

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)
 2. The Section on Initial and Subsequent Meeting of the Community (2. Saṅghādisesakaṇḍam)



PaliVerse

1. Commentary on the Expulsion

2. The Section on Initial and Subsequent Meeting of the Community

1. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning the Emission of Semen

That which was chanted immediately following the chapter on expulsion offences,
this is the explanation of unprecedented terms of that chapter of thirteen.

234. At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One, was dwelling at Sāvattthī in Jeta's Grove, Anāthapiṇḍika's park. In the phrase "Now at that time the Venerable Seyyasaka was living the holy life without delight," here "Venerable" is a term of endearment. "Seyyasaka" is the name of that monk. "Without delight" means with a distracted mind, burning with the fever of sensual lust, but not wishing for the lay life. "Because of that he became lean" means that Seyyasaka became lean because of that state of discontent.

In the phrase "The Venerable Udāyī saw," here "Udāyī" is the name of that elder. For this one was Seyyasaka's preceptor, named Lāḷudāyī, comparable to a startled deer, one of those greedy monks given to delight in sleep and the like. "Kacci no tvaṇ" means "are you perhaps." In the phrases beginning with "eat as much as you like," "as much as there is need" means "as much as one likes." This is what is meant - Eat as much food as you need, as much as you wish; sleep as much time as you wish, whether by night or by day; having rubbed the body with clay and the like and scrubbed it with powder and the like, bathe as much as you wish to bathe; there is no need for recitation, or questioning, or practice of duties, or meditation subjects. "When discontent arises in you" means at whatever time restlessness and distraction of mind arises in you through the power of sensual lust. "Lust assails the mind" means sensual lust destroys the mind, overwhelms it, both scatters it and causes it to wither. "Then having made effort with your hand, release semen" means at that time, having striven with your hand, perform the release of semen, for thus one-pointedness of mind will come to you. Thus the preceptor instructed him, as a fool instructs a fool, as a mad one instructs a mad one.

235. "For those who were unmindful and not fully aware, falling into sleep" means for those who, having abandoned mindfulness and full awareness, were entering into sleep. Therein, although for those falling into sleep the indeterminate life-continuum process occurs and the process of mindfulness and full awareness lapses, nevertheless at the time of lying down, attention should be given. One sleeping during the day should sleep with diligence, thinking "I shall awaken after sleeping only until the hair of a bathed monk has not yet dried." One sleeping at night should sleep with diligence, thinking "Having slept for such and such a portion of the night, I shall awaken when the time has come for the moon or a star to reach such and such a position." One should fall into sleep only after taking up one of the ten meditation

subjects beginning with recollection of the Buddha, or another meditation subject that is pleasing to the mind. For one who does thus is said to fall into sleep mindful and fully aware, without having abandoned mindfulness and full awareness. But those monks, being foolish, greedy, and comparable to startled deer, did not do so. Therefore it was said - "For those who were unmindful and not fully aware, falling into sleep."

"There is volition found here" means here, during a dream, there is volition of enjoyment that is found. "There is this volition, monks; but that is negligible" means, monks, this volition of enjoyment exists, but that, having arisen in a domain that is not within one's control, is negligible and does not constitute a factor of an offence. Thus the Blessed One, having shown the negligible nature of volition during a dream, laid down the training rule with a supplementary rule: "And thus, monks, you should recite this training rule - 'Intentional emission of semen, except during a dream, is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.'"

236-237. Therein, "sañcetanā" means that which has volition existing in it; "sañcetanikā" is just sañcetanā itself, or "sañcetanikā" means that which has sañcetanā existing in it. However, since one whose emission of semen is intentional is one who knows and perceives, and since that emission of semen of his is a transgression done deliberately and with full consideration, therefore, without paying regard to the letter but in order to show the meaning alone, its word-analysis was stated thus: "knowing, perceiving, deliberately, having fully considered, a transgression." Therein, "knowing" means knowing "I am making an effort." "Perceiving" means perceiving "I am releasing semen," meaning knowing together with that very mode of knowing the effort. "Deliberately" means having intended and planned through the volition of delight in releasing. "Having considered" means crushing by way of an attack, having dispatched a mind free from hesitation. "Transgression" means that the transgression of one who has thus proceeded - this is said to be the meaning that has reached the peak of the word "sañcetanikā."

Now, regarding "emission of semen" - in order to show the semen whose emission it is, first by number and by distinction of colour, he said "semen means ten kinds of semen" and so forth. Therein, the distinction of colour such as blue and so forth should be understood according to the distinction of the basis of the seminal fluids and the diversity of the elements.

"Emission" means discharge; but in meaning this is dislodgement from its place, therefore he said - "Emission is called dislodgement from its place." Therein, they determine the place of semen in three ways: the top of the bladder, the hip, and the body. One teacher said "the top of the bladder is the place of semen." One said "the hip," one said "the entire body." Among these, the statement of the third is well spoken. For, excluding the places devoid of flesh such as head-hair, body-hair, nails, and teeth, and excluding faeces, urine, saliva, nasal mucus, and hardened dry skin, the remainder of the entire body, pervaded by skin, flesh, and blood, is indeed the place of body-sensitivity, vitality faculty, unbound bile, and also of seminal fluid. For thus, from elephants overcome by the obsession of lust, seminal fluid issues from both ear-flaps; and King Mahāsena, obsessed by lust and unable to endure the force of the seminal fluid, split open the top of his arm with a knife and showed the seminal fluid issuing from the wound's opening.

Here, however, according to the doctrine of the first teacher, when one makes an effort at the sign with delight in releasing, with as much impurity as a single small fly could drink, having released it from the top of the bladder, when it has merely descended into the urinary passage, whether it has come out externally or not, it is a saṅghādisesa. According to the doctrine of the second, likewise having released it from the hip and it has merely descended into the urinary passage; according to the doctrine of the third, likewise having agitated the entire body and having released it therefrom, when it has merely descended into the urinary passage, whether it has come out externally or not, it is a saṅghādisesa. The descent into the urinary passage is stated here because of the impossibility of preventing it midway once one has proceeded; for what has fallen from its place inevitably descends into the urinary passage. Therefore, the offence here should be understood as arising by the mere dislodgement from its place; but that is only when one is making an effort at the sign - if impurity is released through hand-treatment, foot-treatment, or body-treatment, there is no offence. This is the determination common to all teachers.

Regarding "except during a dream" - here, a dream itself is "during a dream"; it means having set aside and excluded that. But one seeing that dream sees it for four reasons: either from disturbance of the elements, or from what was previously experienced, or from divine intervention, or from an advanced sign.

Therein, one whose elements are disturbed through the conjunction of conditions causing disturbance of bile and so forth sees a dream due to disturbance of the elements, and seeing, one sees various kinds of dreams - as if falling from a mountain, as if going through the sky, as if being pursued by wild beasts, elephants, thieves, and so forth. One seeing from what was previously experienced sees an object previously experienced in the past. For one who sees due to the intervention of deities, deities, out of desire for his welfare or desire for his harm, for his benefit or for his detriment, present various objects; he sees those objects through the power of those deities. One who sees due to a premonitory sign sees a dream that is a premonitory sign of benefit or harm that is about to arise through the force of merit or demerit - like the Bodhisatta's mother seeing the sign of obtaining a son, like the Bodhisatta seeing the five great dreams, like the King of Kosala seeing the sixteen dreams.

Therein, the dream that one sees due to disturbance of the elements and due to what has been previously experienced is not true. What one sees due to the intervention of deities may be true or false, for angry deities, wishing to destroy by means of a stratagem, show things in a distorted manner. But what one sees due to a premonitory sign is absolutely true. And through the combination of these four root causes as well, there is indeed a distinction of dreams.

Now, this fourfold dream is seen only by trainees and ordinary persons, because they have not abandoned perversion; but those beyond training do not see it, because they have abandoned perversion. But does one seeing this see it while asleep, or while awakened, or while neither asleep nor awakened? Herein, if one sees it while asleep, a contradiction with the Abhidhamma arises, for one sleeps with the life-continuum consciousness, and that does not have form-signs and other objects, nor is it associated with lust and so forth; yet such states of consciousness arise in one who sees a dream. If one sees it while awake, a contradiction with the Vinaya arises, for

what one sees while awake, one sees with ordinary consciousness, and there is no such thing as no offence for a transgression committed with ordinary consciousness. But in a transgression committed by one seeing a dream, there is certainly no offence at all. If one sees it neither asleep nor awake, then who indeed sees it? And if so, the non-existence of dreams would follow - but there is no non-existence. Why? Because one overcome by monkey-torpor sees it. For this was said: "One overcome by monkey-torpor, great king, sees a dream." "Overcome by monkey-torpor" means engaged in the sleep of a monkey. For just as a monkey's sleep is of quick turning; so the sleep that, because of being interspersed again and again with wholesome and other states of consciousness, is of quick turning, during the occurrence of which there is again and again emergence from the life-continuum - engaged in that, one sees a dream. Therefore this dream is wholesome, unwholesome, or indeterminate. Therein, it should be understood that at the end of a dream, for one performing worship of shrines, hearing the Teaching, expounding the Teaching and so on, it is wholesome; for one performing killing of living beings and so on, it is unwholesome; freed from both extremes, at the moment of adverting and registration, it is indeterminate. This, because of having a weak basis, is unable to drag along conception through volition; but during occurrence, supported by other wholesome and unwholesome states, it gives result. Even though it gives result, yet, because it has arisen in an improper domain, the volition during a dream is merely ineffective. Therefore he said - "Except during a dream."

"Saṅghādisesa" is the name of this class of offence. Therefore, that which is intentional emission of semen apart from during a dream - this is the class of offence called saṅghādisesa; thus the connection here should be understood. The meaning of the word here is: "saṅghādisesa" means that for which the Community is required at the beginning and at the remainder. What is meant? For one who, having committed this offence, wishes to be rehabilitated, for that rehabilitation from the offence, the Community is required at the beginning for the purpose of giving probation, at the remainder - in the middle for the purpose of giving mānatta, or together with sending back to the beginning, and at the end for the purpose of reinstatement. For herein not even a single act can be performed without the Community - thus "the Community is required at the beginning and at the remainder" means "saṅghādisesa." But without attending to the letter, in order to show just the meaning, "It is the Community alone that gives probation for that offence, sends back to the beginning, gives mānatta, reinstates - not several individuals, not a single person; therefore it is called saṅghādisesa" - this is its word-analysis:

"As to what is said 'saṅghādisesa,' listen to that as it truly is;
The Community itself gives probation, sends back to the beginning;
Gives mānatta, reinstates - therefore it is thus called."

The reason for the terminology has been stated in the Parivāra. Therein, the giving of probation and so forth have been set out in detail in the Samuccayakkhandhaka; we shall provide their commentary in that very place.

"Of that same class of offence" means of that same group of offences. Therein, although this is but a single offence, it is called a "class" by conventional usage applied to a part, or by the collective designation applied to a component - just as in

such expressions as "one aggregate of feeling, one aggregate of consciousness" and so forth.

Having thus analysed the recited training rule in the order of its terms, now, in order to show the means, the occasion, the intention, and the basis of intention of one who commits this emission of semen, he stated the passage beginning with "he emits upon an internal form." Herein, the means is shown by the four terms beginning with "internal form": one may emit upon an internal form, or upon an external form, or upon both, or in space while shaking the hips; beyond this there is no other means. Therein, whether one emits by rubbing against a form or emits by rubbing with a form, it should be understood as emitting upon a form. For it is when there is a form that he emits, not without obtaining a form. The occasion, however, is shown by the five beginning with the support of lust. For at occasions such as the support of lust and so forth, the male organ becomes workable, and it is when there is such workability that he emits. Beyond this there is no other occasion, for without the support of lust and so forth, divisions of time such as the forenoon and so on are not a cause for emission.

The intention is shown by the ten beginning with "for the sake of health"; for one emits through such a variety of intention and not otherwise. The basis of the ninth intention, however, is shown by the ten beginning with blue; for one who examines does so by way of one among blue and so forth, not apart from them.

238. Furthermore, for the purpose of elucidating these very terms such as internal matter and so forth, it is stated beginning with "internal matter means matter that is internally clung-to." Therein, "matter that is internally clung-to" means matter classified as one's own hands and so forth. "Externally clung-to" means that which is of the same kind belonging to another. "Not clung-to" means that which is classified as palm-leaf fans, holes, and so forth. "Both of those" means matter of oneself and of another; this is stated by way of mutual contact of both. It is also applicable in the case of contact together of one's own matter and matter that is not clung-to. "For one striving in the air" means for one who, without making contact with any matter, moves the genitals in the air itself by the effort of shaking the hips.

"Support through lust" means when lust is in a state of strength, or when there is support of the genitals through lust; it is said to mean that a state of stiffness has arisen. "Becomes workable" means it becomes capable of the act of emission, worthy of effort with regard to internal matter and so forth.

"Support through the bite of a caterpillar or insect" means the support of the genitals through the bite of a caterpillar or insect. Caterpillars and insects are hairy creatures. The genitals, when touched by their hairs, become itchy and stiff. Therein, because those hairs pierce as if biting the genitals, therefore it is stated "through the bite of a caterpillar or insect," but in meaning it is said to mean through the piercing by the hairs of a caterpillar or insect.

239. "I will be healthy" means: having released, I will be healthy. "I will produce pleasant feeling" means: the meaning is "I will produce that pleasant feeling which arises through the act of releasing, through the occurrence of what is released, and as a result of what has been released." "It will be medicine" means: this that I have released will be some kind of medicine. "I will give a gift" means: having released, I

will give a gift to insects, ants, and so forth. "There will be merit" means: for one who, having released, gives to insects and so forth, there will be merit. "I will perform a sacrifice" means: having released, I will perform a sacrifice to insects and so forth. What is meant is: having recited some mantra phrase or other, I will give. "I will go to heaven" means: having released, through the gift given to insects and so forth, or through the merit, or through the sacrifice, I will go to heaven. "It will be seed" means: it will be the seed of a child who is a sprout of the family lineage. The meaning is that one releases with the intention "through this seed a son will be born." "For the purpose of investigation" means: for the purpose of knowing. Regarding "it will be blue" and so forth, the meaning should be understood thus: "I shall find out whether what I have released will be blue or one of the other colours such as yellow and so forth." "With the intention of amusement" means: devoted to play; what is meant is that one releases while playing with this or that intention.

240. Now, regarding what has been stated as "emits with internal matter" and so forth, showing how one who emits incurs an offence, and whatever classification of offences there is by way of those terms, displaying all of that, he stated beginning with "with internal matter, he intends, makes effort, and emits - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community."

Therein, "he intends" means he intends "let it be emitted" with volition associated with the pleasure of emitting. "He makes effort" means he makes an effort corresponding to that. "He emits" means for one who thus intends and strives with effort corresponding to that, semen moves from its place. "An offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community" means that by these three factors, for that person there is a class of offence called saṅghādisesa - this is the meaning. This same method applies to the remaining twenty-eight terms beginning with "with external matter" and so forth.

Here, however, two thousand offences should be extracted and shown. How? With internal matter, firstly, with the support of lust, for the purpose of health, for one emitting blue, there is one offence; with internal matter itself, with the support of lust, for the purpose of health, by way of emitting yellow and so forth, there are another nine - thus ten. And just as there are ten for the purpose of health, so for the purpose of the nine terms beginning with pleasure and so forth, making ten for each term, there are ninety; thus these ninety and the former ten - with the support of lust, firstly, there are one hundred. And just as with the support of lust, so also with the support of excrement and so forth, in each of the four supports making one hundred each, there are four hundred; thus these four and the former one - with internal matter, firstly, by way of the five supports, there are five hundred. And just as five with internal matter, so five with external matter, five with internal-external matter, and five for one shaking the hips in space - thus all should be understood as two thousand offences by way of the four groups of five.

Now, in the ten terms beginning with "for the purpose of health" and so forth, whether taken in order or in reverse order, whether taking from below and grasping above, or taking from above and grasping below, or taking from both sides and placing in the middle, or taking from the middle and bringing to both sides, or making all as the root and grasping - to show that when there is intention, effort, and emission, there is no exemption whatsoever, the canonical text stated the variegated

arrangement of broken cycles, bound cycles, and so forth, beginning with "for the purpose of health and for the purpose of pleasure."

Therein, "for the purpose of health and for the purpose of pleasure, for the purpose of health and for the purpose of medicine" - thus the health-term conjoined with all terms constitutes one broken cycle as stated. The pleasure-term and so forth conjoined with all terms, bringing each up to its own immediately preceding term, constitute nine bound cycles as stated - thus there are ten cycles each with a single root; these should be understood by expanding them without confusion together with the double-rooted cycles and so forth. The meaning here, however, is quite evident.

And just as in the ten terms beginning with "for the purpose of health" and so forth, so also in those beginning with blue and so forth, ten cycles are stated by the method beginning with "blue and yellow, he intends, makes effort"; these too should be understood by expanding them without confusion. The meaning here, however, is quite evident.

Again, "for the purpose of health and blue, for the purpose of health and for the purpose of pleasure and blue and yellow" - thus one with one, two with two, etc. ten with ten - thus conjoining the latter terms with the former terms, one mixed cycle is stated.

Now, since for one who, having intended "I shall emit blue," makes effort, and yellow and so forth are emitted, and also for one who, having intended and made effort by way of yellow and so forth, the others are emitted, there is indeed no exemption, therefore to show this method too, cycles are stated by the method beginning with "he intends 'I shall emit blue,' makes effort, and yellow is emitted." Then further, conjoining the very last term with the nine terms beginning with blue, what is called the belly-cycle is stated. Then conjoining the nine terms beginning with yellow with the single term blue alone, what is called the back-cycle is stated. Then conjoining the nine terms beginning with red with the single term yellow alone, the second back-cycle is stated. Thus conjoining the other nine terms each with the terms beginning with red and so forth, eight further cycles are stated - thus the ten-fold back-cycle should be understood.

Having thus shown in detail only the grave offence by way of the many cycles of broken cycles and so forth, now to show the grave offence, the light offence, and the non-offence by way of the factors alone, he stated beginning with "he intends, makes effort, and emits." Therein, by the first method, with internal matter and so forth, when there is the support of lust and so forth, for one who intends for the purpose of health and so forth, makes effort, and emits impurity, a grave offence possessed of three factors is stated. By the second method, when one intends and makes effort but there is no emission, a light thullaccaya offence possessed of two factors. By the six methods beginning with "he intends, does not make effort, and emits," there is no offence.

Now this distinction between offence and non-offence is subtle and fine; therefore it should be carefully discerned. Having carefully discerned, when one troubled by scruples asks, either an offence or a non-offence should be declared, or a disciplinary procedure should be carried out. For one who acts without discerning is like a

physician who treats without knowing the cause of the disease - he encounters difficulty and is unable to cure that person. Herein, this is the method of discernment: A monk who has come with scruples should be questioned up to three times - "By which effort and by which lust have you committed the offence?" If, having said one thing first, he afterwards says another and does not speak consistently, he should be told: "You do not speak consistently, you are evasive; it is not possible to carry out a disciplinary procedure for you. Go and seek your own welfare." But if even three times he speaks consistently and reveals himself as he truly is, then for the purpose of determining offence or non-offence, grave or light offence, eleven modes of effort should be examined in terms of eleven types of lust.

Therein, these are the eleven types of lust: Relish in emitting, relish in emission, relish in what is emitted, relish in sexual intercourse, relish in contact, relish in scratching, relish in seeing, relish in sitting together, relish in speech, affection connected with the household, and forest-produce. Therein, relish in emitting is relish in the act of emitting; relish in emission is relish in the process of emission; relish in what is emitted is relish in what has been emitted; relish in sexual intercourse is relish in sexual intercourse; relish in contact is relish in contact; relish in scratching is relish in scratching; relish in seeing is relish in seeing; relish in sitting together is relish in sitting together; relish in speech is relish in speech; affection connected with the household is affection connected with the household; and forest-produce means whatever flowers, fruits, and so forth that have been broken off and brought from the forest. And here, with nine terms, lust is stated under the heading of associated relish. With one term it is stated in its own nature, and with one term it is stated by way of its object; for forest-produce is the object of lust, not lust itself.

Now, in terms of these types of lust, the modes of effort should be examined thus: In the case of relish in emitting, one who intends with the volition of relish in emitting and who relishes makes effort and emits - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. Likewise, one who intends and relishes and makes effort but does not emit - a grave offence. But if at the time of lying down, being overcome by lust, having firmly pressed the male organ with the thigh or fist, he falls asleep with eagerness for the purpose of emitting, and while sleeping impure matter is emitted - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. If, having calmed the arising of lust by attention to the unattractive, he falls asleep with a purified mind, even if emission occurs while sleeping - there is no offence.

In the case of relish in emission, one who relishes what is being emitted by its own nature and does not make effort - there is no offence. But if, relishing what is being emitted, one makes effort, and through that effort it is emitted - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. When emission occurs by its own nature, thinking "Let it not soil the robe or the lodging," one takes hold of the male organ and goes to a place with water for the purpose of washing - this is permissible, so it is stated in the Mahāpaccarī.

In the case of relish in what is emitted, when impure matter has been emitted by its own nature and has fallen from its place, one who afterwards relishes it without making effort and it flows - there is no offence. If, having relished, one again makes effort on the sign for the purpose of emitting and emits - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the case of relish in sexual intercourse, one seizes a woman through lust for sexual intercourse, and through that effort impure matter is emitted - there is no offence. But because it is an effort towards sexual intercourse, in such seizing there is an offence of wrong-doing; if the head enters - an offence of defeat. If, being lustful through desire for sexual intercourse, one again relishes and makes effort on the sign for the purpose of emitting and emits - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the case of relish in contact, contact is of two kinds: Internal and external. In the case of internal contact, one who plays with his own male organ thinking "I shall know whether it is hard or soft" or through frivolity, and impure matter is emitted - there is no offence. If, while playing, having relished, one makes effort on the sign for the purpose of emitting and emits - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. In the case of external contact, one who through lust for bodily contact touches the limbs of a woman and embraces her, and impure matter is emitted - there is no offence. But one commits an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community for bodily contact. If, being lustful through desire for bodily contact, one again relishes and makes effort on the sign for the purpose of emitting and emits - even on account of the emission, an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the case of delight in scratching, when scratching the genital due to any one among ringworm, scabies, boils, insects, and so forth, if semen is emitted while scratching with delight in scratching alone, there is no offence. If, aroused by delight in scratching, having relished it again, he makes effort upon the genital for the purpose of emission and emits, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the case of delight in seeing, if semen is emitted while repeatedly gazing at the private parts of a woman with delight in seeing, there is no offence. However, for gazing at the private parts of a woman, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, aroused by delight in seeing, having relished it again, he makes effort upon the genital for the purpose of emission and emits, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the case of delight in sitting, if semen is emitted while sitting with a woman in private due to lust arising from delight in sitting, there is no offence. However, he should be made to undergo the procedure for the offence incurred on account of sitting in private. If, aroused by delight in sitting, having relished it again, he makes effort upon the genital for the purpose of emission and emits, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the case of delight in speech, if semen is emitted while addressing a woman with words connected with sexual intercourse due to lust arising from delight in speech, there is no offence. However, he commits an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community for lewd speech. If, aroused by delight in speech, having relished it again, he makes effort upon the genital for the purpose of emission and emits, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the case of affection connected with the household, if semen is emitted while repeatedly touching and embracing one's mother with a mother's affection or one's

sister with a sister's affection, there is no offence. However, for touching on account of affection connected with the household, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, aroused by affection connected with the household, having relished it again, he makes effort upon the genital for the purpose of emission and emits, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the case of forest-gifts, men and women send to one another some kind of gift such as betel, perfume, flowers, scents, and the like, for the purpose of strengthening the bond of friendship - this is called a forest-gift. If a woman sends such a gift to a certain monk who is a frequenter of families and who lives in association with her, and if he, being attached thinking "this was sent by such-and-such a woman," repeatedly plays with that forest-gift with his hands and semen is emitted, there is no offence. If, attached to the forest-gift, having relished it again, he makes effort upon the genital for the purpose of emission and emits, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. If, even while making effort, there is no emission, it is a grave offence.

Thus, having examined these eleven courses of action by way of these eleven types of lust, one should ascertain whether there is an offence or no offence. Having ascertained, if it is a grave offence, it should be declared as "grave." If it is a light offence, it should be declared as "light." And the appropriate disciplinary procedure should be carried out. For what is done thus is well done, like medicine administered by a physician who has understood the cause of the disease, and it conduces to the welfare of that person.

262. In the passage beginning with "he intends, does not make effort, etc.": he intends with the intention of enjoying the emission, does not make effort, and emits - no offence. Afflicted by the desire for the pleasure of emission, he intends thinking "Oh, may I emit!", does not make effort, and does not emit - no offence. He does not intend with the desire for the pleasure of emission, but makes effort for the pleasure of contact or for the pleasure of scratching, and emits - no offence. Likewise, he does not intend, makes effort, and does not emit - no offence. While thinking sensual thoughts, he does not intend for the purpose of emission, does not make effort, and emits - no offence. If, however, even while thinking he does not emit, this simply comes to be the case stated: "He does not intend, does not make effort, does not emit - no offence."

"There is no offence during a dream" means: for one who is asleep, as if engaging in sexual intercourse in a dream, as if committing bodily contact and so forth, for one whose semen is emitted solely by reason of a dream, there is no offence for him. However, when the intention of enjoyment has arisen during a dream, if it becomes within his range of awareness, he should remain still; he should not play with the sexual organ with his hand. But for the purpose of protecting the ochre-robe bedding, it is proper to hold it with the cupped hand and go to a place with water for the purpose of washing.

"For one not intending emission" means: for one who is applying medicine to the sexual organ, or for one who is performing defecation and so forth, who does not intend emission, and yet emits - for him too there is no offence. There is no offence

for a mad person of both kinds. Here, the one who is best in lying down is the first offender; there is no offence for the first offender.

The commentary on the word-analysis is finished.

Regarding origination and so forth: this training rule has the same origination as the first pārājika; it originates from body and mind. It is action, exempt by perception, with consciousness, a worldly fault, bodily action, unwholesome consciousness, of two feelings - by the pair of pleasant and neutral.

263. Among the decided cases, the case of the dream follows the same method as stated under the supplementary rule. The cases of defecation and urination are clear in meaning.

In the case of thought, "sensual thought" means sensual thought connected with the household life. Therein, although non-offence has been stated, one should nevertheless not be given to the course of such thoughts. Among the hot water cases, the first is clear in meaning. In the second, that monk, desiring emission, bathed with hot water striking the genitals repeatedly, therefore an offence was stated for him. In the third, because of the existence of effort, there is a grave offence. The cases of medicine and scratching are clear in meaning.

264. In the cases concerning the path, for the first monk who had thick thighs, while walking along the path, semen was emitted due to rubbing at a narrow place; for him there is no offence because there was no intention to emit. For the second monk, it was emitted in the same way, but because there was intention to emit, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. For the third monk, it was not emitted, but because of the existence of effort, it is a grave offence. Therefore, when walking along the path, if excitement arises, one should not continue walking; having interrupted the walking, having calmed the mind by attention to foulness and so forth, one should take up one's meditation subject and continue walking with a purified mind. If one is unable to dispel it while standing, one should step off the path, sit down, dispel it, take up one's meditation subject, and continue walking with a purified mind only.

In the cases concerning the bladder, those monks, having firmly grasped the bladder, filling and filling it and then releasing, urinated like village boys. In the case concerning the sweat room, for one heating the belly, whether with intention to emit or without intention to emit, when it is emitted there is no offence at all. For one doing the rubbing, semen was emitted by means of moving the genital organ; therefore an offence was declared where there is ground for an offence.

265. In the cases of having the thigh rubbed, it should be understood that those for whom an offence was stated also caused the genitals to be touched - thus it was stated in the Kurundi Commentary. The cases beginning with the novice are clear in meaning.

266. Regarding the case of stiffening the body: "while stiffening his body" means stretching oneself for the purpose of dispelling laziness after sitting for a long time, or lying down for a long time, or doing manual work.

Regarding the case of gazing upon: even if she is wearing a hundred garments, for one standing in front or behind and gazing upon thinking "the sign is in this particular place," it is just an offence of wrong-doing. As for one gazing upon the sign of village girls who are unclothed, what more need be said? The same method applies also regarding the sign of animals. However, for one gazing without looking here and there, even for the whole day, with a single effort, there is just a single offence of wrong-doing. For one looking here and there and gazing upon again and again, there is an offence of wrong-doing for each effort. However, the offence should not be determined by the opening and closing of the eyes. For one who has gazed upon suddenly and then, upon reflection, stands firm in restraint, there is no offence; but for one who abandons that restraint and gazes upon again, it is just an offence of wrong-doing.

267. The cases concerning the keyhole and so forth are clear in meaning. In the cases concerning bathing, an offence is stated for those who struck the water current with their genitals. The same method applies in the cases concerning playing in water. And here, "udañjala" means muddy water. By this same method, all the cases concerning running in water and so forth from here onwards should be understood. But this is the distinction. In the cases concerning the garland of flowers, even though there is no offence for one not intending emission, there is an offence of wrong-doing on account of playing.

The Commentary on the Training Rule concerning the Emission of Semen is finished.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Bodily Contact

269. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the training rule on physical contact. Herein this is the explanation of obscure terms - "Was dwelling in the forest" means not in a separate forest, but at the edge, on one side of the Jetavana monastery itself. "With an inner room" means there is an inner room in the middle of that dwelling. "With a surrounding enclosure" means there is a surrounding pavilion enclosure around it. It is said that having made a rectangular inner room in the middle, it was constructed outside with a surrounding pavilion enclosure, such that it was possible to walk about inside while opening windows.

"Well-arranged" means well placed; in whatever place it was placed, it was pleasing and delightful to people - thus it was placed in each and every such place. For he does not do even a single task carelessly. "Opening some windows" means opening those which, when opened, produce darkness, and closing those which, when opened, let in light.

"When this was said, that brahmin woman said this to that brahmin" means when it was thus said by that brahmin after praising, that brahmin woman, having perceived "This brahmin is pleased and wishes to go forth, it seems," revealing that misconduct done to herself which should have been concealed, solely with the intention of destroying his faith, spoke these words beginning with "From where would he have eminence!" Therein, "one whose self is eminent" is "eminence"; the state of having an eminent self is "eminence of character." Among the terms beginning with "women of good families" - "women of good families" means mistresses of the household. "Daughters of good families" means daughters of good families who have gone to live

with a husband. "Young girls of good families" means those who are unmarried. "Daughters-in-law of good families" means brides brought from other families for the young men of the family.

270. "Overcome" means overcome by lust arising internally, as beings are possessed by yakkhas and the like; or, being lustfully attached in a situation that arouses lust without carefully examining it, as beings fall into wells and the like, one has oneself descended into lust. However, since in both ways this is a designation for one who is endowed with lust, therefore the word-analysis of this has been stated thus: "Overcome means one who is deeply attached, desirous, with a fettered mind."

Therein, "deeply attached" means thoroughly dyed with lust for physical contact. "Desirous" means desirous with desire for physical contact. "With a fettered mind" means with a mind fettered by lust for physical contact to that object. "With a perverted" means having abandoned its natural state, which is reckoned as the pure life-continuum stream, and occurring otherwise; or having changed into a distorted form, having turned into a distorted state - the meaning is that it has turned in such a way that, as it turns, it becomes distorted, and having so turned, it remains thus.

271. However, since this does not go beyond association with lust and so forth, therefore, having stated the word-analysis by the method beginning with "changed means a mind infatuated with lust," at the end, showing the meaning intended here, he said: "But a mind infatuated with lust is intended in this meaning as 'changed'."

"Born that very day" means born on that day, just born, having the appearance of a fresh piece of flesh; for even with one of such a kind, there is a saṅghādisesa offence for physical contact, a pārājika offence for transgressing into sexual intercourse, and a pācittiya offence for sitting alone in private with her and so forth. "How much more" means all the more so.

"Should engage in physical contact" means should engage in bodily association such as grasping the hand and so forth, in mingling of bodies. However, since for one who engages in this, that which is called physical contact is in meaning a transgression - conduct that, being overcome by the power of lust, oversteps the boundary of restraint - therefore, showing the meaning in brief, he stated the word-analysis as "is called transgression."

The detailed showing of meaning, however, is through the classification beginning with "grasping the hand and so forth." Therein, for the purpose of showing the distinction of hand and so forth, he said beginning with "hand means from the elbow." Therein, "from the elbow" is the second meaning. From the major joint. Elsewhere, however, the hand is from the wrist up to the tips of the nails; here, together with the upper arm, it is intended from the elbow onwards.

"Pure hair" means hair that is pure, unmixed with thread and so forth. "Braid of hair" is the name for a bundle of hair made by plaiting together three twists of hair. "Mixed with thread" means made by mixing hair with thread of five colours. "Mixed with garlands" means made by mixing with jasmine flowers and so forth and plaiting together three twists of hair; or even without being plaited, merely a bundle of hair mixed with flowers should be understood here as a "braid of hair." "Mixed with silver" means made by mixing with a string of coins. "Mixed with gold" means made by

mixing with gold strips or ornaments such as pāmaṅga and so forth. "Mixed with pearls" means made by mixing with strings of pearls. "Mixed with gems" means made by mixing with gems strung on thread. For whoever grasps any of these braids of hair, it is indeed a saṅghādisesa offence. There is no release for one who says "I grasped a mixed braid of hair." And here, by grasping a braid of hair, the hair too is indeed grasped; therefore, for one who grasps even a single hair, there is indeed an offence.

"Setting aside the hand and the braid of hair" means setting aside the hand as defined here and the braid of hair of all kinds, the remaining body should be understood as "limb." When the hand and so forth have been thus distinguished, grasping the hand is grasping of the hand, grasping the braid of hair is grasping of the braid of hair, touching the remaining body is touching of one or another limb; whoever should engage in grasping of the hand, or grasping of the braid of hair, or touching of one or another limb, for him the class of offence called saṅghādisesa applies. This is the meaning of the training rule.

272. Now, since the grasping of the hand, the grasping of the braid, and the touching of any remaining limb - all of these are twelvefold by way of classification, therefore, in order to show that classification, the word-analysis has been stated by the method beginning with "touching, fondling." Therein, as to what has been stated "touching means merely having touched" and "touching means merely having touched" - the distinction between these is as follows: "Touching" means rubbing - pressing against without going beyond the area touched, right there itself. For this is called "merely having touched." "Touching" means merely having come into contact without pressing against.

Also, in the exposition of both "fondling upwards" and "lifting up," the single phrase "lifting up above" has been stated. Therein too, the distinction is as follows: The first is stated in the sense of sending one's own body upwards upon the woman's body; the second is in the sense of lifting up the woman's body; the rest is self-evident.

273. Now, showing in detail the classification of offences by means of these terms for one who, overcome, engages in bodily contact with a corrupted mind, he said beginning with "It is a woman, and he perceives her as a woman, and is filled with lust, and the monk, with his body, the body of the woman." Therein, "and the monk, with his body, the body of the woman" means that monk who is filled with lust and perceives her as a woman, with his own body. "Naṃ" is merely a particle. Or alternatively, it refers to that body of the woman, distinguished as hands and so forth. "Touches, fondles" - if he transgresses in even one of these ways, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. Therein, for one who touches once, there is one offence; for one who touches repeatedly, there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community with each attempt.

In the case of fondling too, if without releasing from the body he moves, carries, or sends his hand or body here and there, even if he fondles for a whole day, there is only one offence. If he releases from the body and fondles again and again, there is an offence with each attempt.

In the case of fondling downwards too, if without releasing from the body he fondles

from the woman's head down to the top of the feet, there is only one offence. But if, having reached each particular spot on the belly and so forth, he releases and releases and fondles again, there is an offence with each attempt. In the case of fondling upwards too, for one fondling upwards from the feet up to the head, the same method applies.

In the case of bending down, having seized the woman by the hair and bent her down, having done whatever transgression he wishes such as kissing and so forth, for one who then releases, there is only one offence. For one who bends her down again and again after she has risen up, there is an offence with each attempt. In the case of lifting up too, for one who seizes by the hair or hands and raises her up, the same method applies.

In the case of pulling, for one pulling her towards himself, as long as he does not release, there is only one offence. For one who releases and releases and pulls again, there is an offence with each attempt. In the case of pushing back too, for one who seizes from behind and pushes away, the same method applies.

In the case of restraining, for one who firmly seizes by the hand or arm and goes even a yojana, there is only one offence. For one who releases and seizes again and again, there is an offence with each attempt. The Elder Mahāsuma said that for one who, without releasing, touches again and again and embraces, there is an offence with each attempt. But the Elder Mahāpaduma said - "The original seizing alone is the measure; therefore, as long as he does not release, there is only one offence."

In the case of crushing, for one who presses together with cloth or ornament, if he does not touch the limb, it is a grave offence; if he touches, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community; with a single attempt there is one offence, with separate attempts there are separate offences.

In the case of grasping and touching, even without making any other alteration, one commits an offence by the mere act of grasping or the mere act of touching.

Thus, in these acts of touching and so forth, by transgressing in even one way, for one who perceives a woman as a woman, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community; for one who is doubtful, it is a grave offence; for one who perceives her as a eunuch, a man, or an animal, it is also a grave offence. In the case of a eunuch, for one who perceives him as a eunuch, it is a grave offence; for one who is doubtful, it is an offence of wrong-doing. For one who perceives him as a man, an animal, or a woman, it is also an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of a man, for one who perceives him as a man, for one who is doubtful, and for one who perceives him as a woman, a eunuch, or an animal, it is also an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of an animal too, in every way it is only an offence of wrong-doing. Having noted these offences stated in the single-root method, by this same approach, the offences in the double-root method stated as "two women, of two women" and so forth should be understood as twofold. And just as in the case of two women there are two offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community; so in the case of several women, several should be understood.

For one who embraces several women standing together by encircling them with his arms, he commits offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community according to the number of women touched, and grave offences according to the number of those in between. For they are touched by what is connected to his body. But one who gathers together the fingers or hair of several women and grasps them, he should be dealt with for offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community by counting the women, not by counting the fingers and hair. And for those women whose fingers or hair are in between, he commits grave offences according to their number. For they are touched by what is connected to his body. But one who encircles several women with ropes, cloths, and the like that are connected to the body and grasps them, commits grave offences according to the number of all those who are within the encirclement. In the Mahāpaccarī, an offence of wrong-doing is stated for those not touched. Therein, since in the canonical text there is no such thing as touching by what is connected to what is connected to the body, therefore, including all that is connected to what is connected to the body under what is connected to the body itself, the former method stated in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā and the Kurundī appears to be the more fitting here.

For one who, having grasped hand to hand, with equal lust towards women standing in a row, grasps one by the hand, he commits one offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community on account of the woman grasped, and grave offences according to the number of the others by the former method itself. If he grasps the cloth or flower connected to her body, he commits grave offences according to the number of all of them. For just as when encircling with ropes, cloths, and the like, all are touched by what is connected to the body, so here too all are touched by what is connected to the body. But if those women are standing holding the edge of each other's cloth, and there he grasps the first woman by the hand by the former method itself, he commits an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community on account of the one grasped, and offences of wrong-doing according to the number of the others. For in the case of all of them, by the former method itself, what is connected to the body has been touched by what is connected to the body. But if he too grasps what is connected to her body itself, he commits a grave offence on account of that woman, and offences of wrong-doing according to the number of the others by the immediately preceding method itself.

But one who, with lust for bodily contact, rubs against the cloth of a woman dressed in thick clothing - a grave offence. If he rubs against one dressed in thin clothing, and there through the gaps in the clothing either the protruding hairs of the woman touch the monk, or the penetrating hairs of the monk touch the woman, or the hairs of both touch each other's hairs - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. For even when touching what is clung to or what is not clung to with clung-to kamma-born matter, or touching what is clung to or what is not clung to with anything not clung to such as hair and the like, one commits an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

Therein, in the Kurundī it is stated: "Counting the hairs, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community." But in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā it is stated: "He should not be dealt with for the offence by counting the hairs; he commits only one offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. But one who

lies down without spreading anything on a communal bed should be dealt with by counting the hairs." That itself is fitting. For this offence is on account of the woman, not on account of the bodily parts.

Here it is asked: "But one who grasps the body thinking 'I shall grasp what is connected to the body,' or grasps what is connected to the body thinking 'I shall grasp the body' - what does he commit?" The Elder Mahāsuma says: "According to the actual object itself." This, it is said, was his view -

"The object, perception, and lust, and the awareness of contact;
According to the description as stated, one should be dealt with for the grave offence thereby."

Here, "object" means the woman. "Perception" means the perception of a woman. "Lust" means lust for bodily contact. "Awareness of contact" means the awareness of the contact of bodily contact. Therefore, one who, perceiving a woman as a woman, with lust for bodily contact, even though intending 'I shall grasp what is connected to the body,' touches the body, commits the grave offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community itself. But the Elder Mahāpaduma said that the other is a grave offence -

"When perception has deviated, and grasping too has deviated,
In the description as stated, a grave offence is not seen therein."

This is his view: for one who perceives a woman as a woman, an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community has been stated. And by this, the perception of a woman has deviated and a perception of something connected with the body has arisen regarding what is connected with the body; but for one who grasps that, a grave offence has been stated. And by this, the grasping too has deviated - not having grasped that, a woman was grasped; therefore here, due to the absence of the perception of a woman, an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community is not seen; due to what is connected with the body not having been grasped, a grave offence is not seen; but because of having been touched with lust for bodily contact, it is an offence of wrong-doing. For there is no non-offence for one who touches any such object with lust for bodily contact; therefore it is merely an offence of wrong-doing.

And having said this, he stated this fourfold classification: "Thinking 'I shall grasp one who is lustful,' he grasped one who is lustful - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. Thinking 'I shall grasp one who is without lust,' he grasped one who is without lust - an offence of wrong-doing. Thinking 'I shall grasp one who is lustful,' he grasped one who is without lust - an offence of wrong-doing. Thinking 'I shall grasp one who is without lust,' he grasped one who is lustful - merely an offence of wrong-doing." Even though he said thus, the position of the Elder Mahāsuma accords here with this canonical text: "It is a woman, and he perceives her as a woman, and is filled with lust, and the monk touches, fondles, etc. grasps, or touches what is connected with her body with his body - a grave offence," and with the commentarial decisions such as: "One who embraces with his arms several women standing together incurs offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community according to the number of women touched, and grave

offences according to the number of those in between." For if there were deviation through deviation of perception and so forth, then just as in the cases beginning with "it is a eunuch and he perceives him as a woman," a distinction should also be stated in the canonical text by the method beginning with "it is something connected with the body and he perceives it as the body." But since that was not stated, therefore when there is the perception of a woman regarding a woman, for one who touches the woman it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community, and for one who touches what is connected with the body it is a grave offence - thus the principle of "according to the actual object" is fitting.

And this was also stated in the Mahāpaccarī: "Thinking 'I shall rub the body of a dark-skinned woman lying down covered with a dark cloth,' he rubs the body - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. Thinking 'I shall rub the body,' he rubs the dark cloth - a grave offence. Thinking 'I shall rub the dark cloth,' he rubs the body - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. Thinking 'I shall rub the dark cloth,' he rubs the dark cloth - a grave offence." The method of mixed objects stated by the method beginning with "a woman and a eunuch" - in that too, the offences stated by way of the object and doubt about perception should be understood by one who is not confused about the canonical text.

In the case of body with what is connected with the body, for one who perceives a woman as a woman and grasps what is connected with the body, it is a grave offence; in the remaining cases, everywhere it is an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of what is connected with the body with the body too, the same method applies. And in the case of what is connected with the body with what is connected with the body, and in the cases beginning with what is to be relinquished with the body, everywhere it is merely an offence of wrong-doing.

The section beginning with "It is a woman, and he perceives her as a woman, and is filled with lust, and the woman touches the monk's body with her body" is stated by way of a woman's lust towards a monk. Therein, "the woman touches the monk's body with her body" means: a woman filled with lust towards the monk, having gone to the place where he is sitting or lying down, touches that monk's body with her own body, etc. touches. "With the intention of sexual intercourse, he exerts with the body, he recognises the contact" means: having been thus touched or contacted by her, if with the intention of sexual intercourse he moves or stirs the body even slightly for the purpose of recognising the contact, he incurs an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

"Two women" - here he incurs two offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community; in the case of a woman and a eunuch, an offence of wrong-doing together with an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. By this method, the classification of offences should be understood by the former method up to "he touches what is to be relinquished with what is to be relinquished, with the intention of sexual intercourse he exerts with the body but does not recognise the contact - an offence of wrong-doing."

Here, "he exerts with the body but does not recognise the contact" means: seeing a woman striking with a flower or fruit that he has released, striking with her own flower or fruit that is to be relinquished, he makes a bodily movement, or moves a finger, or raises an eyebrow, or blinks an eye, or makes some other such movement - this is called "he exerts with the body but does not recognise the contact." This one too, because of having exerted with the body, incurs an offence of wrong-doing; in the case of two women, two; in the case of a woman and a eunuch too, he incurs just two offences of wrong-doing.

279. Having thus shown the classification of offences in detail by way of cases, now showing in brief the classification of offences and the classification of non-offences by way of characteristics, he said "with the intention for intercourse" and so forth. Therein, in the first method, being touched by a woman, with the intention for intercourse he strives with his body and recognises the contact - through the fulfilment of three factors, it is a saṅghādisesa. In the second method, just as in the case of striving in the forfeitable sitting upon a forfeitable item, and just as in the case of not recognising the contact when there is no touching, through the fulfilment of two factors, it is a dukkaṭa. In the third, because he does not strive with the body, there is no offence. For one who, even with the intention for intercourse, merely recognises, accepts, and experiences the contact with an unmoving body, because there is no offence in the mere arising of a mental impulse, there is no offence. In the fourth, however, just as in the case of the forfeitable sitting upon a forfeitable item, there is not even the recognition of contact; there is merely the arising of a mental impulse alone, therefore there is no offence. For one with the intention for release, in all cases there is indeed no offence.

Here, however, one who is seized by a woman and, wishing to free himself from her body, pushes her back or strikes her - this one strives with his body and recognises the contact. One who, seeing her approaching and wishing to escape from that, frightens her and makes her flee - this one strives with his body but does not recognise the contact. One who, seeing such a long creature that has climbed onto his body, thinking "let it go slowly, if disturbed it could lead to harm," does not disturb it; or one who, knowing that a woman is touching his limb, thinking "she will think 'this one has no interest in me' and will depart of her own accord," remains still as if unaware; or a young monk who, though seized by a strong woman who has tightly embraced him and wishing to flee, remains still because he is firmly held - this one does not strive with his body, but recognises the contact. One who, however, seeing her approaching, thinking "let her come, then having struck her or pushed her away, I shall depart," remains still - this one should be understood as having the intention for release, not striving with his body, and not recognising the contact.

280. "Unintentionally" means without having intended "I shall touch this person by this means." For indeed, when one has not so intended, there is no offence even if a woman's body is touched during the receiving of a bowl and so forth.

"Without mindfulness" means one is otherwise occupied and there is no mindfulness thinking "I am touching a woman." Thus, when without mindfulness, there is no offence for one who touches at the time of stretching out a hand or foot and so forth.

"For one who does not know" means one who does not know that a girl standing in the guise of a boy is "a woman" touches her for some task or other. Thus, there is no offence for one who touches not knowing "she is a woman."

"For one who does not consent" means for one who does not consent to bodily contact. There is no offence for him, as in the case of a monk led away by a succession of arms. "A mad man" and so forth are according to the method already stated. Here, however, the Elder Udāyī was the first offender; there is no offence for him as the first offender.

The commentary on the word-analysis is finished.

Regarding the origin and so forth, this training rule has the same origin as the first pārājika; it arises from body and mind, it is an act of commission, it is released by perception, it involves intention, it is blameworthy in the world, it is bodily action, it is unwholesome consciousness, it has two feelings - by the pair of pleasant and neutral.

281. Regarding the decided cases - "Touched his mother with motherly affection" means he touched his mother's body with motherly affection. The same method applies in the cases concerning a daughter and a sister. Therein, because whether it be a mother or a daughter, all women are indeed obstructors of the holy life. Therefore, even when one touches with household-based affection thinking "this is my mother, this is my daughter, this is my sister," only an offence of wrong-doing is stated.

However, one who bears in mind this command of the Blessed One, even if he sees his mother being carried away by a river current, should never touch her with his hand. Rather, a wise monk should bring a boat, a plank, a banana trunk, or a log of wood. In the absence of such, even a yellow robe should be brought and placed in front of her, but she should not be told "grab hold here." When she has taken hold, one should go pulling it, thinking "I am pulling the requisite." If she is frightened, one should go ahead of her and reassure her saying "do not be afraid." If, being frightened, she suddenly climbs onto her son's shoulders or grasps his hands, she should not be shaken off saying "get away, old woman," but should be brought to dry land. The same method applies even when she is stuck in mud or has fallen into a well.

For in that case too, having thrown in a rope or cloth and knowing that she has grasped it with her hand, she should be pulled up, but should never be touched. Not only is a woman's body itself not to be touched, but also her lower garment, upper garment, ornamental articles, and even a grass-ring cushion or a palm-leaf finger-ring are not to be touched - that is, the lower and upper garments set aside for wearing. However, if she converts a lower garment or upper garment and places it at one's feet for the purpose of making a robe, it is allowable. Among ornamental articles, however, allowable items such as hair ornaments, bone needles, and the like, when being given saying "Venerable sir, please accept this for yourselves," should be accepted for the purpose of making shell-needle and similar implements. However, those made of gold, silver, pearls, and the like are not to be touched and should not be accepted even when being given. Not only are those things that have come into contact with their bodies not to be touched, but also a figure made in the form of a

woman - whether of wood, ivory, iron, copper, tin, cloth, any precious material, or even one made of flour - is not to be touched. However, for the purpose of use, having received it saying "let this be yours" and having set it aside, it is allowable to break apart those made of all precious materials and the remainder, and to apply what is suitable as an implement to implements and what is suitable for use to use.

Just as with a female figure, so too the seven kinds of grain are not to be touched. Therefore, when going through the middle of a field, one should go without touching even the grain and fruit growing there. If grain has been spread out at a house door or along a path and there is a way along the side, one should go without treading on it. When there is no path for walking, one should determine it as a path and go. If inside a house they prepare a seat on top of grain and offer it, it is allowable to sit down. Some people scatter grain in the assembly hall; if it is possible to have it removed, it should be removed; if not, one should prepare a small bench to one side without treading on the grain and sit down. If there is no space and people prepare a seat right in the middle of the grain and offer it, one should sit down. Pulses such as mung beans and the like growing there, as well as minor grains, and fruits such as palmyra, jackfruit, and the like, should not be touched in play. The same method applies even when they have been heaped up by people. However, in the forest, it is allowable to pick up fruits that have fallen from a tree, thinking "I shall give them to those who are not fully ordained."

Pearls, gems, beryl, conch, stone, coral, silver, gold, ruby, and cat's eye - among these ten precious things, pearls that are unwashed and unstrung, just as they are in their natural state, are permissible to touch. The rest are not to be touched, they say. However, in the Mahāpaccaṛī it is stated: "Pearls, whether washed or unwashed, are not to be touched, and it is not permissible to accept them for the purpose of exchanging for requisites, but it is permissible for the purpose of medicine for leprosy." Even including nutmeg, every gem of whatever colour distinction - blue, yellow, and so forth - that has been washed and strung is not to be touched; but a gem in its natural state, just as it comes from the mine, is said to be permissible to accept for the purpose of exchanging for requisites such as bowls and the like. That too is rejected in the Mahāpaccaṛī; only glass gems that have been made by smelting are said to be permissible. Regarding beryl too, the determination is the same as for gems.

A conch - a blowing conch, and one that is washed and strung, and one mixed with precious materials - is not to be touched. A drinking conch, whether washed or unwashed, is permissible to touch, and the rest is permissible to accept for the purpose of medicine such as collyrium and the like, and also for the purpose of exchanging for requisites. Stones that are washed, strung, combined with precious materials, and of mung-bean colour alone are not to be touched. The rest are permissible to take for the purpose of making knives, whetstones, and the like. Here, "combined with precious materials" means joined together with gold and made by smelting, they say. Coral that is washed and strung is not to be touched. The rest is permissible to touch and permissible to accept for the purpose of exchanging for requisites. However, in the Mahāpaccaṛī it is stated: "Whether washed or unwashed, all is not to be touched, and it is not permissible to accept it."

Silver and gold, whether fashioned into articles or not fashioned into articles, in every

way from the ore onwards, are not to be touched and not to be accepted. It is said that Prince Uttara had a golden reliquary made and sent it to the Elder Mahāpaduma. The Elder rejected it saying: "It is not permissible." In a shrine house there are golden lotuses, golden stars, and the like; these too are not to be touched. However, the shrine house caretakers are stationed at the place where coins are deposited, therefore it is said that it is permissible for them to sweep them aside. But in the Kurundī that is rejected. Only removing rubbish from a golden shrine is permissible - only this much is allowed. Brass too follows the same rule as gold and is not to be touched - this is stated in all the commentaries. However, the use of dwelling requisites is entirely permissible; therefore all dwelling accessories made of gold and silver are permissible to touch. At the place where the Dhamma and Vinaya are expounded for monks, they make jewelled pavilions with crystal pillars adorned with garlands of precious materials; therein it is permissible for monks to look after all the furnishings.

Rubies and cat's eyes that are washed and strung are not to be touched; the others are permissible to touch, and it is said they are permissible for the purpose of exchanging for requisites. However, in the Mahāpaccarī it is stated: "Whether washed or unwashed, they are entirely not to be touched, and it is not permissible to accept them."

All weapon articles are not to be touched, and even when given for the purpose of exchanging for requisites, they should not be accepted. Trade in weapons is not permissible. Even a plain bow-staff, a bowstring, a goad, an elephant hook, and even down to axes, adzes, and the like - things made in the category of weapons - are not to be touched. If someone has placed a spear or a lance in a monastery, the one looking after the monastery should send word to the owners saying: "Take them away." If they do not take them away, the monastery should be looked after without disturbing them. Having seen a sword, a spear, or a lance fallen on a battlefield, it is permissible to break the sword with a stone or something else and take it for the purpose of making a knife; the others too may be dismantled, and some parts may be taken for the purpose of making knives and some for the purpose of making walking sticks and the like. However, when something is being given saying "Take this," it is permissible to accept all of it thinking "I shall destroy it and make it into a permissible article."

Fish nets, bird nets and the like, board lattices and the like, and arrow shields are all not to be touched. However, when they are obtainable for the purpose of use, it is allowable to take a net, thinking "I shall tie it over a seat or a shrine, or I shall wrap an umbrella with it." It is allowable to accept all arrow shields for the purpose of exchanging for requisites. For this is a prevention of obstruction by others and does not cause obstruction; it is allowable to take a board, thinking "I shall make a tooth-stick vessel."

Leather-bound instruments such as lutes and drums are not to be touched. However, in the Kurundī it is said: "An assembled leather drum, an assembled leather lute, an empty sound-box, leather placed on a rim, and a lute handle - all are not to be touched." It is not allowable either to cover them with leather or to have them covered, either to play them or to have them played. Even upon seeing them discarded by people after making offerings in the shrine courtyard, one should sweep

around them without moving them; however, at the time of removing rubbish, it is allowable to carry them away in the manner of rubbish and place them to one side - thus it is said in the Mahāpaccarī. It is also allowable to accept them for the purpose of exchanging for requisites. However, when they are obtainable for the purpose of use, it is allowable to take the body of a lute and the sound-box of a drum to make a tooth-stick vessel, and the leather to make a knife sheath - thus, having taken each requisite for the purpose of making utensils, it is allowable to make them accordingly.

The case of the former wife is self-evident. In the case of the female yakkha, even if one engages in physical contact with a female deity of the Paranimmitavasavattī realm, it is only a grave offence. The case of the eunuch and the case of the sleeping woman are well known. In the case of the dead woman, during the period when it could constitute an offence of defeat, it is a grave offence; beyond that, it is an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of an animal, whether with a female nāga, a female supaṇṇa, a kinnarī, or a cow, it is only an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of the wooden doll, not only with one made of wood, but even with a female figure drawn in a painting, it is an offence of wrong-doing.

282. The case of oppressing is clear in meaning. In the case of the bridge, whether it be a single-plank footbridge or a cart-road bridge, by the mere effort of attempting to shake it, whether it shakes or not, it is an offence of wrong-doing. The case of the path is self-evident. In the case of the tree, whether the tree be large, the size of a great rose-apple tree, or small, whether one is able to shake it or not, by the mere effort it is an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of the boat too, the same method applies. In the case of the rope, where by pulling the rope one is able to dislodge her from her position, there it is a grave offence. Where it is a large rope and she does not move from her position even slightly, there it is an offence of wrong-doing. In the case of the stick too, the same method applies. For even a large tree fallen on the ground is included here under the taking hold of a stick. The case of the bowl is self-evident. In the case of paying homage, if a woman, having massaged his feet, wishes to pay homage, she should be prevented, or the feet should be withdrawn, or one should remain motionless. For if one remains motionless, even if one consents mentally, there is no offence. At the end, the case of seizing is self-evident.

The Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Bodily Contact is finished.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Lewd Speech

283. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the training rule concerning lewd speech. Therein, "pointing out" means having indicated. "Spoke praise" and so forth will become clear later. "Shameless" means those whose moral dread has been cut off. "Wicked" means deceitful. "Without moral shame" means without modesty. "Laughed" means having smiled, they laugh with gentle laughter. "Chatted" means in the manner of "Oh, noble sir" and so forth, they speak various kinds of enticing talk in a loud manner. "Laughed aloud" means they laugh with loud laughter. "Mocked" means in the manner of "This one is a eunuch, this one is not a man" and so forth, they make ridicule.

285. "Filled with lust" means filled with lust through the desire-lust for lewd speech. "Expectant, with a bound mind" is according to the method already stated; only here the desire-lust for speech should be connected. In the phrase "a woman with lewd speech," showing the woman intended here, he said "a woman" and so forth. Therein, "intelligent, competent to understand what is well-spoken and ill-spoken, what is lewd and not lewd" means one who is wise, competent to understand meaningful and meaningless talk, and talk connected with what is contrary to the true Dhamma and with the true Dhamma - this is the one intended here. But one who, even though elderly, is foolish and dull-witted - this one is not intended here, so it shows.

"Should address" means should speak to, should utter various kinds of speech contrary to the true Dhamma. Since for one who thus addresses, that which is called addressing is in meaning a transgression - conduct that, being overcome by lust, oversteps the boundary of restraint - therefore, showing that meaning, he said "should address is called transgression." In "as a young man would a young woman," herein "taṃ" is merely a particle; the meaning is "as a young man would a young woman."

"Pointing out the two passages" and so forth is stated to show the manner in which addressing constitutes an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. Therein, "the two passages" means the anus and the vagina. The remainder in the summary is already clear. But in the exposition, "extols" means he says "you are endowed with the female characteristic, with a beautiful characteristic" - this does not yet reach the head. When he says "your anus and vagina are such, and therefore you are endowed with such a female characteristic, with a beautiful characteristic," it reaches the head, and it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. "Praises" and "commends" - these are merely synonyms of the word "extols."

"Jeers at" means strikes with the goad of speech. "Scoffs at" means disparages. "Censures" means finds fault with. Furthermore, when not connected with the eleven terms beginning with "you are without a sign" that come in the canonical text, it does not reach the head; but even when connected, only when connected with these three - "you are with protruding flesh," "you are broken," and "you have both characteristics" - is it an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the case of requesting with "give to me," by just that alone it does not reach the head; only when connected with sexual intercourse as in "give me sexual intercourse" is it an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the imploring statements beginning with "when will your mother be pleased," by just that alone it does not reach the head; but only when connected with sexual intercourse in such a manner as "when will your mother be pleased, when will I obtain sexual intercourse with you" or "when your mother is pleased, I will obtain sexual intercourse" is it an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

In the questioning statements beginning with "how do you give to your husband," it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community only when sexual intercourse is stated, not otherwise. In the counter-questioning statements "so

I hear you give thus to your husband," the same method applies.

"In explaining, when asked he speaks" means when asked thus "how does one giving become dear to her husband," he explains. And here, even when it is said "give thus, giving thus," it does not reach the head. But only when connected with sexual intercourse in such a manner as "give sexual intercourse thus, offer it thus, giving sexual intercourse thus, offering it thus, she becomes dear" is it an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. In instructing statements too, the same method applies.

In the exposition of reviling - "You are without a sign" means you are devoid of the female sign; it means that your water-channel is merely the size of a keyhole.

"You are merely a sign" means your female sign is incomplete, merely a semblance; this is what is meant. "Without blood" means with a dry channel. "Constantly bleeding" means always bleeding, with a wet water-channel. "Constantly with a cloth" means always with a cloth inserted; it means she always uses a plug-cloth. "Dripping" means flowing; it means your urine is always flowing. "With protruding flesh" means with flesh of the plug protruding outward. "A female eunuch" is called one without a sign. "Mannish" means a woman with a beard and fangs, having a masculine appearance. "Broken" means with the anus and vagina merged together. "With both characteristics" means endowed with both characteristics, namely the female sign and the male sign.

However, among these eleven terms, only these three terms - "you are with protruding flesh," "you are broken," and "you have both characteristics" - by themselves alone reach the head. Thus, these three and the former three terms concerning the anus, the vagina, and sexual intercourse - six terms in all - are by themselves alone productive of an offence. The remaining terms beginning with "you are without a sign" etc. should be understood as being productive of an offence only when connected with sexual intercourse, in such a manner as "give me sexual intercourse, you who are without a sign" or "you are without a sign, give me sexual intercourse" and so forth.

286. Now, showing in detail the classification of offences by way of speaking praise and so forth regarding the anus and the vagina of one who, being overcome, makes suggestive speech with a corrupted mind, he said beginning with "It is a woman, and he perceives her as a woman." The meaning of these should be understood in the same manner as stated in the section on bodily contact.

But this is the distinction - "Below the collar-bone" means downward starting from the collar-bone. "Above the knee-cap" means upward starting from the knee-cap. "Above the collar-bone" means upward starting from the collar-bone. "Below the knee-cap" means downward starting from the knee-cap. However, the collar-bone and the knee-cap themselves are included in the territory of wrong-doing, just as in the case of bodily contact with a nun. For the Buddhas do not lay down a grave offence with a remainder. "Connected to the body" means cloth, or flowers, or ornaments.

287. "For one with meaning as the aim" means for one who is explaining the meaning of terms such as "signless" and so forth, or for one who is reciting the commentary.

"For one with the teaching as the aim" means for one who is teaching the canonical text or reciting it. Thus, for one who speaks having given priority to the meaning and the teaching, there is no offence for one with meaning as the aim and for one with the teaching as the aim.

"For one with instruction as the aim" means there is no offence for one with instruction as the aim who speaks having given priority to admonition thus: "Even now you are without distinguishing characteristics, you are of dual sex; you should now practise diligence, so that in the future too you will not be of such a nature." But whoever, while teaching the canonical text to nuns, abandoning the normal manner of recitation, laughing and laughing, says repeatedly "You are peaked, you are split open, you are of dual sex" - for him there is indeed an offence. There is no offence for a madman. Here the first offender is the Elder Udāyī; there is no offence for him as the first offender.

The commentary on the word-analysis is finished.

Regarding the origins and so forth, this training rule has three origins: it arises from body and mind, from speech and mind, and from body, speech and mind; it is action, it is exempt through perception, it is with consciousness, it is worldly wrong, it is bodily action, it is verbal action, it is unwholesome consciousness, and it is of two feelings.

288. In the Vinītavatthu, in the case concerning blood, that monk spoke referring to the woman's blood-red sign of femininity - the other woman did not understand, therefore it is an offence of wrong-doing.

"Rough hair" means abundant hair with short hairs. "Tangled hair" means matted hair. "Coarse hair" means stiff hair. "Long hair" means hair that is not short. All of this was stated referring to the sign of femininity itself.

289. "Has it been sown for you" - he said this referring to sexual intercourse. She, not having perceived this, said "but it has not been re-sown." "Re-sown" means: in wet-field sowing, having placed seed again in a spot where seeds had not taken root, or in a spot where seeds had been destroyed by creatures, and then watered; or in dry-field sowing, having levelled again with an eight-toothed harrow for the purpose of making even the seeds that had fallen unevenly - she said this referring to one of these.

In the case concerning the path, "is the path sinking" - he said this referring to the passage of the sexual organ. The remainder is clear in itself.

The Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Lewd Speech is finished.

4. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Ministering to One's Own Sensual Desires

290. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the training rule concerning ministering to one's own sensuality. Therein, "dependent on families" means one who frequents families, constantly engaged in approaching families for the purpose of the four requisites.

"Requisites of robes, almsfood, lodging and medicine for the sick" means robes,

almsfood, lodging, and medicine as requisites for the sick. In "medicine as requisites for the sick," here "requisite" means in the sense of counteracting; this is a designation for whatever is beneficial for anyone. "Medicine" (bhesajja) means the work of a physician, because it is permitted by him. The medicine that is itself a requisite for the sick is "medicine as requisite for the sick"; whatever is beneficial for the sick, the work of a physician - oil, honey, sugar, and so forth - is what is meant. As for "requisite," in such passages as "well furnished with seven city requisites," it means an accessory. In such passages as "the chariot with head-requisite, with the axle of absorption, with the wheel of energy," it means an adornment. In such passages as "those requisites for life that are to be procured by one gone forth," it means a provision. But here both materials and retinue are applicable. For that medicine as requisite for the sick is an accessory of life because it protects by not giving an opening for the arising of illness that destroys life, and it is also a provision because it is the cause for life to continue for a long time; therefore it is called "requisite." Thus, the meaning should be understood as follows: it is medicine as requisite for the sick and it is a requisite - thus "medicine-requisite for the sick"; that is the medicine-requisite for the sick.

"Outcast" means low, inferior. Or alternatively, one who oozes is an outcast, the meaning being one who drips; that outcast - it means one from whom impurity oozes. "Having spat" means having expelled saliva.

"To whom am I inferior in what" illustrates: to what other woman am I inferior in what wealth, or adornment, or beauty - who indeed is superior to me?

291. "In the presence of" means standing within proximity, nearby, not far away; this same meaning is also shown in the word-analysis. "Of ministering to his own sensuality" means: service through sensuality reckoned as sexual intercourse is sensuality-service. Sensuality-service for one's own sake is ministering to one's own sensuality; or "one's own sensuality" means desired and wished for by oneself, the meaning being aspired to through one's own passion for sexual intercourse. It is one's own sensuality and it is service - thus "ministering to one's own sensuality"; of that ministering to one's own sensuality. "Should praise" means should declare the virtue and benefit.

Therein, since in the interpretation of meaning "sensuality-service for one's own sake," sensuality, reason, and service are the meaning, the remainder is mere wording. In the interpretation of meaning "it is one's own sensuality and it is service - thus ministering to one's own sensuality," intention and service are the meaning, the remainder is mere wording. Therefore, without regard for the wording, in order to show only the meaning, the word-analysis is stated as "one's own sensuality, one's own reason, one's own intention, one's own service." For when "one's own sensuality, one's own reason, one's own service" is stated, the wise will understand "to this extent, sensuality-service for one's own sake is stated." Even when "one's own intention, one's own service" is stated, they will understand "to this extent, ministering to one's own sensuality in the sense of being desired and wished for by oneself is stated."

Now, showing the manner of praising that ministering to one's own sensuality, he said "this is the foremost" and so forth. That is clear in meaning both in the summary and in the detailed exposition. Here, however, this is the connection of words and the determination of the offence - "This is the foremost" etc. "Should minister" means: she who should minister to one like me, virtuous, of good character, a practitioner of the holy life, with this practice - of her thus ministering to one like me, this service that is so called, this is the foremost of services.

"Connected with sexual intercourse, it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community" means: thus praising ministering to one's own sensuality, whoever should speak with words connected with sexual intercourse, for him it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

Now here, since an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community is stated only for one who speaks with words connected with sexual intercourse, therefore for one who praises service with such words as "I too am a noble warrior, you too are a noble warrior woman, a noble warrior woman deserves to give to a noble warrior because of being of the same birth," there is no offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. But having spoken in many ways beginning with "I too am a noble warrior," for one who then speaks with words connected with sexual intercourse thus: "You deserve to give me sexual intercourse," it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

"If she is a woman" and so forth is according to the method stated previously. Here the Elder Udāyī is the original offender; for him there is no offence as the original offender.

The origin and all else is similar to that of the gross speech offence. The adjudicated cases are clear in meaning.

The Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Ministering to One's Own Sensual Desires is finished.

5. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Acting as a Go-Between

296. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the acting as a go-between. Therein, "wise" means endowed with wisdom, possessing discernment. "Experienced" means endowed with proficiency, endowed with skill, knowing the means, confident. "Intelligent" means endowed with intelligence; she deals with each thing as it presents itself. "Skilful" means adept. "Not lazy" means endowed with energy and initiative. "Suitable" means fitting.

"As if it were difficult" - the meaning is: it is as if it were a difficulty, as if it were a defilement, as if it were a matter of shame for us. "To speak on account of the girl" means to speak on account of the girl, saying "You take this one."

Among "marriage from the bride's side" and so forth, "marriage from the bride's side" means the bringing of a girl from another family for a boy. "Marriage from the groom's side" means the sending of one's own girl to another family. "Proposal of marriage" means the request "Give us a girl for our boy," or the determining of the day, constellation, and auspicious moment.

297. "Of a former accountant's wife" means of the wife of a certain accountant. While he was alive, she was known as "the accountant's wife," but when he died, she came to be reckoned as "the former accountant's wife." "From another village" means an outside village; the meaning is another village. "People" means people who knew of Udāyī's state of being engaged and involved in this go-between activity.

"With the treatment of a daughter-in-law" means they treated her with the treatment by which a daughter-in-law should be treated, such as cooking, having food prepared, and entering the kitchen, etc. "After that, with the treatment of a slave" means after the passing of a month, they treated her with the treatment by which a slave should be treated, such as field work, sweeping refuse, fetching water, etc. "In misfortune" means poor, or gone to a place where one becomes unfortunate - gone to such a family. "Do not, sirs, this girl" means "let not the sirs this girl." "Giving and receiving" means giving and receiving, taking and offering; they indicate that nothing has been taken or offered by us, and there is no transaction of buying and selling with you for us. "An ascetic should be uninvolved, an ascetic would be a good ascetic" means an ascetic should indeed be uninvolved and unoccupied in such affairs; for thus the venerable one would be an ascetic, a good ascetic. Having thus disparaged him, they said: "Go away, we do not know you."

298. "Well-provided" means endowed with all requisites, or adorned and beautified.

300. "Cheats" means those who are cheats with regard to women. "Amusing themselves" means letting the sense faculties roam here and there all around amongst agreeable forms and so forth; what is meant is playing and enjoying themselves. "They made a bet" means they made a wager: "If he will do it, you owe this much as the loser; if he will not do it, I owe this much." However, it is not allowable for monks to make a bet. "Whoever makes it, the loser must pay" - this is stated in the Mahāpaccariya.

In "How indeed could the noble Udāyī engage in momentary," here "momentary" means a short period of time. "Momentary" means pertaining to a short period of time.

301. "Should engage in matchmaking" means should engage in the act of going between. Since, however, one who engages in this, being sent by someone, has to go somewhere, and from the subsequent words "a man's intention to a woman" and so forth, men and women are intended here, therefore, to show that meaning, the word-analysis has been stated thus: "Being sent by a woman, he goes to the presence of a man, or being sent by a man, he goes to the presence of a woman." In "a man's intention to a woman or a woman's intention to a man," the remainder of the text "should convey" should be understood, and therefore in its word-analysis it is stated: "He conveys a man's intention to a woman, he conveys a woman's intention to a man."

Now, showing the purpose for which he conveys their intention, purpose, disposition, desire, and preference, he said "whether for marriage as a wife or for status of being a mistress" and so forth. Therein, "for marriage as a wife" means for the status of being a wife. "For status of being a mistress" means for the status of being a mistress. For one conveying a man's intention to a woman conveys it for marriage as a wife, and one conveying a woman's intention to a man conveys it for the status of

being a mistress. Furthermore, one conveying a man's intention to a woman conveys it either for marriage as a wife, meaning for the status of a permanent wife, or for the status of being a mistress, meaning for the status of sexual misconduct. Since, however, the one conveying this has to say such things as "You will apparently become his wife," therefore, to show the manner of what is to be said, its word-analysis has been stated: "'For marriage as a wife' means 'you will become his wife'; 'for status of being a mistress' means 'you will become his mistress.'" And by this same method, even when conveying a woman's intention to a man, the manner of what is to be said should be understood as: "You will become her husband, you will become her master, you will become her lover."

"Even for a momentary one" means by the lowest limit, she who is called "momentary" because she is to be lived with for just a moment, for just a brief time; the meaning is "a temporary one." Even for such a one, for one conveying a man's intention thus: "You will become a temporary one," it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. By this same method, it should be understood that one conveying a woman's intention to a man thus: "You will become a temporary one" also commits an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

303. Now, in order to show the types of women intended in the phrase "to a woman or to a man" by way of classification, and to show the distinction of offences in relation to them by way of acting as a go-between, he stated "ten women" and so forth. Therein, "protected by the mother" means protected by the mother. Protected by the mother in such a way that she does not arrange cohabitation with a man; therefore in the word-analysis too it is stated: "The mother protects, guards, exercises authority over, and exerts control." Therein, "protects" means she does not allow her to go anywhere. "Guards" means she places her in a guarded place so that others do not see her. "Exercises authority" means she prevails over her by prohibiting her free conduct, overriding her. "Exerts control" means she exerts her own control over her thus: "Do this, do not do that." By this same method, "protected by the father" and the rest should also be understood. Neither a clan nor a religious community itself protects; but one who is protected by those of the same clan, by co-religionists, by those gone forth under one teacher, and by those belonging to one group is called "protected by the clan" and "protected by co-religionists." Therefore the word-analysis of those terms is stated by the method beginning with "those of the same clan protect."

"Together with protection" means one who has protection. "Together with penalty" means one who is under penalty. The explanations of those are quite clear. Among these ten, only for the last two does sexual misconduct arise when they go to another man, not for the others.

Among "bought with money" and so forth, one bought with little or much money is "bought with money." But since she is not merely bought but is a wife because she was bought for the purpose of cohabitation, therefore in its explanation it is stated "having bought with money, he keeps her."

"One who lives by her own desire and inclination" is a "kept for passion." But since she does not become a wife merely by her own desire alone but because she is accepted by the man, therefore in its explanation it is stated "the beloved keeps the beloved."

"One who lives by means of goods" is a "kept woman." This is the designation for a country woman who, having received household utensils such as a mortar, pestle, and the like, enters into the state of wifehood.

"One who lives by means of cloth" is "one who receives clothes." This is the designation for a poor woman who, having received even just a lower garment or even just an upper garment, enters into the state of wifehood.

"One who provides water" - this is the conventional name for one who is taken as a wife by both of them dipping their hands into a single water bowl and saying "Be united and inseparable like this water." In its explanation too, the meaning should be understood thus: "Having touched the water bowl together with her, he keeps her."

"One whose pad has been taken off" means one whose head-pad has been removed and set down - she is one among wood-gatherers and the like, for whom, having removed the head-pad from her head, he keeps her in the house. This is the designation for her.

"And a slave" means she is both his own slave and a wife.

A "worker" is one who works in the house for wages; someone arranges household life with her, having no need for a wife of his own. She is called "both a worker and a wife."

"Brought by a flag" means brought by a banner - it means brought back after going with an army with raised banners and plundering another territory; someone makes her a wife. She is called "flag-brought." "Wife for the moment" is as already explained. For all these ten, sexual misconduct arises when they go to another man. But for men, sexual misconduct arises with all twenty of these, and for a monk, acting as a go-between also arises.

305. Now, regarding "a man sends a monk" and so forth, "he accepts" means that monk accepts the words spoken by that man - "Go, venerable sir, tell such and such a woman protected by the mother: 'Be, it is said, the wife of such and such a man, bought with money'" - by saying "Very well, lay follower" or "Let it be so" or "I shall inform her," or by making a verbal expression in any manner whatsoever, or by nodding the head and so forth. "Investigates" means having thus accepted, he goes to the presence of that woman and conveys that message. "Reports back" means when he has conveyed it, whether that woman accepts saying "Very well," or refuses, or remains silent out of shyness, he comes back again and informs that man of the outcome.

To this extent, through this fulfilment of the three factors known as accepting, conveying, and reporting back, there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. Whether she becomes his wife or not, that is irrelevant. However, if he, having been sent to the woman protected by the mother, without seeing her, conveys that message to her mother, it is called "investigated outside,"

and therefore it is a deviation - so said the Elder Mahāpaduma. But the Elder Mahāsuma said: whether it be the mother or the father, or even a household slave at the very least, or anyone else whosoever who will accomplish that task, even when it is spoken to that person, it is not called "investigated outside"; at the time of the fulfilment of the three factors, it is indeed an offence.

Is it not the case that just as one wishing to say "I renounce the Buddha," having missed, were to say "I renounce the Dhamma," his training would be renounced? Or just as one wishing to say "I attain the first meditative absorption," having missed, were to say "I attain the second meditative absorption," he would have committed a pārājika offence. He said: this is of the same kind. Moreover, this accords with the statement "he accepts, having had a pupil investigate, he himself reports back - an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community"; therefore it is well spoken.

And just as when one who has been told "tell the woman protected by the mother," having gone and spoken to the mother and others who are capable of conveying the message to her, there is no deviation; even so, when instead of saying "Be, it is said, the wife of such and such a man, bought with money," one says using any one of the terms stated in the canonical text such as "a wife living by consent" and so forth, or even using any one of the terms not stated therein but indicative of cohabitation, such as "Be, it is said, the wife of such and such a man, his spouse, his consort, the mother of his children, his mistress of the house, his lady of the house, his cook, his obedient wife, his attendant" and so forth - for one speaking thus too there is no deviation; with the fulfilment of the three factors it is indeed an offence. However, for one who has been sent with the instruction "tell the woman protected by the mother," having gone and spoken to any one among others such as those protected by the father and so forth, there is a deviation. The same method applies also in the cases beginning with "tell the woman protected by the father."

Here the only distinction is in the variation of the abbreviation according to the single-root, double-root and so forth, such as "the man's mother sends a monk, the mother of the woman protected by the mother sends a monk," and according to the root positions. Since that too can be understood by following the canonical text itself, as the method has been stated previously, we did not make the effort to show its analysis.

338. Now, regarding the two sets of four beginning with "he accepts," in the first set of four, by the first clause, with the fulfilment of three factors, there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community; in the middle two, with the fulfilment of two factors, there is a grave offence; at the end, with one, with the fulfilment of one factor, there is an offence of wrong-doing. In the second set of four, by the first clause, with the fulfilment of two factors, there is a grave offence; in the middle two, with the fulfilment of one factor, there is an offence of wrong-doing; at the end, with one, due to the absence of factors, there is no offence. Therein, "he accepts" means he accepts the message of the one who commands. "He investigates" means having gone to the place to which he was sent, he informs her. "He reports back" means having come back again, he informs the original person.

"He does not report back" means having informed her, he departs from that very place. "He accepts but does not investigate" means when told by a man "Go to such and such a person and speak," saying "Very well," he accepts his message, and whether having forgotten it or not having forgotten it, having gone to her presence on some other errand, he sits down speaking some conversation or other; to this extent it is called "he accepts but does not investigate." Then that woman herself says to him "It seems your supporter wishes to take me into his household," and having said thus, she says either "I shall become his wife" or "I shall not become his wife." He, neither rejoicing at nor rejecting her words, remaining silent, rising from his seat, having come to the presence of that man, informs him of that occurrence; to this extent it is called "he does not investigate but reports back." "He does not investigate and does not report back" means he merely accepts at the time of conveying the message, but does not do the other two.

"He does not accept, investigates, and reports back" means some man speaks such a conversation in the place where the monk is standing or sitting; the monk, though not sent by him, acting as if sent, having gone to the woman's presence and having investigated in the manner of saying "Become, it seems, the wife of such and such a person" and so forth, having come back again, informs him of her willingness or unwillingness. Having investigated in that same manner but not reporting back, it is called "he does not accept, investigates, and does not report back." Having gone in that same manner but without investigating, having heard the conversation initiated by her, coming back and informing him in the manner stated in the third clause of the first set of four, it is called "he does not accept, does not investigate, and reports back." The fourth clause is self-evident.

The method beginning with "he commands many monks" is also self-evident. But just as many monks incur offences in respect of a single case, so it should be understood that even for one monk there are many offences in respect of many cases. How? A man commands a monk: "Go, venerable sir, in such and such a mansion there are standing about sixty or about seventy women; tell them 'Become, it seems, the wives of such and such a person.'" He, having accepted, having gone there, having informed them, reports back that message again. However many women there are, that many offences he incurs. For this has been stated in the Parivāra as well:

"By merely the extent of a step taken, and by a word spoken;
All the grave ones that are remediable;
One might commit sixty-four offences together;
This question was devised by the skilful."

It is said that this question was stated on account of this reason. And here "sixty-four offences" was stated for elegance of expression. But one acting in this way could incur even a hundred or even a thousand. And just as for one sent by one man there are many offences in respect of many women, so when one man sends many monks to the presence of one woman, there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community for all. One man sends many monks to the presence of many women - there are offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community according to the number of women. Many men send one monk to the presence of one woman - there are offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings

of the Community according to the number of men. Many men send one monk to the presence of many women - there are offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community according to the number of cases. Many men send many monks to the presence of one woman - there are offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community according to the number of cases. Many men send many monks to the presence of many women - there are offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community according to the number of cases. This same method applies also in the cases beginning with "one woman sends one monk." And here the classification of similar and dissimilar cases is indeed immeasurable; even for one who performs the act of go-between for one's mother or father or for the five co-religionists, there is indeed an offence.

The set of four beginning with "A man commands a monk: 'Go, venerable sir'" is stated for the purpose of showing the classification of offences according to the factors. In its last clause, "the pupil, having investigated, reports back externally" means that he comes back and, without informing the teacher, goes directly to that man and informs him. "An offence of grave transgression for both" means: for the teacher, a grave offence by two factors - because of having accepted and because of having had another investigate; for the pupil, a grave offence by two factors - because of having investigated and because of having reported back. The remainder is well-known.

339. "While going he accomplishes" means he accepts and investigates. "While coming he deceives" means he does not bring back. "While going he deceives" means he does not accept. "While coming he accomplishes" means he investigates and brings back. Thus in both cases, with two factors, there is a grave offence. In the third clause there is an offence; in the fourth there is no offence.

340. Regarding "there is no offence for one who goes on business for the Community, or for a shrine, or for one who is ill, for a mad man, for the first offender" - here, the Community of monks has an uposatha hall or some unfinished work. There, for the purpose of food and wages for the craftsmen, a male lay follower might send a monk to a female lay follower, or a female lay follower to a male lay follower; for one going on such business for the Community, there is no offence. The same method applies also when shrine work is being done. For the purpose of medicine for one who is ill too, there is no offence for one who goes having been sent by a male lay follower to a female lay follower, or by a female lay follower to a male lay follower. The mad man and the first offender are according to the method already stated.

The commentary on the word-analysis is finished.

Regarding the origins and so forth, this training rule has six origins. It originates from the body for one who, having received a message through a bodily gesture such as a nod of the head, goes and investigates through hand signals, then comes back and reports through hand signals alone. It originates from speech for one who, while sitting in the sitting hall, when someone says "such-and-such a woman will come, you should ascertain her mind," accepts saying "very well," speaks to her when she comes, and when she has gone, reports to that man when he arrives again. It also originates from speech alone for one who, having received the message verbally

saying "very well," goes to her house on some other business, or upon seeing her while going elsewhere, investigates through verbal expression alone, then departing from there on some other business, upon seeing that man at some point, reports to him. However, for one who does not know the rule, it originates from body and speech even for one whose taints are destroyed. How? If his mother and father, having become angry, are to be considered as separated, and the elder father says to that monk who has come to the house: "Dear son, your mother has abandoned me, an old man, and gone to her relatives' family. Go and send her to attend to me." If he goes and tells her that, and then reports to the father her coming or not coming, it is a saṅghādisesa offence. These are the three origins without intention.

However, for one who, knowing the rule, engages in matchmaking by these same three methods, it originates from body and mind, from speech and mind, and from body, speech and mind. These are the three origins with intention through knowing the rule. It is action, not liberation through the attainment of cessation of perception, an offence by rule, bodily action, verbal action; herein there are three types of consciousness according to wholesome and so forth, and three types of feeling according to pleasant and so forth.

341. In the cases of settled matters, in the first group of five cases, there is an offence of wrong-doing merely because of having accepted the commission.

In the matter of a quarrel, he made friendly overtures - having persuaded her, again leading her back to the house.

He made pleasant conversation. "Not one who can be addressed" means she has not been dismissed; that is the meaning. For whichever woman, in whatever manner, in whatever regions, has been dismissed, she is indeed dismissed, she has gone beyond the status of a wife - this one is called "one who can be addressed." But this one was not one who could be addressed, having quarrelled for some reason and gone away; therefore here the Blessed One said "there is no offence." Since, however, in the case of bodily contact a grave offence has been stated regarding a female yakkha, therefore it should be understood that in the case of lewd speech and so forth as well, female yakkhas and female petas are also grounds for a grave offence. But this matter has not been discussed in the commentaries. The remainder is of manifest meaning everywhere.

The Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Acting as a Go-Between is finished.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Building a Hut

342. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning hut-building. Therein, "the Āḷavaka" means boys born in the Āḷavī country were called Āḷavaka, and even at the time of their going forth they were known as "Āḷavaka." Referring to them it is said "the monks of Āḷavī." "Begged for themselves" means with materials obtained by begging themselves. "Were having built" means they both built and had others build; it is said that they, having abandoned both duties in the dispensation - the duty of insight and the duty of study - took up only the duty of new construction as their task. "Without a sponsor" means without an owner; the meaning is devoid of a donor who would have it built. "Destined for themselves" means undertaken for themselves, for their own benefit; this is the meaning. "Without a proper measure" means without a

determined measure such as "they will be completed with this much," of undetermined measure; or of excessive measure, of great measure; this is the meaning.

"Much given to begging" means begging alone is abundant for them, other work is sluggish. "Much given to asking" should be understood in the same way. However, in meaning there is no difference here; this is the designation for those who beg repeatedly "give a man, give a man's labour." Therein, it is not allowable to ask for a man by way of permanent acquisition; but it is allowable to ask "give a man" for the purpose of companionship or for the purpose of doing work. "A man's labour" refers to manual work that is to be done by a man; it is allowable to ask for that. Manual work is not any material thing; therefore, except for the own work of deer-hunters, fishermen and the like, all the rest is allowable. Whether asked "What have you come for, Venerable Sir, for what work?" or not asked, it is allowable to request; there is no fault on account of asking. Therefore, deer-hunters and the like should not be asked for their own work, nor should they be asked without specifying "give manual labour"; for if asked thus, they, having dismissed the monks saying "Very well, Venerable Sir," might even kill deer and bring them. Rather, one should ask by specifying "there is some work to be done at the monastery, give manual labour for that." Even a farmer or anyone else engaged in their own task, having taken ploughs, yokes and other implements, going to plough or to sow or to reap - it is indeed allowable to ask any of them for manual labour. But whoever is a leftover-eater or any other idle person who dwells talking useless talk or sleeping - it is allowable to have such a person do whatever one wishes without even asking, saying "come here, do this or that."

They state this method for the purpose of illustrating the complete allowability of manual labour. For if a monk wishes to have a mansion built, for the purpose of pillars he should go to the house of stone-cutters and say "it is allowable to obtain manual labour, lay followers." "What is to be done, Venerable Sir?" "Stone pillars are to be quarried and given." If they either quarry and give them, or give their own pillars that have been quarried and set aside, it is allowable. And if they say - "We do not have the time to do the manual labour, Venerable Sir; have others quarry them, we will give the payment" - having had them quarried, it is allowable to say "give the payment to the men who quarried the stone pillars." By this same method, for the purpose of timber for a mansion one should go to carpenters, for the purpose of bricks to brick-makers, for the purpose of roofing to house-roofers, for the purpose of decorative work to painters - for whatever purpose there is a need, it is allowable to go to the respective craftsmen for that respective purpose and ask for manual labour. And by way of asking for manual labour, it is allowable to accept everything obtained whether by way of permanent acquisition or by provision of food-wages. And when having things brought from the forest, everything that is uninhabited should be had brought.

Not only by one wishing to have a mansion built, but also by one wishing to have beds, chairs, bowls, water-strainers, water-pots, robes and the like made, having obtained wood, metal, thread and the like, one should approach the respective craftsmen and request manual labour in the manner already stated. And by means of requesting manual labour, whatever is obtained whether through outright gift or through provision of food-wages, all of it should be accepted. But if they do not wish

to do it and expect food-wages, impermissible money and the like should not be given. It is permissible to seek rice and the like through the practice of the alms round and give it.

Having had a bowl made by means of manual labour and having had it fired in the same way, when one has entered the inner village for the purpose of oiling oil for wiping the newly fired bowl, and when it is noticed that one has come for almsfood and gruel or rice is brought, the bowl should be covered with the hand. If a female lay follower asks "What is it, Venerable Sir?", one should say "The newly fired bowl needs wiping oil." If she says "Give it, Venerable Sir" and takes the bowl, wipes it with oil, fills it with gruel or rice and gives it, there is no asking, and it is permissible to accept it.

Monks, having walked for almsfood early in the morning and having gone to the sitting hall, stand not seeing a seat. If there lay followers, having seen the monks standing, themselves have seats brought, those who are leaving after sitting should go having taken leave. Even for those who have gone without taking leave, there is no liability for what is lost, but going after taking leave is the proper conduct. If seats have been brought after monks have said "Bring seats", one should go only after taking leave. For those who have gone without taking leave, there is both a breach of proper conduct and liability for what is lost. The same method applies also to spreads, blankets and the like.

When there are many flies, one should say "Bring a fly-fan." They bring neem branches and the like; having had them made allowable, they should be accepted. When the water vessel in the sitting hall is empty, one should not say "Take the water-pot." For one placing the water-pot into an empty vessel might break it; but it is permissible to say "Go to the river or the pond and bring water." It is not permissible to say "Bring it from the house", nor should what is brought be used. When those taking their meal in the sitting hall or in the forest, if any leaf or fruit that has grown there, that is unoccupied, that is worthy of extra-breakage, and if one has someone doing some work bring it, it is permissible to have it brought by means of manual labour and to use it. But manual labour should not be had done by shameless monks or novices. This, for now, is the method regarding a man's labour.

But it is not permissible to have an ox brought from a place of non-relatives and the uninvited; for one who has it brought, there is an offence of wrong-doing. Even from a place of relatives and the invited, it is not permissible to request as an outright gift, but by the method of temporary use it is permissible everywhere. And an ox thus obtained should be looked after and cared for, and the owners should be made to take it back. If its foot or horn is broken or it is lost, if the owners accept it back, that is good. If they do not accept it back, there is liability. If they say "We give it to you", it should not be accepted. But when they say "We give it to the monastery", one should say "Inform the monastery attendants for the purpose of looking after it."

It is also not permissible to say "Give a cart" to non-relatives and the uninvited; it is indeed an asking and one commits an offence of wrong-doing. But at a place of relatives and the invited it is permissible; temporary use is permissible, and having done the work it should be given back. If the wheel-rims and the like break, they should be restored to their original condition and given back. If it is lost, there is

liability. When they say "We give it to you", it is permissible to accept what is called a wooden article. This is the method for adzes, hatchets, axes, spades and chisels. And for creepers and the like that are possessed by others. And only in creepers and the like that are sufficient for heavy articles is there an asking, not for anything less than that.

However, it is allowable to have anything that is uninhabited brought. For what is called asking is only in regard to a place that is guarded and protected. That is not allowable in any way whatsoever regarding the two requisites, but regarding the requisite of lodging, only the mere asking "bring it, give it" is not allowable; indirect speech, hinting, and making a sign are allowable. Therein, for one who wishes for an uposatha hall, or a dining hall, or any other lodging whatsoever, speech by way of "Indeed, it would be allowable to build such a lodging in this place," or "it would be suitable," or "it would be fitting," and so forth, is called indirect speech. "Lay followers, where do you dwell?" "In a mansion, venerable sir." "But, lay followers, is a mansion not allowable for monks?" - such speech and the like is called hinting. Having seen people, he stretches out a rope, has stakes driven in. When it is said "What is this, venerable sir?" then such action as "We shall build a dwelling here" is called making a sign. But regarding the requisite for the sick, even asking is allowable, let alone indirect speech and the rest.

"People, troubled by the begging, troubled by the asking" means afflicted by that begging and asking of those monks. "Were agitated" means they experienced alarm, disturbance, and agitation, thinking "What will they have us bring?" "Were alarmed" means having suddenly become frightened as if seeing a snake, they withdrew. "Fled" means they fled from afar in whatever direction. "Went another way" means abandoning the path they had taken, turning back, they went taking the left or the right; they even closed their doors.

344. "Once in the past, monks": thus the Blessed One, having reproved those monks and having given a talk on the Teaching appropriate to that, making manifest once again the fault of making requests, showed three stories by this method beginning with "Once in the past, monks." Therein, "Mañikaṇṭha" means that king of serpents, it is said, goes about having adorned his neck with a precious jewel that grants all desires; therefore he was known as "Mañikaṇṭha" (Jewel-neck). "Having made a great hood over the top of his head, stood" means that, it is said, the younger of those two sages was one who dwelt in friendliness; therefore the king of serpents, having crossed the river, having created a divine appearance, having sat down near him, having engaged in friendly conversation, having abandoned that divine appearance and having resumed his own form, having encircled that sage, making a display of devotion, having made a great hood over the top of his head, holding it like an umbrella, having stood for a moment, departed. Therefore it is said "having made a great hood over the top of his head, stood." "A jewel as an ornament on his neck" means a jewel adorned on his neck; the meaning is "worn." "Stood to one side" means having come in that divine appearance and exchanging friendly greetings with the ascetic, he stood in one place.

"My food and drink" means my food and drink. "Abundant" means plentiful. "Lofty" means excellent. "You are an excessive beggar" means an exceedingly persistent beggar; the meaning is "you ask again and again." "Youth" means a young man, a

person endowed with strength who has reached the prime of youth. "Gravel" is called dark stone; one washed on it is called "gravel-washed"; "gravel-washed hands" means having gravel-washed hands; the meaning is one with a sword sharpened by washing on stone in hand. Just as that man with sword in hand would frighten, so "you frighten me begging for the rock"; the meaning is begging for the jewel.

"One should not ask for that" means one should not ask for that. Which one? "That which is dear to him whose favour one seeks" means what one would know to be dear to that being.

"How much more so for human beings" means what need is there to say that it is disagreeable to human beings?

345. "Troubled by the sound of that flock of birds" means that flock of birds made sound incessantly during the first watch and the last watch; that monk, being distressed by that sound, went to the presence of the Blessed One. Therefore he said - "I approached me" (that is, the Blessed One).

In "And from where are you coming, monk?" here, that monk who is seated is not coming, but in the proximity of the present tense it is permissible to speak thus. Therefore he said - "And from where are you coming, monk?" the meaning is "from where have you come?" In "From there, Blessed One, I am coming" the same method applies here too. "Troubled" means distressed, having become wearied - this is the meaning.

That flock of birds - in "The monk requests a bowl" here, those birds do not understand the monk's words, but the Blessed One, through his own power, made it so that they understood.

346. "I do not know many people for you" means: I do not know your people as to "who are these, or whose are these." "Having met, they request" means: having come together and forming groups, they request. "A beggar is disagreeable" means: whoever begs, he is disagreeable. "One not giving what is requested is disagreeable" means: they beg - that is called what is requested; one who does not give the requested thing is also disagreeable. Alternatively, "they beg" - to one who is begging, "one not giving is disagreeable" means: one who does not give is disagreeable. "May there be no aversion towards me" means: may there be no state of disagreeableness towards me; the meaning is: may I not become disagreeable to you, or may you not become disagreeable and displeasing to me.

347. "Difficult to accumulate" means difficult to gather by means such as farming, cattle-rearing, and so forth.

348-349. "Now when a monk begged for oneself" - here "begged for oneself" (saññācīkā) is said to mean a request initiated by oneself; therefore "begged for oneself" means by one's own request, the meaning being with requisites solicited by oneself. Since that which is being made with self-solicited requisites is being made having solicited by oneself, in order to show that synonymous meaning, the word-analysis has been stated thus: "having solicited by oneself, even a man."

"Plastered above" means plastered on the inside. "Plastered below" means plastered on the outside. "Plastered above and below" means it is said to be plastered on both the inside and the outside.

"By one having it built" - in the word-analysis of this, only "by one having it caused to be built" should be stated, for thus the wording agrees. Since, however, even by one building a hut begged for oneself, one must proceed in the manner stated here, therefore whether one is building or having it built, both are included by this very word "by one having it built" - to show this meaning, "whether building or having it built" was stated. If, however, one were to say "by one building or by one having it built," the wording would be contradicted, for one having it built is not called one who is building; therefore it should be understood that only the meaning has been shown here.

"For oneself" means that of which oneself is the designation, thinking "this is for me," thus it is for oneself; that which is for oneself. Since, however, that of which oneself is the designation is for one's own benefit, therefore showing the synonymous meaning, he said: "'for oneself' means for one's own benefit." "It should be made of proper measure" means it should be made conforming to the measure. "Herein this is the measure" means this is the measure of that hut. "By the Fortunate One's span" - the Fortunate One's span is now equal to three spans of a man of medium stature, which is one and a half cubits by a carpenter's cubit. "By the external measure" means twelve spans by the measure of the outer wall of the hut; however, when measuring, the boundary of the thick plaster applied first should not be taken. It should be measured by the boundary of the chaff-plaster. The whitewash above the chaff-plaster is negligible. If one has no need for chaff-plaster and finishes with thick plaster alone, the thick plaster itself is the boundary.

"In width" means in breadth. "Seven" means seven Fortunate One's spans. "Inside" - the explanation of this is "by the internal measure"; not taking the outer edge of the wall, when measuring by the inner edge, it is said that the measure in width is seven Fortunate One's spans.

But if someone, casting a pretext, thinking "I shall make it of the stated measure only," were to make it eleven spans in length and eight spans in width, or thirteen spans in length and six spans in width, it is not allowable. For even exceeding on one side alone is indeed exceeding the measure. Let alone a span - even by reducing the length by as much as a hair-tip and increasing the width, or reducing the width by as much as a hair-tip and increasing the length, it is not allowable; what then need be said of increasing on both sides? For this was said: "Whether in length or in width, having exceeded even by as much as a hair-tip, if one builds or has it built, there is a wrong-doing offence in the effort," etc. But only one of the stated measure is allowable. However, one that is even sixty cubits in length but three cubits or less than four cubits in width, where a bed of proper measure cannot be turned this way and that way, does not count as a "hut"; therefore this too is allowable. But in the Mahāpaccarī, at the final limit, four cubits in width is stated; below that it is not a hut. However, even one of proper measure that is without a designated site, or involving destruction, or without walking space around it, is not allowable. Only one of proper measure, with a designated site, not involving destruction, and with walking space around it, is allowable. Even one smaller than the measure, whether four cubits or

five cubits, must be made by the builder only with a designated site. But one who is building one exceeding the measure incurs a grave offence at the completion of the plastering.

Therein, plastering and non-plastering, and a place for plastering and a place for non-plastering should be understood. That is: "plastering" means two kinds of plastering - clay plastering and lime plastering. But setting aside these two kinds of plastering, the remaining plastering consisting of ash, cow dung and so forth is non-plastering. Even if there is mud plastering, it is just non-plastering. "A place for plastering" means the walls and the roofing; but setting aside the walls and roofing, the remaining space not worthy of plastering, such as pillars, beams, door-frame joints, windows, smoke-holes and so forth, should all be understood as a place for non-plastering.

"Monks should be brought for designating the site" means that monks should be brought for the purpose of designating the site at the place where one wishes to have a hut built. "By that hut-builder" and so forth, however, is stated for the purpose of showing the procedure by which those monks should be brought. Therein, "having cleared the hut site" indicates that one should not take monks and go to uneven forest land, but rather, having first cleared the hut site and made it level ground similar to a boundary circle, one should afterwards approach the Community, make a request, and bring them. "He should be addressed thus" means the Community should be addressed thus. But further on, "should be requested a second time" is stated in the plural with reference to the monks. "If the whole Community does not consent" means if the whole Community does not wish to, those various monks are engaged in recitation, attention and so forth. "Involving destruction, not involving destruction" means with danger, without danger. "With walking space around it, without walking space around it" means with surrounding space, without surrounding space.

"It is fitting" means the time for this inspection has arrived, thus it is the fitting time; the fitting time itself is what is fitting. And this formal act of authorisation for the purpose of inspecting the site is permissible to be done even by the method of announcement through consultation. But further on, the formal act of designating the site must be done with the motion and announcement as already stated; it is not permissible to do it by consultation.

353. "Of ants" means of any ants whatsoever among the varieties such as red, black, tawny, and so forth. "Kipīllakānaṃ" is also a reading. "Dwelling place" means a place of permanent habitation; and just as for ants, so too for termites and the like, the dwelling place should be understood as the place of permanent habitation itself. However, where they come and go for the purpose of foraging, such an area of movement is not prohibited for any of them; therefore it is proper to remove them from there, clean it, and build. These six grounds are prohibited out of compassion for living beings.

"Or of elephants" means for elephants, neither a place of permanent habitation nor a place of permanent foraging is permissible; for lions and the like, neither the dwelling place nor the regular path by which they set out for foraging is permissible. Their foraging ground is not restricted. "Of any whatsoever" means of other wild animals as

well. These seven grounds, being fraught with danger, are prohibited for the welfare of monks. The remaining ones are attended with various hazards. Therein, "dependent on a field of cereals" means situated near a field where the seven grains grow, dependent on cereals. The same method applies to "dependent on a field of legumes" and the rest as well. Here, however, "prison" means a punishment house, a house for enemies; in the Kurundī and other texts it is said to be "made for the purpose of executing criminals".

"Place of execution" is said to mean a place for cutting off hands, feet, and the like. "Cemetery" means a great cemetery. "Thoroughfare" is said to mean a path of coming and going that cannot be cut through. The remainder is clear in itself.

"It is not possible with a properly yoked cart" means it is not possible to go around with a cart yoked with two oxen, placing one wheel at the edge where water falls and one outside. In the Kurundī, however, it is said "yoked with four". "To go around on all sides with a ladder" means those roofing the building, standing on a ladder, are not able to go around on all sides with the ladder. Thus, in a place involving destruction and without walking space around it, a hut should not be built. But it should be built in a place not involving destruction and with walking space around it; that has come in the canonical text by way of the opposite of what was stated.

"Again, 'begged for oneself' means" and so forth is stated for the purpose of clarifying the meaning of "begged for oneself" and the rest as stated thus: "If a monk should have a hut built on a site involving destruction and without walking space around it, begged for by himself."

"For each effort, a wrong-doing" means thus: thinking "I shall have a hut built on a site not designated or exceeding the measure," he sharpens an adze or an axe for the purpose of bringing trees from the forest - a wrong-doing; he enters the forest - a wrong-doing; there he cuts green grass - an offence of expiation together with a wrong-doing; he cuts dry grass - a wrong-doing. The same method applies to trees as well. He clears the ground, digs, removes soil, piles up; thus, up until he binds the fence, this is called the preliminary effort. In that preliminary effort, everywhere where there would be an offence of expiation, there is an offence of expiation together with a wrong-doing; where there would be a wrong-doing, there is a wrong-doing; from that point onwards, it is called the concurrent effort. Therein, for one to be made with pillars, he raises a pillar - a wrong-doing. For one to be built with bricks, he lays a brick - a wrong-doing. Thus, whatever material he applies, for each and every effort there is a wrong-doing. For one who is planing, at each stroke of the hand, and for one going for that purpose, at each step, there is a wrong-doing. However, having thus made a hut with wooden walls, or with brick walls, or with stone walls, or even a leaf hut, thinking "I shall plaster it with walls and roof," for one plastering with lime or with clay, for each and every effort, as long as a grave offence has not arisen, there is a wrong-doing. But this wrong-doing applies only to the main plastering; in making it white or red in colour, or in decorative work, there is no offence.

"When one lump has not arrived" means the one lump of plaster that is the very last - when the hut work has not been completed with that one lump. What is stated is this: "Now it will be finished with two lumps" - upon the giving of the first lump among

those, there is a grave offence.

"When that lump has arrived" means that one lump upon whose non-arrival there is a grave offence in the hut work - when that final lump has arrived, been given, and placed, because the plaster is joined together, there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. And thus for one who is plastering, whether with the inner plaster, or when joined together by making the wall and the roof into one unit with the inner plaster, or with the outer plaster, or when joined together with the outer plaster, there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. But if, having set up a door-frame or a window, one plasters with clay, and when that is placed - having enlarged the opening for it again or without enlarging it - the plaster is not joined together, it is safe for the time being; but when one plasters again, at the very moment of joining together, there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. If that which is being placed stands continuously together with the plaster previously given, there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community from the very first. For the purpose of freeing from termites, having made the roofing incomplete by a measure of eight finger-breadths, one plasters the wall - there is no offence. For the very purpose of freeing from termites, having made a stone wall below and not plastering that, one plasters above - the plaster is not joined together, so there is no offence at all.

In a brick-walled hut, one makes windows and smoke-outlets with bricks themselves - there is an offence only by the joining together of the plaster. One plasters a leaf-hut - there is an offence only by the joining together of the plaster. There, having left a measure of eight finger-breadths for the purpose of light, one plasters - the plaster is not joined together, so there is no offence at all. If one makes it thinking "Having obtained a window, I shall place it here," when the window is placed, there is an offence by the joining together of the plaster. If one makes a wall with clay, there is an offence when it is joined together with the plaster of the roof. One monk, having left one lump remaining, stops; another, seeing that, plasters it thinking "This is a wrong-doing," on his own initiative - there is no offence for either of them.

354. "A monk builds a hut" - such and similar thirty-six sets of four were stated for the purpose of showing the classification of offences. Therein, for involving destruction, a wrong-doing; for being without walking space around it, a wrong-doing; for exceeding the prescribed measurements, an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community; for being on a not designated site, an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. By means of these, the mixed offences should be understood.

355. In the passages beginning with "an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community and two wrong-doings," the meaning should be understood by the method beginning with "two wrong-doings together with two offences entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community."

361. Now, regarding "If he comes when it is not finished" and so forth, here is the determination of meaning. "He" means the monk who, having commanded, departed. "When it is not finished" means when the hut-building work is not completed. "Should be given to another" means it should be relinquished and given to another individual

or to the Community. "Having broken it down, it should be made again" - to what extent is it broken down? If pillars are embedded in the ground, they should be pulled out. If they are placed upon stones, they should be removed. In the case of one built with bricks, the walls should be dismantled down to the foundation bricks. In brief, it is broken down when it has been demolished by making it level with the ground; even if something remains standing above the ground by as little as four finger-breadths, it is as though not broken down. The remainder is evident in all the sets of four. For there is nothing else here that would be difficult to understand merely by following the canonical text.

363. In the passage beginning with "what is not finished by oneself," however, it means a hut begun by oneself. "One makes complete by oneself" means: with whatever material it was made - whether with thick clay or with chaff-mixed clay - wishing to bring it to a state of completion, one makes it complete by applying the final lump with that same material.

"One makes complete by others" means: one has others make it complete for one's own purpose. Whether it is not finished by oneself, by others, or by both, if one makes it complete for one's own purpose - whether one makes it complete by oneself, or makes it complete by others, or makes it complete conjointly by oneself and by others - it is indeed an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. This is the determination herein.

However, in the Kurundī it is said: "Two or three monks build thinking 'we shall dwell together'; it is protected for the time being, there is no offence because it is undivided. If they divide it saying 'this section is yours, this is mine' and build, there is an offence. A novice and a monk build together; as long as it is undivided, it is protected for the time being. If they divide it according to the former method and build, there is an offence for the monk."

364. In "there is no offence for a rock cell" etc., there is no offence for one making even a large rock cell. For here no plastering is involved. For a cave too - whether a brick cave, a stone cave, a wooden cave, or an underground cave - there is no offence for one making even a large one.

"For a grass hut" means that even a seven-storeyed mansion, if roofed with grass and leaves, is called a "grass hut." However, in the commentaries, "a hen-coop house" is stated to be a hut whose roofing is made by binding sticks in a lattice pattern and covering it with grass or leaves; there is no offence in that case. It is allowable to make even a large grass-roofed house, for the characteristic of a hut is precisely the state of being plastered and so forth, and that should be understood as stated with reference to the roofing alone. "Grass particles fall in the walking-hall" - "I allow, monks, having removed the old covering, to plaster inside and outside" - these and similar passages are supporting evidence here; therefore, whether gabled on both sides, or ridge-roofed, or round, or rectangular, whatever is made as the roofing of that house in the manner of a roof, when plastering is applied to it together with wall-plastering, there is an offence. But if they cover the top of a house whose roof is plastered inside and outside with grass for the purpose of protecting the plaster, by that much alone it does not become a "grass hut." But here, is there no offence only

on account of an undesignated site and exceeding the measure, or also on account of causing disturbance and having no surrounding space? There is no offence in all cases. For thus, with reference to such a hut, it is stated in the Parivāra:

"A monk makes a hut by begging for it himself;
On a not designated site, exceeding the proper measure;
Involving destruction, without walking space around it, there is no offence;
This is a question considered by the skilful."

"For the benefit of another" means there is no offence for one making a hut, even one that has reached the characteristics of a hut, for the benefit of another - whether a preceptor, a teacher, or the Community. But what is stated in the canonical text as "there is an offence of three dukkaṭas for the builders" etc., that is stated on account of not carrying out as instructed.

"Setting aside a dwelling house, everywhere" means that, setting aside a house for one's own dwelling, one has it built as something else - an uposatha hall, a bath house, a dining hall, or a fire hall - there is no offence everywhere. If he has it built thinking "it will be an uposatha hall and I too shall dwell there, it will be a bath house and a dining hall and a fire hall and I too shall dwell there," even so there is no offence. However, in the Mahāpaccarī, having said "no offence," it is stated "there is an offence only for one making it for the purpose of one's own dwelling house." There is no offence for a mad man, for the first offenders who were the monks of Āḷavī.

Regarding the origins and so forth: it has six origins, both action and action-and-non-action; for this arises from action when one has the site designated but makes it exceeding the measure, and from action-and-non-action when one makes it without having the site designated; it is not connected with release through cessation of perception; it is without consciousness; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it involves three types of consciousness; it involves three types of feeling.

The Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Building a Hut is finished.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Building a Dwelling

365. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning the building of a dwelling. Therein, "at Kosambī" means in the city so named. "In Ghosita's park" means in the park of Ghosita. It was built, it is said, by a merchant named Ghosita; therefore it is called "Ghosita's park." "Of Channa" means of Channa who was the attendant at the time of the Bodhisatta. "Venerable sir, find out about a monastery site" means "Venerable sir, find out about a foundation place for a dwelling." And here, "dwelling" does not mean an entire monastery, but a single residence; therefore he said - "I shall have a dwelling built for the noble one."

"Shrine tree" - here, "shrine" is so called in the sense of being revered; this is a designation for places of deities worthy of worship; a tree regarded as a "shrine" is a shrine tree. "Venerated by the village" means venerated by the village or venerated of the village. This same method applies to the remaining terms as well. Furthermore, here "countryside" means a single district within the kingdom of one king. "Country" should be understood as the entire kingdom, for the entire kingdom too from time to

time makes offerings to that tree; therefore it is said "venerated by the country." "With one faculty" - they say this referring to the body faculty. "Perceiving a living being" means perceiving a sentient being.

366. "Large" means: by virtue of having a sponsor, it has greatness compared to a hut built by begging, thus it is "large." Or because, having had the site designated, it is permissible to build it even exceeding the prescribed dimensions, therefore it is also "large" by virtue of the greatness of its dimensions - that is "large." But because that greatness of dimensions is obtained only by virtue of having a sponsor, therefore, to show that meaning, the word-analysis was stated thus: "A large dwelling is said to be one having a sponsor." All the rest should be understood in the same manner as stated in the training rule concerning building a hut, together with the origins and so forth. For here the distinction is merely the fact of having a sponsor, the absence of origination from action alone, and the absence of a restriction on dimensions; and because of the absence of a restriction on dimensions, there is a reduction to four factors.

The Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Building a Dwelling is finished.

8. Commentary on the First Training Rule concerning a Corrupt Charge

380. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the training rule concerning corrupt intent. Therein, "in the Bamboo Grove, the Squirrels' Feeding Ground": "Bamboo Grove" is the name of that park. It is said that it was surrounded by bamboos and by a wall eighteen cubits high, fitted with a gateway tower and watchtowers, having a blue lustre, delightful - therefore it is called "Bamboo Grove." And here they gave food to the squirrels, therefore it is called "the Squirrels' Feeding Ground."

Formerly, it is said, a certain king came there for the purpose of sporting in the park. Intoxicated with the madness of liquor, he slept a midday sleep. His retinue too fell asleep, thinking "The king is sleeping," and being enticed by flowers, fruits and the like, went here and there. Then, drawn by the smell of liquor, a black serpent emerged from a certain hollow tree and came towards the king. Seeing this, a tree deity, thinking "I shall save the king's life," came in the form of a squirrel and made a noise at the base of his ear. The king awoke. The black serpent turned back. Seeing that, he thought "My life was given by this squirrel," and he established a feeding place for squirrels there and had a proclamation of safety proclaimed. Therefore, from that time onwards, it came to be known as "the Squirrels' Feeding Ground." For "squirrels" is the name for those black ones.

"Dabba" is that elder's name. "Mallian" means the son of a Malla king. "Arahantship had been realised at seven years old by birth" - it should be understood that the elder, having gained a sense of urgency when he was only seven years old, went forth and attained arahantship at the very tip of the razor. "Whatever is to be attained by a disciple, all that had been attained by him" - what is to be attained by a disciple, namely, the three knowledges, the four analytical discriminations, the six direct knowledges, and the nine supramundane states - this is the set of qualities, and all of that had been attained by him. "And there was nothing further to be done by him" - because the sixteen-fold task had been accomplished through the four truths by

means of the four paths, there is now nothing further to be done by him. "Or any adding to what had been done" - there is no further increase of that very task that has been done, just as there is no re-washing of a washed cloth, no re-grinding of ground perfume, and no re-blossoming of a blossomed flower. "Had gone to a private place" means having gone to a secret place. "Was in seclusion" means having withdrawn from this and that, he was secluded; the meaning is that he had gone into solitude.

Then this occurred to the Venerable Dabba the Mallian - "What if I were to prepare lodgings for the Community and assign meals" - the elder, it is said, seeing that his task was accomplished, reflecting thus: "I bear this final body, and that, like a lamp standing in the face of the wind, stands in the face of impermanence, subject to being extinguished before long. As long as it is not extinguished, what service might I perform for the Community?" - thus he considers: "In outlying countries, many sons of good families go forth without even having seen the Blessed One. They come even from afar, thinking 'We shall see and pay respect to the Blessed One.' Among them, those for whom lodgings are not available make their beds even on stone slabs. But I am able, through my own spiritual power, to create and give to those sons of good families, according to their wishes, lodgings such as mansions, dwelling places, lean-to shelters and the like, as well as beds, chairs, spreads and the like. Furthermore, on the next day, some here are exceedingly weary, and out of respect, standing before the monks, they do not even have meals assigned. But I am able to assign meals for them as well." Thus reflecting, "then this occurred to the Venerable Dabba the Mallian - 'What if I were to prepare lodgings for the Community and assign meals?'"

But are not these two positions suited to one devoted to fondness for talk and the like? And this one is a destroyer of the taints, one who delights in non-proliferation. Why did these occur to him? Because he was prompted by his former aspiration. It is said that under all Buddhas there are indeed disciples who have attained this special position. And this one, having been reborn in a certain family at the time of the Blessed One Padumuttara, seeing the spiritual power of a monk who had attained this special position, having invited the Blessed One together with six million eight hundred thousand monks for seven days and having given a great offering, lying down at his feet, made the aspiration: "In the future, at the time when a Buddha like you has arisen, may I too, being such and such by name, be an appointer of lodgings and a distributor of meals, like your disciple." The Blessed One, directing his knowledge of the future, saw, and having seen, declared: "After the passing of a hundred thousand aeons from now, a Buddha named Gotama will arise. Then you, having become a Mallian named Dabba, going forth at seven years old by birth, will realise arahantship, and you will obtain this special position." He, from that time onwards, fulfilling giving, virtue and the like, having experienced the prosperity of devas and humans, at the time of our Blessed One, realised arahantship just as had been declared by that Blessed One. Then, when he had gone to a private place and was thinking "What service might I perform for the Community?" - because he was prompted by that former aspiration, these two positions occurred to him.

Then this occurred to him - "I have no authority over myself; I dwell in the same place with the Teacher. If the Blessed One will permit me, I shall undertake these two positions" - and he went to the presence of the Blessed One. Therefore it was said -

"Then the Venerable Dabba the Mallian" etc. "and to assign meals." Then the Blessed One, having encouraged him saying "Good, good, Dabba," since such a monk, free from going on wrong courses, is worthy of administering these two positions, therefore he said: "If so, Dabba, prepare lodgings for the Community and assign meals." "Assented to the Blessed One" means he accepted the word of the Blessed One, listened to it face to face; the meaning is that he agreed.

"First Dabba the Mallian should be requested" - why does the Blessed One have him requested? For the purpose of freeing from blame. For the Blessed One sees: "In the future, on account of this position of Dabba, a great calamity will arise through Mettiya and Bhummajaka, and therein some will blame him saying: 'Why does this one, remaining silent and not doing his own work, administer such a position?' Then others will say: 'What fault is there in him? He was requested by them and appointed.' Thus he will be freed from blame." Even after having him requested thus for the purpose of freeing from blame, again, because when an unauthorised monk speaks anything in the midst of the Community, a spirit of complaint arises: "Why does this one make a loud noise in the midst of the Community, displaying authority?" But when an authorised one speaks, there are those who say: "Let the venerable ones not say anything; this one is authorised, let him speak as he pleases." And for one who falsely accuses an unauthorised monk, there is a light offence, merely a wrongdoing. But for one who falsely accuses an authorised monk, there is a heavier offence of expiation. Then an authorised monk, because of the gravity of the offence, becomes even more difficult to assail than by enemies; therefore, in order to have that venerable one authorised, he spoke beginning with "by an experienced monk." But is it proper to give two authorisations to one person? Not merely two; if he is capable, it is proper to give even thirteen. But for those who are not capable, it is proper to give even one to two or three.

382. "Of similar qualities" means of similar qualities in virtues, not of similar qualities in friendly association. Therefore he said "For those monks who are experts in the discourses, for them together" etc. For however many are experts in the discourses, having selected them, he prepares lodgings together for them that are suitable for them; likewise for the rest. "Much devoted to bodily comfort" means much engaged in making the body firm, the meaning is much devoted to nourishing the body. "These venerable ones with this delight" means with this delight in pointless talk, which is contrary to the path to heaven, being of a lowly nature. "Will pass the night" means will dwell.

"Having attained the heat element, by that very light" means having attained the fourth meditative absorption of the fire kasiṇa, emerging from it, having resolved through the knowledge of direct knowing upon the burning of the finger, by the light of the finger-flame produced by that very attainment of the heat element - this is the meaning. This power of the Elder, however, became well known throughout the entire Jambudīpa before long; having heard of it, monks wishing to see the wonder of supernatural power intentionally arrive at the improper time. "They intentionally indicate far places" means they knowingly indicate far places. How? In this manner: "Friend Dabba, for us on the Vulture's Peak."

"He goes ahead with his finger burning" means if there is one monk, he goes himself. If there are many, he creates many forms of himself. All of them, being identical to

himself, prepare the lodgings.

Regarding "This is the bed" etc., when the Elder says "This is the bed," the created forms also say "This is the bed" at each place they have gone to; likewise in all instances. For this is the nature of created forms -

"When one speaks, all the created forms speak;
When one sits in silence, they all become silent."

In whatever monastery beds, chairs and other things are not sufficient, they fill them by his own power. Therefore the speech of the created forms is not without basis.

"Having prepared the lodging, he returns again to the Bamboo Grove" means he does not sit down engaging in country talk with them, but returns to his own dwelling place.

383. "Mettiya and Bhūmajaka" means Mettiya and Bhūmajaka; these were the chief men among the group of six. "And inferior meals" - as for lodgings, it is not surprising that inferior ones fall to junior monks. But as for meals, they allot them by placing tickets into a basket or into the robe-folds, stirring them, and drawing them out one by one; and even these, due to their deficiency of merit, always fall to them as the very last and inferior ones. Whatever meal is a single-invitation meal, even that on the day it falls to them is either inferior, or upon seeing them, without giving the excellent food, they give only the inferior.

"Specially prepared" means made by preparing with various ingredients, well-arranged, well-produced - this is the meaning. "Porridge of broken rice" means a meal of rice with husk-powder. "With vinegar as a second" means with rice-gruel as a second.

"Kalyāṇabhattika" means one whose food is excellent, beautiful, and exceedingly refined - thus he is Kalyāṇabhattika; he was known by his food alone because of being a giver of refined food. "Gives a meal of four" means he gives four meals; but it is expressed as "catukkabhatta" by way of a secondary derivative. "Stood close and served" means having set aside all tasks, having made great honour and respect, standing nearby, he serves. "They ask with cooked rice" means approaching with cooked rice in hand, they ask "Shall we give you cooked rice, venerable sir?" Thus the instrumental case is used in the sense of the instrument itself. The same method applies to lentil curry and the rest.

"For the morrow" means what exists tomorrow is the partaking of food, that is svātana; for its purpose, for the morrow - it is said to mean for the purpose of the partaking of food to be done tomorrow. "Had been allotted" means it had been assigned and given. "For the monks Mettiya and Bhūmajaka, householder" - this the Elder said without due consideration. For so powerful was their deficiency of merit that even for those who had attained fullness of mindfulness, there is lack of due consideration. "Woman" - here "je" is an address to the female slave.

"Yesterday, friends, for us" - while deliberating during the night, referring to the past portion of the day, they say "yesterday." "Not properly" means not in accordance with their wish; as previously, however much they wished to sleep, that much they slept - they did not sleep thus; it is said that they slept only a little.

"In the porch outside the monastery" means in the outer gate-porch of the Veluvana monastery. "With drooping shoulders" means with fallen shoulders, having bent the shoulder-bones, seated. "Pondering" means smouldering.

"From where there was calm, from there comes a storm" - the meaning is that where there was calm, where not even a little wind existed, there a great storm has arisen. "Water, methinks, is ablaze" means ablaze like water.

384. "Do you remember, Dabba, having done such a thing" means "You, Dabba, do you remember having done such a thing?" Alternatively, the meaning here should be understood by construing it thus: "Do you remember, Dabba, such a thing as this nun has said? Did you do such a thing as this nun has said?" But for those who read "katvā" (having done), it is straightforward.

"As the Blessed One knows me, venerable sir" - what does the Elder show by this? "The Blessed One, venerable sir, is omniscient, and I am one whose taints are destroyed; there is no engagement in such a matter on my part; the Blessed One knows me thus; what shall I say in that regard? As the Blessed One knows me, so should I be regarded."

"Indeed, Dabba, the wise do not extricate themselves thus" - here, "Indeed, Dabba, the wise do not extricate themselves in the way that you extricate yourself by relying on another;" "but rather they extricate themselves by what they themselves know" - thus should the meaning be understood. "If it was done by you, say 'it was done'" - what does he show by this? He shows that it is not possible to make a non-doer into a doer by the strength of an assembly or by the support of a faction, nor to make a doer into a non-doer; therefore, one should state only what was done or not done by oneself. But why did the Blessed One, even though he knew, not say "I know; you are one whose taints are destroyed; there is no fault in you; this nun is a speaker of falsehood"? Out of compassion for others. For if the Blessed One were to declare whatever he knows, when another who had committed an offence involving expulsion were questioned, it would have to be said "I know; you are one who is expelled," and then that person would think "Previously he declared Dabba the Mallian pure, but now he declares me impure; to whom shall I now say anything, when even the Teacher shows favouritism among his disciples; how can he be omniscient?" - and having harboured resentment, he would become one destined for a state of misery. Therefore, the Blessed One, out of this compassion for others, did not say so even though he knew.

Furthermore, he did not say so also for the avoidance of reproach. For if the Blessed One had said thus, there would have been this reproach: "The acquittal of Dabba the Mallian was indeed a weighty matter; but having obtained the Perfectly Enlightened One as a witness, he was acquitted." And those who would consider this to be the characteristic of acquittal, thinking "Even in the time of the Buddha, purity or impurity is determined by a witness; we know this person is impure" - thus wicked monks could destroy even a conscientious one. Moreover, also in the future, monks, having charged and reminded one involved in a matter, will take the admission of conscientious ones by saying "If it was done by you, say 'it was done,'" and carry out the formal act. Thus, establishing the guideline in the Vinaya procedure, without saying "I know," he said "If it was done by you, say 'it was done.'"

"I do not know of having engaged in sexual intercourse even in a dream" means "Even in a dream I do not know of sexual intercourse; I have not engaged in it." Alternatively, it means "Having engaged in it, I do not know of sexual intercourse even in a dream." But for those who read "paṭisevitvā" (having engaged in), it is straightforward. "How much less while awake" means "While awake, I certainly do not know of it."

"If so, monks, remove the nun Mettiyā" - because the statements of Dabba and of this nun do not agree, therefore it is said "remove the nun Mettiyā."

Therein, there are three kinds of removal - removal of status, removal of communion, and removal by disciplinary action. Among these, "a corrupter should be removed" - this is "removal of status." They carry out an act of suspension for not acknowledging an offence, or for not making amends, or for not relinquishing a wrong view - this is "removal of communion." They carry out a disciplinary action saying "Go, outsider, be gone!" - this is "removal by disciplinary action." But here, he spoke referring to removal of status - "Remove the nun Mettiyā."

"And investigate these monks" - by this he indicates the following: "This nun, by her own nature, is not the doer; she was certainly incited by others. Therefore, investigate these monks by whom she was incited, search them out, find out."

But was the nun Mettiyā removed by the Blessed One on the basis of her own admission or without her admission? And here, if she was removed on the basis of her admission, the Elder would be the doer and at fault. But if without her admission, the Elder would be not the doer and without fault.

Even in the time of King Bhātiya, there was a dispute on this very point between the elders dwelling at the Mahāvihāra and those dwelling at the Abhayagiri. The Abhayagiri dwellers too, having stated their own text, say: "According to your position, the Elder would be the doer." The Mahāvihāra dwellers too, having stated their own text, say: "According to your position, the Elder would be the doer." The question was not resolved. The king, having heard this, assembled the elders and commanded a minister named Dīghakārāyana, of brahmin birth: "Listen to the discussion of the elders." The minister, it is said, was wise and skilled in the nuances of speech. He said: "Let the elders first state their text." Then the Abhayagiri elders stated their text: "If so, monks, remove the nun Mettiyā on her own admission." The minister said: "Venerable sirs, according to your position, the Elder would be the doer and at fault." The Mahāvihāra dwellers too stated their text: "If so, monks, remove the nun Mettiyā." The minister said: "Venerable sirs, according to your position, the Elder would be not the doer and without fault." But what is proper here? What was stated later - this was examined by the commentarial teachers: when a monk accuses another monk with an unfounded charge of an ultimate offence, it is a saṅghādisesa; when he accuses a nun, it is a dukkaṭa. But in the Kurundī it is stated: "For false speech, a pācittiya."

Herein is this examination: according to the first method, because of the intention to accuse, only a dukkaṭa is fitting. Just as, even though there is false speech, for a monk accusing a monk it is a saṅghādisesa, and even though there is false speech, for one who speaks of an impure person as pure with the intention of insulting, it is a pācittiya only for disparagement, not for deliberate false speech; so here too,

because of the intention to accuse, a pācittiya for deliberate false speech is not fitting; only a dukkaṭa is proper. According to the latter method too, because of the false speech, only a pācittiya is fitting, for by the authority of the text, with the intention of accusing, for a monk against a monk it is a saṅghādisesa. And for one with the intention of insulting, it is disparagement. But there is no statement that for a monk against a nun it is a dukkaṭa; there is the statement that for deliberate false speech it is a pācittiya; therefore only a pācittiya is fitting.

But here this should be further examined: "When there is no intention to accuse, it is a pācittiya; when there is such intention, what should it be?" Therein, since even when a pācittiya is established for one speaking falsely, a separate pācittiya has been stated for accusing with an unfounded saṅghādisesa charge, therefore when there is the intention to accuse, no occasion is seen for a pācittiya for deliberate false speech; and it is not possible for there to be no offence for one who accuses - thus the first method appears purer here. Likewise, when a nun accuses another nun with an unfounded charge of an ultimate offence, it is a saṅghādisesa; when she accuses a monk, it is a dukkaṭa. Therein, a saṅghādisesa leads to rehabilitation, a dukkaṭa leads to confession; by these there is no removal. But since she was by nature an immoral, wicked nun, and now she herself says "I am immoral," therefore the Blessed One had her removed precisely because of her impurity.

"Then the monks Mettiya and Bhūmajaka" - when the Blessed One, having said "Remove the nun Mettiyā and investigate these monks," rose from his seat and entered the dwelling, those monks, seeing that nun being removed by those monks who said "Now give her the white robes," disclosed their own offence out of desire to release her. To show this meaning, "Then the monks Mettiya and Bhūmajaka" and so forth was stated.

385-386. "Corrupt, hateful" means both corrupted and one who corrupts. For when hatred has arisen, a person is corrupted by that hatred, made to abandon his natural state; therefore he is called "corrupt." And he corrupts others, destroys them; therefore it is called "hatred." Thus "corrupt, hateful" is an illustration of the diversity of aspects of one and the same person; therefore it is said "corrupt, hateful means both corrupted and one who corrupts" - therein the characteristic of the word should be sought. But since that person who has come to be designated as "corrupt, hateful," being one possessed of aversion, remains in a state of being angered and so forth, therefore in the word-analysis "angered" and so forth is stated. Therein, "angered" means one who has reached the state of agitation, the state of falling away from one's natural condition. "Displeased" means one whose mind is not under one's own control, whose mind does not remain under one's own power; furthermore, one who is not pleased with rapture and happiness, not of a mind at ease - thus "displeased." "Not gratified" means not happy, or not satisfied - thus "not gratified." "One whose mind is struck" means one whose mind is struck by aversion. "One in whom barrenness has arisen" means one in whom the barrenness of aversion has arisen, which is reckoned as the hardness of mind and the refuse of mind. "Not content" means not content, deprived of rapture, happiness and so forth; the meaning is "not pervaded." But in the word-analysis, in order to show the states on account of which one is not content, "with that anger" and so forth is stated.

Therein, "with that anger" means that by which one is called both "corrupt" and "angered" - both of these are of one aspect, since they cause the abandoning of one's natural state. "With that hatred" means that by which one is called "hateful." By these two, the aggregate of mental activities alone is shown.

"With that displeasure" means that by which one is called "displeased." "With that lack of gratification" means that by which one is called "not gratified." By these two, the aggregate of feeling is shown.

"With an unfounded charge of an offence involving expulsion" - here, "unfounded" means it has no foundation; but that unfoundedness is intended from the standpoint of the accuser, not from the standpoint of the accused. Therefore, in order to show that meaning, in the word-analysis it is said "unfounded means not seen, not heard, not suspected." By this, the following is elucidated: "Whatever offence involving expulsion has been neither seen, nor heard, nor suspected by the accuser in the person of the accused - this is called 'unfounded' because of the absence of the foundations reckoned as seeing, hearing, and suspecting; but whether he has committed it or not committed it, that is of no account here."

Therein, "not seen" means not seen with one's own eye of the flesh or with the divine eye. "Not heard" means likewise not heard when being spoken of by anyone. "Not suspected" means not suspected in one's mind.

"Seen" means seen by oneself or by another, with the eye of the flesh or with the divine eye. "Heard" means likewise heard. "Suspected" also means suspected by oneself or by another. Therein, what is seen by oneself is simply seen; what is seen by others is heard by oneself; what is heard by others, what is suspected by others - all of this stands only in the position of what is heard by oneself.

Suspicion, however, is threefold - suspicion based on what is seen, suspicion based on what is heard, and suspicion based on what is sensed. Therein, suspicion based on what is seen means: a certain monk entered a thicket near a village for the purpose of defecation and urination, and a certain woman also, having entered that thicket for some errand, turned back, and neither did the monk see the woman; nor did the woman see the monk, and without seeing each other both departed as they pleased. Another monk, having observed the emergence of both of them from there, suspects: "Surely these have done it or will do it." This is called suspicion based on what is seen.

Suspicion based on what is heard means: here a certain person hears in the darkness or in a concealed place such friendly conversation of a monk with a woman, and even though another person is present nearby, he does not know whether there is one or not. He suspects: "Surely these have done it or will do it." This is called suspicion based on what is heard.

Suspicion based on what is sensed means: several rogues, having taken flowers, perfumes, meat, liquor and the like during the night, went with women to a border monastery and, having enjoyed themselves as they pleased in the pavilion or in the dining halls and the like, scattered flowers and so forth and departed. The next day the monks, seeing that disorder, investigate: "Whose deed is this?" And therein, a certain monk, having risen early and attending to the pavilion or the dining hall as

part of his duties, had touched the flowers and the like; a certain monk had made an offering with flowers brought from a supporter's family; a certain monk had drunk a medicinal tonic for medicinal purposes. Then those monks investigating "Whose deed is this?", having smelt the scent of the hands and the scent of the mouths of those monks, suspect those monks. This is called suspicion based on what is sensed.

Therein, what is seen may be with foundation or without foundation; what is seen itself may be with foundation of perception or without foundation of perception. The same method applies to what is heard as well. In the case of suspicion, however, suspicion based on what is seen may be with foundation or without foundation; suspicion based on what is seen itself may be with foundation of perception or without foundation of perception. The same method applies to suspicion based on what is heard and suspicion based on what is sensed. Therein, what is seen with foundation means: having seen someone committing a pārājika offence, he says "It was seen by me." Without foundation means: having seen someone coming out from a concealed place, without seeing the transgression, he says "It was seen by me." What is seen itself with foundation of perception means: having seen it, being one who has the perception of having seen, he accuses. Without foundation of perception means: having previously seen a pārājika transgression, he later becomes one who has the perception of not having seen it; he, having made it without foundation by perception, accuses saying "It was seen by me." By this method, suspicion based on what is heard and suspicion based on what is sensed should also be understood in detail. And here, in every case, there is no offence for one who accuses with foundation or with foundation of perception; but there is an offence only for one who accuses without foundation or without foundation of perception.

"Should accuse" means: should assail, should attack, should overpower, should overwhelm. Since that accusation is indeed done whether one accuses oneself or causes another to accuse, therefore in the word-analysis it is said "he accuses or causes to accuse."

Therein, "he accuses" means: he himself accuses with such words as "You have committed a pārājika offence"; for each and every utterance of his, there is a saṅghādisesa. "He causes to accuse" means: standing nearby himself, he instructs another monk; that one, by his word, accuses him. For each and every utterance, there is a saṅghādisesa only for the one who causes the accusation. But if that one too accuses saying "There is what was seen and heard by me," for both persons, for each and every utterance, there is a saṅghādisesa.

For the purpose of skill in the classification of accusations, the fourfold scheme beginning with one matter and one accuser should first be understood here. Therein, one monk accuses one monk with one matter; in this accusation there is one matter and one accuser. Several monks accuse one monk with one matter, just as five hundred monks of the group of six headed by Mettiya and Bhūmajaka accused the Venerable Dabba Mallaputta; in this accusation there is one matter and various accusers. One monk accuses one monk with several matters; in this accusation there are various matters and one accuser. Several monks accuse several monks with several matters; in this accusation there are various matters and various accusers.

But who is entitled to accuse, and who is not entitled? Taking first the statement regarding a weak accuser, no one is entitled. A weak accuser means: when several monks are sitting in conversation, one monk, taking up a matter concerning one person but making it non-specific, speaks about a pārajika matter. Another, having heard that, goes and informs the other person. That person, having approached him, says: "It seems you say this and that about me." He replies: "I do not know of such a thing; however, in the course of conversation I spoke making it non-specific. If I had known this would cause you distress, I would not have spoken even that much." This is a weak accuser. Taking this conversation, no one is entitled to accuse that monk. However, setting this aside, the Elder Mahāpaduma said that a monk endowed with virtue is entitled to accuse a monk or a nun, and a nun endowed with virtue is entitled to accuse only a nun. But the Elder Mahāsuma said: "All five classes of those living in communion are entitled." But the Elder Godatta, having said "No one is not entitled," cited this sutta: "Having heard from a monk, he accuses; having heard from a nun, he accuses; etc. having heard from followers of other sects, he accuses." In the view of all three elders, the accused should be dealt with only according to his own admission.

Now, this accusation does not reach its head for one who accuses by sending a messenger, a letter, or a message; but it reaches its head only for one who accuses while standing near the person, either by hand gesture or by verbal expression. For the renunciation of the training alone does not reach its head by hand gesture, but this false accusation and the report of what is untrue do indeed reach it. But if one specifies one of two persons standing in a place and accuses him, if that one knows, it reaches its head. If the other knows, it does not reach its head. If one specifies both and accuses, whether one knows or both know, it indeed reaches its head. The same method applies in the case of several persons. And knowing at that very moment is indeed difficult, but when one reflects in due course and it is known, then it is known. If one knows afterwards, it does not reach its head. The training rules concerning renunciation of the training, report of what is untrue, gross speech, self-praise, and the report of what is true with corrupt intent - all these indeed have the same determination.

Thus this accusation is also twofold by way of body and speech. Again, it is threefold: accusation based on what is seen, accusation based on what is heard, and accusation based on what is suspected. Again, it is also fourfold: accusation of failure in virtue, accusation of failure in conduct, accusation of failure in view, and accusation of failure in livelihood. Therein, accusation of failure in virtue should be understood by way of the two weighty classes of offences. Accusation of failure in conduct by way of the remaining ones; accusation of failure in view by way of wrong view and extreme-grasping view; accusation of failure in livelihood should be understood by way of the six training rules laid down on account of livelihood.

Again, it is also fourfold: pointing out the matter, pointing out the offence, refusal of communion, and refusal of proper duties. Therein, pointing out the matter is that which proceeds thus: "You have engaged in sexual intercourse, you have taken what is not given, you have killed a human being, you have made a false report." Pointing out the offence is that which proceeds in such a manner as: "You have committed the offence of expulsion involving sexual intercourse." Refusal of communion is that

which proceeds thus: "There is no observance day, or invitation ceremony, or community act together with you." But by this much alone it does not reach its head; it reaches its head only when combined with such words as "You are not a recluse, you are not a son of the Sakyans." Refusal of proper duties is the non-performance of acts such as salutation, rising up, reverential salutation with joined palms, fanning, and the like. This should be understood as occurring when one who is performing salutations and the like in sequence fails to do so for one person while performing them for the rest. By this much it is indeed an accusation, but the offence does not reach its head. But when asked "Why do you not perform salutations and the like towards me?" it reaches its head only when combined with such words as "You are not a recluse, you are not a son of the Sakyans." But when one passes over whomever one wishes in the distribution of gruel, food, and the like, by that much it does not constitute an accusation.

Furthermore, in the chapter on the suspension of the Pātimokkha, beginning with "One unlawful suspension of the Pātimokkha, monks, one lawful" up to "ten unlawful suspensions of the Pātimokkha, ten lawful," thus fifty-five unlawful and fifty-five lawful, one hundred and ten accusations are stated. Those are one hundred and ten for one accusing based on what is seen, one hundred and ten for one accusing based on what is heard, one hundred and ten for one accusing based on what is suspected - thus they amount to three hundred and thirty. Those, for one accusing by body, for one accusing by speech, and for one accusing by both body and speech, being tripled, amount to nine hundred and ninety. Those, for one accusing oneself and for one having another accuse, being just as many, amount to one thousand nine hundred and eighty; and it should be understood that, again, by the division into what is seen and so forth, by way of what is founded and unfounded, there are many thousands of accusations.

Standing at this point, in the commentary, having brought in many discourses stated in the Upāli-pentads and so forth, such as "Upāli, a monk wishing to take up an accusation should take up an accusation endowed with five factors" and "Upāli, a monk who is an accuser, wishing to accuse another, should accuse another after reflecting internally on five qualities" - the characteristics of an accusation, the duty of the accuser, the duty of the accused, the task to be performed by the Community, and the duty of the investigator - all were explained in detail. We shall comment on that in the very place where it occurs.

Among these accusations of the types already stated, by means of whatever accusation, when a case has been brought before the midst of the Community, the accused and the accuser should be told: "Will you be satisfied with our judgement?" If they say "We will be," the Community should accept that legal case. But if they say: "Judge first, venerable sirs; if it is acceptable to us, we shall accept it." Having said such things as "Go and pay respects at the shrine first," and having drawn the matter out at length, they should be dismissed. If they, being wearied over a long time, with the assembly having departed and their supporters having been cut off, request again, having refused up to a third time, when they become free from pride, then their legal case should be adjudicated. And if, when adjudicating, the assembly is predominated by the shameless, that legal case should be adjudicated by a committee. If the assembly is predominated by the foolish, having had them seek out

experts in the Vinaya of their own group by saying "Seek out experts in the Vinaya of your own group," that legal case should be settled in the way by which that legal case is settled - by whatever is the Dhamma, by whatever is the Vinaya, by whatever is the Teacher's instruction.

Therein, "Dhamma" means the actual matter. "Vinaya" means the accusation and the reminder. "The Teacher's instruction" means the completeness of the motion and the completeness of the proclamation. Therefore, when the matter has been declared by the accuser, the accused should be asked: "Is this true or not?" Thus, having examined the matter, having accused with an actual matter and having reminded, that legal case should be settled with the completeness of the motion and the completeness of the proclamation. If therein a shameless one accuses a conscientious one, and that shameless one is foolish and incompetent, no guidance should be given to him. Rather, he should be told thus - "On what ground do you accuse him?" Surely he will say: "What is this, venerable sir? On what ground indeed?" "You do not even know on what ground, it is not fitting for one as foolish as you to accuse another" - he should be dismissed, and no cross-examination should be given to him. But if that shameless one is wise and competent, and is able to overwhelm and succeed by what was seen or heard, having given cross-examination to this one, the procedure should be carried out according to the admission of the conscientious one alone.

If a conscientious one accuses a shameless one, and that conscientious one is foolish and incompetent, and is unable to give cross-examination, guidance should be given to him: "On what ground do you accuse him - is it failure in virtue or one of the failures in conduct and so forth?" But why should guidance be given thus only to this one and not to the other? Is it not the case that it is not fitting for experts in the Vinaya to take a wrong course? It is indeed not fitting. But this is not taking a wrong course; this is called support of the Dhamma, for the training rule was laid down for the restraint of the shameless and for the support of the conscientious. Therein, the shameless one, having received guidance, would come overwhelming; but the conscientious one, having received guidance, will speak having established his case - in what was seen, by the continuity of what was seen; in what was heard, by the continuity of what was heard. Therefore, support of the Dhamma is fitting for him. But if that conscientious one is wise and competent, and speaks having established his case, and the shameless one does not give an admission saying "This too does not exist, this too does not exist," the procedure should be carried out according to the admission of the shameless one alone.

And for the purpose of illustrating that meaning, this story should be known. The Elder Cūḷābhaya, master of the three Piṭakas, it is said, having taught the Vinaya to the monks beneath the Brazen Palace, would rise in the evening. At the time of his rising, two adversaries set a discussion in motion. One did not give an admission, saying "This too does not exist, this too does not exist." Then, when little remained in the first watch, the conviction of impurity arose in the Elder regarding that person: "This one speaks having established his case, but this one does not give an admission, and many matters have been brought forward - surely this must have been done by him." Then, giving a signal with the handle of a fan to the foot-rest, he said: "Friends, I am not suitable to adjudicate; have it adjudicated by another." "Why, venerable sir?" The Elder declared that matter. A burning arose in the body of the

accused person. Then he, having paid respects to the Elder, said: "Venerable sir, it is fitting that one suitable to adjudicate, an expert in the Vinaya, should be just such as you. And it is fitting that an accuser should be just such as this one." Having said this, he put on white garments and, having asked forgiveness saying "I have troubled you for a long time," he departed.

Thus, when accused by a conscientious monk, a shameless monk does not give admission even when many cases have arisen; he should be called neither "pure" nor "impure." He is what is called "a living dead" and what is called "one rotten while still raw."

If yet another such case arises against him, it should not be adjudicated. He will simply be as one expelled. If, however, a shameless monk accuses a shameless monk, he should be told: "Friend, what can be said about this one on the basis of your word?" Having said the same to the other as well, both should be dismissed with the words: "Live as those sharing common goods and requisites." No adjudication should be made for them regarding the matter of virtue. However, for matters concerning bowls, robes, dwelling places and the like, it should be made after obtaining a suitable witness.

Then, if a conscientious monk accuses a conscientious monk, and their dispute is only a trifling matter, they should be persuaded with "Do not act thus," made to confess the transgression, and dismissed. But here, if the accused has suddenly gone wrong, and from the beginning there has been no one called shameless. And he does not give admission for the sake of protecting his faction, and many rise up saying: "We believe, we believe." Let him be pure once or twice on the basis of their admission. But from the time of the transgression onwards, he does not stand in his position, and no adjudication should be given.

Thus, when a case has come before the midst of the Community by virtue of any accusation whatsoever, having understood the proper conduct regarding the accused and the accuser, the adjudication should be understood by way of the beginning, middle, conclusion and so forth of that very accusation, for the purpose of knowing its success or failure. That is to say: what is the beginning of an accusation, what is the middle, what is the conclusion? The beginning of an accusation is the act of seeking permission thus: "I wish to speak to you; let the venerable one grant me leave." The middle is the adjudication after accusing and reminding with the case that has been brought forward. The conclusion is the settlement by establishing either an offence or a non-offence.

How many roots does an accusation have, how many grounds, how many bases? An accusation has two roots - either with foundation or without foundation; three cases - what is seen, what is heard, what is suspected; five bases - "I shall speak at the right time, not at the wrong time; I shall speak truthfully, not untruthfully; I shall speak gently, not harshly; I shall speak what is connected with the goal, not what is unconnected with the goal; I shall speak with a mind of friendliness, not with inner hatred." And furthermore, in this accusation, the accusing person should be established in the fifteen qualities stated in the Upāli-pentad, by way of "Am I one of pure bodily conduct?" and so forth; the accused should be established in two qualities: in truthfulness and in non-anger.

"Perhaps I might cause him to fall from this holy life" means "Perhaps I might cause this person to fall from this supreme conduct"; it is said that "should accuse" is spoken with the intention: "It would be good indeed if I could cause this person to fall from this holy life." In the word-analysis, however, in order to show the synonymous meaning of this very phrase "might cause to fall from the holy life," it is said "might cause to fall from the state of being a monk" and so forth.

"Moment" and the rest are synonyms for "time." "That moment, that interval, that instant having passed" means when that moment, that interval, that instant has passed. For this is an accusative expression used in the sense of the locative.

In the description of "being pressed for reasons," "with whatever ground he has been accused" means: among the four grounds for expulsion, with whatever ground the accused has been accused, overwhelmed, and overcome by the accuser. "Being pressed for reasons regarding that ground" means: regarding that ground stated by the accuser, that accuser is being investigated, examined, and scrutinised by the investigator by way of "What did you see? How did you see it?" and so forth.

In the description of "not being pressed for reasons," "not being questioned by anyone" means: not being questioned by anyone, whether the investigator or another; or alternatively, not being questioned by anyone regarding the grounds of what was seen and so forth. And the connection of these two matrix terms with what follows should be understood through "and the monk admits to hatred." For this is what is meant - "Whether being pressed for reasons or not being pressed for reasons, the monk admits to hatred, relies upon it, acknowledges it - it is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community." And this is said only for the purpose of showing the time when the baselessness becomes evident. However, the offence is incurred at the very moment of the accusation.

Now, regarding the phrase "and that legal case is indeed unfounded," since the characteristic of being unfounded has already been stated above, in order to show something not yet stated rather than repeating that, he said beginning with "a legal case means." Therein, since a legal case, though one in the sense of being a legal case, is diverse by way of subject matter, in order to show that diversity he said beginning with "there are four legal cases: a dispute-legal case." But what is that sense of 'legal case' by which it is one? The quality of being adjudicable by means of settlements. Therefore, that concerning which, on account of which, in dependence on which, with reference to which, settlements operate - that should be understood as a "legal case."

However, in the commentaries it is said: "Some say a legal case is grasping, some say volition, some say impatience, some say verbal expression, some say designation." It was further examined thus: "If grasping were a legal case, then when one, having taken up a charge, while consulting with a fellow monk sees the danger therein and then abandons it, that legal case of his would have reached settlement. If volition were a legal case, the volition that arose as 'I shall take up this charge' ceases. If impatience were a legal case, even having taken up a charge through impatience, at a later stage, not obtaining a judgement or being asked for

forgiveness, one abandons it. If verbal expression were a legal case, having gone about speaking, at a later stage one becomes silent, without sound; thus that legal case of his would have reached settlement. Therefore, designation is a legal case."

But that is contradicted by such passages as "the offence of defeat involving sexual intercourse is of the same class as the offence of defeat involving sexual intercourse," etc. "thus an offence-legal case is of the same class as an offence-legal case," and "a dispute-legal case may be wholesome, may be unwholesome, may be indeterminate," and so forth. For they do not accept that designation has the nature of being wholesome and so forth, nor is the offence involving defeat mentioned in the phrase "with an unfounded charge of an offence involving defeat" a mere designation. Why? Because it is absolutely unwholesome. For this too was said - "An offence-legal case may be unwholesome or may be indeterminate."

And as for the unfounded defeat indicated in the phrase "with an unfounded charge of defeat," this phrase "and that legal case is indeed unfounded" is a cross-reference to that very same thing, not to a designation; for one does not cross-reference one thing having indicated another. However, since by whatever designation, by whatever utterance, the accuser has declared that person to have committed an offence involving defeat, and since the legal case reckoned as defeat is unfounded, that declaration too is unfounded; and because it operates in relation to a legal case, it is a legal case. Therefore, by this method, designation could be fitting as a "legal case"; or because what is called an unfounded legal case does not exist in reality, and exists merely as a designation. Therefore too, designation could be fitting as a legal case. But that is so only here, not everywhere. For designation is not a legal case in the case of disputes and so forth. The sense of 'legal case' for those, however, is the quality of being adjudicable by the settlements stated above. Thus, by this sense of 'legal case,' a certain dispute here is both a dispute and a legal case, hence a dispute-legal case. The same method applies in the remaining ones.

Therein, a dispute that has arisen in dependence on the eighteen grounds for schism, thus: "Here monks dispute, saying 'it is Dhamma' or 'it is not Dhamma,'" is a dispute-legal case. A censure that has arisen in dependence on the four kinds of failure, thus: "Here monks censure a monk for failure in virtue," is a censure-legal case. "The five classes of offences are an offence-legal case, the seven classes of offences are an offence-legal case" - thus an offence itself is an offence-legal case. "Whatever is the duty and obligation of the Community - a transaction by announcement, a transaction by motion, a transaction by motion with one proclamation, a transaction by motion with three proclamations" - thus the fourfold act of the Community should be understood as a duty-legal case.

In this matter, however, what is intended is only the offence-legal case, reckoned as a pārajika offence. The remaining ones are stated by way of extracting the meaning, for these are the meanings of the word "legal case." Among those, only pārajika is intended here. That legal case is indeed unfounded by the bases of what is seen, etc. And this monk is established in hate, stands dependent on it, and admits it by saying "What I said was empty" and so forth. For that monk, it is a saṅghādisesa at the very moment of the accusation - this, then, is the meaning of this training rule together with its word-by-word analysis.

387. Now, showing the determination of offences in detail by means of those grounds for accusation beginning with "seen" and so forth that were stated in brief, he said beginning with "one who is not seen." Therein, "one who is not seen" means he is unseen by him. He is unseen by this accuser; the meaning is that that person is committing an offence involving expulsion. The same method applies also in "one who is not heard" and so forth.

"Seen by me" means the statement is "you were seen by me." The same method applies also in "heard by me" and so forth. The remainder in the section based on not seeing is clear in meaning. However, in the section based on seeing, when he accuses him saying "heard by me," the groundlessness should be understood through the absence of what is heard and so forth as thus stated.

And in this entire section on the accuser, just as with the statements that have come here - "you have committed an offence involving expulsion, you are not a recluse, you are not a disciple of the son of the Sakyan" - there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community for each speech by virtue of each one, so too with the statements that have come elsewhere - "immoral, of evil nature, of impure and suspect conduct, of concealed actions, not a recluse though claiming to be a recluse, not a celibate though claiming to be a celibate, inwardly rotten, oozing with defilements, born of rubbish" - there is indeed an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community for each speech by virtue of each one.

However, "there is not with you the Observance or the invitation ceremony to admonish or a legal act of the Community" - these alone do not constitute a heading; but when combined with any of the terms beginning with "you are immoral, there is not with you the Observance" or with any of the terms beginning with "you have committed an offence involving expulsion," they do constitute a heading and are productive of an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

But the Elder Mahāpaduma said - "Not only do the terms beginning with 'immoral, of evil nature' that have not come in the canonical text here constitute a heading, but these too constitute a heading: 'you are a eunuch, you are a great novice, you are a great lay follower, you are one of senior observance, you are a Nigaṇṭha, you are an Ājīvaka, you are an ascetic, you are a wandering ascetic, you are a paṇḍaka, you are one living in theft, you are one who has gone over to another sect, you are an animal, you are a matricide, you are a patricide, you are a killer of an arahant, you are a schismatic, you are one who has shed blood, you are a defiler of a nun, you are one of dual sex.'" And the Elder Mahāpaduma himself says: "In 'being doubtful about what was seen' and so forth, to the extent that one is doubtful, to that extent one does not consider; to the extent that one does not consider, to that extent it slips away; to the extent that it slips away, to that extent one has forgotten."

But the Elder Mahāsuma, dividing each one into two, shows the method for each of the four separately. How? "Being doubtful about what was seen" - here, first, one is doubtful either about the seeing or about the person. Therein, "was he seen by me or not seen?" - thus one is doubtful about the seeing. "Was this the one seen by me or another?" - thus one is doubtful about the person. Similarly, one does not consider either the seeing or the person, either the seeing slips away or the person, one has forgotten either the seeing or the person. Here, "doubtful" means one in whom doubt

has arisen. "Does not consider" means does not believe. "Slips away" means it slips away when not being reminded. But when they remind him thus: "Venerable sir, at such and such a place, at such and such a time," then he remembers. "Forgotten" means one who, even when being reminded by various means, still does not remember. By this same method the section on the instigator should also be understood; the only difference is that therein "by me" is omitted, the rest is the same as the section on the accuser.

389. Thereafter, in order to show the classification of offences and the classification of non-offences, having set forth the group of four beginning with "view of what is pure regarding what is impure," each term is described with four divisions each, and all of that can be understood by the method of the canonical text itself. Only the classification of intention herein should be understood. For this intention is of many kinds, namely - intention of causing to fall, intention of reviling, intention of formal action, intention of rehabilitation, intention of suspending the observance day or the invitation ceremony, intention of investigating, and intention of giving a talk on the Teaching. Therein, in the first four intentions, for one who has not obtained permission, there is a wrong-doing. And even having obtained permission, for one who charges face to face with a groundless offence involving expulsion, there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. For one who charges with a groundless offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community, there is an offence of expiation. For one who charges with failure in conduct, there is a wrong-doing. For one who speaks with the intention of reviling, there is an offence of expiation. But for one who speaks not face to face with any of the seven classes of offences, there is a wrong-doing. For one who carries out any of the seven kinds of formal action not face to face, there is only a wrong-doing.

However, in the Kurundī it is stated: "For one who speaks with the intention of rehabilitation, saying 'You have committed this offence; you should make amends for it,' there is no need for the procedure of obtaining permission." But in all texts it is stated: "For one who suspends the observance day or the invitation ceremony, there is no procedure of obtaining permission." However, the scope for suspension should be understood. For in the announcement "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. Today is the fifteenth day observance. If it is suitable for the Community, the Community should carry out the observance" - it is permissible to suspend only while the re-syllable has not been passed. But after that, when the yya-syllable has been reached, it is not permissible. This is the method for the invitation ceremony as well. For an investigator too, when the matter has been brought forward, for one who speaks with the intention of investigating, saying "This concerns you," there is no procedure of obtaining permission.

For a Dhamma-speaker too, having sat on the Dhamma-seat, for one who teaches the Dhamma without specifying anyone, in such a manner as "Whoever does this and that, this monk is not a true recluse," there is no procedure of obtaining permission. But if he specifies and designates, saying "So-and-so and so-and-so is not a true recluse, not a true lay follower," he should descend from the Dhamma-seat, confess the offence, and then go. But wherever it is stated "without having obtained permission," the meaning of that should be understood as "not having obtained

permission," for there is no such thing as "non-permission" by which one commits an offence; rather, one commits an offence by not having obtained permission. The remainder is clear in itself.

Regarding the origins and so forth, it has three origins -it originates from body and mind, from speech and mind, and from body, speech, and mind. It is action, exempt from the factor of perception, with consciousness, a worldly fault, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling.

The Commentary on the First Training Rule concerning Malicious False Accusation is finished.

9. Commentary on the Second Training Rule on Corrupt Ill-Will

391. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the second training rule concerning corrupt accusation. Therein, "Come, friends, let us name this he-goat Dabba the Mallian" - it is said that they, being unable to accomplish their desire in the first case, having received censure and having become distressed, wandered about seeking such an occasion, thinking "Now we shall know." Then one day, having seen and being delighted, looking at one another, they said thus - "Come, friends, let us name this he-goat Dabba the Mallian" - what is meant is "let us make his name 'Dabba the Mallian.'" The same method applies here also with regard to "the nun named Mettiyā."

"Those monks questioned the monks Mettiya and Bhūmajaka" - they questioned thus - "Friends, where was Dabba the Mallian seen by you together with the nun Mettiyā?" "At the foot of the Vulture's Peak mountain." "At what time?" "At the time of going for alms-round." "Friend Dabba, these say thus - where were you then?" "I was assigning meals in the Bamboo Grove." "Who knows of your presence in the Bamboo Grove at that time?" "The Community of monks, venerable sir." They asked the Community - "Do you know of this one's presence in the Bamboo Grove at that time?" "Yes, friends, we know; the Elder has been in the Bamboo Grove itself from the day he received the appointment." Then they said to Mettiya and Bhūmajaka - "Friends, your account does not agree; surely you are not speaking having cast a pretext upon him?" Thus, being questioned by those monks, having said "Yes, friends," they reported this matter.

"But did you, friends, the Venerable Dabba the Mallian, from a legal case belonging to another class" - herein, "belonging to another class" means "this belongs to another class" or "it has another class." "Legal case" should be understood as a basis; what is meant is a ground, a foundation. For that he-goat which was called "named Dabba the Mallian" - whereas the Venerable Dabba the Mallian's class, portion, and side are human birth and the state of being a monk, that he-goat belongs to another class, portion, and side, namely animal birth and the state of being a he-goat, or it has another class - therefore it receives the designation "belonging to another class." And because for those who were saying "let us name this one Dabba the Mallian," the basis, ground, and foundation of that act of naming was that, therefore it should be understood as a "legal case." For it was with reference to that that those monks said "from a legal case belonging to another class," not one among the legal cases of dispute and so forth. Why? Because of impossibility. For they did not take up any pretext, even a mere trifle, from any legal case belonging to another class among the

four kinds of legal cases. And there is no such thing as a pretext of the four kinds of legal cases. For pretexts such as the pretext of birth and so forth are stated as pretexts of persons only, not of legal cases of dispute and so forth. And this name "Dabba the Mallian" is some pretext of that he-goat standing in the position of a legal case belonging to another class, a mere trifle sufficient to accuse the Elder with a baseless offence involving expulsion.

Herein, "pretext" means: it is spoken of as "this is his" - it appears and is attributed to him. This is a designation for any one category among birth and so forth. "Trifling pretext" means: it touches, clings to, and slightly adheres to another matter merely by way of expression. This is a designation for any one category among birth and so forth only. What follows beyond that is of clear meaning. The same meaning applies also in the laying down of the training rule. However, in the word-analysis, regarding "one who should accuse with an offence involving expulsion, taking up some trifling pretext from a legal case belonging to another class" - since that has become manifest only by way of the originating incident, it should be understood that it was not analysed.

393. "Whatever legal cases" means the four legal cases that have proceeded by way of extracting the meaning from the common usage of the term; since their belonging to another class and belonging to the same class are not evident and should be known by bearers of the Vinaya, therefore, depending on the legal case obtained from the common usage of the term, making it clear, he said: "'Of a legal case belonging to another class' means either belonging to another class of offence or belonging to another class of legal case," etc. And the accusation that was stated at the end by way of a legal case belonging to another class of offence - in order to show that as well, it should be understood that this classification of belonging to the same class and belonging to another class of all legal cases has been compiled.

Therein, since "or belonging to another class of offence" was mentioned first, the exposition should have begun with "And how is an offence belonging to another class of an offence?" But since this matter will come up in the very investigation of belonging to the same class of a legal case arising from offences, therefore it should be understood that, without beginning thus, the exposition was commenced by taking up only the latter phrase: "How is a legal case belonging to another class of a legal case?"

Therein, the section on belonging to another class is clear in meaning. For each legal case belongs to another class, another side, another portion of the remaining three, because of the dissimilarity of the basis; but in the section on belonging to the same class, a legal case arising from contention belongs to the same class, the same side, the same portion as a legal case arising from contention, because of the similarity of the basis; likewise a legal case arising from censure belongs to the same class as a legal case arising from censure. How? For a dispute that has arisen depending on the eighteen grounds for schism from the time of the Buddha and a dispute arising now are just one legal case arising from contention, because of the similarity of the basis; likewise censure that has arisen depending on the four kinds of misconduct from the time of the Buddha and censure arising now are just one legal case arising from censure, because of the similarity of the basis. But since a legal case arising from offences does not categorically belong to the same class as a legal case arising from

offences, due to similar and dissimilar bases and due to similar and dissimilar natures, therefore it was said: "A legal case arising from offences may belong to the same class as a legal case arising from offences, or may belong to another class." Therein, since belonging to another class was described first from the beginning, here too belonging to another class was described first; therein, the belonging to another class and further the belonging to the same class should be understood in the manner already stated.

Regarding "a legal case arising from obligations belongs to the same class as a legal case arising from obligations" - here, a legal case that has arisen depending on the four acts of the Community from the time of the Buddha and a legal case arising now depending on the four acts of the Community are just one legal case arising from obligations, because of the similarity and likeness. But is a legal case arising from obligations a legal case that has arisen depending on acts of the Community, or is this merely a designation for acts of the Community themselves? This is merely a designation for acts of the Community themselves. Even so, what is called an act of the Community - since it arises depending on the characteristic of the act that one attends to as "this and that should be done thus," and since it arises depending on each preceding act of the Community, it was said that a legal case that has arisen depending on acts of the Community is a legal case arising from obligations.

394. "Taking up some trifling pretext from a certain point": here, however, since "point" or "trifling pretext" are different only in wording but identical in meaning, in the manner already stated above, therefore he said "pretext means ten pretexts - pretext of birth, pretext of name" etc. Therein, birth itself is the pretext of birth. The same method applies in the remaining ones.

395. Now, in order to show that same pretext in detail, demonstrating it with a concrete case as to how, based on that, intimidation occurs, he said beginning with "The pretext of birth: a warrior is seen." Therein, "a warrior is seen" means some other person of the warrior caste has been seen by this accuser. "Committing an offence involving expulsion" means committing any one among sexual intercourse and the other such offences. "Having seen another warrior, he accuses him" means then he, having seen another monk of the warrior caste who is his enemy, and seizing upon that pretext of warrior birth, accuses him thus: "A warrior was seen by me committing an offence involving expulsion; you are a warrior, you have committed an offence involving expulsion," or alternatively, "You are that warrior, not another; you have committed an offence involving expulsion, you are not a recluse, you are not a disciple of the son of the Sakyan, there is not with you the Observance or the invitation ceremony to admonish or a legal act of the Community," there is an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community for each speech. And here, it should be understood that the dissimilarity between those warriors, one to another, constitutes the factor of being of a different category by virtue of their respective tall stature and so forth, or by virtue of being seen and so forth, and the factor of being the basis is by virtue of the designation of warrior birth; by this method, the application in all cases should be understood.

400. And in the description of the pretext of bowl, "glazed clay bowl" means a clay bowl that is similar to an iron bowl, well-shaped, smooth-surfaced, glossy, and the colour of a bee. "Ordinary clay bowl" means an ordinary clay bowl.

406. But since the exposition of the offence-pretext was stated in brief in just a single phrase, therefore in order to show it in detail as well, "a monk is seen committing an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community" and so forth was stated. But why was it stated separately here without giving the exposition right there? Because it is dissimilar to the remaining expositions. For the remaining expositions were stated by way of accusing another having seen one thing in another. But this was stated by way of accusing with a different offence having seen one and the same person committing a different offence. If so, how does it belong to another class of legal issue? By reason of the offence. For that very reason it was said - "Thus also it belongs to another class of offence and a pretext has been grasped." For that offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community which he has committed, that is a legal issue belonging to another class than expulsion. The pretext of that legal issue belonging to another class is the state of being an offence which is common to all offences, just as the state of being a warrior-noble is common to all warrior-nobles. By this method, the pattern based on the remaining offences as root and the section on the accuser should be understood.

408. "There is no offence if one who perceives it as actual accuses or causes to accuse" means: whoever, perceiving it as actual thus - "this one has indeed committed a pārājika offence" - accuses or causes to accuse, there is no offence for him. The remainder is clear everywhere. The origins and so forth are similar to those of the first case concerning corrupt motive.

The Commentary on the Second Training Rule concerning Malicious False Accusation is finished.

10. Commentary on the First Training Rule on Schism of the Community

409. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the training rule concerning schism in the Community. Therein, in the passage beginning with "Then Devadatta" etc., who Devadatta was, how he went forth, and for what reason he approached Kokālika and the others and said "Come, friends, let us create a schism in the Community of the ascetic Gotama, a breaking of the concord." All that has already come in the Chapter on Schism in the Community. However, although the request for the five cases will also come there itself, since it has also come here, we shall proceed only after stating what should be said here.

"It would be good, venerable sir" - this is the request. "Monks should be forest-dwellers for life" means having undertaken the forest-dweller ascetic practice, all monks should be forest-dwellers as long as they live, they should dwell only in the forest. "Whoever would resort to the edge of a village, a fault would touch him" means whoever, even a single monk, having abandoned the forest, would resort to the edge of a village for the purpose of dwelling, a fault would touch him - he speaks with the intention that "let a fault touch that monk, let the Blessed One make him liable to an offence." The same method applies to the remaining cases as well.

410. "We shall convince people" means we shall make people know our state of having few wishes and so forth, or alternatively, it is said to mean we shall please them, we shall inspire confidence in them.

However, just upon hearing the words of Devadatta requesting these five cases, the Blessed One understood: "This one requests having become desirous of schism in the Community." But because those cases, if allowed, would lead to obstruction of the path for many sons of good families, therefore the Blessed One, having rejected them saying "Enough, Devadatta," said "Whoever wishes, let him be a forest-dweller" and so forth.

Here, however, having understood the Blessed One's intention, a son of good family should discern what is suitable for himself. For here this is the Blessed One's intention - "One monk is of great aspiration and great energy, and is able, having rejected a dwelling at the edge of a village, to make an end of suffering while dwelling in the forest. One is weak and of little strength, unable in the forest, but able only at the edge of a village. One is of great strength, of balanced constitution, endowed with the patience of endurance, even-minded towards the pleasant and unpleasant, and is able both in the forest and at the edge of a village. One is able neither at the edge of a village nor in the forest, and is one for whom the text alone is the highest attainment.

Therein, he who is of great aspiration and great energy, and is able, having rejected a dwelling at the edge of a village, to make an end of suffering while dwelling in the forest - let him dwell in the forest itself; this is suitable for him. And his co-residents and others, following his example, will also consider that one should dwell in the forest.

But he who is weak and of little strength, and is able to make an end of suffering only at the edge of a village, not in the forest - let him dwell at the edge of a village itself. He who is of great strength, of balanced constitution, endowed with the patience of endurance, even-minded towards the pleasant and unpleasant, and is able both in the forest and at the edge of a village - let him too, having abandoned a dwelling at the edge of a village, dwell in the forest; this is suitable for him. For his co-residents too, following his example, will consider that one should dwell in the forest.

But he who is able neither at the edge of a village nor in the forest, and is one for whom the text alone is the highest attainment - let him too dwell in the forest itself. For his practice of the austere practices and development of meditation subjects will become a supporting condition for the path and fruits in the future. And his co-residents and others, following his example, will consider that one should dwell in the forest."

Thus, with reference to this person who is weak and of little strength, and who, while dwelling only at the edge of a village, is able to make an end of suffering, not in the forest, the Blessed One said "Whoever wishes, let him dwell at the edge of a village." And by this person, the door was opened for others as well.

But if the Blessed One were to accept Devadatta's proposal, for that person who is naturally weak and of little strength, and also for one who, having managed forest-dwelling in youth, is unable to manage it in old age or at a time when disturbance of the elements has arisen through wind, bile and so forth, but who, while dwelling at the edge of a village, is able to make an end of suffering - for them there would be an obstruction of the noble path, there would be no attainment of the fruit of arahantship, the Teacher's dispensation would be contrary to the Dhamma, contrary

to the Vinaya, adverse, and not leading to liberation, and the Teacher would be one of incomplete knowledge regarding them, and would be blameworthy as "having abandoned his own doctrine, he has established himself in Devadatta's doctrine." Therefore the Blessed One, encompassing such persons, rejected Devadatta's proposal. By this same method, the determination should be understood in the case of the almsfood-eater, in the case of the rag-robe wearer, and in the case of the tree-root dweller for eight months. But for four months, the tree-root dwelling is simply rejected.

In the case of fish and meat, "pure in three respects" means purified by three points, meaning free from the impurities of being seen and so forth. Therefore he said - "Not seen, not heard, not suspected." Therein, "not seen" means not having seen game and fish being killed and taken for the sake of monks. "Not heard" means not having heard that game and fish were killed and taken for the sake of monks. "Not suspected," however, should be understood from the opposite of what is suspected through seeing, suspected through hearing, and suspected free from both of those. How? Here monks see people going out from a village or wandering in the forest with nets, snares and so forth in their hands, and on the following day, when they have entered that village for alms, they offer them almsfood containing fish and meat. They suspect on account of what was seen: "Was this perhaps done for the sake of monks?" This is called "suspected through seeing"; it is not proper to accept this. What is thus unsuspected, that is proper. But if those people, having asked "Why, venerable sir, do you not accept?" and having heard the reason, say "This, venerable sir, was not done for the sake of monks; it was done by us for our own sake or for the sake of those in the king's service and so forth," then it is allowable.

The monks indeed do not see; but they hear, "People with nets, traps, and so forth in hand are reportedly going out from the village or wandering in the forest." And on the second day, when they have entered that village for almsfood, they suspect "Was this perhaps done for the sake of monks?" - this is called "suspected through hearing." On the second day, when they have entered that village for almsfood, the suspicion "Was this perhaps done for the sake of monks?" - this is called "suspected through hearing." It is not proper to accept this; that which is thus unsuspected, that is proper. But if those people, having asked "Why, venerable sir, do you not accept?" and having heard the reason, say "This, venerable sir, was not done for the sake of monks; it was done by us for our own sake or for the sake of those in the king's service and others," it is allowable.

The monks indeed neither see nor hear; but when they have entered the village for almsfood, people take their bowls and, having prepared almsfood with fish and meat, offer it to them. They suspect "Was this perhaps done for the sake of monks?" - this is called "suspected through freedom from both." It is not proper to accept this. What is thus unsuspected, that is proper. But if those people, having asked "Why, venerable sir, do you not accept?" and having heard the reason, say "This, venerable sir, was not done for the sake of monks; it was done by us for our own sake or for the sake of those in the king's service and others, or having obtained only allowable meat that was already available, it was prepared for the sake of monks," it is allowable. Even

when done for the purpose of funeral rites for the dead or for the purpose of blessings and so on, the same method applies. For whatever is not done solely for the sake of monks, and regarding which one is without doubt, all that is allowable.

But if in one monastery it has been done specifically for monks, and they do not know the fact of its having been done for their own benefit, but others know. For those who know, it is not proper; for the others, it is proper. The others do not know, but those very ones know; for those very ones it is not proper, for the others it is proper. They too know "It was done for our sake," and the others too know "It was done for their sake" - for all it is not proper. All do not know - for all it is proper. For among the five co-residents, when it has been done designating any one of them, it is not allowable for all.

But if someone, having killed a living being designating one monk, fills his bowl and gives it, and he, knowing that it was done for his sake, takes it and gives it to another monk, and that one consumes it in good faith, for whom is there an offence? There is no offence for either of the two. For the one for whom it was done by designation, there is no offence because he did not eat it; for the other, because he did not know. For indeed there is no offence in accepting allowable meat. And for one who, not knowing it was done by designation, ate it and later came to know, there is no duty of confessing an offence; but for one who, not knowing it was unallowable meat, ate it and later came to know, the offence should be confessed. For an offence arises only for one who eats knowing it was done by designation. Even for one who eats unallowable meat without knowing, there is indeed an offence. Therefore, one who fears offences, even while examining the appearance, should accept meat only after asking. Or, having taken it thinking "I shall ask at the time of consumption and then consume it," one should consume it only after asking. Why? Because of the difficulty of cognising. For bear meat is similar to pork, and leopard meat and so forth are similar to deer meat and so forth; therefore they say that one should accept it only after asking.

"Glad and elated" means having become pleased and with uplifted body and mind. It is said that he, having shown a gesture to Kokālika indicating "The Blessed One does not allow these five cases; now I shall be able to create a schism in the Community," just as a man wishing to die by eating poison, or by hanging himself with a rope, or by taking up a weapon, having obtained one of these such as poison, not knowing the suffering of death that is near on account of that, is glad and elated; just so, not knowing the suffering to be experienced after being reborn in Avīci on account of the schism in the Community that was near, thinking "Now I have found the means for schism in the Community," glad and elated, together with his retinue, rising from his seat, with that very gladness, having paid homage to the Blessed One, having circumambulated him, he departed.

"We shall live having undertaken these five cases" - here, although it should have been said "these five cases," because of the force of his constant preoccupation with "we shall convince people with these five cases," without noticing the grammatical irregularity due to constant preoccupation, he said "we with these five cases" in accordance with his constant preoccupation, as one whose mind was distracted.

"Austere, living in detachment" - the practice that shakes off the defilements, because of being endowed with that, they are austere. And that which pares away the defilements, that is their way of living, thus they are living in detachment.

"Given to luxurious living" - the abundance of requisites such as robes is luxury; that luxury exists for him, or he is engaged and established in that luxury, thus he is given to luxurious living. "He intends for luxurious living" means he intends, plans, and arranges for abundance. The meaning is: he has fallen into eagerness thinking "How indeed could there be abundance of requisites such as robes for both me and my disciples." "For breaking of the concord" means for breaking of the authority.

"Having given a talk on Dhamma" means according to the method stated in the Khandhaka: "Enough, Devadatta, do not let schism in the Community please you. Schism in the Community is grave, Devadatta. Whoever, Devadatta, splits a united Community, produces a demerit lasting for an aeon, is tormented in hell for an aeon; but whoever, Devadatta, reunites a divided Community, produces the highest merit, rejoices in heaven for an aeon" - having given such a manifold talk on Dhamma, suitable and appropriate, to Devadatta and the monks.

411. "Of a united" means of one that is harmonious, not separated in mind and body - this is the meaning. For this very meaning has been shown in the word-analysis as well. For by saying "of the same communion," non-separation in mind has been shown. By saying "standing within the same boundary," in body. How? For one of the same communion, being free from one of different communion by views or one of different communion by act, is not separated in mind due to equality of mind. One standing within the same boundary is not separated in body due to the giving of bodily unity.

"A legal case conducive to schism" means a cause conducive to the purpose of schism, that is, the splitting of the Community. For in this context, "legal case" (adhikaraṇa) is intended as "cause," just as in such passages as "on account of desire, with desire as origin, with desire as cause" and so forth. And since that is of eighteen kinds, therefore in the word-analysis it is said "eighteen grounds for creating schism." These, however, have come in the Khandhaka by the method beginning with "Here, Upāli, a monk represents what is not Dhamma as Dhamma," therefore we shall explain their meaning in that very place. And also that schism of the Community occurs based on these grounds by five causes - namely, by act, by recitation, by declaration, by proclamation, and by taking of voting tickets - that too we shall make clear in the very place where it occurs. In brief, however, "taking up a legal case conducive to schism" - here the meaning should be understood thus: having taken up a cause conducive to the purpose of schism of the Community, capable of accomplishing the schism of the Community. "Holding forth" means having held up, raised up, and made manifest. "Should persist" means should remain keeping it just as undertaken and just as held forth. But since by one who thus holds forth and persists, that is both displayed and not relinquished, therefore in the word-analysis it is said "should display" and "should not relinquish."

"Should be addressed thus by the monks" means he should be thus spoken to by other conscientious monks. And in the word-analysis, "those who see" means those who see him face to face holding forth and persisting. "Those who hear" means also

those who hear "In such and such a monastery, monks are persisting in taking up and holding forth a legal case conducive to schism."

"Let the venerable one be united with the Community" means let the venerable one come together with the Community, let him assemble together, let him be of one view - this is the meaning. Why? For a united Community, being joyful, without contention, with common recitation, dwells comfortably.

Therein, "being joyful" means rejoicing with one another through the attainment of the Teacher. "Without contention" means not disputing thus: "This is Dhamma, this is not Dhamma." "With common recitation" (ekuddeso) means there is one recitation, the Pātimokkha recitation carried out together, not separately - this is the meaning. "Dwells comfortably" means dwells happily.

"This is wholesome" means this relinquishment is wholesome, safe, a state of well-being for that monk. "If he does not relinquish, there is an offence of wrong-doing" means an offence of wrong-doing for one who does not relinquish after being told three times. "Those who, having heard, do not speak, there is an offence of wrong-doing" means for those who, having heard, do not speak, there is also an offence of wrong-doing. At what distance is there an offence of wrong-doing for those who, having heard, do not speak? Within one monastery, there is nothing to be said about it. But in the Commentary it is said: "Within half a yojana all around, it is the responsibility of the monks. There is no freedom from offence even for one who speaks by sending a messenger or a letter. One should go oneself and restrain him saying: 'Schism of the Community is serious, friend. Do not strive for schism of the Community.'" But one who is able should go even far, for it is indeed the responsibility of those who are not ill even at a distance.

Now, in order to show only the meaning in the passage beginning with "And if that monk, when spoken to thus by the monks," he stated the passage beginning with "that monk should be spoken to even by dragging him into the midst of the Community." Therein, "even by dragging him into the midst of the Community" means: if, when spoken to in the former manner, he does not relinquish it, even by seizing him by the hands and feet and dragging him into the midst of the Community, he should again be spoken to three times in the manner beginning with "Let not the venerable one."

"Should be admonished up to the third time" means: he should be admonished up to the third admonition. It is stated that the formal act should be performed with three formal act statements of admonition. However, in the word-analysis, taking only the meaning, in order to show the procedure of admonition, the passage beginning with "that monk should be admonished. And thus, monks, he should be admonished" etc. was stated.

414. Therein, "at the motion there is a wrong-doing, at the two proclamations the grave offences are revoked" means: both the wrong-doing committed at the conclusion of the motion, and the grave offences at the two proclamations - those three offences too are revoked by the third proclamation merely upon reaching the syllable "yya" in the phrase "let him who does not consent speak," and only the offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community remains. But do offences already committed become revoked, or those not yet committed? The Elder

Mahāsuma states: "One who will relinquish at the conclusion does not commit those offences; therefore, offences not yet committed are revoked." The Elder Mahāpaduma, however, said: "Just as offences not shared in common are revoked through change of sex-characteristic, so too offences already committed are revoked; what need is there of revocation for those not yet committed?"

415. "If it is a legally valid act, perceiving it as a legally valid act" means: if that act of admonition is a legally valid act, "perceiving it as a legally valid act" in regard to that - this is the meaning. This same method applies everywhere. Here, perception does not protect; precisely because the act is legally valid, one who does not relinquish commits an offence.

416. "For one who is not admonished" means there is no offence of saṅghādisesa for one who is not being admonished, even if he does not relinquish.

"For one who gives up" means there is no offence of saṅghādisesa for one who gives up before the motion, or at the moment of the motion, or at the conclusion of the motion, or at the first proclamation, or at the second, or at the third, so long as the final syllable "-yya" has not been reached.

For the first offender. Here, however, because it is stated in the Parivāra "Devadatta strove for the schism of a united Community, in that matter," Devadatta is the first offender. And that was only for striving for schism of the Community, not for not relinquishing. For that formal act was not carried out against him. If one asks, how is this to be known? From the text. For just as it is understood that the formal act was carried out against Ariṭṭha because it is stated in the Parivāra "The monk Ariṭṭha, formerly a vulture-trainer, did not relinquish after being admonished up to three times, in that matter," it is not so in the case of Devadatta. Even if someone were to say merely according to his own preference that the formal act must have been carried out against him, even so there is no such thing as non-offence for the first offender in the case of not relinquishing. For there is no such thing as non-offence seen for one who transgresses an enacted training rule, except for what has been specifically permitted. Whatever has been written in the manuscripts as "for the first offender" in the non-offence clause of Ariṭṭha's training rule, that was written through carelessness. And that it was written through carelessness should be understood from the statement concerning the imposition of the offence in the Kammakkhandhaka thus: "First the monk Ariṭṭha should be charged, having charged him he should be reminded, having reminded him the offence should be imposed upon him."

Thus, since that formal act was not carried out against Devadatta, the first offender, in the case of striving for schism, therefore no offence at all arose for him. However, because the training rule was enacted on account of him, he is called "the first offender." Thus non-offence is stated for him precisely because of the absence of an offence. Although this non-offence is already established by the phrase "for one who is not admonished," the term "one who is not admonished" refers to one against whom they simply do not carry out the admonition, not to the first offender. And this Devadatta is indeed the first offender, therefore "for the first offender" is stated. By this method, the determination in all admonitions should be understood, except for Ariṭṭha's training rule. The remainder is clear everywhere.

Among the origins and so forth, it is three-factored, of one origin, and this is called the admonition-origin; it arises from body, speech, and mind. However, because the offence is incurred by one who does not make any bodily gesture or verbal expression saying "I relinquish," it is non-activity, released by perception, with consciousness, a worldly fault, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling.

The Commentary on the First Training Rule concerning Schism of the Community is finished.

11. Commentary on the Second Training Rule on Schism of the Community

417-418. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the second training rule on schism in the Community. Therein, "followers" means those who follow along by adopting his views, acceptance, and approval. "Partisans" means those who speak words siding with discord, that is, factious speech. In the word-analysis, however, it is stated "they stand for his praise and for his faction." The meaning is: they stand for the purpose of praising him who is striving for schism in the Community and for the purpose of increasing his faction. For those who are partisans are invariably of this nature; therefore it is stated thus. But since those numbering more than three are not eligible for the formal act - for the Community does not perform a formal act against the Community - therefore it is stated "one or two or three."

"He knows us" means he knows our desires and so forth. "He speaks" means he speaks together with us saying "let us do thus." "This is agreeable to us too" means what he does, that is pleasing to us as well.

"Let the venerable ones' minds be reconciled with the Community" means: let the venerable ones' minds come together, meet with the Community, become unified - this is what is stated. The remainder here is evident by reason of having been stated in the method of the first training rule and by reason of its meaning being clear.

The origin and so forth are also similar to those of the first training rule.

The Commentary on the Second Training Rule concerning Schism of the Community is finished.

12. Commentary on the Training Rule on Being Difficult to Admonish

424. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the training rule on being difficult to speak to. Therein, "was engaging in misconduct" means he was committing manifold transgressions through the doors of body and speech. "What indeed" - this is a word of disparagement. "I indeed" - this is a word of self-exaltation. "I should speak to you" shows that "do this, do not do this" - I am worthy to speak thus to you. If one asks why? Because he spoke referring to such matters as "the Blessed One, the Buddha, having mounted Kaṇṭhaka, went forth together with me and became a renunciant." Having said "the Teaching is ours," then showing the justification for its being his own possession, he said "the Teaching was fully realised by our master's son." Because the Teaching of the Four Truths was penetrated by our master's son, therefore the Teaching too is ours - this is what is meant. However, considering the Community as standing on the side of his enemies, he does not say "the Community is ours." But having stated a simile, wishing to disparage the Community, he said "just as" and so forth. "Grass, sticks, and fallen leaves" means grass, sticks, and leaves fallen here and there. Alternatively, grass and worthless,

light sticks are "grass and sticks." "Fallen leaves" means old leaves. "Might heap together" means might make into a pile.

"Mountain" means originating from a mountain; for such a river has a swift current, therefore he takes that very one. "Shells, moss, and water plants" - herein, "shells" refers to the long-rooted leaf-moss. "Moss" means blue-green moss; the remainder - water-scum, sesame seeds, and so forth - all come under the designation of "water plants." "Heaped together" shows that they have been gathered together and made into a pile in one place by whatever means.

425-426. "Difficult to admonish by nature" means one whose nature is difficult to admonish, meaning one who cannot be spoken to. In the word-analysis too, "difficult to admonish" means one who must be spoken to with difficulty and hardship; it is not possible to speak to him with ease - this is the meaning. "With qualities that make one difficult to admonish" means with those that produce the state of being difficult to admonish; endowed with those qualities that make a person difficult to admonish - this is the meaning. Those, however, are set out in sequence in the Anumāna Sutta by the method beginning with "And what, friends, are the qualities that make one difficult to admonish? Here, friends, a monk has evil wishes" - having evil wishes, self-exaltation and disparagement of others, being prone to anger, bearing grudges on account of anger, being resentful on account of anger, uttering words bordering on anger on account of anger, opposing the accuser, disparaging the accuser, counter-charging the accuser, evading the issue with another issue, not explaining one's conduct, being contemptuous and domineering, being envious and miserly, being deceitful and fraudulent, being obstinate and arrogant, and adhering to one's own views, grasping firmly and being difficult to make relinquish - these nineteen qualities should be understood.

One who does not endure admonition, who does not accept it, is "impatient." Because of not practising as instructed, one who does not receive instruction in the proper manner is "one who does not receive instruction properly."

"Included in the recitation" means included in, comprised within, the recitation. Because they are comprised thus: "Whoever should have an offence, let him reveal it" - the meaning is: occurring within the Pātimokkha. "Being spoken to legitimately" means being spoken to by means of what is legitimate - this is an instrumental used in the sense of means; because one must train in the five legitimate matters, or because they belong to those, the meaning is: being spoken to by means of a training rule laid down by the Buddha, which has received the designation "legitimate."

"Refrain, venerable ones, from speaking to me" means: refrain from that speech of mine by which you speak to me. What is said is: "Do not speak those words to me."

"Let him speak with reason" means: let him speak by means of a legitimate training rule, or with reason, or even with any other speech conducive to a state of confidence. "That is to say" is a particle used in the sense of indicating the cause of growth. By that, the cause of the growth of the assembly is shown thus: "This mutual speech of benefit to one another and the raising up from offences - by that mutual speaking and mutual raising up, the assembly has grown." The remainder is clear everywhere.

The origin and other factors are similar to those of the first schism.

The Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Difficult to Admonish is finished.

13. Commentary on the Training Rule on Corrupting Families

431. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the training rule concerning the corruption of families. Therein, "named Assaji and Punabbasuka" means Assaji and Punabbasuka. "At Kīṭāgiri" means in the country district so named. "Were resident" - here, "resident" means those who have a residence. "Residence" refers to a monastery. Those upon whom it is dependent by way of bearing the burden of carrying out new construction, restoring old buildings, and so forth - they are "resident monks." But those who merely dwell in a monastery are called "nevāsikā" (mere dwellers). These were resident monks. "Shameless, evil monks" means monks without shame, inferior monks; for they were the senior group of six among the group of six.

It is said that in Sāvatthī, six companions said: "Farming and such work are difficult; come, friends, let us go forth! And when a matter arises for those going forth, it is proper to go forth at a place where one can get through it," and having consulted thus, they went forth in the presence of the two chief disciples. Having become five years in seniority and having mastered the mātikā, they consulted: "A country district is sometimes prosperous and sometimes in famine; let us not dwell in one place, let us dwell in three places." Then they said to Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka: "Friends, Sāvatthī is inhabited by five million seven hundred thousand families, and is the gateway to the two kingdoms of Kāśi and Kosala, each three hundred leagues in extent and adorned with eighty thousand villages. There, having built residences in a strategic location, having planted mangoes, jackfruits, coconuts, and the like, winning over families with flowers and fruits, having ordained the young men of families, increase your following."

They said to Mettiya and Bhūmajaka: "Friends, Rājagaha is inhabited by one hundred and eighty million people and is the gateway to the two kingdoms of Aṅga and Magadha, each three hundred leagues in extent and adorned with eighty thousand villages. There, in a strategic location, you should etc. increase your following."

They said to Assaji and Punabbasuka: "Friends, Kīṭāgiri, being supported by two rains, produces three harvests. There, having built residences in a strategic location etc. increase your following." They did so. Among them, each faction had five hundred monks as a retinue; thus there were somewhat more than one thousand five hundred monks. Therein, Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka with their retinue were virtuous and even wandered on tour of the country districts with the Blessed One; they created cases without precedent but did not transgress the training rules that had been laid down. All the others, however, were shameless; they both created cases without precedent and transgressed the training rules that had been laid down. Therefore it is said: "Shameless, evil monks."

"Such" means of such a kind. "Engaged in misconduct" means they practised what should not be practised, they did what should not be done. "Flower shrubs" means young flowering trees; for young flowering trees as well as flowering bushes are all called "flower shrubs." And they planted flower shrubs of many kinds themselves and

also had others plant them. Therefore it is said: "They planted and had others plant flower shrubs." "They watered" means they themselves watered with water. "They had others water" means they had others water as well.

Here, however, five things should be known: improper conduct, proper conduct, indirect expression, hint, and making a sign. Therein, improper conduct means: cutting and having others cut fresh green plants, digging and having others dig a pit, planting and having others plant a flower shrub, binding and having others bind an embankment, watering and having others water, straightening a channel, pouring allowable water, and pouring water for washing hands, face, feet, and bathing. Proper conduct means: the statement "attend to this tree, attend to this pit, attend to this flower shrub, attend to the water here," and straightening a dry channel. Indirect expression means: a statement such as "a wise person should have flower shrubs and the like planted; before long they serve a useful purpose." Hint means: standing while holding hoes, spades, and the like together with flower shrubs; for having seen one standing thus, novices and others, thinking "the elder wishes to have it done," go and do it. Making a sign means: bringing hoes, spades, adzes, axes, and water vessels and placing them nearby.

All five of these are not allowable for planting for the purpose of winning over families; for the purpose of enjoying the fruit, only the two - proper and improper conduct - are not allowable, the other three are allowable. However, in the Mahāpaccaṛī it is said: "Proper conduct is also allowable. And whatever is allowable for one's own enjoyment is also allowable for the purpose of another individual, or the Community, or a shrine."

However, for the purpose of a park, for the purpose of a grove, and for the purpose of shade, only improper conduct is not allowable, the rest is allowable; and not only the rest - it is also allowable to straighten any channel whatsoever, to pour allowable water, to make a bathing room and bathe, and to discard hand-washing, foot-washing, and face-washing water there. However, in the Mahāpaccaṛī and the Kurundī it is said: "It is also allowable to plant oneself on allowable ground." And it is also allowable to enjoy the fruit of what has been planted or had planted for the purpose of a park and the like.

In picking and having others pick, there is a pācittiya offence even ordinarily. But for the purpose of corrupting families, there is both a pācittiya and a dukkaṭa offence. And in stringing and the like, ending with breast-coverings, for one doing it for the purpose of corrupting families or for any other purpose, there is only a dukkaṭa offence. Why? Because it is misconduct, and because of the evil conduct stated here as "of evil conduct." If one asks: just as in planting trees for the purpose of a park and the like, why is there no offence for the purpose of honouring a sacred object? There is indeed no offence. For just as there is no offence there through proper conduct and indirect expression and the like, so too for the purpose of honouring a sacred object there is indeed no offence.

But was it not said there: "It is also allowable to plant oneself on allowable ground"? It was said, but not in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā. And yet you might think that what is said in the other commentaries is also authoritative. And in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā the pouring of allowable water is stated - how about that? That too is not contradictory. For

therein, when it could have been said without distinction "they plant and have others plant trees, they water and have others water," by saying "flower shrub" he indicates: "this was said referring only to what yields flowers and fruits, for the purpose of winning over families, but elsewhere there is an indirect expression." Therefore, knowing the indirect expression there and the absence of indirect expression here, whatever is said in the commentaries is well said indeed. And this was said -

"The Dhamma and Vinaya were declared by the Buddha;
Which was known in the same way by his sons;
Because those who, not abandoning their understanding,
Made commentaries in ancient times.

"Therefore, whatever is stated in the commentaries,
Setting aside errors of carelessness,
All of it, for those who are respectful towards the training rules,
Is authoritative here for the wise."

Everything should be understood in the manner already stated. Therein, one might ask: if there is an offence in stringing etc. even for the purpose of venerating a shrine, why is there no offence in carrying etc.? Because carrying is for the sake of women of good families etc., in the section on carrying, it is specified by stating "for those women of good families" etc.; therefore, there is no offence for one carrying for the sake of the Buddha etc.

Therein, "single-stalked" means a garland made by gathering the stalks of flowers together on one side. "Double-stalked" means a garland made by arranging the flower stalks on both sides. As for "flower-bunch" and so forth, a flower arrangement made like a cluster is called a flower-bunch. "Pierced garland" means one made by piercing sinduvāra flowers and the like with a needle or a pin. "Wreath" means a head-ornament. "Ear-ornament" means an ear-decoration. "Breast-covering" means a flower garland resembling a necklace, placed upon the chest. This, for now, is the word commentary herein.

Now this is the detailed determination of offences from the beginning. For one planting a flower shrub on unallowable ground for the purpose of corrupting families, there is both a pācittiya and a dukkaṭa offence; likewise for one having others plant by means of unallowable speech. For planting or having others plant on allowable ground, there is only a dukkaṭa offence. In both cases, with a single command, even when many are planted, there is only one dukkaṭa with pācittiya or a pure dukkaṭa. For the purpose of personal use, there is no offence in having others plant by means of allowable speech, whether on allowable or unallowable ground. Even for the purpose of a monastery etc., for one planting on unallowable ground or having others plant by means of unallowable speech, there is a pācittiya offence. However, this method is not well analysed in the Great Commentary, but is analysed in the Mahāpaccarī.

As for watering and having others water, with unallowable water there is a pācittiya offence in all cases, and also a dukkaṭa offence when for the purpose of corrupting families or for personal use. With allowable water, for those same two purposes, there is a dukkaṭa offence. For the purpose of personal use, there is no offence herein

when having others water by means of allowable speech. However, at the point of offence, the multiplicity of offences should be understood according to the multiplicity of efforts by way of the breaking of the stream.

For picking for the purpose of corrupting families, there are dukkaṭa and pācittiya offences according to the count of flowers; elsewhere, there are only pācittiya offences. However, when picking many flowers with a single effort, one should be dealt with according to the effort. In having others pick, for the purpose of corrupting families, when commanded once, even if one picks many, there is only one dukkaṭa with pācittiya; elsewhere, there is only a pācittiya offence.

Regarding stringing and so forth, all six types of flower arrangements should be understood - the knotted, the woven, the pierced, the wrapped, the filled, and the plaited. Therein, "the knotted" should be seen in flowers with stems, such as blue lotuses, red lotuses, and others with long stalks. For the knotted is indeed made by tying stem to stem or stalk to stalk. It is not allowable for a bhikkhu or a nun either to make it or to have it made using improper speech. However, it is allowable to have it made using proper speech such as "Know this, it would look beautiful if done thus, do it in such a way that these flowers do not scatter."

"The woven" means the weaving of jasmine flowers and the like with thread or bark fibre and so forth in the manner of single-stalked and double-stalked garlands; or doubling bark fibre or cord and inserting stalkless flowers such as nīpa flowers and the like therein, binding them in sequence - this too is indeed woven. All of it is not allowable in the same manner as before.

"The pierced" means flowers with stalks such as jasmine flowers and the like are strung through their stalks, or stalkless flowers such as vakula flowers and the like are pierced through their inner holes with needles, palm-leaf ribs, and the like, and strung together - this is called the pierced; that too is not allowable in the same manner as before. Some, however, insert thorns or palm-leaf ribs and the like into a plantain trunk and pierce flowers thereon and place them; some on thorny branches; some insert thorns into canopies and walls and place them there for the purpose of making flower-parasols and flower-pavilions; some on thorns tied to the canopy of the Dhamma seat; some pierce kaṇikāra flowers and the like with sticks and make them like parasol upon parasol - that is extremely coarse indeed. However, it is not allowable to tie even a thorn to the canopy of the Dhamma seat for the purpose of piercing flowers, or to pierce even a single flower with thorns and the like, or to insert a flower into a flower. But there is no fault in inserting flowers into the holes of net-canopies, railings, wall-pegs, flower-receptacles, palm-leaf balls, and the like, or in the spaces between asoka flower-clusters. This is not called the pierced. The same method applies also to the Dhamma-cord.

"The wrapped" should be seen in flower garlands and flower bouquets. For some, when making a crown garland, wrap flowers around the lower part to show a pot-like shape; some tie eight or ten blue lotus flowers and the like with thread or bark fibre to sticks and make blue lotus bouquets or red lotus bouquets - all of that is not allowable in the same manner as before. It is not allowable to tie into a bundle with the robe blue lotuses and the like that have been plucked by novices and placed on dry ground. However, it is allowable to tie those very same with bark fibre or a stick,

or to make a shoulder-bundle. A shoulder-bundle means bringing together both ends of the robe placed on the shoulder, making a bundle, and placing flowers therein as if in a bag - this is called a shoulder-bundle; it is allowable to make this. They pierce lotus leaves with sticks and wrap blue lotuses and the like with the leaf and take them; in that case too, it is allowable to tie only a lotus leaf over the flowers. However, it is not allowable to tie a stick underneath.

"The filled" should be seen in garland strings and flower-cloths. For whoever, while encircling a cetiya, a Bodhi tree, or a railing with a garland string, brings it back and passes the filling point - even to that extent it is called the filled. What need to speak of one who encircles many times; passing through the spaces of wall-pegs and carrying it, making a hanging loop and encircling the wall-peg again - this too is called the filled. However, it is allowable to insert a flower ring onto a wall-peg. They make flower-cloths with garland strings. In that case too, it is allowable to carry only a single garland string. When one brings it back again, it becomes the filled itself; all of that is not allowable in the same manner as before. However, having obtained a flower garland made with even many garland strings, it is allowable to tie it at the top of a seat and such places. However, it is allowable, having carried or encircled an excessively long garland string once, to give it to another bhikkhu. It is allowable for him too to do likewise.

"Woven" should be understood in relation to flower-nets, flower-cloths, and flower-figures. For one making a flower-net at shrines, there is an offence of wrong-doing for each mesh-opening of the net. The same method applies also to walls, parasols, Bodhi-tree pillars, and so forth. However, a flower-cloth, even if filled by others, may not be woven. They make figures of elephants, horses, and so forth with tied flowers alone, and these too fall under the category of woven. In the same manner as before, all of it is not allowable. However, for one placing flowers in an outline made by others, it is allowable to make even figures of elephants, horses, and so forth. In the Mahāpaccarī, however, eight types of flower-arrangements are stated, together with the festoon and the half-moon. Therein, "festoon" is stated as a hanging garland-strand in the space between half-moons. "Half-moon" is the encircling of a garland-strand in the shape of a half-moon. Both of these are included under the category of "filled" itself. In the Kurundī, however, it is stated: "Making a flower-garland by combining two or three garland-strands together is also woven itself." That too is included here under the category of "filled" itself. And not only flower-ball garlands, but also flour-made garlands and ball-flower garlands are stated in the Kurundī; and rough-leaf garlands too, because the training rule is common to both, are not allowable for either monks or nuns to make or to have made. However, for the purpose of worship, it is allowable everywhere to use permissible speech. Indirect suggestion, intimation, and hinting are indeed allowable.

"They shared" means they lay down. "They performed" means rising up as if floating with delight, they perform a lively dance, they give a display. "They danced while she danced" means when the dancing woman dances, then they too, going in front of or behind her, dance. "They sang while she danced" means when she dances, then they sing in accordance with the dance. This same method applies everywhere. "They played with eight-row boards" means they play a board game on an eight-row board. Likewise with ten-row boards; "in space" means they play in space itself, just as with

eight-row and ten-row boards. "On circular paths" means having made various circular path designs on the ground, they play by navigating the path that must be navigated there. "They played santikā" means they play the santikā game; pieces or stone pebbles placed together, without moving them, they remove and bring near with the fingernail alone; if any one of them moves, there is defeat. "Khalikā" means they play with dice on a gambling board. "Ghaṭikā" means ghaṭikā is called the stick-game; they play with that. They go about striking a short stick with a long stick.

"With hand-sticks" means having dipped a hand-stick in lac, or in red dye, or in flour-water, saying "what shall it be?" they strike it on the ground or on a wall and play by showing figures of elephants, horses, and so forth. "With dice" means with a ball.

"With leaf-pipes" means paṅgacīra is called a leaf-tube; they play by blowing into it.

"With toy ploughs" means with a small plough, a plaything for village boys. "With somersaults" means mokkhacikā is called the tumbling game; the meaning is that they play by turning upside down, either grasping a bar in the air or placing the head on the ground. "With windmills" means a windmill is called a revolving wheel made from palm leaves and the like, which spins by the force of the wind; they play with that. "With toy measures" means toy measures is called a leaf-tube; with it they play by measuring sand and the like. "With toy chariots" means with a small chariot. "With toy bows" means with a small bow.

"At guessing letters" means guessing letters is called the game of guessing letters written in the air or on the back; they play with that. "At guessing thoughts" means guessing thoughts is called the game of guessing what has been thought in the mind; they play with that. "They played at mimicking defects" means: yathāvajja is called the game of displaying by imitating whatever defects of the one-eyed, the crippled, the lame, and so forth; they play that game, like jesters. "They trained in elephants" means: whatever skill pertaining to elephants is to be trained in, that they train in. The same method applies to horses and so forth. "They ran" means: they run going with their backs turned. "They ran back" means: however far they run, that same distance they run back again coming face to face. "They wrestled" means: they engage in wrestling. "They gave forehead-taps" means: saying "Well done, well done, sister," they place a finger on their own forehead and then place it on her forehead. "They engaged in various misconduct" means: they engage in various other misconduct not mentioned in the text, such as mouth-drumming and the like.

432. "With pleasing" means bringing about confidence, befitting and suitable for a recluse. "With going forward" means by going. "With going back" means by turning back. "With looking ahead" means by looking in front. "With looking around" means by looking here and there. "With bending" means by the contraction of the limbs. "With stretching" means by the extending of those very same limbs. In all cases the instrumental case is used in the sense of a predicate of manner; because of being fashioned by mindfulness and clear comprehension, what is stated is that he was one whose going forward, going back, looking ahead, looking around, bending and stretching were pleasing. "With eyes downcast" means with eyes cast downward. "Accomplished in deportment" means one whose deportment is accomplished through that pleasing manner of going forward and so on.

"Where is this one" means who is this one. "Like a weakling" - a weak person is called a simpleton, and this reduplication is in the sense of excess, therefore what is stated

is "like an utter simpleton." "Like a dullard" means excessively dull due to the unagitated nature of his going forward and so on. "Excessively refined" - thus they show a virtue itself as a fault. "Like one who frowns and frowns" - because of his having downcast eyes, thinking that he goes about with a frown, with a contracted face, as if angry, they say this. "Smooth" means skilful, adept at bringing lay people to the appropriate place by addressing them as "mother, father, sister" - not like this one; thus the intended meaning is "like a weakling." "Kindly in speech" means endowed with kindliness. "Pleasant to converse with" - this is a statement of the reason for the former. For those whose pleasant conversation, friendly talk, is faultless and agreeable to the ear, they are called "kindly in speech." Therefore they said - "kindly in speech, pleasant to converse with." Now here this is the intention - our noble ones, having seen lay followers, speak sweet friendly talk, therefore they are kindly in speech and pleasant to converse with, not like this one; thus "like dullards." "Preceded by a smile" - a smile is the forerunner of their speech, thus they are "preceded by a smile"; the meaning is that they first smile and then speak. "Saying 'come, welcome'" means those who, having seen a lay follower, speak thus "come, welcome to you" - not like this one; thus, having shown the absence of frowning by implication through the quality of being preceded by a smile and so on, in contrast to the appearance of frowning due to having a contracted face, showing it again in its own form as well, they said - "without frowning, with open faces, speaking first." Or it should be understood that this is a showing of the absence of all three aspects in reverse order. How? Here, by "without frowning" the absence of the frowning aspect is shown. By "with open faces" the absence of the dullard aspect is shown, for those who have open faces by looking with eyes wide open are not dullards. By "speaking first" the absence of the weakling aspect is shown, for those who, through skill in addressing, speak first saying "mother, father," they are not weaklings.

"Come, venerable sir, let us go to the house" - that lay follower, it seems, when it was said "No indeed, friend, almsfood has not been obtained," having said "This has been done by your monks themselves; even if you wander through the entire village you will not obtain any," wishing to give almsfood, said "Come, venerable sir, let us go to the house." But is this a prompted utterance or not? It is not. This is called a question asked, and it is proper to speak of it. Therefore, even now, if someone were to ask a monk who has entered among the houses in the morning or in the evening - "Why, venerable sir, are you walking about?" Having stated the purpose for which he is walking, when asked "Has it been obtained or not obtained?" if it has not been obtained, having said "It has not been obtained," it is proper to accept what that person gives.

"Corrupted" means not corrupted through the destruction of faith and the like, but corrupted on account of the persons. "Channels for gifts" means the gifts themselves are referred to. Alternatively, "channels for gifts" means what is said is gifts that are regularly established, regular practices of giving. "Cut off" means cut off by the donors; they do not give those now. "Are leaving" means they become separate, they become dispersed; what is said is that they depart. "Might become established" means it might stand properly, it might become a support for well-behaved monks.

"Yes, friend" - that monk accepted the message of the lay follower who had faith and was devoted. It seems it is proper to carry such a message as is allowable; therefore, one should not have scruples regarding such messages as "In my name pay respect at the Blessed One's feet," or "Pay respect to the shrine, the image, the Bodhi tree, the elder of the Community," or "Make an offering of incense at the shrine, make an offering of flowers," or "Assemble the monks, we will give a gift, we will listen to the Dhamma." These are allowable messages, not connected with the household affairs of laypeople. "And from where are you coming, monk?" - that monk, being seated, is not coming, but in meaning he has come; even so, the use of the present tense in proximity to the present is obtained; therefore there is no fault. At the conclusion, in the utterance "From there, Blessed One, I am coming" - here too the same method applies.

433. "First the monks Assaji and Punabbasuka should be accused" means that having obtained permission by saying "we wish to speak to you," they should be accused with the ground and the offence. Having accused, whatever they do not remember, they should be reminded of that. If they acknowledge both the ground and the offence, or if they acknowledge only the offence but not the ground, the offence should be charged. But if they acknowledge only the ground and not the offence; even so, the charge should be made thus: "In this ground, this is the offence named such." If they acknowledge neither the ground nor the offence, the offence should not be charged - this is the decision herein. But having charged the offence according to the acknowledgement; showing that the act of banishment should be performed thus, he said beginning with "an experienced monk," and that is clear in meaning.

A monk upon whom the act of banishment has thus been performed should not dwell in the monastery where he was dwelling or in the village where the act of corrupting families was committed. While dwelling in that monastery, he should not go for alms even in the neighbouring village. Even while dwelling in a neighbouring monastery, he should not go for alms in that village. However, when the Elder Upatissa was told by his pupils "Venerable sir, a city can be large, even twelve leagues in extent," he said "It is prohibited only in the street where the act of corrupting families was committed." Then when told "A street too can be large, even the extent of a city," he said "In the row of houses." When told "A row of houses too can be the extent of a street," he said "Seven houses on this side and that side are prohibited." But all of that is merely the Elder's personal opinion. Even if the monastery extends up to three leagues and the city up to twelve leagues, it is neither permissible to dwell in the monastery nor to go about in the city.

435. "They, having had the act of banishment performed on them by the Community" - how did the Community perform the act on them? It did not perform it by simply going and overwhelming them. Rather, having been invited by families, when communal meals were being prepared, the elders at each place explained the practice of a recluse, made the people understand "this one is a recluse, this one is not a recluse," sent one or two monks into the boundary, and by this very means performed the act of banishment on all of them. And for one who has had the act of banishment thus performed on him, the act should be revoked when he requests it after fulfilling the eighteen duties. And even for one whose act has been revoked, from those families where he previously committed the act of corrupting families,

requisites should not be accepted from them; even by one who has attained the destruction of the taints they should not be accepted - they are simply not allowable. When asked "Why do you not accept?" and it is said "Because of what was previously done thus," if they say "We do not give for that reason; we now give on account of your virtuous conduct," then it should be accepted. The act of corrupting families is done precisely at the place of ordinary giving. From that, it is proper to accept only the ordinary offering; what they give having increased it, that is not proper.

"Do not behave properly" means those monks Assaji and Punabbasuka do not behave properly in the eighteen duties. "Are not subdued" means by not following the conforming practice, they are not of fallen hair, i.e. not subdued. "Do not make amends" means they do not follow the path of their own extrication. "Do not ask forgiveness of the monks" means they do not make the act of asking forgiveness of the monks thus: "Venerable sirs, a wrong-doing has been committed by us; we shall not do so again; please forgive us." "Revile" means they revile the Community that performed the act with the ten grounds of abuse. "Abuse" means they instil fear in them. "Acting through desire" etc. "Bring charges of acting through fear" means these are acting through desire and etc. acting through fear, and thus they bring charges of acting through desire and etc. acting through fear; the meaning is they charge, they accuse. "Depart" means among their retinue of five hundred recluses, some depart to other regions. "Leave the monastic community" means some become laypeople. "How indeed could the monks Assaji and Punabbasuka" - here, by virtue of the two leaders, all of them are called "Assaji and Punabbasuka."

436-437. In "a village or," here a city too is included by the term "village." Therefore in its word-analysis it is stated: "a village, a market town, or a city - both a village and a market town." Therein, a market town should be understood as one without a surrounding wall but having shops.

"He corrupts families" - thus he is a corrupter of families. And in corrupting, he does not corrupt with impure mud and the like, but rather he destroys their confidence through his own misconduct. Therefore in its word-analysis "with flowers or" and so forth is stated. Therein, whoever, having brought or having caused to be brought, having invited or having caused to be invited, or to those who have come of their own accord, gives any flowers belonging to himself for the purpose of winning over families, it is an offence of wrong-doing. If he gives what belongs to another, it is likewise an offence of wrong-doing. If he gives with a thieving intent, he should be made to pay the value of the goods. The same method applies also to what belongs to the Community. But there is this distinction: for one who gives by authority of ownership what has been designated for the purpose of lodgings, it is a grave offence.

To whom is it allowable to give flowers, and to whom is it not allowable? To mother and father, first of all, it is allowable to give by bringing, by having them brought, by inviting, or by having them invited; to other relatives, only by having them invited. And that is for the purpose of venerating objects of worship; but for the purpose of adornment or for the purpose of worshipping a Siva-līṅga and the like, it is not allowable to give to anyone. And when having flowers brought for mother and father, they should be brought only by novices who are relatives. But if the others themselves wish to do so, it is allowable. By an appointed flower-distributor, at the

time of distribution, it is allowable to give a half share to novices who are present. In the Kurundī, a half share to lay people who are present. In the Mahāpaccaṛī it is stated: "It is allowable to give a small portion." By one who is not appointed, it should be given after obtaining permission.

Novices who are respectful towards their teachers and preceptors, having brought many flowers, make a heap and set them down; the elders give to co-residents and others or to lay devotees who arrive early in the morning, saying "You take this, you take this" - this is not called a gift of flowers. Even those who, having taken them saying "We shall make an offering at the shrine," go and make offerings, and give to those present here and there for the purpose of shrine-worship - this too is not called a gift of flowers. Having seen lay devotees making offerings with akka flowers and the like, it is also allowable to say: "There are kaṇikāra flowers and the like at the monastery; lay devotees, take those and make offerings." When monks, having made a flower-offering, enter the village earlier in the day, people ask: "Why, venerable sirs, have you entered so early?" They reply: "There were many flowers at the monastery; we made an offering." People, thinking "There are apparently many flowers at the monastery," on the following day take abundant hard and soft food, go to the monastery, make a flower-offering and give a gift - this is allowable. People, having requested a turn for flowers saying "We, venerable sir, shall make an offering on such and such a day," come on the permitted day, and the novices have already picked and set aside the flowers; those people, not seeing flowers on the trees, say "Where, venerable sir, are the flowers?" - "They have been picked and set aside by the novices; but you make your offering and go; the Community will make its offering on another day." They make the offering, give a gift, and go - this is allowable. But in the Mahāpaccaṛī and the Kurundī: "The elders are not permitted to have the novices give them. If they themselves give those flowers to them, it is allowable. But the elders should say only this much: 'They have been picked and set aside by the novices.'" But if, having requested a turn for flowers, when the flowers have not yet been picked, they come bringing congee, rice-food and the like, and say to the novices "Pick them and give them." It is allowable to pick and give only to novices who are relatives. Non-relatives they lift up and place on a tree branch; they should not climb down and run away; it is allowable to pick and give. But if any speaker of the Teaching says "There are many flowers at the monastery, lay devotees; take congee, rice-food and the like, go and make a flower-offering" - it is not allowable for him alone - thus it is stated in the Mahāpaccaṛī and the Kurundī. But in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā it is stated without distinction: "This is not allowable, it is not proper."

Fruit too, being one's own, is allowable to give to parents and other relatives in the manner already stated. However, for one giving for the purpose of ingratiating families, offences of wrong-doing and so forth should be understood in the manner already stated regarding what is one's own, what belongs to others, what belongs to the Community, and what has been designated for the purpose of lodgings. It is allowable to give only what is one's own to sick people, or to visiting persons of authority, or to those whose provisions are exhausted; this does not constitute the giving of fruit. Even by an appointed fruit-distributor, at the time of distributing the Community's fruit, it is allowable to give a half-share to people who have arrived. By one who is not appointed, it should be given after obtaining permission. Even in a monastery, an agreement should be made either by apportioning fruit or by

apportioning trees. Then, to sick people or to others requesting fruit, four or five fruits should be given according to the apportionment. Or trees should be pointed out, saying "It is permissible to take from here." However, one should not say thus: "Here the fruits are fine, take from here."

Regarding "with powder" - herein, if one gives one's own siris-tree powder or any other astringent substance for the purpose of ingratiating families, it is an offence of wrong-doing. Regarding what belongs to others and so forth too, the judgement should be understood in the manner already stated. But this is the distinction - herein, even tree bark guarded and protected by the Community is heavy property indeed. Regarding clay, tooth-sticks, and bamboo too, knowing them to be accessory to heavy property, the judgement should be understood in the manner already stated for powder. However, the giving of leaves has not been mentioned here; that too should be understood in the manner already stated. Further on, in the judgement concerning heavy property, we shall explain everything in detail.

Regarding "or by medical practice" - herein, the procedure for medical practice should be understood in the manner already stated in the commentary on the third offence of defeat.

Regarding "by running errands on foot" - herein, "running errands on foot" refers to the act of carrying messages and communications for householders; this should not be done. For one who takes a message for householders and goes, there is an offence of wrong-doing at every step. For one who eats food obtained on account of that act too, there is an offence of wrong-doing with every mouthful. Even for one who did not initially accept a message but later, thinking "This is now that village, come, let me deliver that message," turns off the path, there is an offence of wrong-doing at every step. For one who eats food obtained after delivering the message, there is an offence of wrong-doing in the manner already stated. However, for one who has come without accepting a message, when asked "Venerable sir, what is the situation of so-and-so in that village?" it is allowable to tell; there is no fault in a question that is asked. However, it is allowable to carry messages for the five who are fellow Dhamma-followers, for parents, for one who is gravely ill, and for one's own attendant, and also permissible messages for householders of the kind previously stated. For this does not constitute the act of running errands on foot. However, requisites arising from these eight acts of corrupting families are not allowable even for the five fellow Dhamma-followers; they are just like requisites arising from false accusation and trading in money.

"Whose conduct is evil" means one of evil conduct. But since planting garland-creepers and the like are intended here, therefore the word-analysis was stated in the manner beginning with "they also plant garland-creepers." "Behind their backs" means in their absence. Regarding "and families corrupted by him" - herein, since "families" is merely a conventional expression, for in reality it is the people who are corrupted by him, therefore in the word-analysis it was said beginning with "having formerly been faithful." "Led by desire" means those who go by desire, thus they are led by desire. The same method applies in the remaining ones. Regarding "he should be admonished for the relinquishment of that" - herein, by the act of corrupting families there is merely an offence of wrong-doing. But that which he said, showing contempt for the Community, beginning with "led by desire." The meaning should be

understood thus: the act of admonition should be performed for the relinquishment of that. The remainder is of manifest meaning everywhere.

The origin and other factors are similar to those of the first offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community concerning schism.

The Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Corrupter of Families is finished.

Commentary on the Conclusion

442. "The following have been recited" etc. In the passage "thus I remember it," herein "the offence is the first for these" means "become offences at once" (paṭhamāpattikā); the meaning is that the offence is to be committed at the very first moment of transgression. But the others, just as they occur on the third and fourth day, are called by the designation "third-time" and "fourth-time"; thus "up to the third time" (yāvatatīyakā) should be understood as meaning that they become offences at the third act of admonition.

"For as many days as he knowingly conceals" means for however many days he knowingly conceals it, he does not inform his fellow monks in the holy life, saying "I have committed such-and-such an offence." "For that many days" means that number of days. "Must unwillingly undergo probation" means not willingly, not by one's own power, but rather unwillingly, without control, one must undertake and observe probation. "A further six nights" means six nights beyond the probation. "For penance before the monks" means for the purpose of winning the approval of the monks; the meaning stated is "for the purpose of pleasing them." "A group of twenty would be the community" means a group of twenty (vīsatiḡaṇo). "There" means where, by the final reckoning, there is a community of monks with a group of twenty, there. "Should be rehabilitated" means should be accepted, should be received back; the meaning stated is that he should be reinstated by means of the act of rehabilitation, or the meaning is that he should be called back. "Not rehabilitated" means not rehabilitated, not accepted back; the meaning stated is that the act of rehabilitation has not been performed, or the meaning is that he has not been called back. "The proper course" means conformity with the Dhamma, instruction and guidance that follows the supramundane Dhamma; the meaning stated is that it is the proper procedure in accordance with the Dhamma. The remainder here is the same as the method already stated.

In the Samantapāsādikā, the commentary on the Vinaya,

The Commentary on the Thirteen 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. 2. The Section on Initial and Subsequent Meeting of the Community 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