

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)

4. The Section on Forfeiture (4. Nissaggiyakaṇḍam)



PaliVerse

1. Commentary on the Expulsion

4. The Section on Forfeiture

1. The Chapter on Robes

1. Commentary on the First Training Rule on Kaṭhina

The thirty rules entailing relinquishment, which were spoken by the Peaceful One;

Of those I shall now make a word-by-word commentary on terms not previously explained.

459. At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One, was dwelling at Vesālī in the Gotamaka shrine. "Now at that time the three robes had been permitted by the Blessed One for the monks" - here, "three robes" means the inner robe, the upper robe, and the double-layered robe; this set of three robes had been permitted for use. Where this was permitted, when it was permitted, and for what reason it was permitted - all of that has come in the Jīvaka account in the Cīvarakkhandhaka. "They entered the village with one set of three robes" means with a set different from the one with which they stayed in the monastery and went down to bathe; thus, day after day, they wore nine robes.

460. "It has arisen" means that, giving an opening for non-enactment, it has arisen by way of acquisition, not by way of production.

"He wished to give to the Venerable Sāriputta" means that the Venerable Ānanda, it is said, out of great respect for his virtues, was excessively attached to the Venerable Sāriputta, thinking that apart from the Blessed One there was no other person so distinguished in virtues. He, whenever he obtained a pleasing robe, having dyed it and applied the mark of legitimacy, would give it to the Elder alone; having obtained before the meal excellent rice-gruel or hard food or almsfood, he would give it to the Elder alone; having obtained after the meal honey, sugar and so forth, he would give it to the Elder alone; and having brought boys from supporter families and given them the going forth, he would have them take the Elder as their preceptor and himself perform the announcing ceremony. The Venerable Sāriputta too, thinking "The duty to be done for a father is indeed the burden of the eldest son; that duty which should be done by me for the Blessed One, Ānanda does it; depending on Ānanda I am able to dwell free from concern," was excessively attached to the Venerable Ānanda; and he too, having obtained a pleasing robe, would give it to the Elder Ānanda alone - everything was just as before. Thus, being attached out of great respect for virtues, it should be understood that at that time, even though that robe had arisen, he wished to give it to the Venerable Sāriputta.

"On the ninth or the tenth day, Blessed One" - here, however, if there should be the question "How does the Elder know?" He knows by many reasons. The Elder Sāriputta, it is said, when setting out on a journey through the countryside, would depart only after taking leave of the Elder Ānanda, saying "I shall return within such and such a

time; in the meantime, do not be negligent regarding the Blessed One." If he does not take leave in person, he sends monks and departs only after taking leave. If he spends the rains residence elsewhere, he sends those monks who come first, saying "In my name, pay homage with your heads at the feet of the Blessed One, and having conveyed wishes for good health to Ānanda, tell him 'He will come on such and such a day'"; and he always comes on the very day determined. Moreover, the Venerable Ānanda knows even by inference: "The Venerable Sāriputta has dwelt enduring and bearing separation from the Blessed One for so many days; from now on he will not exceed such and such a day; he will certainly come." For those who have great wisdom, their love and reverence for the Blessed One is also great - by this method too he knows. Thus he knows by many reasons. Therefore he said - "On the ninth or the tenth day, Blessed One." When this was said, since this training rule is an offence by enactment, not an offence by worldly convention, therefore, the Venerable Ānanda, making a determination just as stated, "Then the Blessed One etc. should keep." If, however, the Elder had specified a fortnight or a month, that too would have been permitted by the Blessed One.

462-463. "When the robe is finished" means when the robe is finished by whatever kind of completion. But since that robe can be finished by making it, and also by loss and so forth, therefore in the word-analysis, to show only the meaning, it is stated "a monk's robe is either made" and so forth. Therein, "made" means made by the completion of needlework; the completion of needlework means having done whatever is to be done with a needle up to the completion of the border-strip and the knotted border-strip, and then putting away the needle. "Lost" means taken by thieves and the like; for this too is called "finished" because the hindrance of making is finished. "Destroyed" means eaten by termites and the like. "Burnt" means burnt by fire. "Or the expectation of a robe is cut off" means whatever expectation of a robe has arisen, thinking "I shall obtain a robe from such and such a family," that expectation is cut off; for in these cases too, the state of being finished should be understood as the finishing of the hindrance of making itself.

"When the kathina-privilege has been withdrawn" means when the kathina has been withdrawn. By this, he shows the absence of the second hindrance. But since that kathina is withdrawn either by one of the eight grounds or by a formal withdrawal in between, therefore in its exposition it is stated "of the eight grounds" and so forth. Therein, "There are, monks, these eight grounds for the withdrawal of the kathina-privilege - ending with departure, ending with completion, ending with decision, ending with loss, ending with hearing, cutting off of expectation, passing beyond the boundary, and simultaneous withdrawal" - thus eight grounds have come in the Kathina Section. The formal withdrawal in between is also: "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. If the Community is ready, the Community should withdraw the kathina-privilege. This is the motion. Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. The Community withdraws the kathina-privilege. If the venerable one approves of the withdrawal of the kathina-privilege, let him be silent. he to whom it is not agreeable should speak. The kathina-privilege has been withdrawn by the Community. The Community approves, therefore it is silent. Thus do I hold it." Thus it has come in the Bhikkhunī Vibhaṅga. What is to be said there, we shall explain in the very place where it has come. But when it is discussed here, the text has to be brought in, and the meaning also has to be stated. And even when stated, it is not easily understood,

because it is stated out of place.

"For ten days at most" means ten days is the maximum limit, thus "ten days at most"; the meaning is that it may be kept for that period of ten days at most. But in the word-analysis, to show only the meaning, it is stated "it may be kept for a maximum of ten days." For what is stated here is this: in "for ten days at most," the state of being ten days at most, the condition of being ten days at most - for this much time, as long as one does not exceed it, it may be kept.

"Extra robe" means an extra robe because it is not included among those that are determined or assigned. Therefore in its word-analysis it is stated "not determined, not assigned."

"Any one of the six kinds of robe" means any one of these six kinds of robe: linen, cotton, silk, wool, hemp, and mixed fabric. Having thus shown the type of robe, now to show the measurement, he said "the smallest eligible for assignment." Its measurement is two spans in length and one span in width. Herein this is the canonical text - "I allow, monks, that the smallest robe eligible for assignment, eight finger-breadths in length by the Sugata finger-breadth and four finger-breadths in width, may be assigned."

"For one who exceeds that, it is an expiation involving forfeiture" means: for one who causes that robe of the aforementioned type and measure to exceed the period of ten days at most, without acting in such a way that it does not remain an extra robe during that interval, it is an expiation involving forfeiture; and that robe becomes subject to forfeiture, and there is a pācittiya offence for him - this is the meaning. Alternatively, forfeiture is nissaggiya; this is the name of the disciplinary procedure that must be performed as a preliminary part. "There is nissaggiya for this" means simply nissaggiya. What is that? An expiation. For one who exceeds that, there is a pācittiya with a disciplinary procedure involving forfeiture - this is the meaning here. However, in the word-analysis, in order to first show the interpretation of the meaning, having set down the matrix "for one who exceeds that, it becomes subject to forfeiture," it was stated "at the eleventh break of dawn it becomes subject to forfeiture, it must be forfeited." Again, in order to show to whom it must be forfeited and how it must be forfeited, "to the Community or" etc. was stated. Therein, "at the eleventh break of dawn" means: the dawn of the day on which the robe arose is dependent on the day of arising; therefore it should be understood that it becomes subject to forfeiture at the eleventh break of dawn counting together with the day on which the robe arose. Even if many robes are placed together, having been tied or wrapped, there is only one offence. For those not tied or wrapped, there are offences according to the count of the items.

"Having forfeited, the offence should be confessed" - how should it be confessed? As stated in the Khandhaka. And how was it stated there? It was stated thus - "That monk, monks, having approached the Community, having arranged the upper robe over one shoulder, having paid homage at the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having raised his joined palms, should say thus - 'Venerable sirs, I have committed such-and-such an offence; I confess it.'" Here, however, if there is one robe, one should say "one expiation involving forfeiture." If there are two, one should say "two." If there are many, one should say "several." In the forfeiture too, if

there is one, one should say exactly as in the text "this robe of mine, venerable sirs." If there are two or many, one should say "these robes of mine, venerable sirs, having exceeded ten days, are subject to forfeiture; I forfeit them to the Community." By one who is unable to say the text, it may also be said otherwise.

"The offence should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent monk" means it should be acknowledged in the manner stated in the Khandhaka. For thus it was stated there - "By an experienced, competent monk the Community should be informed -

'Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. This monk named so-and-so remembers, reveals, makes open, and confesses an offence. If the Community is ready, I would acknowledge the offence of the monk named so-and-so.'

He should be asked by him 'Do you see it?' 'Yes, I see it.' 'You should restrain yourself in the future.'" However, for two or several offences, the variation in wording should be understood in the same manner as before.

Regarding the giving of the robe too, the variation in wording should be understood according to the object: "the Community this robe" or "these robes." The same method applies to forfeiture to a group and to an individual as well.

However, here regarding the confession and acceptance of the offence, this is the canonical text - "That monk, monks, having approached several monks, having arranged the upper robe over one shoulder, having paid homage at the feet of the senior monks, having sat down on his haunches, having raised his joined palms, should address them thus - 'Venerable sirs, I have committed such-and-such an offence; I confess it.' An experienced and competent monk should inform those monks:

'Let the venerable ones hear me. This monk named so-and-so remembers, reveals, makes open, and confesses an offence. If it seems right to the venerable ones, I would accept the offence of the monk named so-and-so.'

He should be asked by him 'Do you see it?' 'Yes, I see it.' 'You should restrain yourself in the future.'

That monk, having approached one monk, having arranged his upper robe on one shoulder, having sat down squatting, having raised joined palms, should address him thus - 'Friend, I have committed such-and-such an offence; I confess it.' He should be asked by him: 'Do you see it?' 'Yes, I see it.' 'You should restrain yourself in the future.'" Therein, the naming of the offence and the variation in wording should be understood in the same manner as before.

And just as the canonical text applies to forfeiture to a group, so too should the canonical text be understood for forfeiture to two monks. For if there were a distinction, just as by the method beginning with "I allow, monks, the observance of the purity-uposatha for three monks, and it should be done thus, monks. A competent and capable monk should inform those monks" - having said "to perform the purity-uposatha for three," and then again by the method beginning with "I allow, monks, the purity-uposatha to be performed for two monks, and it should be done thus,

monks. The senior monk, having arranged the upper robe over one shoulder" - the purity-uposatha for two was stated separately; so here too a separate canonical text would have been stated. But since there is none, it was passed over without stating it; thus the canonical text stated for a group is the canonical text here as well. However, in the acceptance of the offence there is this distinction: just as when, after forfeiting to a group, the offence is being confessed, the monk who accepts the offence puts forth a motion, so too, without putting forth a motion, the offence should be accepted just as a single individual accepts it, by either one of the two.

For there is no such thing as putting forth a motion for two monks; if there were, the purity-uposatha for two would not have been stated separately. Regarding the giving of the forfeited robe too, just as one person says "I give this robe to the venerable one," so it is proper to say "We give this robe to the venerable one."

For even acts of a motion with one announcement, which are weightier than this, have been stated as "to be done after consultation"; this is in conformity with those. However, the forfeited robe must indeed be given back; it is not allowable not to give it, for this is merely a disciplinary procedure. It is not the case that by that act it has been actually given to the Community, or to the group, or to the individual. It is not the case that by that it has been given to the Community, or to a group, or to an individual.

468. "When ten days have passed, perceiving it as passed" means one who has such a perception that "this has passed" regarding a robe when ten days have passed, or one who has such a perception that "the ten days have passed" when the ten days have passed. "An expiation involving forfeiture" - here perception does not protect. Even one who has such a perception, for him too that robe is forfeitable and there is an offence of expiation. Both interpretations of meaning are applicable, namely "an expiation together with the disciplinary act of forfeiture" or "an expiation." This same method applies everywhere.

"When not relinquished, perceiving it as relinquished" means one who has such a perception that "it has been relinquished by me" when it has not been given to anyone and has not been given up.

"When not lost, perceiving it as lost" means thieves carry away many robes of others that were placed together with one's own robe. Therein, one has the perception that it is lost regarding one's own robe when it is not lost. This method applies also in the cases of not destroyed and so forth.

"Not plundered" - here, however, "not plundered" should be understood in the sense of not taken by force after breaking into a room.

"Uses without relinquishing it, an offence of wrong-doing" means if one goes about even for a day without removing from the body what was once worn as a lower robe or once donned as an upper robe, there is only one offence. If one removes it and removes it again and again, and wears it as a lower robe or dons it as an upper robe, there is a wrong-doing with each attempt. There is no offence for one who is adjusting what is badly worn as a lower robe or badly donned as an upper robe. There is no offence for another person using it either, and the statement beginning with "there is

no offence for one who uses what has been made by another after receiving it" is the supporting evidence here. The wrong-doing for one who perceives it as passed when it has not passed, and for one who is doubtful, is stated with reference to use.

469. Regarding the statement "there is no offence if within ten days he determines or assigns," here one should understand what is subject to determination and what is subject to assignment. Herein this is the canonical text - Then it occurred to the monks - "Those things that have been permitted by the Blessed One as 'the three robes,' or 'the rains-bathing cloth,' or 'the sitting cloth,' or 'the bedspread,' or 'the itch-covering cloth,' or 'the face-wiping cloth,' or 'the requisite cloth' - should all of those be determined or should they be assigned?" They reported this matter to the Blessed One -

"I allow, monks, the three robes to be determined, not to be assigned; the rains-bathing cloth to be determined for the four months of the rains, and after that to be assigned; to determine the sitting cloth, not to assign it; to determine the bed-sheet, not to assign it; to determine the scab cloth for as long as the illness lasts, after that to assign it; to determine the face-wiping cloth, not to assign it; the requisite cloth to be determined, not to be assigned."

Therein, "the three robes" - one who determines them should determine them only after dyeing, applying the mark of legitimacy, and ensuring they are of the proper measurement. As for their measurement, by the maximum limit, less than the Sugata's robe size is allowable; by the minimum limit, for the outer robe and the upper robe, the measurement of five fist-lengths in length and three fist-lengths in width is allowable. The inner robe may be five fist-lengths in length and even two cubits in width. For it is possible to cover the navel even with the outer wrapping. However, what exceeds or falls short of the stated measurement should be determined as a requisite cloth.

Therein, since it has been stated "there are two ways of determining a robe -one determines either by body or by speech," therefore, having relinquished the old outer robe by saying "I relinquish this outer robe," and having taken the new outer robe in hand, having directed the mind with the thought "I determine this outer robe," it should be determined by body through making a bodily action. This is determination by body; it is not allowable for one who is not touching it with any bodily limb. But in determination by speech, having made a verbal utterance, it should be determined by speech. Therein, determination is twofold - if it is within arm's reach, the words "I determine this outer robe" should be uttered. But if it is inside a room, or on an upper storey, or in a neighbouring monastery, having noted the place where it is kept, the words "I determine that outer robe" should be uttered. The same method applies for the upper robe and the inner robe. For the difference is merely in the name. Therefore, all should be determined by their own names thus: outer robe, upper robe, inner robe. If one makes outer robes and so forth from cloths that have been determined and set aside, when the dyeing and the marking of legitimacy are completed, having relinquished this by saying "I relinquish," they should be

determined again. But when sewing on a second layer or a patch larger than the one already determined, it must be determined again. When it is equal or smaller, there is no need for determination.

But is it allowable to determine the three robes as requisite cloths or not? The Elder Mahāpaduma reportedly said: "The three robes should be determined as the three robes only. If the determination as requisite cloth were obtainable, the safeguard in the training rule concerning keeping robes overnight would become meaningless." When this was said, the remaining monks reportedly said: "It was stated by the Blessed One himself that requisite cloth should be determined, therefore it is allowable." In the Mahāpaccarī too it is stated: "What is called requisite cloth is a separate means of storage, therefore it is allowable to determine the three robes as requisite cloth and use them. But in the training rule concerning keeping robes overnight, the safeguard is stated for one who maintains them having determined them as the three robes." The Elder Mahātissa of Puṇṇavālika, a reciter of both Vibhaṅgas, also reportedly said: "We formerly heard from the great elders that forest-dwelling monks, having placed their robes in tree hollows and such places, go for the purpose of striving in exertion. And when they have gone to a neighbouring monastery for the purpose of hearing the Dhamma, after the sun has risen, novices or junior monks take their bowl and robes and go. Therefore, for the purpose of comfortable use, it is allowable to determine the three robes as requisite cloth." In the Mahāpaccarī too it is stated: "Formerly, forest-dwelling monks, finding them difficult to maintain in an unbound boundary, used them having determined the three robes as requisite cloth only."

The "rain-bathing cloth" of a size not exceeding the limit should be determined for the four rainy months by stating its name in the manner already described, and after that it should be relinquished and assigned. And even one dyed merely with a different colour is allowable. But two are not allowable. The "sitting cloth" should only be determined in the manner already described, and that of the proper size, only one; two are not allowable. The "bedspread" too should only be determined, but a large one is allowable, one is allowable, and many are allowable. Blue, yellow, crimson, or flower-patterned - every kind is allowable. Once determined, it remains determined. The "itch-covering cloth" should be determined of the proper size as long as the affliction exists. When the affliction has subsided, it should be relinquished and assigned; only one is allowable. The "face-wiping cloth" should only be determined; since while one is being washed another is needed for use, two are allowable. But other elders say: "This is a means of storage; many too are allowable." For requisite cloths there is no limit; as many as one wishes, that many should be determined. Even a bag and a water-strainer of the minimum size eligible for assigning should only be determined as "requisite cloth." It is also allowable to determine many together, saying: "I determine these robes as requisite cloths." Even when setting aside for the purpose of medicine, new construction, mother, father, and so forth, one should still determine them. But in the Mahāpaccarī it is stated: "There is no offence." However, for bed pillows, chair pillows, bolsters, cloaks, and coverlets, and for bedspreads given for the purpose of lodging requisites, there is no need for determination at all.

But how does the determination lapse for one using a determined robe? It lapses by these nine reasons: by giving to another, by taking after snatching, by taking on trust, by reverting to the lower life, by renouncing the training, by death, by change of sex, by relinquishment, and by becoming torn. Therein, by the first eight, all robes lose their determination; but by becoming torn, the loss of determination is stated in all the commentaries only for the three robes, and that by a hole the size of a fingernail-back. Therein, the size of a fingernail-back should be understood in terms of the little finger's nail, and the hole must be a pierced-through hole only. For if even a single thread within the hole remains uncut, it preserves the determination. Therein, for the outer robe and the upper robe, a hole within the area of a span in length and eight finger-breadths in width breaks the determination; beyond that it does not break it. But for the inner robe, a hole within the area of a span in length and four finger-breadths in width breaks the determination; beyond that it does not break it. Therefore, when a hole has arisen, that robe stands in the position of an extra robe, and after doing needlework it should be determined again. But the Elder Mahāsuma said: "For a robe of the minimum size, a hole anywhere breaks the determination; but for a large one, a hole outside the minimum size does not break the determination; one arising within does break it." The Elder Karavīkatissa said: "Whether small or large is not the measure. For one wearing two robes, a hole at the place where they are gathered and placed on the left hand does not break the determination; in the portion below it does break it. For the inner robe too, a hole at the place gathered when making the waistband does not break it; below that it does break it." But in the Andhaka Commentary, taking the view of the Elder Mahāsuma as authoritative regarding the three robes, this further statement is made: "The minimum size preserves the determination." For a requisite cloth, a hole anywhere within eight finger-breadths in length by the Sugata finger-breadth and four finger-breadths in width causes the determination to lapse. For a large cloth, a hole beyond that does not cause the determination to lapse. This method applies to all robes that are to be determined.

Therein, since for all robes that are to be determined there is no minimum measure other than the minimum measure subject to assignment, for the measure stated for the sitting cloth, the itch-covering cloth, and the rains-bathing cloth is the maximum, because anything exceeding that is prohibited, it is not the minimum, because anything below that is not prohibited. For the three robes too, being less than the measure of the Sugata's robe is itself the maximum measure. But no minimum has been separately stated in the sutta. For the face-wiping cloth, the bed-spread, and the requisite cloth, there is no maximum limit at all. But the minimum limit has been stated by means of the minimum subject to assignment. Therefore, as for what was stated in the Andhaka Commentary, having said "the minimum measure protects the determination," and having shown therein the minimum measure of eight finger-breadths by four finger-breadths in Sugata finger-breadths for the requisite cloth alone, and then referring to the minimum measure of the five fist-spans and so forth for the remaining three robes and others, the statement "the same method applies to all robes that are to be determined" - that does not hold.

In the opinion of the Elder Karavīkatissa too, the hole was shown only in terms of the length, not in terms of the breadth; therefore that is indeterminate. In the opinion of the Elder Mahāsuma, it was stated: "For a robe of the minimum measure, a hole

anywhere breaks the determination, but for a larger one, a hole outside the measure does not break the determination." But this was not stated - "This is a robe of the minimum measure, anything larger than this is a large robe." Moreover, here the intended meaning is that the minimum measure for the three robes and others is the classification of five fist-spans and so forth. Therein, if a hole outside the minimum measure were not to break the determination, then even for a bowl of the superior size or of the middle size, a hole outside the inferior measure would not break the determination, but it does indeed break it. Therefore this opinion too is indeterminate.

But the very first commentary opinion - that alone is the authority here. Why? Because of the existence of a clear definition. For regarding the three robes, the minimum measure, the measure of the hole, and the measure of the area where the hole arises have been defined and stated in all the commentaries; therefore that opinion alone is the authority. Indeed, that was certainly stated having followed the Blessed One's intention. But in the others, there is neither a clear definition, nor do the earlier and later statements agree.

But one who first applies a patch to a weak spot and afterwards cuts away and removes the weak spot - the determination is not broken. The same method applies in the case of replacing a circular patch. When in a double-layered robe a hole arises in one layer or it becomes worn away, the determination is not broken. When one makes a small robe larger, or makes a large one smaller, the determination is not broken. When bringing both ends to the middle, if one first cuts and afterwards joins, the determination is broken. But if one joins and then cuts, it is not broken. Even for one who has it washed by washermen and has it made white, the determination remains the determination. This, then, is the decision regarding determination in the phrase "within ten days he determines or assigns."

Regarding assignment, there are two types of assignment - assignment in one's presence and assignment in one's absence. How does assignment in the presence take place? Having known whether the robes are one or many and whether they are near or far, one should say "this robe" or "these robes" or "that robe" or "those robes" - "I assign to you." This is one type of assignment in the presence. To this extent, it is allowable to store it, but it is not allowable to use it, to give it away, or to determine it. But when it is said thus: "It is my property, they are my property - use it, or give it away, or do with it as you see fit," this constitutes a relinquishment. From that point onwards, use and so forth are also allowable.

There is also another method - Having likewise known the singular or plural nature of the robes and their proximate or non-proximate state, in the presence of that very monk, having said "this robe" or "these robes" or "that robe" or "those robes," having taken the name of any one among the five co-religionists whom one personally favours, one should say "I assign to the monk Tissa" or "I assign to the nun Tissā, to the female trainee, to the novice Tissa, to the female novice Tissā." This too is a face-to-face assignment. To this extent it is allowable to store, but as for use and so forth, not even one of them is allowable. But when that monk says "The property of the monk Tissa" etc. "the property of the female novice Tissā - use it or give it away or do as you see fit," this is called a relinquishment. From that point onwards, use and so forth are also allowable.

How does an assignment in the absence of the recipient take place? Having likewise known the singular or plural nature of the robes and their proximate or non-proximate state, having said "this robe" or "these robes" or "that robe" or "those robes," one should say "I give this to you for the purpose of assigning." He should be told - "Who is your friend or acquaintance?" Then by the other, in the same manner as before, it should be said "the monk Tissa" or etc. "the female novice Tissā." Then by that monk it should be said "I give to the monk Tissa" or etc. "I give to the female novice Tissā." This is an assignment in the absence of the recipient. To this extent it is allowable to store, but as for use and so forth, not even one of them is allowable. But when that monk, in the same manner as stated in the second face-to-face assignment, says "The property of so-and-so - use it or give it away or do as you see fit," this is called a relinquishment. From that point onwards, use and so forth are also allowable.

What is the difference between the two types of assignment? In the face-to-face assignment, one assigns oneself and has another make the relinquishment. In the assignment in the absence of the recipient, one has another make the assignment and has another make the relinquishment. This is the difference here. But if the one to whom he assigns is not skilled in the formulations and does not know how to make the relinquishment, one should take that robe, go to the presence of another competent person, assign it again, and have him make the relinquishment. This is called an assignment of what has already been assigned, and it is allowable. This is the determination regarding the word "assigns."

And because of the statement "I allow, monks, the triple robe to be determined, not to be assigned," and so forth, this word "assigns" stated without distinction appears to be contradictory, but the Truth-finders do not speak what is contradictory. Therefore its meaning should be understood thus: I allow one who maintains the triple robe simply as a set of three robes only to determine it, not to assign it. But the rainy-season robe, after the four months, is only to be assigned, not to be determined. This being so, for one who wishes to dwell apart from one robe among the triple robe, having relinquished the determination of the triple robe, the opportunity for assignment is given for the sake of comfortable separation. And there is no offence in exceeding ten days - by this method, the non-prohibited nature of assignment everywhere should be understood.

"Gives up" means he gives to another. But how is it given, and how is it received? Whether he says "I give this to you, I bestow, I would give, I hand over, I relinquish, I let go, I give up," or "I give to so-and-so" etc. "I let go," whether face-to-face or in the absence of the recipient, it is indeed given. When he says "Take it for yourself," and the other says "I take it for myself," it is well given and well received. When he says "Make it your own property, let it be your own property, you shall make it your own property," and the other says "I make it my own property, let it be my own property, I shall make it my own property," it is badly given and badly received. Neither does the giver know how to give, nor does the other know how to receive. But if when he says "Make it your own property," the other takes it saying "Very well, venerable sir, I take it for myself," it is well received. But if one says "Take it yourself," the other says "I do not take it," and then the first says "It has been given by me to you, take it," and the other also says "I have no need of this." Then the first one exceeds ten days thinking "It has been given by me," and the latter also thinking "It has been refused by me."

For whom is there an offence? There is no offence for anyone. But whoever wishes it, he should determine it and use it.

But one who is doubtful about the determination, what should he do? Having declared his state of doubt, he should relinquish it in the manner already stated, saying "if it is undetermined, in this way it is allowable for me." For there is no false speech for one who, having made it known thus, performs the Vinaya procedure. Some, however, say "having taken it on trust by one monk and then giving it back is allowable," but that is not fitting. For this is not a Vinaya procedure for him, nor does it become a different matter by that much.

"If it is lost" etc. is of obvious meaning. Regarding "whoever would not give, there is an offence of wrong-doing," the offence of wrong-doing is for one who does not give with the perception "this was given to me by him." But knowing that it belongs to him, one who takes it away on a pretext should have the goods appraised and should have it settled.

Regarding the origin and so forth, this training rule is called "of kathina origin"; it arises from body and speech and from body, speech, and mind; since the offence is committed through non-determination and non-assignment, it is one of non-doing; even in the absence of perception one is not freed, and even one who does not know commits it, thus it is not freed by perception; it is without consciousness; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is of three types of consciousness; it is of three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the First Kaṭhina Training Rule is completed.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule on Keeping Beyond the Time Limit

471. "At that time the Buddha, the Blessed One" - this is the training rule concerning separation. Therein, "with just their inner and upper robes" - "inner" refers to the inner robe, "upper" refers to the upper robe, the upper together with the inner is "inner-and-upper," "with that inner-and-upper" means together with the inner robe and the upper robe. "Mildewed" means having developed dark and white patches in places affected by moisture. "The Venerable Ānanda, wandering on a lodging tour, saw" - it is said that when the Blessed One had entered the Fragrant Chamber for the purpose of daytime seclusion, the Elder, having obtained that opportunity, while putting away improperly placed wooden articles and earthen articles, sweeping unswept places, and exchanging friendly greetings with sick monks, arrived at the lodging place of those monks and saw them. Therefore it was said - "The Venerable Ānanda, wandering on a lodging tour, saw."

473. "To give authorisation for non-separation": authorisation regarding non-separation is authorisation for non-separation, or authorisation for the purpose of non-separation is authorisation for non-separation. But what is the benefit herein? The robe from which one is separated does not become subject to forfeiture, and one does not incur an offence. For how long? The Elder Mahāsuma first said: "As long as the illness has not subsided; but when the illness has subsided, one should come quickly to the place where the robe is." The Elder Mahāpaduma said - "If one comes quickly, the illness might relapse; therefore one should come gradually. For from the time one seeks a caravan or turns one's attention thinking 'I shall go,' from that time

it is valid. But if one abandons the responsibility thinking 'I shall not go now,' it should be revoked; it will stand in the position of an extra robe." But if his illness relapses, what should be done? The Elder Phussadeva first said - "If that same illness relapses, that same authorisation stands; there is no need to give the authorisation again. But if another illness arises, the authorisation should be given again." The Elder Upatissa said - "Whether it be that same illness or another, there is no need to give the authorisation again."

475-476. "When the robe is finished by a monk" - here, however, without taking the meaning as in the preceding training rule, the meaning of the instrumental case should be understood in the sense of the genitive, thus: "when the robe is finished, for a monk." For in the sense of the instrumental, there is nothing that must be done by a monk in this regard. But in the sense of the genitive, the meaning fits thus: "when the robe is finished for a monk and the kathina-privilege has been withdrawn, thus freed from the obstacle, if a monk should stay apart from the three robes even for one night." Therein, "from the three robes" means from any one among the three robes that have been determined. For even one who has stayed apart from one robe is one who has stayed apart from the three robes, because he has stayed apart from one included in what is prohibited. Therefore, in the word-analysis of this rule, "from the outer robe, or" etc. is stated. "Should stay apart" means should dwell separated.

477-478. "A village has one precincts" etc. is stated for the purpose of determining the characteristic of non-separation. Thereafter, elaborating those same fifteen matrix terms in sequence, he said beginning with "a village named as having one precincts." Therein, "a village of one family" means a village belonging to one king or one feudal lord. "Enclosed" means enclosed by any wall, fence, or moat whatsoever. To this extent, the state of having one precincts for a single-family village has been shown. "One should stay within the village" means that in such a village, having deposited the robe, it is permissible to let dawn rise at any place one likes within the village. "Unenclosed" - by this, the state of having different precincts for that same village is shown. In such a village, one should stay in whichever house the robe has been deposited. "Or one should not leave the reach of the hand" means alternatively, one should not leave the reach of the hand all around that house; it is said that one should not go beyond a distance measuring two and a half cubits. However, it is permissible to stay within the area of two and a half cubits. Having exceeded that measure, even if a monk with supernormal powers lets dawn rise in the air, it is still entailing forfeiture. And here, "in whichever house" - the delimitation of the house should be understood by the characteristic beginning with "it is a dwelling of one family."

479. "A village of different families" means a village belonging to different kings or chieftains, similar to Vesālī, Kusinārā, and so forth. "Fenced" - by this, the single-boundary status of the village of different families is shown. "In the assembly hall or at the doorway" - here "sabhāya" is stated as "sabhā" with all three genders. "At the doorway" means near the city gate. This is what is meant - In such a village, one should stay in whichever house the robe has been deposited. If one is unable to stay there due to the disturbance of noise or the crowding of people, one should stay either in the assembly hall or at the city gate. If one is unable to stay even there,

having stayed in any comfortable place, one should come back before dawn and not leave the arm's reach of those very assembly halls or doorways. However, there is no requirement to stay within arm's reach of the house or the robe.

"When going to the assembly hall, having deposited the robe within arm's reach" - if, having placed it in the house, one goes to the assembly hall thinking "I shall deposit it in the assembly hall," then "when going to the assembly hall, within arm's reach" means having stretched out the hand, thinking "let me deposit this robe here," having deposited the robe in some shop that is within arm's reach where it is convenient to deposit, one should stay either in the assembly hall or at the doorway in the same manner as before, or one should not leave the arm's reach.

Herein this is the determination - The Elder Phussadeva first said: "There is no requirement to stay within arm's reach of the robe; it is permissible to stay anywhere - within arm's reach of the street, within arm's reach of the assembly hall, or within arm's reach of the doorway." But the Elder Upatissa said: "A city may have many gates and many assembly halls; therefore, it is not permissible everywhere. Rather, on whichever street the robe has been deposited, whichever assembly hall and gate are in the place directly facing that street - one should not leave the arm's reach of that assembly hall and that gate. For in this way, it is possible to know the whereabouts of the robe." However, when going to the assembly hall, if one has deposited it in the hands of a shopkeeper, and if he carries that robe away and deposits it in his house, the arm's reach of the street is not maintained; one should stay within arm's reach of the house. If the house is large, standing spanning two streets, one should await the dawn within arm's reach either in front or behind. But having deposited it in the assembly hall, one should await the dawn either in the assembly hall, or at the city gate directly facing it, or within arm's reach of those very places.

"Unfenced" - by this, the separate-boundary status of that same village is shown. By this same method, the single-boundary status and separate-boundary status should be understood everywhere. But in the canonical text, having extracted a single matrix term at the beginning as "a village is called single-boundary" and at the end as "an open space is called single-boundary," the word analysis has been elaborated. Therefore, following that very term, the single-boundary status and separate-boundary status should be understood everywhere by way of fencing and so forth.

480-481. Regarding "chambers" in the passage beginning with "dwelling": this is just a synonym for inner rooms. "Or the stretched arm's reach" means the stretched arm's reach from the inner room. "Or at the entrance of the door" means at the entrance of the house door that is common to all. "Or the stretched arm's reach" means the stretched arm's reach from the inner room or from the entrance of the house door.

482-487. "Storehouse" means a hall for goods such as vehicles and the like. And from this point onwards, the determination should be understood in the same manner as stated regarding a dwelling. "Raised structure" means a special type of shelter with thick walls made of bricks, having four or five storeys, for the purpose of warding off rival kings and the like. "Pavilion" means a square mansion comprised under a single peak. "Mansion" means a long mansion. "Pinnacled house" means a mansion with a flat roof.

489. Regarding "seven interiors" here, one interior is twenty-eight cubits. If the caravan, while travelling, passes through a village or a river and stands still, being joined together with one who has entered within, extending across both the near and far sides, only the caravan allowance is obtained. But if one who has entered within is included within the village or the river, both the village allowance and the river allowance are obtained. If it stands having passed beyond the monastery boundary, and the robe is within the boundary, one should go to the monastery and dwell there. If the robe is outside the boundary, one should dwell near the caravan itself. If, while travelling, the caravan is broken off midway due to a cart breaking or an ox being lost, one should dwell in whichever section the robe is.

490. In a field of one family, the stretched arm's reach means the stretched arm's reach from the robe itself; in a field of different families, the stretched arm's reach means the stretched arm's reach from the field's doorway. In an unfenced one, the stretched arm's reach is from the robe itself.

491-494. "Threshing floor" (dhaññaṅkaraṇa) means a threshing ground (khala). "Garden" (ārāma) means either a flower garden or a fruit garden. In both cases, the determination is the same as stated for a field. A monastery (vihāra) is similar to a dwelling. "At the foot of a tree, within the shade" means within the area covered by the shade. However, if a robe is placed in a spot touched by sunlight under a tree with sparse branches, it entails forfeiture. Therefore, it should be placed in the shade of the branches or the shade of the trunk of such a tree. If one places it on a branch or in the foliage, it should be placed only in a spot above that is covered by the shade of another branch. The shade of a crooked tree extends far; it is indeed allowable to place it at the spot where the shade reaches. Here too, "the stretched arm's reach" means the stretched arm's reach for a robe only.

"In a wilderness without a village" means a wilderness without a village can be found in places such as the Vindhya forest and the like, or on islands in the middle of the ocean that are not on the route of fishermen. "Seven abbhantaras on all sides" means seven abbhantaras in all directions from one standing in the middle; by full extent, they amount to fourteen. One sitting in the middle guards a robe placed at the boundary in either the eastern or the western direction. However, if at the time of break of dawn one moves even a hair's tip towards the eastern direction, the robe in the western direction entails forfeiture. The same method applies in the other case. But at the time of the Uposatha, the boundary of seven abbhantaras should be reckoned starting from the monk sitting at the edge of the assembly. To whatever extent the community of monks increases, to that extent the boundary also increases.

495. Regarding "if one uses without relinquishing, there is an offence of wrong-doing" - here, if a monk devoted to striving, having engaged in striving throughout the entire night, at the time before dawn, thinking "I shall bathe," places all three robes on the bank and descends into the river, and while he is bathing dawn arises, what should be done? For if he comes out and puts on a robe, he commits a wrong-doing on account of using a forfeitable robe without relinquishing it. But if he goes naked, does he also commit a wrong-doing? He does not commit an offence. For as long as he has not seen another monk and performed the disciplinary procedure, he stands in the position of one whose robes are lost, because those robes are not worthy of use. And

for one whose robes are lost, there is nothing that is improper. Therefore, having put on one, taking two in hand, he should go to the monastery and perform the disciplinary procedure. If the monastery is far away and people are moving about along the road, he should put on one, wrap one around, place one on the shoulder, and go. If he does not see fellow monks at the monastery, and they have gone on alms-round, he should leave the outer robe outside the village, and wearing the inner and upper robes, go to the assembly hall and perform the disciplinary procedure. If there is danger from thieves outside the village, he should go wearing it. If the assembly hall is crowded and full of people, and it is not possible to remove a robe to one side and perform the disciplinary procedure, he should take one monk, go outside the village, perform the disciplinary procedure, and then use the robes.

If monks, having given their bowls and robes into the hands of junior monks while travelling on the road, wish to sleep during the last watch, they should sleep keeping their own robes within arm's reach. If, while the junior monks who are still travelling have not arrived, dawn arises, the robe becomes forfeitable, but the dependence is not cancelled. The same method applies also when the junior monks are going ahead and the elders have not arrived. The same method applies also when they have missed the road and cannot see each other in the forest. But if the junior monks say "Venerable sir, we shall sleep for a moment and meet you at such and such a place" and sleep until the break of dawn, the robe becomes forfeitable and the dependence is cancelled. The same method applies also when the elders sleep after sending the junior monks ahead. Having seen a fork in the road, the elders say "this is the path" and the junior monks say "this is the path," and without accepting each other's word they go their ways - at the break of dawn the robes become forfeitable and the dependence is cancelled. If the junior monks, leaving the road, thinking "we shall return before dawn," enter a village for the purpose of obtaining medicine and come back, and dawn arises while they have not yet arrived, the robes become forfeitable, but the dependence is not cancelled. But if, out of fear of cows or fear of dogs, thinking "we shall stand for a moment and then go," they stand or sit down and then go, and dawn arises in the meantime, the robes become forfeitable and the dependence is cancelled. If, thinking "we shall come back before dawn," they have entered a village within the boundary and dawn arises in the meantime, neither do the robes become forfeitable nor is the dependence cancelled. But if they sit down thinking "let it become light first," even when dawn has arisen the robes do not become forfeitable, but the dependence is cancelled. Also those who, thinking "we shall come back before dawn," go eagerly to a neighbouring monastery for the purpose of hearing the Dhamma, and dawn arises while they are still on the road, the robes become forfeitable, but the dependence is not cancelled. If, out of respect for the Dhamma, they sit down thinking "we shall go only after hearing it to the end," at the break of dawn the robes also become forfeitable and the dependence is also cancelled. When an elder sends a junior monk to a village for the purpose of washing robes, he should give them only after withdrawing the determination of his own robe. The junior monk's robe too should be kept after having him withdraw its determination. If he goes through forgetfulness, one should withdraw the determination of one's own robe, take the junior monk's robe on trust, and keep it. If the elder forgets but the junior monk remembers, the junior monk should withdraw the determination of his own robe, take the elder's robe on trust, go and say to him

"Venerable sir, please determine your robe and use it," and he too should determine his own robe. Thus, even when one of them remembers, there is freedom from offence. The remainder is of clear meaning.

Regarding the origin and so forth, in the first Kaṭhina training rule, non-determination and non-assignment are the non-action; here, non-withdrawal is the only difference. The remainder is the same as the method stated everywhere.

The Explanation of the Expired Training Rule is completed.

3. Commentary on the Third Training Rule on Kaṭhina

497. "At that time" - this is the third Kaṭhina training rule. Therein, "having lifted up, wiped it again and again" means: thinking "when the creases have disappeared, this will become large," he sprinkled it with water, trampled it with his feet, lifted it up with his hands, raised it, and rubbed it on his back; when that dried in the sun, it was just the same size as before. He did the same again; therefore it is said - "having lifted up, wiped it again and again." The Blessed One, having seen him thus struggling while seated in the Fragrant Chamber itself, came out and went there as though wandering on a lodging tour. Therefore it was said - "The Blessed One saw" etc.

499-500. "Eleven months" means the remaining eleven months, excluding the one last month of Kattika. "Seven months" means the remaining seven months, excluding the five months consisting of the month of Kattika and the four of the winter season. "Given designating even in season" means either given to the Community having designated it saying "this is out-of-season robe-cloth," or given to an individual saying "I give this to you."

"From the Community" means it may arise from the Community by way of one's own allotted share. "From a group" means they give to a group thus: "We give this to the group of sutta-specialists, we give this to the group of Abhidhamma-specialists." From that, it may arise from a group by way of one's own allotted share.

"If there is no fulfilment for him" means if there were no fulfilment, the meaning is: if the robe being made is sufficient as a determined robe with a certain amount, but that robe-cloth were not of that amount and were deficient.

Regarding "there is expectation from the Community" etc., the expectation from the Community or from a group is thus: "On such-and-such a day the Community will receive robes, the group will receive them, and from that a robe will arise for me." The expectation from relatives or friends is thus: "Robe-cloth has been sent for me by relatives for the purpose of robes, sent by friends; when they come they will give robes." "Or rag-cloth" - here, however, it should be construed thus: the expectation is "I shall obtain rag-cloth." "Or with one's own wealth" means with one's own wealth such as cotton, thread, and so forth; the meaning is: the expectation is thus "I shall obtain it on such-and-such a day."

"If he should set it aside beyond that, even if there is expectation" means if he should set it aside beyond the month at most, the meaning is: it is an expiation involving forfeiture. However, without stating it thus, because when expected robe-cloth arises in the interval, expected robe-cloth that arises up to the twentieth day from the day the original robe-cloth arose makes the original robe-cloth follow its own course, and

beyond that the original robe-cloth makes the expected robe-cloth follow its own course. Therefore, in order to show that distinction, the word-analysis is stated by the method beginning with "when the original robe-cloth arises on that very day"; that is clear in meaning.

"When incompatible original robe-cloth arises" means if the original robe-cloth is fine and the expected robe-cloth is coarse, they cannot be combined. And nights remain, the month is not yet complete, the robe should not be made unwillingly by force. It should be made only after obtaining other expected robe-cloth within the time period. The expected robe-cloth too should be determined as an accessory cloth. But if the original robe-cloth is coarse and the expected robe-cloth is fine, having determined the original robe-cloth as an accessory cloth, only the expected robe-cloth should be kept as the original robe-cloth. That again obtains the month's allowance; by this method, for as long as one wishes, it is permissible to keep setting aside each one in turn as the original robe-cloth. The remainder is clear in itself.

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

The Explanation of the Third Kaṭhina Training Rule is completed.

4. Commentary on the Training Rule on Old Robes

503-505. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning old robes. Therein, "up to the seventh generation of grandfathers" means: one's father's father is the grandfather; the generation of the grandfather is the grandfather-generation. "Generation" is called the measure of a lifespan. This is merely a manner of expression. In meaning, however, the grandfather himself is the generation of ancestors. Beyond that, all the forefathers too are included by the term "grandfather" itself. Thus, one who is not related up to the seventh person is said to be "not related up to the seventh grandfather-generation." This is merely a mode of teaching. However, from the statement "from the mother's side or from the father's side," it should be understood that the grandfather-generation, the grandmother-generation, the maternal grandfather-generation, the maternal grandmother-generation, and their brothers, sisters, nephews, sons, grandsons, and so forth are all included herein.

Herein, this is the detailed method - Father, father's father, his father, his father too - thus up to the seventh generation; father, father's mother, her father and mother and brother and sister and sons and daughters - thus too both upwards and downwards up to the seventh generation; father, father's brother, father's sister, father's sons, father's daughters, and their succession of sons and daughters too - thus too up to the seventh generation; mother, mother's mother, her mother, her mother too - thus too up to the seventh generation; mother, mother's father, his mother and father and brother and sister and sons and daughters - thus too both upwards and downwards up to the seventh generation; mother, mother's brother, mother's sister, mother's sons, mother's daughters, and their succession of sons and daughters too - thus too up to the seventh generation; one who is connected neither through the mother's relationship nor through the father's relationship - this one is called "not a relative."

"In both Saṅghas" means one who has received the full ordination through a formal act of the Vinaya with eight proclamations - by a motion with three announcements in the nun Community and by a motion with three announcements in the bhikkhu

Community.

"Even once worn or even once draped" means having dyed it and made it allowable, even once worn as a lower robe or draped as an upper robe. Even if one has merely placed it on the shoulder or on the head as a token of use and gone on a journey, or has used it as a pillow and lain down, this too is indeed an old robe. But if one places it under a bedspread and lies down, or lifts it up with the hands and makes a canopy in the air and walks without touching it with the head, this is said in the Kurundī not to constitute use.

Regarding "washed, it is to be forfeited" - herein, a nun so instructed prepares a stove for the purpose of washing, gathers firewood, makes a fire, brings water - with each and every effort by the nun until she has washed it and taken it out, there is an offence of wrong-doing for the monk. As soon as it has been washed and taken out, it becomes subject to forfeiture. If, thinking it is poorly washed, she sprinkles or washes it again, with each and every effort until it reaches completion, there is an offence of wrong-doing. This same method applies to dyeing and beating. For in the dyeing trough, having scattered the dye, as long as she dyes the robe even once, whatever she does before that for the purpose of dyeing, or afterwards re-dyes it, in every case with each and every effort there is an offence of wrong-doing for the monk. Thus the effort in beating too should be understood.

506. "Perceiving one who is not a relative as not a relative, she causes an old robe to be washed" - even if she does not say "wash this," yet having made a bodily gesture for the purpose of washing, she either gives it into her hand by hand, or places it at her feet, or throws it towards her, or sends it into the hands of a female probationer, a female novice, a male novice, a male lay follower, a follower of another sect, and so forth, or throws it within the vicinity of one who is washing at a river ford - standing within a space of twelve cubits, it is indeed as if she has caused it to be washed. But if, having left the vicinity, she places it on this side, and that one washes it and brings it back, there is no offence. If she gives it into the hands of a female probationer, a female novice, or a female lay follower for the purpose of washing, and that one, having received full ordination, washes it, it is indeed an offence. If she gives it into the hands of a male lay follower, and he, upon a change of sex, goes forth among the nuns and receives full ordination and washes it, it is indeed an offence. Even if it is given into the hands of a male novice or a bhikkhu, in the case of a change of sex, the same method applies.

In the cases of "she causes it to be washed and causes it to be dyed" and so forth, by one act there is an offence entailing forfeiture, and by the second a wrong-doing. For one who causes all three to be done, by one there is an offence entailing forfeiture, and by the remaining two there are two wrong-doings. Since there is no escape for one who causes these acts of washing and so forth to be done whether in order or out of order, therefore three sets of four are stated here. For even if it is said "dye this robe, wash it, and bring it," and that nun first washes it and afterwards dyes it, with the forfeiture there is only a wrong-doing. Thus the method should be applied in all cases of reversed instructions. But if one who is told "wash it and bring it" both washes and dyes it, the offence is only on account of causing it to be washed; in the dyeing there is no offence. Thus in all cases where something additional to what was stated is done, there is no offence, which should be understood by the principle "she

washes without being told." But one who says "whatever needs to be done to this robe, all that is your responsibility" incurs multiple offences by a single statement.

The terms "if she is doubtful about one who is not a relative" and "perceiving one who is not a relative as a relative" - these terms too should be understood in detail by way of the same three sets of four already stated.

"One ordained unilaterally" - for one who causes a robe to be washed by one who has received full ordination in the presence of nuns only, there is a wrong-doing. But for one who has received full ordination in the presence of bhikkhus, it is as in the original case itself. Those who received full ordination in the presence of bhikkhus are the five hundred Sākiyan women.

507. "Without being asked she washes" means: having come for recitation or exhortation, seeing a soiled robe, she takes it from the place where it was kept, or having had it brought saying "Give it, venerable sir, I shall wash it," she washes, dyes, and beats it - this is called "without being asked she washes." Also she who, having heard a monk instructing a young one or a novice saying "Wash this robe," says "Bring it, venerable sir, I shall wash it" and washes it, or takes it for the time being, washes it, dyes it, and gives it back - this too is called "without being asked she washes."

"Another requisite" means: whatever she causes to be washed - a sandal-bag, a bowl-bag, a shoulder-strap, a waist-band, a bed, a chair, a mattress, a bolster, and so forth - there is no offence. The remainder here is clear in meaning.

Among the origins and so forth, this training rule has six origins, is an act of commission, is not a liberation through perception, is without consciousness, is an offence by convention, is bodily action, is verbal action, has three types of consciousness, and has three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Old Robe Training Rule is completed.

5. Commentary on the Training Rule on Accepting Robes

508. "At that time" refers to the training rule on accepting robes. Therein, "having returned from the alms round" means having returned from the almsfood collection. "She approached the Blind Men's Grove" means she approached the Blind Men's Grove when the training rule had not yet been laid down. "Having done their deed" means having done their thieving deed; it means they had stolen others' goods by means of breaking through walls and so forth. "Chief of the thieves" means the leader of the thieves. He, it is said, knew the elder nun from before; therefore, going ahead of the thieves and seeing her, he said "Do not go this way, all of you come this way," and taking them, he went by another path. "Having emerged from concentration" means the elder nun, it is said, emerged from concentration at the very time she had determined. He too spoke thus at that very moment; therefore she heard it, and having heard, thinking "There is now no other ascetic or brahmin here apart from me," she took that meat. Therefore it was said - "Then the nun Uppalavaṇṇā" etc.

"Left behind" means the one remaining behind; the meaning is that, having received the turn of monastery duty, he alone stayed in the monastery. Why did he say "If you would give me your inner robe"? Having seen the smooth, thick, and well-finished

inner robe, out of greed; however, his greed for the inner robe was slight, but having aroused improper greed thinking "I shall see the bodily perfection of the elder nun who has attained the peak of excellence in her physical endowments," he spoke thus. "Last" means being the final one of the five robes as the outermost limit of all; "last" means the final one. "There is no other robe set aside even by expedient, whether by assigning or by withdrawing" - thus she spoke only in terms of wearing the five robes as permitted, not out of greed, for there is no greed in those who have destroyed the taints. "Being pressured" means being firmly pressed after he had shown a simile.

"Having given the inner robe, she went to her dwelling" means having wrapped herself in a bodice, she showed it only on the palm of her hand so that his desire would not be fulfilled, and departed.

510. Why did they grumble when the exchange robe was not accepted? Because of feeling disregarded and being distressed, thinking: "If the venerable ones do not have even this much trust in us, how shall we get along?"

"I allow, monks, from these five" means: the meaning is "I allow to accept an exchange from these five who are fellow practitioners of the Dhamma, of equal faith, of equal virtue, and of equal views."

512. "There is a wrong-doing in the effort" means there is a wrong-doing in the extending of the hand and so forth for the purpose of taking. "By the acquisition" means by the accepting. And therein, whether she gives it into his hand, or places it at his feet, or throws it from above, if he consents to it, it is as good as taken. But if he accepts what has been sent through the hands of female probationers, male novices, female novices, male lay followers, female lay followers and so forth, there is no offence. When one is giving a talk on the Teaching, all four assemblies bring robes and various dyed cloths and place them at his feet, or standing within the vicinity or releasing them from the vicinity they throw them; whatever therein belongs to nuns, for one who takes that except in exchange, there is indeed an offence. But if they are thrown during the night-time, and it is not possible to know "this belongs to a nun, this belongs to others," it is stated in the Mahāpaccaṇḍī and the Kurundī that there is no need for exchange; that does not accord with the principle of absence of intention. If a nun gives a rains-residence offering, an exchange should indeed be made. But if she places it on a rubbish heap and so forth, it is allowable to determine it as a rag-robe and take it, thinking "they will take it as a rag-robe."

513. "Perceiving one who is not a relative as not a relative" - a triad of expiation offences. "One ordained unilaterally" means for one who accepts from the hand of one ordained in the presence of nuns, there is a wrong-doing; but for one ordained in the presence of bhikkhus, it is indeed an expiation offence.

514. "Something small for something large" means if one exchanges a robe of little value, or sandal-cases, bowl-cases, shoulder-straps, waist-bands and the like, for something of great value and receives a robe, there is no offence. In the Mahāpaccaṇḍī, however, it is said "even with a piece of myrobalan." "Something large for something small" - this should be understood by reversing what has been stated. "Another requisite" means bowl-cases and the like, whatever they may be. However, even a cloth water-strainer of the size of a robe eligible for assignment as the last robe is not permissible. Whatever is neither eligible for determination nor eligible for

assignment, all of that is permissible. Even if a lotus-fibre skin is the size of a bed, it is indeed permissible; what then need be said of bowl-cases and the like? The remainder is of clear meaning.

Among the origins and so forth, this has six origins, is action and non-action, is not liberation through perception, is without consciousness, is an offence by convention, is bodily action and verbal action, involves three types of consciousness, and involves three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Robe-Acceptance Training Rule is completed.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Requesting from Those Who Are Not Related

515. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning making requests to unrelated persons. Therein, "Upananda the Sakyan" was despised among the approximately eighty thousand monks who had gone forth from the Sakyan clan, being of a greedy nature. "Competent" means skilful, accomplished, capable, endowed with a good voice, and possessed of sweetness of throat. "How could we" means what is it like, it is like affliction, the meaning is that it is like trembling, like shaking, on account of moral shame and fear of wrongdoing.

"Highway" means a long road reckoned as a journey, the meaning is not a city street road. "Those monks robbed them" means they plundered them, the meaning is they took away their bowls and robes. "Examine them" means question them for the purpose of ascertaining their status as monks. "Being examined" means being questioned about their going forth, higher ordination, determination of bowls and robes, and so forth. "They reported this matter" means having made known their status as monks, they reported this matter which was stated in the manner beginning with "travelling along the highway from Sāketa to Sāvatthī."

517. Regarding "an unrelated householder or" and so forth, what is stated further on as "having covered oneself with grass or leaves," taking that as the starting point, the gradual discussion should be understood thus. If, upon seeing thieves, the junior monks took their bowls and robes and fled, and the thieves carry off only the lower and upper robes of the elders, the elders should not yet ask for robes, nor should they break off branches and leaves. But if the junior monks fled abandoning all their belongings, and the thieves take the elders' lower and upper robes together with those belongings, the junior monks, having returned, should not yet give their own lower and upper robes to the elders, for those whose robes have not been stolen are not permitted to break off branches and leaves for their own sake, but they are permitted to do so for the sake of those whose robes have been stolen, and those whose robes have been stolen are permitted to do so for both their own sake and for the sake of others. Therefore, either the elders should break off branches and leaves, tie them with bark and the like, and give them to the junior monks, or the junior monks should break off and tie them for the elders' sake, and whether or not placing them in the elders' hands, having dressed themselves, they should give their own lower and upper robes to the elders; there is no pācittiya offence for destroying plant life, nor is there a dukkaṭa offence for wearing them.

If on the road there is a washerman's spreading cloth, or they see other such people, they should ask for a robe. And whatever cloths those people who were asked, or others, seeing monks dressed in branches and leaves, being inspired, give to them - whether those are with fringes or without fringes, or of various colours such as blue and so forth, whether allowable or not allowable - all of them, because of being in the position of those whose robes have been stolen, are suitable for them to wear as lower and upper robes. For this too has been stated in the Parivāra:

"Not made allowable, nor dyed with dye;
Clothed in that he may go wherever he wishes;
And there is no offence for him;
And that rule was taught by the Fortunate One;
This is a question considered by the skilful."

For this question was stated with reference to a monk whose robe has been stolen. But if they travel together with sectarians, and those give them garments of kusa grass, bark garments, or wooden-strip garments, it is suitable to wear even those without adopting their views, and even after wearing them, their views should not be adopted.

Now, regarding "to whatever residence he first goes, if there is the Community's dwelling robe" and so forth, a dwelling robe means: people, having had a residence built, prepare a set of three robes thinking "let even the four requisites, being our own property, go for use," and place them in the residence they had built; this is called a dwelling robe. Upper cover means a covering spread on top of a bed. Floor covering means a covering made of cloth strips for the purpose of protecting the prepared floor; spreading a mat on top of it, they walk about. Mattress skin means the skin of a bed mattress or a chair mattress; if it is stuffed, it is suitable to take it even after shaking out the stuffing. Thus, among these dwelling robes and so forth, whatever is there in the residence, it should be understood that it is permissible for monks whose robes have been stolen to take it, even without asking, and to wear it as a lower or upper robe. And that should be obtained with the intention "I will put it back, I will replace it," not for the purpose of permanent appropriation. And having obtained it, one should restore it to its original state from a relative, or a supporter, or from anywhere else. One who has gone to another region should deposit it in a single Community residence for use as Community property. If through his use alone it wears out or is lost, there is no fault. But if none of these aforementioned things, from lay cloths and so forth up to mattress skins, can be obtained, then one should come having covered oneself with grass or leaves.

519. Regarding "or has been stolen by anyone whomsoever," here it is fitting to say that even when teachers and preceptors whose robes have been stolen obtain robes from others either by requesting "Bring robes, friends" or by taking them on trust, that too falls within the scope of this rule.

Regarding "or has become worn out through use," here too it is fitting to say that even a robe given after one has covered teachers, preceptors and others whose robes have been stolen with grass and leaves oneself, that too falls within the scope

of this rule. For in this way they will be standing in the position of those whose robes have been stolen and those whose robes have been lost, and therefore there will be a fitting non-offence for them in making a request and in the use of improper robes.

521. Regarding "for relatives, for those who have invited to admonish" - here the meaning should be understood thus: there is no offence for one who requests or asks "Give from what belongs to them." For indeed, there is neither offence nor non-offence for those who are relatives and have invited to admonish. Regarding "with one's own wealth" - here too the meaning should be understood thus: there is no offence for one who requests, procures, or exchanges a robe with one's own allowable goods through an allowable transaction. Regarding "for those who have invited to admonish" - here, when one has been invited on behalf of the Community, only the proper measure is appropriate. In the case of a personal invitation, whatever one invites for, only that should be requested. One who, having invited with the four requisites, himself observes and gives robes from time to time, rice-gruel and meals and so forth day by day - thus giving whatever is needed - for him there is no need to make a request. But one who, having invited, does not give due to foolishness or lapse of memory, he should be requested. One who says "I invite you to my house" - having gone to his house, one may sit or lie down at ease, but nothing should be taken. But one who says "Whatever is in my house, that I invite you to." Whatever is allowable there, that may be requested, but one is not permitted to sit or lie down in the house - thus it is stated in the Kurundī.

Regarding "for the benefit of another" - here one meaning is: there is no offence for one who requests from those who are one's own relatives and have invited to admonish, not merely for one's own benefit, but for the benefit of another. But this is the second meaning: "of another" means those who are relatives and have invited to admonish of another - there is no offence for one who requests for the benefit of that very person designated as "another," whether Buddhārakkhita or Dhammārakkhita. The remainder is of clear meaning.

Regarding the origins and so forth, this too has six origins, is an act of commission, is not a liberation through the cessation of perception, is without consciousness, is an offence by convention, is bodily action and verbal action, involves three types of consciousness, and involves three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Asking from Unrelated Training Rule is completed.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Beyond That

522-524. "At that time" refers to the next training rule. Therein, "abhihaṭṭhum" - "abhi" is a prefix, the meaning is "to bring," and what is stated is "to take." "Pavāreyya" means one would cause to wish, would arouse a wish and inclination, would say, would invite - this is the meaning. However, to show the manner in which one who invites by bringing should speak, the word-analysis is stated thus: "Take as much as you wish." Alternatively, just as in "nekkhammaṃ daṭṭhu khemato" the meaning is "having seen," so too here "abhihaṭṭhum pavāreyya" means "having brought, one would invite." Therein, bringing is twofold: bodily bringing and verbal bringing. For one might invite by physically bringing cloths and placing them at the

feet, saying "Take as much as you wish," or one might invite verbally, saying "Our cloth storehouse is full, take as much as you wish." Combining both of these together, it is said "abhihaṭṭhum pavāreyya."

"Santaruttaraparamaṃ" means that which has an inner robe, an upper robe, and an outer robe as the maximum for that robe - this is "santaruttaraparamaṃ." What is stated is that the upper limit is the outer robe together with the inner robe. "Tato cīvaraṃ sāditaḥḥamaṃ" means from those brought robes, this much robe should be accepted, and not more than this - this is the meaning. However, since only a monk who has had all three robes stolen, possessing the triple robe, should act thus, while another may act differently, in order to show that distinction, the word-analysis is stated by the method beginning with "if three are lost."

Herein this is the determination - For one whose three are lost, two should be accepted; having dressed in one and having wrapped in one, he will seek another from a suitable place. For one whose two are lost, one should be accepted. If one normally goes about with just the inner and upper robe, two should be accepted. Thus by accepting just one, he will be equal. For one whose one out of three is lost, none should be accepted. But for one whose one out of two is lost, one should be accepted. For one who has only one, and that is lost, two should be accepted. But for a nun, even when five are lost, two should be accepted. When four are lost, one should be accepted; when three are lost, nothing should be accepted - what need to speak of two or one. For by whatever means one must maintain the state of having the inner robe, upper robe, and outer robe as the maximum, nothing beyond that is obtainable - this is the principle herein.

526. "I will bring the remainder" means having made two robes, he will bring the remainder again - this is the meaning. "Not because of robbery" means they give on account of qualities such as great learning and so forth. In the passage beginning with "for relatives" and so forth, the meaning is: there is no offence for one who accepts when relatives give, for one who accepts when those who have invited give, and for one who accepts with one's own wealth. However, in the commentaries it is said: "In the case of relatives and those who have invited, even much is allowable by nature; when it is because of robbery, only the prescribed amount is allowable." That does not accord with the canonical text. Since, however, this training rule was laid down only in connection with the matter of making a request for the sake of another, therefore "for the sake of another" is not stated here. The remainder is of clear meaning.

Regarding the origins and so forth, this too has six origins, is an act of commission, is not a liberation through the cessation of perception, is without consciousness, is an offence by convention, is bodily action and verbal action, involves three types of consciousness, and involves three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Beyond-That Training Rule is completed.

8. Commentary on the First Training Rule Concerning What Has Been Prepared

527. "At that time" refers to the training rule that has been prepared. Therein, "Friend, he is my attendant" means: "Friend, the one you speak of, there is indeed such an attendant of mine" - this is the meaning here. "Indeed, noble sir, it occurs to

me thus" means "indeed, to me, noble sir, it occurs thus." There is also the reading "api mayyā evaṃ."

528-529. In "but for a monk, having designated" (bhikkhuṃ paneva uddissa), here "having designated" (uddissa) means having indicated, with reference to. Since whatever has been set aside designating someone, that is called set aside for his purpose. Therefore in its word-analysis it is stated "for the monk's purpose" (bhikkhussatthāya).

"Having made the monk the object" (bhikkhuṃ ārammaṇaṃ karitvā) means having made the monk the reason; for whatever has been set aside designating a monk, that has necessarily been set aside making the monk the reason; therefore it is stated - "having made the monk the object." For "reason" (paccaya) too has come as "object" (ārammaṇa) in such passages as "Māra gains an object" etc. Now, to show the manner of the agent in "having designated" (uddissā), it is stated "desiring to clothe the monk" (bhikkhuṃ acchādetukāmo). For it is by one desiring to clothe the monk that it has been set aside designating him, not for any other reason. Thus he is one desiring to clothe. Therefore it was said - "desiring to clothe the monk."

"Of an unrelated householder or" (aññātakassa gahapatissa vā) means by an unrelated householder or; this is the meaning. For this is the genitive case used in the instrumental sense. But in the word-analysis, without examining the letter, merely to show the meaning, "one called unrelated" etc. "one called a householder" etc. is stated.

"Robe fund" (cīvaracetāpanna) means the price of a robe; and since that is one among gold and such things, therefore in the word-analysis "gold or" etc. is stated. "Has been set aside" (upakkhaṭaṃ hoti) means has been prepared, collected and deposited; but since its state of being set aside has been shown by the expression "gold or" etc., therefore the term "what is called set aside" (upakkhaṭaṃ nāma) has not been extracted and analysed separately in the word-analysis. "With this" (iminā) is said referring to what has been set aside; therefore in its word-analysis it is stated "with what is available" (paccupaṭṭhitena). For whatever has been set aside, collected and deposited, that is available. "I will clothe" (acchādessāmi) is a conventional expression; "I will give to the monk of such and such a name" - this is the meaning here. Therefore in its word-analysis too it is stated "I will give" (dassāmi).

"If that monk there" (tatra ce so bhikkhu) - the syntactical connection here is: where that householder or woman householder is, there that monk, not previously invited, having approached, should put forward a consideration regarding a robe. Therein, for "having approached" (upasaṅkamitvā), though the meaning is established by just "having gone" (gantvā), by common usage "house" (ghara) is stated. But the meaning here is just "having gone to where that donor is"; therefore it is also stated "having approached wherever" (yattha katthaci upasaṅkamitvā). "Should put forward a consideration" (vikappaṃ āpajjeyya) means should put forward a special arrangement, an additional specification; but in the word-analysis, to show the very manner in which one puts forward a consideration, "long or" etc. is stated. "Good" (sādhū) is a particle of request. "Indeed" (vata) is used in reflection. "Me" (maṃ) indicates oneself. "Venerable one" (āyasmā) addresses and calls upon another. But since all of this is merely a matter of wording, with obvious meaning, therefore its

meaning is not stated in the word-analysis. "Desiring something fine" (kalyāṇakamyataṃ upādāya) means having taken up mentally the desire for something beautiful, the desire for something superior; its syntactical connection is with "should put forward" (āpajjeyya ce). But since one who puts forward a consideration desiring something fine is one who desires something good, who desires something costly, therefore in its word-analysis, setting aside the letter and showing only the intended meaning, that very expression is stated. But since the offence does not come to a head merely by his putting forward a consideration, therefore "by his word" (tassa vacanena) etc. is stated.

531. In the passage beginning with "there is no offence for relatives," the meaning should be understood thus: there is no offence for one who makes an arrangement regarding a robe with relatives. "When one wishing to get in exchange something very costly gets in exchange something of little value" means: when a householder wishes to get in exchange a robe worth twenty, one says "this is sufficient for me, give me one worth ten or one worth eight" - there is no offence. "Of little value" - this is stated only for the purpose of preventing excess, but there is no offence even for an equal amount, and that indeed is by way of value, not by way of measure, for this training rule concerns the increase of value. Therefore, one who wishes to get in exchange an inner robe worth twenty may also say "give me a robe of exactly that much value." The remainder is of clear meaning.

The origin and so forth are similar to the training rule concerning the higher robe.

The Explanation of the First Prepared Training Rule is completed.

9. Commentary on the Second Training Rule Concerning What Has Been Prepared

532. In the second case of what has been prepared too, the meaning should be understood by this same method. For that is similar to a subsequent enactment of this. The only difference here is that in the first training rule, the affliction was caused to one person, while in the second, to two. All the rest is exactly the same as the first. And just as with two, so also when one takes after causing affliction to many, an offence should be understood.

The Explanation of the Second Prepared Training Rule is completed.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning the King

537. "At that time" - this is the King training rule. Therein, "having informed the lay follower" means having made him know, the intention being that he said thus: "Having purchased a robe with this fund, give it to the elder." "Bound to fifty" means it is said to be a penalty of fifty kahāpaṇas. "Bound to pay fifty" is also a reading; the intention is: defeated by fifty, he must be made to pay fifty. "Wait for today, venerable sir" means: venerable sir, stay with us for just one day today, please be patient - this is the meaning. "Fondled" means he seized. "You have lost" means you have been defeated.

538-539. "A king's official" means one who has something to be enjoyed, something that should be consumed, from the king - thus a king's official. There is also the reading "rājabhogo"; the meaning is: one who has wealth from the king.

"Should send" means should dispatch. Because its meaning is plain, the word-analysis has not been stated. And just as for this, so too it should be understood that the word-analysis has not been stated for the words "a robe for the monk of such and such a name" etc., precisely because their meaning is plain. "Brought" means conveyed. "At the right time that is allowable" means at the appropriate and fitting time; the meaning is: when we have need, then we accept an allowable robe.

"Steward" means one who performs duties; the meaning is one who acts as an agent for allowable things. "He has been informed by me" means he has been instructed by me, such that when you have need of a robe he will give a robe - thus is the meaning of what was said. "I have need, friend, for a robe" - this is an illustration of the characteristic of prompting, for this statement should be spoken, or its meaning in whatever language; this is the characteristic of prompting. But "Give me a robe" and so forth are stated to show the manner in which one should not speak, for these statements, or their meaning in whatever language, should not be spoken.

"He should be told a second time and a third time" means this very statement "I have need, friend, for a robe" should be spoken up to three times. Thus, having shown the limit of the prompting prescribed in "he should be prompted and reminded two or three times," now showing in brief the meaning of the words "prompting and reminding two or three times, if he should produce that robe, this is wholesome," he said "if he produces it, this is wholesome." Thus, prompting up to three times, if he produces that robe, if he is able to produce it by way of one's own obtaining, this is wholesome - good, excellent, fine.

"He should stand silently for it four times, five times, six times at most" - this is an illustration of the characteristic of standing. And "six times at most" is a neuter expression denoting a state; for by this one should stand silently for the robe six times at most, and nothing else should be done - this is the characteristic of standing. Therein, in order to show the silence that is common to all standings, in the word-analysis it is stated "having gone there, remaining silent" etc. Therein, "one should not sit on a seat" means one should not sit even when told "Please sit here, venerable sir." "Material gifts should not be accepted" means one should not accept any material gift such as gruel, hard food and the like, even when requested "Please accept, venerable sir." "The Dhamma should not be spoken" means one should not speak anything even when requested "Please speak a blessing or a thanksgiving"; only when asked "For what reason have you come?" one should say "You know, friend." "When asked" - this is indeed a reflexive case used in the instrumental sense. Or alternatively, the meaning here should be understood as: one who is making an inquiry is "one who asks." For one who makes an inquiry, by saying just that much, breaks the standing - that is, breaks the purpose for which he came.

Now three promptings and six standings have been stated. Therein, showing the increase and decrease, he said "having prompted four times" etc. And because here, with the increase of one prompting, the decrease of two standings has been stated, therefore the characteristic "one prompting equals double the standing" has been shown. Thus by this characteristic, having prompted three times one should stand six times, having prompted twice one should stand eight times, having prompted once one should stand ten times. And just as it is said "having prompted six times one should not stand," so too it is as if said "having stood twelve times one should not

prompt." Therefore, if one only prompts and does not stand, six promptings are obtained. If one only stands and does not prompt, twelve standings are obtained. If one both prompts and stands, for each prompting two standings must be deducted. Therein, one who goes repeatedly on a single day and prompts six times, or having gone just once says "I have need, friend, for a robe" six times - likewise, one who goes repeatedly on a single day and stands twelve times, or having gone just once stands at various spots - he too breaks all the promptings and all the standings. What need to speak of one who does so on different days - thus the determination here should be understood.

"From where the robe fund was brought for him" means from where - whether from the king or from the king's official - the robe fund was brought for that monk. "Yatvassā" is also a reading. The meaning is the same. Some also read "yatthassā," and they explain the meaning as "to the place where the robe fund was sent for him," but the wording does not fit. "Therein" means in the presence of that king or king's official; for this is a locative case used in the sense of proximity. "That does not benefit that monk in any way" means that robe fund does not accomplish even the slightest purpose for that monk. "Let the venerable ones recover your own" means let the venerable ones retrieve their own wealth. "Lest your own be lost" means let what belongs to you not be lost. But one who neither goes himself nor sends a messenger commits an offence of wrong-doing for breach of proper conduct.

But should one proceed in this manner with regard to all stewards? One should not proceed thus. For a steward, in brief, is of two kinds: pointed out and not pointed out. Therein, the pointed out is of two kinds - pointed out by the monk, and pointed out by the messenger. The not pointed out is also of two kinds - the face-to-face volunteer steward, and the behind-the-back steward. Among these, the one pointed out by the monk is of four kinds by way of being in his presence and not in his presence. Likewise, the one pointed out by the messenger also.

How? Here someone sends an unallowable item by messenger for a monk's robe, the messenger having approached that monk says "This, venerable sir, has been sent by so-and-so for your robe, please accept it," the monk refuses saying "This is not allowable," the messenger asks "But do you, venerable sir, have a steward?" and either lay followers desiring merit have been instructed "Perform services for the monks," or there are some stewards who are acquaintances and companions of the monks, and one of them is at that moment seated near the monk, and the monk points him out saying "This is a steward for the monks." The messenger, having placed the unallowable item in his hands and saying "Buy a robe for the elder and give it," departs. This is one pointed out by the monk in his presence.

If he is not seated near the monk, but the monk points out - "In such and such a village, so-and-so is a steward for the monks," and he, having gone and placed the unallowable item in his hands and saying "You should buy a robe for the elder and give it," having come back and informed the monk, departs. This is the first one pointed out by the monk not in his presence.

That messenger does not come himself to inform, but rather sends another saying "I have given, venerable sir, the robe fund into his hands; you should accept the robe." This is the second one pointed out by the monk not in his presence.

He does not send another, but rather while departing says to the monk "I shall give the robe fund into his hands; you should accept the robe." This is the third one pointed out by the monk not in his presence. Thus one pointed out in his presence and three pointed out not in his presence - these four are called stewards pointed out by the monk. Among these, one should proceed in the manner stated in this training rule concerning the king.

Another monk, when asked by the messenger in the same manner as before, says "We have no steward," either because there is none or because he does not wish to make arrangements, and at that moment some person arrives, the messenger places the unallowable item in his hands and saying "You should accept the robe from this person's hands," departs. This is one pointed out by the messenger in his presence.

Another messenger, having entered the village and placed the unallowable item in the hands of someone he himself approves of, either comes back and informs in the same manner as before, or sends another, or while departing says "I shall give the robe fund into the hands of so-and-so; you should accept the robe," and departs. This is the third one pointed out by the messenger not in his presence. Thus one pointed out in his presence and three pointed out not in his presence - these four are called stewards pointed out by the messenger. Among these, one should proceed in the manner stated in the *Meṇḍaka* training rule. For this was said: "There are, monks, people who are faithful and devoted; they deposit gold in the hands of stewards - 'With this give whatever is allowable to the noble one.' I allow, monks, to accept whatever is allowable from that. But I do not say, monks, that by any means whatsoever gold and silver should be accepted or sought after." Here there is no limit to prompting; one who does not accept the capital may obtain allowable goods even a thousand times by prompting or by standing. If he does not give, one may have it brought even by appointing another steward. If he wishes, he may also speak to the owners of the capital; if he does not wish, he should not speak to them.

Another monk, when asked by the messenger in the same manner as before, says "We have no steward," and another person standing nearby, having heard, says "Bring it, sir, I will get a robe in exchange and give it to the venerable one." The messenger, saying "Well then, sir, please give it," places it in his hands and departs without informing the monk. This is a mouth-opening steward. Another person, having placed an unallowable item in the hands of the monk's attendant or someone else, saying "Please give a robe to the elder," departs right there. This is an absent steward. These two are called undesignated stewards. In their case, one should act as with uninvited persons who are not relatives. If they themselves bring a robe and give it, it should be accepted. If not, nothing should be said to them. This is merely a teaching example that "one should send a robe fund by messenger"; the same method applies even when one brings it oneself and gives it for the purpose of almsfood and so forth. It is not only for one's own purpose that it is not allowable to accept; even if someone brings gold and silver and says "I give this to the Community, build either a monastery or a shrine or a dining hall or any other," this too is not allowable to accept. For whoever accepts it for any other purpose whatsoever, there is an offence of wrong-doing - thus it is stated in the *Mahāpaccarī*.

But if, when it has been refused saying "It is not allowable for monks to accept this," he says "It will be in the hands of carpenters or labourers; you just know what is well

done and what is wrongly done," and places it in their hands and departs, it is allowable. And also if he says "It will be in the hands of my people or in my own hands; you just send for whatever purpose whatever should be given," this too is allowable.

But if, without addressing the Community or a group or an individual, they say "We give this gold and silver for the shrine, we give it for the monastery, we give it for new construction," it is not allowable to refuse. "These people are saying this" - thus it should be made known to the stewards. But if one says "Take it and keep it for the purpose of the shrine and so forth," it should be refused saying "It is not allowable for us to take it."

But if someone brings a large amount of gold and silver and says "I give this to the Community, use the four requisites," if the Community accepts it, there is an offence both in the acceptance and in the use. If therein one monk refuses saying "This is not allowable," and the lay follower says "If it is not allowable, it will be mine," and goes away - That monk should not be told anything by anyone saying "You have caused an obstruction to the Community's gain." For whoever reproves him, he himself becomes one with an offence, but by that one person many have been made free from offence. But if, when it has been refused by the monks saying "It is not allowable," he says "It will be in the hands of the stewards, or in the hands of my men, or in my own hands; you just use the requisites," it is allowable.

What is given for the purpose of the four requisites should be applied for the purpose of whichever requisite is needed; what is given for the purpose of robes should be applied to robes only. If there is no such need for robes and the Community is struggling with almsfood and so forth, having announced it for the well-being of the Community, it should be applied for that purpose too. The same method applies to what is given for the purpose of almsfood and medicine for the sick; but what is given for the purpose of lodgings, because lodgings are heavy property, should be applied to lodgings only. But if, when monks have abandoned the lodgings and departed, the lodgings are deteriorating, at such a time the use by monks is permitted even by disposing of the lodgings; therefore, for the purpose of maintaining the lodgings, without cutting off the capital, only enough for sustenance should be used.

Not only gold and silver, but also other unallowable things such as fields and land should not be accepted. For if someone says "I have a great reservoir that produces three crops, I give it to the Community," if the Community accepts it, there is indeed an offence both in the acceptance and in the use. But whoever refuses it, he, in the same manner as before, should not be told anything by anyone. For whoever reproves him, he himself becomes one with an offence, but by that one person many have been made free from offence.

But if one who has said "I will give just such a reservoir" and has been refused by the monks saying "It is not allowable," says "Such and such a reservoir belongs to the Community; how is that allowable?" He should be told - "It must have been given having been made allowable." How is what is given made allowable? "By saying 'Use the four requisites' and then giving." If he says "Very well, venerable sir, let the Community use the four requisites" and gives, it is allowable. And also if, having said "Accept the reservoir" and being refused saying "It is not allowable," he asks "Is there

a steward?" and when told "There is not," says "So-and-so will manage this, or it will be in so-and-so's hands, or in my own hands; let the Community use the allowable goods," it is allowable. Even if, when refused saying "It is not allowable," he says "They will use the water, they will wash their belongings, animals and birds will drink," this too is allowable. And also if, when refused saying "It is not allowable," he says "Accept it under an allowable heading." Having said "Very well, lay follower, the Community will drink the water, will wash their belongings, animals and birds will drink," it is allowable to use.

Furthermore, when it is said "I give my pond or my lotus pool to the Community," having said "Very well, lay follower, the Community will drink the water" and so forth, it is indeed allowable to make use of it. But if, having been requested by monks for manual labour and having dug allowable earth with their own hands, a pond has been made for the purpose of using water, and if, depending on that, people produce crops and give allowable goods to the monastery, it is allowable. If people themselves, for the purpose of assisting the Community, dig the Community's land and give allowable goods from the crops produced depending on that, this too is allowable. And when it is said "Appoint one steward for us," it is also permissible to appoint one. But if those people, oppressed by the king's tax, depart, and others take over, and they do not give anything to the monks, it is permissible to withhold the water. And that only at the time of ploughing, not at the time of the crop. If they say "But, venerable sir, did not people formerly also grow crops depending on this?" Then they should be told: "They rendered such and such service to the Community, and gave such and such allowable goods." If they say: "We too shall give," this too is allowable.

But if any ignorant person accepts or has made a pond through an unallowable transaction, that should not be used by monks, and even the allowable goods obtained depending on that are themselves unallowable. If, having known that it has been relinquished by the monks, the owner or his sons and daughters or anyone else arisen in the lineage gives it again through an allowable transaction, it is allowable. When the family lineage is cut off, whoever is the lord of that country, having reclaimed it, gives it again - just as the chief queen of King Aṭanāga gave the water channel that had been removed by a monk at Cittalapabbata - this too is allowable.

Even in an allowable transaction, in a pond accepted on the basis of water, it is allowable for those of pure intention to do such things as removing clay, binding embankments, and so forth. But seeing people growing crops depending on that, it is not allowable to appoint a steward. If they themselves give allowable goods, they should be accepted. If they do not give, they should not be prompted, nor reminded. In a pond accepted on the basis of requisites, it is allowable to appoint a steward. But it is not allowable to do such things as removing clay, binding embankments, and so forth. If the stewards do them of their own accord, it is allowable. But when things are made to be done by an ignorant conscientious monk, although the acceptance is allowable, because of being mixed with what has arisen through the monk's own effort, it becomes difficult to separate - like almsfood that has gone beyond the boundary, or like food mixed with the taste of unallowable meat - and it is unallowable for all.

But if he manages only the water thus: "There is space for water, the embankment of the pond is firm, make it so that it holds much water, make water near the bank" -

this is allowable. They do not light a fire in the oven. It is allowable to say "Let the water work be done, lay followers." But it is not allowable to say "Grow crops and bring them." But if, seeing too much water in the pond, whether in his presence or behind his back, he has a channel led out, has forest cut down and has paddy fields made, or in old paddy fields takes more than the customary share without taking the standard portion, or in new crops or out-of-season crops where the share has not been determined, raises money saying "Give so many coins" - it is unallowable for all.

But whoever, without saying "Plough and sow," establishes the land thus: "In such an extent of land, such is the share," and when farmers say "We have grown crops on such an extent of land, take such a share," measures with a rope or a rod for the purpose of ascertaining the extent of land, or stands at the threshing floor and guards it, or has it removed from the threshing floor, or stores it in the granary - for him alone that is unallowable.

If farmers bring coins and say "These have been brought for the Community," and a certain monk, with the perception that "The Community does not eat coins," says "With so many coins bring cloth, with so many procure gruel and so forth." Whatever they bring, it is unallowable for all. Why? Because of having managed the coins.

If they bring grain and say "this has been brought for the Community," and a certain monk, in the same manner as before, says "with this much rice, bring such and such things." Whatever they bring is not allowable for that monk alone. Why? Because grain has been disposed of.

If they bring husked rice or pulses and say "this has been brought for the Community," and a certain monk, in the same manner as before, says "with this much husked rice, bring such and such things." Whatever they bring is allowable for all. Why? Because allowable things such as husked rice have been disposed of. There is no offence even in buying and selling, because it has been indicated to the steward.

Formerly, however, at Cittalapabbata, a certain monk drew a circle on the ground at the entrance of the dining hall, in order to give a hint to the monastery attendants, thinking "Oh, if only tomorrow they would bake cakes of such a size for the Community." A clever monastery attendant, having seen that and done accordingly, on the second day, when the Community had assembled at the sounding of the drum, took the cakes and said to the elder of the Community - "Venerable sir, neither by us before this, nor by our fathers, nor by our grandfathers has such a thing been heard of before. A hint for cakes was made by one master at the entrance of the dining hall. From now on, let the masters each say whatever accords with their own wishes, and there will be comfortable living for us too." The Great Elder turned back from that very place, and not even one monk accepted a cake. Thus, in the past, they did not even partake of what arose there. Therefore -

By a monk who excels in austerity, who is heedful,
Even in allowable things, greed for the sake of material gain should not be practised.

And what has been stated regarding a pond applies in the same way to lotus ponds, water channels, irrigation canals, and the like.

Even when someone says "I give whatever field or site that is a growing place for early crops, later crops, sugar cane, fruits, non-fruits, and the like," it should be refused saying "it is not allowable," and in the same manner as stated for the pond, when he says in allowable terms "I give it for the purpose of using the four requisites," then it should be accepted. But when he says "I give a forest, I give a wilderness," it is allowable. If people, without being instructed by the monks, cut trees there and produce pulses and the like and give a share to the monks, it is allowable; If they do not give, they should not be prompted. If due to some obstacle those people depart and others take over, and they do not give anything to the monks, they should be prevented. If they say: "But, venerable sir, did not people formerly cultivate crops here too?" then they should be told - "They gave such and such allowable goods to the Community." If they say: "We too shall give" - thus it is allowable.

If, referring to a certain tract of land with good produce, they say "we give a boundary," it is allowable. However, for the purpose of demarcating the boundary, pillars or stones should not be placed by oneself. Why? Land is invaluable; one could incur defeat even for a small amount. But the monastery attendants should be told - "Our boundary extends to this place." Even if they take more, because it has been stated indirectly, there is no offence. But if kings, royal ministers, and the like themselves have pillars set up and give saying "use the four requisites," it is indeed allowable.

If someone digs a pond within the boundary, or leads a canal through the middle of the monastery, and the shrine grounds, the Bodhi tree grounds, and so forth are damaged, he should be prevented. If the Community, having received something, does not prevent it out of regard for material gain, but one monk prevents it, that monk alone has authority. If one monk does not prevent it, saying "You may proceed," he takes their side; if the Community prevents it, the Community alone has authority. For in communal affairs, whoever performs the act in accordance with the Dhamma, he alone has authority. If he continues even when being prevented, the earth taken from below should be thrown back below, and the earth taken from above should be thrown back above, and it should be filled in.

If someone, wishing to give sugarcane or pulses or gourds, pumpkins, and the like, or creeper fruits just as they have grown, says "I give all this - the sugarcane field, the pulse land, the creeper-fruit garden," the Elder Mahāsuma said "It is not allowable" because it is grasped together with the land. But the Elder Mahāpaduma said "This is merely a verbal expression, for that portion of land remains the owners' own, therefore it is allowable."

If one says "I give a slave," it is not allowable. If one says "I give a monastery attendant, I give a steward, I give an attendant for allowable matters," it is allowable. If that monastery attendant works for the Community both before and after the meal, all medicine and care should be provided for him, just as for a novice. If he works for the Community only before the meal and does his own work after the meal, the evening meal-offering should not be given. Even those who work for the Community on a five-day rotation or a fortnightly rotation and do their own work the rest of the time, food and meal-offerings should be given to them only during the time they are working. If there is no work for the Community and they live by doing their own work, if they bring and give the proceeds of their handiwork, it should be accepted. If they

do not give, nothing should be said to them. It is allowable to accept under the name of monastery attendant any washerman-servant or weaver-servant whatsoever.

If they say "We give cows," they should be refused saying "It is not allowable." When the wise ask "Where did these cows come from?" and are told they were given for the use of the five cow-products, if they say "We too give them for the use of the five cow-products," it is allowable. The same method applies to she-goats and the like as well. If they say "We give an elephant, a horse, a buffalo, chickens, pigs," it is not allowable to accept them. If some people say "Be unconcerned, venerable sirs, we shall take these and give you allowable goods," and they take them, it is allowable. It is allowable to release chickens and pigs into the forest saying "May the chickens and pigs live happily." When it is said "We give this pond, this field, this site to the monastery," it cannot be refused. The remainder here is clear in meaning.

Regarding the origin and so forth, this too is of sixfold origin, is an act of commission, is not connected with the perception-release, is without consciousness, is an offence by convention, is bodily action and verbal action, involves three types of consciousness, and involves three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the King Training Rule is completed.

The first chapter on robes is completed.

2. The Chapter on Silk

1. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Silk

542. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning silk. Therein, "made by spreading out" means it is made by spreading silk threads layer upon layer on a level piece of ground and sprinkling them with rice gruel and the like. "Mixed with even a single silk thread" means setting aside what is mixed according to one's own preference, even if the wind brings and drops a single silk thread at the place where it is being made, it is still considered made by mixing. The remainder is of clear meaning.

Six origins, action, not liberation by cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action and verbal action.

Three types of consciousness, three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Silk Training Rule is completed.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Pure Black

547. "At that time" - this is the training rule concerning pure black. Therein, "of pure black" means of pure black ones, meaning of black ones unmixed with others. The remainder is of clear meaning. The origin and so forth are similar to the training rule concerning silk.

The Explanation of the Pure Black Training Rule is completed.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Two Parts

552. "At that time" refers to the two-portion training rule. Therein, "having taken at the edge" means having displayed white at the edge of the rug like a border strip and having attached it.

"Two portions" means two parts. "Should be taken" means should be obtained. "Of tawny" means of tawny-coloured ones. "Two tulā should be taken" is said with reference to one who wishes to have it made with four tulā. But in meaning, it should be understood that this itself has been shown: of whatever amount of goat wool one wishes to make it, two parts of that should be of black, one of white, and one of tawny. The remainder is of clear meaning.

The origin and so forth are similar to those of the silk training rule. However, this should be understood as involving action and non-action, since it can be done both by taking and by not taking.

The Explanation of the Two-Parts Training Rule is completed.

4. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Six Years

557. "At that time" refers to the six-year training rule. Therein, "defecate and urinate" means it is said that they defecate and urinate upon the rugs.

"The authorisation for a rug has been given by the Community to the monk named so-and-so" - a monk who has thus received authorisation is permitted to make a rug wherever he goes, as long as the illness has not subsided. If, having recovered, he falls ill again with the same original disease, the same remedy applies and there is no need for another authorisation procedure - so said the Elder Phussadeva. But the Elder Upatissa said: "Whether that disease recurs or another arises, once the designation 'ill' has been obtained, it is obtained indeed; there is no need for another authorisation procedure."

"If within six years" means in the earlier part of six years; the meaning is "within." But in the word-analysis, "less than six years" is stated for the purpose of showing the mere number.

"There is no offence if he makes it after six years" means when six years are complete, then he makes a rug. Regarding the second term also, the meaning should be understood thus: "When more than six years have passed, then he makes it." For he does not make it within six years. The remainder is of clear meaning.

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

The Explanation of the Six-Years Training Rule is completed.

5. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning the Sitting-cloth Spread

565. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning the sitting-cloth spread. Therein, "I wish, monks" - the Blessed One, it is said, during those three months did not see any being capable of being awakened, therefore he spoke thus. Even so, a teaching of the Dhamma should have been given by way of the textual tradition. But because this occurred to him - "When I have made an occasion and gone into seclusion, the monks will make an unlawful agreement, and Upasena will break it. Having been pleased with him, I will allow the monks an audience, and then many

monks wishing to see me will undertake the ascetic practices, and I will lay down a training rule on account of the spread discarded by them" - therefore he spoke thus. For there are indeed many benefits in this.

"Together with his following, he approached the Blessed One" - the Elder, it is said, having received censure in the manner beginning with "How can you, foolish man, who should yourself be admonished and instructed by others, think to admonish and instruct another" regarding this chapter training rule "Monks, one should not give full ordination to one of less than ten years' standing; whoever should give full ordination, there is an offence of wrong-doing," the good-hearted son of family, thinking "The Teacher gave me censure on account of my following; now I shall cause the Blessed One, having uttered his Brahmā-like voice from that very face resplendent as the full moon and complete in every respect, to give approval on account of my following itself," having travelled back more than a hundred leagues, having gathered a following, surrounded by about five hundred monks, was again approaching the Blessed One. Therefore it was said - "Together with his following, he approached the Blessed One." For it is not possible to please the Buddhas otherwise than through the accomplishment of proper conduct.

"Seated not far from the Blessed One" - being without apprehension due to the purity of his accomplishment of proper conduct, like a lion, he sat not far from the Blessed One who was like a golden mountain. "Said this" - he said this for the purpose of initiating a conversation. "Are rag-robcs agreeable to you, monk" - the meaning is: monk, these rag-robcs of yours are agreeable, taken by your own preference and liking. "No indeed, venerable sir, they are not agreeable to me" - he shows that "Venerable sir, they were not taken by me through my own preference; I was made to take them as if seized by the throat and as if struck on the head."

"Will be known" - he will be known and recognised; what is meant is that it will be evident therein. "We will not establish what has not been established" - we who are disciples will not establish what has not been established, for this is the domain of the Buddha, namely the establishing of training rules not yet established or the abolishing of those established, in the manner of "an expiation, a wrong-doing" and so forth. "Having accepted" - having undertaken each respective training rule, having agreed "Good, excellent," he shows that "we will train in all training rules as they were established." Being pleased in mind with him, he again gave his approval saying "Good, good."

566. "It has been permitted, friends" means "it has been permitted, friend."

"Longing" means desiring. "Having abandoned their rugs" means having abandoned all rugs, since the rug was regarded as a fourth robe. "Having given a talk on the Teaching, he addressed the monks" means the Blessed One, having seen the rugs scattered about, thinking "there is no reason for the destruction of what is given in faith; I shall show them a means of making use of them," gave a talk on the Teaching and addressed the monks.

567. "Once worn and once draped" means once sat upon and once lain upon. "From the edge" means having cut a round or square piece from one side, the place taken should be a span in measure; thus it should be taken. However, one who is spreading

it should spread it on one spot in the manner stated in the canonical text, or having unravelled it and mixed it, it should be spread; thus it becomes more durable. The remainder is of clear meaning.

The origin and other factors of this training rule, owing to its nature of being both an act of commission and an act of omission, are similar to the two-part training rule.

Among these five rugs, the first three, even after performing a formal act of the Vinaya and obtaining them, are not allowable to use; the last two are allowable - thus it should be understood.

The Explanation of the Sitting-Mat Spread Training Rule is completed.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Sheep's Wool

571. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning goat wool. Therein, "mocked" means they ridiculed him, saying such things as "For how much, venerable sir, were they bought?" "Threw down while still standing" means just as people, having brought a large load of wood from the forest, being exhausted, drop it while still standing, so too he dropped it - this is the meaning.

572. "With one's own hand" means by one's own hand; it is stated that they should be carried by oneself. "Drops beyond three yojanas" means he drops them outside of three yojanas. When they fall without obstruction, as soon as they are released from the hand, there are expiation offences involving forfeiture according to the count of hairs. If, beyond three yojanas, they strike a tree or a pillar and fall back inside, there is no offence. If a bundle of goat wool, having fallen on the ground and rolling, stopping and stopping, enters back inside, it is indeed an offence. If, standing inside, one rolls it with the hand, foot, or stick, whether the bundle goes rolling while standing or not standing, it is indeed an offence. If one places it thinking "another will carry it," even if that person carries it, it is indeed an offence. If what was placed with an innocent mind is dropped outside by the wind or by another through its own nature, it is indeed an offence. Because the training rule involves effort and is without mental intention. However, in the Kurundī and other texts it is stated "here there is no offence," but that non-offence does not accord with the canonical text. If one makes a double bundle tied as one and places one bundle inside the boundary and one outside the boundary, it is protected for the time being. The same method applies to a single tied carrying-pole load as well. But if, without tying, it is merely placed on the end of the carrying-pole, it does not protect. Even when tied as one, if it is turned around and placed, it is indeed an offence.

Regarding "or in another's vehicle," here one places it on a moving vehicle or on an elephant's back and so forth, without the owner knowing, thinking "it will be carried." When that passes beyond three yojanas, there is an offence. The same method applies even when it is not moving. But if one places it on a stationary vehicle or on an elephant's back and so forth, mounts and drives it, or walking below urges it on, or calling out causes it to follow, there is no offence because of the statement "he has another carry it." However, in the Kurundī and other texts it is stated "there is an offence," but that does not accord with this statement "he has another carry it." But in the case of taking what is not given, there is an offence in evading customs duty. For what is an offence there is a non-offence here. What is an offence here is a non-

offence there. If, having reached that place, one goes off being occupied with something else or being troubled by thieves and so forth, it is indeed an offence. Everywhere, the determination of the offence should be understood according to the count of hairs.

575. "Having gone with the intention of residing for three yojanas, carries it beyond that" means wherever one has gone, due to not obtaining recitation, questioning and the like, or requisites and the like there, one goes elsewhere beyond that, and from there to yet another place - thus even for one carrying it a hundred yojanas, there is no offence. "Having received back what was robbed" means robbers, having stolen it and knowing it to be useless, return it; for one carrying that, there is no offence. "Having received back what was handed over" means having received back what was subjected to a disciplinary act of the Vinaya - this is the meaning.

"Made-up goods" means goods that have been made up - blankets, coverlets, spreads and the like, anything whatsoever, even merely bound with thread. But whoever, placing wool in the spaces between thin-leafed bags, or in the spaces between yokes, shoulder-straps, body-bands and the like, for the purpose of protecting against dirt from long pepper and the like, or in a shell-case, or even one afflicted by wind disorder placing wool in the ear-hole and going - it is indeed an offence. But that which is inserted after being bound with thread stands in the category of made-up goods; one who carries it having made it into a braid - this is called a "store-opening," and it is indeed an offence. The remainder is of clear meaning.

Regarding the origin and so forth, this is called the sheep-wool origin; it arises from body and from body-and-mind; it is an act, not liberation through cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Sheep's Wool Training Rule is completed.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Having Sheep's Wool Washed

576. "At that time" refers to the training rule on having goat wool washed. Therein, "neglecting" means they abandon, give up; the meaning stated is that they are unable to apply themselves. The remainder here, together with the origin and so forth, is according to the method stated in the training rule on old robes.

The Explanation of the Washing Sheep's Wool Training Rule is completed.

8. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Money

582. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning money. Therein, "portion" means a share.

583-584. In the phrase "gold and silver" (jātarūparajata), herein "gold" (jātarūpa) is a name for gold (suvanṇa). But since it is similar in colour to the Truth-finder, therefore in the word-analysis it is stated "it is called the Teacher's colour." Its meaning is - "That which is the Teacher's colour, a special kind of metal - this is called 'gold' (jātarūpa)." But "silver" (rajata) - in such passages as "conch, stone, coral, silver, gold" etc., it refers to silver coin (rūpiya). But here, whatever is current in

trade, such as kahāpaṇas and the like, is intended. Therefore in its word-analysis it is stated "a kahāpaṇa, a metal coin" etc. Therein, "kahāpaṇa" means one made of gold, or one made of silver, or an ordinary one. "Metal coin" (lohamāsaka) means a coin made of copper and other metals. "Wooden coin" (dārumāsaka) means a coin made by cutting a form from heartwood, or from a strip of bamboo, or even from a palmyra leaf. "Lac coin" (jatumāsaka) means a coin made by moulding a form from lac or from resin. But by the phrase "whatever passes as currency," whatever in whatever region at whatever time passes as currency - even one made of bone, or one made of leather, or one made of fruit seeds, whether with a moulded form or without a moulded form - all is included.

Thus all this - silver, gold, gold coins, and all silver coins of the kinds described - constitutes the fourfold subject of forfeiture. Pearls, gems, lapis lazuli, conch, stone, coral, ruby, agate, the seven grains, female slaves, male slaves, fields, sites, flower gardens, fruit orchards and the like - this is the subject of wrongdoing. Thread, ploughshares, cloth, cotton, various kinds of green crops, and medicines such as ghee, butter, oil, honey, sugar and the like - this is the allowable subject. Therein, it is not proper to accept the subject of forfeiture for one's own benefit or for the benefit of the Community, a group, an individual, or a shrine. For one who accepts it for one's own benefit, there is an expiation involving forfeiture; for the benefit of the others, there is a wrongdoing. For one who accepts the subject of wrongdoing for the benefit of any of them, there is only a wrongdoing. In the case of the allowable subject, there is no offence. For one who accepts all of it for the purpose of depositing it, under the authority of a steward, there is an expiation by virtue of what is stated above in the training rule on precious things.

"Should take" (uggaṇheyya) means should take. But since one who takes it incurs an offence, therefore in its word-analysis it is stated "if he takes it himself, it is an expiation involving forfeiture." This same method applies to the remaining terms as well.

Therein, in the case of gold and silver articles and kahāpaṇa coins, for one who takes or has taken one, there is one offence. Even if one takes or has taken a thousand at once, the offences are according to the counting of the objects. But in the Mahāpaccarī and the Kurundī, in the case of a loosely tied bag or a loosely filled vessel, the offence is according to the counting of the coins. But in the case of a tightly tied or tightly filled one, it is stated that there is only one offence.

But regarding consenting to what is placed nearby, when it is said "let this be for the venerable one," even if one consents to it mentally, desiring to take it, but rejects it by body or by speech saying "this is not allowable," there is no offence. Even without rejecting it by body or speech, if one remains with a pure mind and does not consent, thinking "this is not allowable for us," there is no offence indeed. For among the three doors, what is rejected by any one of them is indeed rejected. But if, without rejecting it by body or speech, one consents to it mentally, because of the non-performance of the rejection that should have been done by body and speech, one incurs an offence arising from non-action at the body-door and the speech-door; but at the mind-door there is no such thing as an offence.

Someone places a hundred or a thousand at his feet saying "May this be for you," the monk rejects it saying "This is not allowable," the lay follower goes away thinking "It has been relinquished by me to them," another person comes there and asks - "What is this, venerable sir?" What was said by him and by oneself, that should be told. If he says - "I will keep it safe, venerable sir, show me a secure place," even having climbed up to a seven-storeyed mansion, one should indicate "This is a secure place," but one should not say "Place it here." To this extent, it remains dependent on both what is allowable and what is not allowable. One should dwell guarding it, having closed the door. If some merchandise, a bowl or a robe, comes along, and it is said "Please accept this, venerable sir," one should say "Lay follower, we have need of this, and there exists such and such a fund, but there is no steward." If he says "I will be the steward, open the door and give it," having opened the door, one should say "It was placed in this spot," but one should not say "Take this." Even so, it remains dependent on both what is allowable and what is not allowable. If he takes that and gives allowable goods in exchange, it is permissible. If he takes more, he should be told "We do not accept your goods, 'please leave.'"

Regarding "it should be forfeited in the midst of the Community" - here, since money is indeed not allowable, it is not said "therefore it should be forfeited to the Community or to a group or to an individual." But since it has merely been received and no allowable goods have been procured with it, therefore it is said "it should be forfeited in the midst of the Community" for the purpose of showing the means of use. Regarding "what is allowable should be indicated, ghee or" - it should be indicated thus: "Ghee or oil is allowable for those gone forth, lay followers."

Regarding "it should be enjoyed by all except the one who received the money" - it should be divided and enjoyed by all. The one who received the money should not take a share. It is not permissible to obtain and enjoy even the share allotted to other monks or to monastery attendants. Even what has been carried away from there by monkeys and the like and left in the forest, or what has fallen from their hands, even what is possessed by animals, even what is like a rag-robe, is not permissible at all. Even fumigating a dwelling with molasses brought from there is not permissible. It is not permissible to make a lamp with ghee or oil and lie down by the lamplight, or to do kasiṇa practice, or to read a book. It is certainly not permissible to smear a wound on the body with oil, honey, or molasses. If beds, chairs, and the like are obtained with that fund, or an uposatha hall or a dining hall is built, it is not permissible to use them. Even the shadow standing within the boundary of the building is not permissible, but that which has passed beyond the boundary is permissible because it is adventitious. It is not permissible to travel by a road made by disposing of that fund, or by a bridge, or by a boat, or by a raft. It is not permissible to drink or use spring water from a pond dug with that fund. But when there is no water inside, other adventitious water or rainwater that has entered is permissible. In the case of a purchased pond, the water together with which it was purchased, even that adventitious water is not permissible. If that fund is placed as a deposit and the Community enjoys requisites from it, those requisites too are not permissible for him. If a park has been acquired, it too is not permissible to use. If both the land and the seeds are not allowable, it is not permissible to use either the land or the fruit. If only the land is purchased and other seeds are planted, the fruit is permissible. But if seeds are purchased and planted on allowable land, the fruit is not permissible;

however, it is permissible to sit or lie down on the land.

Regarding "if he discards it" - he throws it anywhere. And if he does not discard it but takes it himself and goes, he should not be prevented. Regarding "if he does not discard it" - then he neither takes it and goes nor discards it, thinking "What have I to do with this business?" and departs wherever he wishes. Then a money-disposer with the aforementioned qualifications should be appointed.

Regarding "one who does not act through desire" and so forth - through the influence of greed, one who makes that fund his own or who exalts himself is said to follow the course of desire. Through the influence of hatred, one who disparages another saying "This one knows neither the matrix nor the Vinaya" is said to follow the course of hatred. Through the influence of delusion, one who falls into a state of confused and bewildered mindfulness is said to follow the course of delusion. One who is unable to discard it through fear of the one who received the money is said to follow the course of fear. One who does not act thus should be understood as one who does not follow the course of desire, does not follow the course of hatred, does not follow the course of delusion, and does not follow the course of fear.

585. "Having made it without a sign" means without making a sign, having closed the eyes, it should be thrown away by one who is indifferent, like excrement, without taking note of the place where it has fallen, whether in a river, a precipice, or a dense forest - this is the meaning. Even though money is thus to be abhorred, the Blessed One indicated by a method its use by monks. However, for one who accepts money, the use of requisites arisen from it is not permissible by any method whatsoever. And just as this is not permissible for him, so too requisites arisen through claiming non-existent attainments, or through the act of corrupting families, or through scheming and the like, are permissible neither for him nor for another; even those arisen through the Dhamma in a proper way are not permissible to use without reflection.

For there are four kinds of use: use by theft, use by debt, use by inheritance, and use by ownership. Therein, the use by an immoral person who sits even in the midst of the Community and consumes is called "use by theft." The unreflected use by a virtuous person is called "use by debt." Therefore, the robe should be reflected upon each time it is used, and almsfood at each morsel. By one unable to do so, it should be reflected upon before the meal, after the meal, in the first watch, and in the last watch. If dawn rises while he has not yet reflected, he stands in the position of use by debt. Lodging too should be reflected upon each time it is used. For medicine, mindful reflection is appropriate both at the time of receiving and at the time of using. Even so, for one who applies mindfulness at the time of receiving but does not do so at the time of using, there is an offence; but for one who does not apply mindfulness at the time of receiving yet does so at the time of using, there is no offence.

For there is a fourfold purification: purification by confession, purification by restraint, purification by seeking, and purification by reflection. Therein, purification by confession is the virtue of Pātimokkha restraint, for since it is purified by confession, it is called "purification by confession." Purification by restraint is the virtue of sense-faculty restraint, for since it is purified solely by the restraint of mental resolution "I shall not do thus again," it is called "purification by restraint." Purification by seeking

is the virtue of livelihood purification, for since it is purified through the seeking of one who, having abandoned wrong livelihood, produces requisites through the Dhamma in a proper way, it is called "purification by seeking." Purification by reflection is the virtue dependent on the use of requisites, for since it is purified by reflection stated in the manner beginning with "Reflecting wisely, he uses the robe," it is called "purification by reflection." Therefore it was said - "But for one who does not apply mindfulness at the time of receiving yet does so at the time of using, there is no offence."

The use of requisites by the seven trainees is called use by inheritance, for they are sons of the Blessed One, therefore, having become heirs to the requisites belonging to the Father, they use those requisites. But do they use the requisites of the Blessed One, or do they use the requisites of householders? Even though given by householders, because they have been permitted by the Blessed One, they belong to the Blessed One; therefore it should be understood that they use the requisites of the Blessed One. The Dhammadāyāda Sutta is the supporting text here.

The use by those with taints destroyed is called use by ownership, for having gone beyond the slavery of craving, they use as owners. Among these kinds of use, use by ownership and use by inheritance are permissible for all. Use by debt is not permissible; regarding use by theft, there is no discussion at all.

There are also another four kinds of use: use by one with moral conscience, use by one without moral conscience, rightful use, and wrongful use.

Therein, the use by one without moral conscience together with one who has moral conscience is permissible; he should not be made to make amends for the offence. For one with moral conscience, use together with one without moral conscience is permissible as long as he does not know. For from the beginning there is no one called "without moral conscience"; therefore, when he knows of his state of being without moral conscience, he should be told: "You commit transgressions through the door of body and the door of speech; that is improper, do not act thus." If, disregarding this, he continues to do so, and if one shares in use with him, that one too becomes one without moral conscience. He too who shares in use with one without moral conscience who is his dependent should be restrained. If he does not desist, he too becomes one without moral conscience. Thus one person without moral conscience can make even a hundred without moral conscience. But for those without moral conscience sharing in use only with others without moral conscience, there is no offence as such. The use by one with moral conscience together with one who has moral conscience is like the meal of two royal princes from a golden dish.

The lawful and unlawful use should be understood in terms of requisites. Therein, if both the person is shameless and the almsfood is unlawful, both are to be abhorred. If the person is shameless but the almsfood is lawful, having abhorred the person, the almsfood should not be accepted. However, in the Mahāpaccarī it is said that an immoral person, having received designated meals and the like from the Community, gives them back to the Community itself, and these are allowable since they go just as they were given. If the person is conscientious but the almsfood is unlawful, the almsfood is to be abhorred and should not be accepted. If the person is conscientious and the almsfood is also lawful, it is allowable.

There are another two kinds of support; and two kinds of use - support of a conscientious person, support of a shameless person; use of the Dhamma and use of material things.

Therein, it is allowable for a shameless person to support a conscientious person; he should not be made to undergo the penalty for an offence. But if a conscientious person supports a shameless person, invites him for thanksgiving, invites him for talks on the Teaching, and establishes him in families. The other one too speaks praise in his assembly saying "Our teacher is such and such," this should be understood as causing the Dispensation to decline and to disappear.

Regarding the use of the Dhamma and the use of material things, wherever the use of material things is allowable, there the use of the Dhamma is also allowable. But it is said that a text which stands at the point of being lost and will perish upon that person's passing away, it is allowable to learn it through the support of the Dhamma.

Herein is this story - During the Great Terror, it is said, only one single monk had mastered the Mahānidhesa. Then the preceptor of the Elder Tissatthera of the Four Nikāyas, the Elder known as the Master of the Three Piṭakas, said to the Elder Mahārakkhita - "Friend Mahārakkhita, learn the Mahānidhesa in his presence." "This one is said to be wicked, venerable sir; I will not learn it." "Learn it, friend; I shall sit in your presence." "Very well, venerable sir, I shall learn it while you are seated there." Having begun, while learning continuously day and night, on the final day, seeing a woman under the bed, he said: "Venerable sir, I had only heard of this before; had I known it to be so, I would not have learned the Dhamma in the presence of such a person." However, many great elders, having learned in his presence, established the Mahānidhesa.

586. "If it is money, perceiving it as money" - here it should be understood that all gold and silver falls under the category of money.

"If it is money, being doubtful" means doubt has arisen in such a manner as "Is it gold or is it base metal?" and so forth.

"If it is money, perceiving it as not money" means perceiving gold and the like as base metal and the like. Furthermore, royal consorts and others who desire merit place gold coins inside offerings of cooked food, hard food, balls of perfume, and the like, and give them; to those going about for cloth-almos, donors give cloths together with coins tied up in them and the like; monks accept them with the perception of cooked food and the like or with the perception of cloth - thus too it should be understood that one perceiving money as not money accepts money. However, the one who accepts should note "This was received in this house." For the one by whom it was given inadvertently, having regained awareness, comes back again, and then he should be told - "Look at your cloth." The remainder here is clear in meaning.

Regarding the origin and so forth, it has six origins; it may be an act of commission since the offence is incurred by accepting, or it may be an act of omission since there is failure to make the rejection. The training rules on money, false speech, and overhearing - these three are of a single category; they are not released by

perception, they are non-mental, they are an offence by convention, they are bodily action and verbal action, they are associated with three types of consciousness, and with three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Gold and Silver Training Rule is completed.

9. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Exchange of Money

587. "At that time" - this is the training rule on monetary transactions. Therein, "of various kinds" means of many sorts by way of wrought and unwrought, and so forth. "Monetary transactions" means the exchange of gold and silver. "They engaged in" means that, since only the acceptance was prohibited, not seeing any fault in the exchange of what had been accepted, they did so.

589. Regarding "what goes on the head" and so forth: "what goes on the head" means what approaches the head; however, in the manuscripts it is written as "sīsūpaka"; this is a designation for any head ornament whatsoever. This same method applies everywhere. Regarding "wrought in exchange for wrought" and so forth, this is purely a monetary transaction involving money.

Regarding "perceiving money as money" and so forth, among the cases stated in the preceding training rule, for one who exchanges a forfeitable item for a forfeitable item, at the initial acquisition there is an expiation involving forfeiture by the preceding training rule, and for the subsequent exchange there is an expiation involving forfeiture by this rule. The same method applies also for one who exchanges a forfeitable item for a wrongdoing item or an allowable item. For the second triad stated as "perceiving what is not money as money, he exchanges it for money" and so forth, by analogy with that, although not stated, this other triad beginning with "perceiving money as money, he exchanges it for what is not money" should also be understood. For whether one exchanges what is not money of one's own for money of another, or money of one's own for what is not money of another, in both cases a monetary transaction has indeed been carried out; therefore in the canonical text, only one triad is stated, being exclusively on the side of money.

However, for one who exchanges a wrongdoing item for a forfeitable item, at the initial acquisition there is a wrongdoing offence by the preceding training rule, and for the subsequent exchange there is an expiation involving forfeiture by this rule, because what is weighty has been exchanged. For one who exchanges a wrongdoing item for a wrongdoing item itself, or for an allowable item, at the initial acquisition there is a wrongdoing offence by the preceding training rule, and for the subsequent exchange also there is only a wrongdoing offence by this rule. Why? Because it has been exchanged for an unallowable item. However, in the Andhaka Commentary it is stated: "If he should engage in buying and selling, it is an expiation involving forfeiture." That is wrongly stated. Why? For there is no buying and selling other than giving and receiving, and the training rule on buying and selling was stated with reference to the exchange of an allowable item for an allowable item, and that too except with those sharing the same Dhamma. This training rule concerns the exchange of money for money or what is not money, and the exchange of what is not money for money. However, the exchange of a wrongdoing item for a wrongdoing item is stated neither here nor there in the canonical text, and there should not be

non-offence in this matter. Therefore, just as there is a wrongdoing offence for the acceptance of a wrongdoing item, so too there is a wrongdoing offence for exchanging that or by means of that - thus it has been stated by those who know the intention of the Blessed One.

However, for one who exchanges an allowable item for a forfeitable item, at the initial acquisition there is non-offence by the preceding training rule, and for the subsequent exchange there is an expiation involving forfeiture by this rule. For this was said:

"Perceiving what is not money as not money, he exchanges it for money - an expiation involving forfeiture." Likewise, for one who exchanges an allowable item for a wrongdoing item, at the initial acceptance there is similarly non-offence, and for the subsequent exchange there is a wrongdoing offence by this rule. Why? Because it has been exchanged for what is unallowable. However, for one who exchanges an allowable item for an allowable item, except with those sharing the same Dhamma, at the initial acquisition there is non-offence by the preceding training rule, and for the subsequent exchange there is an expiation involving forfeiture by the training rule on buying and selling above. For one who takes it having released it from buying and selling, there is non-offence even by the training rule above; for one who charges interest, there is a wrongdoing offence.

And this set of four regarding bowls should be understood as illustrating the gravity of this monetary transaction. For one who, having accepted money, procures iron ore with it, and having smelted that, has a bowl made with that metal - this bowl is called greatly unallowable, and it cannot be made allowable by any means whatsoever. For if, having destroyed that, he has a plate made, that too is unallowable. If he has an adze made, even a tooth-stick cut with it is unallowable. If he has a fish-hook made, even fish killed with it are unallowable. If, having heated the blade of the adze, he warms water or milk, that too is entirely unallowable.

But whoever, having accepted money, buys a bowl with it - this bowl too is not allowable. "It is not allowable even for the five co-religionists" - this was stated in the Mahāpaccarī. However, it can be made allowable; for when the money is given to the owners of the money and the bowl to the owners of the bowl, it becomes allowable. It is proper to give allowable goods, take it, and use it.

And whoever, having had money accepted, goes with the attendant to a smith's family, and having seen a bowl, says "This pleases me." And the attendant gives that money and negotiates with the smith - this bowl too, even though obtained through an allowable transaction, is just like the second bowl; because the money was accepted, it is not allowable. Why is it not allowable for the others? Because the money has not been relinquished.

But whoever, without having accepted the money, goes with an attendant sent with the instruction "Buy a bowl for the elder and give it to him" to a smith's family, and having seen a bowl, says "Take these coins and give me this one," and having had the coins given, obtains it - this bowl is not proper for that monk himself, because of his misconduct, but it is proper for others, because the money was not accepted by him.

It is said that the preceptor of the Elder Mahāsuma was the Elder named Anuruddha. He filled such a bowl of his own with ghee and relinquished it to the Community. The co-residents of the Elder Tipiṭaka Cūḷanāga also had such a bowl. That elder too had it

filled with ghee and had it relinquished to the Community. This is the fourfold classification of not-allowable bowls.

But if, without having accepted the money, one goes with an attendant sent with the instruction "Buy a bowl for the elder and give it to him" to a smith's family, and having seen a bowl, says either "This pleases me" or "I shall take this one," and the attendant gives that money and negotiates with the smith - this bowl is entirely allowable and is worthy of use even by Buddhas.

591. "If it is not money, perceiving it as money" means perceiving gold and the like in rough leaves and such things. "An offence of wrong-doing" means if one gets what is not money in exchange by means of that, there is an offence of wrong-doing. The same method applies in the case of being doubtful. However, for one who perceives it as not money, even when conducting buying and selling with the five co-religionists, saying "Take this and give that," there is no offence. The remainder is clear in itself.

It has six origins, it is action, it is not release through perception, it is without mind, it is an offence by convention, it is bodily action and verbal action, it involves three types of consciousness, and three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Gold and Silver Exchange Training Rule is completed.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Buying and Selling

593. "At that time" refers to the training rule on buying and selling. Therein, "katihipi tyāyaṃ" means "kati te ayaṃ" (how many for you this); the syllable "hi" here is a mere particle for completing the word, the syllable "pi" is used in the sense of reproach; the meaning is "for how many days will this flimsy double robe of yours last?" Alternatively, "katihampi tyāyaṃ" is also a reading. Therein, "katihaṃ" means "how many days, how many days" - this is what is stated. The remainder is according to the method already stated. "Katihipi myāyaṃ" - this too should be understood by the same method. In "gihīpi naṃ gihissa," here "naṃ" is a particle used in the sense of a name; what is stated is "a householder indeed to a householder."

594. "Of various kinds" means of many kinds by way of allowable goods such as robes and so forth. Therefore, in the word-analysis of this rule, only allowable goods are shown, beginning with robes and ending with cotton thread. For the exchange of unallowable goods does not come under the category of buying and selling. "Buying and selling" means both buying and selling. For by the method beginning with "give this for this," one who takes another's allowable goods engages in buying, and one who gives one's own allowable goods engages in selling.

595. "He transgresses" means he acts in an overbearing manner; the meaning is that he speaks words of transgression. "When it has been bought and sold" means when it has been bought by one making another's goods come into one's own hand, and sold by one making one's own goods go into another's hand. However, in accordance with the wording beginning with "this for this," in the text one's own goods are shown first.

"It should be forfeited" means the allowable goods thus taken from another's hand by way of buying should be forfeited. For this buying and selling, apart from the five co-religionists, is not permissible with the remaining householders and renunciants, even down to one's own mother and father.

Herein this is the determination - Whether cloth for cloth or food for food, whatever allowable thing one says "give this for this," it is an offence of wrong-doing. Having spoken thus, if one gives one's own goods even to one's mother, it is an offence of wrong-doing. Whether told "give this for this," or having said "give this, I will give you this," if one takes goods even from one's mother, it is an offence of wrong-doing. When one's own goods have reached another's hand and another's goods have reached one's own hand, it is forfeitable. However, when one says "give this" to one's mother or father, there is no solicitation. When one says "take this," there is no misuse of gifts given in faith. When one says "give this" to an unrelated person, there is solicitation. When one says "take this," there is misuse of gifts given in faith. When one engages in buying and selling saying "give this for this," it is forfeitable. Therefore, one exchanging allowable goods should exchange even with one's mother and father avoiding buying and selling, and with unrelated persons avoiding the three offences.

Herein this is the method of exchanging: A monk has rice for provisions on a journey. He, seeing a man with food in hand along the road, says "we have rice, but we have no need for it; however, we have need for cooked food." The man takes the rice and gives cooked food; it is permissible. The three offences too do not arise. Even down to the mere act of hinting does not occur. Why? Because of the existence of a basis. And further on it is stated thus: "He says 'we have this, and we have need for this and this.'" But whoever, without doing thus, exchanges saying "give this for this"; it is just as in the case of the original matter. Seeing one who eats leftovers, if one says "having eaten this rice, bring dye or firewood," by the reckoning of dye-bark and by the reckoning of firewood, they are forfeitable. Saying "having eaten this rice, do such and such work," if one has craftsmen such as ivory-workers make various requisites such as bellows, or has washermen wash cloth; it is just as in the case of the original matter. If one has a barber cut hair, or has labourers do new construction work; it is just as in the case of the original matter. But if one does not say "having eaten this food, do this," but says "eat this food; you have eaten, you will eat; do such and such work," it is permissible. And here, although in the washing of cloth, or cutting of hair, or new construction work such as ground-clearing, there is no other's goods that have come into one's own hand to be forfeited. But since it is stated firmly in the Great Commentary, it cannot be rejected. Therefore, just as when a forfeitable object has been used or lost one confesses an offence of expiation, so too here it should be confessed.

596. In the passage beginning with "if it is buying and selling, perceiving it as buying and selling," whoever engages in buying and selling, whether he perceives it as buying and selling, or is doubtful, or does not perceive it as buying and selling, it is only an expiation involving forfeiture. In the minor triad, in the two cases it is only an offence of wrong-doing - thus should the meaning be understood.

597. "Asks the price" means he asks "What is this bowl of yours worth?" When it is stated "It is worth such and such," however, if his legally allowable goods are of great value, and he replies to him thus: "Lay follower, this article of mine is of great value; give your bowl to someone else." Having heard that, if the other says "I will give an additional dish as well," it is allowable to accept it; it falls under the category of what has been stated as "This we have." If that bowl is of great value, the monk's article is

of little value, and the owner of the bowl does not know its low value, the bowl should not be accepted, and he should inform him: "My article is of little value." For one who, knowing its great value, deceives and accepts it, incurs the obligation to have the accepted goods appraised and to have it made up. If the owner of the bowl gives it saying "Let it be, venerable sir, the remainder will be merit for me," it is allowable.

"Tells the caretaker of legally allowable things" means setting aside the one from whose hand he receives the goods, he appoints another person, even that person's son or brother, as the caretaker of legally allowable things, and tells him: "Take this particular thing with this and give it." If he is skilful, he removes items repeatedly, bargains, and accepts; one should stand silent. If he is not skilful, does not know how to take, and the trader deceives him, one should say "Do not accept it."

Regarding "This we have" and so forth, he says: "This received oil or ghee we have, and we have need for other unreceived items." If he takes that and gives something else, one's own oil should not be measured out first. Why? For there is oil remaining in the measure, and when measuring afterwards, it would contaminate the unreceived item. The remainder is clear in itself.

It has six origins, it is action, it is not release through perception, it is without mind, it is an offence by convention, it is bodily action and verbal action, it involves three types of consciousness, and three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Buying and Selling Training Rule is completed.

The second chapter on silk is completed.

3. The Bowl Chapter

1. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Bowls

598. "At that time" - this is the training rule concerning bowls. Therein, "bowl trade" means wandering about in villages, towns, and so forth, they will engage in bowl trade. "Or a crockery shop" - "amattāni" are called vessels; those whose merchandise they are, they are "āmattikā"; the shop of those crockery dealers is "āmattikāpaṇaṃ"; the meaning is the shop of traders in potter's wares.

602. "Three sizes of bowls" means three measures of bowls. "Takes half an āḷhaka of cooked rice" means it takes cooked rice made from two nāḷi measures of husked rice by the Magadhan nāḷi. "A Magadhan nāḷi is twelve and a half palas" - this was stated in the Andhaka Commentary. In the island of Sīhaḷa, the ordinary nāḷi is large, the Damiḷa nāḷi is small, the Magadhan nāḷi is of proper measure, and one and a half Magadhan nāḷis make one Sīhaḷa nāḷi - this was stated in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā. "A quarter portion of food" means food amounting to a quarter of the cooked rice; this should be understood in terms of mung bean soup that can be taken by hand. "A suitable amount of vegetables" means vegetables such as fish, meat, greens, fruits, bamboo shoots, and so forth, suitable for that cooked rice.

Herein this is the determination - Having taken two Magadhan nāḷis of undamaged old rice grains that are well-pounded and purified, having cooked with those grains undrained cooked rice that is free from uncooked grains, not soggy, not lumpy, well separated, resembling a heap of jasmine buds, and having placed all of it without

remainder into the bowl, mung bean soup amounting to a quarter of that cooked rice, neither too thick nor too thin, that can be taken by hand, prepared with all ingredients, should be placed in. Then, suitable for each morsel, sufficient up to the last morsel, vegetables such as fish, meat, and so forth should be placed in; but ghee, oil, buttermilk, fruit juice, sour gruel, and the like are not to be counted, for they simply go with the cooked rice and can neither diminish nor increase it. If all this thus placed in stands level with the lower rim of the bowl's mouth-circle, or when cutting with a thread or a string, the lower edge of the thread or string touches it, this is called a large bowl. If it stands heaped up exceeding that rim, this is called a bowl that is smaller than large. If it does not reach that rim and remains below, this is called a bowl that is larger than large.

"A nāḷi of cooked rice" means cooked rice made from one nāḷi measure of husked rice by the Magadhan nāḷi. "A pattha of cooked rice" means cooked rice made from half a nāḷi by the Magadhan nāḷi. The remainder should be understood by the method already stated. But here is the difference only in name: If all the nāḷi of cooked rice and so forth placed in stands level with the lower rim in the same manner as stated, this is called a medium-sized bowl. If it stands heaped up exceeding that rim, this is called a bowl that is smaller than medium-sized. If it does not reach that rim and remains below, this is called a bowl that is larger than medium-sized. If all the pattha of cooked rice and so forth placed in stands level with the lower rim, this is called a small bowl. If it stands heaped up exceeding that rim, this is called a bowl that is smaller than small. If it does not reach that rim and remains below, this is called a bowl that is larger than small - thus there are these nine bowls. Among them, two are not bowls: the one larger than large and the one smaller than small. "Larger than that is not a bowl, smaller than that is not a bowl" - this was stated with reference to these. For here, the one larger than large, being larger than the large, is called "larger than that is not a bowl." And the one smaller than small, being smaller than the small, is called "smaller than that is not a bowl." Therefore, these should be used merely as vessels, they are not subject to determination, nor subject to assignment. But the other seven should be used after either determining or assigning them; for one who, not having done so, allows those ten days to pass, it is an offence of relinquishment with expiation - meaning that for one who allows any of those seven kinds of bowls to exceed the period of ten days at most, it is an offence of relinquishment with expiation.

607. "If one uses a forfeitable bowl without relinquishing it" means: when one has drunk gruel and washes it - an offence of wrong-doing; when one has eaten hard food and eaten rice and washes it - an offence of wrong-doing. Thus, for each and every use, an offence of wrong-doing.

608. Regarding "there is no offence if within ten days he determines or assigns," here the eligibility for determination and assignment even of one that meets the standard should be understood thus: An iron bowl fired five times and a clay bowl fired twice is eligible for determination, and for both, whatever price is to be paid, only when that has been paid. If even one firing is lacking, or even a kākāṇika's worth of the price has not been paid, it is not eligible for determination. Even if the bowl-owner says "When you have the money, then you shall pay; having determined it, use it," it is still not eligible for determination, for due to the deficiency in firing it does not

count as a bowl, and due to the price - whether in whole or in part - not having been paid, it does not come into one's own possession but remains the property of another; therefore it is eligible for determination only when both the firing and the price are completed. What is eligible for determination is itself eligible for assignment; whether it has come to hand or has not yet come, it should be determined or assigned. If indeed the bowl-maker, having received the price, or wishing to give it himself, says "Venerable sir, I shall make your bowl and fire it and set it aside on such-and-such a day," and the monk lets ten days pass from that specified day, it is an offence of forfeiture with expiation. But if the bowl-maker, having said "I shall make your bowl, fire it, and send a message," does accordingly, but the monk sent by him does not inform that monk, and another, having seen or heard, informs him "Venerable sir, your bowl is finished," that person's notification is not authoritative. But when the very one sent by him informs, from the day of hearing his words, if one lets ten days pass, it is an offence of forfeiture with expiation. If the bowl-maker, having said "I shall make your bowl, fire it, and send it by someone's hand," does accordingly, but the monk who came carrying the bowl, having placed it in his own dwelling, does not inform him, and someone else says "Indeed, venerable sir, a fine bowl has just been brought!" "Where is the bowl, friend?" "It was sent into the hands of so-and-so." This person's words too are not authoritative. But when that monk gives the bowl, from the day of receiving it, if one lets ten days pass, it is an offence of forfeiture with expiation. Therefore, without letting ten days pass, it should be determined or assigned.

Therein, there are two ways of determining a bowl: one determines either by body or determines by speech. And in accordance with these, the one determining should, having relinquished the old bowl standing either in front or out of sight by saying "I relinquish this bowl" or "I relinquish that bowl," or having given it to another, and having touched with the hand the new bowl standing wherever it may be, having made mental advertence thinking "I determine this bowl," determine it by body by making a bodily gesture, or determine it by speech by making a verbal utterance. Therein, determination is twofold - if it is within arm's reach, the words "I determine this bowl" should be uttered. But if it is inside the inner room, or upstairs in the upper storey, or in a neighbouring monastery, having noted the place where it was deposited, the words "I determine that bowl" should be uttered.

Furthermore, it is proper for the one determining to determine alone, and it is also proper to determine in the presence of another. The benefit of determining in the presence of another is this: if doubt arises in him, "Have I determined it or not?" the other, having reminded him, will dispel the doubt. If someone, having obtained ten bowls, wishes to use them all himself, he should not determine all of them. Having determined one bowl, on the following day he should relinquish that one and determine another. By this method, one can maintain them even for a hundred years.

Could there be a relinquishing of determination for a monk who is thus diligent? There could be. For if he gives the bowl to another, or disrobes, or renounces the training, or dies, or his sex changes, or he relinquishes it, or a hole appears in the bowl, the determination is abandoned. And this too was said -

"By giving, by disrobing, by renouncing,
By death, by change of sex, by relinquishing, and by a hole - the seventh."

The determination is also relinquished by theft, by taking by force, and by taking on trust. By how large a hole is the determination broken? By one through which a grain of millet can both exit and enter. For this is the husk of the inferior grain among the seven grains; when a repair has been made to it with iron filings or a rivet, it should be re-determined within ten days. This, then, is the decision regarding determination in the phrase "within ten days he determines or assigns."

Regarding assignment, there are two types of assignment - assignment in one's presence and assignment in one's absence. How does assigning in the presence take place? Having ascertained whether the bowls are one or many, and whether they are present or not present, having said "this bowl" or "these bowls" or "that bowl" or "those bowls," one should say "I assign it to you." This is one kind of assigning in the presence. By this much it is allowable to store it, but it is not allowable to use it, to give it away, or to determine it. But when it is said "Use what belongs to me, or give it away, or do with it as you see fit," this is called relinquishment, and from then on use and so forth are also allowable.

Another method - Likewise, having ascertained whether the bowls are one or many, and whether they are present or not present, having said in the presence of that very monk "this bowl" or "these bowls" or "that bowl" or "those bowls," having taken the name of any one among the five co-religionists whom one personally favours, one should say "I assign it to the monk Tissa" or "I assign it to the nun Tissā, to the female trainee, to the novice, to the female novice Tissā" - this is another kind of assigning in the presence. To this extent it is allowable to store, but as for use and so forth, not even one of them is allowable. But when that monk says "The property of the monk Tissa" etc. "the property of the female novice Tissā - use it or give it away or do as you see fit," this is called a relinquishment. From that point onwards, use and so forth are also allowable.

How does assigning in the absence take place? Having ascertained likewise whether the bowls are one or many, and whether they are present or not present, having said "this bowl" or "these bowls" or "that bowl" or "those bowls," one should say "I give it to you for the purpose of assigning." He should be told - "Who is your friend or acquaintance?" Then by the other, in the same manner as before, it should be said "the monk Tissa" or etc. "the female novice Tissā." Then again by that monk it should be said "I give it to the monk Tissa" or etc. "I give it to the female novice Tissā" - this is assigning in the absence. By this much it is allowable to store it, but not even one among use and so forth is allowable. But when that monk, in the same manner as stated in the second face-to-face assignment, says "The property of so-and-so - use it or give it away or do as you see fit," this is called a relinquishment. From that point onwards, use and so forth are also allowable.

However, the distinction between these two kinds of assigning, and all the remaining procedural sequence, should be understood in the manner stated in the explanation of the first Kaṭhina training rule, together with the origins and so forth.

The Explanation of the Bowl Training Rule is completed.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Less Than Five Bindings

609. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning fewer than five bindings. Therein, "he could not sustain himself" means that, it is said, if he had not been a noble disciple, he would even have changed his mind; being thus harassed by them,

but because of being a stream-enterer, he could not sustain himself only in body. Therefore it was said - "He could not sustain himself, and his children and wife became exhausted."

612-613. "With a bowl having less than five bindings" - here, "one whose five bindings are incomplete" is "one having less than five bindings," meaning its five bindings are not complete; with such a bowl having less than five bindings. The instrumental case is used in the sense of characterising one in such a state. Therein, since even for one without any binding, the five bindings are not complete, due to their complete absence, therefore in the word-analysis it is stated "without binding, or" etc. And because it is stated "with a bowl having less than five bindings," for one whose bowl has reached five bindings, that is not a bowl for him; therefore it is allowable to make known the need for another. And since this so-called binding exists when there is an occasion for binding, and does not exist when there is none, therefore to show its characteristic, it is stated "one without occasion for binding means" etc.

"There is no crack of two finger-breadths" means there is not even a single crack measuring two finger-breadths below the rim. "For one which has a crack of two finger-breadths" means for one which has one such crack, it should be pierced with a bowl-borer at the lower end of that crack, fired, and bound with string-cord, fibre-cord, or the like, or with tin wire; that binding should be covered with a tin plate or with some boundite to prevent food from sticking. And that bowl should be determined and used, or a fine hole should be made and it should be bound. However, it is not allowable to bind with pure beeswax, lac, resin, and the like. It is allowable to burn molasses and bind with stone powder. However, when being pierced with a bowl-borer near the rim, it breaks due to the thickness of the sherd; therefore it should be pierced lower down. For one which has two cracks, or a single one of four finger-breadths, two bindings should be given. For one which has three, or a single one of six finger-breadths, three. For one which has four, or a single one of eight finger-breadths, four. For one which has five, or a single one of ten finger-breadths, whether bound or unbound, it is simply not a bowl; another should be made known. This, for now, is the determination regarding a clay bowl.

But regarding an iron bowl, even if there are five or more holes, if they are bound and smoothed with iron powder, or a rivet, or a metal disc, that very bowl should be used, and another should not be made known. But if even one hole is large, and even though bound with a metal disc it is not smooth, and food sticks to the bowl, it is not allowable; this is not a bowl. Another should be made known.

615. "The elder should be addressed" means having shown the benefit of the bowl, he should be addressed thus: "Venerable sir, this bowl is of proper size, beautiful, and suitable for the elder; please take it." "Whoever should not take it" means there is an offence of wrong-doing for one who does not take it out of compassion. But whoever does not take it out of contentment, thinking "What need have I of another bowl?" - for him there is no offence. "The last bowl" means the bowl standing at the end after having been exchanged in this way.

"Not in an unsuitable place" means it should not be placed in an unsuitable place such as on beds, chairs, umbrellas, ivory, and the like. It should be placed in the very same place where one places one's former good bowl. For the suitable place for placing a bowl has already been stated in the Khandhaka by the method beginning with "I allow, monks, a bowl-stand."

"Not without reflective attention" means it should not be used without proper use, such as cooking gruel, dyeing, boiling, and the like. However, if illness arises while on the road and there is no other vessel, it is allowable to smear it with clay and cook gruel or heat water.

"Should not be given up" means it should not be given to another. But if a co-resident or a pupil, setting aside another excellent bowl, takes it thinking "This one is suitable for me, this one is for the elder," it is allowable. Or if another takes that one and gives his own bowl, it is allowable. There is no obligation to say "Bring the bowl to me alone."

617. "For those who have invited to admonish" - here, in the case of invitation on behalf of the Community, only a five-fold binding is applicable. In the case of invitation on behalf of an individual, even a binding of less than five is applicable - so it is stated in the Kurundī. The remainder here is clear in meaning.

It has six origins, it is action, it is not release through perception, it is without mind, it is an offence by convention, it is bodily action and verbal action, it involves three types of consciousness, and three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Less-Than-Five-Mending Training Rule is completed.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Medicines

618. "At that time" - this is the training rule concerning medicines. Therein, "Is there need, venerable sir" - the king, having seen the monks strenuously engaged in cleaning the cave for the purpose of making a rock cell for the elder, wished to give a monastery attendant and asked.

619-621. "Separate" means individually one. "Garlanded" means wearing made garlands, garland-bearers; the meaning is adorned with flower garlands. "Grass-ring" means a grass pad. "Fastened" means placed. "That became a golden garland" means that as soon as it was placed on the girl's head, through the Elder's determination, it became a golden lotus garland. For that grass-ring, as soon as it was placed on the head, the Elder determined: "Let it become a golden garland." For the second time, etc. "Approached him" means he approached on the very second day.

"Determined as gold" means he determined: "Let it become made of gold." "Of the five medicines" means of ghee and so forth. "Given to luxury" means practising abundance of requisites. In "in pots and jars too," here "pots" are called large-mouthed vessels. "Dripping and oozing" means having flowed down below and on both sides. "Scattered and strewn about" means scattered by those digging the ground due to the smell of ghee and so forth, and strewn about by those digging the walls and moving about above. "Having internal storerooms" means having storerooms arranged within.

622. "To be used" means to be taken, the meaning is to be consumed. "Medicines" means those that have acquired this designation whether or not they serve a medicinal purpose. Having shown what is well known in the world by means of "cow's ghee" and so forth, by the phrase "whose flesh is allowable," he showed inclusively the ghee of other animals such as deer, rohita fish, hare, and so forth. For those from whom there is milk, there is certainly ghee from them as well; whether it be easily obtainable or difficult to obtain, this was stated for the purpose of avoiding confusion. The same applies to butter as well.

"May be consumed stored" means they may be consumed after storing and keeping them. How? Among the ghee and so forth mentioned in the canonical text, ghee received before the meal is allowable to be consumed on that same day before the meal, whether with or without staple food; from the afternoon onwards, it should be consumed without staple food for seven days. When the seven days are exceeded, if it is stored in one vessel, there is one offence of forfeiture. If in many vessels, there are offences of forfeiture according to the count of items; that received in the afternoon is allowable only without staple food for seven days. That which has been picked up without formal receiving, whether before the meal or after the meal, and stored, is not allowable to be swallowed; it should be applied for anointing and such purposes. Even when the seven days are exceeded, there is no offence, because it has reached the status of not being fit for swallowing. For it is said "to be used." If an unordained person makes ghee from butter received before the meal and gives it, it is allowable with staple food before the meal. If one makes it oneself, it is allowable only without staple food even for seven days. However, ghee made by anyone from butter received after the meal is allowable only without staple food even for seven days. In the case of that made from what was picked up without formal receiving, the determination should be understood according to the method of pure ghee stated previously.

Ghee made from milk or curds received before the meal, if made by an unordained person, is allowable even with staple food on that same day before the meal. That made by oneself is allowable only without staple food. For in heating butter, there is no self-cooking; but with that which is self-cooked, staple food is not allowable. And from the afternoon onwards, it is certainly not allowable. Even when the seven days are exceeded, there is no offence, because it was received with its base substance; for it is said "having received them." However, that made from what was received after the meal should be applied for anointing and such purposes. And that made from what was picked up without formal receiving even before the meal - for both of these, there is no offence when the seven days are exceeded. This same method applies to ghee from animals whose flesh is not allowable. But this is the distinction - where with ghee mentioned in the canonical text there is an offence of forfeiture, with this there is an offence of wrong-doing. In the Andhaka Commentary, having stated a semblance of reason, human ghee and butter were rejected; that rejection is improper, because they are permitted in all the commentaries. And further on, the determination regarding this will also come.

Butter mentioned in the canonical text, when received before the meal, is allowable even with staple food on that same day before the meal, but from after the meal onwards, only without staple food. When exceeding seven days, if stored in separate

containers, they are to be forfeited by count of containers; if stored unmixed in a single container in separate lumps, they are to be forfeited by count of lumps. That received after the meal should be understood in the same manner as for ghee. Here, however, even in a ball of curd there are drops of buttermilk; therefore, the half-elders said that it is allowable when washed. But the Elder Mahāsīva said: "From the time it was permitted by the Blessed One, they consumed only what was freshly taken out from the buttermilk." Therefore, one consuming butter should wash it, remove curd, buttermilk, flies, ants and the like, and then consume it. For one wishing to cook it and make ghee and then consume it, it is allowable to cook it even unwashed. Whatever curd or buttermilk is therein will be destroyed in the process; to this extent, it is not reckoned as received together with its base - this is the intention here. But because it is cooked together with staple food, even regarding that the scrupulous have scruples. Now, regarding butter that has been picked up and stored, butter made from milk and curd received before the meal, butter made from those received after the meal, butter made from what was picked up, and butter from the flesh of animals whose meat is not allowable - the entire method regarding offence and non-offence, allowable and non-allowable consumption, should be understood in the same order as stated for ghee.

However, for monks who have entered for oil-alms, right there they pour out ghee, butter, cooked oil, and uncooked oil; therein there are drops of buttermilk and curd, leftover rice, rice husks, flies and the like. Having sun-cooked it and strained it, what is obtained becomes seven-day allowable; having cooked it together with medicines that were received and stored, it is allowable even to make nasal medicine. If at the time of rendering, a conscientious novice, freeing it from cooking with staple food in such a way that the rice husks and the like that have fallen therein are not cooked, melts it over fire, strains it, cooks it again and gives it, it is allowable for seven days in the same manner as before.

Among oils, first, sesame oil received before the meal is allowable even with staple food before the meal, but from after the meal onwards, only without staple food. When exceeding seven days, however, its status as requiring forfeiture should be understood by count of containers. That received after the meal is allowable for seven days only without staple food. What has been picked up and stored is not allowable to swallow; it should be applied for anointing the head and the like; there is no offence even when exceeding seven days. Oil made from sesame seeds received before the meal is allowable even with staple food before the meal; from after the meal onwards, it becomes not to be swallowed; it should be applied for anointing the head and the like; there is no offence even when exceeding seven days. Oil made from sesame seeds received after the meal is simply not to be swallowed, because it was received together with its base; there is no offence even when exceeding seven days; it should be applied for anointing the head and the like. The same method applies also to oil made from sesame seeds that were picked up, whether before the meal or after the meal.

Oil made from sesame seeds received before the meal by roasting them, or grinding them into sesame flour, or moistening them with hot water - if made by an unordained person, it is allowable even with staple food before the meal. But oil made by oneself is allowable only without staple food before the meal, because it has been

produced. Because it is self-cooked, it is not allowable with staple food; but because it was received together with its base, from after the meal onwards both are not to be swallowed; they should be applied for anointing the head and the like; there is no offence even when exceeding seven days. But if the hot water is only a small amount, merely for sprinkling, it is negligible and does not count as self-cooking. Regarding mustard oil and the like too, when received without their base, the determination is the same as stated for sesame oil without its base.

But if it is possible to make oil by sun-cooking the powder of mustard seeds and the like received before the meal, that is allowable even with staple food before the meal, only without staple food from after the meal onwards, and requiring forfeiture when exceeding seven days. But since they make oil by sweating mustard, madhuka powder and the like, and by roasting castor seeds, therefore oil made from them by unordained persons is allowable even with staple food before the meal. But because the base materials are lifetime allowables, there is no fault in receiving them together with their base. That made by oneself should be consumed for seven days only by consumption without staple food. That made by those who picked it up is not to be swallowed; it is allowable for external use; there is no offence even when exceeding seven days.

Oil made after receiving mustard seeds, madhuka seeds, or castor nuts for the purpose of making oil is of seven-day duration. That made on the second day is allowable for six days. That made on the third day is allowable for five days. That made on the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh day is allowable for that very day only. If it remains until the break of dawn, it entails forfeiture. That made on the eighth day is not to be consumed. However, because it does not entail forfeiture, it is allowable for external use. Even if one does not make it, when mustard seeds and so forth taken for the purpose of making oil exceed seven days, it is merely a wrongdoing. However, there are also other oils not mentioned in the canonical text, such as oils of coconut, neem, kosambaka, karamanda, linseed, and so forth; for one who, having received them, causes them to exceed seven days, there is a wrongdoing. This is the distinction among these. The remainder should be understood entirely in the manner already stated, having considered the raw material of limited-period allowables and the raw material of lifetime allowables, and the classification regarding self-cooking, with-raw-material, received before the meal, received after the meal, and picked-up-by-oneself raw material.

623. "Fat oil" means the oil of fats permitted thus: "I allow, monks, fats as medicines - bear fat, fish fat, crocodile fat, pig fat, donkey fat." And here, by the expression "bear fat," excluding human fat, the fats of all animals whose meat is not allowable are permitted. And by the inclusion of fish, crocodiles are also included, but because they are fierce fish, they are mentioned separately. And here, by the inclusion of fish and so forth, the fats of all animals whose meat is allowable are permitted. For among meats, ten are not allowable - the meats of humans, elephants, horses, dogs, snakes, lions, tigers, leopards, bears and hyenas. Among fats, only human fat alone is not allowable. Among milk and so forth, there is nothing that is not allowable.

Fat oil produced and made by those not fully ordained, received before the meal, is allowable even with food before the meal. From after the meal onwards, it is allowable for seven days only without food. But whatever flesh or sinew or bone or

blood therein is like fine dust, that is negligible. But if, having received the fat, one makes it oneself, having received it before the meal, having cooked it and strained it, it should be consumed for seven days by use without food. For this was stated with reference to use without food - "Received at the proper time, cooked at the proper time, mixed at the proper time, it may be consumed by use as oil." There too, what is negligible is just negligible. But after the meal, it is not allowable either to receive or to make it. For this was said:

"If, monks, it is received at the wrong time, cooked at the wrong time, mixed at the wrong time, and if one should consume it, there is an offence of three wrong-doings. If, monks, received at the proper time, boiled at the improper time, conjoined at the improper time, if one should consume that, there is an offence of two wrong-doings. If, monks, received at the proper time, boiled at the proper time, conjoined at the improper time, if one should consume that, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If, monks, it is received at the proper time, cooked at the proper time, mixed at the proper time, and if one should consume it, there is no offence."

But the pupils asked the Elder Upatissa - "Venerable sir, are ghee, butter and fats cooked together and produced allowable or not allowable?" "They are not allowable, friends." The Elder, it seems, had scruples here as with the residue of cooked oil. Then they asked him further - "Venerable sir, if in butter there is a lump of curd or a drop of buttermilk, is that allowable?" "That too, friends, is not allowable." Then they said to her - "Venerable sir, when cooked together and mixed, they become potent and suppress disease." "Very well, friends," the Elder accepted.

But the Elder Mahāsuma said: "Fat of allowable meat is permissible for consumption with food, the other is permissible for consumption without food." But the Elder Mahāpaduma, rejecting this by saying "What is this?", said "Do not monks afflicted with wind disorders drink gruel made with a decoction of five roots into which bear fat, pig fat, oil, and so forth have been added, and that gruel, being potent in energy, suppresses the disease?" and declared "It is permissible."

"Honey means bee honey": honey made by honey-bees, namely honey-making bees, small bees, and bumble-bees. That, if received before the meal, is permissible even for consumption with food before the meal; from after the meal onwards, it is permissible only for consumption without food for seven days. When the seven days are exceeded, if thick honey resembling phlegm has been stored broken into pieces, or the other kind in various containers, they are forfeitable by counting of items. If there is only one piece, or the other kind in one container, it is only one forfeitable offence. What has been picked up should be understood in the manner already stated, and should be applied for smearing on sores and the like. If a honeycomb or beeswax is unsmeared with honey and pure, it is a lifetime allowable. But if smeared with honey, it follows the course of honey itself. Cīrikā are winged long flies, and those called tumbalā are black large bumble-bees with bony wings; in their dwelling places there is honey resembling resin, and that is a lifetime allowable.

"Molasses means produced from sugar-cane": taking sugar-cane juice as the basis, whether uncooked or cooked without a base, all baseless sugar-cane products should be understood as "molasses." That molasses, if received before the meal, is

permissible even with food before the meal; from after the meal onwards, it is permissible only without food for seven days. When the seven days are exceeded, it is forfeitable by counting of items. If many lumps are crushed and placed in one container in a dense mass, it is only one forfeitable offence. What has been picked up should be understood in the manner already stated, and should be applied for fumigating houses and the like. Molasses made from unstrained sugar-cane juice received before the meal, if made by one not fully ordained, is permissible even with food. That made by oneself is allowable only without staple food. From after the meal onwards, however, because it was received with a base, it is not to be swallowed, and there is no offence even when the seven days are exceeded. That which is made from what was received unstrained after the meal is also not to be swallowed, and there is no offence even when the seven days are exceeded. This same method applies also to molasses made after receiving sugar-cane. But that which is made from what was received strained before the meal, if made by one not fully ordained, is permissible even with food before the meal; from after the meal onwards, only without food for seven days. If self-made, even before the meal it is only without food. But that which is made from what was received strained after the meal is permissible only without food for seven days. That made from what has been picked up follows the method already stated. "Molasses from burnt sugar-cane or molasses from pounded sugar-cane is permissible only before the meal" - thus it is stated in the Great Commentary.

But in the Mahāpaccaṛī, having raised the question "Is this, cooked with a base, permissible or not permissible?", it is stated "There is nothing called sugar-cane molasses that is not permissible after the meal." That is reasonable. Madhuka-flower molasses made with cold water is permissible with food before the meal; from after the meal onwards, only without food for seven days. When the seven days are exceeded, it is a wrongdoing by counting of items. Madhuka molasses made by adding milk is a one-period allowable. But raw sugar is purified by removing the milk froth, therefore it is permissible. Madhuka flowers, however, are permissible fresh before the meal, and also permissible when roasted. Having roasted them, whether mixed or unmixed with sesame and the like, even when pounded, it is permissible. But if, having taken that, they prepare it for the purpose of making liquor, from the moment it is prepared as a ferment onwards, it is not permissible. The molasses of all one-period allowable fruits such as banana, date palm, mango, breadfruit, jackfruit, tamarind, and the like is itself only a one-period allowable. They make molasses from ripe pepper; that is a lifetime allowable.

"Having received them": even if one receives all of them and places them undifferentiated in a single pot, when the seven days are exceeded, it is only one forfeitable offence. When they are separated, there are five forfeitable offences. However, without exceeding the seven days, whether ill or not ill, they may be consumed at pleasure in the manner stated. For there are seven kinds of specific allowance: specific to illness, specific to person, specific to time, specific to occasion, specific to region, specific to fat, and specific to medicine.

Therein, specific to illness means: "I allow, monks, raw flesh and raw blood for affliction by non-human beings" - thus what is allowed with reference to an illness is permissible only for one afflicted by that very illness, not for another. And that is

permissible both in the proper time and in the improper time, whether allowable or not allowable.

Specific to person means: "I allow, monks, chewing the cud for one who chews the cud. But, monks, it should not be taken out through the outer door and swallowed" - thus what is allowed with reference to a person is permissible only for that person, not for another.

Specific to time means: "I allow, monks, the giving of four great disgusting things - dung, urine, ashes, and clay" - thus what is allowed with reference to the time of being bitten by a snake is permissible even without formal receiving at that very time only, not at another time.

Specific to occasion means: By the method beginning with "in a group meal, except on an occasion" - the non-offences allowed with reference to each particular occasion are non-offences only at that particular occasion, not at other times.

Specific to region means: "I allow, monks, in such border regions, ordination by a group with a Vinaya-holder as the fifth" - thus ordination and the like allowed with reference to a border region are permissible only there, not in the middle country.

Specific to fat means: "I allow, monks, fats as medicines" - thus what is allowed under the name of fat, excluding human fat, the oil of all fats whether allowable or not allowable may be consumed by those who need them for the purpose of oil use.

Specific to medicine means: "I allow, monks, five medicines" - thus what is allowed under the name of medicine, being capable of pervading for the purpose of nourishment, namely ghee, butter, oil, honey, and molasses. Having received them, on that same day before the meal they may be consumed at pleasure; from after the meal onwards, when there is a reason, they may be consumed for seven days in the manner stated.

624. "When seven days have passed, perceiving it as passed - an expiation involving forfeiture": even if it is only the size of a mustard seed, or just enough to take once with a finger and taste with the tongue, it must indeed be forfeited, and an expiation must be confessed.

"It should not be used for bodily use": it should not be applied to the body or to a sore on the body. Items smeared with those, such as robes, scissors, staffs, sandals, foot-stools, beds, chairs and so forth, are also not to be used. "The place for grasping with the hand on doors, windows and shutters should not be smeared" - this was stated in the Mahāpaccarī. "However, having mixed them into a dye, doors, windows and shutters may be smeared" - this was stated in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā.

"No offence: within seven days one determines": within the seven-day period, one determines ghee, oil, fat, head-oil, ointment, honey, wound-salve, molasses, or house-fumigation - no offence. If one wishes to pour determined oil into a vessel containing undetermined oil, and if through a fine hole in the vessel the oil enters little by little and is covered over by the old oil, it must be determined again. But if the opening is large, and much oil enters at once and covers over the old oil, there is

no need for the act of determination again. For that follows the course of what has been determined. By this method, the pouring of undetermined oil into a vessel of determined oil should also be understood.

625. "Gives up" - here, if what belongs to two persons has been received by one and remains undivided, when seven days have passed there is no offence for either of them, but it is not proper to use it. If the one by whom it was received says to the other - "Friend, use this oil for just seven days." And he does not make use of it, for whom is there an offence? There is no offence for anyone. Why? Because it was given up by the one who received it, and because the other did not receive it.

"Perishes" means it becomes unfit for use. In "as discarded" etc., the mental state by which medicine is discarded, rejected, and released - that mental state is called "discarded, rejected, released." A person with that mental state is called "without attachment" - thus the meaning is "having given to a novice without attachment." Why was this said? The Elder Mahāsūma said: "For the purpose of showing that there is no offence for one who, having given thus within seven days, later receives it back and uses it." But the Elder Mahāpaduma said - "This should not be asked for, for indeed there is simply no offence in using again what was given within seven days. This was stated for the purpose of showing that there is no offence in using what has exceeded seven days." Therefore, if a novice should give such given medicine to that monk for the purpose of nasal treatment, whether having prepared it or without having prepared it, he should take it and perform the nasal treatment. If he is young and does not know how to give, another monk should say - "Do you have oil, novice?" "Yes, venerable sir, I have." "Bring it, we shall prepare medicine for the elder." This too is proper. The remainder is of clear meaning.

Kāṭhina origin, non-action, not liberation by cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action and verbal action.

Three types of consciousness, three types of feeling.

The Explanation of the Medicine Training Rule is completed.

4. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning the Rains-Bathing Cloth

626. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning the cloth for the rains. Therein, "the cloth for the rains had been permitted" means permitted in the Cīvarakkhandhaka in the account of Visākhā. "Beforehand" means before indeed.

627. "When a month of summer remains" means one last month of the four summer months remains. "Having made" means having completed by finishing the sewing, dyeing, and marking. And the one making it should make only one and determine it at the proper time; it is not allowable to determine two.

"When more than a month of summer remains" means when more than a month of what is called summer remains.

"When more than a fortnight of summer remains, having made it, he wears it" - now, standing here, regarding the cloth for the rains, four kinds of scope should be understood: the scope for seeking, the scope for making, the scope for wearing, and

the scope for determining; two kinds of season: the inner season and the outer season; and two groups of four: the group of four for the outer season and the group of four for the inner season.

Therein, from the first day after the full moon of the first month of Jetṭhamūla up to the Uposatha of the dark fortnight, this is one fortnight that is the scope for seeking and the scope for making. For during this interval, it is allowable to seek a cloth for the rains if not yet obtained and to make it if obtained, but it is not allowable to wear it or to determine it. From the first day after the Uposatha of the dark fortnight up to the full moon of Āsāḷhī, this is one fortnight that is the scope for all three: seeking, making, and wearing. For during this interval, it is allowable to seek, to make, and to wear, but it is not allowable to determine. From the first day after the full moon of Āsāḷhī up to the full moon of Kattika, these four months are the scope for all four: seeking, making, wearing, and determining. For during this interval, it is allowable to seek if not yet obtained, to make if obtained, to wear, and to determine. This is the fourfold scope that should be understood for now.

However, from the first day after the full moon of Kattika up to the full moon of Jetṭhamūla, these seven months are called the outer season. During this interval, for one who, by arousing awareness in the manner beginning with "It is the time for the cloth for the rains," produces robe-material as a cloth for the rains from a place of those who are not relatives and have not given invitation, there is an expiation involving forfeiture under this training rule. For one who, by making a request in the manner beginning with "Give me robe-material as a cloth for the rains," produces it, there is an expiation involving forfeiture under the training rule concerning requesting from non-relatives. For one who, by arousing awareness in the aforesaid manner, produces it from a place of relatives or those who have given invitation, there is an expiation involving forfeiture under this very training rule. For one who, having made a request, produces it, there is no offence under the training rule concerning requesting from non-relatives. For this has been stated in the Parivāra:

"Should one ask one's mother for a robe, and it is not assigned to the Community;
By what is there an offence for him, and no offence regarding relatives;
This is a question considered by the skilful."

For this question was stated with reference to this meaning. Thus the group of four for the outer season should be understood.

However, from the first day after the full moon of Jetṭhamūla up to the full moon of Kattika, these five months are called the inner season. During this interval, for one who, by arousing awareness in the aforesaid manner, produces robe-material as a cloth for the rains from a place of those who are not relatives and have not given invitation, there is an offence of wrong-doing for breach of proper conduct. But those people who have given robe-material as cloths for the rains even previously - even if these are not relatives of his and have not given invitation, there is no breach of proper conduct, because arousing awareness regarding them is permitted. For one who, having made a request, produces it, there is an expiation involving forfeiture under the training rule concerning requesting from non-relatives. And this applies even to those who are regular givers of robe-material as cloths for the rains. For one

who, by arousing awareness in the aforesaid manner, produces it from a place of relatives or those who have given invitation, there is no offence under this training rule. For one who, having made a request, produces it, there is no offence under the training rule concerning requesting from non-relatives. "They should not be told 'give me'" - for this was stated with reference only to those who are not relatives and have not given invitation at the time of seeking. Thus the group of four for the inner season should be understood.

Regarding "naked, he lets the body be rained upon, there is an offence of wrong-doing," here, without counting by the number of water drops that touch him, he should be dealt with by a wrong-doing for each effort, by way of the completion of bathing. And that is only when bathing in an open space with water fallen from the sky. There is no offence for one bathing in a bathing room, reservoir, and so forth, with water poured from pots.

Regarding "the rains are postponed," here, if, having spent the last month of summer with a cloth for the rains that has been sought and made, they then postpone the first month of the rains and make it the last month of summer itself, the cloth for the rains should be washed and put away. Not determined and not shared, it receives an allowance of two months, and it should be determined on the day of the approach of the rains. If through lapse of mindfulness or through insufficiency it has not been made, it receives an allowance of six months - those two months and the four months of the rains. But if the kaṭhina is spread in the month of Kattika, it receives a further four months, thus there are ten months. Beyond that too, with mindful expectation, for one who makes it into a basic robe and keeps it, one month - thus it receives an allowance of eleven months. But if it is obtained and completed one day, two days, etc. before the approach of the rains has arrived within ten days, or during the rains, when should it be determined? This has not been discussed in the commentaries. However, if completed within ten days from the day of obtaining, it should be determined within those very ten days. If completed after the lapse of ten days, it should be determined on that very day. When ten days are not sufficient, the robe-season should not be exceeded - this is our own view. Why? "I allow, monks, the three robes to be determined, not to be assigned; the cloth for the rains to be determined for four months of the rains, after that let him share it" - for thus it has been said. Therefore, before the approach of the rains, even if ten days are exceeded, there is no offence. "Extra robe-material should be kept for ten days at most" - this too has been said. Therefore, if obtained and completed one day, two days, etc. before the approach of the rains has arrived within ten days, or during the rains, it should be determined in the manner stated either within ten days or on that very day; when ten days are not sufficient, the robe-season should not be exceeded.

Therein, one might say, from the statement "let him determine it for four months of the rains," "it is proper to determine it at any time within the four months." If so, regarding what has been said "let him determine the itch-covering cloth for as long as the illness lasts," that too could be allowed to exceed ten days. And if that were the case, the statement "extra robe-material should be kept for ten days at most" would be contradicted. Therefore, it should be understood as stated, or having found another firm reason, it should be rejected. Moreover, in the Kurundī too, at the end of the forfeiture section, it is said: "When should it be determined? However, if

completed within ten days from the day of obtaining, it should be determined within those very ten days. If it is not sufficient, it receives an allowance until the full moon of Kattika."

630. "For one whose robe has been stolen" - this is said with reference to the cloth for the rains itself. For those who are naked, there is no offence in bathing the body. And here, the danger of thieves for one who bathes having worn an expensive cloth for the rains is called a misfortune. The remainder here is clear in itself.

It has six origins, it is action, it is not release through perception, it is without mind, it is an offence by convention, it is bodily action and verbal action, it involves three types of consciousness, and three types of feeling.

The explanation of the training rule on the rains-bathing cloth is finished.

5. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Snatching Away a Robe

631. "At that time" - this is the training rule concerning the snatching away of a robe. Therein, "even that which I gave you" means "even that which I gave to you." He, it seems, gave it thinking "Carrying my bowl, robe, sandals, and bedding, he will set out on a journey with me." Therefore he spoke thus. "Took by force" means he seized it forcibly. However, because he took it with the perception that it was his own, there is no offence of defeat for him. Because he took it causing distress, an offence was laid down.

633. "He takes by force himself - an expiation involving forfeiture" means when taking by force one robe or many that are bound together as one, there is a single offence. When taking by force many that are not bound together or standing separately, and when having them brought thus: "Bring the outer cloak, bring the upper robe," the offences are according to the number of items. Even when saying "Bring all that were given by me," by a single statement there are multiple offences.

"He commands another - an offence of wrong-doing" means he commands "Take the robe" - a single offence of wrong-doing. The one commanded takes many - a single expiation. When saying "Take the outer cloak, take the upper robe," for each statement there is an offence of wrong-doing. When saying "Take all that were given by me," by a single statement there are multiple offences.

634. "Another requisite" means anything whatsoever, down to even a needle, apart from the last robe eligible for assignment. Even regarding needles that have been wrapped and set aside, there are offences of wrong-doing according to the number of items. Thus it is regarding those loosely wrapped. However, regarding those firmly bound, there is only a single offence of wrong-doing - this was stated in the Mahāpaccarī. The same method applies also regarding those placed in a needle case. The same method applies also regarding medicines such as the three pungents placed in a bag, whether loosely tied or firmly tied.

635. "He gives it" means he gives it thus: "Venerable sir, this is indeed suitable for you," or else, when told "Friend, we gave you the robe thinking 'He will fulfil the duties, he will take ordination in our presence, he will learn the Dhamma,' but now you do not fulfil the duties, you do not take ordination, you do not learn the Dhamma," he gives it saying "Venerable sir, I think you are speaking for the sake of

the robe; here is your robe." In this way too, "he gives it." Or else, he tells a young monk who has departed to another region "Will you not return?" and he does not return. "Take the robe and restrain him" - if he returns in this way, good. If he gives it saying "I think you are speaking for the sake of the bowl and robe; take them, will you not?" In this way too, "he gives it." Or having seen one who has left the order, he says "We gave you the bowl and robe thinking 'He will fulfil the duties,' but now you have left the order and are wandering about." The other gives it saying "Take your bowl and robe." In this way too, "he gives it." "I give only to one who takes ordination in my presence; I do not give to one who takes it elsewhere. I give only to one who fulfils the duties; I do not give to one who does not. I give only to one who learns the Dhamma; I do not give to one who does not. I give only to one who does not leave the order; I do not give to one who leaves the order." However, it is not proper to give in this way; for one who gives thus, there is an offence of wrong-doing. However, it is proper to have it brought back. One who takes by seizing what was given after relinquishing it should be dealt with according to the value of the goods. The remainder here is clear in itself.

It has three origins - it originates from body and mind, from speech and mind, and from body, speech and mind; it is action; it has release through perception; it is with consciousness; it is a worldly offence; it is bodily action and verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is unpleasant feeling.

The explanation of the training rule on snatching back a robe is finished.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Requesting Thread

636. "At that time" - this is the training rule concerning asking for yarn. Therein, "linen" means yarn made from linen fibres. "Cotton" means produced from cotton. "Silk" means yarn made by spinning from silkworm threads. "Wool" means yarn of sheep's wool. "Hemp" means yarn of hemp fibres. "Mixed" - some say it is simply yarn of separate fibres. However, yarn made by mixing these five should be understood as "mixed."

"Has it woven - for each effort, an offence of wrong-doing" means if the weaver does not have a loom and such things, and he sharpens an adze or an axe thinking "I shall bring them from the forest," from that point onwards, whatever he does for the purpose of equipment or for the purpose of weaving the robe, in every case, for each effort of the weaver, there is an offence of wrong-doing for the monk. When woven to the measure of a span in length and a cubit in width, it is an offence of relinquishment with expiation. However, in the Mahāpaccarī it is stated: "For one having it woven until completion, for each stroke of the shuttle, it is an offence of relinquishment with expiation." That too should be understood as stated with reference to this very measure. For the last robe eligible for shared ownership counts as a robe.

Moreover, here the determination should be understood thus - Firstly, yarn asked for by oneself is not allowable; the remainder, obtained through relatives and so forth, is allowable. A weaver too, who is unrelated and not previously invited, obtained through asking, is not allowable; the remainder is allowable. Therein, for one having not-allowable yarn woven by a not-allowable weaver, it is an offence of relinquishment in the manner stated previously. But for one having allowable yarn

woven by that same weaver, just as previously it would be an offence of relinquishment, so it is an offence of wrong-doing. For one having both allowable and not-allowable yarn woven by that same weaver, if by the measure of the last robe one section is made purely of allowable yarn and one section is made of not-allowable yarn, thus the robe is like a field with boundaries - in the section made of not-allowable yarn there is an offence of expiation, in the other there is likewise an offence of wrong-doing. If the sections are smaller than that, even down to the size of a flame circle, in all sections, by the counting of sections, there is an offence of wrong-doing. But if it is woven with alternating yarn or with allowable yarn lengthwise and not-allowable yarn widthwise, for each stroke of the shuttle there is an offence of wrong-doing. Even when having not-allowable yarn woven by an allowable weaver, just as previously it would be an offence of relinquishment, so it is an offence of wrong-doing. For one having both allowable and not-allowable yarn woven by that same weaver, if the sections of not-allowable yarn are of the measure of the last robe or smaller, in those, by the counting of sections, there is an offence of wrong-doing. In sections of allowable yarn, there is no offence. But if it is woven with alternating yarn or with allowable yarn lengthwise and not-allowable yarn widthwise, for each stroke of the shuttle there is an offence of wrong-doing.

If, however, there are two weavers, one allowable and one not-allowable, and the yarn is not-allowable, if they weave in turns, when woven by the not-allowable weaver, for each stroke of the shuttle there is an offence of expiation; when less than the measure, an offence of wrong-doing. When woven by the other, in both cases there is an offence of wrong-doing. If both take an end each and weave together, for each stroke of the shuttle there is an offence of expiation. But if the yarn is allowable and the robe has sections through field-boundaries and such, when woven by the not-allowable weaver, for each section there is an offence of wrong-doing; when woven by the other, there is no offence. If both take an end each and weave together, for each stroke of the shuttle there is an offence of wrong-doing. But if the yarn is both allowable and not-allowable, and they weave in turns, when sections of the measure of the last robe made of not-allowable yarn are woven by the not-allowable weaver, by the counting of sections there is an offence of expiation. In those that are smaller and in those made of allowable yarn, there is an offence of wrong-doing. When sections made of not-allowable yarn, whether of the proper measure or smaller, are woven by the allowable weaver, it is only an offence of wrong-doing. In sections made of allowable yarn, there is no offence.

If they weave with alternate yarn or making the lengthwise allowable and the crosswise unallowable, or if both of them take the edges and weave together, for a robe without sections there is an offence of wrong-doing for each stroke of the shuttle, and for a robe with sections there are offences of wrong-doing according to the sections. This meaning, however, is not evident in the Great Commentary, but is evident in the Mahāpaccarī and others. Here it is evident in every respect.

If the yarn too is allowable, and the weaver too is allowable - being either a relative or one not prohibited, or engaged by means of funds - there is no offence on account of having it woven. However, one guarding against an offence on account of exceeding ten days should determine it while still on the loom, as soon as the measure eligible for shared ownership has been woven. For if it is completed by exceeding ten days, it

would become subject to forfeiture. The same method applies even when relatives and others have set up the loom and offered it saying "Venerable sir, please accept this robe."

If the weaver, being thus engaged or wishing to give of his own accord, says "I, venerable sir, will weave your robe and keep it ready on such and such a day," and the monk exceeds ten days from the day specified by him, it is an offence of forfeiture with expiation.

If, however, the weaver, having said "I will weave your robe and send a message," does accordingly, but the monk sent by him does not inform that monk, and another, having seen or heard, informs him "Your robe, venerable sir, is finished," that person's notification is not authoritative. But when the very one sent by him informs, from the day of hearing his words, if one lets ten days pass, it is an offence of forfeiture with expiation.

If the weaver, having said "I will weave your robe and send it by someone's hand," does accordingly, but the monk who took the robe and went places it in his own dwelling and does not inform that monk, and someone else says "Is the robe recently brought beautiful, venerable sir?" "Where is the robe, friend?" "It was sent by the hand of so-and-so." This person's words too are not authoritative. But when that monk gives the robe, from the day of receiving it, if one exceeds ten days, it is an offence of forfeiture with expiation. If, however, the payment for weaving has not been given, as long as even so much as a kākāṇika coin remains outstanding, it protects for that long.

640. "No offence - for sewing a robe" means there is no offence for one who requests thread for the purpose of sewing a robe. In "for a bandage" and so forth as well, the locative case is used in the sense of a reason; it is said that there is no offence for one who requests on account of a bandage and so forth. The remainder here is clear in meaning.

It has six origins, it is action, it is not release through perception, it is without mind, it is an offence by convention, it is bodily action and verbal action, it involves three types of consciousness, and three types of feeling.

The explanation of the training rule on requesting thread is finished.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning the Master Weaver

641. "At that time" refers to the Great Weaver training rule. Therein, "having weighed the thread" means having measured the thread and determined the quantity of yarn. "Thick" means dense. "Well-woven" means well woven, woven evenly in all places. "Well-spread" means well spread out, the warp threads spread evenly in all places. "Well-scraped" means well scraped with a scraping instrument. "Well-smoothed" means well combed with a comb; the meaning is well-cleaned. "Bound" means deficient. "Onto the loom" means the meaning is having put it onto the loom by stretching it lengthwise.

642. "If that monk there" means wherever those weavers are, whether in a village or a town, there. "Should put forward a consideration" means he should put forward a superior arrangement, an additional specification. However, in order to show the

manner in which he has put forward a consideration in the canonical text, "This, friend" and so forth was stated.

"He also speaks the Teaching" means he also delivers a talk on the Teaching; "by his word, long or wide or thick" shows only the manner of increasing the thread.

"Not previously invited" means not having been previously invited by the owners of the robe. The remainder is of manifest meaning only.

It has six origins, it is an act of commission, it is not the liberation through non-perception, it is without consciousness, it is an offence by convention, it is bodily action and verbal action.

Three types of consciousness, three types of feeling.

The explanation of the training rule on the master weaver is finished.

8. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Out-of-Season Robes

646-649. "At that time" refers to the training rule on emergency robes. Therein, "ten days before the arrival" means ten days is a period of ten days; not arrived within that period of ten days means "ten days before the arrival"; the meaning is "not yet reached within ten days." That "ten days before the arrival" - the accusative case is used in the locative sense by way of absolute connection; therefore in the word analysis it is stated as "ten days before the arrival of." "Of the Pavāraṇā" - this, however, is a non-accusative expression for the purpose of avoiding confusion, in order to show in its own form what was referred to as "ten days before the arrival."

"The full moon of the Kattika month" means the full moon of the first Kattika month. Here too, because the first word is non-accusative, the accusative case is used in the locative sense in the same manner as before. This is what is meant - "From the time when it is said 'ten days before the arrival of the first great Pavāraṇā,' if during those days an emergency robe should arise for a monk at any time whatsoever, it should all be accepted by the monk who knows 'this is an emergency robe.'" Thus the time for storing a robe that has arisen from the fifth day of the bright fortnight of the Pavāraṇā month has been shown. Although this is indeed already established by the rule "an extra robe may be kept for ten days at most," the training rule was laid down by showing the purpose as if it were something unprecedented, by way of the originating circumstance.

"Emergency robe" means an urgent robe; however, to show its urgent nature, "wishing to go with the army" and so forth was stated. Therein, "faith" - by this, mere faith alone is indicated. "Confidence" - by this, well-established strong faith is indicated. "This is called an emergency robe" means a robe that has been announced thus - "I will give a rains-residence gift" - by one wishing to give for these reasons, either by sending a messenger or by coming oneself, is called an emergency robe. However, even a non-emergency robe that has arisen from the sixth day onwards, and even a robe that has been withdrawn and set aside, obtains this same allowance.

"Having made a mark, it should be set aside" means it should be stored having made some distinguishing sign. Why was this stated? For if they distribute it before the Pavāraṇā, the one by whom it was taken must not have broken the rains residence.

But if he has, that robe becomes the property of the Community itself. Therefore, having ascertained this, it will be easy to distribute.

650. "In the case of an emergency robe, perceiving it as an emergency robe" and so forth is stated with reference to what has been taken after having been divided. But if it has not been divided, or is in the storehouse of the Community, there is no offence even when the robe-season has been exceeded. Thus, the allowable period for an extra robe is ten days. For an unmade rain-cloth robe, when the kaṭhina has not been spread, five months; when the rains residence has been extended, six months; when the kaṭhina has been spread, a further four months. On the last day of the cold season, by means of determining it as a basic robe, yet another one month - thus the allowable period is eleven months. It should be understood that for a basic robe with expectation in mind, one month; for an emergency robe, when the kaṭhina has not been spread, one month plus eleven days; when the kaṭhina has been spread, five months plus eleven days; beyond that, there is no allowable period even for a single day.

"Not an emergency robe" means another robe similar to an emergency robe. The remainder here is clear in meaning.

The origin of the kaṭhina offence - it is non-commission, not release through perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action and verbal action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The explanation of the training rule on the out-of-season robe is finished.

9. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Dangerous Places

652. "At that time" refers to the training rule concerning suspicion. Therein, "who had finished keeping the rains retreat, in forest lodgings" means they had been dwelling in the forest even before. However, due to the weakness of their robes, they spent the rains residence in lodgings near a village on account of requisites, and having completed their robes, thinking "Now, free from hindrances, we shall practise the ascetic's duty," they dwell in forest lodgings. "Thieves of the Kattika month" means thieves in the month of Kattika. "Attacked" means they assailed, rushing here and there, frightening and driving them away. "To deposit in an inhabited area" means to deposit within a village. The Blessed One, because requisites are indeed difficult to obtain by righteous and proper means - for a monk practising austerity is unable to make a request even of his own mother. Therefore, for the purpose of safeguarding robes, he allows depositing them in an inhabited area. However, because forest dwelling is suitable for monks, he did not prohibit dwelling in the forest.

653. "After having observed the rains retreat" - here "upavassam" means "upavassa" from "upavassanti"; it means "having observed the rains retreat." For here the nasal should be understood as in "upasampajjanti" and so forth. The meaning is "having entered upon and dwelt through the rains retreat." And this word is connected with "a monk dwelling in such lodgings." What is meant? Having entered upon and dwelt through the rains retreat, and thereafter until the concluding time of the full moon of the last month of Kattika, whatever forest lodgings are considered dangerous and perilous; a monk dwelling in such lodgings, if he wishes, may deposit any one of the three robes in an inhabited area. But since one who has entered upon the rains

retreat and dwells until the first full moon of Kattika is included among those who have completed the rains retreat, therefore, without making this excessively complex analysis of the wording, in the word-analysis, merely to indicate the person eligible to deposit a robe, "of those who have completed the rains retreat" was stated. That too is connected with "a monk dwelling in lodgings." For the meaning here is this: "of those who have completed the rains retreat, a monk dwelling in lodgings" - it means any monk whatsoever among such monks.

The characteristic of forest has been stated in the explanation of the taking of what is not given. But this is the distinction - if the monastery is enclosed, one should measure from the boundary post of an enclosed village, or from the place deserving of enclosure of an unenclosed village, up to the enclosure of the monastery. If the monastery is unenclosed, whichever comes first - a lodging, a refectory, a place of regular assembly, a Bodhi tree, or a shrine - even if it is far from the lodging, one should make that the boundary and measure from there. Even if the village is nearby, and the sounds of householders can be heard by those standing in the monastery, but because of being obstructed by mountains, rivers, and so forth, one cannot go directly, and whatever is the normal path, even if one must travel by boat, one should reckon five hundred bow-lengths from the village by that path. One who blocks paths here and there in order to fulfil the qualifying condition of a nearby village should be known as "a dhutaṅga thief."

"Considered dangerous" means considered as "dangerous"; the meaning is "thus recognised." But in the word-analysis, in order to show the reason why they are considered dangerous, "in a monastery, in the vicinity of a monastery" and so forth was stated.

"Perilous" means accompanied by peril; the meaning is that danger and threat are present nearby. But in the word-analysis, the reason why they are perilous; in order to show that, "in a monastery, in the vicinity of a monastery" and so forth was stated.

"He may deposit in the surrounding alms-resort village" means he may deposit, when the qualifying conditions are met, in an alms-resort village of his own choice in all directions surrounding the forest lodging.

Herein, these are the qualifying conditions - he has entered upon the earlier rains retreat and has been invited at the great Pavāraṇā; this is the first condition. If he has entered upon the later rains retreat or has a broken rains retreat, he is not permitted to deposit. It is the month of Kattika itself; this is the second condition. After the month of Kattika it is not permitted. The lodging is at the last measurement of exactly five hundred bow-lengths; this is the third condition. If the measurement is less or exceeds a quarter-yojana, it is not permitted; for wherever, having gone for alms, one is able to return to the monastery at mealtime, that alone is intended here. But when invited, one may go even half a yojana or a yojana and return to dwell; this is without fixed measure. It is indeed considered dangerous and perilous; this is the fourth condition. For one dwelling in a lodging that is not dangerous and not perilous, even if the other conditions are met, is not permitted to deposit.

"Except with the authorisation of the monks" means except for the Kosambaka authorisation that was permitted in the Udosita training rule; if that has been obtained, it is allowable to stay apart even beyond six nights.

"Having re-entered the village boundary" means if the lodging is to the east of the alms-resort village; and he has gone to the western direction, the meaning is that one who is unable to return to the lodging and see the seventh dawn arise there, may even enter the village boundary and, having stayed in a hall or wherever, ascertain the status of the robe and then depart. One who is thus unable and remains right there should retrieve it, as it will stand in the position of surplus robe. The remainder is clear in itself.

The origin of the kaṭhina offence - it originates from body and speech, and from body, speech and mind; it is a non-act; it is not release through cessation of perception; it is without consciousness; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action and verbal action; it involves three types of consciousness; it involves three types of feeling.

The explanation of the training rule on dangerous situations is finished.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Dedicated Offerings

657. "At that time" - this is the training rule on diversion. Therein, "of the guild" means of the group; the meaning is "of the association." "Prepared" means made ready. "The Community has many supporters" means the Community has many meals, many sources of gain; they indicate that there is no loss to the Community from anyone. "Distribute" means give. "But is it proper to say thus?" - why is it not proper? For this is an offering brought and prepared in one place for the benefit of the Community, and there is no prescribed statement applicable to what has been brought and prepared and to portions set aside by designation.

658. "Belonging to the monastic community" means the property of the monastic community. For even though it has not yet come into hand, by reason of being designated for the monastic community, it belongs to the monastic community in one sense; but in the word-analysis, by way of extracting the meaning thus: "What is 'belonging to the monastic community' is what has been given to the monastic community, relinquished" - thus what belongs to the monastic community is shown in the absolute sense. "Material gain" refers to the object to be received. Therefore in its exposition, "even a robe" and so forth is stated. "Designated" means standing as inclined towards the monastic community, sloping towards the monastic community, tending towards the monastic community. But to show the reason by which it becomes designated, the word-analysis states: "The utterance 'we shall give, we shall make' has been made."

659. "For the effort, a wrong-doing" means there is a wrong-doing for the effort of diverting to oneself a designated material gain; by the acquisition, when it has come into one's hands, it is forfeitable. If, however, it has been given to the Community, it is not allowable to take it; it should be given to the Community itself. Even one who eats together with the monastery attendants should be made to pay after having the goods valued. However, for one who, knowing the state of being designated for the Community, diverts to himself and takes what is designated for fellow Dhamma practitioners or for householders, or even what belongs to one's own mother, saying "Give this to me" - it is a forfeitable offence with expiation. For one who diverts to another, saying "Give it to this monk," it is a simple offence of expiation. If one

diverts one bowl or robe to oneself and one to another, there is both a forfeitable offence with expiation and a simple offence of expiation. The same method applies in the case of many. And this too was said -

"An offence with forfeiture, and a simple expiation,
One may commit at once;
This is a question considered by the skilful."

For this was stated with reference to diversion. Even one who, at the time of the rains-bathing cloth, knowing that a rains-bathing cloth designated for the Community even at one's mother's house, diverts it to oneself - it is a forfeitable offence with expiation. If one diverts it to another, it is a simple offence of expiation. When people bring ghee, oil and the like, saying "We shall prepare a meal for the Community," even if a sick monk, knowing the state of being designated for the Community, asks for anything, it is indeed a forfeitable offence with expiation. If, however, he asks "Do you have ghee and the like brought for yourselves?" and when told "Yes, we do," he says "Please give some to me too," it is allowable. Moreover, if lay followers say to him while he is feeling scrupulous: "The Community too receives only what is given by us; please accept it, venerable sir" - in this way too it is allowable.

660. "What is designated for the Community, to another Community" means what is designated for the Community in one monastery, he diverts by specifying another monastery, saying "Give it to the Community in such-and-such a great monastery."

"Or to a shrine" means he diverts to a shrine thus: "What is the use of giving to the Community? Make an offering to the shrine."

"What is designated for a shrine" - here, having been specifically designated, it is not allowable even to place a flower upon another shrine from a flower-bed planted for the purpose of another shrine. However, having placed a canopy or a banner upon one shrine, seeing someone standing with the remainder, it is allowable to have it given to another shrine.

"What is designated for an individual" - even what is designated for a dog, he diverts to another individual thus: "Do not give to this dog, give to that one" - an offence of wrong-doing. But if the donors say: "We wish to give food to the Community, we wish to make an offering to a shrine, we wish to give requisites to a single monk; we shall give according to your preference; tell us, where shall we give?" When spoken to thus, that monk should say: "Give wherever you wish." But if they merely ask "Where shall we give?", one should speak in the manner given in the canonical text itself. The remainder here is clear in meaning.

It has three origins - it originates from body-and-mind, from speech-and-mind, and from body-speech-and-mind; it is an action; it has release through right perception; it is with consciousness; it is a worldly offence; it is bodily action and verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; and it is of three feelings.

In the Samantapāsādikā, the commentary on the Vinaya,

the explanation of the training rule on the dedicated robe is finished.

The third chapter on the bowl is finished.

The explanation of the Relinquishment section is finished.

The commentary on Expulsion 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. 4. The Section on Forfeiture 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