a single monk, exceedingly vast like the great earth, the ocean, and space - how indeed could the Blessed One destroy one for a mere pāda!" Then, not knowing the power of the Truth-finder's knowledge, they would undermine the training rule, and even the enacted training rule would not remain in its proper place. But when enacted after consulting with those who are experts in worldly conventions, that reproach does not arise. Rather, those who speak say thus - "Even householders, for a mere pāda, execute, imprison, or banish a thief. Why would the Blessed One not expel one gone forth, so that not even as much as a

blade of grass belonging to another should be taken!" And they will know the power of the Truth-finder's knowledge. And the enacted training rule will be unshakeable, it will remain in its proper place. Therefore, wishing to enact it after consulting with those who are experts in worldly conventions, surveying the entire assembly, then the Blessed One, seeing that monk seated not far away, said this to him: "For how much, monk, does King Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha, having seized a thief, execute or imprison or banish him?"

Therein, "of Magadha" means the lord of the Magadhans. "Seniya" means endowed with an army. "Bimbisāra" is his name. "Or banishes" means he expels from the realm. The remainder here is clear in meaning. "A pāda is five māsakas" - at that time in Rājagaha a kahāpaṇa was twenty māsakas, therefore a pāda is five māsakas. By this characteristic, in all regions a quarter of a kahāpaṇa should be understood as a "pāda." And that is reckoned according to the ancient nīla-kahāpaṇa, not according to other coins such as the rudradāmaka and so forth. For by that very pāda, past Buddhas too enacted the pārājika offence, and future Buddhas too will enact it. For among all Buddhas there is no difference either in the basis for pārājika or in the pārājika offence itself. There are just these four bases for pārājika. There are just these four pārājika offences. There is neither fewer nor more than these. Therefore the Blessed One too, having rebuked Dhaniya, enacting the second pārājika offence based on a pāda, said "Whatever monk takes what is not given, reckoned as theft" and so forth.

When the second pārājika had been laid down, made firm by way of cutting off at the root, the incident of the washerman's bundle arose for the purpose of further supplementary laying down, and this was stated for the purpose of illustrating its arising - "And thus this training rule was laid down by the Blessed One for the monks." Its meaning and the connection with the supplementary laying down should be understood in the same manner as stated in the commentary on the first pārājika. And just as here, so too in all the training rules hereafter. Whatever has been stated previously, omitting all of that, we shall comment only on what is new, progressively. For if we were to comment again on whatever has already been explained, when would we reach the end of the commentary! Therefore, whatever has been stated previously, having carefully noted all of that, the meaning and the construction should be understood in each respective place. However, whatever is new and of unclear meaning, all of that we ourselves shall comment upon.

The description of the story of Dhaniya is concluded.

90. "Having gone to the washerman's spreading place" means having gone to the washerman's ford; for since washermen spread out cloths there, therefore it is called "the washerman's spreading place." "The washerman's bundle" means the bundle of the washermen; washermen, entering the city in the evening time, tie up many cloths into individual bundles. The meaning is: having stolen one bundle from among those, taking it while they were not watching due to their negligence.

Commentary on the Word-Analysis

92. "Village means" and so forth is stated for the purpose of showing the distinction between the village and the forest mentioned in the passage "from a village or from a forest." Therein, a village in which there is just one hut, one dwelling, as for example in the Malaya country; this is called a village with one hut. The others should be understood by this method. "With non-humans" means one that has become the possession of yakkhas due to the complete absence of humans; or from which humans have departed for some reason, yet wishing to return again. "Fenced" means fenced beginning with a brick wall, and even at the least fenced with thorny branches. "Settled in the manner of cows sitting down" means without being settled in the manner of a street arrangement and so forth, just as cows sit down here and there in twos and threes, so it is settled with two or three houses built here and there. "Caravan" means any among foot caravans, cart caravans, and so forth. And it should be understood that in this training rule, a market town and a city too are included by the term "village."

"Precincts of the village" and so forth is stated for the purpose of showing the delimitation of the forest. "Standing at the gate" means for a village that has two gateposts just like Anurādhapura, standing at the inner gatepost; for the outer gatepost of that village falls within the category of forest according to the Abhidhamma method. But for one that has a single gatepost, standing in the middle of the village gate-posts. For even where there is no gatepost, the middle of the village gate-posts is called the "gatepost." Therefore it was said - "standing in the middle of the village gate-posts." "Of a middling man" means of middling strength, not of middling size, neither of little strength nor of great strength; the meaning is of middling strength. "A stone's throw" means not throwing as a woman chasing away crows throws a clod by raising the hand straight up, and not throwing as one throws water in splashing water, but the place where a clod falls when thrown as young men, displaying their strength, throw a clod by extending the arm. But where it falls and rolls to, that should not be taken into account.

Regarding "a stone's throw of a middling man standing in the precincts of a house of an unfenced village" - here, the throw of a winnowing fan or the throw of a pestle of a middling man standing at the place where water falls from the eaves is called the precincts of a house. In the Kurundī Commentary it is stated that a stone's throw of one standing in those precincts of a house is the precincts of the village. The Mahāpaccaṇḍī is likewise. But in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā, having set down the matrix as "house, precincts of a house, village, precincts of the village," the area within the place where water falls from the eaves is called a house. And the place where the water for washing vessels falls when a woman standing at the door discards it, and the place where a winnowing fan or a broom falls when naturally thrown outward by a woman standing inside the house, and the enclosure made by connecting the two corners in front of the house and placing a wooden-spike gate in the middle for the purpose of preventing the entry of cattle - all of this is called the precincts of a house. Within a stone's throw of a middling man standing in those precincts of a house is called a village. It is stated that within another stone's throw from there is called the precincts of the village. This is the measure here. And just as here, so everywhere, whatever commentary statement or Elder's statement is stated later should be regarded as the standard.

Now, what was stated in the Great Commentary appears to be contradictory to the canonical text. For in the canonical text - only this much was stated: "a stone's throw of a middling man standing in the precincts of a house." But in the Commentary, that stone's throw was made the boundary of the village, and beyond that was stated to be the precincts of the village? It is said - what was stated in the canonical text is indeed true, but the intention here should be understood. And that is known only to the commentators. Therefore, just as in the phrase "standing in the precincts of a house," the characteristic of the precincts of a house, though not stated in the canonical text, was accepted as stated in the Commentary. In the same way, the remainder too should be accepted.

Herein this is the method - here, a village is of two kinds - fenced and unfenced. In the case of a fenced village, the fence itself is the boundary. Therefore, without stating its boundary separately, it was stated in the canonical text: "the precincts of the village means a stone's throw of a middling man standing at the gate of a fenced village." But for an unfenced village, the boundary of the village needs to be stated. Therefore, to show the boundary of that village, it was stated: "a stone's throw of a middling man standing in the precincts of a house of an unfenced village." And since, when the boundary of the village has been shown, the characteristic of the precincts of the village can be known by the method previously stated, it was not again stated: "a stone's throw of a middling man standing there." But whoever says that the stone's throw of one standing in the precincts of a house is itself "the precincts of the village," for him the precincts of a house becomes the village. Consequently, the division into house, precincts of a house, village, and precincts of a village becomes confused. And here the determination should be understood without confusion in matters such as entering a village at the wrong time. Therefore, by comparing the canonical text and the Commentary, the village and the precincts of the village here should be understood in the manner stated. And even a village that was formerly large but later became small when families perished, its boundary should be determined by a stone's throw from the precincts of a house alone. But its former boundary, whether fenced or unfenced, is of no account.

"Forest means setting aside the village and the precincts of the village" - setting aside the village and the precincts of the village as characterised above, the remainder in this training rule on taking what is not given should be understood as "forest." But in the Abhidhamma it is stated: "forest means having gone out beyond the gate, all of that is forest." In the training rule on forest-dwelling, it is stated: "a forest dwelling means one that is five hundred bow-lengths distant." That should be understood as five hundred bow-lengths measured from the gate by the teacher's bow. Thus, by the Blessed One, in analysing the meaning of "from a village or from a forest," five divisions were shown - "house, precincts of a house, village, precincts of a village, forest" - for the purpose of preventing any loophole for evil monks. Therefore, it should be understood that for one who carries away property belonging to an owner, worth a pāda or more, whether in a house, in the precincts of a house, in a village, in the precincts of a village, or in a forest, it is indeed an offence of expulsion.

Now, in order to show the meaning of "should take what is not given, reckoned a theft" etc., he stated "not given means" etc. Therein, "not given" - in the training rule on tooth-wood, even what belongs to oneself, if not formally received, is called

allowable food to be consumed. But here, whatever property belonging to another that has an owner - that which has not been given by those owners either by body or by speech is "not given." "Not relinquished" means not released from one's own hand or from its established place. "Not abandoned" means even though standing in its place, not given up due to indifference. "Guarded" means guarded by the arrangement of protection. "Protected" means protected by being placed in chests and the like. "Cherished" means cherished through the possessiveness of craving, thinking "this is mine." "Belonging to another" means possessed by those others, the owners of the goods, through those acts of non-abandonment, guarding, and protecting. This is called not given.

"Reckoned a theft" - herein, "thena" means thief; the state of being a thief is "thievery" (theyyam); this is a designation for the intention to carry away. "Saṅkhā" and "saṅkhāta" are one in meaning; this is a designation for a category, as in "for proliferations have their source in perception" and so forth. "Theft and that reckoned" is "reckoned a theft"; the meaning is one mental portion reckoned as the consciousness of theft. And this is a nominative case used in the instrumental sense; therefore it should be seen in meaning as "by what is reckoned a theft." And since one who takes by means of what is reckoned a theft has thieving intention, it should be understood that, without adhering to the letter, in order to show just the meaning, its word-analysis has been stated thus: "with thieving intention, with intention to carry away."

"Should take, should carry, should carry away, should disturb the posture, should dislodge from position, should pass beyond the rendezvous" - herein, the first term is stated in terms of a legal claim, the second term in terms of one going while carrying another's goods, the third term in terms of deposited goods, the fourth in terms of sentient beings, the fifth in terms of what is placed on dry land and so forth, and the sixth is stated in terms of a pre-arrangement or in terms of a toll-station - thus it should be understood. The application herein is both in terms of a single type of goods and in terms of different types of goods. In terms of a single type of goods, it is obtained only with a sentient being; in terms of different types of goods, with a mixture of sentient and non-sentient things.

Therein, in terms of different types of goods, it should first be understood thus - "Should take" means he makes a legal claim to a monastery; there is an offence of wrong-doing. He arouses doubt in the owner, there is a grave offence. The owner gives up responsibility thinking "it will not be mine"; there is an offence of expulsion.

"Should carry" means while carrying another's goods, with thieving intention he touches the load on his head; there is an offence of wrong-doing. He causes it to shake, there is a grave offence. He lowers it to the shoulder, there is an offence entailing defeat.

"Should carry away" means when told "give me the deposited goods," he says "I did not take them"; there is an offence of wrong-doing. He arouses doubt in the owner, there is a grave offence. The owner gives up responsibility thinking "he will not give it to me"; there is an offence of expulsion.

"Should disturb the posture" means thinking "I shall lead away the one carrying the goods together with the goods," he moves the first foot; there is an offence of grave

transgression. He moves the second foot, there is an offence entailing defeat.

"Should dislodge from position" means with thieving intention he touches goods placed on dry land; there is an offence of wrong-doing. He causes it to shake, there is a grave offence. He dislodges it from its position, there is an offence entailing defeat.

"Should pass beyond the rendezvous" means he passes the pre-arranged place with the first foot; there is an offence of grave transgression. He moves the second foot past, there is an offence entailing defeat. Or alternatively, he passes the toll-station with the first foot; there is an offence of grave transgression. He passes with the second foot; there is an offence of expulsion - this is the application herein in terms of different types of goods.

However, in terms of a single item, one takes, or carries, or carries away, or disturbs the posture, or dislodges from position, or passes beyond the boundary, an owned slave or animal by the method of legal claim and so forth as stated above - this is the application in terms of a single item here.

Discussion on the Twenty-Five Modes of Removal

Furthermore, one explaining these six terms should show twenty-five modes of taking by combining five sets of five. For when explained thus, this pārajika of taking what is not given is well explained. And in this matter, all the commentaries are confused, muddled, and difficult to determine. For in all the commentaries, those factors of taking that are stated in the canonical text by the method beginning with "for one taking what is not given in five ways, there is an offence of pārajika, and it belongs to another," having taken those, in some places one set of five is shown, and in some places two sets of five are shown together with those that come as "in six ways." But these are not proper sets of five. For where a mode of taking is accomplished by each single term, that is called a set of five. But here, by all the terms together there is only one mode of taking. And even those sets of five that are shown there as obtainable, the meaning of all of them is not made clear. Thus in this matter, all the commentaries are confused, muddled, and difficult to determine. Therefore, these twenty-five modes of taking, shown by combining five sets of five, should be carefully examined.

The five sets of five are: the set of five for diverse items, the set of five for a single item, the set of five for personal action, the set of five for prior effort, and the set of five for modes of theft. Therein, the set of five for diverse items and the set of five for a single item are obtained by means of the terms "should take, should carry, should carry away, should disturb the posture, should dislodge from position." These should be understood in the manner already applied and shown above. But that sixth term "should pass beyond the rendezvous" is common to both the mode of taking by design and the mode of taking by relinquishing. Therefore, it should be applied by means of the obtainable term in the third and fifth sets of five. The set of five for diverse items and the set of five for a single item have been stated.

What is the set of five for personal action? Five types of carrying away - personal action, commanding, relinquishing, accomplishing the purpose, and abandoning responsibility. Therein, personal action means one carries away another's property with one's own hand. Commanding means one commands another thus: "Carry away

such-and-such a person's property." Relinquishing means one standing within the customs boundary causes it to fall beyond the customs boundary - there is an offence of pārajika - and together with this, the term "should pass beyond the rendezvous" obtains its application. Accomplishing the purpose means one commands thus: "Such-and-such property, whenever you are able, carry it away." Therein, if the other, being without obstacle, carries it away, the one who commanded becomes defeated at the very moment of commanding, but the one who carries it away at the time of carrying away. This is accomplishing the purpose. Abandoning responsibility, however, should be understood in terms of deposited property. This is the set of five for personal action.

What is the pentad of prior effort? There are another five kinds of taking -prior effort, concurrent effort, taking by collusion, act of appointment, and act of signalling. Therein, prior effort should be understood by way of command. Concurrent effort by way of dislodging from position. But the other three should be understood in the manner as they come in the canonical text. This is the pentad of prior effort.

What is the pentad of taking by theft? There are another five kinds of taking -taking by theft, taking by force, taking by scheming, taking by concealment, and taking by lot. We shall explain all five of these in the case of the lot-transferring incident: "A certain monk, when the Community's robes were being distributed, with thieving intention transferred a lot and seized a robe." This is the pentad of taking by theft. Thus, combining these five pentads, these twenty-five kinds of taking should be understood.

And in these five pentads, a skilled bearer of the Vinaya, without hastily adjudicating a case that has arisen, should examine five points. Referring to which the ancients said -

"The object, the time, and the place, the value, with use as the fifth;
Having weighed these five points, the discerning one should determine the matter."

Therein, "object" means the article; for even when the one who took says "I took this particular thing," without imposing an offence, that article should be examined as to whether it has an owner or is ownerless. Even when it has an owner, it should be examined whether the owners have attachment or non-attachment. If it was taken at a time when they had attachment, the article should be valued and the offence should be determined. If at a time of non-attachment, he should not be made to incur an offence of expulsion. But when the owners of the article demand the return of the article, the article should be given back. This is the proper procedure herein.

For the illustration of this meaning, there is this case -During the reign of King Bhātiya, it is said, for the great cetiya festival, a monk from the southern direction, having placed a seven-cubit pale-yellow robe on his shoulder, entered the cetiya courtyard; and at that very moment the king too had come for the purpose of worshipping the cetiya. There, while the ceremony was taking place, there was a great crush of people. Then that monk, pressed by the crush of people, went out without even seeing the robe falling from his shoulder; and having gone out, not seeing the robe, thinking "Who will find a robe in such a crush of people? It is no

longer mine," he abandoned his claim and departed. Then another monk, coming afterwards, seeing that robe, took it with thieving intention, but then becoming remorseful, even though the thought arose "I am now not a recluse, I shall disrobe," he thought "I shall find out by asking those who bear the Vinaya."

At that time, an elder named Cūḷasumana, a master of the entire textual tradition and the foremost teacher of the Vinaya, was residing at the Mahāvihāra. That monk approached the elder, paid homage, asked for permission, and inquired about his own scruple. The elder, knowing that he had taken it after the crowd of people had departed, considered "there is now an opportunity here" and said: "If you could bring the monk who owns the robe-cloth, it would be possible to establish your standing." "How shall I find him, venerable sir?" "Go here and there and look." He searched all five great monasteries but did not find him. Then the elder asked him: "From which direction do many monks come?" "From the southern direction, venerable sir." "Then measure the robe-cloth in length and width and set it aside. Having set it aside, search monastery by monastery in the southern direction and bring that monk." He did so, and having found that monk, brought him to the elder's presence. The elder asked: "Is this your robe-cloth?" "Yes, venerable sir." "Where was it dropped from you?" He explained everything. The elder, having heard about the abandonment of responsibility made by him, asked the other one: "Where did you see this and take it?" He too reported everything. Then the elder said to him: "If you had taken it with a pure mind, there would have been no offence for you. But because it was taken with thieving intention, you have committed an offence of wrong-doing. Confess that and become free of offence. And having made this robe-cloth your own property, give it to this very monk." That monk was as if sprinkled with the deathless and attained the highest relief. Thus should the matter be examined.

"Time" means the time of the theft. For that same article is sometimes of little value and sometimes of great value. Therefore, the offence should be determined according to the value of that article at the very time when it was stolen. Thus should the time be examined.

"Place" means the place of the theft. For whatever goods were stolen in whatever place, the offence should be determined by the value of those goods in that very place. For in the place where the goods originate, the goods are of low value, but elsewhere they are of high value.

And to illustrate this meaning, there is this case - In an island in the ocean, it is said, a certain monk obtained a well-shaped coconut, mounted it on a lathe, made it into a beautiful drinking bowl resembling a conch-shell dish, left it there, and went to Cetiyaḡiri. Then another monk, having gone to the island in the ocean and residing in that monastery, saw that bowl, took it with thieving intent, and came to Cetiyaḡiri itself. When the owner of the bowl saw that bowl as the other monk was drinking gruel there, the monk who owned the bowl said - "Where did you get this?" "I brought it from the island in the ocean." He dragged him into the midst of the Community, saying "This is not your property, it was taken by you through theft." And not obtaining a judgement there, they went to the Mahāvihāra. There, having had the drum beaten, they held an assembly near the Great Cetiya and began the adjudication. The elder experts in the Vinaya acknowledged the theft.

And at that assembly there was an elder named Ābhidhammika Godatta who was skilled in the Vinaya. He speaks thus: "Where was this bowl stolen by this monk?" "It was stolen on the island in the ocean." "What is it worth there?" "It is not worth anything. For there they split open coconuts, eat the kernel, and throw away the shell, though it serves the purpose of firewood." "What is this monk's handiwork worth here?" "A māsa or less than a māsa." "But has a pārājika offence been laid down anywhere by the Perfectly Enlightened One for a māsa or less than a māsa?" When this was said, "Excellent! Excellent! Well spoken, well adjudicated" - there was a single cry of approval. And at that time, King Bhātiya too, coming out from the city to pay homage to the cetiya, hearing that sound, asking "What is this?" and hearing everything in order, had a drum beaten throughout the city - "While I am present, any legal case of monks, nuns, or laypeople adjudicated by the Elder Ābhidhammika Godatta is well adjudicated; whoever does not abide by his adjudication, I place under the king's authority." Thus the place should be examined.

"Value" means the value of the goods. For whatever value new goods have, that diminishes afterwards; just as a newly washed bowl is worth eight or ten, but afterwards when broken or cracked or struck at the pin-joint, it becomes of little value; therefore goods should not always be assessed at their original value. Thus the value should be examined.

"Use" means the use of the goods. For through use too, the value of goods such as an axe diminishes. Therefore it should be examined thus: if someone carries away another's axe worth a pāda, the owner of the axe should be asked - "For how much was this axe bought by you?" "For a pāda, venerable sir." "But was it just bought and kept by you, or did you use it?" If he says "For one day I cut a tooth-stick or dyeing bark or firewood for cooking almsfood, or it was sharpened by grinding." Then it should be understood that its original value has fallen. And just as with an axe, so too with a collyrium box or a collyrium stick or a key or with straw or with husks or with brick powder, even by merely washing after rubbing once, the value falls. Even by cutting with a crocodile-tooth file a tin disc or by merely polishing it, even by wearing and wrapping a water-cloth once, even by merely placing a head-rest on the shoulder or on the head, even by winnowing rice and the like or by removing one or two grains from it, even by merely picking up and discarding a single stone pebble, even by pouring ghee and oil and the like from one vessel into another, even by merely picking up and discarding a fly or an ant from it, even by merely piercing a lump of jaggery with a fingernail and taking a tiny amount to ascertain its sweetness - the value falls. Therefore whatever is worth a pāda that has been reduced in value through use by the owners in the manner stated, the monk who carried it away should not be dealt with under the offence of expulsion. Thus use should be examined. Thus, having weighed these five grounds, the discerning one should determine an offence or non-offence, or a grave or a light offence, placing it in its proper place.

The section on "should take" etc. "should pass beyond the rendezvous" is concluded.

The determination of these terms.

Now, in analysing "in such a taking of what is not given" and so forth, "of such a kind" and so forth was stated. Therein, "of such a kind" means of such a nature. But since that begins from a pāda, therefore he said "a pāda or the value of a pāda or more than a pāda." Therein, by "a pāda" he indicates only impermissible goods worth a quarter of a kahāpaṇa. By "the value of a pāda," permissible goods worth a pāda. By "more than a pāda," both kinds. By this much, the basis for incurring the second offence of expulsion has been shown in every respect.

"King of the earth" means a king of the entire earth, a universal monarch of an island, like Asoka, or any other king of a single island, like the king of Sīhaḷa. "Regional king" means a lord of a region of a single island, like Bimbisāra, Pasenadi, and others.

"Feudal lords" means those who enjoy one district each even within a region of an island. "Those with intermediate revenues" means those who own several villages between two kings. "Judges" means those who adjudicate according to the law; they sit in the hall of justice and instruct the cutting off of hands and feet and the like of thieves in accordance with their offences. But when ministers or princes who have attained positions commit offences, they report to the king; they do not themselves adjudicate serious matters. "Chief ministers" means great ministers who have attained positions; they too sit here and there in villages or market towns and carry out the king's business. "Or whoever" means also any others who, being dependent on the royal family or dependent on their own authority, instruct in cutting and breaking punishments - all of them are indicated as "kings" in this context.

"Would execute" means they would both strike and cut. "Would banish" means they would expel. "You are a thief" - having said such things as these, they would revile; therefore he said - "this is abuse." "With reference to the former" means with reference to the person who, having engaged in sexual intercourse, has incurred an offence of expulsion. The remainder is evident owing to the method having been stated before and owing to the meaning of the words being clear.

93. Having thus analysed the training rule as stated in the order of its terms, and now having shown the taking in brief by means of the six terms beginning with "should take," and having shown in brief the article to be taken as "a quarter or the value of a quarter or more than a quarter" - in order to show in detail wherever that article is situated and in whatever manner the taking occurs, for the purpose of blocking any pretext or opportunity for corrupt monks in the future, he laid down the matrix by the method beginning with "situated on the ground, situated on land," and stated its analysis by the method beginning with "what is called 'situated on the ground' means an article deposited on the ground."

The discussion on the twenty-five types of theft is concluded.

Discussion on What is on the Ground

94. Herein is the discussion of judgement together with the explanation of terms that are not clear. "Buried" means dug into the ground and placed there. "Concealed" means covered with soil, bricks, and so forth. "Goods situated on the ground" etc. "Or goes, there is an offence of wrong-doing" - whatever monk, having come to know by whatever means about goods situated on the ground because they were thus buried or concealed and placed there, with thieving intention thinking "I shall take it," rises

up during the night and goes, even without reaching the place of the goods, he commits an offence of wrong-doing in respect of all bodily and verbal actions. How? For as he rises up for the purpose of taking it, whatever limb or minor limb he moves, in every case it is a wrong-doing. He arranges his lower and upper robes - with each movement of the hand, a wrong-doing. Thinking "The great treasure cannot be taken by one person alone, I shall seek a companion," wishing to go to the presence of some companion, he opens the door - with each step and each movement of the hand, a wrong-doing. But in closing the door, or in any other action that does not assist the going, there is no offence. Having gone to the place where he is lying down, he calls out "So-and-so," informs him of the matter and says "Come, let us go" - with each utterance, a wrong-doing. That one rises at his word - for him too, a wrong-doing. Having risen, wishing to go to his presence, he arranges his lower and upper robes, opens the door and goes to his vicinity - in all movements of hand and step, a wrong-doing. He asks him "Where are so-and-so and so-and-so? Call so-and-so and so-and-so" - with each utterance, a wrong-doing. Seeing all assembled, he says "I have discovered such a treasure in such-and-such a place; let us go, take it, perform meritorious deeds, and live happily" - with each utterance, just a wrong-doing.

Having thus obtained companions, he seeks a spade. If he has his own spade, going to fetch it, taking it, and bringing it - everywhere in movements of hand and step, he commits a wrong-doing. If he does not have one, he goes to another monk or a householder and asks; and if while asking he asks without speaking falsely, saying "Give me a spade, I have need of a spade, there is something to be done, having done it I shall return it" - with each utterance, a wrong-doing. If he also speaks falsely, saying "There is an irrigation channel to be cleaned, there is ground-work to be done at the monastery" - whatever utterance is false, in each case a *pācittiya* offence. In the Great Commentary, however, it is stated that whether truthful or false, it is only a wrong-doing; that should be understood as written through carelessness. For in the preliminary effort of taking what is not given, there is no such thing as a wrong-doing where a *pācittiya* offence applies. If, however, the spade has no handle, thinking "I shall make a handle," he borrows an adze or an axe, goes for that purpose, and having gone, cuts dry wood, planes it, and shapes it - everywhere in movements of hand and step, a wrong-doing. He cuts a living tree - a *pācittiya* offence. Thereafter, in all efforts, a wrong-doing. In the Abridged Commentary and the Great Rejoinder, it is stated that even for those seeking an adze or an axe for the purpose of cutting wood and creepers that have grown over it, there is a wrong-doing. If, however, they think thus: "Asking for adzes, axes, and spades, we shall become suspected; let us smelt iron and make them." Then, having gone to the forest, they dig the earth for iron ore - for those digging unsuitable earth, there are *pācittiya* offences together with wrong-doings, so it is stated in the Great Rejoinder. And just as here, so everywhere one is not freed from wrong-doing where a *pācittiya* offence applies. For those digging suitable earth, there are only wrong-doings. But having taken the ore, thereafter in all activities, with each effort, a wrong-doing.

In seeking a basket too, there is a wrong-doing at each movement of the hand and each step, in the manner already stated. In false speech, there is a *pācittiya* offence. In cutting creepers out of desire to make a basket, there is a *pācittiya* offence - all this should be understood in the manner already stated. "Or goes, there is an offence of wrong-doing" means: thus, having sought a companion, a spade and a basket, he

goes to the place of the treasure; at each step there is a wrong-doing. But if while going he generates wholesome intention thinking "Having obtained this treasure, I shall make an offering to the Buddha, or an offering to the Dhamma, or a meal for the Community," there is no offence in going with a wholesome mind. Why? "With thieving intention, a companion or etc. or goes, there is an offence of wrong-doing" - because this has been stated. And just as here, so everywhere there is no offence for one without thieving intention. Having turned off the road, while making a path for the purpose of going to the place of the treasure, he cuts plant life - there is a pācittiya offence. He cuts dry wood - there is a wrong-doing.

"Grown over it" means what has grown over a pot that has been deposited for a long time. "Wood or creepers" means not merely wood and creepers alone; for one who cuts anything whether fresh or dry - grass, trees, creepers and so forth - because it is a concurrent effort, there is only a wrong-doing.

For this eightfold wrong-doing has been shown by the Elders by bringing together in this context - wrong-doing of preliminary effort, wrong-doing of concurrent effort, wrong-doing of not-to-be-touched, wrong-doing of wrong conduct, wrong-doing of Vinaya, wrong-doing of what is known, wrong-doing of motion, and wrong-doing of promise. Therein, "with thieving intention he seeks a companion or a spade or a basket or goes, there is an offence of wrong-doing" - this is called wrong-doing of preliminary effort. Here indeed, in a case for wrong-doing there is a wrong-doing, and in a case for pācittiya there is indeed a pācittiya offence. "He cuts wood or creepers that have grown over it, there is an offence of wrong-doing" - this is called wrong-doing of concurrent effort. Here, however, both the basis for pācittiya and the basis for wrong-doing remain only at the level of wrong-doing. Why? Because it is a concurrent effort of the theft. That which is stated as a wrong-doing for one who touches the ten kinds of precious things, the seven kinds of grain, and all weapons and such goods - this is called wrong-doing of not-to-be-touched. That which is stated as a wrong-doing for one who touches the fruits grown on plantains, coconut palms and such - this is called wrong-doing of wrong conduct. That which is stated as a wrong-doing for one going on alms-round who, when dust has fallen on his bowl, receives almsfood therein without having received the bowl properly or without having washed it - this is called wrong-doing of Vinaya. "Having heard, they do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing" - this is called wrong-doing of what is known. That which is stated in the eleven formal admonitions as "wrong-doing at the motion" - this is called wrong-doing of motion. "For that monk, monks, the former one is not apparent, and in the promise there is an offence of wrong-doing" - this is called wrong-doing of promise. This, however, is wrong-doing of concurrent effort. Therefore it was said - "For one who cuts anything whether fresh or dry - grass, trees, creepers and so forth - because it is a concurrent effort, there is only a wrong-doing."

If, however, when the growth upon it - grass, trees, creepers, and so forth - has been cut, a sense of moral shame arises in him and restraint comes about, he is freed by confessing the wrong-doing on account of the cutting. But if, without abandoning the endeavour, he digs the soil with the same zeal, the wrong-doing for cutting subsides and he stands in the wrong-doing for digging. For even one who digs unsuitable earth

here incurs only a wrong-doing, because it is a concurrent effort. If, however, even after digging on all sides and reaching the base of the pot, a sense of moral shame arises in him, he is freed by confessing the wrong-doing on account of the digging.

"Or heaps up" means: but if with the same zeal he heaps up the soil, making a pile on one side, the wrong-doing for digging subsides and he stands in the wrong-doing for heaping up. And as he makes that soil into heaps here and there, he incurs a wrong-doing with each effort. If, however, even after making a heap, he abandons the endeavour and a sense of moral shame arises in him, he is freed by confessing the wrong-doing for heaping up. "Or removes" means: but if with the same zeal he lifts up the soil and throws it outside, the wrong-doing for heaping up subsides and he stands in the wrong-doing for removing. As he throws the soil here and there with a spade or with his hands or with a basket, he incurs a wrong-doing with each effort. If, however, even after removing all the soil and exposing the pot on dry ground, a sense of moral shame arises in him, he is freed by confessing the wrong-doing for removing. But if with the same zeal he touches the pot, the wrong-doing for removing subsides and he stands in the wrong-doing for touching. And even after touching, if a sense of moral shame arises in him, he is freed by confessing the wrong-doing for touching. But if with the same zeal he causes the pot to shake, the wrong-doing for touching subsides and he stands in the grave offence stated as "he causes it to shake, there is a grave offence."

Herein is the meaning of the words for both wrong-doing and grave offence: First, herein, "wrongly done" - done having failed in the duty prescribed by the Teacher - thus it is a wrong-doing. Or alternatively, "badly done" - that action is unseemly, it does not look well among the actions of monks - thus too it is a wrong-doing. And this was said -

"What has been called a wrong-doing, listen to that as it truly is;
What is failed and missed, stumbled and wrong-doing.

"Whatever evil a person does, whether openly or in secret;
They declare it a wrong-doing, therefore it is so called."

The other, however, is a grave offence because of its grossness and because of its being a transgression. And herein the compounding should be understood as in "and misfortune in the hereafter," "what has bitter fruit," and so forth. For among transgressions that are to be confessed in the presence of one person, there is no gross transgression equal to that. Therefore it is said "because of its grossness and because of its being a transgression, it is a grave offence." And this was said -

"What has been called a grave offence, listen to that as it truly is;
He who confesses at the foot of one person, and he who receives it -
There is no transgression equal to that, therefore it is so called."

And for one who causes it to shake, there is a grave offence with each effort. And even after causing it to shake, one in whom a sense of moral shame has arisen is freed by confessing the grave offence. And herein, beginning from the concurrent effort, each preceding offence subsides. But one in whom a sense of moral shame has arisen without having performed the concurrent effort must confess all those wrong-

doings and pācittiyas incurred in the preliminary effort. And in the concurrent effort, even many wrong-doings for cutting the growth upon it subside upon reaching the digging of the soil. There is only one wrong-doing for digging. Even many wrong-doings in digging subside upon reaching the heaping up; even many in heaping up subside upon reaching the removing; even many in removing subside upon reaching the touching; even many in touching subside upon reaching the shaking. And it is said in the Kurundi Commentary: "Even if there are many offences arising when a sense of moral shame occurs during the digging of soil and so forth, one is freed by confessing just one." And this subsiding of the preceding offence has come only in the proclamation suttas thus: "By the motion, the wrong-doing subsides; by the two announcements of the formal act, the grave offences subside." But here, in the second pārājika, it should be accepted on the authority of the commentators.

"He dislodges it from its position, there is an offence entailing defeat" means that one who, even after causing it to shake, without a sense of shame arising, dislodges that pot from its position even by as little as a hair-tip, commits an offence entailing defeat - this is the meaning. And here, dislodging from its position should be understood in six ways. How? Having grasped the pot at the rim and pulling it towards oneself, with the far end one passes even by as little as a hair-tip beyond the place touched by this end - it is an offence entailing defeat. Having grasped it in the same way and pushing it away, with this end one passes even by as little as a hair-tip beyond the place touched by the far end - it is an offence entailing defeat. Tilting it to the left or to the right, with the right end one passes even by as little as a hair-tip beyond the place touched by the left end - it is an offence entailing defeat. Or with the left end one passes even by as little as a hair-tip beyond the place touched by the right end - it is an offence entailing defeat. Lifting it upwards, one releases it from the ground even by as little as a hair-tip - it is an offence entailing defeat. Having dug underneath and pushing it downwards, with the rim one passes even by as little as a hair-tip beyond the place touched by the bottom - it is an offence entailing defeat. Thus for a pot standing in one position. If, however, having made a loop at the rim of the pot, they drive an iron stake or a heartwood stake of acacia and the like into the ground and bind it there with a chain, when bound with one chain in one direction, two positions are obtained; when bound with four chains in two, three, or four directions, five positions are obtained.

Therein, for a pot bound to a single stake, one first pulls up the stake or cuts the chain - it is a grave offence. Then one dislodges the pot from its position even by as little as a hair-tip in the manner stated above - it is an offence entailing defeat. Or first one lifts up the pot - it is a grave offence. Then one dislodges the stake from its position even by as little as a hair-tip, or cuts the chain - it is an offence entailing defeat. By this method, even for a pot bound to two, three, or four stakes, at the last dislodging from position it is an offence entailing defeat. In the remaining cases, it should be understood as a grave offence.

If there is no stake, and a ring has been made at the end of the chain and inserted into a root that has grown there, one first lifts up the pot and afterwards cuts the root and removes the ring - it is an offence entailing defeat. But if without cutting the root one slides the ring this way and that, it is held in reserve. If, however, without

removing it from the root, one grasps it with the hand and lifts it into the air - it is an offence entailing defeat. This here is the distinction. The remainder is according to the method already stated.

Some, however, for the purpose of concealment, plant banyan trees and the like on top of the pot, and the roots stand binding the pot. For one cutting them thinking "I shall cut the roots and take the pot," at each effort there is a wrong-doing. Having cut them and made space, one dislodges the pot from its position even by as little as a hair-tip - it is an offence entailing defeat. While cutting the roots, the pot rolls and goes to a lower place - it is held in reserve for the time being. One lifts it from the place where it has gone - it is an offence entailing defeat. If, when the roots have been cut, the pot stands by just one root, and he cuts it knowing "when this root is cut, it will fall" - at the very moment of cutting, it is an offence entailing defeat. If, however, it stands held by just one root like a pig tied to a post, and there is nothing else supporting it, at the very moment of cutting that root too, it is an offence entailing defeat. If a large stone has been placed on top of the pot, one wishing to lift it with a lever and remove it cuts a tree that has grown on top of the pot - it is a wrong-doing. One cuts vegetation that has grown near it and brings it - since it is not vegetation that has grown over the treasure, cutting it is an offence of expiation.

"His own vessel" means if, being unable to lift up the pot, for the purpose of taking the goods inside the pot, having inserted his own vessel, with thieving intention he touches something inside the pot worth five māsakas or more than five māsakas - there is an offence of wrong-doing. And here the specification is stated for the purpose of determining the offence entailing defeat. However, even one who touches something worth less than five māsakas with thieving intention commits a wrong-doing indeed.

"He causes it to shake" - here, as long as he makes it into one mass and inserts his own vessel, it is called "he causes it to shake." Moreover, even one who separates it this way and that way is indeed causing it to shake; he commits a grave offence. But when the state of being one mass is severed, what is in the pot remains in the pot alone, and what is in the vessel remains in the vessel alone - then it is called "gone into his own vessel." Having done so, even though the vessel has not been removed from the pot, he commits an offence entailing defeat.

"Or he closes his fist" - here, just as coins that have come out between the fingers do not touch the coins inside the pot, so one making a fist is called "closing the fist." He too commits an offence entailing defeat.

"Mounted on a string" means placed upon a string. This is a designation for what is wound with string as well as what is made of string. Waist-bands and the like may be made of gold, made of silver, or made of string; pearl necklaces and the like are also included here. "Turban" means a cloth for wrapping the head. Among these, whatever one with thieving intention touches - a wrong-doing. He causes it to shake - a grave offence. Having grasped waist-bands and the like by the end, he lifts them up without making them airborne - a grave offence.

"Rubbing, he takes it out" - here, however, whether it is placed on top of a full pot making it level with the pot, or placed with one end at the bottom and one end at the rim - for one rubbing and taking it out, a grave offence. For one releasing it from the

mouth of the pot - an offence entailing defeat. But whatever is placed in a half-full pot or an empty pot, its position is only the place it itself touches, not the entire pot; therefore, even for one rubbing and taking it out, when it is released even a hair-tip from its resting place - an offence entailing defeat itself. Whether the pot is full or not full, for one lifting it straight up, the very moment it is released from the resting place of its lower end - an offence entailing defeat. For one moving any goods placed inside the pot that are sufficient for an offence entailing defeat around the entire pot, and for one rubbing and taking out waist-bands and the like, as long as it does not pass beyond the rim - only a grave offence. For the entire pot is its position - thus it is stated in the Saṅkhepa and Mahāpaccaṛī and other commentaries. But in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā it is stated: "Only the place where it is placed is its position, not the entire pot. Therefore, for one releasing it even a hair-tip from the place where it stands - an offence entailing defeat itself." That is authoritative. The other view, however, was stated according to the principle of a robe-wrapping placed on a robe-stand, without making it airborne; that should not be accepted. For in a Vinaya adjudication, one should stand by the weightier authority; this is the nature of the Vinaya. Moreover, this can also be understood from the statement "he makes it go into his own vessel or he closes his fist." Just as for something standing inside the pot, the entire pot is not its position.

Regarding ghee and the like, whatever one drinks, at the very moment it is drunk with one effort - an offence entailing defeat; thus it is stated in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā. But in the Mahāpaccaṛī and other commentaries, this distinction is shown: "For one who drinks by drawing it in without removing the mouth, if what has gone past the throat is not worth a pāda, but together with what is in the mouth it is worth a pāda, it is protected for the time being. But at the very moment it is cut off by the throat - an offence entailing defeat. Even if one cuts it off by closing the lips - an offence entailing defeat itself. Even for one drinking through a lotus stalk, a bamboo tube, a reed tube, and the like, if what has gone past the throat alone is worth a pāda - an offence entailing defeat. If together with what is in the mouth it is worth a pāda, it is not yet an offence entailing defeat. Having disrupted the state of being one mass together with what is in the lotus stalk and the like, at the very moment it is cut off by the lips - an offence entailing defeat. If together with what is in the lotus stalk and the like it is worth a pāda, at the very moment the bottom of the lotus stalk and the like is blocked even with a finger - an offence entailing defeat. When what is worth a pāda has not entered past the throat, and even more than a pāda's worth remains as one mass in the lotus stalk and the like and in the mouth, it is still protected." All of that, since it follows this principle - "he makes it go into his own vessel or he closes his fist" - is therefore well demonstrated. This, then, is the principle regarding what is one mass.

If, however, he takes it by hand, or by bowl, or by any vessel such as a dish, etc., and drinks, at whichever effort he fills up the amount worth a pāda, when that effort is completed, it is an offence entailing defeat. If, however, it is of great value, and even with a small shell one can take the amount worth a pāda with a single effort, it is an offence entailing defeat at the very first extraction. But for one who takes by submerging a vessel, as long as it remains as one connected mass, it is held in reserve. It is an offence entailing defeat either by the delimitation of the rim or by extraction. But when one draws out ghee, or oil, or clear honey-molasses resembling

oil, from the pot and transfers it into one's own vessel, then because of their clarity there is no state of being one connected mass, so it is an offence entailing defeat as soon as the amount worth a pāda has flowed from the rim.

But honey-molasses that has been cooked and stored is sticky like mucus, suitable for pulling back and forth, and when remorse arises, being one connected mass, it can be returned. Even though this has exited the rim and entered the vessel, because of being one connected mass with what is outside, it is held in reserve; but when it is severed from the rim, it is an offence entailing defeat. Also, whoever with thieving intention inserts into another's pot any fine cloth or one of the pieces of leather, etc., that can absorb ghee or oil worth a pāda, it is an offence entailing defeat as soon as it is released from the hand.

Knowing that "now they will pour oil" into an empty pot, one with thieving intention inserts any article; if, when oil has been poured there, one drinks the amount worth five māśakas, it is an offence entailing defeat as soon as it is drunk - so it is stated in the Great Commentary. But that conflicts with the adjudication concerning straightening a dry channel at a dry reservoir in that very place, and the characteristic of theft is not apparent here; therefore it should not be accepted. But in the Mahāpaccarī and others, an offence entailing defeat is stated for the extraction of that, and that is correct.

Having placed an article in another's empty pot for the purpose of concealment, when oil has been poured there, being afraid that "if he finds out, he will obstruct me," one with thieving intention removes the article that has absorbed oil worth a pāda - it is an offence entailing defeat. If one removes it with a pure intention, when the others demand compensation, there is liability for goods-compensation. Goods-compensation means that whatever has been lost to another, either its value or that very article must be given - that is the meaning. If one does not give, when the owner abandons the pursuit, it is an offence entailing defeat. If another pours ghee or oil into another's pot, and this one with thieving intention inserts an article that absorbs oil, it is an offence entailing defeat in the manner already stated. Knowing that another's ghee or oil will be poured into one's own empty pot, one with thieving intention deposits an article; it is an offence entailing defeat upon extraction in the manner previously stated. Having deposited it with a pure intention, one afterwards removes it with thieving intention - it is indeed an offence entailing defeat. If one removes it with a pure intention only, it is neither theft nor a case for censure; but in the Mahāpaccarī, only the absence of an offence is stated. "Angry, saying 'Why did you pour oil into my pot?', he removes his own article and discards it - there is no goods-compensation" - so it is stated in the Kurundī. With thieving intention, grasping the rim, one tilts the pot wishing to make the oil flow out; when the amount worth a pāda has flowed out, it is an offence entailing defeat. With thieving intention itself, one makes it dilapidated, thinking "it will flow out and go"; when the amount worth a pāda has flowed out and gone, it is an offence entailing defeat. With thieving intention itself, one makes a hole - downward-facing, or upward-facing, or horizontal - but this is a point of confusion; therefore it should be carefully examined. Here is the adjudication on this: "Downward-facing" means a hole facing downwards; "upward-facing" means a hole facing upwards; "horizontal" means a straight-through hole like that of a ladle. In the case of a downward-facing hole made starting from the outside,

when oil worth a pāda has flowed to the inner side, even though it has not come out on the outside, it is an offence entailing defeat. Why? Because as soon as it has flowed from there, it is reckoned as having gone outside; it does not retain the designation of being within the pot. In the case of one made starting from the inside, when the amount worth a pāda has flowed to the outer side, it is an offence entailing defeat. In the case of an upward-facing hole, however it is made, when the amount worth a pāda has flowed to the outer side, it is an offence entailing defeat. For as long as it has not flowed to the outer side, it remains reckoned as being within the pot. "In the case of a horizontal hole, it should be determined by the flow from the middle of the potsherd" - so it is stated in the commentaries. But that accords with the breaching of the embankment of a reservoir in the case of a hole made by leaving a portion in the middle, starting from both inside and outside. But in the case of one made starting from the inside, it should be determined by the outer side; in the case of one made starting from the outside, it should be determined by the inner side - this is what is correct here. But whoever with thieving intention removes the support or the propping stones from the pot, thinking "it will roll away," when it has rolled away, it is an offence entailing defeat. But having known that oil would be poured, when deterioration or holes have been made in the empty pot, there is liability for goods-compensation in proportion to the oil that subsequently leaked out. But in some commentaries, "an offence entailing defeat" is also written; that was written through carelessness.

On top of a full pot, with thieving intention, he loosely fastens a slab or a stone thinking "It will fall and break it, and then the oil will flow out," or he places it in a faulty position - for one who makes it such that it will inevitably fall, at the moment it is done, there is an offence entailing defeat. He does this on top of an empty pot, and later when it is full, it falls and breaks it - there is liability for compensation for the goods. For in such cases, since the effort was made at a time when the goods did not exist, there is no offence entailing defeat from the outset. But since the means for the destruction of goods has been created, there is liability for compensation for the goods. When those demanding restitution are not given it, through the owners' abandonment of the claim, there is an offence entailing defeat.

With thieving intention, he straightens a channel thinking "It will either roll away or overflow the embankment." Whether it rolls away or overflows the embankment, at the time of straightening, there is an offence entailing defeat. For such efforts are included under preliminary-effort theft. When a dry channel has been straightened and water comes afterwards, whether it rolls away or overflows the embankment, there is liability for compensation for the goods. Why? Because of the absence of an effort to dislodge from its position. The characteristic of this will become evident in the section on boats.

Regarding "Right there he breaks" etc., in the Commentary it is stated thus: "He breaks' means he strikes with a mallet and breaks it. 'He throws away' means he pours in water or sand and causes it to overflow. 'He burns' means he brings firewood and burns it. 'He makes unfit for use' means he makes it unfit to be eaten or unfit to be drunk; he drops in faeces or urine or poison or leftovers or a corpse - there is an offence of wrong-doing: because there is no dislodging from its position, it is a wrong-doing; this is the domain of the Buddha. Although it is a wrong-doing, when restitution

is demanded, there is liability for compensation for the goods." Therein, the first pair does not accord. For that has the same characteristic as making the pot fragile and straightening the channel. But the latter pair can be done even without dislodging from its position. Therefore, here they state the judgement thus: "In the Commentary, it seems that the statement 'a wrong-doing because there is no dislodging from its position' was said with reference to the latter pair. For even without dislodging from its position, one might burn it with thieving intention or with the desire to destroy, or might make it unfit for use. But in the case of the first pair, for one who breaks or throws away in the manner stated, there is dislodging from its position; therefore, for one who does so with the desire to destroy, there is liability for compensation for the goods; with thieving intention, there is an offence entailing defeat." If one objects that this is improper because "wrong-doing" is stated in the canonical text? No; because the meaning should be understood differently. For in the canonical text, regarding the case of thieving intention, some say thus: "'He breaks' means he breaks it up with water; 'he throws away' means he vomits there or drops urine there."

But here the essence is this - Like the grass-burner in the Vinīta case, one who wishes to dislodge it from its position merely breaks it, but because of the breaking, oil and so forth come out; or whatever therein is solid, that remains as one mass. And without wishing to throw it away, one merely pours water, sand, and so forth into it, but because of the pouring in, the oil is displaced. Therefore, by way of common usage, it is said "he breaks or throws away." Thus the meaning of these terms should be understood. But in the case of one wishing to destroy, it is fitting in the other way as well. For when explained thus, the canonical text and the commentary are spoken in agreement with what precedes and what follows. And even with this much, one should not be satisfied, but should attend upon teachers and ascertain the decision.

The discussion on what is on the ground is concluded.

Discussion on What is on Dry Land

95. Regarding "situated on land, placed on land": whether placed on the ground surface, or on rock surfaces, mountain surfaces, and so forth, wherever, whether covered or uncovered, it should be understood as "situated on land." If that is heaped up, it should be adjudicated by the determination concerning placing inside a pot, putting into a vessel, and cutting off a handful. If it is bound together, such as resin, gum, and so forth, it should be adjudicated by the determination concerning ripe honey and molasses. If it is heavy, bound as a load, such as a lump of metal, a ball of raw sugar, a pot of oil or honey, and so forth, it should be adjudicated by the determination concerning dislodging from its position in a pot. And for what is bound by a chain, the breaking of position should be observed. However, when something spread out and placed, such as a cloak, a rug, a cloth, and so forth, is taken hold of straight and dragged, when the far end passes beyond the area touched by the near end, it is an offence entailing defeat. Thus it should be observed in all directions. If one rolls it up and lifts it, when one causes even a hair-tip's measure to go into the air, it is an offence entailing defeat. The remainder is just by the method already stated.

The discussion on what is on dry land is concluded.

Discussion on What is in the Air

96. Regarding a peacock situated in space, the delimitation of its position should be understood by six aspects - in front by the tip of its beak, behind by the end of its tail-fan, on both sides by the edges of its wings, below by the tips of its toe-nails, and above by the tip of its crest. A monk, thinking "I shall seize an owned peacock situated in space," stands in front or extends his hand; the peacock, while still in space, moves its wings, catches the wind, interrupts its movement, and remains stationary. For that monk, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Without causing it to shake, he touches it with his hand - it is just an offence of wrong-doing. Without dislodging it from its position, he causes it to shake - a grave offence. However, having seized it with his hand or without seizing it, he makes the end of the tail-fan pass beyond the space touched by the tip of the beak, or makes the tip of the beak pass beyond the space touched by the end of the tail-fan - an offence entailing defeat. Likewise, he makes the edge of the right wing pass beyond the space touched by the edge of the left wing, or makes the edge of the left wing pass beyond the space touched by the edge of the right wing - an offence entailing defeat. Likewise, he makes the tip of the crest pass beyond the space touched by the tips of the toe-nails, or makes the tips of the toe-nails pass beyond the space touched by the tip of the crest - an offence entailing defeat.

When a peacock going through space alights on whichever limb such as the head, that is its position. Therefore, even moving it here and there when it has alighted on the hand is merely causing it to shake; but if he seizes it with the other hand and dislodges it from its position - an offence entailing defeat. He brings the other hand near, and the peacock of its own accord flies up and alights there - there is no offence. Knowing that it has alighted on a limb, with thieving intention he takes one step - a grave offence. At the second step - an offence entailing defeat.

A peacock standing on the ground obtains three positions by virtue of its two feet and its tail-fan. For one lifting it up, as long as even one position still touches the ground - a grave offence. As soon as it is freed from the ground even by the amount of a hair-tip - an offence entailing defeat. He lifts up one standing in a cage together with the cage - an offence entailing defeat. But if it is not worth a pāda, everywhere the determination should be made according to value. Leading a peacock roaming within the premises outside the premises on foot with thieving intention, he passes beyond the boundary of the door - an offence entailing defeat. For just as an enclosure is the position of a tethered sacrificial animal standing in an enclosure, so the premises within is its position. But for one who, having seized it with the hand, makes it go into space even within the premises - it is indeed an offence entailing defeat. Even for one roaming within the village, for one who makes it pass beyond the village boundary - an offence entailing defeat. But if it has gone out of its own accord and is roaming in the vicinity of the village or the vicinity of the premises, one with thieving intention frightens it with a stick or a clod and turns it towards the forest; the peacock flies up and alights within the village or within the premises or on a rooftop - it is protected. But if it flies up towards the forest or goes, in the absence of the plan "I shall drive it into the forest and seize it," as soon as it has flown up even by the amount of a hair-

tip from the ground, or at the second step - an offence entailing defeat. Why? Because for one that has left the village, the very place where it stands is its position. The same determination applies also for francolins and so forth.

"Or a cloth" - a cloth tied in a bundle, lifted up by the force of the wind, going through space as if spread out and placed on the surface of the ground, coming towards him - he seizes it with his hand at one end; without disturbing its position here and there, in interrupting its movement - an offence of wrong-doing. Without dislodging it from its position, he shakes it; in causing it to shake - a grave offence. He dislodges it from its position - an offence entailing defeat. And the delimitation of its position should be understood by six aspects just as for the peacock.

However, an unbound cloth, as soon as it is grasped at one end, falls by the other end and rests on the ground; it has two positions - the hand and the ground. He moves it, just as grasped, first from the place where it was grasped, there is a grave offence. Afterwards he lifts it from the ground with the other hand or with the foot, there is an offence entailing defeat. Or first he lifts it from the ground, there is a grave offence. Afterwards he dislodges it from the place where it was grasped, there is an offence entailing defeat. Or without releasing his grip, he bends his hand straight down, brings it to the ground, and lifts it up with that same hand, there is an offence entailing defeat. The same determination applies to a turban as well.

"Unwrought gold or gold being cut" means an ornament such as a necklace of people who are adorning themselves, or a piece of gold of goldsmiths who are cutting a gold rod, being cut, falls. If a monk, with thieving intention, grasps it with his hand as it comes through the air, the grasping itself is the position. He moves his hand away from the place where it was grasped, there is an offence entailing defeat. He lifts up with his hand what has fallen on his robe, there is an offence entailing defeat. Without lifting it up he simply walks away, at the second step there is an offence entailing defeat. The same method applies when it has fallen into the bowl. He grasps with his hand what has settled on his head, or face, or foot, there is an offence entailing defeat. Without grasping it he simply walks away, at the second step there is an offence entailing defeat. Wherever it falls, the place where it has fallen is its position, not the whole of one's limbs and minor limbs, nor the bowl or robe.

The discussion on what is in the sky is concluded.

Discussion on What is in Mid-Air

97. Regarding goods situated in the sky, whether goods placed on beds, chairs and so forth are touchable or untouchable, for one who touches them with thieving intention, there is an offence of wrong-doing. However, here regarding goods placed on beds and chairs, the determination should be understood in the manner stated for goods situated on the ground. But this is the distinction - if a cloth tied at the edges is spread over a bed or a chair and its middle does not touch the surface of the bed but touches only the legs of the bed, the position should be understood by reference to those legs. For merely by passing beyond the area touched above the legs, there is an offence entailing defeat in that case. But for one carrying it away together with the bed or chair, the position should be understood by reference to the place where the legs of the bed or chair are established.

"Or on a bamboo pole for robes" means on a bamboo pole or a wooden stick that has been tied and set up for the purpose of placing robes. Therein, for a robe that has been folded and placed with the far end and the near side forming a bend, the position is only the area touched by the place where it rests, not the entire robe-pole. Therefore, for one who, with thieving intention, grasps it at the bend and pulls it, causing the area where it rests on the pole on the far side and the area where the robe touches the pole on the near side to be passed beyond, there is an offence entailing defeat by pulling merely one or two finger-breadths. The same method applies also for one who grasps it at the end and pulls. But for one who, right there on the robe-pole, slides it to the left or to the right, when the left end passes beyond the position of the right end, or the right end passes beyond the position of the left end, there is an offence entailing defeat by sliding merely ten or twelve finger-breadths. For one lifting it upwards, there is an offence entailing defeat by lifting even a hair-tip's measure. For one who loosens a robe that has been tied with a cord and placed, whether touching the robe-pole or not touching it, there is a grave offence; when it is loosened, there is an offence entailing defeat. For as soon as it is loosened, it is reckoned as "dislodged from its position." For one unwinding what has been wound around the pole and placed there, there is a grave offence; as soon as it is unwound, there is an offence entailing defeat. When it has been placed by making a loop, if one cuts the loop, or loosens it, or releases one end of the pole and removes it, there is a grave offence. As soon as it is cut, as soon as it is loosened, or as soon as it is removed, there is an offence entailing defeat. Without doing any of that, if one slides it here and there on the robe-pole, it is still protected for the time being. For in the case of a loop, the entire robe-pole is the position. Why? Because of the nature of being able to slide about therein. But when one grasps it with the hand and makes it gone into the sky, there is an offence entailing defeat. For one that has been spread out and placed, the position is only the area touched by the place where it rests. Therein, when it has been folded and placed, the determination should be understood in the manner stated. But when it stands touching the ground at one end, there are two positions for it - by reference to the place where it rests on the robe-pole and on the ground. Therein, for a cloth not tied that rests on the ground at one end, the determination should be understood in the very manner stated. The same determination applies also to the robe-cord.

Now, regarding goods hung on a hook and placed there, such as a medicine pot or a medicine bag, if it is placed without touching the wall or the ground, for one who rubs against the hanging device and removes it, as soon as it has come out from the tip of the hook, there is an offence entailing defeat. If the hanging device is tied, for one who lifts it up by the base and makes it gone into the sky, even though it has not come out from the tip of the hook, there is an offence entailing defeat. If it rests against the wall, and one first removes it from the tip of the hook, there is a grave offence. Afterwards, when one detaches it from the wall, there is an offence entailing defeat. The same method applies also for one who first detaches it from the wall and afterwards removes it from the hook. But if, being unable to remove the heavy goods, one oneself makes it rest against the wall and removes it from the hook, even without detaching it from the wall again, as soon as it is removed from the hook, there is an offence entailing defeat. For a position made by oneself is not a position. But for one that stands touching the ground, there are just two positions. Therein, the

determination is as already stated. But whatever has been hung by inserting it on a peg, for one who removes it from the peg, or for one who removes it from the hook together with the peg, there is an offence entailing defeat. And here the distinction of positions should be understood by reference to resting against the wall or the ground.

"Wall peg" means one that is made straight and hammered into a wall, or one that has grown there naturally; an ivory peg, however, is curved and only hammered in. Goods hung and placed on these should be adjudicated in the same manner as stated for hooks. However, when placed upon two or three standing in a row, if one grasps a spear or a javelin by the tip or by the base and pulls it, when it passes beyond the space touched by each one, there is an offence entailing defeat. For only the space touched by each is their position, not all the pegs or ivory pegs. Standing facing the wall and grasping it in the middle and pulling, when the far end passes beyond the space touched by the near end, there is an offence entailing defeat. The same method applies also to one pushing it from the far side. Grasping it with the hand and lifting it straight up, even making it go into the air by as much as a hair-tip, there is an offence entailing defeat. When placed leaning against a wall, one pulls it rubbing against the wall - for one who causes the base to pass beyond the space touched by the tip, or the tip to pass beyond the space touched by the base, there is an offence entailing defeat. Standing facing the wall and pulling, one causes the other end to pass beyond the space touched by one end, there is an offence entailing defeat. Lifting it straight up, one makes even a hair-tip amount go into the air, there is an offence entailing defeat.

"Or hung on a tree" means the adjudication should be understood in the manner stated for hooks etc., regarding items placed upon and hung on palmyra trees and the like. However, for one shaking a cluster of fruit grown there naturally, there is a grave offence. When the fruit in which the matter for defeat is fulfilled becomes freed from its bond, at the very moment of being freed, there is an offence entailing defeat. One cuts the cluster, there is an offence entailing defeat. Fruit placed by being set up amongst the leaves at the top obtains two positions - the position where it is placed and the position of the stalk; therein the adjudication should be understood in the manner stated. But one who, out of fear that "when cut it would make a sound while falling," himself places it up amongst the leaves at the top and then cuts it, at the very moment of cutting there is an offence entailing defeat. For a position made by oneself is not a position. By this method, the adjudication regarding the flowers and fruits of all trees should be understood.

"Even on a prop for bowls" - here, whether it be a tree-stand, or a ring-stand, or a stick-stand, whatever bowl-holder it may be, even a basket, it is reckoned as a prop for bowls. Therein, the position of a bowl placed there is only the space touched by the bowl. Therein, on a tree-stand, the delimitation of position occurs in five ways. Therein, grasping a bowl standing there by the rim and pulling it from any direction among the four directions, one causes the other end to pass beyond the space touched by one end, there is an offence entailing defeat. Lifting it upwards by even a hair-tip amount, there is an offence entailing defeat. The same method applies also to one carrying it together with the stand.

The discussion on what is in mid-air is concluded.

Discussion on What is in Water

98. Regarding "situated in water" - "placed in water" means that those who are frightened by fear of kings and so forth, having well concealed them in copper vessels and the like, which are things that are not destroyed by water, placed them in still water in ponds and so forth. Its position is only the place where it is established, not the entire water. "Or he goes, there is an offence of wrong-doing" means for one going on foot in shallow water, there is a wrong-doing at each step. For one making an effort with hands or feet in deep water, there is a wrong-doing at each effort, whether by strokes of the hands or strokes of the feet. The same method applies to diving and emerging for the purpose of seizing the pot. But if in the meantime, having seen a water snake or a fierce fish, he flees in fear, there is no offence. Regarding touching and so forth, the determination should be understood in the same manner as stated for a pot situated on the ground. But this is the distinction - there one digs the ground and pulls it out, here one pushes it into the mud. Thus the determination of position is by six modes.

Regarding water lilies and the like, whichever flower fulfils the basis, when that is merely cut, there is an offence entailing defeat. And here, for those of the water lily species, as long as the bark on even one side is not cut through, it still protects. But for those of the lotus species, when the stalk is cut, even if the thread inside is uncut, it does not protect. There are water lilies and the like that have been cut and placed by the owners; whichever fulfils the basis, when that is lifted, there is an offence entailing defeat. There are those tied in bunches; whichever bunch fulfils the basis, when that is lifted, there is an offence entailing defeat. There are those tied in loads; for one dislodging that load from its position by any one of the six modes, there is an offence entailing defeat in the manner stated for a pot situated on the ground. There are water lilies and the like with long stalks; having made a braid with the flowers or the stalks, they either place or tie them on the surface of the water, having spread grass on ropes. The determination of dislodging from position should be understood by the six modes: lengthwise by the tip of the flower and the end of the stalk, crosswise by the edges, below by the place where it is established, above by the surface of what stands on top.

Even one who, by stirring the water and raising a wave, dislodges a bunch of flowers placed on the surface of the water from its established position by even a hair's tip, commits an offence entailing defeat. But if he plans "I shall take it when it has gone there," it still protects; but when he lifts it at the place where it has gone, there is an offence entailing defeat. For a flower rising above the water, the entire water is its position; for one uprooting it and pulling it straight up, when the end of the stalk has passed beyond the water by even a hair's tip, there is an offence entailing defeat. Having grasped the flower and bent it aside, he pulls it out and uproots it - the water is not its position; at the mere moment of uprooting, there is an offence entailing defeat. Flowers tied in bunches are tied and placed at a water location, or on a tree, or on a bush. For one moving them here and there without releasing the binding, there is a grave offence; at the mere moment the binding is released, there is an offence entailing defeat. First releasing the binding and afterwards carrying it away - here the determination of position is by the six modes. Both of these are stated in the Mahāpaccaṛī and other texts. For one wishing to take flowers together with the lotus

plant, the determination of position should be understood both upwards and crosswise, by way of the water touched by the flower stalks and the leaf stalks. But for one pulling the flowers or leaves towards oneself without uprooting that lotus plant, there is a grave offence. At the mere moment of uprooting, there is an offence entailing defeat.

Even without dislodging the flower and leaf stalks from their position, for one first uprooting the lotus plant, there is a grave offence. Afterwards, when the flower and leaf stalks are dislodged from their position, there is an offence entailing defeat. But one who takes a flower from an uprooted lotus plant should be made to pay after the goods have been assessed. The same method applies also to flowers placed outside, whether heaped, tied in bunches, or tied in loads. For one uprooting a lotus root or a fibrous root by which the basis is fulfilled, there is an offence entailing defeat. And here the position should be determined by way of the area touched by the mud. For one uprooting them, as long as even a fine root remains uncut, it still protects. A leaf or a flower that has grown on a lotus root joint also protects - this is stated in the Great Commentary itself. But on a lotus root knot there is a thorn, like the facial pimples of those who have reached youth; this, because of its lack of length, does not protect. The remainder is in the same manner as stated regarding water lilies and the like.

For fish and tortoises that have owners, the entire water in reservoirs and so forth is their position. Therefore, one who catches an owned fish at a tending place with a hook, a net, a trap, or by hand - when the fish by which the matter is fulfilled is lifted even by a hair's tip from the water, there is an offence entailing defeat. If a fish being caught runs here and there, or leaps into the air, or falls on the bank, even taking it while situated in the air or fallen on the bank is still an offence entailing defeat. The same method applies also to a tortoise that has gone outside for foraging and is caught. However, for one situated in water, releasing it from the water is an offence entailing defeat.

In various districts, depending on the sluice gate of a great lake that is common to all, they dig a water channel resembling a small river that is also common to all. From that, having drawn off small canals, at the end of the canals they dig pits for their own respective use. When they have need of water, they clear the pits, the small canals, and the water channel, and open the sluice gate. Then fish come out together with the water and gradually reach the pits and dwell there. There, they do not prevent those catching fish in the lake and in the water channels. However, in their own respective small canals and water pits, they do not allow others to catch the fish that have entered, they prevent them; therein, one who catches fish in the lake, the sluice gate, or the water channel should not be penalised for theft. However, one who catches fish that have entered the small canals or the pits should be penalised according to the value of what was taken. If a fish being caught leaps into the air or falls on the bank, for one who takes it situated in the air or on the bank, freed from the water, there is no theft. Why? Because the owners are owners only of what remains in their own area of possession. For such is the agreement there. The same method applies also to tortoises.

If, however, a fish being caught climbs from the pit into the small canal, even catching it there is still theft. But for one who catches it having climbed from the

small canal into the water channel, and from there into the lake, there is no theft. One who lures fish from the pit with rice grains, causes them to ascend into the canal, and catches them - that is indeed theft. But for one who lures them from there and causes them to ascend into the water channel and catches them, there is no theft. Some, however, having brought fish from some common place and thrown them into water pits in the rear part of their property, rear them and kill two or three daily for the purpose of extra provisions. For one who takes such a fish situated anywhere - in water, in the air, or on the bank - it is indeed theft. The same method applies also to tortoises.

In the dry season, however, when the flow of a river is cut off, water remains in some low-lying place; there people throw in intoxicating fruits and such substances for the destruction of fish and go away; the fish, eating those, die and float belly-up in the water. One who goes there and takes them thinking "I shall take these fish before the owners come" should be penalised according to their value. For one who takes them with the perception of discarded property, there is no theft; but if he has them brought, the goods are to be given back. The people who threw in the fish poison, having brought vessels, filled them, and gone away - as long as they have the intention "we shall come again," those fish are still owned. But when they depart without attachment thinking "that is enough for us," from that point onwards, for one who takes them with thieving intention, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For one with the perception of discarded property, there is no offence. And just as with fish and tortoises, so should the determination be understood for all aquatic species.

The discussion on what is in water is concluded.

Discussion on What is on a Boat

99. Regarding goods situated on a boat -First, showing the boat, he said: "A boat means that by which one crosses." Therefore, here even a dye-trough or a bundle of bamboo should be understood as a "boat." However, in the designation of a boundary, a permanent boat made by hollowing out the inside or by fastening with planks, at the very minimum limit, is suitable only if it has a capacity of three cartloads. But here, even one with a capacity of a single cartload is called a "boat." "Placed on a boat" means anything whether attached to a living being or not attached to a living being; the characteristic of its stealing should be understood in the same manner as stated for goods situated on land. And regarding "I will steal the boat" and so forth, seeking a companion, going, touching, and causing to shake are in the same manner as stated. Regarding "he releases the mooring," here, for a boat that does not move from its position merely when the mooring is released, as long as the mooring has not been released, there is an offence of wrong-doing. But when it is released, there is either a grave offence or an offence entailing defeat; that will become clear later. The remainder is according to the method already stated. This is the explanation of the canonical text.

Now here is the determination beyond the canonical text -For a boat moored and placed in a swift current, the mooring alone is its one position; when that is merely released, there is an offence entailing defeat. The reasoning therein has been stated previously. But for a lost boat, whatever area of water it has spread over and remains in, that is its position. Therefore, for one raising it upwards, or sinking it downwards,

or moving it past the contacted area in the four directions, at the mere moment of passing beyond, there is an offence entailing defeat. For one dragging a boat that is unmoored and standing by its own nature in still water, forwards or backwards or to the left or right side, at the mere moment when one end passes beyond the contacted area while the other end remains established in the water, there is an offence entailing defeat. When lifted upwards from the water even as little as a hair-tip, at the mere moment when the bottom of the boat passes beyond the rim of the contacted area below, there is an offence entailing defeat. For a boat moored to the bank and placed in still water, there are two positions: the mooring and the place where it stands. If one first releases it from the mooring, there is a grave offence. Afterwards, if one dislodges it from its position by any one of the six modes, there is an offence entailing defeat. If one first dislodges it from its position and afterwards releases the mooring, the same method applies. For a boat hauled up on dry land and placed upright, the contacted area alone is its position. The delimitation of its position should be understood by the five modes.

But for a boat placed upside down, the contacted area of the rim alone is its position; having known the delimitation of its position also by the five modes, it should be understood that at the mere moment of passing beyond the contacted area from any direction and upwards even as little as a hair-tip, there is an offence entailing defeat. But for a boat hauled up on dry land and placed upon two wooden supports, the contacted area of the wooden supports alone is its position; therefore, the determination there should be understood in the manner stated for a cloth spread and tied on the tops of bed-legs and for a water-pot placed on wall-pegs.

But in the case of a boat fastened with a rope, without unfastening the rope measuring sixty or seventy fathoms, having dragged it away -

For a boat placed on dry land together with a rope attached to the ground, the position is not merely the contacted area alone. Rather, it should be understood that the position is, in length, from the end of the rope up to the far end of the area where the boat rests on the ground, and across, the measure of the extent where both the boat and the rope rest on the ground. For one dragging it lengthwise or across, at the mere moment when one end passes beyond the contacted area while the other end remains established on the ground, or when lifted upwards even as little as a hair-tip together with the rope from the ground, there is an offence entailing defeat. But one who, having boarded a boat standing at a landing, with thieving intention propels it with a rudder or an oar, there is an offence entailing defeat. But if, having extended an umbrella or having stepped on a robe with the feet and lifted it up with the hands making it like a sail to catch the wind, and a strong wind comes and carries the boat away, it is carried away by the wind alone; there is no stealing on the part of the person. There is an effort, but that effort is not an effort to dislodge from its position. But if one interrupts the natural course of that boat going thus and takes it to another direction, there is an offence entailing defeat. If it arrives of its own accord at some village landing and one sells it without dislodging it from its position and goes away, there is no stealing at all. But there is liability for the goods.

The discussion on boats is concluded.

Discussion on What is on a Vehicle

100. Regarding what is situated on a vehicle -First showing the vehicle, he said beginning with "a vehicle means a litter." Therein, a litter is one made by covering it with a canopy-like structure above, covered with cloth, or fully enclosed on all sides. A palanquin is one made in the manner of a garuḷa's wings, with rafters made of gold, silver, and such materials placed on both sides. A chariot and a cart are well known. Among these, wherever goods - whether sentient or non-sentient - placed in a heap or otherwise, are dislodged from their position with thieving intention, the offence entailing defeat should be understood in the same manner as stated for what is situated on a boat and what is situated on land.

But this is the distinction - When one takes goods situated on a vehicle, such as rice and the like, with a basket, even though the basket has not been lifted up, if by removing the basket the unified state of the rice and the like is disrupted, it is an offence entailing defeat. This method applies also to what is situated on land and so forth. In the case beginning with "with the intention to steal a vehicle," seeking a companion and so forth are in the same manner as stated. Regarding "he dislodges it from its position," here, for a vehicle yoked with a pair, there are ten positions: eight feet of the two oxen and two wheels. For one with thieving intention who sits on the yoke and drives it, when the oxen lift their feet, it is a grave offence. But when the wheels have passed beyond the spot where they rested on the ground by even a hair's tip, it is an offence entailing defeat. But if the oxen, knowing "this is not our master," abandon the yoke and stand pulling back or struggle, it is still guarded for the time being. When one straightens the oxen again, places them at the yoke, fastens them firmly, strikes them with a goad and drives them, when their feet are lifted, it is a grave offence in the same manner as stated. When the wheels pass beyond, it is an offence entailing defeat.

Even if on a muddy road one wheel is stuck in the mud, and the oxen turning cause the second wheel to roll, because one wheel remains stationary, there is no taking for the time being. But when one straightens the oxen again and drives them, when the stationary wheel passes beyond the spot it touched by even a hair's tip, it is an offence entailing defeat. For one yoked with four, there are eighteen positions; for one yoked with eight, thirty-four - by this method, the distinction of positions for a yoked vehicle should be understood.

But for one that is unyoked, propped up with one support at the front and two supports at the back, there are five positions by way of the three supports and the wheels. If the support at the front has been fashioned with a split at the lower part, there are six positions. But for one propped up only at the front without being propped up at the back, there are three or four positions by way of the supports. For one placed upon a plank or a piece of timber by means of the yoke-pole, there are three positions. Likewise for one placed on the ground. For one who dislodges it from its position by pulling the yoke-pole or by lifting it, either forwards or backwards, it is a grave offence. When the wheels have passed beyond the spot where they rested by even a hair's tip, it is an offence entailing defeat. For one placed upon pieces of timber by the two axle-heads with the wheels removed, there are two positions. When one pulling or lifting it causes it to pass beyond the spot it touched, it is an offence entailing defeat. For one placed on the ground, there are five positions by way of the yoke-pole and the four axle-projections resting on the ground. When one grasps the

yoke-pole and pulls, when the rear ends of the axle-projections pass beyond the front ends, it is an offence entailing defeat. When one grasps the axle-projections and pulls, when the front ends of the axle-projections pass beyond the rear ends, it is an offence entailing defeat. When one grasps the side and pulls, it is an offence entailing defeat by the axle-projections passing laterally beyond the spot where they rested. When one grasps the middle and lifts, when it is released from the ground by even a hair's tip, it is an offence entailing defeat. Now, if there are no axle-projection pegs, and the axle-heads have been inserted by making the shaft level and piercing through the middle, the lower surface of that rests touching the ground all around. Therein, the offence entailing defeat should be understood by way of passing beyond the spot touched in the four directions and upwards. For a wheel placed on the ground on its hub, there is just one position, and its delimitation is in five ways. For one standing touching the ground by the side of the rim and the hub, there are two positions. When one steps on the raised part of the rim with the foot, making it touch the ground, and then grasps the spokes or the rim and lifts it, the position created by oneself does not count as a position; therefore, even though that position remains, when the remaining position is passed beyond by even the slightest amount, it is an offence entailing defeat.

A wheel placed leaning against a wall also has two positions. Therein, for one first dislodging it from the wall, there is a grave offence. Afterwards, when it is lifted from the ground by even a hair's breadth, there is an offence entailing defeat. However, for one first dislodging it from the ground, if the position established against the wall is not disturbed, the same method applies. Then, for one grasping the spokes and pulling downwards, when the upper end of the area that was touching the wall passes beyond the lower end, there is an offence entailing defeat. When a vehicle has set out on the road and the owner of the vehicle has dismounted for some task and gone off the road, then another monk coming from the opposite direction, seeing it unguarded, mounts it thinking "I shall steal the vehicle" - if without any effort on his part the oxen take off and depart, there is no theft. The remainder is similar to what was stated regarding a boat.

The discussion on vehicles is concluded.

Discussion on What is a Burden

101. Hereafter, the burden itself is the subject of the burden section. It is shown in four ways by means of head-burden and so forth. Therein, for the purpose of avoiding confusion regarding head-burdens and so forth, the delimitation of the head and so forth should be understood. Therein, as for the head first: at the front of the neck is the throat-hollow; at the back of the neck, at the ends of the hair, there is a whorl; on both sides of the neck itself, some hairs grow downwards, which are called sideburns; and below these - this is the lower boundary; above that is the head. A burden resting within this area is called a head-burden.

On both sides, from the sideburns downwards, from the elbows upwards, from the whorl at the back of the neck and from the throat-hollow downwards, and from the whorl at the middle of the back and from the heart-hollow at the middle of the chest boundary upwards - this is the shoulder. A burden resting within this area is called a shoulder-burden.

From the whorl at the middle of the back and from the heart-hollow downwards as far as the tips of the toenails - this is the hip delimitation. A burden resting within this area all around the body is called a hip-burden.

From the elbows downwards as far as the tips of the fingernails - this is the hanging-burden delimitation. A burden resting within this area is called a hanging burden.

Now, regarding "with thieving intention he touches a burden on the head" and so forth, this is the unprecedented determination: If a monk, not commanded by the owners saying "take this and go there," himself says "give me such-and-such, I will carry your goods," and while going with their goods on his head, touches those goods with thieving intention, it is an offence of wrong-doing. While not exceeding the aforesaid head-boundary, rubbing here and there, whether he moves it forward or moves it backward, it is a grave offence. As soon as he lowers it to the shoulder, even though the owners have the thought "let him carry it," because he was not commanded by them, it is an offence entailing defeat. Even without lowering it to the shoulder, for one who dislodges it from the head even by a hair-tip, it is an offence entailing defeat. In the case of a double burden, however, one burden rests on the head and one on the back; therein, the determination should be understood by way of the two positions. But this teaching has been undertaken only by way of pure head-burdens and so forth. And the determination that has been stated regarding the head-burden applies equally to shoulder-burdens and so forth.

Regarding "a burden in the hand" - here, because it is held by the hand, a hanging load is called "a burden in the hand."

Whether it was first taken from the ground or with pure intention by the head and so forth, it is reckoned simply as "a burden in the hand." For one who, with thieving intention, seeing a suitable place to seize it, puts it down on the ground or on a cart and so forth, as soon as it is released from the hand, it is an offence entailing defeat. Regarding "with thieving intention he takes it from the ground," herein, for one who, having put down any of those burdens on the ground with pure intention for the purpose of breakfast and so forth, then lifts it up again with thieving intention even by a hair-tip, it is an offence entailing defeat.

The discussion on burdens is concluded.

Discussion on What is in a Monastery Garden

102. Regarding goods situated in a park -First, showing the park, he said: "A park means a flower park or a fruit park." Among these, a flower park is one where jasmine and such plants flower. A fruit park is one where mango fruits and such bear fruit. The determination regarding what is placed in a park in four positions follows the same method as stated for goods situated on the ground, etc.

However, regarding what has grown there, "root" means any root such as *usīra* grass, *hirivera* and so forth; for one who uproots it or takes what has been uprooted, when the root by which the value is fulfilled is taken, there is an offence entailing defeat. A tuber is also included under root. And here, for one who is uprooting, even when a small amount is cut off, it is only a grave offence. The determination therein should be understood in the same manner as stated regarding lotus roots. "Bark" means any

tree bark that is suitable for use as medicine or as dye; for one who strips it off or takes what has been stripped off, there is an offence entailing defeat in the same manner as stated regarding roots. "Flower" means any flower such as jasmine, mallika and so forth; for one who picks it or takes what has been picked, there is an offence entailing defeat in the same manner as stated regarding water lilies and lotuses. For even regarding flowers, an uncut stalk or attachment point protects. However, in the interior of the stalk of some, there is a needle-like part; that does not protect. "Fruit" means any such as mango fruit, palm fruit and so forth; the determination for one who takes it from a tree is stated in the discussion of what is attached to a tree. What has been removed and placed is included under goods situated on the ground, etc.

"He lays claim to a park" means he falsely says of what belongs to another "This belongs to me" and lays claim to it; because it is an attempt at taking what is not given, it is an offence of wrong-doing. "He arouses doubt in the owner" means through skill in legal proceedings or through being supported by a powerful person and so forth, he generates uncertainty in the park owner. How? For seeing him thus engaged in legal proceedings, the owner thinks: "Will I be able to keep this park as my own, or will I not be able to?" Thus the doubt arising in him has been aroused by that person; therefore he commits a grave offence.

"He gives up the responsibility" means when the owner gives up the responsibility thinking "This person is obstinate and harsh; he might even create an obstacle to my life and holy life; enough now for me with this park," the claimant commits an offence entailing defeat. If he himself has also given up the responsibility, but even when the owner has given up the responsibility, the claimant, without giving up the responsibility, is zealous about giving it away thinking "Having thoroughly oppressed this person and having shown the exercise of my authority and having placed him in a state of obedient servitude, I shall give it," it still protects. Furthermore, if the claimant gives up the responsibility thinking "Having seized it, I shall not now give it to him," but the owner does not give up the responsibility, seeks allies, bides his time, thinking "Let me first obtain a sympathetic assembly, I shall deal with it afterwards," and is still zealous about recovering it, it still protects. But when he too thinks "I shall not give it," and the owner too thinks "I shall not obtain it" - thus when both give up the responsibility, then there is an offence entailing defeat for the claimant. But if, having laid claim and conducting the legal proceedings, while the proceedings are unfinished and the owner has not given up the responsibility, knowing himself to be a non-owner, he takes from there some flower or fruit, he should be made to pay the value of the goods.

"Pursuing the case" means conducting legal proceedings either in the community of monks or in the royal court. "He defeats the owner" means he gives a bribe to the judges and brings in false witnesses and defeats the park owner - this is the meaning. "There is an offence entailing defeat" means not only for him alone, but for all those who deliberately act to accomplish his purpose - the fraudulent judges and the false witnesses too - there is an offence entailing defeat. And here, the defeat of the owner should be understood only by way of his giving up the responsibility. For one who has not given up the responsibility is indeed undefeated. "Pursuing the case, he is defeated" means even if, because the proceedings are conducted according to the

Dhamma, the Vinaya and the Teacher's instruction, he himself reaches defeat; even so, because of causing distress to the owners through false speech, he commits a grave offence.

The discussion on parks is concluded.

Discussion on What is in a Dwelling

103. Regarding goods situated in a monastery -placed in four positions is according to the method already stated. And here, regarding a claim, when one lays claim to a monastery, whether large or small, or a precinct, or a dwelling given to monks dedicated to the Community of the four directions, the claim does not succeed. One is also unable to seize it by forceful appropriation. Why? Because there is no giving up of responsibility by all. For here, not all monks of the four directions give up responsibility. However, when one lays claim to and takes the property of a group of the various kinds such as the long-reciter group, or of a single individual, one is able to make them give up responsibility. Therefore, in that case, the adjudication should be understood according to the method stated regarding a monastery.

The discussion on monasteries is concluded.

Discussion on Fields

104. Regarding goods situated in a field -First, showing what a field is, he said: "A field means where early crops or late crops are produced." Therein, early crops means the seven grains such as rice and so forth; late crops means mung beans, black beans and so forth; sugarcane fields and the like are also included here. Here too, the method stated regarding goods placed in four positions is the same. However, regarding crops that have grown there, for one who takes them by grasping rice heads and the like, or by cutting them one by one with the hand alone, or by reaping with a sickle, or by uprooting many together - whichever seed, or head, or fistful, or fruit of mung beans and the like completes the requisite value, at the mere moment of releasing it from its bond, there is an offence entailing defeat. However, the uncut stalk, or bark, or skin, even a small amount, protects.

Even though the rice stalk is long, as long as the stem of the rice head does not emerge from within the stalk, it protects. When even a hair-tip's measure of the lower surface of the stem emerges from the stalk, he should be dealt with according to the value of the goods. However, for one who takes by reaping with a sickle, even though those in the fistful are cut below, if the heads are entangled, they still protect. But having disentangled them, if when lifting up even a hair-tip's measure the requisite value is completed, there is an offence entailing defeat. However, for one who takes what has been reaped and set aside by the owners, whether with chaff or without chaff, by whichever the requisite value is completed, when that is taken there is an offence entailing defeat. If he plans: "I shall thresh this and winnow it and take only the essence," it still protects. Even for one who dislodges it from its position during threshing and winnowing, there is no offence entailing defeat; afterwards, at the mere moment of placing it into a container, there is an offence entailing defeat. The method for laying claim here is the same as already stated.

Regarding the moving of stakes and so forth, land is priceless. Therefore, if by means of a single stake one makes one's own even a hair-tip's measure of a portion of land from here, whether the owners are watching or not watching, at the mere moment of moving that stake - whether having cut the name or without cutting it - there is an offence entailing defeat for him and for all who share the same intention with him. But if it is to be taken by means of two stakes, at the first stake there is a grave offence; at the second, an offence entailing defeat. If it is to be taken by means of three, at the first there is an offence of wrong-doing, at the second a grave offence, at the third an offence entailing defeat. Thus even with many, setting aside the last two, for the earlier ones there is an offence of wrong-doing; of the last two, for one there is a grave offence, for the other an offence entailing defeat - this should be understood. And that is by the owners' giving up of responsibility. Thus everywhere.

"Or a rope" means wishing to make known "this is my own," he stretches out a rope or lays down a measuring rod - an offence of wrong-doing. "I shall now make it my own by two efforts" - of those, at the first there is a grave offence, at the second an offence entailing defeat.

"Or a fence" means wishing to make another's field one's own by means of enclosure, he plants posts; at each effort there is an offence of wrong-doing. When one has not arrived, there is a grave offence; when that has arrived, there is an offence entailing defeat. If being unable with just that much, he is able to make it his own by means of branches alone as an enclosure, the same method applies to the laying of branches as well. Thus by whatever means one is able to make it one's own by enclosing, in each case for the earlier efforts there is an offence of wrong-doing. Of the last two, for one there is a grave offence, for the other an offence entailing defeat - this should be understood.

"Or the boundary" - here, one who wishes to make known "this is mine" regarding another's field, the boundary of one's own field -

He moves the field boundary so that it encroaches upon another's field, or by adding earth and clay and so forth he makes it extended, or he establishes one that was not previously made - for the preceding efforts, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Of the last two, by one there is a grave offence, by the other there is an offence entailing defeat.

The discussion on fields is concluded.

Discussion on Sites

105. Regarding what is situated on a site -First, showing the site, he said: "Site means a park site, a monastery site." Therein, without planting seeds or seedlings, merely by clearing the ground and enclosing it with any of the three walls or without enclosing it, a portion of land set aside for the purpose of flower gardens and the like is called a park site. By this same method, a portion of land set aside for the purpose of a single monastery, a compound, or a dwelling is called a monastery site. Even that which was formerly a park or a monastery but later fell into ruin and remains as mere ground, no longer serving the function of a park or monastery, is also included under the classification of park site and monastery site. The determination here, however, is similar to what was stated regarding what is situated on a field.

106. Regarding goods situated in a village, what should be said has already been said.

Discussion on Forests

107. Regarding "situated in the forest" -First showing what "forest" means, he said: "Whatever is owned by human beings, that is forest." Therein, since what is called "forest" includes both that which is owned by human beings and that which is not owned; but here what is intended is that which is owned and guarded, from which firewood, creepers and the like cannot be taken without payment. Therefore, having said "whatever is owned by human beings," the word "forest" is stated again. By this he shows this meaning: "The state of being owned is not the defining characteristic of a forest. But whatever is a forest by its own characteristic of being a forest and is also owned by human beings, that is 'forest' in this context." Therein, the determination is similar to what was stated regarding goods situated in a park and so forth.

Regarding things that have grown there, even when a single valuable tree is cut, there is an offence entailing defeat. With regard to "or creepers," here both cane and creepers are indeed creepers; therein, whichever cane or creeper is long and has gone through or wound around large trees and bushes, even if cut at the root it does not constitute theft, even if cut at the top; but when it is cut at both the top and the root, then it constitutes theft. But if it stands wound around, when wound around and standing, merely being released from the tree constitutes theft.

With regard to "or grass," whether it be grass or leaves, all is included by the term "grass"; one who takes it, whether cut by others or cut by oneself for the purpose of roofing houses and the like, should be made to pay the value of the goods. And not only grass and leaves, but also any bark and the like, wherever the owners have an interest, one who takes it should be made to pay the value of the goods. A tree that has been hewn and left, even if a long time has passed, should not be taken. But one that has been cut at both the top and the root, whose branches have become rotten and whose bark has fallen off, may be taken thinking "this has been abandoned by the owners." Even in the case of one that has been cut with a mark, when the mark has been covered over by bark, then it is permissible to take it. When trees have been cut for the purpose of building houses and the like, and when those houses have been built and inhabited, and the remaining timber in the forest is decaying from rain and sun, even seeing such timber, it is permissible to take it thinking "these have been abandoned." Why? Because the forest owners have no authority over them. Those who cut them after giving the due payment to the forest owners are the ones with authority, and they have abandoned them, having become indifferent towards them.

A monk who first gives the due payment to the forest wardens and then enters the forest and has trees taken as he wishes, it is permissible for him to go by whatever path he wishes even without going to their guard station. Also, if one enters without giving, thinking "I shall give when leaving," and has trees taken, and when leaving gives them what is due and goes, it is indeed permissible. Also, if one goes having made a mental note, when told "give," one says "I shall give"; when told "give," one

must indeed give. If someone gives his own wealth and says "allow the monk to pass," it is fully permissible, and it is permissible to go. But if some person of authority, without giving wealth, forbids them saying "do not take a share from monks," and the forest wardens say "if we do not take a share from monks and ascetics, from where shall we obtain it? Please give, venerable sir," then one must indeed give.

But one who comes when the forest wardens are sleeping, or absorbed in play, or have gone somewhere, and having called out "where are the forest wardens?" and not seeing them, goes on - the value of the goods is due. Even one who, having reached the guard station, passes by through forgetfulness while attending to meditation subjects and the like or being otherwise occupied - the value of the goods is still due. Even for one who, having reached that place, is confronted by a thief, an elephant, a wild beast, or a great storm, and who hastily passes that place out of desire to escape from that danger - he is protected for the time being, but the value of the goods is due. This guard station in the forest is indeed more serious than evading customs duty. For one who avoids the customs boundary without entering it, going around from a distance, incurs only an offence of wrong-doing. But one who avoids this with thieving intention, even if going through the air, incurs an offence entailing defeat. Therefore, one should be heedful in this matter.

The discussion on forests is concluded.

Discussion on Water

108. Regarding water, however - "In a vessel" means stored and kept in vessels such as water-pots during times when water is scarce; the judgement should be understood according to the method stated for ghee and oil, for one who takes it by tipping over or making a hole in whatever vessel it has been placed in, and also for one who takes it by inserting one's own vessel into ponds and lakes there.

Regarding the breaking of a boundary, however, there is a wrong-doing for one who breaks the boundary even together with plants that have grown there, because it constitutes an effort of taking what is not given. And that occurs with each blow. One who stands inside and cuts facing outward should be dealt with according to the outer edge. One who stands outside and cuts facing inward should be dealt with according to the inner edge. One who cuts both inside and outside and then, standing in the middle, cuts that, should be dealt with according to the middle. Having weakened the boundary, he calls cows, or has village boys call them; they come and break the boundary with their hooves - it is broken by that very means. Having weakened the boundary, he drives cows into the water, or has village boys drive them in; the waves raised by them break the boundary and go forth. Or he says to village boys "Play in the water," or he frightens those who are playing; the waves raised by them also break the boundary and go forth. He cuts a tree growing in the water, or has another cut it; by the waves raised by that falling tree also, the boundary is broken and they go forth - it is broken by that very means. Having weakened the boundary, for the purpose of protecting the lake, he blocks the overflow water from the lake or the drainage channel, or he builds an embankment so that water going elsewhere enters here, or he straightens a canal, or he breaches his own lake situated in the upper

region of that; the overflowing water carries away the boundary - it is broken by that very means. In all cases, he should be dealt with according to the theft proportionate to the value of the water that has gone out.

The same method applies also for one who removes water by opening the drainage pipe. But if, after the boundary has been weakened by him, cows coming of their own accord or driven by village boys who were not commanded break the boundary with their hooves, or waves are raised by cows entering the water of their own accord or driven by village boys who were not commanded, or village boys themselves enter and raise waves while playing, or a tree in the water being cut by another falls and raises waves, and the raised waves break the boundary; or even if, having weakened the boundary, he blocks the water-outlet or the water-drainage channel of a dry lake, or builds an embankment on a path where water goes elsewhere, or straightens a dry canal, and afterwards when it rains, water comes and breaks the boundary - in all cases, there is liability for compensation.

But whoever, in the hot season, cuts the boundary of a dry reservoir down to the bottom, and afterwards when it rains, the water that comes flows away - there is liability for compensation. Whatever crop arises on account of that, one who does not give even a quarter's worth from it becomes a non-ascetic through abandonment of duty towards the owners.

But whatever lake is common to all; all people are masters of the water in the lake. Below it, however, they cultivate crops; for the purpose of protecting the crops, a main canal goes out from the lake and runs through the middle of the fields, and that too is common to all during the time of constant flow. But from that, having drawn out minor canals, they channel water into their own respective paddy fields. They do not allow others to take that. In the hot season itself, when the water has become scarce, they give water by turns; whoever does not obtain it when his water-turn arrives, his crops wither; therefore, another cannot take during others' turns. Therein, whatever monk, with thieving intention, channels water from others' minor canals or paddy fields into his own or another's canal or paddy field, or diverts it towards the forest, there is a theft for him.

Even one who thinks "my turn for water will come only after a long time, and this crop is withering," into others' paddy fields -

Blocking the entry path of water that is entering and channelling it into his own paddy field is indeed a theft. But if, when the water has not yet left the lake and has not yet reached others' canal-mouths, he builds embankments here and there along a dry canal so that the approaching water enters only his own paddy field without entering others' paddy fields. If built when the water has not yet left, it is well-built; if built when the water has left, there is liability for compensation. Even for one who goes to the lake and himself opens the drainage pipe and channels water into his own paddy field, there is no theft. Why? Because the field was made in dependence on the lake. But in the Kurundī and other texts, it is said "there is a theft." That does not accord with the criterion "the object, the time, and the place." Therefore, what is stated in the Great Commentary alone is proper.

The discussion on water is concluded.

Discussion on Tooth-cleaning Sticks

109. A tooth-stick container should be adjudicated according to the adjudication of monastery attendants. But this is the distinction - One who, being hired by the Community for wages, brings tooth-sticks daily or at fortnightly or monthly intervals - having brought and even cut them, as long as he has not made the community of monks accept them, they remain his own. Therefore, one who takes them with thieving intention should be dealt with according to the value of the goods. But what grows there is heavy property; one who takes that too, which is guarded and protected by the community of monks, should be dealt with according to the value of the goods. The same method applies also to what belongs to a group, an individual, or lay people, whether cut or uncut. Novices who bring tooth-sticks in turn for the community of monks from what grows in the monastery and garden grounds also bring them for their teachers and preceptors; as long as they have not cut them and made the Community accept them, all of it remains theirs. Therefore, one who takes that too with thieving intention should be dealt with according to the value of the goods. But when they have cut them and made the Community accept them and placed them in the tooth-stick shed, saying "Let the community of monks use them as they please"; from that point onwards there is no theft, but the proper practice should be known. For one who enters the midst of the Community daily should take only one tooth-stick each day. But one who does not enter daily, who stays in the meditation hall and is seen at the Dhamma hearing or at the Uposatha hall, should take four or five tooth-sticks after considering the appropriate amount, keep them at his dwelling place, and chew them. When those are used up, if there are still many in the tooth-stick shed, he may again bring and chew them. But if he brings them without considering the appropriate amount, and while those are not yet used up the shed becomes depleted, then some elders might say "Those who took them should bring them back," while others might say "Let them chew them, the novices will bring more again." Therefore, to avoid disputes, the appropriate amount should be considered. But there is no fault in taking them. Even one going on a journey should put one or two into a bag and go.

The discussion on tooth-sticks is concluded.

Discussion on Trees

110. "Lord of the forest" (vanappati) means the lord (pati) of the forest (vana); this is a designation for the chief tree of the forest. Here, however, every tree owned by human beings is intended, such as mango, breadfruit, jackfruit, and so forth. Where, moreover, pepper vines and the like are grown upon it, if when being cut it falls to the ground while still connected by even a single strip of bark, or fibre, or splinter, or sapwood, it is still protected.

But one which, even though cut, remains standing upright because it is held up by creepers or by branches of neighbouring trees, or which while falling does not reach the ground, there is no exemption in that case; it is simply a taking away. Even one which, cut with a saw, remains standing just as if uncut, the same principle applies in that case too.

But one who, having weakened a tree, afterwards shakes it and fells it, or has another shake it; or cuts down another tree near it and crushes it, or has another crush it; or drives monkeys away and places them upon it, or has another place them upon it; or places bats upon it, or has another place them upon it; they fell that tree - it is his taking away alone.

But if, when he has weakened the tree, another person, without being instructed, shakes it and makes it fall -

Or he crushes it with a tree, or monkeys or bats climb upon it of their own nature, or another places them without being instructed, or he himself clears the wind-path, and a strong wind comes and fells the tree; in all cases the goods must be returned. However, clearing the wind-path here corresponds to straightening a dry channel and the like when the wind has not yet arrived, not otherwise. Having pierced a tree, he strikes it with a blade, or sets fire to it, or drives in a frog-thorn or poison, by which it dies - in all cases the goods must indeed be returned.

The discussion on trees is concluded.

Discussion on Removable Property

111. Regarding movable property - "With thieving intention he touches goods being carried by another": having seen another person going along carrying goods by means of a head-load and so forth, thinking "I will take this," he goes quickly and touches it; to that extent there is a wrong-doing for him. "He causes it to shake": he pulls it back and forth; the owner does not let go; therefore there is a grave offence for him. "He dislodges it from its position": having pulled it, he frees it from the owner's hand; therefore there is an offence entailing defeat for him. But if the owner of the goods, having risen up and struck him, causes him to release that goods and takes it back, the monk is defeated by the first taking itself. For one who takes an ornament by cutting or removing it from the head, ear, neck, or hand, at the mere moment of freeing it from the head and so forth, there is an offence entailing defeat. But if, without removing a bangle or bracelet from the hand, while rubbing along the forearm he pushes it back and forth, or causes it to go into the air, it is still guarded. Like a bangle at the foot of a tree or on a robe-pole, it does not produce an offence entailing defeat. Why? Because it is on a sentient being. For as long as it has not been removed from the portion belonging to a sentient being, it remains right there. The same method applies to finger rings, ankle bracelets, waist chains, and ornamental bands.

But one who snatches the cloth worn by another, and the other out of shame does not suddenly let go, the thief pulls from one end, the other from the other end - it is still guarded. At the mere moment of release from the other's hand, there is an offence entailing defeat. And if, while he is pulling it, it tears and a portion comes into his hand, and that is worth a pāda, it is an offence entailing defeat itself. "Together with the goods-carrier": having thought "I will lead the goods together with the goods-carrier," he threatens the goods-carrier saying "Go from here!" The latter, frightened, facing the direction intended by the thief, moves one foot; for the thief there is a grave offence. at the second, an offence entailing defeat. "He causes it to fall": and further, the thief, seeing a weapon in the hand of the goods-carrier, becoming

apprehensive, wishing to take it after causing it to fall, stepping aside and threatening, causes it to fall; at the mere moment of release from the other's hand, there is an offence entailing defeat.

"He causes it to fall, there is an offence of wrong-doing" and so forth, however, is stated by way of planning. For one who, having caused the goods to fall, plans "I will take whatever pleases me" and causes it to fall, for him there is a wrong-doing in the causing to fall and in the touching, a grave offence in the causing to shake. In dislodging from its position that which is worth a pāda, there is an offence entailing defeat. For one who afterwards has it restored to him, even if he relinquishes it, there is no state of recluseship whatsoever. Also one who, seeing the goods-carrier passing by, following him and saying "Stop, stop, put down the goods!" causes him to put it down - for him too, at the mere moment of release from the other's hand, there is an offence entailing defeat.

But one who says "Stop, stop!" but does not say "Put it down!" And the other, looking at him, thinking "If he catches me, he might even kill me," becoming anxious, places the goods in a thicket and departs thinking "I will return and take it again" - there is no offence entailing defeat on account of the causing to fall. But for one who comes back and takes it with thieving intention, at the lifting up there is an offence entailing defeat. But then it occurs to him thus: "By my very act of causing it to fall, this has been made my own property" - and he takes it from there with the perception that it is his own. In the taking, it is still guarded; but there is liability for the goods. When told "Give it back," for one who does not give, when the owners abandon their claim, there is an offence entailing defeat. "He discarded this and went away; this is now ownerless" - even for one who takes it with the perception of it being a rag, the same method applies. But if the owner, merely upon hearing "Stop, stop!" looking around and seeing him, thinking "This is no longer mine," abandoning his claim, discards it without attachment and flees - for one who takes that with thieving intention, at the lifting up there is a wrong-doing. If asked to bring it back, it should be given; for one who does not give, there is an offence entailing defeat. Why? Because it was discarded through his effort - so it is stated in the Great Commentary. But in the other texts there is no discussion at all. Even for one who takes it with the perception of it being one's own or with the perception of it being a rag, by the former method itself, this is the determination.

The discussion on removable goods is concluded.

Discussion on Deposits

112. Regarding the pledge - Even though it is deliberate lying when he says "I did not take it," it is a wrong-doing because it is an effort towards taking what is not given. "What are you saying? This is not befitting for me, nor for you" - even for one saying such things, it is merely a wrong-doing. "I placed it in his hands in private, no one else knows, 'will he give it to me or not?'" - the owner arouses doubt; for the monk, it is a grave offence. Having seen his harsh behaviour and so forth, the owner gives up the responsibility thinking "He will not give it to me." Therein, if this monk is zealous about giving, thinking "I shall trouble him and then give it," he is still safeguarded. Even if he is without zeal for giving, but the owner of the goods is zealous about recovering them, he is still safeguarded. But if he is without zeal for giving and the

owner of the goods also gives up the responsibility thinking "He will not give it to me," thus by both giving up the responsibility, it is an offence entailing defeat for the monk. Even if he says with his mouth "I shall give it," but in his mind does not wish to give, even so, when the owner gives up the responsibility, it is an offence entailing defeat. Now, that pledge means goods placed in one's hands by others for safekeeping. There is no offence for one who carries them from an unguarded place, having removed them from their location, for the purpose of placing them in a guarded place. Even for one who removes them from their location with thieving intent, there is no taking away. Why? Because they were deposited in his own hands; however, there is liability for the goods. The same principle applies even for one who uses them with thieving intent. The same applies even for temporary taking. "Pursuing the case" and so forth is as already explained. This is the explanation of the canonical text.

The determination beyond the canonical text is here stated by way of the bowl tetrad and so forth as follows - A certain monk, it is said, having aroused greed for another's expensive bowl and wishing to steal it, having carefully noted the place where it was kept, placed his own bowl near that very spot. He came at the time before dawn, had the Dhamma recited, and then said to the elder who was dozing - "I pay respects, venerable sir." "Who is this?" "I, venerable sir, am a visiting monk. I wish to leave early. My bowl has been placed in such-and-such a place, with such-and-such a shoulder strap and such-and-such a bowl bag. It would be good, venerable sir, if I could obtain it." The elder went in and took it. At the very lifting up, it is an offence entailing defeat for the thief. If, having come, he is told "Who are you, coming at an improper time?" and runs away frightened, he runs away having already incurred the offence entailing defeat. But for the elder, because of his pure intention, there is no offence. The elder, intending to take that one, took a different one - the same principle applies. But this applies when he takes another one of the same kind, as in the case of an object similar to the one commanded regarding a human form. In the Kurundī, however, it is said "he should be dealt with by tracking," and that applies when he takes one that is not of the same kind.

Thinking it to be that, he took his own bowl and gave it; for the thief there is no offence entailing defeat because it was given by the owner, but there is a wrong-doing because it was taken with an impure mind. Thinking it to be that, he took the thief's own bowl and gave it; here too there is no offence entailing defeat for the thief because it was his own property, but there is merely a wrong-doing because it was taken with an impure mind. In all cases there is no offence for the elder.

Another, thinking "I shall steal the bowl," likewise paid respects to the elder who was sleeping. When asked "Who is this?" he said: "I, venerable sir, am a sick monk. Please give me a bowl for now; I shall go to the village entrance and bring back medicine." The elder, having considered "There is no sick person here; this must be a thief," thinking "Let him take this," brought out and gave the bowl of a monk who was his enemy. For both of them there is an offence entailing defeat at the very lifting up. Even when lifting up another's bowl with the perception that it is "the enemy monk's bowl," the same method applies. But if, with the perception that it is "the enemy's," he lifts up and gives the thief's own bowl, there is an offence entailing defeat for the

elder in the manner stated, and a wrong-doing for the thief. Then, thinking it to be "the enemy's," he gives his own bowl; in the manner stated there is a wrong-doing for both.

A great elder said to his attendant, a junior monk: "Take the bowl and robe; we shall go to such-and-such a village and walk for alms." The junior, having taken them and walking behind the elder, arouses an intention to steal; if he shifts the load on his head to his shoulder, there is no offence entailing defeat. Why? Because it was taken under command. But if he turns off the path and enters the forest, he should be dealt with by tracking his footsteps. Then, having turned back and fled towards the monastery, entering the monastery and going on, there is an offence entailing defeat upon passing beyond the precincts. And also if he flees towards the village from the place where the great elder changed his lower robe, there is an offence entailing defeat upon passing beyond the village precincts. But if both of them, having walked for alms, depart having either eaten or taken food, and the elder again says to him: "Take the bowl and robe; we shall go to the monastery." If therein he, in the same manner as before, with an intention to steal shifts the load on his head to his shoulder, it is still guarded for the time being. He enters the forest, he should be dealt with by tracking his footsteps. Having turned back, he flees towards the village itself; upon passing beyond the village precincts there is an offence entailing defeat. Fleeing forward towards the monastery, having arrived at the monastery without stopping, without sitting down, with the intention to steal still unsubsidied, he goes on; upon passing beyond the precincts there is an offence entailing defeat. But one who takes without being commanded, for him there is an offence entailing defeat even in shifting the load on his head to his shoulder and so forth. The remainder is just as before.

But one who, having been told "Go to such-and-such a monastery, wash the robe or dye it, and come back," takes it saying "Very well" and goes; for him too, having aroused an intention to steal along the way, there is no offence entailing defeat in shifting the load on his head to his shoulder and so forth. In turning off the path, he should be dealt with by tracking his footsteps. Having gone to that monastery and dwelling right there, using it with an intention to steal until it wears out, or thieves carry it away from him - there is no taking away, but there is liability for the goods. Even when departing from there and coming back, the same method applies.

But one who, not commanded, when the elder has made a hint or having himself noticed that it is soiled, says "Give me the robe, venerable sir; I shall go to such-and-such a village, dye it and bring it back," and having taken it, goes; for him, having aroused an intention to steal along the way, there is an offence entailing defeat in shifting the load on his head to his shoulder and so forth. Why? Because it was taken without being commanded. Whether turning off the path, or turning back and coming to that very monastery and passing beyond the monastery boundary, there is an offence entailing defeat in the manner stated. Even when, having gone there and dyed it, he comes back, if an intention to steal arises, the same method applies. But if, wherever he went, whether there or at a monastery along the way, or having come back to that very monastery, or on one side of it, dwelling without passing beyond the precinct boundary, using it with an intention to steal until it wears out, or thieves

carry it away from him, or it is destroyed in whatever way, there is liability for the goods. But upon passing beyond the precinct boundary, there is an offence entailing defeat.

But when the elder is making a hint, one says "Give it, venerable sir, I shall dye it and bring it back," and then asks "Where shall I go to dye it, venerable sir?" And the elder tells him "Go wherever you wish and dye it" - this is called a "freely dispatched messenger." Even if he flees with thievish intent, he should not be dealt with as having committed theft. But even if he flees with thievish intent, or destroys it through use or otherwise, it is merely an obligation to return the goods. A monk sends some requisite by the hand of another monk - "Give it to such-and-such a monk at such-and-such a monastery." If thievish intent arises in him, the judgement in all cases is similar to that stated in the case of "Go to such-and-such a monastery and wash or dye the robe and come back."

Another, wishing to send something by a monk, makes a hint - "Who will take this and go?" And if one says - "Give it, venerable sir, I shall take it and go," and takes it and goes, if thievish intent arises in him, the judgement in all cases is similar to that stated in the case of "Give me the robe, venerable sir, I shall go to such-and-such a village and dye it and bring it back." Cloth obtained by the elder for the purpose of making a robe has been deposited at the family of his attendant. Then his pupil, wishing to take the cloth, goes there and speaks as if sent by the elder, saying "Please give that cloth." Believing his word, if a laywoman gives out what was deposited by a layman, or a layman gives out what was deposited by a laywoman, or anyone else takes it out and gives it, there is an offence entailing defeat for him at the very lifting up. But if the elder's attendants have deposited their own cloth thinking "We shall give this to the elder." Then his pupil, wishing to take it, goes there and says "You apparently wish to give cloth to the elder; give it." And they, believing him, give it saying "We deposited it intending to give it after offering a meal, venerable sir; here, take it." Because it was given by the owners, there is no offence entailing defeat, but because it was taken with impure intent, there is an offence of wrong-doing, and there is an obligation to return the goods.

A monk tells another monk and goes to the village: "So-and-so will give my rains-residence gift; take it and keep it." "Very well," that monk, having placed the expensive cloth given by him together with the cheap cloth obtained by himself, when the other comes back, whether knowing or not knowing that his expensive cloth has been received, being told "Give me my rains-residence gift," says "Your coarse cloth has been received, but my cloth is expensive; both are placed in such-and-such a place; go in and take it." When he enters and takes the coarse cloth, for the other who takes the other one, there is an offence entailing defeat at the lifting up. And also if he writes the other's name on his own cloth and his own name on the other's cloth and says "Go, read the name and take it," the same principle applies there too. But if one places the cloths obtained by himself and by the other together and says to him thus - "The two cloths obtained by you and by me are both placed inside the room; go, select whichever you wish and take it." And if out of modesty he takes only the coarse cloth obtained by the resident monk, then for the resident monk who takes the remaining other one after selecting, there is no offence. A visiting monk places his bowl and robe near the resident monks who are doing robe-work, and thinking

"They will look after these," goes to bathe or elsewhere. If the resident monks look after it, that is well and good. If not, when it is lost there is no liability. Even if he says "Please keep this, venerable sirs" and goes, and the others do not know because they are occupied with their own tasks, the same principle applies. And also if they, when told "Please keep this, venerable sirs," refuse saying "We are busy," and the other disregards this and goes thinking "They will surely keep it," the same principle applies. But if, whether asked by him or unasked, they say "We shall keep it; you go" - that must be looked after. If they do not look after it, when it is lost there is liability. Why? Because they accepted the responsibility.

A monk who, being the storekeeper, early at the time before dawn brings down the monks' bowls and robes to the lower storey of the building, closes the door, and without even informing them goes far away on alms-round; if thieves carry those away, the liability is his alone. But one who, when told by the monks "Please bring down the bowls and robes, venerable sir; it is time for taking meal-tickets," asks "Have you all assembled?" and when told "Yes, we have assembled," takes out and sets down the bowls and robes, fastens the storeroom door, and saying "You should take your bowls and robes, look after the door of the lower storey of the building, and then go," goes away. There, one lazy-natured monk, after the other monks have gone, gets up later rubbing his eyes and goes to the water place for washing his face; seeing that moment, thieves carry away his bowl and robe - that is well taken. There is no liability for the storekeeper.

If anyone, without even informing the storekeeper, places his own requisite in the storeroom, even if that is lost, there is no liability for the storekeeper. But if the storekeeper, seeing that, takes it up thinking "It has been placed in an improper place" and places it elsewhere, if it is lost, the liability is his. If, when told by the monk who placed it "Venerable sir, I have placed such and such a requisite here, please take note of it," he accepts saying "Very well," or thinking it improperly placed, places it in another location, the liability is his alone. But for one who refuses saying "I do not know about it," there is no liability. Even one who places it while the storekeeper is watching but does not make the storekeeper accept responsibility, if it is lost, it is simply well lost. If the storekeeper places it elsewhere, if it is lost, the liability is his. If the storeroom is well secured, and all the requisites of the Community and the shrine are placed right there, but the storekeeper, being foolish and incompetent, opens the door and goes somewhere to listen to a talk on the Teaching or to do something else, and seeing that moment, whatever thieves carry away, all of it is his liability. Whether he has come out of the storeroom and is walking outside, or has opened the door to air his body, or is sitting right there engaged in the practice of the ascetic's duties, or is sitting right there occupied with some task, or even when pressed by the need for defecation or urination, if there is a latrine within the vicinity but he goes outside, or through any other manner is negligent - whether thieves open the door, or enter through an already open door, or break through a wall, whatever they carry away on account of his negligence, all of it is his liability alone. But in hot weather, they say it is permissible to open the window and lie down. However, for one pressed by the need for defecation, when there is no latrine within the vicinity, going elsewhere falls under the category of illness, and is beyond his control; therefore there is no liability.

But one who, oppressed by heat inside, secures the door well and goes outside, and thieves seize him and say "Open the door" - he should not open it up to the third demand. But if those thieves raise axes and the like, saying "If you do not open it, we shall kill you and break down the door and carry away the requisites." Thinking "If I die and the Community's dwelling is destroyed, there is no benefit," it is permissible to open it. Here too, they say there is no liability because it is beyond his control. If any visitor gives the key or opens the door, whatever thieves carry away, all of it is that person's liability. If the Community has provided a needle-mechanism lock and a key-seal for the protection of the storeroom, and the storekeeper merely puts on the bolt and lies down, and thieves open it and carry away the requisites, the liability is his alone. But if, having fitted both the needle-mechanism lock and the key-seal, he lies down, and thieves come and say "Open up," one should act in the same manner as before. But if, having secured it thus and lying down, they break through the wall or the roof or enter through a tunnel and carry things away, there is no liability for him. If other senior monks also dwell in the storeroom, and when the door is open they take their own requisites and go, and the storekeeper does not watch the door after they have gone, if anything is stolen there, because of the storekeeper's authority, the liability is the storekeeper's alone. But the senior monks should be cooperative. This is the proper conduct in that matter.

If the storekeeper says "You should stand outside and take your requisites, do not enter," but one of them, a meddlesome senior monk, enters the storeroom together with novices and attendants and sits down and lies down, whatever goods are lost, all of it is his liability. But the storekeeper and the remaining senior monks should be cooperative. Then if the storekeeper himself, taking meddlesome novices and attendants, sits down and lies down in the storeroom, whatever is lost there, all of it is his liability alone. Therefore only the storekeeper should dwell there. The others should dwell even at the foot of a tree rather than in the storeroom.

However, those who store requisites in the dwelling rooms of their fellow monks, when the requisites are lost, the liability falls upon those by whom they were stored. But the others should be cooperative. If, however, the Community provides gruel and rice to the storekeeper at the monastery itself, and he goes to the village for the purpose of alms-round, the liability for what is lost falls upon him. Even for the monastery watchman appointed for the purpose of guarding the extra robes of those going on alms-round, if while receiving gruel and rice or provisions he goes on alms-round, the liability for whatever is lost there falls entirely upon him. And not only this much; just as with the storekeeper, whatever is lost through his negligence, the liability for all of it falls upon him.

If the monastery is large, and while he goes to guard one area, what was placed in another area is taken, there is no liability because it is outside his domain. However, in such a monastery, one should sit in the middle, at a place accessible to all, having placed the requisites there. Or two or three monastery watchmen should be appointed. If, while they are diligent and guarding here and there, something is lost, there is no liability. Even if thieves tie up the monastery watchmen and take the goods, and even if they take goods by another route when the watchmen have gone to confront the thieves, there is no liability for them. If there is no gruel and rice or provisions to be given to the monastery watchmen at the monastery, it is proper to

set aside two or three extra gruel tickets from what is obtainable, and sufficient meal tickets for them. However, they should not be set aside permanently, for people become regretful, thinking "The monastery watchmen alone are eating our food." Therefore, they should be set aside on a rotating basis. If their fellow monks bring and give them ticket-meals, that is good; if they do not give, the meals should be obtained by having them take a turn and brought out. If the monastery watchman, while receiving two or three gruel tickets and four or five ticket-meals, goes on alms-round, just as with the storekeeper, the liability for all that is lost falls upon him. If there is no food or provisions to be given by the Community to the monastery guardians, the monks take the monastery watch duty and look after their own dependants; they are not permitted to refuse the duty when their turn comes, and it should be done just as other monks do it. However, for one who has no companion, or who is only with one other, or for whom there is no fellow monk to bring and give food, the turn should not be assigned to such a person.

Whatever is stored at the monastery for the purpose of cooking provisions, the duty should be undertaken by one who subsists on that. One who does not subsist on that should not be made to take the turn. They also appoint a monk at the monastery for the purpose of fruits and produce; having watched over and protected them, they divide them by turns of fruit-shares and eat them. The duty should be undertaken by one who eats those. One who does not subsist on them should not be made to take the turn. They also appoint someone for the purpose of guarding lodgings, beds, chairs, and spreads; the duty should be undertaken by one dwelling in the residence. However, one who dwells in the open or at the foot of a tree should not be made to take the turn.

There is one who is junior, but being learned, he expounds the Teaching to many, gives answers to questions, explains the texts, delivers talks on the Teaching, and bears the burden of the Community; such a one, even though enjoying gains and dwelling in the residence, should not be made to take the turn. They say: "A distinguished person should be recognised."

However, for the caretaker of the uposatha hall and the image house, double gruel and rice, a daily measure of rice, the three robes annually, and allowable goods worth ten or twenty should be given. If, however, while he is receiving that, something is lost there through his negligence, the liability for all of it falls upon him. But if it is seized by force after being tied up, there is no liability. Therein, it is proper to have the property of the shrine guarded with what belongs to either the shrine or the Community. It is not proper to have the property of the Community guarded with what belongs to the shrine. However, when the property of the Community has been stored together with the property of the shrine, when the shrine's property is guarded, that too is thereby guarded; thus it is proper. Even for one who guards the uposatha hall and so forth on a fortnightly turn, what is lost through negligence is indeed his liability.

The discussion on deposits is concluded.

Discussion on Toll Evasion

113. "They destroy (hananti) the toll (suṅkaṃ) from there (tato)" means a customs post (suṅkaghātaṃ); this is a designation for the toll station. For since those who remove goods liable to toll from there without paying the toll destroy and eliminate the king's toll, therefore it is called a customs post (suṅkaghāta). "Having entered there" means having entered the toll station established by the king, having demarcated a boundary at a mountain pass and so forth. "Goods belonging to the king (rājaggaṃ bhaṇḍaṃ)" means goods due to the king; the meaning is: goods from which a toll worth five māsakas or more than five māsakas must be given to the king. There is also the reading "rājakaṃ"; the meaning is the same. "With thieving intention" means having aroused the thieving intention "I shall not give the king's toll from this," he touches those goods - a wrong-doing. Having taken them from the place where they were set down, he puts them into a bag, or binds them together with his thigh in a concealed place - a grave offence. Because it is delimited by the toll station, there is no displacement from the base. He moves the second foot past the boundary of the toll station - an offence entailing defeat.

"He throws it outside the customs post" means having seen that the king's men are occupied elsewhere, while standing inside he throws it for the purpose of falling outside. If that will certainly fall outside, at the mere moment of release from the hand - an offence entailing defeat. If that, having struck a tree or a stump, or having been thrown back by the force of a strong wind, falls back inside again, he is absolved. If he picks it up again and throws it, it is an offence entailing defeat in the same manner as stated before. If, having fallen on the ground and rolling, it enters inside again - it is still an offence entailing defeat. But in the Kurundī and Saṅkhepāṭṭhakathā it is said: "If, having fallen outside and come to a stop, it then rolls back inside - an offence entailing defeat. If, without having come to a stop, it rolls back and enters inside, he is absolved."

Standing inside, he rolls it with his hand, foot, or stick, or has another roll it - if, without having come to a stop, it goes rolling, it is an offence entailing defeat. Standing inside, that which goes outside absolves him; thinking "it will roll and go" or "another will roll it," what was placed inside afterwards goes outside either rolling by itself or rolled by another - he is absolved indeed. But when it was placed with a pure intention and goes thus, there is nothing whatsoever to be said. He ties two packages together and places them on the boundary line of the toll station; even though the outside package is worth a quarter in toll, because of being tied together with it, the inside package absolves him. But if, having reversed them, he places the inner one outside - an offence entailing defeat. The same method applies when placed tied together on a carrying pole. But if, without tying them, it is merely placed on the end of the carrying pole - an offence entailing defeat.

He places it on a moving vehicle or on the back of a horse and so forth, thinking "it will be taken outside" - even when taken out, there is no theft, nor is there any goods-liability. Why? Because it was said "Let them collect the toll from one who has entered here," and this stood outside the toll station, and it was not carried by him; therefore there is neither goods-liability nor an offence entailing defeat.

When placed on stationary vehicles and so forth, if they move without his effort, even though there is thieving intention, there is no theft. But if, having placed it, he drives the vehicles and so forth past, or because of familiarity gained through elephant

training and so forth, standing in front he calls out "Come, hey!" - at the crossing of the boundary, an offence entailing defeat. In the training rule concerning goats' wool, in this situation, having another carry it - no offence; here, an offence entailing defeat. There, having placed it in another's vehicle or goods without his knowledge and passing beyond three yojanas, because they become forfeitable - an offence of expiation. Here, no offence.

It is proper to go at the customs post only after having paid the toll. One goes having made the intention: "If they say 'Pay the toll,' I shall pay; if they do not say so, I shall go." Seeing him, one toll collector says "That monk is going, collect the toll from him," another says "Why should a renunciant pay toll? Let him go" - it is allowable, he should go. But when it is said "It is not proper for monks to go without paying the toll, collect it, lay follower," yet if it is said "Those who collect toll from a monk would have to take his bowl and robe - what is the use of that? Let him go," it is still allowable. Even if the toll collectors are sleeping, or playing dice, or have gone somewhere, and he, having called out "Where are the toll collectors?" does not see them, it is still allowable. Even if, having reached the customs post, he is absent-minded, or thinking about something, or reciting, or engaged in attention, or suddenly pursued by robbers, elephants, lions, tigers and the like having risen up, or having seen a great storm cloud arisen and wishing to enter a hall ahead, he passes that place, it is still allowable.

Regarding "evades the tax" - here, although one evades it by entering the vicinity, it is still theft -

This is stated in the Kurundi Commentary. But in the Great Commentary it is stated: "Having shown merely the danger that 'the king's men harass one who evades the toll,' for one who evades having entered the vicinity, there is an offence of wrongdoing; for one who evades without entering the vicinity, there is no offence." This accords with the canonical text. Here, the vicinity should be determined by two stone-throws.

The discussion on tax evasion is concluded.

Discussion on Living Beings

114. Showing the living being that definitely suffices for theft in what follows, he said "a human being." Even so, there is no theft for one who takes away a free person. Even a free person who has been placed by his mother or father, or who has taken upon himself fifty or sixty, there is no theft for one who takes him away; but the money increases at the place where it has gone. However, there is theft only for one who takes away a slave of the types: born in the household, bought with money, or brought by force. For it is with reference to that very thing that this was said - "A living being means a human being is called." Herein, one born in the womb of a household slave-woman from a slave is one born in the household; one bought with money is one bought with wealth; one brought from a foreign land by striking and reducing to slavery is one brought by force - thus it should be understood. He touches such a living being thinking "I will take it away" - an offence of wrong-doing. Seizing by the hand or foot and lifting up, he causes it to shake - a grave offence.

Having lifted up, wishing to flee, he moves even a hair-tip's measure from the standing place - an offence entailing defeat. Seizing by the hair or hands and dragging - the foot-step method should be applied.

Thinking "I will lead on foot," whether threatening or striking, he says "Go from here" - when that person goes in the direction indicated, at the second foot-step there is an offence entailing defeat. Those who are of one intention with him, for all of them there is an offence entailing defeat at the same moment. A monk, having seen a slave, whether having asked about his welfare or not, says "Go, flee and live happily" - if he flees, at the second foot-step there is an offence entailing defeat. When that one comes near him, another says "Flee" - if a hundred monks in succession say it as he comes near each one, there is an offence entailing defeat for all of them. But one who says to one already fleeing swiftly "Flee, before your masters catch you" - there is no offence entailing defeat. But if he says it to one going slowly, and that one goes quickly because of his words - an offence entailing defeat. Having fled, seeing him gone to another village or region, for one who makes him flee from there too - it is an offence entailing defeat indeed.

Taking what is not given is released by indirect speech. For one who speaks thus - "What are you doing here?

Is it not fitting for you to flee? Or is it not fitting to go somewhere and live happily? Or slave men and women, having fled, go to such and such a region and live happily" - and if he, having heard those words, flees, there is no theft. Also one who, having said "We are going to such and such a region, those who have gone there live happily, and for those going with us there is no hardship even on the way with provisions and such," takes the one coming happily along with him and goes by way of travelling the road, not with thieving intention - there is no theft. And when robbers arise on the way, even for one who says "Hey! Robbers have arisen, flee quickly, come, go!" - because it was said for the purpose of freeing from the danger of robbers, they do not call it theft.

The discussion on living beings is concluded.

Discussion on Footless Creatures

Regarding footless creatures, a snake means a snake with an owner, caught by snake-charmers and the like; which, while making it perform,

They obtain half a pāda, a pāda, or a kahāpaṇa, and even when releasing them, they release them only after receiving silver or gold. They go to a place where a certain monk is sitting, place the snake basket down, and either fall asleep or go somewhere. If that monk, with thieving intention, touches that basket, it is a wrong-doing. He causes it to shake - a grave offence. He dislodges it from its position - an offence entailing defeat. If, however, he opens the basket and grasps the snake by the neck, it is a wrong-doing. He lifts it up, it is a grave offence. When one straightens it and lifts it up, at the moment the snake's tail-tip is released from the bottom of the basket by even a hair's breadth, it is an offence entailing defeat. When one rubs and pulls it out, at the moment the tail-tip is released from the rim of the opening, it is an offence entailing defeat. If he slightly opens the mouth of the basket and either strikes it or calls it by name saying "Come, fellow" and makes it come out, it is an offence

entailing defeat. Likewise, having opened it, he makes the sound of a frog or the sound of a mouse or scatters puffed rice, and calls it by name or snaps his fingers - even if it comes out in this way, it is an offence entailing defeat. Even without opening the mouth, when this is done, a hungry snake strikes the lid of the basket with its head, makes an opening, and escapes - it is indeed an offence entailing defeat. If, however, when the mouth is open, the snake itself comes out and escapes of its own accord, the goods must be returned. Furthermore, whether having opened the mouth or not, he merely makes the sound of a frog or mouse or merely scatters puffed rice, does not call it by name, does not snap his fingers, and the snake, being hungry, thinking "I shall eat frogs and such," comes out and escapes - it is merely a case where the goods must be returned. Fish is included here merely by the designation of footless creatures. Whatever should be said here has already been stated in the section on water.

The discussion on footless creatures is finished.

Discussion on Two-footed Creatures

115. Regarding two-footed creatures - Showing those that can be stolen, he said "human beings, winged creatures." Deities, however, cannot be stolen. "Winged creatures" means those for whom wings have arisen. They are of three kinds: feather-winged, skin-winged, and bone-winged. Therein, peacocks, fowl, and the like should be understood as feather-winged; bats and the like as skin-winged; beetles and the like as bone-winged. All of these - both human beings and winged creatures - are included here simply by the term "two-footed." Whatever should be said here, that follows the same method as stated regarding creatures in the sky and living beings.

The discussion on two-footed creatures is finished.

Discussion on Four-footed Creatures

116. Regarding quadrupeds - "Livestock" should be understood as all species of quadrupeds remaining beyond those mentioned in the canonical text. Elephants and so forth are well known indeed. Therein, for one who touches an elephant with thieving intention, there is an offence of wrong-doing; for one who causes it to shake, a grave offence. But if a very strong person, intoxicated by strength, lifting a young elephant calf by the head at the base of the navel and seizing it, releases the four feet and the trunk from the ground even by a hair's breadth, it is an offence entailing defeat. Now, a certain elephant is kept tied up in an elephant stable, a certain one stands unbound, a certain one stands within the premises, a certain one stands in the royal courtyard. Therein, for one kept tied by the neck in the elephant stable, there are five positions: the neck-binding and the four feet. For one bound by the neck and by one foot with an iron chain, there are six positions. For one bound by the neck and by two feet, there are seven positions. According to these, the causing to shake and the dislodging from position should be understood. For one unbound, the entire elephant stable is the position. Upon passing beyond that, it is an offence entailing defeat. For one standing within the premises, the entire premises itself is the position. Upon its passing beyond the gate of the premises, it is an offence entailing defeat. For one standing in the royal courtyard, the entire city is the position. Upon its passing beyond the city gate, it is an offence entailing defeat. For one standing

outside the city, the very place where it stands is the position. When leading it away, it should be reckoned by footsteps. For one lying down, there is only one position. For one who raises it up with thieving intention, as soon as it has risen, it is an offence entailing defeat. For a horse too, this same adjudication applies. But if it is bound at all four feet, eight positions should be understood. This same method applies to camels as well.

A certain ox too is kept tied up in a house. A certain one stands unbound, a certain one however is kept tied up in a pen, a certain one stands unbound. Therein, for one kept tied up in a house, there are five positions: the four feet and the binding. For one unbound, the entire house is the position. For one bound in a pen too, there are five positions. For one unbound, the entire pen is the position. If one makes it pass beyond the gate of the pen, it is an offence entailing defeat. If one, having broken the pen, leads it away and makes it pass beyond the broken opening, it is an offence entailing defeat. If one, having either opened the gate or broken the pen, standing outside, calls it by name and makes it come out, it is an offence entailing defeat. For one who calls it by showing a broken branch too, this same method applies. If, without opening the gate and without breaking the pen, one waves a broken branch and calls, and the ox, out of hunger, leaps over the pen and comes out, it is indeed an offence entailing defeat. But if, when the gate has been opened or the pen has been broken, it comes out by itself, it is to be returned as goods. Whether having opened the gate or not, whether having broken the pen or not, if one merely waves a broken branch and does not call, and the ox, out of hunger, comes out on foot or by leaping, it is merely to be returned as goods. One ox stands tied up in the middle of a village, one is lying down. For a standing ox there are five positions, for one lying down there are two positions. According to these, the causing to shake and the dislodging from position should be understood.

But one who, without making a lying one stand up, slaughters it right there, it is to be made good. But in a well-enclosed village fitted with gates, the entire village is the position of a standing ox. For one standing or wandering in an unenclosed area, the very place trodden by its feet is its position. This same judgement applies also to donkeys and livestock.

The discussion on four-footed creatures is finished.

Discussion on Many-footed Creatures

117. Regarding many-footed creatures - If the basis is fulfilled by a single centipede, for one leading it on foot, there are ninety-nine grave offences and one offence entailing defeat. The remainder is just by the method already stated.

The discussion on many-footed creatures is finished.

Discussion on Reconnoitring

118. "One who investigates" means an informant; what is meant is that he enters inside here and there. "Having investigated" means having observed, having ascertained - this is the meaning. "Tells" means he informs another who is capable of committing theft about goods placed in other families' houses or in monasteries and such places that are unguarded. "There is an offence entailing defeat for both" means

when the goods are inevitably to be taken, for the informant at the moment of commanding, and for the other at the dislodging from its position - thus there is an offence entailing defeat for both. But whoever speaks in an indirect manner thus: "There is no man in the house, the goods are placed in such and such a place, unguarded, the door is not secured, one could take them merely by going there, is there really no one who lives by manly deeds who would go and take them?" - and having heard that, another goes and takes them thinking "I shall now take them," for him there is an offence entailing defeat at the dislodging from its position, but for the other there is no offence. For through indirect speech one is freed from taking what is not given.

The discussion on spying is finished.

Discussion on Guarding the Booty

"One who guards a deposit" means a deposit-guardian. One who, when goods brought by another to one's own dwelling place - "Please,

Venerable sir, look after this for a moment until I return after doing such and such a task" - being thus asked, guards them; this is the designation for that person. Therefore he said - "A deposit-guardian means one who is guarding brought goods." Therein, the deposit-guardian generally, without unfastening goods that have been tied up and hung, cuts open a bag or a wrapper from below, takes a small amount, and restores the stitching and so forth to its original state. For one who touches and so forth thinking "I shall take in this way," the corresponding offences should be understood.

The discussion on concealment is finished.

Discussion on Prearranged Theft

Theft by arrangement is stealing having arranged together; what is meant is theft done by mutual agreement. "Having arranged together" means having consulted with one desire and one intention - this is the meaning. Herein this is the determination - Several monks, having arranged together saying "Let us go to such and such a house, and having broken through the roof or having cut through the wall, let us steal the goods," they go. Among them, one steals the goods. At his lifting it up, there is an offence entailing defeat for all. And this is stated in the Parivāra too -

"Four persons, having arranged together, stole heavy goods;
Three are defeated, one is not defeated;
This is a question considered by the skilful."

This is the meaning of that - Four persons, a teacher and pupils, wished to take heavy goods worth six māsakas. Therein the teacher said: "You take one māśaka, you take one, you take one, I shall take three." But the first among the pupils said: "You, venerable sir, take three, you take one, you take one, I shall take one." The other two also said the same. Therein, for each of the pupils, one māśaka each is done by one's own hand, therefore there are offences of wrong-doing for them; Five are by command, through those there is an offence entailing defeat for all three. But for the teacher, three are done by his own hand, through those there is a grave offence for

him. Three are by command, through those too there is only a grave offence. For in this training rule on taking what is not given, what is done by one's own hand does not become a factor for what is by command, nor does what is by command become a factor for what is done by one's own hand. Rather, what is done by one's own hand must be fulfilled only by what is done by one's own hand, and what is by command only by what is by command. Therefore it was said - "Four persons, having arranged together, etc. This question was considered by the skilled."

Furthermore, for the purpose of avoiding confusion regarding theft by arrangement, this fourfold classification should be considered in terms of meaning: "one goods in one place, one goods in different places; different goods in one place, different goods in different places." Therein, "one goods in one place" means having seen goods worth five māsakas placed carelessly on the shop-counter of one family, several monks command one: "Go and bring those," upon his removing them, there is an offence entailing defeat for all. "One goods in different places" means having seen one māśaka each placed carelessly on five shop-counters of one family, several command one: "Go and bring those," upon the removal of the fifth māśaka, there is an offence entailing defeat for all. "Different goods in one place" means having seen goods belonging to many people, worth five māsakas or more than five māsakas, placed carelessly in one place, several command one: "Go and bring those," upon his removing them, there is an offence entailing defeat for all. "Different goods in different places" means having seen one māśaka each placed carelessly on five shop-counters of five families, several command one: "Go and bring those," upon the removal of the fifth māśaka, there is an offence entailing defeat for all.

The discussion on conveying by arrangement is finished.

Discussion on Acting by Appointment

119. "Making a rendezvous" means the act of making an arrangement; the meaning is making an agreement by way of delimiting a time. Here, when it is said "steal before the meal," whether he steals before the meal today, or tomorrow, or in a future year, there is no breach of the rendezvous; for both, there is an offence entailing defeat in the same manner as stated regarding the spy. But if, when it is said "steal before the meal today," he steals before the meal tomorrow, it has been stolen afterwards, having exceeded that rendezvous which was fixed as "today." If, when it is said "steal before the meal tomorrow," he steals before the meal today, it has been stolen before, without reaching that rendezvous which was fixed as "tomorrow"; for the one who steals in this way, there is an offence entailing defeat only for the one who steals, and there is no offence for the instigator. When it is said "before the meal tomorrow," even one who steals on that very day or after the meal tomorrow should be understood as stealing before and after that rendezvous. This same method applies also to after the meal, night, and day. And here, the state of keeping or breaching the rendezvous should be understood also by way of the first watch, the middle watch, the last watch, the dark fortnight, the bright fortnight, the month, the season, the year, and so forth. When it is said "steal before the meal," and for one striving thinking "I shall steal before the meal itself," it becomes after the meal; what is said here? The Elder Mahāsuma first said: "This is merely an effort

made before the meal, therefore the instigator is not freed." But the Elder Mahāpaduma said - "Because the time delimitation has been exceeded, it is a breach of the rendezvous, therefore the instigator is freed."

The discussion on acting by appointment is finished.

Discussion on Acting by Gesture

120. "Making a sign" means making a sign to someone for the purpose of arousing a perception; this has been stated in three ways by the method beginning with "I will bury my eyes." However, here many other kinds should also be included, such as waving the hand, striking with the palm, snapping the fingers, stretching the neck, clearing the throat, and so forth. The remainder here follows the same method as stated in the case of making an arrangement.

The discussion on acting by gesture is finished.

Discussion on Commanding

121. Now, for the purpose of non-confusion regarding these very acts of signalling and acts of hinting, he stated beginning with "a monk commands a monk." Therein, "he, imagining that to be that" means that the one who steals, imagining "this is that" which was indicated by the one who commands through making a sign, steals that very thing - there is an offence entailing defeat for both. "He, imagining that to be that, steals another" means imagining "this is that" which was indicated to be stolen, he steals another thing placed in that very same place - there is no offence for the instigator. "Imagining another to be that" means the goods indicated by the one who commands through making a sign are of little value, and imagining "this other thing placed near it is valuable goods," thus imagining it to be another, he steals that very thing - there is an offence entailing defeat for both. "Imagining another to be another" means by the same method as before, he imagines "this other thing placed near it is valuable goods," and if that is indeed another thing, there is an offence entailing defeat for him alone.

In the passages beginning with "tell such and such a person," one teacher and three pupils named Buddharakkhita, Dhammarakkhita, and Saṅgharakkhita should be understood. Therein, "a monk commands a monk" means the teacher, having identified some goods somewhere, commands Buddharakkhita for the purpose of stealing them. "Tell such and such a person" means: go, Buddharakkhita, and tell this matter to Dhammarakkhita. "Let such and such a person tell such and such a person" means let Dhammarakkhita also tell Saṅgharakkhita. "Let such and such a person steal such and such goods" means let Saṅgharakkhita, thus commanded by Dhammarakkhita who was commanded by you, steal such and such goods, for he is a bold one among us, capable of this task. "There is an offence of wrong-doing" means for the teacher who thus commands, there is firstly a wrong-doing. But if that command proceeds according to intention, what is stated later as a grave offence occurs at the very moment of commanding. Then if those goods will certainly be stolen, what is stated later as "there is an offence entailing defeat for all" - from that, there is an offence entailing defeat for him at that very moment. This principle should be understood everywhere.

"He informs the other" means Buddharakkhita informs Dhammarakkhita, and Dhammarakkhita informs Saṅgharakkhita: "Our teacher says thus - 'Steal such and such goods, indeed you are a brave man among us'" - thus he informs, and for them too there is a wrong-doing. "The one who steals accepts" means Saṅgharakkhita accepts saying "Good, I shall steal it." "There is a grave offence for the instigator" means at the mere acceptance by Saṅgharakkhita, there is a grave offence for the teacher, for a great number of people have been engaged by him in evil. "He steals those goods" means if Saṅgharakkhita steals those goods, there is an offence entailing defeat for all four persons. And not only for four; by this method, without breaking the arrangement, whether it be a hundred or a thousand ascetics commanding in succession, there is an offence entailing defeat for all.

In the second case - "He commands another" means Buddharakkhita, commanded by the teacher, not having seen Dhammarakkhita or not wishing to tell him, approaches Saṅgharakkhita himself and says: "Our teacher says thus - 'Steal such and such goods'" - thus he commands. "There is an offence of wrong-doing" means by the command, there is firstly a wrong-doing for Buddharakkhita. "He accepts, there is an offence of wrong-doing" means when Saṅgharakkhita accepts, it should be understood that there is a wrong-doing for the instigator alone. But if he steals those goods, there is an offence entailing defeat for both - for Buddharakkhita as the one who commands and for Saṅgharakkhita as the one who steals. But for the instigator, the teacher, because of the breaking of the arrangement, there is no offence entailing defeat. For Dhammarakkhita, because of not knowing, there is no offence whatsoever. But Buddharakkhita, having secured the safety of two, is himself ruined.

In the first of the four remaining cases of commanding: "he, having gone, returns again" means having gone to the place where the goods are and seeing guards both inside and outside, being unable to steal, he comes back. "When you are able, then" means must it be stolen today itself? Go, when you are able, then steal it. "There is an offence of wrong-doing" means thus even by commanding again, there is only a wrong-doing. But if those goods will certainly be stolen, the intention that accomplishes the purpose is like the fruit immediately following the path, therefore he incurs defeat at the very moment of commanding. Even if the one who steals takes those goods after the lapse of sixty years, and the one who commands dies in the meantime or reverts to the lower life; he will have died or will have reverted to the lower life as one who is already not an ascetic, but for the one who steals, there is an offence entailing defeat at the very moment of stealing.

In the second case - because, either speaking it softly or due to the other's deafness, he does not make heard the words "Do not steal,"

therefore the instigator is not freed. In the third case - however, he is freed because he made it heard. In the fourth case - because he made it heard, and because the other, having accepted saying "Good," desisted, both are freed.

The discussion on command is finished.

Classification of Offences

122. Now, showing the factors of taking what is not given - which was stated by way of dislodging from its position in various places - and the classification of offences according to the classification of objects, he said beginning with "in five ways." Therein, "in five ways" means by five reasons; it is said to mean "by five factors." Therein this is the meaning in brief - for one taking what is not given, there is an offence entailing defeat by the five ways stated in the manner beginning with "it belongs to another," and not by fewer than that. Therein, these are the five ways - belonging to another, perceiving it as belonging to another, the heaviness of the requisite, intention to steal, and dislodging from its position. But in the two following sections, a grave offence and a wrong-doing are shown according to the classification of objects in the case of a light requisite.

125. In the three cases stated by the method beginning with "in six ways," the six aspects should be understood thus: not perceiving it as one's own, not taking on trust, not being temporary, the requisite being heavy, intention to steal, and dislodging from its position. Here too, according to the distinction of the object, in the first case there is an offence entailing defeat. In the second and third cases, grave offences and offences of wrong-doing are stated. However, in the remaining three cases, even though there is a distinction of the object, only an offence of wrong-doing is stated because the object is not possessed by others. Therein, what is stated as "not possessed by another" - whether it be an unoccupied thing, a discarded thing, a thing whose trace is lost, an ownerless object, or one's own property - both are reckoned as "not possessed by another." But since here there is the perception of it being possessed by another, and it is taken with intention to steal, therefore non-offence is not stated.

The classification of offences is finished.

Classification of Non-offences

131. Having thus shown the classification of offences by way of the object and by way of intention, now showing the classification of non-offences, he said beginning with "there is no offence for one who perceives it as one's own." Therein, "for one who perceives it as one's own" means for one with the perception that it is one's own; there is no offence in taking even another's goods for one who takes them with the perception "this article belongs to me," but what has been taken must be given back. If, when told by the owners "give it back," he does not give it back, upon their laying down the charge, it is a pārājika offence.

"For taking on trust" means there is no offence even in taking on trust. However, the characteristic of taking on trust should be understood by this sutta: "I allow, monks, one endowed with five factors to take on trust - one is personally known, one is intimate, one has been invited, one is alive, and one is pleased when it is taken." Therein, "personally known" means a friend by mere acquaintance; "intimate" means a close friend; "invited" means one who has been told "whatever of my belongings you wish, you may take; there is no need to ask before taking." "Is alive" means even though lying on a bed from which he will not rise, he has not yet reached the cutting off of the life faculty. "Pleased when it is taken" means he is of a contented mind when it is taken; it is proper for one who knows "he will be pleased when I take it" to take the belongings of such a person. And these five factors are stated by way of

exhaustive inclusion. However, taking on trust is established with three factors: personally known, alive, pleased when it is taken; intimate, alive, pleased when it is taken; invited, alive, pleased when it is taken.

But one who is not alive, and is not pleased when it is taken; even what has been taken from his belongings by taking on trust must be given back. And when giving back, first, regarding the property of the deceased, it should be given to those who have authority over his property, whether householders or those gone forth. The belongings of one who is displeased should be given back to that very person. But one who at first approved either by verbal expression or by mere arising of thought, saying "well done by you in taking my belongings," and later became angry for some reason, is not entitled to have it returned. Even one who does not wish to give but endures it mentally and says nothing, he too is not entitled to have it returned again. But one who, when told "I have taken or used your belongings," says "whether it was taken or used, but I had set that aside for some purpose, it is proper to restore it to its original state." This person is entitled to have it returned.

"For temporary taking" means there is no offence even in temporary taking for one who takes saying "I shall return it, I shall replace it." But if the owner of the goods, whether an individual or a group, permits saying "let this be yours," that is well and good. If they do not permit, it must be given back when they request its return. However, what belongs to the Community is proper only to return.

"For possession of ghosts" - here, even those reborn in the realm of the departed, even those who, having died, are reborn in that very same existence, even devas such as those of the Cātumahārājika realm and others, all are reckoned as "departed beings"; there is no offence regarding their possessions. Even if Sakka, the king of the devas, were sitting having spread out a shop, and a monk with the divine eye, knowing this, were to take even a cloth worth a hundred thousand for the purpose of his own robe and go away, even while that one says "do not take it, do not take it," it is permissible. However, regarding cloths hung on trees and the like by those making offerings dedicated to deities, there is nothing to be said.

"For possession of animals" means there is no offence even in taking the possessions of animals. Even if a nāga king or a supaṇṇa youth spreads out a shop in human form, and some monk takes what belongs to him and goes away in the same manner as before, it is allowable. A lion or a tiger or deer, buffalo and the like, when afflicted by hunger, killing and eating, should not be driven away from the very beginning. For it might cause harm. But if, after it has eaten a little, one is able to drive it away, it is allowable to drive it away and take it. It is also allowable to make hawks and the like drop what they have taken and are carrying away, and to take it.

"For one perceiving them as rag-robres" means there is no offence in taking even for one who perceives an ownerless thing thus: "This is a rag-robe." But if that has an owner, it should be given back when the owner demands its return. "For a mad man" means there is no offence even for a mad man of the kind previously described. "For the first offender" means here Dhaniya is the first offender; there is no offence for him. But for the rest - the thieves such as the washerman's bundle thieves, the group of six and others - there is indeed an offence.

The classification of non-offences is finished.

Miscellaneous Discussion

Origin and action, then perception and with consciousness;
Worldly wrong and deed, wholesome and with feeling.

In this miscellaneous section, this training rule has three origins -done by oneself, it originates from body and mind; done by command, it originates from speech and mind; done by oneself and by command, it originates from body, speech and mind. And it is of action-origin, for one commits this only by doing, not by not doing. It is freed by perception because one is released through the absence of the perception "I am taking what is not given"; it is with consciousness; it is worldly wrong; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; whether pleased or frightened or neutral one commits it, thus it is of three feelings - all this should be understood in the same manner as stated in the first training rule.

The miscellaneous talk is completed.

Commentary on the Precedent Cases

132. In the discussions of the decided cases, the case of the group of six has already been stated under the supplementary rule.

Regarding the second case - The mind of ordinary persons, having abandoned its natural state through the influence of lust and so forth, runs, runs on, and runs about in various ways. If the Blessed One were to lay down an offence merely by the arising of a thought, without any breach through the door of body or speech, who would be able to make oneself free from offence! Therefore he said - "There is no offence, monk, in the arising of a thought." However, one should not be under the control of the mind; the mind should indeed be restrained by the power of wise reflection.

133-134. The cases of touching, causing to move, and dislodging from position are clear in meaning. And those that follow conclude with the case "with thieving intention he took it from the ground."

135. In the case concerning a figure of speech, "he took it" means he seized it, and "you are a thief" means he accused him. The other, however, when asked "by whom was it taken away?" gave an admission in conformity with the question, saying "it was taken away by me." For if the other had said "by whom was it seized, by whom was it removed, by whom was it placed?" then this one too would have said "it was seized by me, removed by me, placed by me." The mouth is made for the purpose of eating and for the purpose of speaking, but without a thievish intention there is no taking away. Therefore the Blessed One said - "There is no offence, monk, in a figure of speech." The meaning is: there is no offence in a mere conventional expression. From that point onwards, everything up to the end of the turban case is of clear meaning.

137. "Was dwelling in the unbroken body" means he was reborn in that very body due to craving for the cloth. "Paying no heed" means not accepting his words, or not showing regard. "That body, having risen up" means the ghost, by his own power, caused that body to rise up. Therefore it is said - Therefore it was said - "that body,

having risen up." "Closed the door" means the monk's monastery was right near the cemetery, therefore the monk, being of a timid nature, quickly entered there and closed the door. "Fell down right there" means when the door was closed, the ghost, having no further attachment to the cloth, abandoned that body and departed according to his kamma; therefore that body fell down right there - it is said that it fell.

"From an unbroken body" means a rag-robe should not be taken from a fresh, moist body; for one who takes it, such dangers arise, and one commits an offence of wrongdoing. But it is permissible to take from a broken body. But to what extent is it considered broken? Even by being slightly split by the beak or fangs of crows, hawks, dogs, jackals, and the like. But if, through abrasion from falling, only the outer skin is cut while the inner skin is uncut, this is still unbroken; but when the inner skin is cut, it is broken. Also, if even while still alive there were burst boils, leprosy sores, or wounds, this too is broken. From the third day onwards, having reached the state of a corpse through bloating and so forth, this too is indeed broken. In all cases, however, even from an unbroken body, it is permissible to have it taken by cemetery keepers or other people. If one cannot obtain another person, one should make a wound with a knife or something else and then take it. But in the case of a body of the opposite sex, having established mindfulness and arousing the perception of a recluse, it is permissible to make a wound on the head or on the back of the hands and feet and then take it.

Discussion on the Case of Passing over Grass

138. In the immediately following case, "having moved a lot, took a robe" means that among the theft by stealth, theft by force, theft by scheming, theft by concealment, and theft by lot-switching - which were shown only by name in the earlier explanation of the meaning of the word "should take" - he took by theft by lot-switching. This is the meaning.

The diversity of these types of taking should be understood thus -Whoever takes another's property during the night or during the day, having broken through walls and so forth, unseen, or whoever takes it by deceiving with false measures, counterfeit coins, and the like - the taking of one who takes in such a way should be understood as "theft by stealth."

But whoever, having overpowered others by force, having subdued them, or else having threatened them and shown them danger, takes their belongings - like rebel bandits who carry out highway robbery, village raids, and the like, or like those who, under the influence of anger, plunder others' houses, or like kings, royal ministers, and the like who take by force beyond their rightful power; the taking of one who takes in such a way should be understood as "theft by force."

But the taking of one who takes by scheming is called "theft by scheming," and it is twofold by way of scheming about the article and scheming about the location. Herein, this is scheming about the article - Here a certain person desiring a cloth, having entered an inner room, schemes: "If it is a cloth, I shall take it; if it is thread, I shall not take it," and in the darkness takes a bag. If there is a cloth therein, it is an offence involving expulsion at the very moment of lifting. If it is thread, he is not defeated. Having taken it outside and opened it, knowing "it is thread," he brings it

back and places it in its original place - he is not defeated. Even knowing "it is thread," if he goes thinking "whatever is obtained, that should be taken," he should be dealt with according to the step-by-step procedure. He places it on the ground and takes it up - at the lifting, it is an offence involving expulsion. Surrounded by the owners crying "Thief, thief!" he drops it and flees - he is not defeated. The owners see it and take it back - this is fortunate. If someone else takes it, there is liability for the article. Then, when the owners have turned back, he himself sees it and takes it thinking "This was already taken out by me, it is now my own" - he is not defeated; but there is liability for the article. "If it is thread, I shall take it; if it is a cloth, I shall not take it. If it is ghee, I shall take it; if it is oil, I shall not take it" - the same method applies to one who takes by scheming in this and similar ways.

But in the Mahāpaccarī and other texts it is said: "Even one desiring a cloth, having taken just the bag of cloth and gone out, standing outside and opening it, seeing 'this is a cloth' and going, should be dealt with by the step-by-step lifting procedure alone." But here, because he schemed "if it is a cloth, I shall take it," the scheming is evident; but because he saw it and was pleased, the theft by scheming is not evident. But in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā, the taking is stated for one who lifts what was schemed about while it remains unseen and still in the state of being schemed about; therefore, theft by scheming is evident therein. And it accords with the canonical text "thinking it to be that, he took that." Therein, the scheming that occurred in the manner "if it is a cloth, I shall take it" and so forth - this is called "scheming about the article."

But scheming about the location should be understood thus - Here a certain greedy monk, having entered another's dwelling, or a lay family's house, or a workshop in the forest, and sitting there engaged in conversation, looks at some desirable requisite; and looking, having seen it, having determined a boundary by way of the doorway, the area in front, the lower storey, the monastery dwelling, the gatehouse, the foot of a tree, and so forth, he schemes: "If they see me within this area, I shall show it to them as if I were walking about having taken it out of desire to look at it; if they do not see me, I shall take it away." For him, as soon as he passes beyond the determined boundary having taken it, it is an offence involving expulsion. If he determines the vicinity boundary, and while going towards it, attending to meditation subjects and the like, or being otherwise engaged, he heedlessly crosses the vicinity boundary - there is liability for the article. And if, when he has reached that place, a thief, or an elephant, or a wild beast, or a great storm arises, and he hastily crosses that place out of desire to escape from that danger - it is merely liability for the article. But some say here: "Since it was taken from the very beginning with thieving intention, therefore he is not absolved; it is indeed a taking." This, then, is the method of the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā. But in the Mahāpaccarī it is said: "Even if he, within the determined boundary, mounts an elephant or a horse, he neither drives it nor causes it to be driven; even when the boundary has been crossed, there is no offence involving expulsion; it is merely liability for the article." Therein, the scheming that occurred thus: "If they see me within this area, I shall show it to them as if I were walking about having taken it out of desire to look at it" - this is called "scheming about the location."

Thus, the taking away by one who takes having planned by means of both these two kinds of planning should be understood as "taking away by planning."

But taking away by concealing is "concealed taking away." That should be understood thus - Whatever monk, having seen ornamental goods removed and placed aside by people playing in parks and the like, or by those entering, thinking "If I bend down and take it, they might recognise me thinking 'What is the ascetic taking?' and harass me," covers it with dust or a leaf - thinking "I shall take it later" - for him, to that extent there is no lifting up, so there is no taking away yet. But when those people, wishing to enter the village, even searching for that article but not seeing it, thinking "It is dark now, we shall find out tomorrow," have gone to their hall. Then, when he lifts it up, at the lifting up there is an offence involving expulsion. But for one who takes it with the perception of ownership thinking "At the time of concealing itself, that became mine," or with the perception of a discarded article thinking "They have gone now, this is a discarded article" - there is an offence requiring restitution of the article. Even when those people, having come on the second day, having searched and not seen it, having given up the effort and gone - what was taken is still only an offence requiring restitution of the article. Why? Because through his effort it was not seen by them. But whoever, having seen such an article standing in its very place, without concealing it, with thieving intention, treading on it with his foot, pushes it into mud or sand - for him, at the very moment of pushing it in, there is an offence involving expulsion.

But taking away by moving a lot is called "taking away by lot." That too should be understood thus - Whatever monk, having cast a lot, when robes are being distributed, wishing to take another's share standing near his own share - whether of lesser value, greater value, or equal value - lifts up the lot-stick fallen on his own share wishing to drop it on another's share, it is protected for the time being. He drops it on another's share - it is still protected. But when, after that has fallen, he lifts up another's lot-stick from another's share, at the very moment of lifting up he becomes one who has committed an offence involving expulsion. If he first lifts up the lot-stick from the other's share with the desire to drop it on his own share - at the lifting up it is protected, at the dropping it is protected. But when he lifts up his own lot-stick from his own share, at the very lifting up it is protected. Having lifted that up, for one dropping it on another's share, at the very moment it is released from the hand, there is an offence involving expulsion.

But if he makes the sticks fallen on both shares disappear, then when the remaining monks have gone, the other says: "Venerable sir, my stick is not apparent." "Mine too, friend, is not apparent." "But which, venerable sir, is my share?" "This is your share" - he shows his own share. Whether the other, having disputed or not disputed, having taken that and gone, the former lifts up his share - at the lifting up there is an offence involving expulsion. Even if the other has said "I do not give my share to you, but you, knowing your own share, take it" - even though knowing "This is not mine," he takes that very one's share - at the lifting up there is an offence involving expulsion. But if the other, thinking "This is your share, this is my share - what is the point of this dispute?" says "Whether it falls to me or to you, whichever is the better share, you take that" - what is taken is taken as given, there is no taking away here. Even if that

monk, fearful of dispute, told "Take whatever pleases you," leaving aside the better share that had come to him, takes only the inferior one and goes - then for the other too, taking what remains after the selection, there is no taking away at all.

But in the commentaries it is said - "In this place, only one matter concerning the distribution of robes has come by way of moving the lot, but the arising and distribution of all four requisites should be drawn out and shown." And having said thus, in the Robe Section: "May the Blessed One accept from me, venerable sir, a pair of Siveyyaka cloths; and may he allow householder-robes for the Community of monks" - beginning with this account of Jīvaka, the discussion on robes that have arisen; in the Lodgings Section: "Now at that time there was a famine in Rājagaha, people were unable to provide a meal for the Community, they wished to provide a designated meal, an invitation, a meal by ticket, a fortnightly meal, an Uposatha meal, a meal on the first of the fortnight" - beginning with this passage, the discussion on almsfood; in the Lodgings Section itself: "Now at that time the group of seventeen monks were repairing a certain great monastery on the border - "Here we shall reside for the rains retreat." The group of six monks saw the group of seventeen monks repairing the monastery" - beginning with this account of the group of six, the discussion on lodgings that have arisen, and at the end of that, the discussion on medicines such as ghee and the like was spoken of in detail. But we shall speak of all that in each place as it comes; the reason for speaking thus has already been stated.

The discussion on the case of passing over grass is finished.

139. Hereafter, the account of the sweat room is clear in meaning.

140. Regarding the five cases of scraps, those monks, having had them made allowable by an unordained person, consumed them. However, one taking scraps should take what has been eaten and left behind, discarded. If one is able to have them drop it while they are eating and then take it, this too is permissible. However, for the purpose of self-protection and out of compassion for others, it should not be taken.

141. In the cases of distribution of cooked rice, solid food, cake, sugar-cane, and timbarūsaka fruit, "give the share to another" refers to a non-existent person. "Took on an unfounded charge" means he took it thus while the owners were giving. "There is no offence, monk, of expulsion" means he took what was given by the owners; therefore no offence was stated for him. "There is an offence of expiation for conscious lying" means that regarding the conscious lying stated by him, he declares an expiation for that; as in the case of the tekaṭṭa gruel matter later on. However, regarding the taking, this is the determination: When what belongs to the Community is being given by one who is authorised or by those commanded or by monastery attendants and the like, and when what belongs to laypeople is being given by the owner or by one commanded, for one who takes it saying "give the share to another," it is to be forfeited. When it is being given by someone else, one who takes it should be made to pay the value of the goods. When it is being given by one who is not authorised or by one who is not commanded, one who takes it by saying "give a share to another as well" or by counting fraudulent years, should be made to pay the value of the goods as a deduction from his share, as in the case of the bowl group of four. When it is being given by the others, for one who takes it thus, it is to be

forfeited. However, what is caused to be given by the owner saying "give to this one," or what is given by himself, is well-given - this is the essence here according to the determination of all the commentaries.

142-143. Regarding the cases of cooked rice houses and so forth -A cooked rice house means a house where food is cooked for sale. A slaughter house means a house where meat is cooked for sale. A cake house means a house where edible delicacies are cooked for sale. The remainder here, and in the cases concerning requisites, is evident.

144. In the case of the chair -that monk, having planned "I shall take this thing when it has arrived at the intended place," moved it. Therefore, in his moving it, there is no theft. But having moved it, in the taking from the planned place, an offence involving expulsion is stated. And if, while carrying in this way, there is no thieving intention regarding the chair, the bag should be valued and he should be dealt with accordingly. But if there is also regarding the chair, both should be valued and he should be dealt with accordingly. The three cases beginning with the mattress are self-evident.

146. There is no offence in taking in the three cases beginning with taking on trust; the goods should be given back when they are not pleased. The share of one who has entered for almsfood is proper to be taken only while he is standing within the precincts boundary. But if the donors say "Venerable sirs, take the share even for those at a place outside the precincts; they will come and consume it," then it is proper to take it even for those at a place within the village. The remainder here is clear in meaning.

148-149. In the seven cases beginning with the mango thieves, there is no offence in taking with the perception of rag-robes; when they are brought, there is liability for the goods; in consuming with intent to steal, there is an offence involving expulsion. Herein this is the determination - When the owners too have a base and the thieves too have a base, for one eating with the perception of rag-robes there is liability for the goods; for one taking with intent to steal, the theft is by removal itself, and he should be dealt with after having the goods assessed in value. When the owners have a base and the thieves have no base, the same method applies. When the owners have no base and the thieves have a base; having thrown them down at some place of concealment and gone, thinking "We shall take them again," the same method applies. When both have no base, there is no offence for one eating with the perception of rag-robes; with intent to steal, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

Regarding mangoes and so forth belonging to the Community, whether grown in a monastery of the Community or brought and given, for one who steals what is worth five māsakas or more than five māsakas, there is an offence involving expulsion. In the border regions, when villagers are departing due to the danger of thieves, monks too, abandoning the monastery, go with the intention of returning, thinking "We shall come back when the countryside is inhabited again." Monks, having arrived at such a monastery, consume ripe mangoes and so forth with the perception of rag-robes, thinking "These are discarded" - there is no offence; for one consuming with intent to steal, there is theft, and he should be dealt with after having the goods assessed in value.

However, in the Mahāpaccarī and in the Abridged Commentary, it is stated without distinction: "For one consuming fruits and non-fruits with intent to steal in an abandoned monastery, there is an offence involving expulsion. Why? Because they are the property of those who have come and those yet to come." However, regarding what belongs to a group and what is personal, only the mere intention to return is the criterion. But if from that one gives ripe mangoes and so forth for the purpose of ingratiating families, there is an offence of wrong-doing for corrupting families. One giving with intent to steal should be dealt with according to the value. The same method applies even in the case of what belongs to the monastic community. For one giving what is designated for the purpose of lodgings for the purpose of ingratiating families, there is an offence of wrong-doing; by acting as an owner, a grave offence; with intent to steal, an offence involving expulsion. If the object is not sufficient, he should be dealt with according to the value. For one sitting outside the boundary of the precincts and consuming by acting as an owner, there is a grave offence. Having struck the bell and announced the time, what is eaten thinking "It falls to me" is well eaten. Without striking the bell but announcing the time, or striking the bell but not announcing the time, or neither striking the bell nor announcing the time, having known the absence of others, what is eaten thinking "It falls to me" is also well eaten. The two cases concerning the Flower Park are well known.

150. In the three cases concerning speaking as instructed, "I will speak as instructed" means having been instructed by you, "I speak by your word" - this is the meaning. "There is no offence, monk, of expulsion" means there is no offence because it was given by the owners. "And, monks, one should not say 'I will speak as instructed'" means another monk should not say to another monk thus: "Having been instructed by you, I speak by your word" - this is the meaning. However, having made a specification, it is allowable to say "I will take such-and-such by your word." "Speak as instructed" means having been instructed by me, speak by my word - this is the meaning. The remainder is according to the method already stated. And in these two cases also, it is allowable to speak having made a specification. For by this much one is freed from reproach.

151-152. In the middle case of the three cases concerning the jewel -"I am not ill" means "I am not sick." The remainder is well-known.

153. In the two cases concerning the pig -although for the first monk there is no offence because he released it out of compassion, having seen its state of hunger. However, when the owners do not accept this, compensation is due; either a dead pig of equal size should be brought and given, or goods of equivalent value. If he does not see the owners of the snare anywhere, he should place a cloth, a robe, or a bowl of equivalent value near the snare in such a place where they, upon coming, would see it, and only then should he go. But for one who releases it with intent to steal, it is an offence involving expulsion. And here, a certain pig, having dragged the snare with its foot, when the snare is merely broken, stands in its place by the nature of standing where it was displaced from its position, like a boat fastened in a swift current. A certain one stands by its own nature, a certain one lies down, and a certain one is bound by a hooked snare. A hooked snare is one at the end of which a small bow, a hook, or some other stick is fastened, which, catching here and there on trees and the like, prevents the pig from going. Therein, for one standing having dragged the

snare, there is only one base - the binding of the snare; for it runs away as soon as the snare is released or broken. For one standing by its own nature, there are five bases - the binding and the four feet. For one lying down, there are two bases - the binding and the lying position. For one bound by a hooked snare, wherever it goes, that very place is its base. Therefore, monks who release it from here and there - even ten, even twenty, even a hundred - commit an offence involving expulsion. It is like seeing a single slave who has arrived here and there and causing him to flee.

However, for the first three, the agitation and displacement from bases should be understood according to the method stated in the discussion on quadrupeds. Even for one who causes the release of a pig seized by a dog, with an intention of compassion, compensation is due; with intent to steal, it is an offence involving expulsion.

However, for one who, having gone by a different path that has not reached the vicinity of the dog or the place of the snare, causes it to flee beforehand, there is no taking. Also, one who, having given food and water to the bound pig and having made it gain strength, makes a shout - "It will flee in fright" - if it flees, it is an offence involving expulsion. The same method applies also for one who, having weakened the snare, causes it to flee by the sound of a shout.

But one who, having given food and water, goes away, thinking "Having gained strength, it will flee" - if it flees, compensation is due. The same method applies also for one who, having weakened the snare, goes away. He places a knife or fire near the snare, thinking "When it is cut or burnt, it will flee." The pig, shaking the snare, when it is cut or burnt, flees - compensation only is due. He knocks down the snare together with the stake; afterwards the pig, trampling over it, goes away - compensation is due. A pig is weighed down by a heavy stone; for one wishing to cause it to flee, if he lifts the heavy stone out of compassion, compensation is due; with intent to steal, it is an offence involving expulsion. If, as soon as it is lifted, it does not go but goes away afterwards, compensation only is due. He knocks down the heavy stone that was lifted and placed; afterwards the pig, trampling over it, goes away - compensation is due. Even for one who lifts out a pig that has fallen into a pit, out of compassion, compensation is due; with intent to steal, it is an offence involving expulsion. He fills up the pit and drives it away; afterwards the pig, trampling over it, goes away - compensation is due. One who lifts out one impaled on a stake, out of compassion - compensation is due; with intent to steal, it is an offence involving expulsion. He pulls out the stake and discards it - compensation is due.

However, those who set snares or deadfall stones on monastery grounds should be prevented - "This is a place of refuge for animals, do not do such things here." If they say "Have them removed, venerable sir," it is proper to have them removed. If they remove them themselves, that is excellent. If they neither remove them nor allow them to be removed, it is proper to request protection and have them removed. People, during the time of crop protection, set snares and deadfall stones and such in their fields - "By eating the flesh, we shall protect the crops." When the crop season has passed and those people have departed without attachment, it is proper to release whatever is caught or fallen there.

In the two cases concerning deer as well, the judgement is similar to that stated in the cases concerning pigs.

In the two cases concerning fish as well, the same method applies. But this is the distinction - for one who, having opened the mouth of the fish-trap, or having released the rear pouch, or having made a hole in the side, drives out the fish from the fish-trap and causes them to flee, it is an offence involving expulsion. For one who, having shown rice grains and thus causes them to flee, it is also an offence involving expulsion. For one who lifts them up together with the fish-trap, it is also an offence involving expulsion. If one merely opens the mouth of the fish-trap, releases the rear pouch, or makes a hole, but the fish flee of their own nature, it is compensation. Having done thus, one shows rice grains, and the fish, having come out seeking food, flee - it is only compensation. Without opening the mouth, without releasing the rear pouch, without making a hole in the side, one merely shows rice grains, but the fish, being afflicted by hunger, strike with their heads and make an opening and come out seeking food and flee - it is only compensation. If one opens the mouth of an empty fish-trap, or releases the rear pouch, or makes a hole, and fish that come along, having reached the entrance, flee through the holes in the pouch - it is only compensation. If one takes an empty fish-trap and throws it into a thicket - it is only compensation. The goods on a vehicle are similar to those on a bench or in a bag.

In the case concerning the slice of flesh - if one takes it in the air, the place where it was taken is itself the base. That should be understood as removal from the base by delimiting it in six directions. The remainder here should be judged according to the method stated in the cases concerning timber, the cowherd, the washerman's cloth, and in the cases concerning the mango thief and so forth.

155. In the case of the pot - One who, having taken ghee, oil, and such things not amounting to the value of a pāda, having established himself in restraint thinking "I shall not do thus again," and when the desire arises again on the second day and so forth, having likewise relinquished the responsibility and consuming it, even if he consumes all of it, there is no offence of expulsion. He commits either a wrong-doing or a grave offence, but there is liability for the goods. This monk too did exactly thus. Therefore it was said - "There is no offence, monk, of expulsion." However, for one who, without relinquishing the responsibility, consumes little by little thinking "I shall consume day after day," on whichever day the value of a pāda is fulfilled, on that day there is expulsion.

The cases of theft by arrangement should be understood according to the method of adjudication stated in the case of theft by arrangement; the cases of the handful should be understood according to that stated in the cases of the rice-cooking house and so forth; and the two cases of leftover food should be understood according to that stated in the cases of the mango thief and so forth. The two cases of grass are self-evident in meaning.

156. In the cases concerning the distribution of mangoes and so forth, those monks went to a certain village monastery with a limited number of monks. There, although the monks were consuming fruits and other produce, when those monks arrived, they did not say to the attendants who make things allowable: "Give fruits to the elders." Then those monks, thinking "Does what belongs to the Community not reach us?", struck the bell, had it distributed, gave a share to those monks too according to seniority of rains, and consumed it themselves as well. Therefore the Blessed One

said to them: "There is no offence, monks, for the purpose of use." Therefore even now, wherever resident monks do not give to visiting monks, and when the fruit season has arrived, seeing the presence of others, they eat by themselves as if by stealth, there it is proper for visiting monks to strike the bell, distribute, and consume.

But where resident monks, having tended the trees, when the fruit season has arrived, distribute and eat, and properly apply them to the four requisites, visiting monks have no authority there. Even regarding trees given having been designated for the purpose of robes, visiting monks have no authority over those either. The same method applies also to those given having been designated for the purpose of the remaining requisites.

But those that are not so designated, and the resident monks, having guarded and protected them, consume them as if by stealth - one should not abide by the agreement of the resident monks regarding those. Those given for the purpose of consuming the fruits, even if the resident monks guard and protect them and properly apply them - regarding those very ones, one should abide by their agreement. But in the Mahāpaccarī it is said: "One who consumes with thieving intention what has been given having been designated for the four requisites should be made to pay after having the goods assessed. For one who distributes and consumes that merely for the purpose of use, there is liability for the goods. But whatever here has been designated for the purpose of lodgings, for one who distributes and consumes that merely for the purpose of use, there is both a grave offence and liability for the goods."

What has been given having been specifically designated for the purpose of robes should be applied to robes only. If there is a famine, and monks are struggling with almsfood, but robes are easily obtainable, having performed an act of announcement for the well-being of the Community, it is proper to apply it to almsfood as well. When they are struggling with lodgings or medicine for the sick, having performed an act of announcement for the well-being of the Community, it is proper to apply it for that purpose as well. The same method applies also to what has been given specifically designated for the purpose of almsfood and for the purpose of medicine for the sick. But what has been given specifically designated for the purpose of lodgings is heavy property; that should be guarded and protected and applied for that very purpose only. But if there is a famine, and monks cannot sustain themselves with almsfood - here, when those going elsewhere due to dangers from kings, disease, thieves and so forth, the monasteries fall into ruin, they destroy the palms, coconuts and the like, but it is possible to sustain oneself depending on the lodging requisite. At such a time, even having disposed of lodgings, use for the purpose of maintaining the lodgings has been permitted by the Blessed One. Therefore, having set aside one or two excellent lodgings, it is proper to dispose of the others, beginning with the inferior ones, for the purpose of almsfood. But having made a complete destruction of the foundation, one should not apply it.

But whatever monastery has been given having been designated for the purpose of the four requisites, an act of announcement should not be performed there. But whichever requisite is deficient, it is proper to apply it for that purpose. The monastery should be maintained; it is proper to have it maintained even by giving

wages. But those who, having received wages, build a house in the monastery itself and live there guarding it - if they give coconuts or palm nuts to monks who have come, whatever has been permitted to them by the Community - "Each day you may eat this much" - they are entitled to give only that; it is not proper to accept from them even if they give more than that.

But whoever, having taken a monastery on lease, gives only allowable goods to the Community for the purpose of the four requisites, he is permitted to give even much. A monastery given for the purpose of lamps for a shrine or for the purpose of repairing what is broken and dilapidated should also be maintained; it should be maintained even by giving wages. And here it is proper to give wages from what belongs to the shrine as well as from what belongs to the Community. Regarding this monastery too, the giving of fruits produced therein by those who live there and guard it for wages, and by those who give allowable goods having taken it on lease, should be understood in the manner already stated.

In the cases beginning with the mango-keepers - "There is no offence, monks, in a gift from a guardian" - here, which gift from a guardian is proper and which is not proper? The Elder Mahāsuma first said: "What has been given after apportioning to the guardian - 'Take this much day by day' - only that is proper; beyond that it is not proper." But the Elder Mahāpaduma said - "Is there anything given to guardians by written document or by making a sign as agreement? These are masters over what has been entrusted into their hands; therefore whatever they give, even much, is proper." But in the Kurundi Commentary it is said - "Children guard a monastery or other fruits belonging to people; what is given by them is proper. But one should not accept what has been brought by request. But regarding what belongs to the Community and what belongs to a shrine, only the gift of one who guards having taken it on lease is proper. For one who guards for wages, only one's own share is proper." But in the Mahāpaccarī: "What the monastery guardians of laypeople give to monks, that is proper. But what the monastery guardians of the Community of monks give, having broken off from their own wages, that is proper. Even one who guards having received wages for half the monastery or for certain trees only, it is proper for him to give only from the trees allotted to him. But for one who guards having taken it on lease, even all is proper" - thus it is said. But all this is different only in wording, in meaning it is one and the same; therefore it should be understood by knowing the intention.

In the case of wood - "It was temporary, Blessed One" was said by one wishing to say "my intention was temporary, Blessed One"; "with temporary intention" means it is said "my intention was thus: 'I shall bring it back and return it.'" The Blessed One said: "There is no offence for temporary taking."

Now here is the determination beyond the canonical text - if the Community is carrying out a communal work, an uposatha hall or a dining hall, one should ask permission from that and take it temporarily. But whatever communal building material is unprotected, gets wet when it rains, and dries out in the sun, it is proper to take all of it and use it for one's own dwelling. When the Community requests it back, one should be compensated with other building materials or with money. If it is not possible to compensate, one should say: "Venerable sir, it was made with communal

property; use it as communal property." But this very monk is the master of the dwelling. Even if a stone pillar or a wooden pillar or a door panel or a window is lacking, it is proper to take communal property temporarily and make it permanent. This same method applies to other building materials as well.

In the case concerning water - when water is difficult to obtain, it is brought from a yojana or half a yojana away; in such a case, stealing appropriated water constitutes theft. Even from water that is being brought or standing in lotus ponds and the like, from which they merely prepare gruel and rice and use for drinking, and do not make other great use of it, for one who takes even that with thieving intention, it constitutes theft. However, where one may take one or two pots to wash seats, to water Bodhi trees, to make water offerings, or to cook dye, in that case one should act only according to the agreement of the Community. One who takes in excess, or who with thieving intention throws in clay and the like, should be made to pay after having the goods assessed.

If the resident monks make the agreement strict, not allowing others to wash or dye their belongings, but themselves take it when others are not looking and do everything, their agreement need not be observed. However much they wash, that much may be washed. If the Community has two or three lotus ponds or water cisterns, and an agreement has been made: "One should bathe here, drinking water should be taken from here, all use should be made here." Everything should be done according to the agreement alone. Where there is no agreement, all use is permissible.

In the case concerning clay - where clay is difficult to obtain, or various coloured clays have been brought and stored, even a small amount there is worth five māsakas; therefore it is an offence involving expulsion. However, when Community work or shrine work has been completed, it is permissible to take it after asking the Community or as a temporary loan. The same method applies to plaster and to paints for decorative work.

In the cases concerning grass - in the case of burned grass, because there is no removal from its place, it is a wrong-doing, but compensation for the goods is due. The Community, having tended the grass plot, thatches the Community dwelling; if at some time it is unable to tend it again, and another single monk tends it out of pure faith, it still belongs to the Community. If he does not tend it, one monk should be told by the Community: "Tend it and give it." If he wishes for a share, he should be made to tend it even by giving a share. If he increases the share, it should indeed be given. If he keeps increasing it, he should be told: "Go, tend it, take all of it, and thatch your own dwelling." Why? When it is lost, there is no benefit. However, those giving should not give it together with the land, as it is heavy property; but the grass alone should be given. If, while he is tending it and thatching his own dwelling, the Community is again able to tend it, he should be told: "You should not tend it; the Community will tend it."

The seven cases beginning with beds are well known. Even though not mentioned in the canonical text, for one who carries away a stone pillar or a wooden pillar or anything else of equivalent value, it is indeed an offence involving expulsion. The same method applies also to one who breaks the walls or enclosure walls of

abandoned and fallen residences and the like in meditation halls and such places, and carries away bricks and the like. Why? What belongs to the Community is sometimes inhabited and sometimes not inhabited. The same method applies also to one who carries away any requisite from abandoned monasteries and the like when people depart from the border regions due to fear of bandits. However, those who take from there temporarily, and when the monasteries are inhabited again the monks request them to return it, it should be given back. Even if a dwelling has been made from what was brought from there, that or its equivalent value should indeed be given back. Having cut off attachment thinking "We shall inhabit it again," when people have departed from the regions, what belongs to a group or to an individual may have been taken; if they give consent, there is no need for restitution. However, what belongs to the Community is heavy property; therefore restitution must indeed be made.

157. The matter concerning the use of dwelling requisites is clear in meaning.

Regarding "I allow, monks, to take temporarily": here, if a monk, having temporarily taken a bed or chair belonging to the Community, uses it for the Community's use at a place comfortable for himself for even one or two months, gives it to more senior monks who come from time to time, and does not refuse them, then even if it is lost, worn out, or carried off by thieves, there is no liability for him. However, when departing after having stayed, it should be placed back in its original place. But whoever uses it for personal use and does not give it to more senior monks who come from time to time, if it is lost, there is liability for him. However, if one who has taken it to another dwelling and is using it there is made to vacate by a more senior monk who arrives, he should say: "I brought this from such-and-such a dwelling; I shall go and restore it to its original place." If that monk says "I will restore it to its original place," it is proper to go even after making it his responsibility - thus it is stated in the Abridged Commentary.

In the Campā matter: "Rice-gruel containing the three pungent ingredients" means gruel made with three ingredients by adding any one kind of pulse together with sesame and rice - either sesame, rice, and mung beans, or sesame, rice, and black beans, or sesame, rice, and horse gram. They make this, it is said, by combining these three with milk mixed with one-quarter water, together with ghee, honey, sugar, and so forth.

In the Rājagaha matter: "Honey-ball" means an excessively sweet cake; they also call it "honey-head." The remainder here in both these matters should be understood in the same way as stated in the matter concerning the sharing of rice.

158. In the case of Ajjuka - "Said this" means he said it after becoming ill. "The Venerable Upāli was on the Venerable Ajjuka's side" - he was not on his side by way of partiality, but rather the Elder should be understood as being on his side through recognising it as a non-offence, through supporting one who is conscientious, and through supporting the Vinaya. The remainder here is clear in itself.

159. In the Bārāṇasī account - "Troubled by thieves" means plundered by thieves. "Having brought by supernormal power, placed them in the mansion" means that the Elder, it is said, having seen that family afflicted by the dart of sorrow, turning this way and that, out of compassion for that family, for the purpose of preserving their

confidence, through the support of the Dhamma, by his own supernormal power, resolved thus: "Let their very mansion be near the boys." The boys, recognising "This is our mansion," climbed up into it. Then the Elder withdrew the supernormal power, and the mansion stood in its own place again. However, it was stated in conventional terms: "Having brought those boys by supernormal power, he placed them in the mansion." "In the extent of supernormal power" means there is no offence with such supernormal power of resolution. However, the supernormal power of transformation is not permissible.

160-161. The two cases at the end have a clear meaning.

In the Samantapāsādikā, the commentary on the Vinaya,

the commentary on the second Pārājika is finished.

Herein is this instruction -

The second Pārājika, which was made known by the Conqueror who is without a second;

By him whose defilements are conquered - this is the pārājika here.

A training rule equal to that, no other whatsoever is found;

Interspersed with manifold methods, with a determination of profound meaning.

Therefore, when a case has arisen, by a monk who knows the Vinaya,

Making a determination herein with the support of the Vinaya,

Having plunged into the canonical text and the commentary together with their intention completely,

The determination should be made by one who is heedful.

Eagerness to see an offence should never be exercised;

One should make up one's mind thus: "I shall see non-offence."

And even having seen an offence, without declaring it, again and again

Having investigated and then having compared it with the wise, one should state it.

Even in an allowable matter, due to the fickleness of the mind,

Ordinary persons here fall away from the qualities of recluseship.

Therefore, regarding another's requisites, seeing them as a venomous serpent,

And as fire, the wise one should not lie down with them.

Of the commentary on the Pārājika section,

The first part is concluded.

Homage to the Blessed One, the Worthy One, the Perfectly Enlightened One

3. The Third Expulsion

The third pārājika, which was elucidated by the Buddha who is pure in three ways,

The order of commentary on that has now been reached.

Since therefore what has been explained before is easy to understand;

Setting that aside, this commentary too is given.

Explanation of the Origin of the First Laying Down

162. Here, in "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One, was dwelling at Vesālī in the Great Wood in the Pinnacled Hall," "at Vesālī" means in the city so named, the conventional usage of which operates by way of the feminine gender. For that city is called "Vesālī" because it became extensive (*visālībhūtattā*) through the expansion of its wall-enclosure three times. And it should be understood that this city too reached full prosperity in every respect only when the Perfectly Enlightened One attained omniscience. Having thus indicated the resort village, he stated the place of dwelling - "in the Great Wood in the Pinnacled Hall." Therein, the Great Wood is a naturally grown, unplanted, bounded, great forest. But in the vicinity of Kapilavatthu, the Great Wood, connected as one with the Himalayas, being without boundary, stood reaching the great ocean. This one is not like that; a bounded great forest is the Great Wood. The Pinnacled Hall should be understood as the perfumed chamber of the Buddha, the Blessed One, complete in every respect, made with a peaked-roof covering in the style of a swan-circle, having a pinnacled structure within, in the monastery built in dependence on the Great Wood.

"Speaks in many ways about the talk on foulness" means he speaks a talk that produces disenchantment with the body, proceeding by way of displaying the aspect of foulness through many reasons. That is: "There are in this body head hairs, body hairs, etc. ... urine." What is meant? Monks, searching in every way in this fathom-long carcass, no one sees any pearl, or gem, or beryl, or aloe-wood, or sandalwood, or saffron, or camphor, or fragrant powders and the like, or even the slightest state of purity. Rather, one sees only impurity of various kinds such as head hairs, body hairs, and so forth, which is extremely foul-smelling, disgusting, and unsightly in appearance. Therefore, neither desire nor lust should be generated here. For even the head hairs that grow on the head, the highest limb, are foul, impure, and repulsive. And their state of being foul, impure, and repulsive should be understood through five reasons: by way of colour, by way of shape, by way of smell, by way of origin, and by way of location. So too for body hairs and the rest. This is the summary here; the detailed account should be understood according to the method stated in the *Visuddhimagga*. Thus the Blessed One speaks the talk on foulness in many ways, with a fivefold analysis in each and every portion.

"Praises foulness" means having set down the matrix of foulness by way of the bloated and so forth, he praises foulness by analysing it through the method of word-analysis, describing and extolling it. "Praises the development of foulness" means that which is the meditation, the growth, the increase of consciousness that proceeds having taken the aspect of foulness in internal and external objects such as head hairs and so on or the bloated and so on - showing the benefit of that development of

foulness, he praises it, he extols its virtue. That is: "A monk devoted to the development of foulness, monks, in objects such as head hairs and so forth or the bloated and so forth, attains the first meditative absorption, which is abandoned in five factors, possessed of five factors, threefold good, and endowed with ten characteristics. He, in dependence on that casket of consciousness called the first meditative absorption, having developed insight, attains the highest good, arahantship."

Therein, these are the ten characteristics of the first meditative absorption - purification of mind from obstacles, the practice of the middle sign of concentration, the mind's leaping forward therein, looking on with equanimity at the purified mind, looking on with equanimity at what has entered upon tranquillity, looking on with equanimity at the state of singleness, elation in the sense of the non-exceeding of states arisen therein, elation in the sense of the single flavour of the faculties, in the sense of conveying the energy appropriate thereto, and in the sense of repeated practice.

Herein this is the canonical text - "What is the beginning of the first meditative absorption, what is the middle, what is the conclusion? Purification of practice is the beginning of the first meditative absorption, development of equanimity is the middle, gladdening is the end. The purification of the practice is the beginning of the first meditative absorption; how many characteristics does the beginning have? The beginning has three characteristics - whatever is its obstacle, from that the mind is purified; because of being purified, the mind enters upon the middle sign of tranquillity; because of having entered upon it, the mind springs forward therein. And that the mind becomes pure from the obstacle, and that because of purity the mind proceeds to the middle sign of serenity, and that because of having proceeded the mind springs forward there. Purification of practice is the beginning of the first meditative absorption; these are the three characteristics of the beginning. Therefore it is said - 'The first meditative absorption is beautiful in the beginning and endowed with three characteristics.'

"The strengthening of equanimity is the middle of the first meditative absorption; how many characteristics does the middle have? The middle has three characteristics - one looks on with equanimity at the purified mind, one looks on with equanimity at what has entered upon tranquillity, one looks on with equanimity at what is established in singleness. That one looks on with equanimity at the purified mind, that one looks on with equanimity at what has entered upon tranquillity, and that one looks on with equanimity at what is established in singleness. The development of equanimity of the first meditative absorption is the middle; these are the three characteristics of the middle. Therefore it is said - 'The first meditative absorption is beautiful in the middle and endowed with three characteristics.'

"Exhilaration is the conclusion of the first meditative absorption; how many characteristics does the conclusion have? The end has four characteristics - exhilaration in the sense of the non-exceeding of states arisen therein, exhilaration in the sense of the faculties having one flavour, exhilaration in the sense of conveying the appropriate energy, exhilaration in the sense of repeated practice. The gladdening of the first meditative absorption is the end; these are the four characteristics of the end. Therefore it is said - 'The first meditative absorption is

beautiful in the conclusion and endowed with four characteristics.' "Thus the mind that has gone to the threefold state is threefold in beauty, endowed with ten characteristics, endowed with applied thought, endowed with sustained thought, endowed with rapture, endowed with happiness, endowed with the resolution of mind, endowed with faith, endowed with energy, endowed with mindfulness, endowed with concentration, and endowed with wisdom."

"Repeatedly praising the attainment of foulness" means: having made the determination again and again as "in this way and in that way," pointing out, he praises the attainment of foulness, speaks of its benefits, and proclaims its virtues. That is: "Monks, for a monk who dwells frequently with a mind cultivated by the perception of foulness, the mind shrinks back, draws back, turns away from the engagement in sexual intercourse, and does not extend towards it; either equanimity or repulsiveness is established. Just as, monks, a cock's feather or a strip of sinew thrown into a fire shrinks back, draws back, turns away, and does not extend; just so, monks, for a monk who dwells frequently with a mind cultivated by the perception of foulness, the mind shrinks back, draws back, turns away from the engagement in sexual intercourse, and does not extend towards it."

"I wish, monks, to go into seclusion for a fortnight" means: I wish, monks, to go into seclusion for one fortnight, to withdraw, to dwell alone - this is the meaning. "I should not be approached by anyone except for one bringing almsfood" means: except for one monk who, without himself making any soliciting speech, brings out almsfood prepared in faithful families for my sake and offers it to me - except for that one monk who brings almsfood, I should not be approached by any other monk or householder.

But why did he say thus? In the past, it is said, five hundred deer hunters, having surrounded the forest with great stakes and nets, delighted and pleased, making their livelihood solely by the killing of deer and birds for their entire lives, were reborn in hell; having been tormented there, by some wholesome kamma done previously, they were reborn among humans, and by the force of a wholesome supporting condition, they all obtained the going forth and the full ordination in the presence of the Blessed One; from that root unwholesome kamma, the volitions whose results had not yet ripened, one after another, created the opportunity for the cutting off of life by self-infliction and by the infliction of others within that fortnight - this the Blessed One saw. The result of action indeed cannot be prevented by anyone. And among those monks there were both ordinary persons and stream-enterers, once-returners, non-returners, and those with taints destroyed. Therein, those with taints destroyed are without renewed existence; the other noble disciples have a fixed destination with a happy realm as their goal; but the destination of ordinary persons is unfixed. Then the Blessed One thought - "These, frightened by the fear of death through desire and lust for their individual existence, will not be able to purify their destination. Come, let me speak to them the talk on foulness for the abandoning of desire and lust. Having heard that, through the absence of desire and lust for their individual existence, having purified their destination, they will take rebirth in heaven. Thus their going forth in my presence will be fruitful."

Thereupon, for their assistance, he spoke the talk on foulness with the meditation subject as the lead, not with the intention of praising and extolling death. And having

spoken, this occurred to him - "If the monks see me during this fortnight, they will come again and again and report, 'Today one monk has died, today two,' etc. 'Today ten,' coming again and again they will report. And this result of kamma cannot be warded off by me or by anyone else. What shall I do even upon hearing that? What use is it for me to hear of such purposeless misfortune and calamity? Come, let me resort to not seeing the monks." Therefore he spoke thus - "I wish, monks, to go into seclusion for a fortnight; I should not be approached by anyone except for one bringing almsfood."

Others, however, say - "He spoke thus and went into seclusion for the purpose of avoiding censure by others." Others, it is said, would blame the Blessed One - "This one, who claims 'I am omniscient, I am the supreme sovereign of the true Dhamma,' is unable to prevent even his own disciples from killing one another. What else will he be able to do?" Therein, the wise would say: "The Blessed One was devoted to seclusion and did not know of this occurrence; there was no one to report it to him either. If he had known, he would certainly have prevented it." But this is merely a wish; the first is indeed the reason here. Regarding "nāssudhā," herein "assudhā" is a particle used merely as a sentence filler or in the sense of emphasis; the meaning is: no one at all approached the Blessed One.

Because there is a manifestation through many causes such as colour, shape, and so forth, it is "of manifold manifestation" (anekākāravokāro); it means "of manifold variety, mixed with many causes." What is that? The pursuit of the development of foulness; "dwelling engaged in the pursuit of the development of foulness of manifold manifestation" means they dwell devoted and engaged. "They were troubled" means they are distressed and afflicted by their own bodies. "They were ashamed" means they are embarrassed. "They were disgusted" means disgust has arisen in them. "Young" means of tender age. "Youthful" means endowed with youth. "Fond of adornment" means one whose nature is to adorn. "Having bathed the head" means having bathed together with the head. Here, by the words "young, youthful," the word "young" indicates the state of early youth. For in early youth, beings are especially fond of adornment. "Having bathed the head" - by this, the time of engagement in adornment is indicated. For even a youthful person, having done some work, with a soiled body, is not engaged in adornment; but having bathed the head, he engages in nothing but adornment. He does not even wish to see snake carcasses and the like. Just as at that moment he would be troubled, ashamed, and disgusted by a snake carcass or a dog carcass or a human carcass hung around his neck, brought by some enemy and tied and fastened around his neck; just so those monks, being troubled, ashamed, and disgusted by their own bodies, like that man wishing to abandon that carcass, wishing to abandon their own bodies through the absence of desire and lust, taking a weapon, deprived themselves of life. "You deprive me of life; I will deprive you" - thus they also deprived one another of life.

"Migalaṇḍika the fake ascetic" - "Migalaṇḍika" is his name; "fake ascetic" means one who wears the guise of an ascetic. He, it is said, leaving just a topknot, having shaved his head, having donned one ochre robe as a lower garment and having put one over his shoulder, lived depending on the monastery itself, subsisting on leftovers. Having approached that very Migalaṇḍika the fake ascetic, they spoke thus. "Good!" is an indeclinable particle in the sense of a request. "Us" is the accusative plural; it means

"Good, friend, deprive us of life." Here, the noble ones neither committed the taking of life, nor incited others to do so, nor approved of it. But the worldlings did all of it. "Blood-stained" means smeared with blood. "The river Vaggumudā" - the Vaggumata is a river regarded by the world as meritorious. He too, it is said, went with the perception "I shall wash away that evil there"; but by the power of the river, not even the slightest evil is abandoned.

163. "There was indeed remorse": among those monks, it is said, no bodily misconduct or verbal misconduct had been committed by any of them; they all lay down on their right side, mindful and clearly comprehending. As he recollected that, remorse indeed arose in him. "There was regret": this is stated for the purpose of defining the inherent nature of that very remorse. It was the remorse of regret, not the remorse concerning Vinaya. "It is a loss for me indeed" etc. is stated for the purpose of showing the manner in which the remorse occurred. Therein, "it is a loss for me indeed" means he laments thus: "Henceforth there is now no gain of benefit and happiness for me." But by "it is not a gain for me indeed" he makes that very meaning firm. For this is the intention here: even if someone were to say "it is a gain for you," that would be wrong; it is not a gain for me indeed. "It is ill-gained for me indeed" means: even this human existence obtained through the power of wholesome deeds is ill-gained for me indeed. But by "it is not well-gained for me indeed" he makes that very meaning firm. For this is the intention here: even if someone were to say "it is well-gained for you," that would be wrong; it is not well-gained for me indeed. "Demerit has been produced" means demerit has been accumulated or generated. If one asks why? "That I, monks" etc. "deprived of life." Its meaning is - that I deprived of life monks who were virtuous - by that very virtue being of good character, of supreme character, of excellent character.

"A certain deity belonging to Māra's retinue" means: a certain earth deity, unknown by name, holding wrong view, on Māra's side, following Māra, having thought "thus this one will not go beyond Māra's domain, Māra's realm," having adorned herself with all ornaments, displaying her own power, came as if walking on the surface of the earth upon the unbroken water, and said this to Migalaṇḍika the fake ascetic. "Good, good" is a particle used in the sense of encouragement; therefore the double expression is made. "You help those who have not crossed over to cross over" means: those who have not crossed over from saṃsāra, you help to cross over, you liberate them, by this deprivation of life. This, it is said, was the view of this foolish, unwise deity: "Those who have not died are not freed from saṃsāra. Those who have died are freed." Therefore, like a barbarian who liberates from saṃsāra, holding such a view, she encouraged him in that, and spoke thus. Then Migalaṇḍika the fake ascetic, although such intense regret had arisen, having seen that power of the deity, thought "this deity speaks thus - surely in this matter it must be just so," and having reached that conclusion, proclaiming "it is a gain for me, it is said" and so forth. "Having approached from dwelling to dwelling, from residential cell to residential cell, said thus" means: having approached each dwelling and residential cell, having opened the door, having entered inside, he said thus to the monks - "Who has not crossed over, whom shall I help to cross over?"

"There was indeed fear" means there is mental terror on account of death. "There was trepidation" means there is bodily trembling starting with the heart-flesh; some say it means rigidity of the body due to extreme fear, for "thambhitatta" (rigidity) is called "chambhitatta" (trepidation). "Terror" means the standing up of body hair. However, those with taints destroyed, because of having well seen the emptiness of beings, do not see any being subject to death at all; therefore it should be understood that none of this occurred for them. "Even one monk, even two" etc. "deprived even sixty monks of life in one day" means thus by way of counting he deprived all those five hundred monks of life.

164. "Having emerged from seclusion" means having known that those five hundred monks had reached the destruction of life, he emerged from solitude, and though knowing, as if not knowing, in order to initiate a discussion, he addressed the Venerable Ānanda. "Why indeed, Ānanda, does the Community of monks seem to have become diminished" means: Ānanda, previously many monks used to come together for attendance, take up recitation and questioning, and engage in chanting, and the monastery appeared as if ablaze with a single light; but now, by the elapse of merely a fortnight, the Community of monks seems to have become diminished - thin, feeble, few, and sparse. What indeed is the reason? Have the monks departed to the various directions?

Then the Venerable Ānanda, not perceiving that their reaching the destruction of life was due to the result of kamma, but perceiving it as being due to the practice of the meditation subject on foulness, having said "Because indeed, venerable sir, the Blessed One" and so forth, and requesting another meditation subject for the monks' attainment of arahantship, said "It would be good, venerable sir, if the Blessed One" and so forth. Its meaning is - It would be good, venerable sir, if the Blessed One would explain another method by which the Community of monks might become established in arahantship; for just as there are landing places for descending into the great ocean, so too there are many meditation subjects for descending into nibbāna, classified as the ten recollections, the ten kasiṇas, the determination of the four elements, the divine abidings, and mindfulness of breathing. The intention is: among these, may the Blessed One, having encouraged the monks, explain a certain meditation subject.

Then the Blessed One, wishing to do so, urging the Elder on, said "Then, Ānanda" and so forth. Therein, "dwelling in dependence on Vesālī" means: assemble all the monks who are dwelling in dependence on Vesālī, all around, whether within a gāvuta or half a yojana - that is the meaning. "Having assembled all of them in the assembly hall" means: having himself gone to the places appropriate for him to go, and having sent junior monks elsewhere, in just a moment, having gathered all the monks without remainder in the assembly hall. "Now let the Blessed One do as he thinks fit, venerable sir" - herein the intention is this: Blessed One, the Community of monks has assembled; this is the time to give a talk on the Teaching to the monks, to give instruction; now whatever you know to be timely, that should be done.

Discussion on the Concentration of Mindfulness of Breathing

165. Then the Blessed One, etc. addressed the monks - Having addressed them with "This too, monks," and then, teaching a different method from the meditation subject on the foul (asubha) previously taught to the monks for the attainment of arahantship, he said "the concentration of mindfulness of breathing."

Now, since this passage was spoken by the Blessed One precisely for the purpose of showing the monks a peaceful and sublime meditation subject, I shall therefore give the commentary here without omitting the sequence of meaning-explanation. Therein, the explanation of this passage "This too, monks" is as follows - Monks, it is not only the development of the foul that leads to the abandoning of defilements, but this too, the concentration of mindfulness of breathing... etc. appeases them.

Now here this is the explanation of the meaning - "Mindfulness of breathing" (ānāpānassati) means mindfulness that comprehends the in-breath and out-breath. For this was said in the Paṭisambhidā -

"'Āna' means the in-breath, not the out-breath. 'Apāna' means out-breath, not in-breath. Mindfulness is the establishing by means of in-breath; mindfulness is the establishing by means of out-breath. For one who breathes in, it is established for him; for one who breathes out, it is established for him."

"Concentration" (samādhi) means one-pointedness of mind arisen together with that mindfulness which comprehends the in-breathing and out-breathing; and this teaching is given under the heading of concentration, not under the heading of mindfulness. Therefore the meaning here should be understood thus: concentration conjoined with mindfulness of breathing is the concentration of mindfulness of breathing, or concentration in mindfulness of breathing is the concentration of mindfulness of breathing. "Developed" (bhāvito) means produced and increased. "Cultivated" means done again and again. "Peaceful and sublime" (santo ceva paṇīto ca) means peaceful and indeed sublime; in both instances the restriction should be understood by the word "indeed" (eva). What is meant? Whereas the meditation subject on the foul is peaceful and sublime merely by way of penetration, yet because of having a gross object and a repulsive object, it is by way of the object neither peaceful nor sublime, this is not so - it is not by any method unpeaceful or unsublime; rather, it is peaceful, stilled, and quenched also by the peacefulness of its object, and sublime also by the sublimity of the factors reckoned as penetration, also by the sublimity of the object, producing satisfaction, and also by the sublimity of the factors. Therefore it was said - "peaceful and sublime."

"An unadulterated pleasant dwelling" (asecanako ca sukho ca vihāro): here, "there is no seasoning for it" means unadulterated, unmixed, unblended, distinctive, unique; there is no peacefulness here through preliminary work or access - from the initial attention onwards, it is by its own nature peaceful and sublime - this is the meaning. Some, however, say that "unadulterated" means unmixed, full of essence, sweet by its very nature. Thus this should be understood as unadulterated and as a pleasant dwelling because at each and every moment of attainment it leads to the acquisition of bodily and mental happiness.

"Arisen, arisen" (uppannuppanne) means unsuppressed, unsuppressed. "Evil" means inferior. "Unwholesome mental states" means mental states arisen from lack of skilfulness. "Causes to disappear with reason and cause" means causes to disappear in a moment, suppresses. "Appeases" (vūpasameti) means thoroughly calms; or, because of being of the nature that leads to penetration, it gradually, having grown to the noble path, cuts off utterly and tranquillises - this too is the meaning.

"Just as" - this is an illustration by way of simile. "In the last month of summer" means in the month of Āsāḷha. "The dust and dirt that has been raised up" means the dust and grit that has been struck up, raised up, and arisen in the sky from the earth that has been dried by wind and sun for a fortnight and broken up by the trampling of cows, buffaloes, and other such animals. "A great untimely rain cloud" means a rain cloud that has arisen covering the entire sky during the bright fortnight of Āsāḷha for the whole fortnight. For it is called an "untimely cloud" here because it has arisen when the rainy season has not yet arrived. "Causes to disappear with reason and cause, and appeases" means it instantly leads to disappearance and causes it to settle down upon the earth. "Just so" - this is the application of the simile. What follows is just the method already stated.

Now, in "And how, monks, is the concentration of mindfulness of breathing developed," here "how" is a question expressing the desire to elaborate in various ways the development of the concentration of mindfulness of breathing. "The concentration of mindfulness of breathing, monks, when developed" is an indication of the teaching that is asked about with the desire to elaborate in various ways. This same method applies to the second term as well. Now here this is the meaning in brief - Monks, in what manner, in what way, by what method is the concentration of mindfulness of breathing developed, in what manner is it cultivated so that it is peaceful and etc. appeases them.

Now, elaborating that meaning, he said "Here, monks" and so forth. Therein, "here, monks, a monk" means monks, a monk in this dispensation. For here the word "here" illuminates the dispensation as the support of the person who produces the concentration of mindfulness of breathing in all its aspects, and it negates such a state in other dispensations. For this was said: "Here only, monks, is an ascetic, etc. The other doctrines are empty of other ascetics." Therefore it was said - "a monk in this dispensation."

"Having gone to the forest" etc. "or having gone to an empty house" - this is an elucidation of the adoption of a dwelling suitable for the development of the concentration of mindfulness of breathing. For this monk's mind, which has long been dispersed among sense objects such as visible forms, does not wish to ascend to the object of the concentration of mindfulness of breathing. Like a chariot yoked to an unruly ox, it runs only off the path. Therefore, just as a cowherd, wishing to tame an untamed calf that has grown up having drunk all the milk of an untamed cow, having removed it from the cow, having planted a large post to one side, would tie it there with a string. Then that calf, having struggled here and there and being unable to run away, would sit down or lie down beside that very post; just so, this monk too, wishing to tame the unruly mind that has long been nourished by drinking the flavour of sense objects such as visible forms, having removed it from objects such as visible forms, having led it into the forest or etc. or into an empty house, should tie it there

to the post of in-breathing and out-breathing with the rope of mindfulness. Thus his mind, even though having struggled here and there, not obtaining the object formerly habitually practised, being unable to cut the string of mindfulness and run away, sits close to and lies down close to that very object by way of access and absorption. Therefore the ancients said:

"Just as a man here would tie an untamed calf to a post,
So one should bind one's own mind firmly to the object with mindfulness."

Thus this lodging is suitable for development. Therefore it was said - "This is the elucidation of the adoption of a dwelling place suitable for the development of the concentration of mindfulness of breathing."

Or alternatively, since this meditation subject of mindfulness of breathing, which is the foremost among the varieties of meditation subjects, and which is the foundation for the attainment of distinction and the pleasant dwelling in this very life for omniscient Buddhas, paccekabuddhas, and disciples of the Buddha, is not easy to accomplish without abandoning the vicinity of a village crowded with the sounds of women, men, elephants, horses, and so forth, because sound is a thorn to meditative absorption. But in an uninhabited forest it is easy for a meditator to take up this meditation subject, produce the fourth meditative absorption of mindfulness of breathing, and using that as a basis, comprehend activities and reach the supreme fruit of arahantship. Therefore, showing a suitable dwelling for him, the Blessed One said "having gone to the forest" and so forth.

For the Blessed One is like a teacher of the science of site-selection. Just as a teacher of the science of site-selection, having seen a site for a city and having thoroughly examined it, advises "Build a city here," and when the city is safely completed, receives great honour from the royal family; just so, having examined a suitable dwelling for the meditator, he advises "Here one should devote oneself to the meditation subject." Then, when the yogī devoted to the meditation subject there gradually attains arahantship, he receives great honour thus: "Truly that Blessed One is a Perfectly Enlightened One." But this monk is said to be "like a panther." For just as a great leopard king, relying on a grass thicket, a forest thicket, or a mountain thicket in the wilderness, lurks in hiding and catches wild animals such as wild buffalo, gayal, and boar; just so, this monk, devoting himself to the meditation subject in the forest and so forth, should be understood as progressively attaining the paths of stream-entry, once-returning, non-returning, and arahantship, as well as the noble fruits. Therefore the ancients said:

"Just as a panther, having hidden, catches deer;
Just so this son of the Buddha, engaged in exertion, gifted with introspection;
Having entered the forest, takes the highest fruit."

Therefore, showing the forest lodging as the ground suitable for the training born of effort, the Blessed One said beginning with "having gone to the forest, or."

Therein, "having gone to the forest": "forest" means having gone to any forest conducive to the happiness of seclusion, among forests defined thus: "Having gone out beyond the boundary post, all that is forest" and "A forest dwelling is one that is

at least five hundred bow-lengths distant." "Having gone to the root of a tree" means having gone to the vicinity of a tree. "Having gone to an empty house" means having gone to an empty, secluded place. And here, apart from the forest and the root of a tree, even one who has gone to any of the remaining seven kinds of dwellings may be said to have "gone to an empty house." Thus, having indicated a dwelling suitable for the development of mindfulness of breathing, in accordance with the three seasons and in accordance with the elements and temperaments, he said "sits down," indicating a peaceful posture that is neither inclined to sluggishness nor to restlessness. Then, showing the firmness of the sitting posture, the ease of the functioning of the in-breaths and out-breaths, and the means of apprehending the object, he said "folding the legs crosswise" and so forth.

Therein, "cross-legged" means a seat with the thighs bound all around. "Having folded" means having bound. "Directing his body upright" means having placed the upper body upright, having arranged the eighteen vertebrae of the spine tip to tip. For indeed, for one seated thus, the skin, flesh, and sinews do not bend. Then those feelings that would arise moment by moment due to the bending down of those do not arise. When those do not arise, the mind becomes unified. The meditation subject does not decline. It reaches growth and increase.

"Having established mindfulness in front of him" means having placed mindfulness facing the meditation subject. Alternatively, "pari" has the meaning of comprehension; "mukha" has the meaning of outlet; "sati" has the meaning of presence; therefore it is said - "having established mindfulness in front of him". Thus the meaning here should be understood according to the method stated in the Paṭisambhidā. Therein this is the summary - "Having made mindfulness that possesses deliverance." "He, mindful, breathes in" means that monk, having sat down thus and having established mindfulness thus, not abandoning that mindfulness, breathes in mindfully, breathes out mindfully, becomes one who acts with mindfulness - this is what is said.

Now, showing the modes by which he becomes one who acts with mindfulness, he said "breathing in long" and so forth. For this was said in the Paṭisambhidā - in the analysis of "he, mindful, breathes in; mindful, he breathes out" itself -

"By thirty-two modes he becomes one who acts with mindfulness. For one who understands unified focus of mind and non-distraction by means of long in-breath, mindfulness is established. By that mindfulness, by that knowledge, he becomes one who acts with mindfulness. By means of long out-breath, etc. For one who understands unified focus of mind and non-distraction while observing relinquishment by means of in-breath and observing relinquishment by means of out-breath, mindfulness is established. By that mindfulness, by that knowledge, he becomes one who acts with mindfulness."

Therein, "breathing in long" means producing a long in-breath. "In-breath" is the wind going out. "Out-breath" is the wind entering within. However, in the Suttanta commentaries it has come in reverse order.

Therein, for all womb-born beings, at the time of emerging from the mother's womb, first the internal wind goes out. Afterwards, the external wind, carrying fine dust, entering within, strikes the palate and ceases. Thus far the in-breath and out-breath should be understood. But their longness and shortness should be understood by means of duration. Just as water or sand that has spread over and remains in a spatial extent is called "long water, long sand, short water, short sand." So too, the in-breaths and out-breaths, though broken into fragments, in the bodies of elephants and snakes, slowly filling the long duration reckoned as their bodily form and slowly going out, are therefore called "long." For dogs, hares, and the like, quickly filling the short duration reckoned as their bodily form and quickly going out, they are therefore called "short." Among humans, however, some breathe in and breathe out long in terms of time-duration, like elephants and snakes. Some short, like dogs and hares. Therefore, those going out and entering over a long duration of time are long. Those going out and entering over a brief duration should be understood as "short." Herein, this monk, breathing in and breathing out long in nine modes, understands "I breathe in long, I breathe out long." And it should be understood that for one who understands thus, the development of the foundation of mindfulness consisting in contemplation of the body succeeds in one mode. As it is said in the Paṭisambhidā -

"How does one breathing in long understand 'I breathe in long,' breathing out long understand 'I breathe out long'? One breathes in a long in-breath reckoned as a duration, one breathes out a long out-breath reckoned as a duration, one breathes in and breathes out a long in-breath and out-breath reckoned as a duration. As he breathes in and breathes out a long in-and-out-breath reckoned as a long duration, desire arises; by the power of desire, he breathes in a long in-breath subtler than that reckoned as a long duration, by the power of desire he breathes out a long out-breath subtler than that reckoned as a long duration, by the power of desire he breathes in and breathes out a long in-and-out-breath subtler than that reckoned as a long duration. As he breathes in and breathes out a long in-and-out-breath subtler than that reckoned as a long duration by the power of desire, gladness arises; by the power of gladness, he breathes in a long in-breath subtler than that reckoned as a long duration, by the power of gladness a long out-breath subtler than that etc. a long in-and-out-breath reckoned as a long duration he breathes in and breathes out. As he breathes in and breathes out a long in-and-out-breath subtler than that reckoned as a long duration by the power of gladness, the mind turns away from the long in-and-out-breaths, and equanimity is established. By these nine modes, the long in-and-out-breaths are the body; the establishment is mindfulness; the contemplation is knowledge; the body is the establishment, not mindfulness; mindfulness is both the establishing and mindfulness. By that mindfulness, by that knowledge, one observes that body. Therefore it is said - "Development of the establishment of mindfulness through observation of the body in the body."

The same method applies also to the short passage. But this is the distinction - "Just as here it is said 'a long in-breath reckoned as a long duration'; so here it comes as 'a short in-breath reckoned as a brief duration, he breathes in.'" Therefore, by its authority, it should be construed up to "therefore it is said 'the development of the

foundation of mindfulness consisting in contemplation of the body in the body.'" Thus this one, understanding the in-and-out-breaths by these modes in terms of long duration and brief duration, breathing in long, understands 'I breathe in long' etc. or breathing out short, understands 'I breathe out short' - this is how it should be understood.

And for one who understands thus -

"Long and short is the in-breath;
And the out-breath is likewise;
Four aspects occur
At the nose-tip of the monk."

'Experiencing the whole body, I shall breathe in' etc. 'I shall breathe out,' he trains - making known, making manifest the beginning, middle and end of the entire in-breath body, he trains thus: 'I shall breathe in.' Making known, making manifest the beginning, middle and end of the entire out-breath body, he trains thus: 'I shall breathe out.' Thus making known, making manifest, he breathes in and breathes out with a mind associated with knowledge; therefore it is said 'he trains: I shall breathe in, I shall breathe out.' For one monk, in the in-breath body or out-breath body that is scattered into fragments, the beginning is manifest, but not the middle and end. He is able to discern only the beginning; he is wearied at the middle and end. For another, the middle is obvious, not the beginning and end. He is able to discern only the middle; he is wearied at the beginning and end. For another, the end is obvious, not the beginning and middle. He is able to discern only the end; he is wearied at the beginning and middle. For another, all is manifest; he is able to discern all, and does not struggle anywhere. Showing that one should be such a one, he said - 'Experiencing the whole body, I shall breathe in' etc. 'I shall breathe out,' he trains."

Therein, "he trains" means thus he strives, he endeavours. Whatever restraint there is for one in such a state - this is the training in higher virtue here. Whatever concentration there is for one in such a state - this is the training in higher consciousness. Whatever wisdom there is for one in such a state - this is the training in higher wisdom. These three trainings, with regard to that object, by means of that mindfulness and that attention, he trains in, cultivates, develops, and frequently practises - thus should the meaning here be understood. Therein, since in the former method one need only breathe in and breathe out, and nothing else need be done; but from this point onwards, effort must be applied to the arousing of knowledge and so forth. Therefore, having stated the text there in the present tense as "he understands: 'I breathe in,' he understands: 'I breathe out,'" from this point onwards, in order to show the manner of the knowledge to be aroused and so forth that is to be accomplished, the text has been set forth in the future tense by the method beginning with "experiencing the whole body, I shall breathe in" - thus it should be understood.

"Calming the bodily activity, I shall breathe in" etc. "I shall breathe out," he trains - means: calming, tranquillising, ceasing, and quieting the gross bodily activity, he trains thus: "I shall breathe in, I shall breathe out."

Therein, the grossness and subtlety and the tranquillity should be understood thus. For when this monk has not yet undertaken the practice, his body and mind are agitated. When the grossness of the body and mind has not been tranquillised, the in-breaths and out-breaths too are gross; they occur forcefully, the nostrils are not sufficient, and he remains breathing in and out through the mouth. But when his body and mind have been discerned, then they are peaceful and calmed. When they are tranquil, the in-breaths and out-breaths become subtle in their occurrence, reaching a state where one must investigate whether they exist or not. Just as for a person who has been running, or having descended from a mountain, or having lowered a great burden from his head, standing there, the in-breaths and out-breaths are gross, the nose is not sufficient, and he stands breathing in and breathing out through the mouth. But when he has dispelled that fatigue, and having bathed and drunk, and having placed a wet cloth on his chest, lies down in a cool shade, then his in-breaths and out-breaths become subtle, reaching a state where one must investigate whether they exist or not. Just so, when this monk has not yet undertaken the practice, his body and mind etc. reach a state where one must investigate whether they exist or not. What is the reason for this? For previously, when he had not yet undertaken the practice, there was no adverting, bringing to mind, attention, and reviewing thus: "I am calming the grosser and grosser bodily activities"; but when the practice has been undertaken, there is. Therefore, compared to the time when it has not been discerned, at the time when it has been discerned, the bodily activity is subtle. Therefore the ancients said:

"When body and mind are passionate, it proceeds excessively;
When the body is not excited, it proceeds subtly."

At the stage of comprehension it is gross; at the access to the first meditative absorption it is subtle. At that stage too it is gross; in the first meditative absorption it is subtle. In the first meditative absorption and at the access to the second meditative absorption it is gross; in the second meditative absorption it is subtle. In the second meditative absorption and at the access to the third meditative absorption it is gross; in the third meditative absorption it is subtle. In the third meditative absorption and at the access to the fourth meditative absorption it is gross; in the fourth meditative absorption it is extremely subtle and reaches non-occurrence itself. This, for now, is the view of the reciters of the Long Collection and the reciters of the Collection of the Connected Discourses.

But the reciters of the Middle Collection wish that "in the first meditative absorption it is gross, at the access to the second meditative absorption it is subtle" - thus from each lower and lower meditative absorption, at the access to each higher and higher meditative absorption too, it becomes more subtle. But according to the view of all, the bodily activity occurring at the time when it has not been discerned is allayed at the time when it has been discerned; the bodily activity occurring at the time when it has been discerned, at the access to the first meditative absorption, etc. The bodily activity occurring at the access to the fourth meditative absorption is allayed in the fourth meditative absorption. This, for now, is the method in serenity.

In insight, however, the bodily activity occurring before comprehension is coarse, and subtle during the comprehension of the great elements. That too is gross; at the discernment of derivative materiality it is subtle. That too is gross; at the discernment of the entirety of materiality it is subtle. That too is gross; at the discernment of the immaterial it is subtle. That too is gross; at the discernment of materiality and the immaterial it is subtle. That too is gross; at the discernment of conditions it is subtle. That too is coarse, and subtle during the comprehension of mentality-materiality together with its conditions. That too is coarse, and subtle during insight that takes characteristics as its object. That too, at weak insight, is gross; at powerful insight it is subtle. Therein, the tranquillisation of each preceding stage by each succeeding stage should be understood in the same way as stated before. Thus the coarseness and subtlety and the tranquillisation herein should be understood.

In the Paṭisambhidā, however, the meaning of this is stated together with challenges and resolutions as follows: "How does he train: 'Calming the bodily activity, I shall breathe in,' etc. 'I shall breathe out'? What are the bodily activities? Long in-breaths are bodily, these states are bound up with the body, they are bodily activities; calming, ceasing, and appeasing those bodily activities, he trains. Long out-breaths are bodily, these states, etc. Short in-breaths, etc. Short out-breaths... Experiencing the whole body, in-breaths... Experiencing the whole body, out-breaths are bodily, these states are bound up with the body, they are bodily activities; calming, ceasing, and appeasing those bodily activities, he trains.

By whatever kind of bodily activities there is bending forward, bending aside, bending together, bending down, shaking, trembling, moving, and quaking of the body - he trains: 'Calming the bodily activity, I shall breathe in'; he trains: 'Calming the bodily activity, I shall breathe out.'

By whatever kind of bodily activities there is no bending forward, no bending aside, no bending together, no bending down, no shaking, no trembling, no moving, no quaking of the body - peaceful, subtle, he trains: 'Calming the bodily activity, I shall breathe in'; he trains: 'Calming the bodily activity, I shall breathe out.'

If indeed he trains: 'Calming the bodily activity, I shall breathe in'; he trains: 'Calming the bodily activity, I shall breathe out.' That being so, there is no production of the perception of wind, no production of in-breaths and out-breaths, no production of mindfulness of breathing, no production of the concentration of mindfulness of breathing, and the wise neither enter into nor emerge from that attainment.

If indeed he trains: 'Calming the bodily activity, I shall breathe in,' etc. 'I shall breathe out.' That being so, there is production of the perception of wind, there is production of in-breaths and out-breaths, there is production of mindfulness of breathing, there is production of the concentration of mindfulness of breathing, and the wise both enter into and emerge from that attainment.

In what way? Just as when a bronze vessel is struck, at first coarse sounds occur, and because the sign of the coarse sounds has been well apprehended, well attended to, and well retained, even when the coarse sound has ceased, afterwards subtle sounds occur, and because the sign of the subtle sounds has been well apprehended, well attended to, and well retained, even when the subtle sound has ceased, afterwards the mind continues with the subtle-sound-sign as its object; just so, at first coarse in-

breaths and out-breaths occur, and because the sign of the coarse in-breaths and out-breaths has been well apprehended, well attended to, and well retained, even when the coarse in-breaths and out-breaths have ceased, afterwards subtle in-breaths and out-breaths occur, and because the sign of the subtle in-breaths and out-breaths has been well apprehended, well attended to, and well retained, even when the subtle in-breaths and out-breaths have ceased, afterwards the mind does not go to distraction even with the subtle-in-breath-and-out-breath-sign as its object.

That being so, there is production of the perception of wind, there is production of in-breaths and out-breaths, there is production of mindfulness of breathing, there is production of the concentration of mindfulness of breathing, and the wise both enter into and emerge from that attainment.

"Calming the bodily activity" means: the in-breaths and out-breaths are the body, the establishment is mindfulness, the contemplation is knowledge. The body is the foundation, not mindfulness; mindfulness is both the foundation and mindfulness; with that mindfulness and with that knowledge one contemplates that body. Therefore it is said - "Contemplation of the body in the body as a foundation of mindfulness - development."

This, for now, is the progressive word-by-word explanation of the first tetrad stated by way of observation of the body.

Since, however, this very tetrad is spoken of as the meditation subject for the beginner, while the other three tetrads are spoken of in terms of contemplation of feeling, mind, and mental objects for one who has attained meditative absorption herein, therefore all that is to be done by a son of the Buddha who wishes to develop this meditation subject and attain arahantship together with the discriminations through insight that has as its proximate cause the fourth meditative absorption of mindfulness of breathing - all that should be understood here first in terms of a beginner, a clansman, from the very beginning as follows. First, the fourfold virtue should be purified. Therein, the purification is threefold: non-transgression, rehabilitation from transgression, and non-oppression by defilements. For the development succeeds for one whose virtue is thus purified. That which is called the duty regarding the shrine terrace, the duty regarding the Bodhi-tree terrace, the duty towards the preceptor, the duty towards the teacher, the duty regarding the bath house, the duty regarding the uposatha hall, the eighty-two chapter duties, and the fourteen kinds of great duties - by means of these what is called the code of proper conduct virtue is spoken of, and that too should be properly fulfilled. For whoever should say "I guard my virtue, what have I to do with the code of proper conduct?" - that his virtue will be fulfilled, this is not possible. But when the code of proper conduct duties is fulfilled, virtue is fulfilled; when virtue is fulfilled, concentration takes conception. For this was said by the Blessed One - "That, monks, a monk without having fulfilled the code of proper conduct will fulfil the virtues - this is not possible." This should be elaborated. Therefore, that which is called the code of proper conduct virtue, such as the duty regarding the shrine terrace and so on, that too should be properly fulfilled by him. Thereupon -

"Dwelling and family, gain, community, and work as the fifth;
Travel, relatives, illness, study, and psychic power - these are the ten."

Among the ten impediments thus stated, whichever impediment exists, that should be cut off.

Having thus cut off the impediments, the meditation subject should be taken up. That too is of two kinds: the universal meditation subject and the specific meditation subject. Therein, the universal meditation subject means friendliness towards the community of monks and others, mindfulness of death, and perception of foulness - so say some. For the monk engaged in meditation should first develop friendliness towards the community of monks within the boundary, having delimited them; then towards the deities within the boundary, then towards the leading people in the alms-resort village, then taking the people there as the starting point, towards all beings. For through friendliness towards the community of monks, he generates soft-heartedness in those who dwell together with him, and then there is pleasant communal living for him. Through friendliness towards the deities within the boundary, he is well provided with protection through the righteous protection of the deities whose minds have been softened. Through friendliness towards the leading people in the alms-resort village, he is well protected in his requisites through the righteous protection of the leaders whose mental continuities have been softened. Through friendliness towards the people there, he moves about unscorned by those whose minds have been inspired with confidence. Through friendliness towards all beings, he has unobstructed movement everywhere.

Through mindfulness of death, however, reflecting "Death is certain," he abandons wrong livelihood and, with ever-increasing sense of urgency, becomes one of unrelenting effort. Through the perception of foulness, craving does not arise even towards heavenly objects. Therefore, because these three are of such great benefit, having determined "They should be employed everywhere and desired," and because they serve as the foundation for the intended work of meditative practice, they are called "universal meditation subjects."

Among the thirty-eight objects, however, whichever is suitable to the temperament of each person, because that must be constantly maintained by him, it is also called "the specific meditation subject" in the manner already stated. Here, however, this very mindfulness of breathing meditation subject is called "the specific meditation subject." This is the summary here. The detail, however, should be obtained from the Visuddhimagga by one who wishes for the discussion on purification of virtue and the discussion on cutting off impediments.

By one of thus purified virtue and with impediments cut off, who is learning this meditation subject, it should be learned in the presence of a son of the Buddha who has attained arahantship by developing the fourth meditative absorption through this very meditation subject and cultivating insight. If such a one is not available, it should be learned in the presence of a non-returner; if even such a one is not available, in the presence of a once-returner; if even such a one is not available, in the presence of a stream-enterer; if even such a one is not available, in the presence of one who has attained the fourth meditative absorption of mindfulness of breathing; if even such a one is not available, it should be learned in the presence of a teacher of judgement who is unconfused in the texts and commentaries. For arahants and others teach only the path they themselves have realised. But this one, like one clearing a great elephant path through a dense place, being unconfused everywhere, discriminates

what is suitable and unsuitable and teaches accordingly.

Herein this is the progressive discourse - That monk, being of light living and accomplished in discipline and conduct, having approached a teacher of the aforesaid kind, should learn the meditation subject with five stages in the presence of that one whose mind has been gladdened through the practice of duties. Therein these are the five stages: Learning, inquiry, manifestation, absorption, and characteristic. Therein, "learning" means the learning of the meditation subject; "inquiry" means the questioning about the meditation subject; "manifestation" means the manifestation of the meditation subject; "absorption" means the absorption of the meditation subject; "characteristic" means the characteristic of the meditation subject. "This meditation subject has such a characteristic" - this means the ascertainment of the intrinsic nature of the meditation subject.

One who learns the meditation subject with five stages in this way neither wearies himself nor troubles the teacher; Therefore, having had a little taught and having recited it for a long time, having thus learned the meditation subject with five stages, if there is suitability there, one should dwell right there. If there is no suitability there, having taken leave of the teacher, if of slow wisdom having gone at most a yojana's distance, if of keen wisdom having gone even far, having approached a dwelling free from the eighteen faults of a dwelling and endowed with the five factors of a dwelling, dwelling there, with minor impediments cut off, having completed the meal duty, having dispelled the drowsiness from the meal, having gladdened the mind by recollecting the qualities of the Triple Gem, not forgetting even a single point from what was learned from the teacher, this mindfulness of breathing meditation subject should be attended to. This is the summary here. The detail, however, should be obtained from the Visuddhimagga by one who wishes for this line of discussion.

As for what was said "This mindfulness of breathing meditation subject should be attended to," herein this is the method of attention:

"Counting, following, touching, placing, discerning,
Turning away, purification, and reviewing of these."

"Counting" means counting itself. "Following" means pursuing. "Touching" means the place of contact. "Fixing" means absorption. "Observing" means insight. "Turning away" means the path. "Purification" means the fruit. "And reviewing of these" means reviewing. Therein, by this beginner clansman, this meditation subject should first be attended to by counting. And when counting, one should not stop below five, should not go above ten, and should not show a break in between. For when one stops below five, the arising of mind becomes agitated in the cramped space, like a herd of cattle confined in a cramped pen. When one goes above ten, the arising of mind becomes dependent on the counting alone. When one shows a break in between, the mind wavers thinking "Has my meditation subject reached its peak or not?" Therefore, avoiding these faults, one should count.

And when counting, one should first count by slow counting, by the counting of a grain measurer. For a grain measurer, having filled a measure, says "one" and pours it out. Filling again, seeing some rubbish, discarding it, he says "one, one." This is the method in "two, two" and so forth. Just so, this one too, taking whichever of the in-

breaths and out-breaths presents itself, beginning with "one, one," should count by observing each one as it occurs up to "ten, ten." As he counts thus, the out-going and in-coming breaths become clear to him.

Then by him, having abandoned that slow counting, the grain-measurer's counting, one should count by the quick counting, the cowherd's counting. For a skilled cowherd, having taken pebbles in his lap, with rope and stick in hand, goes to the cow-pen early in the morning, strikes the cows on the back, and sitting on the top of the gate-bar post, counts each cow as it reaches the gate, throwing a pebble for each, "one, two." The herd of cattle, having dwelt uncomfortably in the cramped space through the three watches of the night, comes out pressing against one another, rushing out in clusters with great speed. He counts rapidly, "three, four, five, ten." Just so, when this one too counts in the former manner, the in-breaths and out-breaths become clear and move back and forth rapidly again and again. Thereupon, having known "they are moving about again and again," by him, without grasping the wind inside and outside, having grasped only each one that has reached the door, "one, two, three, four, five; one, two, three, four, five, six; one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, etc. eight, nine... ten" - one should count rapidly. For when the meditation subject is bound to counting, the mind becomes one-pointed through the power of counting alone, just as steadying a boat in a swift current by means of a rudder.

As he counts thus rapidly, the meditation subject presents itself as though occurring without interruption. Then, having known "it proceeds continuously," without grasping the wind inside and outside, one should count by the former method itself with speed. For when one sends the mind in together with the inwardly entering wind, the interior seems as though struck by wind and filled with fat; when one takes the mind out together with the outwardly going wind, the mind is scattered among the variety of external objects. But the development succeeds only for one who places mindfulness at the place of contact and develops it. Therefore it was said - "Without grasping the wind inside and outside, one should count by the former method itself with speed."

But for how long should one count? Until, without counting, mindfulness becomes settled on the object of the in-breath and out-breath. For counting is only for the purpose of cutting off externally scattered thoughts and establishing mindfulness on the object of the in-breaths and out-breaths.

Having thus attended by counting, one should attend by following. Following means, having withdrawn counting, the continuous pursuit of the in-breaths and out-breaths with mindfulness; and that is not by way of following the beginning, middle, and end. For the outwardly going wind has the navel as its beginning, the heart as its middle, and the nose-tip as its end. The inwardly entering wind has the nose-tip as its beginning, the heart as its middle, and the navel as its end. And for one who follows them thus, the mind that has gone to distraction becomes agitated and restless. As he said -

"When one follows with mindfulness the beginning, middle, and end of the in-breath, with the mind gone to distraction internally, both body and mind become agitated, disturbed, and trembling. When one follows with mindfulness the beginning, middle, and end of the out-breath, with the mind gone to distraction externally, both body and mind become agitated,

disturbed, and trembling."

Therefore, when attending by way of following, one should not attend by way of the beginning, middle, and end. Rather, one should attend by way of touching and by way of fixing. For, just as with counting and following, there is no separate attention by way of touching and fixing. However, counting at the very place where they are touched, one attends by way of counting and by way of touching. Having withdrawn counting right there, following them with mindfulness and fixing the mind by way of absorption, one is said to "attend by way of following, by way of touching, and by way of fixing." This meaning should be understood by means of the similes of the lame man and the gatekeeper given in the Commentary, and the simile of the saw given in the Paṭisambhidā.

Herein this is the simile of the cripple - "Just as a lame man, having pushed the swing for a mother and son playing on a swing, sitting right there at the base of the swing-post, sees both ends and the middle of the swing-plank as it comes and goes, yet is not occupied with seeing both ends and the middle. Just so, this monk, standing at the base of the post of binding by means of mindfulness, having pushed the swing of in-breathing and out-breathing, sitting right there on the sign with mindfulness, following with mindfulness the beginning, middle, and end of the in-breaths and out-breaths at the place where they are touched as they come and go, and fixing the mind there, he sees, yet is not occupied with seeing them. This is the simile of the cripple.

And this is the simile of the doorkeeper - "Just as a gatekeeper does not examine people inside and outside the city, asking 'Who are you, where have you come from, where are you going, what is in your hands?' - for they are not his concern. He examines only those who have arrived at the gate. Just so, for this monk, the winds that have entered inside and the winds that have gone out are not his concern; only those that have arrived at the gate are his concern." This is the simile of the gatekeeper.

The simile of the saw, however, should be understood from the beginning as follows. For this was said:

"The sign, the in-breaths and out-breaths, are not the object of a single mind;
Not knowing these three things, development is not obtained.

"The sign, the in-breaths and out-breaths, are not the object of a single mind;
Knowing these three things, development is obtained."

How are these three things not the object of a single mind, yet these three things are not unknown, and the mind does not go to distraction, and effort becomes manifest, and the endeavour succeeds, and one attains distinction? Just as a tree is placed on a level piece of ground, and a man would cut it with a saw, the man's mindfulness is established by means of the saw-teeth touching the tree; he does not attend to the saw-teeth as they come or go, yet the saw-teeth as they come or go are not unknown; and effort becomes manifest, and the endeavour succeeds.

Just as the tree is placed on a level piece of ground;so is the sign of binding. Just as the saw-teeth; so are the in-breaths and out-breaths. Just as the man's mindfulness is established by means of the saw-teeth touching the tree, and he does not attend to the saw-teeth as they come or go, yet the saw-teeth as they come or go are not unknown, and effort becomes manifest, and the endeavour succeeds; just so, a monk, having established mindfulness at the tip of the nose or at the sign of the mouth, sits; he does not attend to the in-breaths and out-breaths as they come or go, yet the in-breaths and out-breaths as they come or go are not unknown, and effort becomes manifest, and the endeavour succeeds, and he attains distinction.

"Endeavour" - what is that endeavour? For one with aroused energy, both body and mind become workable - this is striving. What is practice? For one who has aroused energy, the corruptions are abandoned, the thoughts are stilled - this is practice. What is distinction? For one who has aroused energy, the fetters are abandoned, the underlying tendencies come to an end - this is the distinction. Thus these three phenomena are not objects of one consciousness, and yet these three phenomena are not unknown, and the mind does not go to distraction, and striving becomes evident, and one accomplishes the practice, and attains distinction.

"Whose mindfulness of breathing is complete, well developed;
Gradually practised, as taught by the Buddha;
He illuminates this world, like the moon freed from a cloud."

This is the simile of the saw. But here, it should be understood that its purpose is merely the non-attention by way of what has come and gone. For one practising this meditation subject, before long the sign arises, and the fixing, which is called absorption, adorned with the remaining factors of meditative absorption, succeeds. But for some, from the very time of attending by way of counting, progressively, when bodily distress has subsided through the cessation of gross in-breaths and out-breaths, both body and mind become light, and the body becomes as if it has reached the state of leaping into the air. Just as when one whose body is agitated sits on a bed or chair, the bed or chair bends down, creaks, and the bedspread becomes wrinkled. But when one whose body is not agitated sits down, the bed or chair neither bends down, nor creaks, nor does the bedspread become wrinkled; the bed or chair is as if filled with cotton wool. Why? Because a body that is not agitated is light; just so, from the very time of attending by way of counting, progressively, when bodily distress has subsided through the cessation of gross in-breaths and out-breaths, both body and mind become light, and the body becomes as if it has reached the state of leaping into the air.

When his gross in-breaths and out-breaths have ceased, the mind occurs with the sign of subtle in-breaths and out-breaths as its object; when that too has ceased, it occurs again and again with a successively subtler and subtlest sign as its object. How? Just as a man might strike a bronze gong with a large iron rod, and with a single blow a loud sound would arise, and his mind would occur with the gross sound as its object; when the gross sound has ceased, then afterwards the mind would occur with the sign of the subtle sound as its object; when that too has ceased, again and again

the mind occurs with the sign of a successively subtler and subtlest sound as its object; thus it should be understood. And this too was said - "just as when a bronze gong is struck" etc. in detail.

For just as other meditation subjects become clear as one progresses higher and higher, this one is not so. Rather, this one, as one develops it higher and higher, becomes subtler, and it does not even come to manifestation. But when it does not manifest thus, that monk should not rise from his seat, dust off his leather mat, and go away. What should be done? One should not get up thinking "I shall ask the teacher" or "My meditation subject is now lost," for when one goes disturbing one's posture, the meditation subject becomes entirely new again. Therefore, it should be brought back from that place while remaining seated just as one is.

Herein, this is the method of retrieval. That monk, having known the state of non-appearance of the meditation subject, should reflect thus: "Where do these in-breaths and out-breaths exist, where do they not exist, for whom do they exist, and for whom do they not exist?" Then, reflecting thus, having known that "these do not exist inside the mother's womb, they do not exist for those submerged in water, likewise for those who have become non-percipient, for the dead, for those attained to the fourth meditative absorption, for those possessed of fine-material and immaterial existence, and for those attained to the cessation attainment," one should admonish oneself by oneself thus: "Surely you, wise one, have neither gone into the mother's womb, nor are submerged in water, nor have become non-percipient, nor are dead, nor are attained to the fourth meditative absorption, nor are possessed of fine-material and immaterial existence, nor are attained to the cessation attainment; your in-breaths and out-breaths certainly exist, but due to dullness of wisdom you are unable to discern them." Then one should place the mind on the spot naturally touched and set the attention in motion. For these occur striking the nose-tip in the case of one with a long nose, and the upper lip in the case of one with a short nose. Therefore one should establish the sign thus: "They strike this particular spot." For it is with reference to this very reason that it was said by the Blessed One - "I do not, monks, speak of the development of mindfulness of breathing for one who is unmindful and not fully aware." Although indeed whatever meditation subject succeeds only for one who is mindful and fully aware, for one attending to another it becomes obvious. But this mindfulness-of-breathing meditation subject is weighty, of weighty development, a field of attention only for great persons such as Buddhas, Paccekabuddhas, and sons of the Buddha; it is neither trivial nor practised by trivial beings. In whatever way it is attended to, in that way it becomes both peaceful and subtle. Therefore, here powerful mindfulness and wisdom should be desired.

Just as when sewing a fine cloth, a fine needle is to be desired, and the threading of the needle's eye even finer than that; just so, at the time of developing this meditation subject, which is like a fine cloth, mindfulness comparable to the needle and the wisdom associated with it, comparable to the threading of the needle's eye, should also be strong and desired. But by a monk endowed with that mindfulness and wisdom, those in-breaths and out-breaths should not be sought elsewhere than the place naturally touched.

Just as a farmer, having ploughed, might release his oxen, turn them towards the pasture, and sit down resting in the shade, and then those oxen might quickly enter

the forest. A skilled farmer, wishing to take them again and yoke them, does not follow in their tracks and wander about in the forest. Rather, taking the rein and the goad, he goes straight to their watering ford and sits down or lies down. Then, seeing those oxen having roamed about for part of the day, having descended to the watering ford, having bathed and drunk and come back out, standing there, he binds them with the rein and, prodding them with the goad, brings them back, yokes them, and resumes his work. Just so, those in-breaths and out-breaths should not be sought by that monk elsewhere than at the spot naturally touched. Rather, having taken the rein of mindfulness and the goad of wisdom, having placed the mind at the place naturally touched, attention should be set going. For when he attends thus, before long they appear, like oxen at the watering ford. Then, binding them with the rein of mindfulness at that very spot, yoking them, and prodding with the goad of wisdom, the meditation subject should be pursued again. For one thus pursuing it, before long the sign appears. But that is not the same for everyone. Rather, some say it appears for some producing a pleasant touch, like cotton wool, like cotton, or like a current of air.

But this is the determination of the commentary: For some it appears like the form of a star, like a gem, or like a pearl; for some, having a rough touch, like a cotton seed, or like a needle of heartwood; for some, like a long string of a garland, like a wreath of flowers, or like a flame of smoke; for some, like an extended spider's web, like a film of cloud, like a lotus flower, like a chariot wheel, like the disc of the moon, or like the disc of the sun. And that is just as when several monks, having recited a discourse and sat down, one monk says "In what form does this discourse appear to you?" and one says "To me it appears like a great mountain river." Another says "To me like a row of forest trees." Another says "To me, like a tree with cool shade, full of branches, laden with the weight of fruit." For to them that one and the same discourse presents itself differently due to the diversity of perception. Thus one and the same meditation subject presents itself differently due to the diversity of perception. For this is born of perception, has perception as its origin, has perception as its source; therefore, due to the diversity of perceptions, it appears differently - thus should it be understood.

Here, the mind with the in-breath as object is one thing, that with the out-breath as object is another, and that with the sign as object is yet another. For one who does not have these three things, his meditation subject reaches neither absorption nor access. But for one who has these three things, his meditation subject reaches both absorption and access. For this was said:

"The sign, the in-breaths and out-breaths, are not the object of a single mind;
Not knowing these three things, development is not obtained.

"The sign, the in-breaths and out-breaths, are not the object of a single mind;
Knowing these three things, development is obtained."

When the sign has thus appeared, that monk should go to the teacher's presence and inform him: "Such and such has appeared to me, venerable sir." The teacher, however, should not say either "this is the sign" or "this is not the sign." Rather, having said "it is so, friend," he should say "attend to it again and again." For if told "it is the sign," he might become complacent; if told "it is not the sign," he might

become despondent and lose hope. Therefore, without saying either of those, he should be directed only to attend to it. Thus say the Long Discourse reciters. But the Middle Discourse reciters say: "He should be told: 'This is the sign, friend; attend to the meditation subject again and again, good man.'" Then by him the mind should be placed upon the sign itself. Thus for him, from this point onwards, the development is by way of fixing. For this was said by the ancients:

"Placing the mind upon the sign, discerning the various aspects,
The wise one binds his own mind to the in-breath and out-breath."

From the appearance of the sign onwards, the hindrances are indeed suppressed, the defilements are indeed settled, mindfulness is indeed established, and the mind is indeed concentrated. For the mind becomes concentrated in two ways: either by the abandoning of the hindrances on the access level, or by the manifestation of the factors on the attainment level. Therein, "access level" means access concentration; "attainment level" means absorption concentration. What is the difference between them? Access concentration, having run its course in the wholesome cognitive process, falls into the life-continuum; absorption concentration, having been absorbed for a day-portion by one sitting, runs even for a day-portion in the wholesome cognitive process and does not fall into the life-continuum. Of these two concentrations, through the manifestation of the sign, the mind becomes concentrated by access concentration. Then he should neither attend to that sign by way of its colour, nor review it by way of its characteristic. Rather, it should be guarded with diligence, just as a queen guards the embryo of a universal monarch, or as a farmer guards the embryo of rice grain; for when guarded, it bears fruit.

"For one who guards the sign, what has been gained does not decline;
When guarding is absent, what has been gained, again and again, is lost."

Herein, this is the method of guarding: That monk, having avoided these seven unsuitable things - dwelling, resort, talk, person, food, climate, and posture - and resorting to those same seven suitable things, should attend again and again to that sign.

Having thus made the sign firm by resorting to what is suitable, and having brought it to growth and increase, one should practise the endeavour without abandoning these ten skills in absorption: making the basis clear, balancing the faculties, skill in the sign, uplifting the mind on the occasion when the mind should be uplifted, restraining the mind on the occasion when the mind should be restrained, gladdening the mind on the occasion when the mind should be gladdened, looking on with equanimity at the mind on the occasion when the mind should be looked on with equanimity, avoidance of unconcentrated persons, association with concentrated persons, and being resolved upon that.

For one dwelling thus devoted, thinking "Now absorption will arise," the life-continuum is interrupted and mind-door adverting with the sign as object arises. When that has ceased, taking that same object, four or five impulses arise, of which the first is preliminary work, the second is access, the third is conformity, the fourth is change-of-lineage, and the fifth is the absorption consciousness. Or the first is both preliminary work and access, the second is conformity, the third is change-of-lineage,

and the fourth is called the absorption consciousness. For it is only the fourth or the fifth that attains absorption, not the sixth or seventh, because of the nearness of falling into the life-continuum.

But the Abhidhammika Elder Godatta said: "By the repetition condition, wholesome states become powerful; therefore the sixth or seventh attains absorption." That was rejected in the commentaries. Therein, the preliminary-stage consciousnesses are of the sense sphere, but the absorption consciousness is of the fine-material sphere. Thus by him the first meditative absorption has been attained, which is abandoned in five factors, possessed of five factors, endowed with ten characteristics, and threefold in excellence. He, having stilled applied thought and the rest in that same object, reaches the second, third, and fourth meditative absorptions. And to this extent he has reached the culmination of development by way of fixing. This is the summary account here. But one who wishes for the detailed account should take it from the Visuddhimagga.

Now, the monk here who has attained the fourth meditative absorption, wishing to reach purification by developing the meditation subject by way of observation and turning away, having made that same meditative absorption well-practised and mastered in the five ways known as adverting, attaining, resolving, emerging, and reviewing, discerns mind-and-matter, having discerned either matter preceded by the immaterial, or the immaterial preceded by matter, and sets up insight. How? For he, having emerged from the meditative absorption, having discerned the factors of meditative absorption, sees their support - the heart-base, and the great elements that are the support of that, and the entire material body that is their support. Then he defines mind-and-matter thus: "The factors of meditative absorption are immaterial; the base and so on are material."

Or, having emerged from the attainment, having discerned in the parts beginning with head hairs the four great elements by way of the earth element and so on, and the matter dependent on them, he sees consciousness together with its associated states, having as object the matter as discerned, or having as object the material base and door as discerned. Then he defines thus: "The great elements and so on are material; consciousness together with its associated states is immaterial."

Or, having emerged from the attainment, he sees that the origin of the in-breaths and out-breaths is the material body and the mind. For just as when a blacksmith's bellows are being blown, the wind moves dependent on the bellows and the man's appropriate effort; just so, dependent on the body and the mind, there are in-breaths and out-breaths. Then he defines thus: "The in-breaths and out-breaths and the body are material; the mind and its associated states are immaterial."

Having thus defined mind-and-matter, he searches for its conditions, and searching, having seen them, he crosses over doubt regarding the occurrence of mind-and-matter in all three periods. Having crossed over doubt, by applying the three characteristics through comprehension by groups, having abandoned the ten imperfections of insight beginning with illumination that arose in the preliminary stage of the contemplation of rise and fall, having defined the practice-knowledge free from imperfections as "the path," having abandoned the rise and reached the contemplation of dissolution, through uninterrupted contemplation of dissolution,

when all activities appear as fearful, becoming disenchanted, becoming dispassionate, becoming liberated, having reached in due order the four noble paths, having become established in the fruit of arahantship, having reached the limit of the reviewing knowledge of nineteen kinds, he becomes the supreme field of merit for the world with its devas. And to this extent, his development of the concentration of mindfulness of breathing, beginning with counting and ending with insight, is complete.

This is the explanation of the first set of four in every respect.

However, in the remaining three tetrads, since there is no separate method of meditation subject development, therefore their meaning should be understood by the method of word-by-word commentary. "Experiencing rapture" means: making rapture experienced, making it manifest, he trains: "I shall breathe in, I shall breathe out." Therein, rapture is experienced in two ways -by way of object and by way of non-delusion.

How is joy experienced by way of object? One attains the two meditative absorptions with rapture; at the moment of that attainment, through the attainment of meditative absorption, joy is experienced by way of object, because the object is experienced.

How by way of non-delusion? Having attained the two meditative absorptions that possess rapture and having emerged, he contemplates the rapture associated with the meditative absorption in terms of destruction and fall; at the moment of his insight, through the penetration of characteristics, rapture is experienced by way of non-delusion. For this was said in the Paṭisambhidā -

"By way of the long in-breath, for one who understands the unification of mind, the non-distraction, mindfulness is established. Through that mindfulness, through that knowledge, that rapture is experienced. By means of long out-breath, etc. by means of short in-breath... by means of short out-breath... experiencing the whole body, by way of the in-breath...experiencing the whole body, by way of the out-breath... calming bodily activity by means of in-breath... calming the bodily activity, by way of the out-breath, for one who understands the unification of mind, the non-distraction, mindfulness is established; through that mindfulness, through that knowledge, that rapture is experienced. Through adverting, that rapture is experienced; through knowing... for one seeing... for one reviewing... for one resolving the mind... for one resolving through faith... for one arousing energy... for one establishing mindfulness... for one concentrating the mind... for one understanding with wisdom... for one directly knowing what should be directly known... for one fully understanding what should be fully understood... for one abandoning what should be abandoned... for one developing what should be developed... through realising what is to be realised, that rapture is experienced. Thus that rapture is experienced."

By this very method, the remaining terms too should be understood in meaning. But here only the distinctive point is this. The experiencing of happiness should be understood by way of three meditative absorptions, and the experiencing of mental activity should be understood by way of all four. "Mental activity" means the two

aggregates beginning with feeling. And here, in the term "experiencing happiness," for the purpose of showing the ground of insight, in the Paṭisambhidā it is said: "Happiness means two kinds of happiness - bodily happiness and mental happiness." "Calming mental activity" means calming, making cease each gross mental activity - this is the meaning. That should be understood in detail by the same method as stated for the bodily activity. Furthermore, here in the term concerning rapture, feeling is stated under the heading of rapture. In the term concerning happiness, feeling is stated in its own nature. In the two terms concerning mental activity, because of the statement "perception and feeling are mental, these states are bound to the mind, they are mental activities," it means feeling associated with perception. Thus it should be understood that this tetrad is spoken by way of contemplation of feeling.

In the third tetrad too, the experiencing of the mind should be understood by way of the four meditative absorptions. "Gladdening the mind" means rejoicing, delighting, making glad, making very glad the mind, he trains: "I shall breathe in; I shall breathe out." Therein, gladdening occurs in two ways - by way of concentration and by way of insight.

How by means of concentration? One attains the two meditative absorptions with rapture; at the moment of attainment, he gladdens and delights the mind with the associated rapture. How by means of insight? Having attained the two meditative absorptions that possess rapture and having emerged, he contemplates the rapture associated with the meditative absorption in terms of dissolution and passing away; thus at the moment of insight, having made the rapture associated with the meditative absorption his object, he delights and rejoices the mind. One thus practising is said to train: "Gladdening the mind, I shall breathe in; I shall breathe out."

"Concentrating the mind" means placing the mind evenly, establishing it evenly upon the object by way of the first meditative absorption and so on; or else, having attained those meditative absorptions and emerged, when one contemplates the mind associated with the meditative absorption in terms of dissolution and passing away, at the moment of insight there arises momentary one-pointedness of mind through the penetration of characteristics; thus, by the power of the arisen momentary one-pointedness of mind too, placing the mind evenly, establishing it evenly upon the object, one is said to "train: 'Concentrating the mind, I shall breathe in, I shall breathe out.'"

"Releasing the mind" means releasing and freeing the mind from the hindrances by the first meditative absorption, from applied thought and sustained thought by the second, from rapture by the third, from pleasure and pain by the fourth. Or else, having attained those meditative absorptions and emerged, he contemplates the mind associated with the meditative absorption in terms of dissolution and passing away. At the moment of insight, releasing, freeing the mind from the perception of permanence through the observation of impermanence, from the perception of pleasure through the observation of suffering, from the perception of self through the observation of non-self, from delight through the observation of disenchantment, from lust through the observation of dispassion, from origin through the observation of cessation, from grasping through the observation of relinquishment, releasing,

freeing the mind, one breathes in and breathes out. Therefore it was said - "Releasing the mind, I shall breathe in; I shall breathe out - thus one trains." Thus it should be known that this set of four is spoken of by way of the observation of mind.

In the fourth set of four, "observing impermanence" - here first impermanence should be known, impermanence should be known, observation of impermanence should be known, and the observer of impermanence should be known. Therein, "impermanent" means the five aggregates. Why? Because of the nature of arising, passing away, and alteration. "Impermanence" means the arising, passing away, and change of those very same, or the meaning is: the breaking up through momentary dissolution of those that have come into being, not persisting in that same mode. "Contemplation of impermanence" means the contemplation as "impermanent" regarding form and so forth by way of that impermanence. "One who contemplates impermanence" means one endowed with that contemplation. Therefore, one who is thus constituted, while breathing in and breathing out, should be understood here as "he trains: 'Observing impermanence, I shall breathe in; I shall breathe out.'"

Regarding "observing dispassion" - here there are two kinds of dispassion: dispassion as destruction and absolute dispassion. Therein, "dispassion as destruction" means the momentary dissolution of activities. "Absolute dispassion" means Nibbāna. "Contemplation of dispassion" means insight and the path that occur by way of seeing both of those. Having been possessed of that twofold observation, breathing in and breathing out, one should be understood as "he trains: 'Observing dispassion, I shall breathe in; I shall breathe out.'"

In the term "observing cessation" too, the same method applies.

Regarding "observing relinquishment" - here too there are two kinds of relinquishment: relinquishment by giving up and relinquishment by springing forward. Relinquishment itself as contemplation is the contemplation of relinquishment. This is a designation for insight and the path. For insight, by way of substitution of opposites, relinquishes defilements together with aggregates and volitional activities, and by seeing the faults in the conditioned, it enters into Nibbāna, which is the opposite of that, through its inclination towards it - thus it is called both relinquishment as giving up and relinquishment as entering into. The path, by way of eradication, relinquishes defilements together with aggregates and volitional activities, and by making it an object, it enters into Nibbāna - thus it is called both relinquishment as giving up and relinquishment as entering into. But both are called observation because of observing again and again in accordance with each preceding knowledge. Being endowed with that twofold contemplation of relinquishment, while breathing in and breathing out, one should be understood as "he trains: 'Observing relinquishment, I shall breathe in; I shall breathe out.'"

"Thus developed" means thus developed in sixteen modes. The remainder is according to the method already stated.

The discussion on the concentration of mindfulness of breathing is finished.

167. Now, in the passage beginning with "Then the Blessed One," the summary meaning is as follows. Thus, the Blessed One, having comforted the monks with the discourse on the concentration of mindfulness of breathing, then - regarding that which had arisen as the origin and the incident for the laying down of the third pārājika, namely the monks' depriving one another of life - having assembled the

community of monks on account of that origin and that incident, having questioned them and having reproved them, since therein the depriving of oneself of life and the causing of deprivation of life by Migalaṇḍika were not grounds for pārājika; therefore, setting that aside, taking only the mutual depriving of one another of life as constituting the ground for pārājika, laying down the pārājika, he spoke the passage beginning with "Whatever monk should intentionally deprive a human being of life." However, here, because noble persons were mixed in, instead of saying "foolish men," it was said "those monks."

Having thus made it firm by way of cutting off the root, when the third pārājika had been laid down, for the purpose of further supplementary laying down, the incident of praising death arose, and for the purpose of illustrating its origin, the passage beginning with "And thus this by the Blessed One" was stated.

168. Therein, "enamoured of" means with minds bound by desire and lust; the meaning is "infatuated, having longing." "Let us praise death" means having shown the danger in life, let us praise the virtues of death; let us show the benefits. In "have done good" and so forth, this is the word meaning: "Good, pure action has been done by you" - thus you are one who has done good. Likewise, "wholesome, blameless action has been done by you" - thus one who has done what is wholesome. The fearfulness reckoned as fear that arises in beings when the time of death arrives - the act of protection, the sheltering action from that, has been done by you - thus one who has made a shelter for the fearful. Evil, wretched action has not been done by you - thus one who has not done evil. Cruel, harsh, immoral action has not been done by you - thus one who has not done what is cruel. Wrong, reckless action overflowing with defilements such as greed has not been done by you - thus one who has not done what is wrong. Why is this said? Because good of every kind has been done by you, evil has not been done by you; therefore we say to you: "What use is this wretched, evil, miserable life to you, overcome as you are by illness?" "Death is better for you than life" means your death is more excellent than life. Why? Because "having passed away from here" means having reached the appointed time, having made an end, having died - this is the meaning. "Upon the body's collapse" etc. "you will arise." "Having thus arisen, there, endowed and furnished with the five divine types of sensual pleasure arisen in the heavenly world, with the five portions of objective sensual pleasure consisting of agreeable forms and so forth, you will indulge yourself" means being conjoined, having come into union, you will move about here and there, you will wander about, you will delight - this is the meaning.

169. "Unsuitable" means unhealthy, not conducive to growth, which quickly bring about the destruction of life.

Commentary on the Word-Analysis

172. "Intentionally" - this is the extraction of the word "intentionally" stated in the matrix as "intentionally a human being". Therein, "saṃ" is a prefix, and together with it, this is an expression of endeavour, "sañcicca"; its meaning is "having intended, having thoroughly intended". But since one who intentionally deprives, he is one who knows and perceives, and that deprivation of his is a transgression done deliberately and having considered. Therefore, without paying attention to the letter but in order to show the meaning itself, the word-analysis was stated thus: "knowing, perceiving,

deliberately, having considered, a transgression." Therein, "knowing" means knowing "it is a living being". "Perceiving" means perceiving "I am depriving of life"; the meaning is knowing together with that very mode of knowing it is a living being. "Deliberately" means having intended by way of murderous volition, having determined. "Having considered" means crushing by way of an attack, having dispatched a mind free from hesitation. "Transgression" means whatever transgression of one who has thus proceeded - this is said to be the meaning that has reached the peak of the word "intentionally".

Now, in order to show from the beginning the state of being a human being stated in "should deprive a human being of life", he said "what is called a human being" and so forth. Therein, "in the mother's womb" was stated for the purpose of showing the subtlest form of individual existence by way of womb-born beings. "First consciousness" means the rebirth-linking consciousness. "Arisen" means born. "The first consciousness has become manifest" - this is a synonym of that very same thing. And here, by the expression "the first consciousness in the mother's womb", the entire five-constituent rebirth-linking is shown. Therefore, that first consciousness, the three immaterial aggregates associated with it, and the embryonic matter produced together with it - this is the very first human being. Therein, "embryonic matter" means for women and men, over thirty material phenomena by way of the body-decad, the base-decad, and the sex-decad; for those of indeterminate sex, twenty by way of the body-decad and the base-decad. Therein, the embryonic matter of women and men is the size of a drop of oil lifted by a single fibre of birth-wool, clear and limpid. And this was stated in the commentary:

"Just as a drop of sesame oil, the cream of ghee, undisturbed;
Of such colour and likeness, it is called 'kalala'."

Having taken as the starting point such a minute substance, the individual existence that has gradually reached maturity from then until the time of death, for a being whose natural lifespan is two thousand years - this is called a human being.

"Should deprive of life" means even at the embryonic stage, by heating and pressing, or by administering medicine, or even beyond that by a suitable attack, one would separate from life - this is the meaning. But since depriving of life in reality is nothing but the cutting off of the life faculty, therefore in the word-analysis of this it was stated: "he cuts off the life faculty, obstructs it, destroys the continuity." Therein, one who cuts off and obstructs the sequential connection of the life faculty is said to "cut off the life faculty, obstruct it". This meaning is shown by the phrase "destroys the continuity". "Destroys" means separates.

Therein, the life faculty is twofold - the material life faculty and the immaterial life faculty. Among these, there is no assault upon the immaterial life faculty; it is not possible to deprive one of it. But there is upon the material life faculty; it is possible to deprive one of it. However, in depriving one of that, one also deprives one of the immaterial life faculty. For together with that indeed it ceases, since its existence is dependent upon it. But in depriving one of it, does one deprive of the past, the future, or the present? Neither the past nor the future, for among these one has ceased and

one has not yet arisen, thus both are non-existent; because of their non-existence there is no assault; because of the absence of assault, it is not possible to deprive one of either. And this too was said -

"In the past mind-moment one lived, one does not live; one will not live. In the future mind-moment one will live, one did not live; one does not live. In the present mind-moment one lives, one did not live; one will not live."

Therefore, where one lives, there the assault is fitting, thus one deprives of the present.

And this present is threefold: momentary present, continuity present, and period present. Therein, the "momentary present" is that which possesses arising, ageing, and dissolution; it is not possible to deprive one of it. Why? Because it ceases of its own accord. The "continuity present" is that which, having proceeded for merely seven or eight javana-cycles by way of a homogeneous continuity, ceases; or for one who, having come from the heat and entered a room and sat down, it is dark; or for one who, having come from the cold and sat down in a room, until the previous temperature does not subside through the appearance of a dissimilar temperature - in between here, it is called "continuity present." But from rebirth-linking up to death, this is called "period present." It is possible to deprive one of both of these. How? For when that assault is made, the life-nonad that has received the assault, while ceasing, becomes a condition for a weak continuity of diminished force. Then the continuity present or the period present ceases in between, without reaching its determined time. Thus it is possible to deprive one of both of these; therefore it should be understood that it is with reference to that very thing that this is stated: "destroys the continuity."

For the clarification of this meaning, a living being should be understood, the destruction of life should be understood, the destroyer of life should be understood, and the effort in the destruction of life should be understood. Therein, "a living being" is, in conventional terms, a being; in the ultimate sense, the life faculty. For in striking down the life faculty, one is said to "strike down a living being" - that is of the manner already stated. "Destruction of life" means that volition by which one initiates an effort that cuts off the life faculty - that killing volition is called "destruction of life." "Destroyer of life" should be seen as the person who possesses the aforementioned volition. "The effort in the destruction of life" means there are six efforts in the destruction of life - by one's own hand, by command, by throwing, by a fixed device, by magical knowledge, and by supernormal power.

Therein, "by one's own hand" means the striking by one who is killing himself, with the body or with something connected to the body. "By command" means the commanding of another by one who commands thus: "Kill him by piercing or by striking." "By throwing" means the releasing of arrows, spears, devices, stones, and so forth, by one who wishes to kill someone standing at a distance, with the body or with something connected to the body. "Stationary" means the setting up of a pit-trap or a leaning-trap, or the preparation of medicine, by one who wishes to kill by means of a non-moving instrument. All four of these will become clear in detail in the explanation of the text further on.

However, those made by knowledge and those made by psychic power have not come in the text. They should be understood thus. In brief, the recitation of spells for the purpose of killing is the effort made by knowledge. But in the commentaries: "Which is the effort made by knowledge? Practitioners of the Athabbaṇa employ the Athabbaṇa; when a city is besieged or when a battle is at hand, against the opposing army, against adversaries, against enemies, they produce calamity, they produce disaster, they produce disease, they produce irregular fever, they cause needle-pain, they cause cholera, they cause dysentery. Thus practitioners of the Atharva Veda employ the Atharva Veda. Spell-bearers, having applied their spells, when a city is besieged, etc. they cause dysentery" - thus, having shown the effort made by knowledge, many cases of those killed by Athabbaṇa practitioners and spell-bearers have been stated - what is the use of those! Here the characteristic is this: the recitation of spells for the purpose of killing is the effort made by knowledge.

The employment of psychic power born of the result of kamma is the effort made by psychic power. And this psychic power born of the result of kamma is of many kinds: the nāga-power of nāgas, the supañña-power of supaññas, the yakkha-power of yakkhas, the deva-power of devas, and the royal power of kings. Therein, in the case of nāgas whose poison works by sight, by bite, and by touch, the causing of harm to others by seeing, biting, and touching should be understood as "nāga-power." In the case of supaññas, the lifting up of nāgas measuring two or three hundred fathoms from the great ocean should be understood as "supañña-power." But yakkhas are seen neither coming nor striking, yet beings struck by them die in that very place; therein their "yakkha-power" should be recognised. In the case of the death of kumbhaṇḍas looked upon with the eye-weapon by Vessavaṇa before the time of his becoming a stream-enterer, and in the case of the psychic might of other devas each according to their own power, "deva-power" should be understood. In the case of the wheel-turning king together with his retinue travelling through the sky and so forth, in the case of Asoka's exercise of command over a distance of a yojana below and above, and in the case of the death of the householder Cūlasumana by the gnashing of teeth of his father the king, the lord of Sīhaḷa, "royal power" should be recognised.

But some, having cited such suttas as "Furthermore, monks, a recluse or a brahmin who is powerful and has attained mastery of mind, observes with an evil mind the embryo gone into the womb of another woman, thinking: 'Oh, may this embryo gone into the womb not come forth safely.' Thus too, monks, there is destruction of the family" - and so forth, assert that even through psychic power produced by meditation, the act of harming others is possible; and they maintain that together with the act of harming others, there is also the destruction of the psychic power, just as there is the breaking of a water-pot thrown upon a burning house; that is merely their wish. Why? Because it does not accord with the wholesome triad, the feeling triad, the thought triad, and the limited triad. How? For this psychic power produced by meditation is, in the wholesome triad, wholesome and indeterminate, whereas the destruction of life is unwholesome. In the feeling triad, it is associated with neither-painful-nor-pleasant feeling, whereas the destruction of life is associated with painful feeling. In the thought triad, it is without initial application and without sustained application, whereas the destruction of life is with initial application and with sustained application. In the limited triad, it is exalted, whereas the destruction of life is limited.

"Or should seek one who would take his life with a knife" - here, "one who takes" means "a taker." What does it take? Life. Alternatively, "that which is to be taken" means "a taker"; the meaning is "that which is to be placed nearby." "A knife and that taker" means "one who would take his life with a knife." "His" means of the human being. "Should seek" means he should do whatever he can obtain; the meaning is "he should place nearby." By this, he indicates the stationary method of effort. For otherwise, one would become defeated by merely seeking; and this is not fitting. However, in the canonical text, disregarding all the wording, in order to show precisely the knife that is included under the stationary method of effort here, the word-analysis was stated as "a sword or etc. or a rope."

Therein, "knife" should be understood as anything sharp that remains beyond what has been stated. And the inclusion of cudgel, stone, poison and rope under "knife" should be understood because of their capacity to destroy life. "Or should praise death" - here, because even one who shows the danger in life by such a method as "What use is this wretched, miserable life to you, since you cannot obtain fine food to eat," and also one who speaks praise of death by such a method as "You, lay follower, have done meritorious deeds, etc. you have done no evil, death is better for you than life, having passed away from here you will be attended upon, surrounded by celestial nymphs, dwelling in happiness in the Nandana grove" - even such a one praises death itself. Therefore, having divided it in two, the word-analysis was stated: "He shows the danger in life, he speaks praise of death."

"Or should instigate to death" means he should cause one to adopt the means for the purpose of death. In "bring a knife" and so forth, whatever was not stated such as "throw yourself into a pit or a chasm or a precipice" and so on, all that should be understood as having been stated in meaning, since it is stated by the method given later. For it is not possible to state everything in its own form.

"Thus mind and mental" means "thus-minded, thus-mental"; the meaning is "having death as the mind-state, having death as the mental-state" as stated here in "death is better for you than life." Since here "mind" was stated for the purpose of elucidating the meaning of the word "consciousness," and since in meaning both are indeed one and the same, therefore, in order to show their non-difference in meaning, it was stated "whatever is consciousness, that is mind; whatever is mind, that is consciousness." However, even having extracted the word "thus," the meaning has not yet been stated. In the term "mental thought," the word "thus" should be brought in by way of governance. For this should be understood: although it is not stated as "thus-mental-thought," it is as good as stated by way of governance. Accordingly, showing that very meaning, he said "perceiving death" and so forth. And since here "thought" is not a name for initial application. Rather, this is a designation for mere arranging. And that arranging, in this context, is included under perception, volition and purpose. Therefore, the meaning should be seen thus: "mental thought" means thought that is of various kinds as to consciousness. Accordingly, its word-analysis too was stated by way of perception, volition and purpose. And here, "purpose" should be understood as initial application.

"By various methods" means by great and small means. Therein, in praising death, firstly, the inferior method should be understood as showing the danger in life, and the superior method as speaking praise of death. However, in instigation, the superior

method should be understood as instigating to death by means of shaking fists, slapping knees, and so forth; the inferior method should be understood as instigating to death and so forth by placing poison on the fingernails while eating together.

"Into a pit or a chasm or a precipice" - here, a pit is a deep hole with banks cut away on all sides. A chasm is a great cavern naturally formed in the earth that splits open here and there, into which even elephants fall, and where robbers stand hidden. A precipice is cut away on one side, whether in the midst of mountains or on level ground. "With reference to the former" means with reference to a person who has committed a defeat offence by engaging in sexual intercourse and by taking what is not given. The remainder is evident because it has been stated by the method explained before and because its meaning is plain.

174. Having thus analysed the training rule as stated, word by word in sequence, now since below in the word-analysis the defeat concerning a human form was shown only in brief, the text was established without attributing the offence in detail. When the matter is shown in brief, monks are unable to grasp the method in all its aspects, and in the future there would be opportunity for evil persons too; therefore, for the purpose of monks grasping the method in all its aspects and for the purpose of preventing opportunity for evil persons in the future, having again set up the matrix by the method beginning with "oneself, having determined," showing the defeat concerning a human form in detail, he said beginning with "'Oneself' means he kills himself."

Herein is the discussion of judgement together with the explanation of terms that are not clear - "With the body" means with the hand, or with the foot, or with the fist, or with the knee, or with any limb or minor limb. "With something connected to the body" means with a weapon such as a sword, etc., not released from the body. "With something thrown" means with an arrow, spear, etc., released from the body or from something connected to the body. Thus far, two modes of effort have been stated: by one's own hand and by throwing.

Therein, each one is twofold by the distinction of designated and undesignated. Therein, in the case of a designated target, one is bound by the kamma through the death of the very one at whom one strikes. In the case of an undesignated target, thinking "Let anyone die," one is bound by the kamma through the death of anyone whatsoever as a result of the blow. In both cases, whether one dies at the very moment of being struck or later from that very affliction, one is bound by the kamma at the very moment of striking. And having given a blow with the intention to kill, if that person does not die, and then a blow is given with a different intention, if later he dies from the first blow alone, then one is bound by the kamma. But if he dies from the second blow, there is no destruction of life. Even if he dies from both, one is bound by the kamma through the first blow alone. If he does not die from both, there is no destruction of life. This same method applies when many blows are given to one person. For therein too, through whichever blow he dies, one is bound by the kamma of that very one.

Here the fourfold case of the ram should also be understood for the purpose of making clear the distinction of kamma and offence. For one who observes a ram lying down in a certain place and thinks "I shall come at night and kill it." And in the place

where the ram was lying, his mother, or father, or an arahant, having put on a dull-coloured robe, is lying down. He comes during the night and thinking "I am killing the ram," kills his mother, or father, or an arahant. Because of the existence of the intention "I am killing this object," he becomes a killer, and he incurs an immediately effective kamma, and he commits a defeat offence. Some other visitor is lying down; thinking "I am killing the ram," he kills that person - he becomes a killer and commits a defeat offence, but does not incur an immediately effective kamma. A yakkha or a departed spirit is lying down; thinking "I am killing the ram," he kills that one - he merely becomes a killer, does not incur an immediately effective kamma, and does not commit a defeat offence, but there is a grave offence. No one else is lying down, it is just the ram - he kills it, becomes a killer, and commits an offence of expiation. Thinking "I shall kill one of the mother, father, or arahant," he kills one of those very ones - he becomes a killer, incurs an immediately effective kamma, and commits a defeat offence. Thinking "I shall kill one of them," he kills another visitor, or kills a yakkha or a departed spirit, or kills a ram - this should be understood by the method stated above. But here the intention is cruel.

Other cases involving a heap of straw and similar objects should also be understood here. For one who, thinking "I shall thrust in a blood-stained sword or spear," while entering a heap of straw, kills a mother, or father, or an arahant, or a visiting man, or a yakkha, or a departed spirit, or an animal lying there - he is called "a killer" by convention, but because of the absence of murderous intention, he neither incurs the kamma nor commits an offence. But one who, while thus entering, having noticed bodily contact, thinks "A being has apparently gone inside - let him die," and having entered, kills - for him, the binding by kamma and the offence should be understood in accordance with those respective objects. This same method applies also to one entering there for the purpose of storing, and also to one throwing into forest thickets and the like.

Also, one who kills his father who is going about in the guise of a robber, thinking "I am killing a robber," commits an act of immediate retribution and becomes defeated. But one who, seeing an enemy army and another warrior and his own father engaged in battle, shoots an arrow at the warrior, thinking "Having pierced this one, it will pierce my father" - when it goes according to his intention, he becomes a parricide. If he shoots thinking "When the warrior is pierced, my father will flee," and the arrow goes contrary to his intention and kills his father, he is called a "parricide" in conventional terms; but there is no act of immediate retribution.

"Having determined" means having stood nearby. "He commands" means he commands either specifying or without specifying. Therein, when an enemy army has presented itself, if he commands without specifying thus: "Pierce thus, strike thus, kill thus," however many the one commanded kills, that many are the acts of taking life for both. If among those are the mother or father of the one who commands, he also commits an act of immediate retribution. If they are the mother or father of the one commanded, he alone commits an act of immediate retribution. If one of them is an arahant, both commit an act of immediate retribution. But if, having specified, he commands thus: "Pierce, strike, kill that tall one, that short one, the one in a red tunic, the one in a blue tunic, the one seated on the elephant's shoulder, the one seated in the middle," and if he kills that very one, there is an act of taking life for

both; and in the case of a subject of immediate retribution, there is an act of immediate retribution. If he kills another, there is no act of taking life for the one who commands. By this, the effort by commanding has been stated. Therein -

The subject, the time, and the place, the weapon, and the posture;
having weighed these five factors, the wise one should bear them in mind.

Another method -

The subject, the time, and the place, the weapon, the posture,
and the specific action - these are the six determinants of a command.

Therein, "subject" means the being to be killed. "Time" means the time such as forenoon or afternoon, and the time such as youth or old age. "Place" means a village, or a forest, or a house doorway, or the middle of a house, or a street, or a crossroads, and so forth. "Weapon" means a sword, or an arrow, or a spear, and so forth. "Posture" means the walking or sitting of the one to be killed, and so forth. "Specific action" means piercing, or cutting, or breaking, or the conch-shaving torture, and so forth.

If indeed, having deviated from the subject, the one commanded to "kill whomever" kills another instead, or the one commanded "kill by striking from the front" kills by striking from behind, or from the side, or at another spot. There is no binding by kamma for the one who commands; the binding by kamma is only for the one commanded. But if, without deviating from the subject, he kills according to the command, there is binding by kamma for both - for the one who commands at the moment of commanding, and for the one commanded at the moment of killing. And herein, according to the particular subject, there is a particular kamma and a particular offence. Thus, for now, the accordance and discordance regarding the subject should be understood.

Regarding time, however, one who is commanded "Kill in the forenoon" without specifying "today or tomorrow," and kills at any time in the forenoon - there is no deviation from the agreement. But one who is told "today in the forenoon" and kills at midday, or in the evening, or the next day in the forenoon - there is a deviation from the agreement, and there is no binding of the deed for the one who commands. Even when one striving to kill in the forenoon accomplishes it at midday, the same principle applies. By this principle, the accordance and deviation from the agreement should be understood in all distinctions of time.

Regarding place also, one who is commanded without specifying "Kill him standing in the village" and kills him wherever he may be - there is no deviation from the agreement. But one who is commanded with the specification "in the village only" and kills in the forest, likewise one commanded "in the forest" and kills in the village - one commanded "at the inner house door" and kills in the middle of the house - there is a deviation from the agreement. By this principle, the accordance and deviation from the agreement should be understood in all distinctions of place.

Regarding weapons also, one who is commanded "Kill with a weapon" without specifying "with a sword or with an arrow" and kills with whatever weapon - there is no deviation from the agreement. But one who is told "with a sword" and kills with an

arrow, or one told "with this sword" and kills with another sword - or one told regarding that very sword "Kill with this edge" and kills with the other edge, or with the flat, or with the point, or with the hilt - there is a deviation from the agreement. By this principle, the accordance and deviation from the agreement should be understood in all distinctions of weapons.

Regarding posture, however, one who says "Kill him while walking," and the one commanded kills him while walking - there is no deviation from the agreement. But one who is told "Kill him only while walking" and kills him while seated - or one told "Kill him only while seated" and kills him while walking - there is a deviation from the agreement. By this principle, the accordance and deviation from the agreement should be understood in all distinctions of posture.

Regarding the type of action also, one who is told "Kill by piercing" and kills by piercing - there is no deviation from the agreement. But one who is told "Kill by piercing" and kills by cutting - there is a deviation from the agreement. By this principle, the accordance and deviation from the agreement should be understood in all distinctions of the type of action.

But one who commands without specifying, by characteristic, "Kill the tall one, the short one, the dark one, the fair one, the thin one, the fat one," and the one commanded kills any such person - there is no deviation from the agreement, and there is an offence entailing defeat for both. But if he commands referring to himself, and the one commanded, thinking "This is indeed such a person," kills the one who commanded - there is an offence of wrong-doing for the one who commands, and an offence entailing defeat for the killer. The one who commands refers to himself when commanding, and the other kills another such person - the one who commands is released, and there is an offence entailing defeat only for the killer. Why? Because the place was not specified. But if one who commands referring to himself also specifies the place, saying "Kill one of such appearance seated in such and such a night-resting place, or day-resting place, or elder's seat, or junior's seat, or middle seat" - and another is seated there, if the one commanded kills him, neither the killer is released nor the one who commands. Why? Because the place was specified. But if he kills at a place other than the specified place, the one who commands is released - this principle was stated firmly and well established in the Great Commentary. Therefore, no disregard should be shown in this matter.

The discussion on the effort by command by way of the matrix beginning with "having determined" is finished.

Now, in order to show the exposition of this matrix term "by means of a messenger," four cases beginning with "a monk commands a monk" are stated. Among these, "he, imagining that one to be that one" means: the one commanded, who was indicated by the commander as "such and such a person," imagining that one to be that one, deprives that very person of life - there is an offence entailing defeat for both. "Imagining that one to be that one, another" means: the one told "deprive him of life," imagining that one to be that one, deprives another similar person of life - there is no offence for the instigator. "Imagining another to be that one" means: having seen a powerful companion of the one indicated by the commander standing nearby, thinking "this one roars because of his strength, let me first deprive this one of life,"

while striking, the other one having moved and stood in that place, imagining him to be "the companion," he deprives him of life - there is an offence entailing defeat for both. "Imagining another to be another" means: in the same manner as before, thinking "let me first deprive his companion of life," he deprives the companion itself - there is an offence entailing defeat for him alone.

In the exposition section of the term "chain of messengers," beginning with "tell such and such a person," one teacher and three pupils named Buddharakkhita, Dhammarakkhita, and Saṅgharakkhita should be understood. Therein, "a monk commands a monk" means: the teacher, wishing to have a certain person killed, having explained the matter, commands Buddharakkhita. "Tell such and such a person" means: go, Buddharakkhita, and tell this matter to Dhammarakkhita. "Let such and such a person tell such and such a person" means let Dhammarakkhita also tell Saṅgharakkhita. "Let such and such a person deprive such and such a person of life" means: thus let Saṅgharakkhita, commanded by Dhammarakkhita who was commanded by you, deprive such and such a person of life; for he is a hero among us, capable of this task. "There is an offence of wrong-doing" means for the teacher who thus commands, there is firstly a wrong-doing. "He informs the other" means Buddharakkhita informs Dhammarakkhita, and Dhammarakkhita informs Saṅgharakkhita: "Our teacher says thus - 'It seems you should deprive such and such a person of life.' You, it seems, are the brave man among us," he informs; thus for them too there is a wrong-doing. "The murderer accepts" means: Saṅgharakkhita agrees, saying "Very well, I shall deprive him." "There is a grave offence for the instigator" means: at the mere moment of acceptance by Saṅgharakkhita, there is a grave offence for the teacher. For a great number of people have been engaged in evil by him. "He, that one" means: if Saṅgharakkhita deprives that person of life, there is an offence entailing defeat for all four persons. And not only for four; by this method, without breaking the agreement, whether it be a hundred or a thousand monks commanding in succession, there is an offence entailing defeat for all.

In the exposition of the term "deviant messenger," "he commands another" means: Buddharakkhita, commanded by the teacher, not having seen Dhammarakkhita or not wishing to speak to him, having approached Saṅgharakkhita himself, commands him, making a deviation, saying "Our teacher says thus - 'It seems you should deprive such and such a person of life,'" making a deviation. For it is precisely because of making a deviation that this is called "a deviant messenger." "There is an offence of wrong-doing" means by the command, there is firstly a wrong-doing for Buddharakkhita. "He accepts, there is an offence of wrong-doing" means: when Saṅgharakkhita accepts, it should be understood as a wrong-doing for the instigator alone. If that were so, there would be no offence at all for the acceptance; but since there is an offence even in the acceptance of go-between activity and in rejoicing at death, how could there not be one in the acceptance of killing? Therefore this wrong-doing is for the one who accepts alone. For that very reason, "for the instigator" is not stated here. And in the previous case too, this should be understood as belonging to the one who accepts; but it was not stated due to lack of opportunity. Therefore, whoever accepts, for each of them there is indeed an offence on account of that - this is our view on this matter. And just as here, so also in the case of taking what is not given.

But if he deprives that one of life, there is an offence entailing defeat for both - for the one who commands, Buddharakkhita, and for the killer, Saṅgharakkhita. But for the instigator, the teacher, because of the breaking of the arrangement, there is no offence entailing defeat. For Dhammarakkhita, because of not knowing, there is no offence whatsoever. But Buddharakkhita, having secured the safety of two others, is himself destroyed.

In the exposition of the messenger who went and returned - "He, having gone, returns again" means having gone near the one who was to be deprived of life, being unable to deprive him of life because of well-arranged protection, he comes back. "When you are able, then" means: is it that only one killed today is considered killed? Go, whenever you are able, then deprive him of life. "There is an offence of wrong-doing" means thus even by commanding again, there is only a wrong-doing. But if that one is certainly to be deprived of life, the intention that accomplishes the purpose is like the fruit immediately following the path, therefore this one is defeated at the very moment of commanding. Even if the killer kills him after the lapse of sixty years, and the one who commands dies in the meantime, or reverts to the lower life, he will have become a non-recluse and will die, or will revert to the lower life. If the one who commands, while still a layman, having commanded thus with reference to his mother, father, or an arahant, goes forth, and after his going forth the one commanded kills that person, the one who commands becomes a matricide, patricide, or killer of an arahant while still a layman; therefore neither his going forth nor his full ordination takes effect. Even if the person to be killed is an ordinary person at the moment of commanding, but when the one commanded kills him he is then an arahant, or having received a blow from the one commanded, practising insight relying on faith rooted in suffering, attains arahantship and dies from that very affliction, the one who commands is a killer of an arahant at the very moment of commanding. But the killer incurs defeat at the very moment of making the attempt in every case.

Now, for the purpose of showing the appointed and the non-appointed in all these matrix terms stated by way of messenger,

Three cases have been stated; among them, in the first case -because, either speaking softly or because of the other's deafness, he does not make heard the words "Do not kill," therefore the instigator is not freed. In the second case - he is freed because he made it heard. But in the third case, because he made it heard and because the other, having accepted saying "Very well," desisted, both are freed.

The discussion on the messenger is finished.

175. In the expositions beginning with "one who is not in a secret place perceiving a secret place," "not in a secret place" means in his presence. "In a secret place" means out of his presence. Therein, one who, at the time of attendance, having come together with the monks while the hostile monk is seated right in front, not knowing of his arrival due to the defect of darkness, extols such words as "Oh, may such and such a person be destroyed! Even robbers do not kill him, nor does a snake bite him, nor does he take a weapon or poison," thus rejoicing in his death - this is called "one who is not in a secret place perceiving a secret place extols." The meaning is: perceiving as out of his presence one who is right in his presence. But one who,

having seen him seated in front, when that person has gone together with the monks who left after paying attendance, yet perceiving "he is still seated right here," extols in the same manner as before - this is called "one in a secret place perceiving one not in a secret place extols." By this same method, "one who is not in a secret place perceiving one not in a secret place" and "one in a secret place perceiving a secret place" should be understood. And it should be understood that for all four of these, for each and every utterance there is a wrong-doing.

Now, in the five expositions of the categories beginning with praising by body, stated for the purpose of showing the classification of the praise of death - "He makes a gesture with the body" means he shows by hand gestures and so forth in such a way that the person understands: "Whoever dies by taking a weapon, or by eating poison, or by hanging with a rope, or by falling into a precipice and so forth, he indeed obtains wealth, or obtains fame, or goes to heaven - this is the meaning conveyed by this." "He speaks with speech" means he speaks that same meaning by making it into verbal expression. The third section is stated in terms of both. In every case, for each and every effort of praising, there is a wrong-doing. When suffering arises in that person, there is a grave offence for the one who praises. When the person with reference to whom the praise was made dies, at the very moment of praising there is an offence entailing defeat for the one who praises. He does not know of it; another, having learned of it, thinking "Indeed I have found a means to a happy rebirth," dies because of that praise - there is no offence. When praise is made with reference to two persons, one having learned of it dies - there is an offence entailing defeat. If both die, there is an offence entailing defeat and also a mass of unwholesome results. This same method applies in the case of many. One who goes about praising death without reference to a specific person - whoever, having learned of that praise, dies, all are killed by him.

In the case of praising through a messenger, merely upon informing the message "Go to such and such a house or village and praise the beauty of death thus to such and such a person," there is a wrong-doing. When suffering arises in the person for whose sake the messenger was sent, there is a grave offence for the principal; upon death, there is an offence entailing defeat. If the messenger, thinking "Now this path to heaven is known," without informing that person, informs his own relative or blood relation, and that one dies, there is a deviation from the arrangement, and the principal is released. If the messenger, having thought likewise, himself acts upon what was said as praise and dies, it is merely a deviation from the arrangement. But when the message is given without reference to a specific person, however many die because of the messenger's praising, that many are the takings of life. If mother or father dies, there is also an offence of immediate retribution.

176. In the explanation of praising by a letter - "He composes a letter" means he writes characters on a leaf or in a book - "Whoever dies by bringing a weapon, or by falling from a precipice, or by other means such as entering fire, entering water, and so forth, obtains this and that" or "it is his rightful due." Here too, the offences of wrong-doing and grave offence should be understood in the manner already stated. However, when written with reference to a specific person, there is an offence entailing defeat only through the death of the one with reference to whom it was written. When written with reference to many, as many as die, that many are acts of

destruction of life. Through the death of one's mother or father, there is an offence of immediate retribution. Even when written without reference to a specific person, the same method applies. When remorse arises thinking "Many are dying," one is freed by burning that book or by making it such that the characters are no longer discernible. If it is another's book, whether written with reference to a specific person or without reference to a specific person, one is freed by placing it back where it was obtained. If it was purchased for a price, one is freed by returning the book to the owners of the book, and by giving back the price to those from whose hands the price was received. If several, being of one intention thinking "We shall write in praise of death," and one climbs a palmyra tree and cuts a leaf, one brings it, one makes a book, one writes, one - if it is an etching with a stylus - applies ink, and having applied ink and prepared that book, they all place it in an assembly hall or in a shop or wherever many who are curious to see the letter gather together. Having read that, even if one person dies, there is an offence entailing defeat for all of them. If many die, the method is the same as already stated. However, when remorse arises, even if they hide that book in a chest, and another seeing it takes it out and shows it again to many, they are not freed. Let alone the chest - even if they throw that book into a river or the sea, or wash it, or cut it into pieces, or burn it in a fire, as long as the characters are still discernible even when rubbed, or poorly washed, or poorly burnt, they are not freed. But when it is done such that the characters are no longer discernible, they are freed.

Now, in the descriptions of the categories beginning with pitfalls, stated for the purpose of showing the classification of stationary effort, "he digs a pitfall with reference to a human being" means having designated a certain human being thinking "So-and-so will fall in and die," he digs a pit where that person walks alone. As for the one digging, even if he digs in natural ground, because it is an effort towards destruction of life, for each effort there is an offence of wrong-doing. For the one with reference to whom he digs, there is a grave offence through the arising of suffering, and an offence entailing defeat through death. When another falls in and dies, there is no offence. If it has been dug without reference to a specific person, thinking "Whoever will die," as many as fall in and die, that many are acts of destruction of life. And in cases involving offences of immediate retribution, there is an offence of immediate retribution; in cases involving grave offences and offences requiring expiation, there are grave offences and offences requiring expiation.

There are many intentions therein; by which one is there an offence entailing defeat? In the Great Commentary it is stated thus - "For one who, having dug the pit in depth and in length and breadth, having set it to the right measure, having trimmed it, having swept it, and removing the last basket of earth, the completing intention that accomplishes the purpose is like the fruit immediately following the path. Even if after the passage of a hundred years a being who will certainly die falls in, the offence entailing defeat is by that very completing intention." But in the Mahāpaccarī and in the Abridged Commentary - "Thinking 'Having fallen into this pit, he will die,' even with a single stroke of the spade given, if anyone stumbles and falls in there and dies, it is an offence entailing defeat itself. The Suttantika elders, however, take the completing intention" - thus it is stated.

One commands another: "Having dug a pitfall, bring so-and-so here, cast him in and kill him." That one casts him in and kills him - there is an offence entailing defeat for both. He casts in and kills a different person, or he himself falls in and dies, or another falls in and dies by his own nature - in all cases there is no connection, and the instigator is freed. Even when it is dug with the thought "So-and-so will bring such-and-such here and kill him," the same method applies. He digs with the thought "Those wishing to die will die here" - upon the death of one, there is an offence entailing defeat. Upon the death of many, there is a mass of unwholesome action; upon the death of mother or father, there is an offence of immediate retribution; in cases involving grave offences or offences requiring expiation, there are grave offences or offences requiring expiation respectively.

He digs with the thought "Whoever wishes to kill, they will cast them in here and kill them." They cast them in there and kill them - when one dies, there is an offence entailing defeat; when many die, there is a mass of unwholesome action; in cases involving offences of immediate retribution and so forth, there are offences of immediate retribution and so forth. Here even arahants are included. But in the former method, "There is no falling in due to their wish to die," therefore they are not included. In both methods, when one who falls in by his own nature dies, there is no connection. He digs with the thought "Whoever will cast their enemies in here and kill them." And there enemies cast enemies in and kill them - when one is killed, there is an offence entailing defeat; when many are killed, there is a mass of unwholesome action; when mother or father or an arahant is brought there by enemies and killed there, there is an offence of immediate retribution. When those who fall in by their own nature die, there is no connection.

But whoever digs entirely without specification, thinking "Whether those wishing to die or not wishing to die, whether those wishing to kill or not wishing to kill, whoever falls in or is cast in here will die." Whoever dies, by the death of each one, he experiences the corresponding action and incurs the corresponding offence. If a pregnant woman falls in and dies together with the foetus, there are two acts of taking life. If only the foetus perishes, there is one. If the foetus does not perish but the mother dies, there is only one. If one being pursued by bandits falls in and dies, there is an offence entailing defeat for the digger of the pitfall alone. If bandits cast someone in there and kill him, it is an offence entailing defeat. If they take out one who has fallen in there and kill him outside, it is an offence entailing defeat. Why? Because he was seized through the effort of falling into the pitfall. If he comes out of the pitfall and dies from that very affliction, it is an offence entailing defeat. If after many years have passed, that very affliction flares up again and he dies from it, it is an offence entailing defeat. If, for one who is already ill with a disease arisen on account of falling into the pitfall, another disease arises, and the pitfall-disease is the stronger, even if he dies from that, the digger of the pitfall is not freed. If the later-arisen disease is the stronger, and he dies from that, he is freed. If he dies from both, he is not freed. If a spontaneously-born human being arises in the pitfall and, being unable to climb out, dies, it is an offence entailing defeat. When the pitfall is dug with reference to a human being, if demons and the like fall in and die, there is no offence. When the pitfall is dug with reference to demons and the like, if human beings and the like die, the same method applies. But for one who digs with reference to demons and the like, even in the digging and even in the arising of suffering for them, it is

only an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of death, depending on the basis, it is either a grave offence or an offence requiring expiation. In a pitfall dug without specification, one falls in the form of a demon or in the form of a ghost, and dies in the form of an animal - the Elder Upatissa says: "The form at falling is the standard, therefore it is a grave offence." The Elder Phussadeva says: "The form at death is the standard, therefore it is an offence requiring expiation." Even when one falls in the form of an animal and dies in the form of a demon or ghost, the same method applies.

The digger of the pitfall sells the pitfall to another or gives it freely; whoever falls in and dies, on account of that, the offence and the bond of kamma belong to him alone. The one who received it is blameless. But if he too, thinking "Those who have fallen in thus, being unable to climb out, will perish, or will not be easily rescued," makes that pitfall deeper or shallower or longer or shorter or wider or narrower, there is both an offence and a bond of kamma for both of them. When remorse arises, thinking "Many are dying," he fills the pitfall with earth; if anyone falls into the earth and dies, even though he has filled it, the original perpetrator is not freed. Even when it rains and mud forms, and someone gets stuck there and dies. Or a falling tree, or wind, or rainwater carries away the earth, or those digging the ground for roots and tubers create a pit there. If anyone gets stuck or falls in there and dies, the original perpetrator is not freed. However, if in that place he has a large lake or lotus pond constructed, or establishes a shrine, or plants a Bodhi tree, or builds a dwelling or a cart road, he is freed. Even when the filled pitfall has been made firm and the roots of trees and such have become intertwined with roots, and natural ground has formed, even then he is freed. Even if a river comes and carries away the pitfall, in this way too he is freed. This, for now, is the discussion on pitfalls.

Now, regarding snares and such which are analogous to pitfalls, one who sets a snare thinking "Beings will be caught here and die" - in respect of beings that will certainly be caught, as soon as it is released from the hand, offences entailing defeat, offences of immediate retribution, grave offences, and offences requiring expiation should be understood. When made with reference to a specific person, if the one for whom it was set is caught, there is no offence for the binding of others. Even when the snare is given for a price or freely, the bond of kamma belongs to the original perpetrator alone. If the one who received it resets a dislodged snare, or seeing someone passing by makes a fence and drives them in front of it, or sets up a stiffer snare-stick, or ties a stronger snare-rope, or drives in a firmer stake, neither of them is freed. If, when remorse has arisen, he dislodges the snare and goes away, and others seeing it reset it, and those caught one after another die, the original perpetrator is not freed.

But if the snare-stick was not made by him, he is freed by placing it back where it was taken from. He is freed by cutting down a stick that grew there naturally. But even by storing away a stick made by himself, he is not freed. For if another takes it and sets up a snare, when beings die on account of that, the original perpetrator is not freed. If he burns it and makes it into a firebrand and discards it, even when beings die from being struck by that firebrand, he is not freed. But by completely burning or destroying it, he is freed; and even the snare-rope, if twisted by others, he is freed by placing it back where it was taken from. Having obtained small ropes and untwisted what was twisted by himself, or having obtained bark fibres and twisted

them, he is freed by unravelling them strand by strand. But even by storing away what was twisted from bark fibres brought by himself from the forest, he is not freed. But by completely burning or destroying it, he is freed.

One preparing a deadfall trap places the deadfall frame on four legs and loads stones upon it; for each effort there is an offence of wrong-doing. When all preparations are complete, as soon as it is released from the hand, in respect of beings that will certainly be crushed, offences entailing defeat and so forth should be understood in accordance with whether it is directed at a specific person or not. Even when the deadfall is given for a price or freely, the bond of kamma belongs to the original perpetrator alone. If the one who received it raises up what has fallen, or loads additional stones making it heavier, or seeing someone passing by makes a fence and drives them into the deadfall, neither of them is freed. Even if, when remorse has arisen, he knocks down the deadfall and goes away, and another seeing it resets it, the original perpetrator is not freed. But by placing the stones back where they were taken from, and by either placing the deadfall legs back where they were taken from in the manner stated for the snare-stick, or by burning them, he is freed.

Also for one planting a stake, when all preparations have been made and at the moment it is released from the hand, offences of defeat and so forth should be understood according to whether it is directed or undirected, in respect of beings who, having fallen upon the point of the stake, will certainly die. Even when the stake is given for a price or freely, only the original instigator is bound by the kamma. If the one who obtained it makes it sharper, thinking "They will die with a single blow," or makes it blunter, thinking "They will die painfully," or, having observed "It is high," replants it lower, or having observed "It is low," replants it higher, or straightens one that is crooked, or makes one that is too straight slightly inclined, neither of them is freed. But if, thinking "It is placed in the wrong spot," he places it in another spot, and if that was made having been sought out from the beginning for the purpose of killing, the original instigator is not freed. But when one that was made without being sought out is obtained and planted, the original instigator is freed. When remorse arises, he is freed by placing it at the place where it was obtained, in the manner stated regarding the snare-stick, or by burning it.

177. "Or a knife on a support" - here, "support" means a bed or a chair that is regularly used, or a backrest board, or a post for leaning against when sitting in a daytime resting place, or a tree growing there, or a tree for holding onto when standing leaning on the walking path, or a board for holding onto - all of this is called "support" in the sense of something to lean against. On that support, he arranges one of the weapons such as an adze, an axe-blade, a spear, a saw, thorns, etc., in such a way that it pierces or cuts the one leaning against it - there is an offence of wrong-doing. When one who is unsuspecting sits down, lies down, or leans against a place of regular use, and painful feeling arises through contact with the weapon, there is a grave offence; through death, an offence entailing defeat. If another monk who is his enemy, while going about the monastery, sees it and goes away approving, thinking "This was surely placed here for his death - good, let him die well," there is an offence of wrong-doing. But if he too does some action there, thinking "If done thus, it will be well done," by making it sharper, etc., for him too there is an offence entailing defeat. But if, thinking "It is placed in the wrong spot," he removes it and places it in another

spot, having placed it for that very purpose of killing, the original perpetrator is not freed. If he obtains the original item and places it back, he is freed. If he removes that and places another sharper one, the original perpetrator is indeed freed.

Regarding smearing with poison too, the same method applies up to the offence of wrong-doing for approving of death. But if he too, having observed that the poison patch is small, makes it larger, or thinking "It is excessive," makes a large one small, or makes a thin one thick, or makes a thick one thin, or heats it with fire and spreads it underneath or on top, for him too there is an offence entailing defeat. Thinking "This is placed in the wrong spot," he scrapes off and wipes away all of it and places it in another spot - if he himself prepares it with medicines and places it, the original perpetrator is not freed; if he himself does not prepare it, he is freed. But if he, thinking "This poison is too little," brings more and adds it, whichever one's poison causes death, for that one there is an offence entailing defeat. If he dies from the poison belonging to both, for both there is an offence entailing defeat. Thinking "This poison is ineffective," he removes it and places his own poison instead - for him alone there is an offence entailing defeat, and the original perpetrator is freed.

"Or makes it weak" means he cuts the lower part of the frame of a bed or chair, or cuts the strips or cords with which it is bound, leaving only a little remaining, and places a weapon underneath, thinking "Falling here, he will die." He also cuts the outer part of the ends of the support boards, etc., and the holding trees and boards on the walking path, and places a weapon underneath; or at pits, etc., he brings and places a bed or a chair or a backrest board so that merely by sitting or merely by leaning against it one falls; or there is a bridge for crossing over pits, etc., and he makes it weak. For one doing thus, in the doing there is an offence of wrong-doing. When painful feeling arises for the other, there is a grave offence; upon death, an offence entailing defeat. He brings a monk and places him at the edge of a pit, etc., thinking "Seeing it, trembling with fear, he will fall and die" - there is an offence of wrong-doing. He falls right there - when painful feeling arises, there is a grave offence; upon death, an offence entailing defeat. Whether he himself pushes him, or causes another to push him, or another uninstructed pushes him by his own nature, or a non-human pushes him, or he falls by a gust of wind, or he falls by his own nature - in all cases, upon death there is an offence entailing defeat. Why? Because he was standing at the edge of the pit, etc., through that one's effort.

"Depositing near" means placing nearby. Therein, having praised the glory of death by such a method as "Whoever dies by this sword obtains wealth," or having said "Let those wishing to die, die by this; let those wishing to kill, kill by this," he deposits a sword nearby - in that depositing there is an offence of wrong-doing. Whether one wishing to die strikes himself with it, or one wishing to kill strikes another, in both cases, when painful feeling arises for another, for the depositor there is a grave offence; upon death, an offence entailing defeat. When it is deposited without specifying anyone, upon the death of many, there is a heap of unwholesome karma. In matters involving defeat, etc., there are offences entailing defeat, etc. When remorse arises, he places the sword back in the place from which it was taken, and is freed. If it was obtained by purchase, the sword belonging to the sword's owners - to those from whose hands the price was taken, having given back the price to them, he is freed. If, having taken a lump of iron, a ploughshare, or a hoe, he had a sword

made, whatever article was taken to have it made, having restored that very thing, he is freed. If, having taken a hoe and had it made into a sword, he destroys it and makes a ploughshare, even if people die from being struck by the ploughshare, he is not freed from the destruction of life. But if, having smelted iron, it was made solely for the purpose of depositing nearby, having ground it with a whetstone and reduced it to fine powder and scattered it, he is freed. If, like a book of praise, it was made by many with a single intention, the determination of the bond of the action should be understood in the same way as stated regarding the book. This same method applies to spears and slings. Regarding a cudgel, the determination is similar to that for a snare-stick. Likewise regarding a stone. Regarding a knife, it is just the same as for a sword. "Or poison" - for one depositing poison nearby, offences entailing defeat, etc., in matters involving defeat, etc., should be understood according to whether it is specified or unspecified, based on the case. When it is placed after purchasing, having restored it to its original state by the former method, he is freed. When it is prepared by oneself with medicines, having rendered it non-poisonous, he is freed. Regarding a rope, the determination is similar to that for a snare-rope.

Regarding medicine - whatever monk, when a rival monk has a fever or a disease of harmful nature arisen, gives ghee and so forth which are unsuitable as though they were suitable, with the intention of death, or gives any other bulb, root, or fruit - for such giving of medicine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. When painful feeling arises in the other, and upon death, there are grave offence and defeat respectively; in the case of a matter involving an immediate result, it should be understood as an immediate result.

178. Regarding the gift of material form - "Brings forward" means either he places an unpleasant form near the other person, or he himself stands having assumed the guise of a yakkha, a peta, and so forth; merely by that act of bringing forward, there is a wrong-doing offence. When the other person, having seen that form, experiences the arising of fear, there is a grave offence; upon death, there is an offence entailing defeat. But if that very same form is pleasant to someone, and he withers through loss and dies, there is no offence. The same method applies also in the case of what is pleasant. Therein, however, specifically, the male form is pleasant to women and the female form is pleasant to men; one adorns it and brings it forward, allows only a mere glimpse, and does not allow even prolonged viewing; the other withers through loss and dies - there is an offence entailing defeat. If he dies from being frightened, there is no offence. But if, without considering whether it was through fright or through loss, one brings it forward thinking "He will die merely from seeing it," whether he dies from fright or from withering, it is indeed an offence entailing defeat. By this same method, the gift of sound and the rest should also be understood. Herein, however, sounds of non-human beings and the like, which generate terror, are unpleasant sounds; for men, the sounds of women's voices, sweet musical sounds, and the like, which produce delight in the mind, are pleasant sounds. In the Himālaya, the odours of roots and so forth of poisonous trees, and the odours of carcasses, are unpleasant odours; the odours of roots of dark sandalwood and the like are pleasant odours. Flavours of repulsive roots and the like are unpleasant flavours; flavours of non-repulsive roots and the like are pleasant flavours. The touch of poison,

the touch of severe itching, and the like are unpleasant tangible objects; the touch of Chinese silk, the touch of swan-feather down cushions, and the like are pleasant tangible objects - thus it should be understood.

Regarding the gift of mental objects - "Mental object" should be understood as the Dhamma of teaching. Or, by way of teaching, the mental object itself is the distinction between misfortune in hell and fortune in heaven. "To one doomed to hell" means one speaks a talk on hell, including the five kinds of bonds and punishments and so forth, to a being whose restraint is broken, who has done evil, and who deserves to be reborn in hell. If, having heard that, he becomes frightened and dies, there is an offence entailing defeat for the speaker. But if, even having heard that, he dies by his own natural course, there is no offence. If one speaks a talk on hell thinking "Having heard this, he will not do such evil, he will desist, he will refrain," and having heard that, the other becomes frightened and dies, there is no offence. "Talk on heaven" means a talk on the fortune of divine entertainments and the like, and of the Nandana grove and the like; having heard that, the other, being intent upon heaven, desiring to quickly attain that fortune, produces suffering by means of taking up a weapon, consuming poison, cutting off food, suppressing breathing, and the like - there is a grave offence for the speaker; if he dies, there is an offence entailing defeat. But if, even having heard that, he remains for the duration of his lifespan and dies by his own natural course, there is no offence. If one speaks thinking "Having heard this, he will perform meritorious deeds," and having heard that, the other, being intent upon it, passes away, there is no offence.

179. Regarding declaring - "When asked he speaks" means when asked thus: "Venerable sir, how does one who has died obtain wealth or be reborn in heaven?" he speaks.

Regarding instruction - "Without being asked" means without being asked thus, he speaks of his own accord.

Making a rendezvous and making a sign should be understood in the same manner as stated in the discussion on taking what is not given.

Having thus shown the classification of offences in various ways, now showing the classification of non-offences, he said "there is no offence for one who acts unintentionally" etc. Therein, "unintentionally" means without having intended: "By this effort I am killing this one." For indeed, when another dies through an effort made without such intention, there is no offence; and it will be stated: "There is no offence for a monk who acts unintentionally." "For one who does not know" means when another dies through an effort made by one who does not know "by this means this one will die," there is no offence; and it will be stated in the case of the poisoned almsfood: "There is no offence for a monk who does not know." "For one not intending death" means for one not wishing for death. For indeed, even when one is killed by the very effort through which another dies, there is no offence for one not intending death. And it will be stated: "There is no offence for a monk not intending death." The mad one and the rest are according to the manner already stated. Here, however, the first offenders are monks who have deprived each other of life; for them there is no offence. For the remaining ones, such as those who praise death, etc., there is indeed an offence.

Regarding the origins and so forth -This training rule has three origins; It originates from body and mind, from speech and mind, and from body, speech and mind. It is action, exempt from perception, with consciousness, worldly wrong, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, painful feeling. For even if a king, having ascended his royal bed and enjoying the happiness of royal prosperity, upon being told "A thief has been brought, Your Majesty," speaks while laughing "Go and kill him," it should be understood that he speaks with a mind of displeasure. But because it is pervaded by pleasure and because of the absence of continuity, this is difficult for ordinary persons to discern.

Commentary on the Precedent Cases

180. In the discussions of the Vinīta cases, regarding the first case -"Out of compassion" means those monks, having seen his great suffering from illness, aroused compassion and, having actually become those who desire death yet not knowing their own state of desiring death, praised death thus: "You are virtuous, one who has made merit; why do you fear while dying? Is not heaven for the virtuous merely dependent on death itself?" That monk too, through their praising, having cut off food, died prematurely. Therefore they committed an offence. However, it was stated in conventional terms that "out of compassion they praised death." Therefore, even now, a wise monk should not praise death in such a way to a sick monk. For if, having heard that praising, he dies prematurely through the effort of cutting off food and so forth, even when there remains but a single javana moment of lifespan, he is killed by this very person. Rather, instruction should be given in this manner -"For one who is virtuous, the arising of path and fruit is not surprising; therefore, without forming attachment to dwellings and the like, having established mindfulness directed towards the Buddha, directed towards the Dhamma, directed towards the Community, and directed towards the body, diligence in attention should be practised." Even when death has been praised, whoever, without making any effort on account of that praising, dies naturally according to his own lifespan and according to his own continuity, on that account the one who praised should not be made to incur an offence.

Regarding the second case - "And, monks, without having examined" - here, what kind of seat should be examined, and what kind need not be examined? That which is simply a bare seat without any covering spread over it, and that which is spread out in the very sight of those who have come and are standing - that need not be examined; it is allowable to sit down. Also that which people themselves press down with their hand and offer saying "Please sit here, venerable sir" - on that too it is allowable. Even if those who came first and sat down afterwards move up or down, there is no duty to examine. Also that which is covered with a thin cloth such that the surface is visible - on that too there is no duty to examine. But that which has been spread beforehand with cloaks, blankets and the like - that should be touched with the hand, examined, and then sat upon. However, in the Mahāpaccaṛī it is said: "Even when spread with a thick cloth, if no fold is apparent in it, that need not be examined."

Regarding the pestle case - "Unintentionally" means he was one without the intention to kill, whose effort went astray. Therefore he said "It was unintentional, Blessed One." The mortar case is self-evident. In the cases of those who went forth when elderly, in the first case, he pushed him away thinking "Do not cause an obstruction to the community of monks." Regarding the second case - Being called "the son of the senior elder" both in the midst of the Community and in the midst of the group, being distressed by that expression, he pushed him away thinking "Let this one die." In the third case - Through causing him suffering, it is a grave offence.

181. The three cases following that are clear in meaning. In the case of the almsfood containing poison - that monk, being one who fulfils the qualities conducive to harmony, eats only after giving the first portion of almsfood to his fellow monks in the holy life. Therefore it is said "he gave the first portion." "The first portion" means the first offering; the meaning is the almsfood first obtained, or the very best, the most excellent almsfood. But the first offering, which is reckoned as his giving, cannot itself be given, for he gave the almsfood starting from the senior seat onwards. "Those monks" means those monks who consumed the almsfood starting from the senior seat onwards; it is said that all of them died. The remainder here is clear in itself. However, having obtained fine food carefully prepared from faithless families holding wrong views, one should not consume it oneself without examining it, nor should one give it to others. Whatever food or hard food prepared the previous evening one obtains from them, that too should not be consumed. For those families give even uncovered food that has been lain upon by snakes, scorpions and the like, which is fit to be discarded. Even almsfood smeared with turmeric-scented substances and the like should not be accepted from them. For those families think that even food placed after wiping diseased areas of the body is fit to be given.

In the case of testing - one who is testing tests two things - either he tests the poison, thinking "Can this kill him or not?", or he tests the person, thinking "Would this person die after eating this poison or not?" In both cases, when given with the intention of testing, whether the person dies or not, it is a grave offence. But when given thinking "Let this poison kill him" or "Let this person die after eating this poison," if the person dies, it is an offence involving expulsion; if not, it is a grave offence.

182-183. The three stone cases and the three brick, adze, and rafter cases that follow from here are self-evident in meaning. And this distinction between offence and non-offence applies not only in respect of stones and so forth, but also in respect of sticks, clubs, chisels, shuttles, and so forth; therefore, what has not come in the canonical text should be understood by the same method as what has come.

Regarding the scaffold cases - "Scaffold" (aṭṭaka) refers to an aerial platform; which they construct for the purpose of whitewashing, garland-work, creeper-work, and so forth. Therein, "friend, standing here, tie it" means with the intention of causing death; he said this referring to such a place where, having fallen from where one stood, one might be broken by a stump, or might die in a pit, a precipice, and so forth. And here, someone specifies the upper place, thinking "he will fall from here and die"; someone specifies the place below, thinking "he will fall here and die"; someone specifies both, thinking "he will fall from here to here and die." In that case, one who, without falling from the specified upper place, falls elsewhere; or without falling at the specified lower place, falls somewhere else; or in the case of both being

specified, fails in either one and falls - if that person dies, there is no offence because of the deviation from the arrangement. The same method applies also in the case of roofing the monastery.

Regarding the case of discontentment - that monk, it is said, having seen the arising of sensual thoughts and so forth, being unable to prevent them, became discontented with the dispensation and inclined towards the lay life. Then he thought - "Before I reach the breaking of my virtue, I shall die." Then, having climbed that mountain, while falling down the precipice, he fell upon a certain bamboo-worker and killed him. "Bamboo-worker" (vilīvakāra) means a worker in bamboo (veṇukāra). "And, monks, one should not throw oneself down" means one should not throw oneself down. But this was stated with a change of grammatical case. And here, not only should one not throw oneself down, but one should not kill oneself by any other means whatsoever, even by the cutting off of food. For even one who is ill, when medicine and attendants are available, if wishing to die he cuts off food, it is an offence of wrong-doing. But for one who has a serious illness that has persisted for a long time, and the monks attending him become weary, feel disgust, and are distressed thinking "when shall we be freed from this sick person" - if he, thinking "this body does not endure even when being looked after, and the monks are becoming weary," cuts off food and does not take medicine, it is allowable. But one who, thinking "this disease is severe, the life-activities do not endure, and my attainment of distinction appears as if within reach," cuts off food, it is indeed allowable. Even for one who is not ill, if spiritual urgency has arisen, thinking "the search for food is indeed an impediment, I shall devote myself only to the meditation subject," for one who cuts off food with the meditation subject as the priority, it is allowable. If one declares the attainment of distinction and then cuts off food, it is not allowable. For it is allowable to speak to fellow conscientious monks.

Regarding the stone case - "For fun" (davāya) means with fun, with laughter; the meaning is "for play." "Stone" (silā) means a rock; and not only a rock, but it is not allowable to hurl any piece of wood or piece of brick whatsoever, whether by hand or by a device. For the purpose of shrines and so forth, rolling, throwing, or lifting up stones and so forth while laughing and laughing during the time of work, it is allowable. Also when doing other such new construction work, or when washing requisites, if they lift up and throw a tree or a washing stick, it is allowable. At meal-distribution times and so forth, if one drives away crows or dogs by throwing a stick or a potsherd, it is allowable.

184. The cases concerning steam treatment and so forth are all clear in meaning. Here, "I have remorse" does not mean that care for the sick should not be undertaken; rather, out of desire for the sick person's welfare, everything should be done after having ascertained the sick person's strength and weakness, preferences, and what is suitable and unsuitable.

185. In the case of the woman pregnant by a lover - "One whose husband has gone away" means one whose husband has gone abroad. "An abortifacient" means a medicine such that when consumed the embryo falls; such a medicine. The two cases concerning the husband are clear in meaning. In the case of crushing the embryo - When told "crush it and make it fall," she has another person crush it and makes it fall; this is a discrepancy. Even when told "have it crushed and make it be expelled,"

she herself crushes it and makes it fall; this too is a discrepancy. In the case of a human form, there is no alternative. Therefore, when it is said "an embryo falls when crushed," whether she crushes it herself or has another person crush it and make it fall, there is no discrepancy; it is an offence of expulsion. The same method applies in the case of heating as well.

In the case of the barren woman -A barren woman is one who does not conceive an embryo. There is no woman who does not conceive at all, but one in whom even a conceived embryo does not become established - it is said with reference to her. At the fertile time, it is said, all women conceive. But she who is called "barren" - for the beings arisen in her womb, the result of unwholesome kamma reaches them. Those who have taken rebirth-linking through the result of slight wholesome kamma are overcome by the result of unwholesome kamma and perish. For at the very time of fresh rebirth-linking, through the power of kamma, the embryo does not become established in two ways - either through wind or through organisms. Wind dries it up and makes it disappear; organisms consume it and make it disappear. But if medicine were prepared to counteract that wind or those organisms, the embryo could become established; that monk, without doing that, gave a different harsh medicine. Because of that, she died. The Blessed One laid down an offence of wrongdoing because of having prepared the medicine.

The same method applies in the second case as well. Therefore, medicine should not be prepared for any and every outsider who comes; one who does so commits an offence of wrongdoing. But it should be prepared for the five co-religionists: a monk, a nun, a female probationer, a male novice, and a female novice. For it is not allowable to not prepare medicine for those of equal virtue, faith, and wisdom who are engaged in the three trainings; and when preparing it, if they have their own, one should take what belongs to them, compound it, and give it. If they do not have any, one should prepare it from one's own supplies. If one does not have any either, it should be sought by means of the alms-round practice or from a place where relatives have given an invitation. If one cannot obtain it, it should be brought and prepared for the benefit of the sick person even without having made a specific request.

It is also proper to prepare medicine for another five persons -for one's mother, father, those who attend upon them, one's own attendant, and a yellow-leaf aspirant. A yellow-leaf aspirant is one who, aspiring to go forth, dwells in the monastery while preparing his bowl and robes. Among these, if the parents are wealthy and one does not expect anything in return, it is proper not to prepare medicine. But if, even though established in kingship, they expect something in return, it is not proper to refrain from preparing medicine. Medicine should be given to those who expect medicine; for those who do not know how to prepare it, it should be prepared and given. For the benefit of all of them, one should seek in the same manner as stated regarding those sharing the same Dhamma. But if one brings one's mother to the monastery and looks after her, all the nursing duties should be done without touching her. Hard food and soft food should be given with one's own hand. But one's father should be attended to with one's own hand by bathing, massaging, and so forth, just as one would a novice. And for those who attend upon and look after one's parents, the same should be done for them as well. An attendant is one who, having received

wages, cuts firewood in the forest or does any other work; when illness arises for him, medicine should be prepared until his relatives come to see him. But for one who, being dependent on a monk, performs all duties, medicine should certainly be prepared. Regarding a yellow-leaf aspirant too, one should act as one would towards a novice.

It is also proper to prepare medicine for another ten persons -for an elder brother, a younger brother, an elder sister, a younger sister, a younger maternal aunt, an elder maternal aunt, a younger paternal uncle, an elder paternal uncle, a paternal aunt, and a maternal uncle. But when preparing medicine for any of them, one should take their own medicine, merely prepare it, and give it to them. But if they are unable to manage and request, "Please give us yours, Venerable Sir, we shall repay you," one should give it temporarily. Even if they do not request, one should give it either by saying, "We have medicine, take it for now," or by reflecting, "When they have the means, they will repay," and then giving it. If they repay, it should be accepted; if they do not give, they should not be pressed. Apart from these ten relatives, medicine should not be prepared for others.

However, through the succession of their children, up to the seventh generation of family lineage, for one who has the four requisites brought, there is neither an offence of making an uninvited request, nor of practising medicine, nor an offence of corrupting families. If a brother's wife or a sister's husband is ill, if they are relatives, it is proper for them too. If they are not relatives, one should prepare it and give it to the brother or sister, saying, "Give it to them in the place where you look after them." Or one should prepare it and give it to their children, saying, "Give it to your parents." By this method, the decision should be understood in all cases.

And when having novices bring medicine from the forest for their benefit, one should have it brought by novices who are relatives. Or one should have it brought for one's own benefit and then give it. By them too, it should be brought under the heading of duty, saying, "Let us bring it for the preceptor." When the preceptor's parents come to the monastery ill and the preceptor has departed to another region, the co-resident should give the preceptor's own medicine. If there is none, one should relinquish one's own medicine to the preceptor and give it. If one has none oneself either, one should seek it in the manner stated and, having made it the preceptor's own, give it. The preceptor too should act in the same way regarding the co-resident's parents. This same method applies also to teachers and their pupils. Moreover, anyone else - whether a visitor, a robber, a ruler defeated in battle, a destitute person abandoned by relatives, or a traveller - who enters the monastery having fallen ill, medicine should be prepared for all of them without expecting anything in return.

There is a faithful family that supports the community of monks with the four requisites and stands in the place of mother and father. If someone there is sick, and they say out of familiarity "Venerable sir, please prepare and give medicine," neither should it be given nor should it be prepared. But if, knowing what is allowable, they ask thus - "Venerable sir, what medicine do they prepare for such-and-such a disease?" It is proper to say "They prepare it by taking this and that." But when asked thus "Venerable sir, my mother is sick, please tell us the medicine," it should not be told. However, a conversation should be held among one another - "Friend, what medicine did they prepare for such-and-such a monk in this disease?" "This and that,

venerable sir." Having heard that, the other person prepares medicine for his mother; that is proper indeed.

The Elder Mahāpaduma too, it is said, when a disease arose in King Vasabha's queen and a woman came and asked him, without saying "I do not know," conversed in just this way with the monks. Having heard that, they prepared medicine for her. And when the disease had subsided, having filled a medicine chest together with the three robes and three hundred kahāpaṇas, they brought it and placed it at the elder's feet, saying "Venerable sir, please make a flower offering." The elder, saying "This is indeed the teacher's share," had it accepted in an allowable manner and made a flower offering. Thus should one conduct oneself regarding medicine.

Regarding protective recitation, however, when it is said "Venerable sir, please perform a protective recitation for the sick person," it should not be done; but when it is said "Please recite," it should be done. If he thinks thus "People do not know; if it is not done, they will feel remorse," it should be done. But when it is said "Please give protective water and a protective thread," their own water should be stirred with the hand and the thread should be rubbed, and then given. If he gives water from the monastery or thread belonging to himself, it is an offence of wrong-doing. When people bring water and thread, sit down, and say "Please recite the protective verses," it should be done. If they do not know, they should be instructed. When people pour water on the feet of seated monks and place a thread and leave, saying "Please perform the protection, please recite the protection," the feet should not be withdrawn. For people would feel remorse. When they send to the monastery for the sake of a sick person within the village, one should say "Let them recite the protective verses." When disease or calamity arises in the royal palace and such places within the village, and they invite and have them recite, the Āṭṇāṭṭiya Sutta and such should be recited. "Come and give the training rules to the sick person, and teach the Dhamma. Come to the royal inner palace or the minister's house and give the training rules, and teach the Dhamma" - even when sent thus, one should go and give the training rules, and the Dhamma should be taught. When they invite saying "Come for the purpose of attending upon the dead," one should not go. But for viewing the charnel ground and viewing the foul, thinking "I shall gain mindfulness of death," it is proper to go on the basis of a meditation subject. Thus should one conduct oneself regarding protective recitation.

Regarding almsfood, however - To whom should untouched almsfood be given, and to whom should it not be given? First, it should be given to one's mother and father. Even if it is worth a kahāpaṇa, there is no squandering of what is given in faith. It should also be given to those who attend upon one's mother and father, to one's attendant, and to the yellow-leaf - to these as well. Therein, it is proper to give to the yellow-leaf even by placing it in a bowl. Apart from those, it is not proper even for one's mother and father among other householders. For what is used by one gone forth is like a shrine for householders. Furthermore, untouched almsfood should be given even to a rebel bandit or a ruler who has arrived. Why? For even when it is not given, they become angry, having touched it, saying "They do not give"; and even when it is given, they become angry saying "They give leftovers." When angry, they

may even deprive one of life, and they create obstacles for the dispensation. The story of the bandit Nāga who was wandering about aspiring to kingship should be told here. Thus should one conduct oneself regarding almsfood.

But for whom should hospitality be shown, and for whom should it not be shown? Hospitality should indeed be shown to anyone who has arrived at the monastery, whether a visitor, a poor person, a robber, or a ruler. How? First, upon seeing a visitor who has arrived at the monastery with exhausted provisions, drinking water should be given, oil for anointing the feet should be given. For one who has arrived at the proper time, gruel and rice; for one who has arrived at the wrong time, if there is uncooked rice; uncooked rice should be given. One who has arrived at an unseasonable hour should not be told "Go away." A sleeping place should be given. All this should be done without any expectation of return. The thought should not be aroused: "People who are givers of the four requisites, when hospitality is shown to them in this way, will be pleased again and again and will render assistance." Even communal property should be given to robbers.

For the purpose of illustrating the benefits of hospitality, the story of the robber Nāga, the story of the great Nāga king who went to Jambudīpa with his brother, the story of the four ministers in the reign of his father the king, and the story of the robber Abhaya - many such stories are told in detail in the Great Commentary.

Herein is the illustration of one story - In the island of Sīhaḷa, it is said, a robber named Abhaya, with a retinue of five hundred, having set up a camp at a certain place, dwelt having laid waste the surrounding area for three yojanas. The inhabitants of Anurādhapura did not cross the Kadamba river, and the movement of people on the road to Cetiyaḡiri was cut off. Then one day the robber went forth thinking "I shall plunder Cetiyaḡiri." The monastery attendants, seeing this, reported it to the Elder Abhaya, the Long Reciter. The Elder asked "Are there ghee, sugar and such things?" "There is, venerable sir." "Give them to the robbers. Are there uncooked rice?" "There are, venerable sir - uncooked rice, leaf-vegetables, and dairy products brought for the use of the Community." "Prepare a meal and give it to the robbers." The monastery attendants did so. The robbers, having eaten the meal, asked "By whom was this hospitality shown?" "By our master, the Elder Abhaya." The robbers went to the Elder's presence, paid homage, and said - "We came to seize and take away the property of the Community and the shrine, but we are pleased by this hospitality of yours. From today onwards, let the rightful protection of the monastery be dependent upon us. Let the townspeople come and give gifts, let them pay homage at the shrine." From then on, when the townspeople came to give gifts, they went out to meet them at the river bank itself, and escorting them protectively, led them to the monastery, and even at the monastery they stood providing protection for those giving gifts. And they too gave the leftovers of the monks' meals to the robbers. Even at the time of departure, those robbers escorted them to the river bank and then turned back.

Then one day a complaint arose among the community of monks: "The elder, acting on his own authority, gave what belonged to the Community to the bandits." The elder had an assembly convened and said: "The bandits came saying 'We shall seize and take away the regular supplies of the Community and what belongs to the shrine.' Then, thinking 'In this way they will not carry it off,' I made this much

hospitality for them. Now calculate the value of all that together. For that reason, calculate the value of the un plundered goods all together." Thereupon, all that was given by the elder did not equal the value of a single fine cloth spread with painted designs in the shrine house. Thereupon they said: "The hospitality made by the elder was well done; it is not possible to reprove or admonish him; there is neither a charge nor a case against him." Thus, recognising that hospitality is of great benefit, it should be practised by a wise monk.

187. In the case of nudging with fingers - "Exhausted" means becoming weary. "Unable to breathe" means without breath. However, in this case, the offence that should apply has been "indicated among the minor rules" and is therefore not stated here.

In the next case - "Having crushed" means having trampled upon. It is said that he fell down while being dragged by them. One climbed upon his belly and sat down. The remaining fifteen persons, having pressed him down on the ground, killed him like an animal with stones placed on a threshing floor. But since their intention was to carry out an act, not to cause death, therefore an offence involving expulsion was not stated.

In the case of the exorcist - "He killed the demon" means that the reciters of exorcism spells, wishing to release one possessed by a demon, having summoned the demon, say "Release him." If it does not release, they make an image out of flour or clay and cut off the hands, feet and so forth; whatever part of it is cut, that same part of the demon is indeed cut. When the head is cut off, the demon also dies. Thus he too killed; therefore a grave offence was stated. And not only in the case of a demon; even one who were to kill Sakka, the king of the gods, would also commit only a grave offence.

In the case of the fierce demon - "A monastery with a fierce demon" means the monastery in which a fierce, violent demon dwells, that monastery. For one who, not knowing of such a monastery, sends merely for the purpose of dwelling, there is no offence. One who sends with the intention of causing death commits an offence involving expulsion if the other dies, and a grave offence if he does not die. And just as in the case of a monastery with a fierce demon, so too, wherever fierce lions, tigers and other wild beasts, or pythons, black snakes and other long-bodied creatures dwell, the distinction between offence and non-offence should be understood for one who sends to such a dangerous monastery. This is a principle not found in the canonical text. And just as for one who sends a monk to a monastery with a fierce demon, so too, the distinction between offence and non-offence should be understood for one who sends a fierce demon to the presence of a monk. The same method applies also in the cases of a wilderness of wild beasts and so forth. Herein, simply, a wilderness in which there are wild beasts or long-bodied creatures is a wilderness of wild beasts. A wilderness in which there are thieves is a wilderness of thieves - thus the difference is merely in the meaning of the words. And this offence involving expulsion concerning a human form is subtle and cannot be escaped through indirect speech. Therefore, one who were to say "In such and such a place a thief is sitting; whoever cuts off his head and brings it receives a special honour from the king." And if, having heard this statement, someone goes and kills him, this one commits an offence involving expulsion.

188. In the passage beginning with "imagining that one to be that one," it is said that that monk, wishing to kill his enemy monk, thought: "It would not be easy for me to get away safely if I were to kill him during the day; I shall kill him at night." Having considered thus, when night came, at the place where many were sleeping, imagining that one to be that one, he deprived that very one of life. Another, imagining that one to be that one, deprived another of life; another, imagining another to be that one's companion, deprived that one of life; another, imagining another to be that one's companion, deprived another who was indeed that one's companion of life. For all of them, it is an offence involving expulsion.

In the cases concerning one seized by a spirit, in the first case, he gave a blow thinking "I shall drive away the spirit," while the other thought "This one is not able to miss; I shall kill him, shall I not?" And here it is stated that there is no offence for one not intending death. One should not give a blow to one seized by a spirit merely on this account; rather, a palm leaf or a protective discourse should be tied to the hand or foot, protective discourses such as the Ratana Sutta should be recited, and a talk on the Teaching should be given saying "Do not harass a virtuous monk." The talks on heaven and so forth are clear in meaning. Whatever should be said here has already been said.

189. The case of cutting down a tree is similar to the case of binding to a post. But this is the distinction - One who, even though crushed by a tree, does not die, and it is possible to escape by cutting the tree on one side or by digging the earth, and there is an adze or axe in his hand - even so, he should give up his life, but should neither cut the tree nor dig the earth. Why? For one doing so commits an offence of expiation, breaks the Buddha's command, and does not maintain his virtue to the end of his life. Therefore, having resolved "Even life should be given up, but not virtue," one should not act thus. However, it is allowable for another monk to extract him by cutting the tree or digging the earth. If he has to be extracted by rolling the tree with a mortar-device, the Elder Mahāsuma said that the very same tree should be cut to make the mortar. The Elder Mahāpaduma said that it is allowable to cut another tree and make it. The same principle applies in the case of rescuing one who has fallen into a pit and the like, by constructing a ladder. One should not make a ladder by cutting plant life oneself; it is allowable for others to make it and lift him out.

190. In the cases concerning setting fire to a grove - "Set fire to a grove" means they gave fire to the forest. Here, however, according to the manner of specifying and not specifying, the offences of expulsion and so forth, and the state of being an unwholesome group, should be understood in accordance with the cases of expulsion, offences bordering on expulsion, grave offences, and offences of expiation, as explained previously. For one who sets fire thinking "Let green grass, forest thickets, and so forth be burnt," there is an offence of expiation. For one who sets fire thinking "Let timber and equipment be destroyed," there is an offence of wrong-doing. It is stated in the Abridged Commentary that even with the intention of play, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For one who sets fire thinking "Let whatever is green or dry, with or without life faculty, be burnt," offences of expulsion, grave offences, offences of expiation, and offences of wrong-doing should be understood according to the basis.

However, giving a counter-fire and making a protection were permitted by the

Blessed One; therefore, having seen in the forest a fire approaching that was given by forest workers or that arose by itself, it is proper to give a counter-fire to that fire thinking "Let the grass huts not be destroyed," whereby the approaching fire, meeting together with it, becomes without fuel and is extinguished. It is also proper to make a protection by clearing the ground all around the grass huts or digging a trench, so that the approaching fire, not obtaining fuel, is extinguished. And all of this is proper to do only when the fire has already arisen. When it has not arisen, it should be done by those who are not fully ordained, using allowable expressions. However, for those extinguishing with water, only water without living beings should be poured.

191. In the case of the place of execution - just as in the statement of a single blow; so also in statements beginning with "with two blows," etc., an offence involving expulsion should be understood. And when "with two" is stated, even if killed with one blow, it is an offence involving expulsion because one has entered the very field; but if killed with three, it is a deviation from the agreement. Thus, whether within the specified limit or within the bounds of the specification, there is no deviation from the agreement; but when the specification is exceeded, everywhere there is deviation from the agreement, the one who commands is released, and the fault belongs only to the killer. And just as with blows; so also with persons, when it is said "let one kill," if killed by one alone, it is an offence involving expulsion; if killed by two, it is a deviation from the agreement. When it is said "let two kill," if killed by one or by two, it is an offence involving expulsion; if killed by three, it should be understood as a deviation from the agreement. One person cuts off with a sword the head of a man running swiftly in battle, the headless trunk continues running, another strikes it and brings it down - when it is asked whose is the offence involving expulsion, half the elders said "it belongs to the one who interrupted the movement." The Elder Godatta, the Abhidhamma specialist, said "it belongs to the one who cut off the head." Such cases too should be discussed in the elucidation of the meaning of this case.

192. In the case of buttermilk - when it is said without specifying "give him buttermilk to drink," if he is killed by giving him any kind of buttermilk whatsoever, it is an offence involving expulsion. But when it is specified and said "cow's buttermilk, buffalo's buttermilk, goat's buttermilk," or "cold, hot, smoked, unsmoked," if he is killed by giving him something other than what was stated, it is a deviation from the agreement.

In the case of sour gruel - sour gruel is a single medicine prepared with all flavours. Those who make it, it is said, put in decoctions of chebulic myrobalan, emblic myrobalan, and beleric myrobalan, all grains, all pulses, cooked rice of all seven grains, all fruits such as plantain fruits and so on, all young shoots such as cane shoots, screw-pine shoots, date-palm shoots and so on, pieces of fish and meat, and numerous medicines such as honey, sugar, rock salt, alkaline salts and so on, then seal the mouth of the jar and store it for one, two, or three years; when it has fully matured, it becomes the colour of rose-apple juice. There is no medicine like it for diseases such as wind disorders, coughs, leprosy, jaundice, and fistula, and as an after-drink for those who have eaten rich food, and as a medicine for digesting food. Moreover, this is allowable for monks even after the meal; for the sick it is in its natural form, but for the healthy it should be mixed with water and used as a beverage.

4. The Fourth Expulsion

The Teacher who knows the four truths, that which he proclaimed as the fourth;

The order of commentary on that has now been reached.

Since therefore what has been explained before is easy to understand;
Setting that aside, this commentary too is given.

Commentary on the Account of the Monks on the Bank of the Vaggumudā

193. At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One, was dwelling at Vesālī... etc. "Let us undertake work for the laypeople" means we undertake the tasks to be done in the laypeople's fields and gardens and so forth; it is said that we instruct and advise them thus: "This should be done, this should not be done." "Messages" means the work of a messenger. "Of super-human achievement" means of a state that has transcended human beings; the meaning is of a state that, having surpassed human beings, leads to the Brahma state or to Nibbāna. Or of the achievement of those superior to human beings, of the excellent persons, of meditators and of Noble Ones. Regarding "such and such a monk" and so forth, it should be understood that having deliberated thus among themselves, afterwards when speaking to the laypeople, they praised by name thus: "The monk named Buddharakkhita is an obtainer of the first meditative absorption, Dhammarakkhita of the second." Therein, "this indeed, friends, is better" means that undertaking work and carrying messages involves many adversaries and great commotion and is not befitting for recluses. But compared to both of those, this indeed is better, more praiseworthy, more excellent - that we have praised to the laypeople each other's super-human achievements. What is meant? Having composed their deportment, whether sitting or walking, whether to laypeople who ask or who do not ask, by such a method as "this monk named so-and-so is an obtainer of the first meditative absorption," that which will have been praised by one of us regarding another's super-human achievement - this indeed is better. However, in the absence of a future connection, since it is not fitting that it was spoken by them at that very moment, therefore by making a future connection, the meaning here should be understood thus: "That which will have been thus spoken, that indeed is better." But the grammatical rule should be sought from the science of grammar.

194. "Became of good complexion" means a completely new bodily complexion arose in them, and by that complexion they became of good complexion. "With full faculties" means that because of the completeness of the place occupied by the five sense faculties, the faculties including mind as the sixth were unfaded, thus they were with full faculties. "With a bright facial complexion" means although they were generally of good complexion in terms of bodily complexion, their facial complexion was even more exceedingly bright; the meaning is clear, unclouded, and pure. "With a very clear skin complexion" means that the complexion by which they were of good complexion, resembling the great kaṇikāra flower and so forth, such a complexion exists in other people too. But as in the case of these monks; the skin complexion of

those others was not so very clear. Therefore it was said - "with a very clear skin complexion." Thus those monks were not pursuing neither recitation, nor questioning, nor meditation subjects. Rather, having eaten the excellent foods obtained through deceit and false praise of non-existent qualities, and indulging at their pleasure in the delight of sleep and the delight of socialising, they attained this bodily beauty, as is the way of fools comparable to bewildered deer.

"Dwelling on the bank of the Vaggumudā" means those living on the bank of the Vaggumudā. "Is it bearable, monks" means monks, is this bodily mechanism of yours with four wheels and nine doors bearable - is it possible to bear it, to endure it, to maintain it, does it not produce any suffering? "Is it endurable" means is it possible to carry on and proceed in all duties, does it not present any obstacle? "The belly be cut open" means it would be better if the belly were cut open; the reading "parikatto" is also fitting. Having thus rebuked the monks dwelling on the bank of the Vaggumudā in many ways, now because the deed done by them constitutes an act of theft, therefore for the purpose of preventing others too from doing such a deed in the future, the Blessed One then addressed the monks.

195. And having addressed them, he spoke beginning with "Monks, there are these five great thieves." Therein, "existing and found" means it is said that they both exist and are discernible. "Here" means in this world of beings. "It occurs thus" means thus in the initial stage a desire arises. In "when indeed shall I," "su" is a particle; the meaning is "when indeed." The meaning is "when indeed." "He, at a later time" means he, having thus thought in the initial stage, gradually increasing his following, having done such things as highway robbery and plundering of border villages, having become one with a following that has reached abundance, making villages into non-villages and inhabited regions into uninhabited regions, killing, slaying, cutting, causing to cut, torturing, causing to torture.

Having thus shown the external great thief, in order to show the five great thieves in the Dispensation who are similar to him, he spoke beginning with "just so." Therein, "evil monk" - in other contexts, one who is cut off at the root, having committed a pārajika offence, is called an "evil monk." But here, one who has not committed a pārajika offence, who stands in the conduct of desire, who goes about trampling upon the lesser and minor training rules, is intended as an "evil monk." For him too, just as for the external thief, in the initial stage it occurs thus - "When indeed shall I" etc. requisites." Therein, "honoured" means one who has attained honour. "Respected" means one who has attained respect. "Revered" means one who is held dear in the mind. "Venerated" means one who is venerated by the veneration of offering the four requisites. "Esteemed" means one who has attained esteem. Therein, one to whom they give the four requisites having honoured them, having well prepared and made them excellent and choice, he is "honoured." One to whom they give having shown an attitude of respect, he is "respected." Whom they hold dear with the mind, he is revered. For whomever they do all this, he is venerated. One for whom they show the highest deference by way of salutation, rising up, placing palms together, and so forth, he is "esteemed." And for this one who desires all this worldly gain, it occurs thus.

"He, at a later time" means he, having thus thought in the initial stage, gradually gathering evil monks who are excessively disrespectful of the training, restless,

conceited, fickle, harsh-spoken, of scattered speech, lacking in mindfulness, without clear comprehension, with unguarded faculties, abandoned by their teachers and preceptors, and valuing gain highly, and having trained them in deceitful practices such as composing deportment, having his qualities praised by evil monks who are capable of winning over the world by such means as praising well-regarded lodgings thus - "This elder, having entered the rains residence at such and such a lodging, dwelt for the rains fulfilling the practice of duties and has come forth" - who are experienced in the Jātakas and other texts, and endowed with a pleasant voice, surrounded by a hundred or a thousand, etc. medicine and requisites. "This, monks, is the first great thief" means this one should be understood as "the first great thief" because, like a burglar and such, he deceives not one family or two, but rather the multitude, and takes the four requisites. But those monks who are experts in the discourses, or experts in the Abhidhamma, or bearers of the Vinaya, who, when almsfood is not forthcoming, go on a journey through the countryside reciting the texts, expounding the commentaries, inspiring the world through thanksgiving, talks on the Teaching, and excellence of deportment, honoured, respected, revered, venerated, and esteemed - they should be understood as "those who maintain the continuity of the textual tradition and illuminators of the Dispensation."

"Proclaimed by the Truth-finder" means penetrated by the Truth-finder, made directly known, or made known to others. "Claims it as his own" means in the midst of an assembly, having compared the canonical text and the commentary, having expounded a discourse that inspires confidence in a sweet voice, when asked by a wise person who is filled with wonder and amazement on account of the talk on the Teaching - "Oh, Venerable Sir, the canonical text and the commentary are very pure; in whose presence were they learnt?" - without indicating a teacher, saying "Who is capable of teaching one such as me?" he proclaims the Teaching and Discipline as penetrated by himself, attained through self-born knowledge. This is the second great thief, a stealer of the Dhamma penetrated by the Truth-finder through difficulty and hardship, having fulfilled the perfections over four incalculable aeons plus a hundred thousand aeons.

"A pure practitioner of the holy life" means a monk whose taints are destroyed.

"Living the pure holy life" means one living the supreme conduct free from defilements; or alternatively, beginning with a non-returner down to a virtuous ordinary person living the pure holy life based on freedom from remorse and so forth. "Accuses with an unfounded charge of not living the holy life" means he charges and accuses that person with a final offence that is non-existent in that individual; this is the third great thief who besmirches one possessing existing virtues and steals the noble qualities.

"Heavy goods, heavy requisites" - just as in the case of taking what is not given, where it is said "four persons having arranged together carried off heavy goods," there what is worth five māsakas is called "heavy goods," but here it is not so. Rather, "These five, monks, are not to be disposed of; they should not be disposed of by the Community, or by a group, or by an individual. Even if disposed of, they are not disposed of. Whoever should dispose of them, there is a grave offence. Which five? A park, a park site, etc. wooden goods, clay goods" - because of the statement thus, they are heavy goods on account of being not to be disposed of. "These five,

monks, are not to be divided; they should not be divided by the Community, or by a group, or by an individual. Even if divided, they are undivided. Whoever should divide them, there is a grave offence. Which five? A park, a park site, etc. wooden goods, clay goods" - because of the statement thus, they are heavy requisites on account of being not to be divided, by virtue of being communal requisites. Regarding "a park, a park site" and so forth, whatever is to be said about all of that, we shall explain in the commentary on the discourse that has come in the Khandhaka section beginning with "These five, monks, are not to be disposed of." "With these he treats kindly householders" means by giving and giving those things, he treats kindly and supports householders. "Entices" means he makes those who speak thus "Oh, our venerable sir," who follow along, affectionate. This is the fourth great thief who, having stolen the heavy requisites that are not to be disposed of and not to be divided from their true status, treats kindly householders. And moreover, this one, disposing of these heavy goods for the purpose of treating kindly families, commits the wrongdoing of corrupting families. And he becomes deserving of the act of banishment. Overpowering the community of monks and disposing of them by way of lordly authority, he commits a grave wrongdoing. One disposing of them with thievish intent should be made to have the goods assessed.

"This is the foremost great thief" means this is the chief thief among these thieves; there is no thief equal to this one, who steals the supramundane dhamma that is exceedingly fine and subtle, beyond the grasp of the five sense faculties. But is it possible to steal the supramundane dhamma by deceiving and stealing it, as one would with gold and silver and so forth? It is not possible; therefore he said - "whoever extols a super-human achievement that is non-existent and not factual." For this one merely extols that dhamma which is non-existent in himself, saying "I have this," but he is not able to dislodge it from its place, or to make it exist in himself. Then why is he called a thief? Because, having extolled it, he receives requisites that arise through the esteem for what is non-existent. For when receiving thus, those requisites have been taken by deceiving and stealing through a subtle means. Therefore he said - "What is the reason for this? The country's almsfood has been consumed by you through theft, monks." For here this is the meaning - that which we said - "this is the foremost great thief, whoever extols a super-human achievement that is non-existent and not factual." "What is the reason for this" means if asked, for what reason did we say this? "The country's almsfood has been consumed by you through theft, monks" - monks, because that country's almsfood has been consumed by him through theft, with thievish intent. For here the word "vo" is merely a particle for completing the metre, as in "ye hi vo ariyā araññavanapatthānī" and so forth. Therefore its meaning should not be understood as "consumed by you."

Now, making that same meaning clearer through verses, he said "aññathā santa" and so forth. Therein, "aññathā santaṃ" means being in another manner through impure bodily conduct and so forth. "Aññathā yo pavedaye" means whoever would declare himself in another manner as having pure bodily conduct and so forth. He would make known thus: "I am supremely pure, there is within me a supramundane state." And having declared thus, he consumes the food arisen from that declaration as though he were an arahant. "Nikacca kitavasseva bhuttaṃ theyyena tassa taṃ" - "nikaccā" means having deceived, being in one manner and displaying himself as

another. Being in reality neither a bush nor a tree, yet displaying himself as if a bush and as if a tree through the concealment of branches, leaves, and foliage.

"Kitavasseva" means just like a fowler, a deceiver, a cheat, who catches birds coming and going in the forest by means of the appearance of a bush or tree, and who makes his living thereby. "Bhuttaṃ theyyena tassa taṃ" means that for him too, being indeed a non-arahant yet displaying the state of an arahant, consuming the food obtained; that which is consumed by him, just as the fowler-cheat's catching of birds is done by deceiving, so because of consuming food obtained by deceiving people, it is called consumed through theft.

But those who, not understanding this reason, consume thus, wearing the orange robe around their necks, etc. "Nirayaṃ te upapajjare" - "kāśāvakaṇṭhā" means those with necks wrapped in the orange robe. This much alone is the mere wearing of the noble banner; the rest of the ascetic life is absent - this is what is stated. "There will be in the future, Ānanda, those of the lineage name only, wearing the orange robe around their necks" - this is the designation for the immoral ones spoken of thus. "Of bad character" means of inferior character. "Asaññatā" means unrestrained in body and so forth. "Pāpā" means inferior persons. "Pāpehi kammehi" means by those evil deeds such as deceiving others, done without seeing the danger at the time of doing them. "Nirayaṃ te upapajjare" means they are reborn in the unpleasant lower realm; therefore the verse "seyyo ayoguḷo." Its meaning is - if this immoral, unrestrained person, established in conduct according to his desires, deceiving the world through hypocrisy, were to consume, were to swallow, a heated iron ball resembling a flame of fire, and between his consuming this country's almsfood and consuming this iron ball, of those two, consuming the iron ball would be better, more excellent, and more superior, for by consuming the iron ball one does not experience in the hereafter suffering whose extent is difficult to determine even by omniscient knowledge. But by consuming that country's almsfood thus obtained, one experiences in the hereafter suffering of the kind described, for this is the extreme of wrong livelihood.

Having thus shown the danger to those who do not see the danger in evil conduct, "then the Blessed One, having rebuked those monks dwelling on the bank of the Vaggumudā in many ways, for being difficult to support, for being difficult to maintain," etc. and having said "you should recite this training rule," laying down the fourth pārājika, he said "yo pana bhikkhu anabhijānaṃ" and so forth.

Thus, having made it firm by means of the root cutting-off, when the fourth pārājika had been laid down, a case of over-estimation arose for the purpose of further supplementary laying down. For the purpose of illustrating its arising, this was said - "And thus this training rule was laid down by the Blessed One for the monks."

Commentary on the Account of Overestimation

196. Therein, "perceiving as seen what was not seen" means having become those who perceive as seen, thinking "Arahantship has been seen by us," when in fact arahantship has not been seen with the eye of knowledge. The same method applies to "not attained" and so forth. But this is the distinction - "Not attained" means not attained by way of arising in one's own continuum. "Not reached" means not reached through the development of the path; the meaning is also "not obtained." "Not realised" means not penetrated, or not made directly visible by way of reviewing.

"Through overestimation" means through the conceit of having attained; the meaning is through conceit arisen thus: "We have attained"; or the meaning is through excessive conceit, through rigid conceit. "Declared the final liberating knowledge" means they declared arahantship; they announced to the monks: "Friends, arahantship has been attained by us, what had to be done has been done." Because their defilements had not been abandoned by the path, and their defilements had merely been suppressed by the power of tranquillity and insight, at a later time, when there was a conjunction of such conditions, the mind inclined towards lust; the meaning is it inclined for the purpose of lust. This same method applies to the others.

"But that is negligible" means that declaration of final liberating knowledge of theirs is negligible, it does not come into usage in the designation of an offence; the meaning is it does not become a factor of an offence.

But for whom does this overestimation arise, and for whom does it not arise? Firstly, it does not arise for a noble disciple, for he is free from doubt regarding the penetration of noble qualities, having gained gladness through reviewing the defilements abandoned by the path, fruit, and nibbāna, and the remaining defilements. Therefore, for stream-enterers and so forth, overestimation does not arise in the manner of thinking "I am a once-returner" and so forth. It does not arise for one of bad conduct, for he is indeed without hope of attaining noble qualities. It does not arise even for one who is virtuous but has abandoned the meditation subject and is given to the enjoyment of sleep and the like. However, it arises for one of thoroughly purified virtue who is diligent in the meditation subject, who has defined mentality-materiality, who has overcome doubt through the discernment of conditions, who has applied the three characteristics and is comprehending activities, and who has begun insight practice; and when it has arisen, it establishes one who has attained pure tranquillity alone or one who has attained pure insight alone at an intermediate stage, for such a one, not seeing the arising of defilements for ten, twenty, or even thirty years, thinks "I am a stream-enterer" or "a once-returner" or "a non-returner." But one who has attained both tranquillity and insight, it establishes at arahantship itself. For his defilements have been suppressed by the power of concentration, and activities have been well comprehended by the power of insight; therefore, even for sixty years, even for eighty years, even for a hundred years, defilements do not arise, and his mental conduct is just like that of one whose taints are destroyed. He, not seeing the arising of defilements for such a long time, without standing at an intermediate stage, thinks "I am an arahant."

Commentary on the Training Rule with Analysis

197. "Not directly knowing" means not knowing directly. Since he behaves as one not directly knowing, it is non-existent in his continuum, not having arisen and not realised through knowledge, thus it is untrue. Therefore, in the word-analysis, having said "non-existent, untrue, not found," it is stated "not knowing, not seeing."

"A super-human achievement" means the achievement of those who are super-human, namely meditators and noble ones. "Bringing it upon himself" means he brings that upon himself, or he brings himself to that - thus it is "bringing upon himself," that "bringing upon himself"; the connection is: having done so, he should behave. In the word-analysis, however, since what is called a super-human

achievement is absorption, liberation, concentration, attainment, knowledge and vision, etc. delight in empty dwellings - thus many states beginning with absorption are stated. Therefore, showing the nature of bringing upon himself in respect of all of those, he made the exposition in the plural: "he brings those wholesome states upon himself." Therein, one who behaves saying "these states are found in me" brings them upon himself. One who behaves saying "I am found among these" should be understood as bringing himself to those.

"A sufficient noble knowledge and vision" - here, mundane and supramundane wisdom is "knowledge" in the sense of knowing; because it makes the Dhamma as if directly seen with the eye, it is "vision" in the sense of seeing - thus "knowledge and vision." Noble, purified, supreme knowledge and vision is "noble knowledge and vision." Sufficient, complete, capable of destroying defilements is the noble knowledge and vision herein; or the noble knowledge and vision is sufficient for the super-human achievement classified as absorption and so forth - thus it is "a sufficient noble knowledge and vision"; that sufficient noble knowledge and vision is the super-human achievement - thus the connection of word-meanings should be understood. Therein, it is by that knowledge and vision that he is called one with sufficient noble knowledge and vision. To show precisely that, the word-analysis is stated under the heading of the three true knowledges: "knowledge means the three true knowledges; vision means whatever is knowledge, that is vision; whatever is vision, that is knowledge" - thus the word-analysis is stated under the heading of the true knowledges. However, here all wisdom that is lofty and supramundane should be understood as "knowledge."

"Should behave" means he should declare this super-human achievement of the aforesaid kind, having brought it upon himself. "To a woman or" and so forth, however, is an indication of the persons to whom the declaration is made. For when it is declared to these, it is declared; it is not declared to devas, Māra, or Brahmā, nor to departed spirits, yakkhas, or animals. "Thus I know, thus I see" - this is an indication of the manner of behaving. In the word-analysis, however, "I know these states, I see these states" - this is an elucidation of the occurrence of knowing and seeing with regard to those states such as absorption and so forth; "and these states exist in me" and so forth is an elucidation of the nature of bringing upon himself.

198. "At a later time" - this is an indication of the time of acknowledging the offence. However, this one commits the offence of expulsion at the very moment of declaring. But since one who has committed an offence acknowledges it whether challenged by another or unchallenged; therefore it is said "whether being pressed for reasons or not being pressed for reasons."

Therein, regarding being pressed for reasons first - "What was attained by you" is the question about attainment; among meditative absorptions, deliverances, etc., or among the path of stream-entry, etc., what was attained by you. "How was it attained by you?" is a question about the method. For the intention here is this - was it attained by you making the characteristic of impermanence the leading principle, or one of the characteristics of suffering or non-self? Was it by applying oneself through the power of concentration, or through the power of insight? Likewise, was it by applying oneself to materiality, or to immateriality? Was it by applying oneself internally, or externally? "When was it attained by you" is the question about time. It

means: at which time among the forenoon, midday, etc.? "Where was it attained by you" is the question about location. It means: at which location - at the night-time dwelling place, the daytime dwelling place, at the foot of a tree, in a pavilion, or at which monastery? "Which mental defilements have been abandoned by you" is the question about abandoned mental defilements. It means: which mental defilements to be destroyed by which path have been abandoned by you? "Of which mental states are you an obtainer" is the question about mental states obtained. It means: of which mental states among the first path, etc., are you an obtainer?

Therefore, even now, if any monk should declare the achievement of a super-human achievement, he should not be honoured merely by that much. Rather, he should be questioned for the purpose of testing in these six grounds - "What was attained by you - was it meditative absorption, or one among deliverances, etc.?" For whatever mental state was attained by whomever, that is obvious to him. If he says "This indeed was attained by me," then he should be asked "How was it attained by you" - "among the characteristic of impermanence, etc., making which the leading principle, or among the thirty-eight objects, or among mental states distinguished as materiality, immateriality, internal, external, etc., by which approach did you apply yourself?" - for whatever is one's approach, that is evident to him. If he says "This indeed is my approach, thus was it attained by me," then he should be asked "When was it attained by you" - "was it in the forenoon, or at one of the other times such as midday, etc.?" - for the time of one's own attainment is evident to all. If he says "It was attained at such and such a time," then he should be asked "Where was it attained by you" - "was it at the daytime dwelling place, or at one of the other locations such as the night-time dwelling place, etc.?" - for the location of one's own attainment is evident to all. If he says "It was attained by me at such and such a location," then he should be asked "Which mental defilements have been abandoned by you" - "those to be destroyed by the first path, or those to be destroyed by the second path, etc.?" - for the mental defilements abandoned by one's own attained path are evident to all. If he says "These indeed are the mental defilements abandoned by me," then he should be asked "Of which mental states are you an obtainer" - "of the path of stream-entry, or of one among the path of once-returning, etc.?" - for the mental states attained by oneself are evident to all. If he says "I am indeed an obtainer of these mental states," even then his word should not be believed, for learned monks skilled in study and questioning are able to test these six grounds.

However, this monk's preliminary practice should be examined. If the preliminary practice is not pure, he should be dismissed thus: "By this practice, a supramundane state is certainly not obtainable." If, however, his preliminary practice is pure, and it is evident that "for a long time he has been heedful in the three trainings, devoted to wakefulness, unattached to the four requisites, dwelling with a mind like the open sky, like the palm of the hand," then that monk's declaration accords with his practice. "Just as the waters of the Ganges flow together and merge with the waters of the Yamunā; just so, the practice leading to nibbāna, well proclaimed by the Blessed One for his disciples, accords - both nibbāna and the practice" - it becomes similar to what was said.

Moreover, honour should not be given even by this much alone. Why? For even a certain worldling may have a practice similar to the practice of one whose taints are destroyed; therefore that monk should be tested by various means. For one whose taints are destroyed, even when a thunderbolt is falling upon his head, there is no fear, no terror, no horripilation. If fear or terror or horripilation arises in him, he should be dismissed thus: "You are not an arahant." But if, being fearless, unterrified, and unafraid, he sits like a lion, this monk, whose declaration is accomplished, deserves the honour sent from all around by kings, royal ministers, and others.

"Having evil desires" means endowed with that evil desire which is stated by the method beginning with "Here a certain one, being immoral, wishes 'May people know me as virtuous.'" "Overcome by desire" means ruined and overcome by that evil desire, having become one who is expelled.

"Desiring purification" means looking for, wishing for, aspiring to one's own purification. For since this one has committed an offence involving expulsion, therefore, while remaining in the state of a monk, he is incapable of attaining meditative absorption and the like; for the state of being a monk is for him both an obstacle to heaven and an obstacle to the path. For this was said: "The ascetic life wrongly grasped drags one down to hell." Furthermore it was said - "For a lax religious life scatters more dust." Thus his state of being a monk is certainly not purification. But since, having become a householder, or a lay follower, or a monastery attendant, or a novice, he is capable of achieving the path to heaven through giving, going for refuge, moral restraint, and the like, or the path to liberation through meditative absorption, deliverance, and the like, therefore his state as a householder and so forth is indeed purification; therefore, because of looking for that purification, he is called "desiring purification." And for that very reason, in the word analysis, "wishing to become a householder" and so forth is stated.

"Should say thus" means should speak thus. How? "Not knowing thus, friend, I said 'I know,' not seeing, 'I see.'" In the word analysis, however, without extracting this phrase "should say thus," in order to show the manner in which one speaking thus says "Not knowing thus, friend, I said 'I know,' not seeing, 'I see,'" the passage beginning with "I do not know these mental states" is stated. "I spoke what is hollow and false" means: being devoid of the meaning of my words, it was hollow; with the intention of deception, it was false - I spoke, I said. This is what is meant. In the word analysis, however, in order to show just the meaning by different words and syllables, "what is hollow was spoken by me" and so forth is stated.

"With reference to the former" means with reference to persons who have committed the former three offences involving expulsion. The remainder is evident because it has been stated by the method explained before and because its meaning is plain.

Commentary on the Word-Analysis

199. Having thus analysed the training rule as formulated in the order of its terms, now since below in the word-analysis, "meditative absorption, deliverance, concentration, attainment, knowledge and vision, etc. delight in empty houses" - thus the super-human achievement was shown only in brief, and the authoritative text was established without attributing the offence in detail. When the matter is shown in brief, not all are able to grasp the method in all its aspects; therefore, for the purpose

of grasping the method in all its aspects, placing that same word-analysis in the position of a matrix, and showing the super-human achievement in detail, wishing to show the classification of offences, he said "meditative absorption means the first meditative absorption, the second meditative absorption" and so forth. Therein, by the first meditative absorption and so forth, the friendliness meditative absorption and so forth, the foulness meditative absorption and so forth, the mindfulness-of-breathing concentration meditative absorption, the mundane meditative absorption, and the supramundane meditative absorption are all included. Therefore, one who says "I have attained the first meditative absorption" etc. or "I have attained the fourth meditative absorption, the friendliness meditative absorption, the equanimity meditative absorption, the foulness meditative absorption, the mindfulness-of-breathing concentration meditative absorption, the mundane meditative absorption, the supramundane meditative absorption" - should be understood as committing a defeat offence.

"Deliverance" means well liberated, or liberated from various defilements. And this is called "emptiness" because of being empty of lust, hate, and delusion. "Signless" because of being without signs, due to the absence of the signs of lust, hate, and delusion. Because of the absence of the aspirations of lust, hate, and delusion, it is called "desireless." "Concentration" means it places the mind evenly, establishes it on the object. "Attainment" means that which is to be attained by the noble ones. The remainder here is the same as the method already stated. And here, by the triad of deliverance and the triad of concentration, only the noble path is stated. But by the triad of attainment, fruition attainment is meant. Among these, taking up any single term whatsoever and saying "I am one who has obtained this" constitutes a defeat offence.

"The three true knowledges" means recollection of past lives, the divine eye, and knowledge of the destruction of the taints. Therein, taking the name of even one of them and saying "I am one who has obtained this true knowledge" constitutes a defeat offence. But in the Abridged Commentary it is said: "One who says 'I am one who has obtained the true knowledges' or one who says 'I am one who has obtained the three true knowledges' also commits a defeat offence." The thirty-seven qualities conducive to enlightenment stated in the word-analysis of path development are those associated with the path, and only the supramundane ones are intended here. Therefore, in the Great Commentary it is said that one who says "I am one who has obtained the supramundane establishments of mindfulness, right strivings, bases for spiritual power, faculties, powers, factors of enlightenment, noble eightfold path" commits a defeat offence. But in the Mahāpaccarī and others it is said: "One who says 'I am one who has obtained the establishments of mindfulness' - thus by each individual category, or 'I am one who has obtained the contemplation-of-the-body establishment of mindfulness' - thus by each individual quality therein, also commits a defeat offence." That too is consistent. Why? Because it is said with reference to what arises at the moment of the path. Regarding the realisation of the fruit too, a defeat offence should be understood for each individual fruit.

In the triad beginning with "the abandoning of lust," only the abandoning of defilements is stated. But since that does not exist without the path - for the abandoning of sensual lust and hate is by the third path, and of delusion by the fourth

- therefore, a defeat offence is stated for one who says "lust has been abandoned by me" and so forth.

In the triad beginning with "the mind free from mental hindrances from lust," only the supramundane consciousness is stated. Therefore, one who says "my mind is free from mental hindrances from lust" and so forth also commits a defeat offence.

However, in the word-analysis of "empty houses," since a defeat offence is not intended by the mere statement "I delight in empty houses" without connecting it with meditative absorption, therefore it is stated "delight in empty houses through the first meditative absorption" etc. Therefore, one who, connecting it with meditative absorption, says "I delight in empty houses through such and such a meditative absorption" - it should be understood that only this one commits a defeat offence.

And in the word-analysis of "knowledge," the five knowledges classified as insight-knowledge, mind-made power, diversity of psychic powers, divine ear, and knowledge of others' minds, which are among the eight knowledges stated in the Ambaṭṭha Sutta and others, are not included. Among those, it should be understood that insight alone does not constitute a ground for defeat, but the rest do. Therefore, there is no defeat offence for one who says "I have attained insight" or "I have attained insight-knowledge." But the Elder Phussadeva says: "The other four knowledges too, when not connected with knowledge, do not constitute grounds for defeat. Therefore, there is no defeat offence for one who says 'I have attained mind-made power, diversity of psychic powers, the divine ear element, I have attained knowledge of others' minds.'" That was rejected by his own pupils: "The teacher is not an Abhidhamma specialist and does not know the underlying basis. Direct knowledges are indeed exalted states based only on the fourth meditative absorption, and they succeed only through meditative absorption. Therefore, whether one says 'I have attained mind-made power' or 'I have attained mind-made knowledge' or however one says it, it is indeed a defeat offence." And here, although nibbāna has not come in the canonical text, nevertheless for one who says "I have attained nibbāna" or "I have realised it," it is indeed a defeat offence. Why? Because nibbāna is supramundane, having arisen as supramundane. Likewise, for one who says "I have penetrated the four truths, they have been penetrated by me," it is indeed a defeat offence. Why? Because "penetration of the truths" is a synonym for the path. However, since it is stated in the Vibhaṅga: "Three analytical knowledges arise in the four knowledge-associated mind-moments from sense-sphere wholesome consciousness, they arise in the four knowledge-associated mind-moments from functional consciousness, and the analytical knowledge of meaning arises in these as well as in the four paths and four fruits." Therefore, if one says "I have attained the analytical knowledge of doctrine," or "linguistic analysis etc. analytical knowledge of perspicacity," or "I have attained mundane analytical knowledge of meaning," there is no defeat offence. If one says "I have attained the analytical knowledges," the case does not yet come to a head. But if one says "I have attained the supramundane analytical knowledge of meaning," there is a defeat offence. However, in the Abridged Commentary, a defeat offence is stated for one who says without distinction "I have attained the analytical knowledge of meaning." In the Kurundī too it is stated "one is not freed." But since in the Great

Commentary it is deliberated "to this extent there is no defeat offence, to this extent the case does not come to a head, to this extent it is not a defeat offence," it is not possible to take another authority.

There is no defeat offence for one who says "I attain the attainment of cessation" or "I have attained it." Why? Because the attainment of cessation is neither mundane nor supramundane. But if he thinks thus: "It is a non-returner or one with taints destroyed who attains cessation; they will know me as one of those" - and he declares this, and the other knows him thus, it is a defeat offence - so it is stated in the Mahāpaccarī and the Abridged Commentary. That should be accepted after careful consideration.

Even for one who says "In a past existence, at the time of the Perfectly Enlightened One Kassapa, I was a stream-enterer," there is no offence of defeat. For since past aggregates are being referred to, the charge does not hold. However, in the Abridged Commentary it is said: "For one who says 'In the past I was an attainer of the eight attainments,' there is no offence of defeat, because they are of an unstable nature; but here some say 'There are those of a stable nature.'" That too was rejected therein itself thus: "For one speaking with reference to a past existence, there is no offence of defeat; it is only for one speaking with reference to the present existence that there is."

Commentary on the Plain Section

200. Having thus elaborated the ten matrix terms beginning with the meditative absorptions and so forth, now, in showing the factors of the conscious lie that one speaks when claiming a superhuman state, and in constructing the wheel of abbreviation by means of that very elaboration in order to show both the manner of claiming and the classification of offences, he stated "in three ways" and so forth. Therein, there are three major sections: the simple section, the desiring-to-speak section, and the section connected with conditions. Among these, in the simple section, beginning with the first meditative absorption up to the term "mind freed from hindrances through delusion," for each individual term, each one of the six terms - "I attained," "I attain," "I am one who has attained," "I am one who possesses," "I am one who has mastery," "it has been realised by me" - is combined five times thus: in three ways, in four, in five, in six, and in seven ways. This is called the simple method. Then, by combining each term with the first meditative absorption thus: "both the first meditative absorption and the second meditative absorption," having combined all terms, with that very elaboration, what is called the broken wheel was stated. For that was not brought back and connected with the first meditative absorption and so forth; therefore it is called "broken wheel." Then, by combining each term with the second meditative absorption thus: "both the second meditative absorption and the third meditative absorption," and bringing it back and connecting it with the first meditative absorption, with that very elaboration, what is called the bound wheel was stated. Then, just as with the second meditative absorption, so too with the third meditative absorption and so forth, having combined each term and bringing it back and connecting it with the second meditative absorption and so forth, with that very elaboration, having stated twenty-nine other bound wheels as well, the single-root method was completed. The text, however, is shown in brief; it should be understood in detail by one who is not confused.

And just as the single-root, so too the double-root and so forth, ending with the all-root, thirty-five methods are stated above four hundred. That is: Double-root twenty-nine, triple-root twenty-eight, quadruple-root twenty-seven; Thus the quintuple-root and so forth should be understood, reducing by one each time, up to the thirty-root. In the text, however, even their names are abbreviated, and the thirty-root method is shown as one, as "this is the all-root." And because the term "empty dwelling" is not combined with meditative absorption and does not enter as a heading, therefore, leaving that aside, it should be understood that the combination is shown everywhere ending only with the term "mind freed from hindrances through delusion." Thus, whether combining the first meditative absorption and so forth in sequence or out of sequence, with the second meditative absorption and so forth, or without combining, for one who claims by the method beginning with "I attained," there is no escape; one incurs an offence entailing defeat indeed.

And in this simple major section, stated for the purpose of showing this meaning, this is the explanation of the meaning in brief: "In three ways" means by three factors that are the constituent elements of a conscious lie. "Beforehand he thinks" means in the preliminary stage itself, that person thinks thus: "I will speak falsely." "While speaking he thinks" means while he is speaking, he thinks. "Having spoken, he thinks" means when it has been spoken, he thinks; the meaning is: when what was to be said has been said, he thinks. Or alternatively, "having spoken" means for one who has spoken, for one whose speech is finished, it occurs. One who thus knows in the preliminary stage, knows while speaking, and knows afterwards, "falsehood was spoken by me" - he, speaking "I attained the first meditative absorption," incurs an offence entailing defeat. This is the meaning shown here. Although it has been shown, however, here there is this distinction - First there is a question: "The preliminary stage 'I will speak falsely' exists, but the subsequent stage 'falsehood was spoken by me' does not exist - for someone forgets as soon as it is merely uttered - does an offence entailing defeat apply to him, or does it not?" That has been resolved thus in the commentaries - For one who knows in the preliminary stage "I will speak falsely" and while speaking "I am speaking falsely," it is not possible that in the subsequent stage "falsehood was spoken by me" does not arise. Even if it does not arise, it is still an offence entailing defeat. For the first pair of factors alone is the measure. Even for one who in the preliminary stage has no intention "I will speak falsely," but while speaking knows "I am speaking falsely," and even after speaking knows "falsehood was spoken by me," he should not be made to incur the offence. For the preliminary stage is the more decisive measure. In its absence, it is either spoken impulsively or spoken as a slip of the tongue.

Here, however, the objection of self-knowledge and the objection of combination of knowledge should be rejected. "The identity of knowledge should be abandoned" means: the notion that by the very same mind-moment with which one knows "I will speak falsely," one also knows "I am speaking falsely" and "falsehood was spoken by me" - thus knowing in three moments by one single mind-moment - this identity of knowledge should be abandoned, for it is not possible to know that mind by that very same mind, just as it is not possible to cut that very sword by that very sword. But each former and former consciousness, having become a condition for the arising of each latter and latter consciousness in that way, ceases. Therefore this is said -

"The preliminary stage alone is the measure; when that exists, it will not be;
The remaining two do not exist here" - thus speech is three-factored.

"The conjunction of knowledge should be abandoned" means that these three mind-moments should not be taken as arising at a single moment. For this thing called consciousness -

When the first has not ceased, the subsequent does not arise;
Because of arising without interval, it appears as though it were one.

Now, beyond this, whoever speaks a conscious lie saying "I attained the first meditative absorption," since he holds the view "I do not have the first meditative absorption," for him indeed this belief exists. Likewise, he accepts and approves thus: "I do not have the first meditative absorption." And his mind is of such a nature: "I do not have the first meditative absorption." But when he wishes to speak falsely, he speaks having set aside, put away, concealed, and made non-existent either that view, or together with the view the acceptance, or together with the view and acceptance the preference, or together with the view, acceptance, and preference the nature; therefore, to show the distinction of factors by means of those as well, "in four ways" and so forth was stated. And since in the Parivāra it is stated "false speech is eightfold," together with the perception intended there, another method should also be applied here as "in eight ways."

And here, "misrepresenting his view" - this was stated by way of the misrepresentation of a strong mental state. "Misrepresenting his acceptance" and so on - by way of the misrepresentation of successively weaker and weaker ones. "Misrepresenting his perception" - this, however, is the setting aside of the weakest of all mental qualities. That one would consciously speak falsehood without misrepresenting even a mere perception - this possibility does not exist. But since by a future expression such as "I will attain" there is no offence entailing defeat, therefore "attained" and so forth should be understood as only past and present tense terms stated in the text.

207. Henceforth, everything in this plain great section is of clear meaning. For there is nothing herein - that could not be understood by means of this analysis, except for the meaning of the terms beginning with "lust in me has been given up, vomited out" in the word-analysis of the section on the abandonment of defilements. That is now stated - herein, "given up" is said by way of relinquishing one's own nature. "Vomited out" is by way of showing the state of no longer taking up again. "Released" is by way of freeing from the continuity. "Abandoned" is by way of showing that even what is released does not remain anywhere. "Relinquished" is by way of showing the giving back of what was formerly taken up. "Rejected" is by way of showing the state of no longer clinging again, because it has been frightened away by the noble path. That meaning should be sought from the science of grammar. "Completely rejected" is said by way of showing the state of no longer clinging again even of that which is accompanied by the minutest trace, having been thoroughly frightened away.

The Discussion of the Plain Section is concluded.

Commentary on the Section on Intention to Speak

215. In the section on wishing to say as well, the meaning of "in three ways" and so forth, and the entire classification of the abbreviated sections, should be understood in the manner stated here. For this was stated solely for the purpose of blocking the opportunity of evil persons who seek an opportunity thus: "Since I, having missed my intended statement, wished to say one thing but said another, therefore there is no offence for me." For just as one wishing to say "I renounce the Buddha" who says whatever he says among the phrases of renouncing the training such as "I renounce the Dhamma" and so forth, because he has entered the field, he is indeed one who has renounced the training; so too, one wishing to say any one thing among the phrases of superhuman states such as the first meditative absorption and so forth, who says whatever else he says other than that, because he has entered the field, he is indeed defeated. If the person to whom he speaks understands that meaning at that very moment. And the characteristic of understanding here should be understood in the manner stated regarding the renunciation of the training.

But this is the distinction - The renunciation of the training does not come under hand gestures alone. This false declaration comes under hand gestures as well. For whoever declares an untrue superhuman state to a person standing within the range of communication, even through gestures of hands and other movements of limbs and minor limbs, and that person understands the meaning, it is indeed an offence entailing defeat. But if the person to whom he declares does not understand "what is this one saying," or falls into doubt, or understands only later after investigating for a long time, he is reckoned as one who does not understand. Thus, when it is spoken to one who does not understand, it is a grave offence. But one who does not know meditative absorptions and so forth either through personal attainment or through learning and inquiry, and has merely heard the bare words "meditative absorption" or "deliverance" - if even he, when it is spoken by that person, understands even this much: "This one is saying that he apparently attains meditative absorption," he is reckoned as one who understands. When it is spoken to him, it is indeed an offence entailing defeat. The remaining distinction regarding whether to one, two, or many, whether specified or unspecified, should all be understood in the manner stated in the discussion on the renunciation of the training.

The Discussion of the Intention Section is finished.

Commentary on the Section Connected with Conditions

220. In the section connected with requisites too -having understood the classification of the abbreviation of the sections and the meaning of the terms that have come before in the manner already stated, the sequence of the text should first be understood thus. For here, "whoever dwelt in your monastery, whoever used your robe, whoever used your almsfood, whoever used your lodging, whoever used your medicinal requisites for the sick" - these are the five sections in the nominative case; "by whom your monastery was used" and so forth are the five sections in the instrumental case; "on account of whom you gave a monastery" and so forth are the five sections in the accusative case - by means of these, together with the term "empty house" stated here, the classification of the abbreviation of the sections should be understood in all the terms beginning with the first meditative absorption and so forth stated before. However, since it is stated by way of "whoever in your

monastery, by whom your monastery, on account of whom you gave a monastery" and since "I" is not stated, the decision here is that even when one who acknowledges has spoken, there is a grave offence here, and for one who does not acknowledge, a wrong-doing.

Commentary on the Classification of Non-Offences

Having thus shown the classification of offences in detail, now showing the non-offence, he said beginning with "there is no offence for one with over-estimation." Therein, "with over-estimation" means there is no offence for one who acts with the belief that one has attained. "For one whose intention is not to boast" means there is no offence for one who, not standing in deceit and wilful conduct, with the intention of not boasting, declares something different in the presence of fellow monks in the holy life. "One who is mad" and so forth are in the manner already stated. Here, however, the original perpetrators are the monks dwelling on the bank of the Vaggumudā river. There is no offence for them.

The commentary on the word-analysis is finished.

Regarding the origins and so forth, this training rule has three origins -it originates from body and mind for one who communicates by hand gestures, from speech and mind for one who communicates by verbal expression, and from body, speech and mind for one who does both. It is action, freed by perception, with consciousness, worldly wrong, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, with three feelings - for indeed one boasts while laughing with pleasant feeling, while being afraid, and also with neutral feeling.

Commentary on the Precedent Cases

223. Regarding the decided cases - The case of overestimation is the same method as stated under the unlegislated section.

Regarding the second case - "Having the intention" means having made an aspiration. "Thus people will honour me" means "Thus people will honour me, dwelling in the forest, as one who has attained Arahantship or the trainee's stage, and thereby I shall be respected, revered, esteemed and venerated by the world." "There is an offence of wrong-doing" means for one going with such an intention thinking "I shall dwell in the forest," there is a wrong-doing at each and every step. Likewise, in the forest, in all activities such as building a hut, walking up and down, sitting, dressing and putting on the outer robe, etc., there is a wrong-doing at each and every effort. Therefore, one should not dwell in the forest in this way. For one dwelling thus commits a wrong-doing whether or not he receives honour. But one who has undertaken the ascetic practice, thinking "I shall maintain the ascetic practice," or thinking "When I dwell near a village my mind becomes distracted, the forest is suitable," or "Surely in the forest I shall attain one of the three kinds of seclusion," or "Having entered the forest, I shall not come out without attaining Arahantship," or "Forest dwelling is indeed praised by the Blessed One, and when I dwell in the forest many fellow practitioners in the holy life will abandon the village vicinity and become forest dwellers" - one who thus wishes to dwell a blameless dwelling, he should dwell there.

In the third case too - Thinking "I shall arrange my deportment and so forth properly and go for almsfood," from the task of dressing and robing onwards until the end of the meal, there is a wrong-doing at each and every effort. Whether or not he receives honour, it is indeed a wrong-doing. However, one who enters for almsfood with graceful going forth and returning, etc., for the purpose of fulfilling the duties of the Khandhaka rules and the Sekhiya rules, or for the purpose of setting an example for fellow practitioners in the holy life, is blameless in the eyes of the wise.

In the fourth and fifth cases - By the same method as stated there regarding "whoever dwelt in your monastery," because "I" was not said, there is no expulsion offence. For the expulsion offence has been stated only for one who speaks bringing it upon oneself.

"Walks up and down with intention" and so forth are by the same methods as stated above.

In the case of the fetters - Whether one says "fetters have been abandoned," or "ten fetters have been abandoned," or "one fetter has been abandoned," the abandonment of defilements has been declared, therefore it is an expulsion offence.

224. Regarding the cases of private places - "Extols in private" means he says "having gone to a private place, I am a Worthy One," he does not merely do what was thought in the mind. Therefore here an offence of wrong-doing is stated.

The case of the monastery and the case of attending upon are according to the method already stated.

225. In the case of the "not difficult" matter - that monk held this view - "Only noble persons are disciples of the Blessed One." Therefore he said - "Those who are disciples of the Blessed One would speak thus." And since his intention was this - "For one possessed of virtue who has begun insight practice, it is not difficult to declare the final liberating knowledge; he is capable of attaining arahantship." Therefore he said "I was not intending to make a claim."

In the case of the energy matter, "can be attained" means it is possible to attain, to accomplish, to bring about - this is the meaning. The remainder is according to the method already stated.

In the case of the death matter, that monk, thinking "One in whom remorse arises would fear. But my virtuous conduct is purified, with no grounds for remorse; why then should I fear death?" - on account of this reason, he said "I do not fear death, friend." Therefore there is no offence for him.

The same method applies in the case of the remorse matter as well. The three matters following that are similar to the energy matter.

In the first of the feeling matters, that monk, standing firm in the patient endurance through the power of reflective consideration, said "No, friend, it is not possible to endure by this or that." Therefore there is no offence for him.

But in the second case, because he did not make it personal and spoke indirectly saying "No, friend, it is not possible by a worldling," it is a grave offence.

226. In the account concerning the brahmin, it is said that the brahmin did not merely say "Come, sirs, Worthy Ones." Rather, whatever words came from his mouth, all were connected with the designation of Worthy Ones, such as "Prepare seats for the Worthy Ones, give water for washing feet, let the Worthy Ones wash their feet." That, however, was his expression of devotion, the speech of one who, being of a faith-inclined nature, was inspired by the strength of his own faith. Therefore the Blessed One said: "There is no offence, monks, for an expression of devotion." However, a monk being addressed thus should not use the requisites merely with delight and satisfaction, but should make effort thus: "I shall fulfil the practice leading to the attainment of Worthy One-ship."

The accounts concerning the declaration of final knowledge are similar to the account concerning the fetters. In the account concerning the household, that monk said "One like me, friend, is incapable" because of his lack of desire for and indifference towards the household life, not with the intention of making a claim. Therefore there is no offence for him.

227. In the case concerning obstructed sensual pleasures, that monk was indifferent towards sensual pleasures as objects and sensual pleasures as defilements through seeing danger in them by worldly means alone. Therefore he said: "Sensual pleasures are obstructed for me, friend." Therefore there is no offence for him. And here, "obstructed" means barred, prevented, rejected - this is the meaning.

In the case concerning delight, that monk said "I am delighted, friend, with the supreme delight" by reason of his state of being without discontent in the dispensation and his state of being delighted in recitation, questioning, and so forth - not with the intention of making a claim. Therefore there is no offence for him.

In the case concerning departing, when an agreement has been made thus - "whoever departs first from this residence" - having designated a residence, a pavilion, a boundary, or any place whatsoever, whoever departs first from that place thinking "let them know me as a Worthy One," he is defeated. But whoever goes beyond that place on business for teachers or preceptors, or for some duty concerning parents, or for the purpose of alms-round, or for the purpose of recitation and questioning, or for any other such duty, there is no offence. If, after having gone thus, the desire to act according to his wish arises afterwards - "I shall not go there now; thus they will regard me as a Worthy One" - there is still no offence.

Also whoever, having arrived at that place for some duty, goes beyond that place being occupied otherwise through recitation, attention, and so forth, or being pursued by thieves and the like, or having seen a rain cloud arisen and wishing to enter a sheltered place, there is no offence. Even one going by vehicle or by psychic power does not commit an offence of expulsion; one commits it only by going on foot. Even that one, going neither ahead nor behind together with those with whom the agreement was made, does not commit an offence. For when going thus, all of them protect one another. If, having designated some place at a pavilion, the foot of a tree, and so forth, an agreement has been made in such a manner as "whoever sits or walks there, we shall know him as a Worthy One," or having placed flowers, "whoever takes these and makes an offering, we shall know him as a Worthy One" - there too, for one who acts thus through desire to act according to his wish, it is an offence of

expulsion. If a lay follower has built a monastery along the road, or robes and the like have been placed there, saying "let those who are Worthy Ones dwell in this monastery and take the robes and the like." There too, for one who dwells or takes the robes and the like through desire to act according to his wish, it is an offence of expulsion. But this is an unlawful agreement practice; therefore it should not be made, nor any other of such kind as "during this three-month period let all be forest-dwellers, or bearers of the remaining ascetic practices such as the practice of eating only alms food, or else let all be ones with taints destroyed" and so forth. For monks from various regions assemble together. Among them, some who are weak and lacking in strength are unable to maintain such a practice. Therefore such a practice too should not be made. But such things as "during this three-month period none should recite, none should question, none should give the going forth, the vow of silence should be taken, the Community's gains should be given even to one standing outside the boundary" - such things should certainly not be made.

228. In the *Lakkhaṇasaṃyutta*, the Elder *Lakkhaṇa* who is referred to as "the Venerable *Lakkhaṇa*" should be understood as one great disciple who was ordained by the "Come, monk" ordination among the thousand matted-hair ascetics and attained arahantship at the conclusion of the Fire Sermon. Since he was endowed with an individual existence complete in all respects, possessing the marks of excellence, and equal to *Brahmā*, he came to be designated as "*Lakkhaṇa*." The Elder *Mahāmoggallāna*, however, attained arahantship on the seventh day from the day of his going forth and was the second chief disciple.

"Manifested a smile" means he manifested a gentle smile; the meaning is that he made known, he showed. But having seen what did the elder manifest a smile? Having seen, with the divine eye and not with the physical eye, a skeleton - a being reborn in the realm of the departed - which is mentioned later in the canonical text. For these individual existences do not come into the range of the eye of sensitive matter. But having seen such a form of individual existence, when compassion should have been shown, why did he manifest a smile? Because of recollecting the excellence of himself and of the Buddha's knowledge. For having seen that, the Elder recollected his own excellence thus: "I am freed from such forms of individual existence that are to be obtained by a person who has not seen the truth. It is indeed a gain for me, it is indeed well gained by me." And then: "Oh, the excellence of the knowledge of the Buddha, the Blessed One, who taught 'The result of action, monks, is inconceivable; it should not be speculated upon.' Indeed, the Buddhas teach having made it directly visible. Well penetrated by the Buddhas is the nature of things." Thus, having recollected the excellence of the Buddha's knowledge as well, he manifested a smile. Since those with taints destroyed do not manifest a smile without reason, therefore the Elder *Lakkhaṇa* asked him - "What now, friend *Moggallāna*, is the cause, what is the condition for the manifestation of a smile?" But since those by whom this rebirth has not been seen for themselves are difficult to convince, the Elder, wishing to explain with the Blessed One as witness, said "It is not the right time, friend" etc. Then, when asked in the presence of the Blessed One, he explained in the manner beginning with "Here I, friend" etc.

Therein, "skeleton" means a white assemblage of bones devoid of flesh and blood. "Vultures, crows, and hawks" - these too should be understood as demon-vultures, demon-crows, and demon-hawks. But for ordinary vultures and so on, this form does not even come into their range. "Having pursued and pursued" means having followed and followed. "Were pecking" means they go piercing through. Or the reading is "vitudenti," the meaning being that they pierce with sharp iron beaks resembling sword-edges. "It was making a cry of distress" - here "sudaṃ" is an indeclinable particle; the meaning is that the skeleton was making a cry of distress, a cry of anguish. It is said that for the purpose of experiencing the results of unwholesome actions, such forms of individual existence arise even to the extent of a league in size, and they are prominent in sensitivity, resembling a ripe boil; therefore that skeleton, afflicted by intense feeling, made such a cry. And having said this, the Venerable Mahāmoggallāna, again showing the spiritual urgency arisen on account of compassion for beings, thinking "Beings going along in the round of existence are indeed not freed from such forms of individual existence," said "This occurred to me, friend - 'Wonderful indeed, friend'" etc.

"Monks grumbled" - those for whom that rebirth as a departed spirit was not directly visible, they grumbled. But the Blessed One, making known the Elder's spiritual power, said "Disciples indeed dwell possessing vision, monks" etc. Therein, "possessing vision" means the eye has become, has arisen, has been produced in them; the meaning is that they are those in whom the eye has become, in whom the eye has arisen; having produced the eye, they dwell. In the second term too, the same method applies. "Yatra hi nāma" - here "yatra" is a word expressing reason. Herein, this is the connection of meaning: Since indeed even a disciple will know or see or bear witness to such a thing, therefore we said - "Disciples indeed dwell possessing vision, monks. Disciples indeed dwell possessing knowledge, monks."

"That being was seen by me before, monks" - he says that by me, who at the seat of enlightenment, through the penetration of omniscient knowledge, was making directly visible the immeasurable groups of beings in immeasurable world-systems, as well as their existences, destinations, births, stations, and abodes, that being was seen before.

"Cattle butcher" means a being who made his livelihood by slaughtering cattle again and again, separating the flesh from the bones, and selling it. "By the remainder of the result of that very action" means of that action accumulated by various volitions, which is action to be experienced in successive existences. For therein, when the result of the volition by which rebirth-linking was generated in hell has been exhausted, taking as object either the remaining action or the sign of action, rebirth-linking arises again among ghosts and the like. Therefore, that rebirth-linking is called "the remainder of the result of that very action" by reason of the similarity of the action or by reason of the similarity of the object. And this being was reborn thus. Therefore he said - "By the remainder of the result of that very action." It is said that at the time of his passing away from hell, the sign that appeared was a heap of bones of cattle that had been stripped of flesh. He, as though making that concealed action obvious to the wise, was born as a skeleton ghost.

229. In the story of the slice of flesh, "cattle butcher" means he made slices of beef, dried them, and earned his livelihood for many years by selling dried meat. Therefore,

at the time of his passing away from hell, a slice of flesh itself was the sign that appeared to him. He was born as a slice-of-flesh ghost.

In the story of the lump of meat, that fowler, having caught birds, at the time of selling them, made them into mere lumps of meat stripped of feathers and skin, and earned his livelihood by selling them. Therefore, at the time of his passing away from hell, a lump of meat itself was the sign that appeared to him. He was born as a lump-of-meat ghost.

In the story of the skinless one, for that sheep-butcher who earned his livelihood by slaughtering goats and skinning them, in the same manner as before, the skinless body of a goat was the sign that appeared to him. He was born as a skinless ghost.

In the story of the sword-haired one, that pig-butcher earned his livelihood for a long time by slaughtering again and again with a sword the pigs that had been fed with fodder for a long time. Therefore, the state of having a raised sword itself was the sign that appeared to him. Therefore he was born as a sword-haired ghost.

In the story of the Spear-haired One, that deer-hunter, having taken one deer and a spear, having gone to the forest, killed the deer that came and went near that deer by piercing them with the spear; for him, the very state of piercing with the spear was the sign. Therefore he was born as a spear-haired ghost.

In the story of the arrow-haired one, "a torturer" means a man whose task was killing, having oppressed those who had offended against the king with many tortures, and at the end having shot them with an arrow. He, it is said, pierced them knowing that "when pierced in such and such a spot, one dies." For him, having earned his livelihood thus and having arisen in hell, by the remainder of the ripened result from there, at the time of rebirth here, the very state of being pierced by arrows was the sign. Therefore he was born as an arrow-haired ghost.

In the story of the needle-haired one, "charioteer" means a horse-trainer. In the Kurundī commentary it is also stated as "an ox-trainer." For him, the very state of being pierced by the goad-needle was the sign. Therefore he was born as a ghost with needle-like hair.

In the second story of the needle-haired one, "informer" means one who engages in slander. He, it is said, divided people against one another. And in the royal court, by informing again and again that "this one has such and such a thing, this one has done such and such a thing," he brought them to ruin and misfortune. Therefore, just as people were divided by his informing, so too, in order to experience the suffering of being pierced by needles, with kamma itself as the sign, he was born as a needle-haired hungry ghost.

In the story of the testicle-burdened one, "village cheat" means a judicial minister. Due to the similarity of his action, his testicles were the size of water-pots, the measure of large vessels. For since he, in secret, in a concealed place, having accepted bribes, by giving false judgements, openly committed offences, he made owners into non-owners. Therefore his private part was born conspicuously. Since, in imposing punishment, he placed an unbearable burden upon others, therefore his

private part was born as an unbearable burden. Since in the position where one standing should be impartial, he stood and was partial, therefore there was an uncomfortable sitting upon his private part.

In the story of the adulterer, that being, touching what was guarded, protected, and owned by another - a touch belonging to another - having delighted his mind with the pleasure of filth, the pleasure of sensuality, was reborn there to experience suffering, touching the contact of excrement, through the similarity of his kamma. The story of the wicked brahmin is obvious.

230. In the story of the skinless woman, since a woman is not sovereign over her own touch, and she, having stolen that touch belonging to her husband, aroused delight in others, therefore, by the similarity of action, having fallen away from pleasant contact, she was reborn as a skinless woman to experience painful contact.

In the story of the hideous woman, "hideous" means ugly, unsightly, and repulsive. She, it seems, while performing the work of a fortune-teller and the work of a spirit-medium, having taken perfumes, flowers, and other things from the people by deception, saying "When such and such offerings are made in this way and that way, such and such prosperity will come to you," caused the people to adopt wrong views and false views. Therefore, by the similarity of that action, because of stealing perfumes, flowers, and other things, she was foul-smelling; because of causing the adoption of wrong views, she was reborn as unsightly, ugly, and repulsive.

In the story of the oozing woman, "scorched, oozing, scattered" means she, it seems, lying on a heap of embers, writhing and turning over, is being burnt. Therefore, she is scorched, with a body cooked by fierce fire; And she is oozing, with a body drenched, as drops trickle from her body. And she is scattered with embers, for beneath her there are embers the colour of kimsuka flowers, on both sides as well, and from the sky above her embers fall. Therefore it is said - "Scorched, oozing, scattered." "She, overcome by jealousy, scattered embers from a pan of charcoal over her co-wife" means that one dancing girl of the King of Kāliṅga, it seems, having placed a pan of charcoal nearby, was wiping water from her body and producing perspiration with her hand. The king too engaged in conversation with her and showed signs of satisfaction. The chief queen, not enduring that, having become overcome by jealousy, not long after the king had departed, having taken that pan of charcoal, scattered the embers over her. She, having done that action, was reborn in the ghost realm to experience just such a result.

In the story of the executioner of thieves, he, having cut off the heads of thieves for a long time by the king's command, when reborn in the realm of the departed, was reborn as a headless trunk.

In the story of the monk, "evil monk" means an inferior monk. He, it seems, having consumed the four requisites given in faith by the world, wandered about with corrupt livelihood, unrestrained through the doors of body and speech, playing about according to his whims. Thereupon, having been tormented in hell for one interval between Buddhas, being reborn in the ghost realm, he was reborn with an individual existence resembling that of a monk. The same determination applies also in the stories of the nun, the female trainee, the novice, and the female novice.

231. In the hot spring account, "clear water" means water that is limpid. "Cool water" means water that is cold. "Sweet water" means water that is pleasant-tasting. "Pure" means clean, free from algae, aquatic plants, and mud. "Has good landing places" means endowed with fine bathing places. "Delightful" means producing delight. "Wheel-sized" means the size of chariot wheels. "Flows boiling" means it flows having become heated there. "From where this, monks" means "from where this, monks." "That lake" means that pool. But from where does this flow? Beneath Vebhāra mountain, it is said, there is a nāga realm of the earth-dwelling nāgas, five hundred yojanas in extent, resembling the deva world, endowed with a floor made of gems and with parks and gardens; there, in the playground of the nāgas, is that water-lake, and from there this hot spring flows. "Comes through the interval between two great hells" means that, it is said, encircling the city of Rājagaha is the great realm of the departed; there, through the interval between two great iron-cauldron hells, this hot spring comes, and therefore it flows boiling.

In the battle account, "delight roams about" means the victory drum goes around. "The king, friends, by the Licchavis" - the Elder, it is said, having sat down in his daytime dwelling place and his night-time dwelling place, reflecting thus: "The Licchavis are skilled in arms and trained in archery, and the king is engaging in combat with them," saw with the divine eye the king defeated and fleeing. Then, having addressed the monks, he said: "The king, friends, your supporter, has been defeated by the Licchavis." "Moggallāna spoke the truth, monks" means that, having reflected upon the time of defeat, speaking of what he had seen, he spoke the truth.

232. In the account of the elephants' plunging, "Sappinikāya" means of the river so named. "Imperturbable concentration" means the concentration of the fourth meditative absorption, which is without trembling, unshakeable, and devoid of bodily and verbal agitation. "Nāgānaṃ" means of elephants. "Plunging in and coming out" means having plunged in, having immersed themselves, and then coming out again. It is said that they descended into deep water, bathed there, drank, took water with their trunks, and came out splashing one another; thus it is said "plunging in and coming out" of them. "Making a heron's cry" means standing on the riverbank, inserting their trunks into their mouths, and making a trumpeting sound. "Heard the sound" means I heard that trumpeting sound. "There is, monks, that concentration, but it is not pure" means there is that concentration of Moggallāna, but it is not pure. It is said that the Elder, having attained arahantship on the very seventh day after his going forth, not having cultivated mastery in the five modes over the eight attainments, not having thoroughly purified the states that obstruct concentration, having merely formed a notion of advertent, attaining, resolving, emerging, and reviewing, entered the fourth meditative absorption and sat; having emerged from the factors of meditative absorption, he heard the sound of the elephants and perceived thus: "I heard it while within the attainment." Therefore it was said - "There is, monks, that concentration. But it is not pure."

In the account of Sobhita, "I, friends, recollect five hundred cosmic cycles" means he said "I recollect with a single advertent." For otherwise, it would not be remarkable for noble disciples to recollect this or that past dwelling in sequence through multiple advertents, and the monks would not have grumbled. But because he said "I recollect with a single advertent," therefore the monks grumbled. "There is that, monks, for

Sobhita, but that is only one birth" means: the birth that Sobhita said he recollects, there is that birth for Sobhita, but that is only one, successive, not recollected out of sequence - this is the meaning.

But how did he recollect this? It is said that this one, more than five hundred cosmic cycles ago, at a sectarian institution,

having gone forth and produced the attainment of non-perception, having died without loss of meditative absorption, was reborn in the realm of non-percipient beings. Having remained there for the full lifespan, at the end he arose in the human world, went forth in the dispensation, and realised the three knowledges. While recollecting his past lives, he saw the rebirth-linking in this present existence, and then beyond that he saw only the death in the third existence. Then, being unable to recollect the mindless existence between the two, he discerned by inference: "Surely I was reborn in the realm of non-percipient beings." In discerning thus, he accomplished a difficult feat - as if the tip of a hair split into a hundred parts were pierced by another tip, as if a footstep were shown in the sky. Therefore the Blessed One, in this very account, placed him in the foremost position: "This is the foremost, monks, among my disciples who are monks recollecting past lives, that is to say, Sobhita."

The Commentary on the Precedent Cases is finished.

Commentary on the Conclusion

233. "Venerable ones, the four offences involving expulsion have been recited" - this is merely an elucidation of the expulsion offences recited herein. However, when combined together, all twenty-four expulsion offences should be understood. Which are the twenty-four? First, those that have come in the canonical text: four for monks and four not shared with nuns - thus eight. There are eleven persons incapable of attainment. Among them, the eunuch, the animal, and the hermaphrodite - these three are deficient in basis, having reconnection without root-cause. For them, heaven is not obstructed, but the path is obstructed, for they are incapable of attaining the path due to deficiency in basis. Going forth is also refused to them, therefore they too are expelled. One who lives in communion by theft, one who has gone over to another sect, a matricide, a patricide, a killer of an arahant, a defiler of a nun, one who draws blood, and a schismatic of the Community - these eight, having reached the state of incapability through failure in their own actions, are indeed expelled. Among them, for these three - one who lives in communion by theft, one who has gone over to another sect, and a defiler of a nun - heaven is not obstructed, but the path is indeed obstructed. For the remaining five, both are obstructed. For they are beings who will be reborn in hell in the immediately following existence. Thus these eleven and the former eight make nineteen. Together with a nun who, having generated a liking for the characteristic of a householder, dresses in the garments of a householder, they make twenty. For she, even without having committed a transgression of misconduct, is by that much alone not a female ascetic - thus far these are the twenty expulsion offences.

And further - one with a pendulous organ, one with a supple back, one who takes another's genital organ in his mouth, one who sits down upon another's genital organ - by virtue of these four, they say there are four expulsion offences by analogy. For since the act of two persons who have come to a similar state under the power of lust is called "sexual intercourse." Therefore, because by this method, without having engaged in sexual intercourse as such, one commits an offence merely by the insertion of a passage into a passage, they conform to the expulsion offence of sexual intercourse - thus they are called expulsion offences by analogy. Thus, combining these four and the former twenty, all twenty-four expulsion offences should be understood.

"He does not obtain communion together with monks" means he does not obtain communion together with monks consisting of the observance day, the invitation, the recitation of the training rules, and the various acts of the Community. "As before so afterwards" means just as formerly during the time as a householder and during the time as one not fully ordained, so too afterwards, even having committed an expulsion offence, he is likewise not in communion. There is no communion for him together with monks consisting of the observance day, the invitation, the recitation of the training rules, and the various acts of the Community - thus he does not obtain communion together with monks. "Therein I ask the venerable ones" means in those four expulsion offences I ask the venerable ones "Are you pure in this?" "Kaccittha" means "kacci ettha" (are you in this); the meaning is "are you pure in these four expulsion offences?" Alternatively, "kaccittha parisuddhā" means "kacci parisuddhā attha, bhavatha" - the meaning is "are you pure?" The remainder is of manifest meaning everywhere.

In the Samantapāsādikā, the commentary on the Vinaya,

The Commentary on the Fourth Pārājika is finished.



ABOUT THIS TRANSLATION

This translation is part of the PaliVerse Project - the first complete, unified English translation of the Pāli Canon together with its Commentaries (Aṭṭhakathā) and Subcommentaries (Tīkā), accompanied by interactive study tools. PaliVerse is an ongoing project. The AI translations are continuously improved through experts' revisions and feedback. This text is the latest translation as of the date of download.

PDF Creation Date: 14 September 2026

HOW TO CITE

PaliVerse (2026). Commentaries. 2. The Canon of Discipline - Commentaries. 1. Commentary on the Expulsion. 1. The Section on Expulsion Retrieved from paliverse.org

© 2026 The PaliVerse Project · All Rights Reserved
Centre for Study and Practice of Theravāda Buddhism
Civic Non-Profit Company registered in Greece
This PDF may be freely distributed for study and practice.

PaliVerse.org