

THE PALIVERSE PROJECT

The Universe of Buddha's Wisdom

Commentaries (Aṭṭhakathā)

- 2. The Canon of Discipline - Commentaries (2. Vinaya Piṭaka - Aṭṭhakathā)
- 2. Commentary on the Expiation (2. Pācittiya-aṭṭhakathā)
- 5. The Section on Expiation (5. Pācittiyakaṇḍam)



PaliVerse

2. Commentary on the Expiation

Homage to the Blessed One, the Worthy One, the Perfectly Self-awakened One

In the Canon of Monastic Discipline

Commentary on Expiation

5. The Section on Expiation

1. The Chapter on Lying

1. Description of the Training Rule on False Speech

For those whose collection is well established in nine sections,
This now becomes the commentary of the minor ones.

1. Herein, in the first training rule of the chapter on false speech, "Hatthaka" is the name of that elder. "Son of the Sakyans" means a Sakyan son. In the time of the Buddha, it is said, eighty thousand men went forth from the Sakyan clan; he was one of them. "Upset in disputation" means thrown, cast, sent, dispatched into the presence of opposing disputants by a dispute pondered thus: "I shall engage in debate." That is the meaning. Or thrown into debate by his own mind. "Upset in disputation" also means wherever there is a debate, he is seen right there. "Having denied, he acknowledges" means noticing some fault in his own argument, having denied it saying "This is not my argument," then speaking again and again, noticing its faultlessness, he acknowledges "This is indeed my argument." "Having acknowledged, he denies" means noticing some benefit in a certain statement, having acknowledged "This is my argument," then speaking again and again, noticing a fault therein, he denies "This is not my argument." "He evades one issue with another" means he evades, conceals, overwhelms one reason with another reason; having said "Form is impermanent because it is to be known," he then says "Because it is of the nature of arising" and so forth. However, in the Kurundī it is said: "For the purpose of concealing that, he speaks much about something else." Therein this is the intention - That acknowledging and denying, for the purpose of concealing it, he speaks much such as "Who said it, what did he say, in what context did he say it?" and so forth. Again, in the Great Commentary it is said: "Having denied, acknowledging, and having acknowledged, denying - this itself is evading one issue with another." "He consciously speaks falsehood" means he knowingly speaks falsehood. "Having made a rendezvous, he deceives" means having made an appointment at such occasions as before the meal, saying "Let the debate take place at such and such a time, at such and such a place," he goes before or after the appointed time and departs saying "Look, sirs, the sectarians have not come; they are defeated."

2. Conscious lying means speaking falsely, having known and while knowing.

3. "Of one with the intention to deceive" means of one who speaks having placed the mind of deception to the fore. "Speech" means the volition that gives rise to utterance included in wrong speech. "Utterance" indicates the sound produced by that volition. "Verbal path" means the path of expression; for speech itself is called "verbal path" because it serves as a path for others who follow what has been seen. "Verbal expression" means the breaking up of speech designated as verbal; speech that has gone into differentiation is thus called. "Verbal intimation" means vocal intimation. Thus it should be understood that by the first term, pure volition is "spoken of"; by the three in the middle, volition together with the sound produced by it; and by the one at the end, volition together with intimation. "Ignoble statements" means the statements of ignoble foolish worldlings.

Having thus shown conscious lying, now showing the characteristic of the ignoble statements reckoned as conscious lying stated at the end, he said "the unseen is seen by me" and so forth. Therein, the meaning should be understood by this method: the statement of one who speaks thus "the unseen is seen by me," or the volition that produces it, is one ignoble statement. Furthermore, here it should be understood that "unseen" is an object not apprehended by means of the eye; "unheard" is what is not apprehended by means of the ear; "unsensed" is what is not apprehended by means of the nose and so forth, having combined the three faculties as though bound together and arrived at but not apprehended; "uncognised" is what is not apprehended by pure consciousness alone apart from the five faculties. However, in the canonical text, the teaching was given in a gross manner thus: "unseen means not seen with the eye." And regarding the seen and so forth, what is seen whether by oneself or by another is simply seen. Likewise with the heard, sensed and cognised - this is one method. Another method is that what is seen by oneself is simply seen. The same method applies to what is heard and so on. But what is seen by another stands in the position of what is heard by oneself. Likewise with the sensed and so forth.

4. Now, showing the assigning of an offence by means of those ignoble expressions, he said beginning with "in three ways." Its meaning should be understood in the same manner as stated in the commentary on the fourth pārajika text beginning with "for one speaking a conscious lie saying 'I attain the first meditative absorption,' there is an offence of defeat in three ways." The only difference is that where there it says "he attained the first meditative absorption," here it says "the unseen is seen by me," and where there it says "there is an offence of defeat," here it says "there is an offence requiring expiation" - thus the difference is merely in the subject matter and in the offence; the remainder is of identical character.

9. The meaning of "being doubtful about what was seen in three ways" and so forth should be understood in the same manner as stated in the explanation of the passage on corrupt offences beginning with "one who is doubtful about what was seen while committing an offence entailing defeat." For here the difference is only in the text, but in meaning, according to the Elder's doctrine, there is no distinction whatsoever.

11. "Speaks hastily" means without examining or without considering, one impulsively says even of what has been seen, "I have not seen it." "Thinking 'I will say one thing,' one says another" means due to dullness or stupidity, stumbling over

words, when one should say "robe" (cīvara), one says "bark-cloth" (cīra) at the beginning. But if one, when asked by a novice, "Venerable sir, have you seen my preceptor?" making mischief, says "Your preceptor must have gone off having yoked a wooden cart," or having heard the sound of a jackal, when asked "Venerable sir, whose sound is that?" says "That is the sound of your mother's wheel stuck in the mud being pulled out while she travels by vehicle" - thus speaking something other than the truth neither in jest nor in fun, he indeed commits an offence. There is another kind of talk called embellishment. One, having obtained a little oil in the village, comes to the monastery and says to a novice - "Where did you go today? The village was full of oil," or having obtained a piece of cake placed in a basket, says "Today in the village they were distributing cakes from baskets" - this is simply false speech. The remainder 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 is released by perception; it is with consciousness; it is worldly wrong; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is of three feelings.

The training rule on false speech is the first.

2. Description of the Training Rule on Insulting Speech

12. In the second training rule, "disparage" means they pierce. "Jeer at" means they revile. "Scoff at" means they denigrate.

13. "Once in the past" - the Blessed One brought forth this story for the purpose of censuring abusive speech. "Named Nandivīsāla" - "Nandī" is the name of that ox, and its horns were large (visāla), therefore it is called "Nandivīsāla." The Bodhisatta at that time was the one named Nandivīsāla. The brahmin nourished him exceedingly well with rice gruel, cooked rice, and so forth. Then he, out of compassion for the brahmin, said "Go you" and so forth. "Stood right there" - even at the time of rebirth without cause, he recognised jeering by others as disagreeable indeed; therefore, wishing to show the brahmin his fault, he stood still. "Pulled a hundred carts tied together" - having arranged them in a row, having placed them on supports, having made them into one train, pulling a hundred carts filled with mung beans, black beans, sand, and so forth; although when the spoke that was previously established on the ground reached the same spoke again it had completed a revolution, the Bodhisatta, however, pulled them a distance equal to a hundred carts in order to establish the last cart at the place where the first cart had stood. For Bodhisattas, there is indeed no such thing as doing things slackly. "Thereby he was delighted" - by that gain of wealth for the brahmin and by his own deed, that Nandivīsāla was delighted.

15. "By reviling" - here, since further on he wishes to analyse "there are two kinds of reviling - inferior reviling and superior reviling," therefore, unlike what was previously stated as "they abuse even with inferior reviling," without saying it in that way, he said simply "by reviling." "Basket-maker birth" means carpenter birth; some also say it means bamboo-worker birth. "Hunter birth" means the birth of deer-hunters and the like.

"Chariot-maker birth" means leather-worker birth. "Refuse-remover birth" means flower-sweeper birth. Avakaṇṇaka and the like are names of slaves; therefore they are inferior. "Looked down upon" means despised; some also read it as "uññāta." "Despised" means known with contempt. "Scorned" means regarded with disgust. "Treated with contempt" means treated as "what is this one worth?" "Not respected" means not regarded with esteem.

"Porch-keeper's work" means carpenter's work. "Hand-signs" means counting by hand-signs. "Arithmetic" means the remaining counting such as unbroken calculation and so forth. "Writing" means the writing of letters. The illness of diabetes is called "superior" because of the absence of painful feeling. "To be expected" means to be wished for. "With the letter 'ya' or with the letter 'bha'" means the reviling that is formed by combining the letters 'ya' and 'bha.' "With reference to the male and female organs" means "kāṭa" is the male organ, "koṭacikā" is the female organ; the reviling that is made with these is called inferior reviling.

16. Now, showing the offence by attributing it according to the classification of birth and so forth, he said beginning with "a fully ordained monk, a fully ordained monk." Therein, "desiring to jeer at, desiring to scoff at, desiring to shame" means desiring to abuse, desiring to humiliate, desiring to reproach, desiring to deprive of vigour - this is the meaning. "With an inferior term, one of inferior birth" means one of inferior birth with an inferior term referring to birth. By this method, the meaning in all the clauses should be understood.

And here, one who addresses one of inferior birth with an inferior term, although he speaks the truth, yet because of his desire to disparage, there is an offence requiring expiation for each speech. And one who addresses one of inferior birth with a superior term, although he speaks what is false, yet because of his desire to disparage, he commits an offence requiring expiation under this very training rule, not under the former one. One who says such things as "You are an utter outcast, you are an utter brahmin, you are a wicked outcast, you are a wicked brahmin," he too should be dealt with for the offence.

26. In the case of "there are here some," however, it is an offence of wrong-doing because it is stated in an indirect manner. The same method applies in the cases of "those who surely" etc. and also in the cases of "not us." However, in the case of one who is not fully ordained, in all four cases it is only an offence of wrong-doing. With words such as "you are a thief, you are a burglar," however, whether towards one who is fully ordained or one who is not fully ordained, in all cases it is only an offence of wrong-doing. However, when done out of a desire for fun, whether towards one who is fully ordained or one who is not fully ordained, in all cases it is an offence of wrong speech. "Desire for fun" means the intention of jesting and laughter. And in this training rule, it should be understood that, apart from a monk, nuns and all other beings stand in the position of those who are not fully ordained.

35. Regarding "for one with meaning as the aim" and so forth: one who explains the meaning of the canonical text is "one with meaning as the aim"; one who recites the canonical text is "one with the teaching as the aim"; one who, standing upon

instruction, speaks in such a manner as "Even now you are an outcaste, do not do evil, do not become one in darkness with darkness as destination" - this should be understood as "one with instruction as the aim." The remainder 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, exempt from the factor of perception, with consciousness, a worldly fault, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling. However, the offence of wrong speech here originates from speech-and-mind; it is action, released by perception, with consciousness, unwholesome consciousness, and of two feelings - pleasant and neutral.

The training rule on insulting speech is the second.

3. Description of the Training Rule on Malicious Speech

36. In the third training rule - "Quarrelling" means of those among whom quarrels have arisen. "Quarrel" is the preliminary stage of strife - "This was done by this one and that one; if such is said, we shall say such" - this kind of deliberation among one's own respective parties. "Strife" is transgression of body and speech leading to an offence. "Contention" is contentious talk. "Engaging in contention" means of those who have entered into that contention. "Divisive speech" means malicious speech; it is said to be speech that makes the state of affection empty.

37. "Divisive speech among monks" means divisive speech of monks; the meaning is divisive speech carried to a monk by a monk, having heard from a monk.

38. "In two ways" means by two reasons. "Either of one desiring to be dear" means or of one who wishes for his own state of being dear, thinking "Thus I shall become dear to this person." "Or of one with the intention of causing division" means or of one who desires the breaking apart of one person from another, thinking "Thus this one will break apart from that one." "By birth" and so forth - all this is according to the method stated in the preceding training rule. Here too, beginning with a nun, all are called unordained.

"Not of one desiring to be dear, not of one with the intention of causing division" means there is no offence for one who, having seen one person reviling and another enduring, speaks merely out of censure of evil, saying "Oh, the shameless one! He will think that even such a venerable one is to be spoken to again in this way." The remainder is of clear meaning. It has three origins - it originates from body and mind, from speech and mind, and from body, speech and mind; it is action; it is released by perception; it is with consciousness; it is worldly wrong; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is of three feelings.

The training rule on tale-bearing is the third.

4. Description of the Training Rule on Teaching the Dhamma Word by Word

44. In the fourth training rule - "Not deferential" means without deference. When "lay followers" is said, they do not even wish to listen to their words; the meaning is "without respect." Or the meaning is "without deference" or "of unbecoming

conduct." "Not courteous" means of discordant livelihood; as one should conduct oneself towards monks, the meaning is "of conduct not in accordance with that."

45. "Should expound the Teaching term by term" means one should expound the Teaching word by word together; the meaning is one should teach portion by portion. Since, however, that word called "portion" is of four kinds, in order to show this, the word-analysis "term, following term, syllable by syllable, consonant by consonant" is stated. Therein, "term" means one line of a verse is intended. "Following term" means the second line. "Syllable by syllable" means each individual syllable. "Consonant by consonant" means a subsequent consonant similar to the preceding consonant. Or, any single syllable is "syllable by syllable," a collection of syllables is "consonant by consonant," and a collection of syllables and consonants is a "term." The first term is indeed the term, the second is the following term - thus the distinction here should be understood.

Now, "term" means they begin together and finish together - when expounding the Teaching in verse form, such as "mind is the forerunner of all states," one begins each term together with the novice and finishes it together. For one teaching thus, expiations should be understood by the count of terms. "Following term" means they begin separately and finish together - when the elder has said "mind is the forerunner of all states," the novice, without reaching that term, recites the second line "mind is the chief, they are mind-made" together; these are said to begin separately and finish together. For one teaching thus also, there is an expiation by the count of following terms. "Syllable by syllable" means when being told "form is impermanent," one utters only "rū" - when being told "recite 'form is impermanent,' novice," one stands having said together only the syllable "rū." For one teaching thus also, there is an expiation by the count of syllables. And this method applies also in verse compositions. "Consonant by consonant" means when being told "form is impermanent," one utters the sound "feeling is impermanent" - when teaching the discourse "form, monks, is impermanent, feeling is impermanent," when the elder says "form is impermanent," the novice, through quickness of understanding, utters speech reciting "feeling is impermanent," this impermanence-term, together with the elder's impermanence-term "form is impermanent." For one teaching thus also, there is an expiation by the count of consonants. Here, however, this is the summary - among these terms and so forth, whatever one recites together, by each of those one commits an offence.

"Spoken by the Buddha" means the entire Vinaya Piṭaka, the Abhidhamma Piṭaka, the Dhammapada, the Cariyāpiṭaka, the Udāna, the Itivuttaka, the Jātaka, the Suttanipāta, the Vimānavatthu, the Petavatthu, and discourses such as the Brahmajāla and others. "Spoken by disciples" means spoken by disciples belonging to the four assemblies, such as the Anaṅgaṇa, Sammādiṭṭhi, Anumāna Sutta, Cūḷavedalla, Mahāvedalla and others. "Spoken by seers" means spoken by outside wanderers, the entire Paribbājaka Vagga, and such as the questions of the sixteen brahmins who were pupils of Bāvarī. "Spoken by deities" means spoken by deities; this should be understood by way of the Devatāsaṃyutta, Devaputtasaṃyutta, Mārasaṃyutta, Brahmasaṃyutta, Sakkaṃyutta and so forth.

"Connected with the meaning" means based on the commentary. "Connected with the Teaching" means based on the canonical text; by both, one speaks only what is

connected with emancipation. Although one speaks what is connected with emancipation, there is an offence only for one who teaches term by term the Teaching that has been included in the three councils. Even regarding what is connected with emancipation, there is no offence for what is composed in various languages by means of verses, stanzas and the like. Even regarding what has not been included in the three councils, for such as the Kulumba Sutta, the Rājovāda Sutta, the Tikkhindriya, the Catuparivaṭṭa, and the Nandopananda, there is indeed an offence. The Apalāladamāna is also mentioned, but the Mahāpaccaṇḍī is rejected. In the Meṇḍaka and Milindapañha, there is no offence regarding the elder's own inspired responses, but regarding what was brought and stated for the purpose of convincing the king, there is an offence. However, the Vaṇṇapiṭaka, Aṅgulimālapiṭaka, Raṭṭhapāla, Gaja, Ajata, Ālavaka, Gajjita, Guḥhamagga, Guḥhavessantara, Guḥhavinaya, and Vedallapiṭaka are said to be not the word of the Buddha. The Sīlūpadesa is said to have been spoken by the General of the Teaching; regarding that, there is indeed an offence. There are also others such as the Maggakathā, Ārammaṇakathā, Buddhikadaṇḍaka, Nāṇavatthu, Asubhakathā and so forth; in those, the thirty-seven factors of enlightenment are analysed, and in the Dhutaṅgapañha the practice is analysed; therefore, it is said there is an offence regarding those. However, among the Mahāpaccaṇḍī and others that have not been included in the councils, having stated that there is an offence only regarding the Rājovāda, Tikkhindriya, Catuparivaṭṭa, Nandopananda, and Kulumba Sutta, regarding the remainder, whatever was brought from the word of the Buddha and stated, that alone is the basis for an offence, not the other - this is the meaning that has been determined.

48. "For one reciting together" means even when learning a recitation together with an unordained person, one speaks together - the meaning is there is no offence.

Herein this is the determination - An ordained person and an unordained person sit down and recite together. The teacher says "I shall recite" to those seated and speaks together with them - there is an offence for the teacher. There is no offence for one learning together with an unordained person. Both stand and learn - the same method applies. A junior monk is seated, a novice is standing - there is no offence for one who recites saying "I shall recite to the one seated." If the junior one stands and the other sits, there is also no offence for one who recites saying "I shall recite to the one standing." If among many monks one novice is seated, there is an unintentional offence for the teacher who teaches the Dhamma word by word while that one is seated. If the novice, having left the vicinity, is standing or seated, since he is not included among those to whom he teaches, it is reckoned that he learns what is called a fleeing text in one direction - therefore there is no offence. "For one rehearsing together" also means an ordained person rehearsing together with an unordained person recites together with that very person - there is no offence. There is also no offence for one learning a recitation in the presence of an unordained person who recites together with him. For this too is reckoned as rehearsing together.

"For one who interrupts one speaking a text mostly well-practised" means if one line of a single verse does not come, but the rest comes, this is called a text mostly well-practised. By this method, it should be understood regarding discourses as well. There is no offence for one who interrupts that person, even speaking together,

saying "recite it thus." "For one who interrupts one reinstating" means there is no offence for one who speaks even together with one who is reciting a discourse and walking through the midst of the assembly, saying "say it thus." However, what is stated in the Mahāpaccarī and other texts - that if one who has been told "do not recite with me" still recites, "there is no offence" - that is not found in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā, and its absence is indeed fitting. Why? Because it originates from action. For otherwise, there would be non-action of action. The remainder is of clear meaning.

The origination of the training rule - It originates from speech and from speech with mind, it is action, it is not liberation through perception, it is unintentional, it is an offence by convention, it is verbal action, it involves three types of consciousness, and three types of feeling.

The training rule on reciting the Dhamma line by line is the fourth.

5. Description of the Training Rule on Sleeping Together

49. In the fifth training rule - "Unmindful, not fully aware" - this is said by way of not exercising mindfulness and full awareness in the preliminary stage; but at the time of falling into the life-continuum, how could there be mindfulness and full awareness! "Chattering" means babbling. "Snoring" means emitting a meaningless sound through the nose like the sound of a crow. "Lay followers" means the lay followers who had risen earlier.

50. "Said this" means the monks said this out of respect for the training rule itself, saying "Friend Rāhula, a training rule has been laid down by the Blessed One." But ordinarily, out of respect for the Blessed One and because of the Venerable Rāhula's desire for training, when that venerable one came to a dwelling place, they would prepare whatever small bed or bench was available, and would give a robe or upper robe for use as a pillow. Herein, this is regarding that venerable one's desire for training - It is said that the monks, seeing him coming from afar, would throw out the broom and the rubbish basket. Then when others asked "Friend, who knocked this down?" others would say thus - "Venerable sir, Rāhula was walking about in this area, perhaps it was knocked down by him." But that venerable one, without saying even for a single day "Venerable sir, this is not my doing," would put it back in order, ask the monks for forgiveness, and go. "Prepared a sleeping place in the toilet" means that, cultivating that very desire for training, not going to the presence of the elders such as the General of the Dhamma, Mahāmoggallāna, Ānanda and others, he prepared a sleeping place in the Blessed One's toilet with a bolt-fastened door. It is said that that toilet, fitted with a door-bolt, furnished with fragrant accessories, adorned with garlands of flowers brought together, stood like a shrine, and was not for the use of others.

51. "For more than two or three nights": the Blessed One granted an allowance of three nights for the purpose of looking after novices. For it is not proper, having given the going forth to sons of good families, not to support them. "Lying down together" means lying down in the same place. "Lying down" refers both to the act of reclining, which is reckoned as the stretching out of the body, and to the lodging in which one sleeps. Therein, to indicate the lodging, it is stated beginning with "a sleeping place

means one that is fully roofed" and so forth. To indicate the stretching out of the body, it is stated beginning with "when one not fully ordained is lying down, a monk lies down" and so forth. Therefore the meaning here is - "Having entered the sleeping place reckoned as a lodging, one should arrange, prepare, or provide the sleeping place reckoned as the stretching out of the body." But by the phrase beginning with "fully roofed," the characteristic of that sleeping place reckoned as a lodging is stated. Therefore, whatever lodging is entirely covered above by the five kinds of roofing or by anything else whatsoever, this is called a "fully roofed" sleeping place. However, in the commentaries, adopting the common usage and by way of the well-known expression, it is stated: "Fully roofed means roofed with the five kinds of roofing." Even though it is so stated, what of it? Since it is not possible to make it a non-offence even for one living in a cloth tent, therefore whatever is capable of providing cover should be understood here as both "roofing" and "enclosure." For if only the five kinds of roofing were taken, there would be no offence of lying down together even in a place roofed with leaves. But whatever lodging is enclosed from the ground up to and touching the roof by a wall or by anything else, even by cloth at the very least, this is called a "fully enclosed" sleeping place. In the Kurundi Commentary it is stated that even one enclosed by a wall and so forth of one and a half cubits in height, as the minimum extent, without reaching the roof, is still "fully enclosed." But that of which the greater part above is roofed and a small part unroofed, or the greater part all around is enclosed and a small part unenclosed, this is called "mostly roofed" and "mostly enclosed." For if a building possessing this characteristic, even a seven-storeyed mansion, has a single access, or a hundred-roomed hall or a quadrangle, it is reckoned as a single sleeping place. With reference to that, it is stated: "On the fourth day, when the sun has set, when one not fully ordained is lying down, a monk lies down - there is an offence of expiation," and so forth.

And therein, there is an expiation merely by the act of lying down. But if there are several novices and one monk, there are expiations according to the number of novices. If they get up and lie down again repeatedly, with each effort of theirs there is an offence for the monk. But when the monk gets up and lies down again repeatedly, the offence is for the monk through the monk's own effort. But if there are several monks and one novice, he creates an offence for all of them; even by his getting up and lying down again repeatedly, there is indeed an offence for the monks. The same method applies even when both are numerous.

Furthermore, here a fourfold classification beginning with a single dwelling should be understood. For one who arranges lying down together with just one person not fully ordained in a single dwelling for three nights, from the fourth day onwards there is a daily offence. Also for one who arranges lying down together with different persons not fully ordained in the very same dwelling for three nights, the same applies. Also for one who arranges lying down together with just one person not fully ordained in different dwellings for three nights, the same applies. Also for one who arranges lying down together with different persons not fully ordained in different dwellings, even having travelled a hundred leagues, from the fourth day onwards there is a daily offence.

And this offence of lying in the same sleeping place occurs even with an animal, because of the statement "apart from a monk, the rest are called not fully ordained"; therein, the delimitation regarding animals should be understood in the same manner as stated for the offence of sexual intercourse. Therefore, even if any among monitor lizards, cats, mongooses, and so forth enters and lies down in the monk's dwelling place in a single-access area, it is indeed lying in the same sleeping place.

But if, in a palace built upon pillars, with walls not connected to the upper storey, one enters through the hollow at the top of a beam resting upon the wall, lies down inside the beam, and then exits through that same hollow and departs, there is no offence for the monk lying down in the lower palace. If there is a hole in the roof, and one enters through it, dwells inside the roof space, and departs through the same, there is an offence for one lying down inside the roof space on the upper storey with separate access, but no offence for one lying down on the lower storey. If one ascends from within the palace itself and uses all the storeys, they are of single access, and there is an offence for one lying down anywhere among them.

When one lies down in a half-walled dwelling made in the manner of a hall, and pigeons and the like enter and lie down in the rafter-joints and such places, it is indeed an offence. If they lie down inside the eaves outside the enclosure, there is no offence. Whether circular or rectangular, if a dwelling has a hundred rooms in a row of rooms under a single roof, and if one enters through a single common door and enters all the rooms whose access is not separated by individual walls, when one not fully ordained lies down even in one room, there is an offence for those lying down in all the rooms. If the rooms have vestibules, and above the vestibule it is unroofed and on a raised platform, one lying down in the vestibule does not create an offence for those lying down in the rooms. But if the roofing is connected with the roofing of the room itself, one lying down there creates an offence for all. Why? Because it is fully roofed and fully enclosed, for the enclosure of the room itself is its enclosure. Indeed, by this very method, in the commentaries an offence is stated in the four gate-chambers of the enclosure of the Brazen Palace.

But what is stated in the Andhaka Commentary - "there is no offence in an unenclosed vestibule, this is said with reference to a vestibule on the ground without a raised platform" - that is said with reference to rows of rooms with a single roof in separate buildings in the Andhaka country. And what is stated there - "on the ground without a raised platform" - that is not found in the commentaries; nor does it accord with the canonical text. For even a raised platform ten hands high does not count as an enclosure. Therefore, what is stated there in the second training rule, having given the measurement of the raised platform, "this is called a single-access enclosed area" - that should not be accepted. Even great palaces arranged with one hall, two halls, three halls, or four halls, where one who has entered after washing one's feet in one place can go around everywhere - even in those one is not freed from the offence of lying in the same sleeping place. If they are made with the access demarcated at each place, the offence applies only in the single-access area.

They make a wall in the middle of a plastered-roof pavilion fitted with two doors; one not fully ordained enters through one door and lies down in one section, a monk in the other - there is no offence. If there is a hole in the wall just large enough for monitor lizards and the like to enter, and monitor lizards lie down in one section -

there is indeed no offence. For a house does not become a single-access area by means of a hole. If they cut through the middle of the wall and fit a door, there is an offence due to it being a single-access area. If they close that door with a door-panel and lie down, it is indeed an offence. For a house does not become a separate-access area by closing a door, whether it is a door or not a door. For a door-panel is made for the purpose of passing through at will by opening and closing, not for the purpose of cutting off passage. But if they close that door again with bricks, it becomes not a door, and it remains in its former state of being a separate-access area. There is a shrine house with a long vestibule. One door-panel is inside, one outside; one not fully ordained between the two door-panels creates an offence for one lying down inside the shrine house, because it is a single-access area.

Therein, one who thinks: "This matter of single access and separate access is stated in the training rule on relinquishment, but here only this much is stated: 'A sleeping place means one that is fully roofed, fully enclosed, mostly roofed, or mostly enclosed,' and a room with its door closed is indeed fully enclosed. Therefore, therein there is an offence only with one who lies down inside, but no offence with one who lies down outside." He should be told thus - "But when the door is not closed, why is there an offence with one who lies down outside?" Because the vestibule together with the room is fully roofed. "But when the room is closed, is the roofing destroyed?" It is not destroyed, but the vestibule together with the room does not have full enclosure. "Is the enclosure destroyed?" He will certainly say: "It is not destroyed; the access is enclosed by the door panel." Thus, even having gone far, he will come back again to the very matter of single access and separate access.

Moreover, if the meaning were easily understood by the letter alone, from the expression "fully roofed," a sleeping place would be one roofed only with one of the five types of roofing, and not with anything else. And if that were so, there would be no offence in places roofed with bark and the like. Then the very purpose for which the training rule was laid down would be defeated. Whether it be defeated or not, how can what is unstated be accepted? And who says "what is unstated should be accepted"? For this was stated in the Undetermined rules: "A concealed seat means a seat concealed by a wall, or by a door panel, or by a screen, or by a curtain-wall, or by a tree, or by a pillar, or by a partition, or concealed by whatever it may be." Therefore, just as there whatever is concealed by whatever means is indeed concealed, so it should be understood here as well. Therefore, whether a dwelling is small or large, connected with another or unconnected, long or round or square, single-storeyed or multi-storeyed, wherever there is single access, in every case where it is fully roofed or fully enclosed or mostly roofed or mostly enclosed by whatever covering, there is an offence of lying down together.

53. Regarding "if half-roofed and half-enclosed, there is an offence of wrong-doing" - here, in the Mahāpaccarī, it is stated that in cases such as "fully roofed and half-enclosed" and so forth, it is only an offence of wrong-doing. However, in the Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā it is stated: "If fully roofed and mostly enclosed, there is an offence requiring expiation; if fully roofed and half-enclosed, there is an offence requiring expiation; if mostly roofed and half-enclosed, there is an offence requiring expiation; if fully enclosed and mostly roofed, there is an offence requiring expiation; if fully enclosed and half-roofed, there is an offence requiring expiation; if mostly enclosed

and half-roofed, there is an offence requiring expiation; together with the offence requiring expiation stated in the canonical text, there are seven offences requiring expiation." It is stated: "If fully roofed and minimally enclosed, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if mostly roofed and minimally enclosed, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if fully enclosed and minimally roofed, there is an offence of wrong-doing; if mostly enclosed and minimally roofed, there is an offence of wrong-doing; together with the offence of wrong-doing in the canonical text, there are five offences of wrong-doing."

It is stated: "If half-roofed and minimally enclosed, there is no offence; if half-enclosed and minimally roofed, there is no offence; if minimally roofed and minimally enclosed, there is no offence; and here 'fully roofed and completely unenclosed' is of the nature of a senamba-pavilion." By this, the following should be understood - "that it does not come under the reckoning of a platform enclosure." The remainder is of clear meaning.

The origin of the sheep's wool rule - It originates from body and from body-and-mind; it is an act of doing; it is not release through perception; it is without consciousness; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it involves three types of consciousness; it involves three types of feeling.

The training rule on sleeping together is the fifth.

6. Description of the Training Rule on the Second Sleeping Together

55. In the second training rule on lying down in the same place - "Rest-house" means a dwelling-house for visitors. "Had been laid down" means it had been made and established out of a desire for merit. "He approached that woman" means having heard from people that in such and such a place there was a rest-house that had been laid down, he approached. "Fragrant with perfumes" means the fragrance of perfumes such as aloe and saffron is perfume-fragrance; she who has that is "fragrant with perfumes." "Having removed her cloth" means she thought "perhaps lust might arise in him seeing this transformation too" and acted thus. "Having withdrawn" means having cast down. "Transgression" (accaya) means offence. "Overcame me" (maṃ accagamā) means it occurred having surpassed and overpowered me. The remainder should be understood in the same manner as stated in the first training rule. This alone is the distinction - in the first training rule the offence is on the fourth day; here it is even on the first day. With female yakkhas and female hungry ghosts having visible bodily forms, and with female animals, there is an offence of wrong-doing only when they are objects of sexual intercourse. With the others there is no offence. The origins and so forth are exactly as in the first.

The second training rule on sleeping together is the sixth.

7. Description of the Training Rule on Teaching the Dhamma

60. In the seventh training rule - "Mistress of the house" means the female head of the household. "At the door of the dwelling" means at the main door of the dwelling. "Daughter-in-law" means the daughter-in-law in that house. "At the door of the rest-house" means at the door of the inner room. "With a clear voice" means with a well-projected sound. "Open" means well-articulated and unrestricted. "The Teaching

should be taught" means this Teaching, classified as the refuges, precepts, and so forth, should be expounded. "To understand" means to comprehend. "By a wise man in male form" means by a wise man, one standing having taken on a male form, not by a yakkha, not by a departed spirit, not by an animal.

66. "There is no offence in the presence of an intelligent male person" means there is no offence for one who teaches even much Dhamma while standing together with an intelligent male person. "With five or six sentences" means there is no offence for one who teaches with six or five sentences. Therein, one verse-quarter counts as one sentence - thus the measure of sentences should be understood everywhere. If one wishes to speak the commentary, the Dhammapada, or the Jātaka stories and so forth, it is appropriate to speak only five or six lines at most. When speaking together with the canonical text, one line from the canonical text and five from the commentary - thus one should speak without exceeding six lines. For the entire classification stated in the Padasodhamma applies here as well. "Teaches to her" means teaches at that moment. Or this locative case is used in the sense of the dative. The meaning is "teaches to her." "To another woman" means having taught to one, one teaches also to another who has come again and again - thus the meaning is that while seated in one sitting, one may teach even to a hundred thousand women. In the Mahāpaccarī Commentary it is stated: to women seated together, one teaches saying "I shall teach one verse to each one of you; listen to it" - there is no offence. It is appropriate to speak having first formed the intention and made known that "I shall speak one verse to each one" - but not afterwards. "Asks a question, when asked a question one speaks" means a woman asks "Venerable sir, what meaning does the Dīgha Nikāya elucidate?" A monk asked a question in this way may speak even the entire Dīgha Nikāya - there is no offence. The remainder here is clear in meaning.

The origination of the training rule - it originates from speech and from speech-and-mind, it is action and non-action, it is not liberation through perception, it is without mind, it is an offence by convention, it is verbal action, it involves three types of consciousness, and three types of feeling.

The training rule on teaching the Dhamma is the seventh.

8. Description of the Training Rule on Declaring Genuine Attainments

67. Regarding the eighth training rule - Whatever should be said concerning the background story, all that is according to the method stated in the commentary on the fourth offence of defeat. This alone is the distinction - there they declared what was untrue, here what was true. Even what was true, ordinary persons declared, not noble ones. For noble ones have no contrived speech whatsoever, but when others were declaring their virtues, they did not prevent them, and they consented to requisites that arose in such a way, not knowing that they had arisen in such a way.

In the passage beginning with "Then those monks reported this matter to the Blessed One," it should be understood that those who praised the super-human achievements were the ones who reported. When asked "But is it true, monks?" all of them acknowledged "It is true, Blessed One." For among the noble ones too, the super-human achievement was indeed genuine. Then the Blessed One, because they were mixed with noble ones, without saying "Foolish men," said "How indeed could you,

monks," and then spoke the passage beginning with "for the sake of the belly." Therein, because the noble ones, having heard from others, when asked by faithful people in such a manner as "The venerable one, it seems, sir, is a stream-enterer," when the training rule had not yet been laid down, seeing no danger, with pure intention acknowledged both their own and others' distinguished attainments. And since by those who thus acknowledged, whatever others produced as almsfood by praising super-human achievements for the sake of the belly, even by those who consented to it with pure intention, it is as if the super-human achievement was praised for the sake of the belly. Therefore, by way of an all-inclusive method, he said: "How indeed could you, monks, for the sake of the belly, praise to laypeople each other's super-human achievements?" The remainder is similar to the background of the fourth offence of defeat. In the analysis of the training rule too, the only distinction is that there it is an offence of defeat and a grave offence, whereas here, because it was true, it is an offence of expiation and a wrongdoing. The remainder is according to the method already stated.

77. "If he reports what is factual to a fully ordained monk" - this is said with reference to superhuman states only. For at the time of final passing away, or at other times when being pressed, it is permissible to report what is factual to a fully ordained monk. However, it is permissible to report the quality of learning, scriptural knowledge and virtue even to one who is not fully ordained. There is no offence for the first offender. But "for one who is insane" is not stated here. Why? Because for those accomplished in right view, there is no occurrence of insanity or mental derangement. For in the Mahāpaccaṇḍī too it was discussed: "But one who has attained meditative absorption, if the meditative absorption has declined, might become insane; for such a one too, it should not be said that there is no offence on account of reporting what is factual, because what is factual no longer exists." The remainder is clear in itself.

This reporting of what is factual originates from three origins not previously mentioned - from body, from speech, and from body and speech. It is functional, not connected with the liberation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action, verbal action, with two types of consciousness being wholesome and indeterminate, and with two feelings being pleasant and neutral.

The training rule on declaring an actual attainment is the eighth.

9. Description of the Training Rule on Declaring Grave Offences

78. Regarding the ninth training rule - In the canonical text stating "a coarse offence means the four defeats and the thirteen formal meetings of the Community," it is stated in the commentaries that "the defeats are mentioned for the purpose of showing the meaning of the term 'coarse,' but the formal meetings of the Community are what is intended here." Herein is this investigation - If there were no offence of expiation for one reporting a defeat, then just as, even though the term 'fully ordained' applies to both monks and nuns, where a nun is not intended, apart from a monk the remainder is called 'not fully ordained'; so too here, even though the term 'coarse' applies to both defeats and formal meetings of the Community, if a defeat were not intended, it should only be stated thus: "a coarse offence means the thirteen formal meetings of the Community." Therein someone might hold: "One who

has committed a defeat has fallen from the state of being a monk, therefore one reporting his offence incurs a wrong-doing." If that were so, even one who insults him would incur a wrong-doing, yet one incurs only an offence of expiation. For this was said: "A person is impure, having transgressed a certain offence entailing defeat; if, regarding him as impure, having obtained permission, one speaks with the intention of insulting, it is an offence of disparaging speech." Thus, when the canonical text is examined, even for one reporting a defeat, only an offence of expiation is seen. Although this is seen, nevertheless, since it is stated in all the commentaries, the commentary teachers alone are the authority here, not any other investigation. And we have previously stated - "The Dhamma and Vinaya were spoken by the Buddha, and they were known in the same way by his sons," etc. For the commentary teachers know the intention of the Buddha.

And this should be understood by this method as well. For it is stated "except by the agreement of monks." And reporting by the agreement of monks was permitted by the Blessed One for the purpose of future restraint, for the purpose of not committing such an offence again, not for the purpose of merely making known the discredit of that monk, nor for the purpose of preventing his establishment in the dispensation; and for one who has committed a defeat, there is no state of being a monk through not committing such an offence again. Therefore, what is stated in the commentaries - "the defeats are mentioned for the purpose of showing the meaning of the term 'coarse,' but the formal meetings of the Community are what is intended here" - that is well stated indeed.

80. However, regarding the passage beginning with "There is an authorisation of the monks with a limit of offences," the authorisation of the monks stated here is not found anywhere else. But it should be understood that since it is stated here, when a monk who frequently commits offences is seen, thinking "In this way, through a sense of moral shame and moral dread before others, he will undertake restraint in the future," it should be carried out by the Community after making a formal announcement three times, out of concern for the welfare of that monk.

82. "If he reports what is not a coarse offence, there is an offence of wrong-doing" - for one who reports any of the five classes of offences, there is an offence of wrong-doing. However, in the Mahāpaccarī, it is stated that even for one who reports a defeat, there is only an offence of wrong-doing. "If he reports to one not fully ordained a coarse or not coarse transgression" - herein, the first five training rules are called coarse transgression, and the remaining are not coarse. However, it is stated that emission of semen, bodily contact, coarse speech, and self-gratification are called transgression for him.

83. "Reports the subject matter" means there is no offence for one who speaks thus: "This one has committed an emission of semen, has committed a gross offence, has committed a self-gratification offence, has committed a bodily contact offence." "Reports the offence" means here there is no offence for one who says: "This one has committed a pārājika, has committed a saṅghādisesa, a grave offence, a pācittiya, a pāṭidesanīya, a dukkaṭa, a dubbhāsita." However, there is an offence for one who reports by combining the offence together with the subject matter in such a manner as: "This one, having released impurity, has committed a saṅghādisesa." 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 fault; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is painful feeling.

The training rule on declaring a gross offence is the ninth.

10. Description of the Training Rule on Digging the Earth

86. Regarding the tenth training rule - By these terms "fertile earth and unfertile earth," he shows both fertile earth and unfertile earth. In the terms "with little stone" and so forth, the meaning should be understood thus: "with little stone" means "there are few stones herein." Therein, what is larger than a fist-size should be understood as "stones"; what is fist-sized is "gravel." "Potsherds" means broken pieces of pottery. "Pebbles" means coarse gravel. "Sand" means just sand itself. "Mostly soil" means that of three portions, two portions are soil, and one is any among stones and so forth. "Unburnt too" means unburnt in various ways, such as in ovens, cooking pots, and potters' kilns. However, it does not exist separately; it should be understood as just one among pure soil and so forth. "Mostly gravel" means gravel is predominant. It is said that having had one basket-full brought from an elephant's belly and having washed it in a trough, knowing that the earth was mostly gravel, the monks dug the pond themselves. But the two terms "with little soil" and "with little clay" that appear in the middle, they fall under the fivefold group of mostly stone and so forth, for this is a showing of the subdivision of those same two. Regarding "he digs himself, there is an offence requiring expiation," herein an offence requiring expiation should be understood with each stroke. Regarding "having been commanded once, even if he digs much," even if he digs for the entire day, for the one who commands there is only one offence requiring expiation. But if he is lazy, he should be commanded again and again. For one who, having commanded him, has him dig, there is an offence requiring expiation with each utterance. This is the explanation of the canonical text.

But this is the determination beyond the canonical text - If one says "dig a pond," it is allowable. For a pond is so called only when it is dug; therefore this is an allowable expression. The same method applies also in cases such as "dig a reservoir, a lake, a pit." But to say "dig this place" or "dig a pond in this place" is not allowable. To say without specifying "dig a tuber" or "dig a root" is allowable. To say "dig this creeper" or "dig a tuber or a root in this place" is not allowable. For those cleaning a pond, thin mud that can be bailed out with pots, it is allowable to remove that; but thick mud is not allowable. Dry mud cracks in the sun; therein, what is underneath and unconnected to the earth, it is allowable to remove just that. In a place where water has gone, there is what is called a water-crust; it moves with the blowing of the wind; it is allowable to remove that.

The bank of ponds and so forth breaks and falls near the water; if it has been rained upon for less than four months, it is allowable to cut or break it; beyond four months it is not allowable. But if it falls into the water itself, even though it has been rained upon for more than four months, it is allowable because the water falls into water itself. They dig a channel on the surface of a rock; if fine dust first falls there, and if it has been rained upon by rain, after four months it comes to be reckoned as impermissible earth. When the water is exhausted, for those cleaning the channel, it

is not allowable to disturb that. If it is first filled with water and dust falls afterwards, it is allowable to disturb that. For therein, even when it rains, the water falls into water itself. There is fine dust on the surface of a rock; when it drizzles, it adheres; it is not allowable to disturb that too after four months. But if an anthill has arisen on an unfrequented slope, it is allowable to disturb it as one wishes. If it arises in the open, it is allowable only if rained upon for less than four months. The same method applies also to termite-clay that has climbed upon trees and so forth. The same method applies also to earthworm castings, mouse-diggings, cow-hoof clods, and so forth.

A cow-hoof clod means the mud cut by the hooves of cows. But if it is connected to the ground by its lower surface, it is not allowable even for one day. The same principle applies to one who takes a lump of clay cut by a plough in a ploughed place. There is an old dwelling, whether roofed or with a destroyed roof; if rained upon for more than four months, it comes to be reckoned as fertile earth. From that, it is allowable to take the remaining roofing bricks or materials such as rafters and so forth with the perception "I am taking a brick, I am taking a rafter, a wall-base, a floor-covering, a stone pillar." If clay falls along with it, there is no offence. But for one who takes wall-clay, there is an offence. If he takes whatever is not moistened, there is no offence.

There is a heap of clay inside a house; when it has been rained upon for one day, they roof the house; if all of it is moistened, after the lapse of four months it is indeed fertile earth. But if only its upper part is moistened and the inside is not moistened, having removed the moistened portion by allowable workers using allowable speech, it is allowable to use the remainder as one wishes. For earth moistened by water becomes fertile earth only when bound together as one mass, not otherwise.

There is a clay wall in the open air; if rained upon for more than four months, it comes to be reckoned as fertile earth. But it is allowable to touch the dust clinging there with a wet hand and take it. If it is a brick wall, it stands mostly in the place of potsherds; it is allowable to break it up as one wishes. It is not allowable to take a canopy-post standing in the open air by shaking it here and there and thereby disturbing the earth; it is allowable to pull it up straight only. The same principle applies to one who takes a dry tree or a dry stump. For the purpose of new construction, they lift stones or trees with poles and roll them along; therein the earth is broken. If they roll them with pure intention, there is no offence. But if under that pretext they actually wish to break the earth, there is an offence. The same principle applies to those who drag branches and the like, and to those who split timber on the ground.

It is not allowable to drive or insert anything such as bones, needles, thorns and the like into the earth. It is not allowable to urinate with the intention "I shall break the earth by the force of the stream of urine." If one does so and it breaks, there is an offence. It is not allowable to scrub with a broom thinking "I shall make uneven ground even," for one should sweep only with the rounded end. Some pound the ground with a scissor-stick, scratch with the big toe, and walk back and forth repeatedly breaking the ground thinking "We shall show the walking path." All of this is not allowable. But it is allowable to walk with pure intention while practising the ascetic's duty for the purpose of arousing energy. They rub against the earth thinking "We shall wash our hands" - this is not allowable. But without rubbing, it is allowable

to place a wet hand on the earth and take the dust. Some who are afflicted with skin diseases such as scabies and itching rub their limbs on cut banks and the like - this is not allowable.

87. "Digs or causes to dig" means even with a big toe or even with a broomstick, one either digs oneself or causes another to dig. "Breaks or causes to break" means even when throwing away water, one either breaks it oneself or causes another to break it. "Burns or causes to burn" means even when firing a bowl, one either burns it oneself or causes another to burn it. In however many places one sets fire or causes fire to be set, there are that many offences requiring expiation. For even when firing a bowl, it should be fired only at a place previously fired. It is not allowable to place fire on unburnt earth. However, it is allowable to place fire on top of a bowl-firing potsherd. If one places it on top of firewood, and that fire, burning those, proceeds to burn the earth, it is not allowable. The same method applies also to bricks, potsherds and the like.

For in that case too, it is allowable to place it only on top of bricks and the like. Why? Because they are not fuel for it. For they do not count as fuel for fire. It is not allowable to set fire to dry stumps, dry trees and the like either. But if one sets fire thinking "I shall extinguish it before it reaches the earth and go," it is allowable. If afterwards one is unable to extinguish it, there is no offence because it is beyond one's control. If one going while holding a grass torch drops it on the ground when the hand is being burnt, there is no offence. It is stated in the Mahāpaccarī that it is allowable to add fuel and make a fire at the very place where it fell. It is stated therein that whatever area of burnt earth has been affected by heat, all of it is allowable to disturb. But if an unknowing monk, having produced fire with a fire-stick, picks it up with his hand and says "What shall I do?", he should be told "Light it." If he says "My hand is being burnt," he should be told "Do it in such a way that it does not burn." But he should not be told "Drop it on the ground." If when his hand is being burnt he drops it, there is no offence because he did not drop it thinking "I shall burn the earth." It is stated in the Kurundī that it is allowable to make a fire at the place where it fell.

88. Regarding the non-offence beginning with "know this," the meaning should be understood thus: "Know the hole for this pillar, know the clay soil, know the chaff-mixed clay, give the clay soil, give the chaff-mixed clay, bring the clay, bring the soil, there is need for clay, there is need for soil, make the hole for this pillar allowable, make this clay allowable, make this soil allowable."

"Unintentionally" means when one is rolling stones, trees and so forth, or when one is walking striking repeatedly with a walking stick, the earth breaks; since it was not broken deliberately with the intention "I shall break it by that means," it is called broken unintentionally. Thus there is no offence for one who breaks unintentionally. "Without mindfulness" means one who is otherwise occupied, talking about something with someone, stands scratching the earth with a toe or a walking stick; thus there is no offence for one who scratches or breaks without mindfulness. "For one who does not know" means one does not know that earth inside a house, rained upon and covered, is "unallowable earth," and disturbs it with the perception that it is "allowable earth," or does not know "I am digging, I am breaking, I am burning," or merely places a spade and so forth for the purpose of storing, or one whose hand is

burning drops the fire; thus there is no offence for one who does not know. The remainder 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 an act of commission, released by perception, with consciousness, an offence by convention, a bodily action, a verbal action, with three types of consciousness, and with three types of feeling.

The training rule on digging the earth is the tenth.

The first chapter on false speech is completed in the order of the exposition.

2. The Chapter on Growing Plants

1. Description of the Training Rule on Plant Life

89. In the first training rule of the Lodgings Chapter - "Paying no heed" means not heeding her words. "Struck the arm of the child" means being unable to restrain the raised axe, he cut off the arm at the very base of the breast of the child lying in the celestial mansion standing upon the tree, obtained from the Great Kings, beyond the range of human vision. In the passage beginning with "It is not proper for me," this is the summary explanation - In the Himalayas, it is said, on the uposatha days there is an assembly of deities, and there they ask about the tree-duty - "Are you established in the tree-duty or not?" The tree-duty is the non-arising of mental corruption in a tree deity when the tree is being cut down. Therein, whatever deity is not established in the tree-duty, that deity is not permitted to enter the assembly of deities. Thus that deity saw this danger of not being established in the tree-duty as a cause, and following the teaching of the Dhamma previously heard in the presence of the Blessed One, she recollected the past conduct of the Truth-finder in the time of the Chaddanta and other lives. Therefore she had this thought - "It is not proper for me, etc. should deprive of life." "What if I were to report this matter to the Blessed One" - this thought arose in her while reflecting: "This monk is a son with a father, surely the Blessed One, having heard of this one's transgression, will establish a boundary and lay down a training rule." "If today you, deity" means if today you, deity. "Would generate" means would produce, would bring about. And having spoken thus, the Blessed One, instructing that deity -

"Whoever indeed would restrain arisen wrath, like a swerving chariot;
Him I call a charioteer, the other person is merely a rein-holder."

He spoke this verse. At the conclusion of the verse, that deity was established in the fruit of stream-entry. Again, the Blessed One, teaching the Dhamma to the assembly that had gathered -

"Whoever removes arisen wrath, spread like snake venom, with medicines;
That monk abandons the here and the beyond, as a serpent sheds its old
worn-out skin."

He spoke this verse. Therein, the first verse is included in the Dhammapada, the second in the Suttanipāṭa, but the story is in the Vinaya. Then the Blessed One, while teaching the Dhamma, attending to the dwelling place of that deity and seeing a

suitable place, said: "Go, deity, in such and such a place there is an unoccupied tree, approach that one." That tree, it is said, was not in the Āḷavi country, but within the precincts of Jetavana, and the son of a god whose possession it had been had passed away; therefore it was said to be "unoccupied." And from that time onwards, that deity, having received accommodation from the Perfectly Enlightened One, became an attendant of the Buddha. When there is an assembly of deities, at that time, when the deities of great influence come, other deities of lesser influence withdraw as far as the great ocean and the surrounding mountains. But this one, sitting in her own dwelling place, listens to the Dhamma. Whatever questions the monks ask in the first watch, and the deities in the middle watch, she listens to all of that sitting right there. And even the Four Great Kings, having come to attend upon the Blessed One, upon seeing that deity as they depart, go on their way.

90. In "bhūtagāmapātabyatāya": "bhūtā" means "they exist and they have existed"; the meaning is "they are born and they grow" and "they have been born and have grown." "Gāma" means a group; "a group of those that have come to be" is "bhūtagāma"; or "those that have come to be" are themselves "the group," thus "bhūtagāma"; this is a designation for established green grass, trees, and so forth. "Pātabyatā" is the state of being liable to damage; the meaning is the state of being used as one pleases by cutting, breaking, and so forth. "Of that damaging of growing plants" - the locative case is used in the sense of reason; the meaning is: on account of damaging growing plants, by reason of cutting and so forth of growing plants, there is an expiation.

91. Now, dividing and showing that growing plant, he said beginning with "growing plants means five species of seed." Therein, it is stated in the commentaries that, having taken up "growing plants means," in order to show that upon which being present there are growing plants, he said "five species of seed." Even this being so, the passages beginning with "or whatever others there are that are born from the root" do not accord. For root-seeds and so forth are not born in roots and so forth; rather, those that are born in roots and so forth have become seeds. Therefore, the explanation here should be understood thus: "Growing plants means" is the term to be analysed. "Five" is the delimitation of its division. "Species of seed" is the indication of the delimited phenomena. Its meaning is - Born from seeds, they are "seed-species"; this is a designation for trees and so forth. Another method - They are seeds and they are produced, having brought forth leaves and roots - thus they are "seed-species." By this, the inclusion of ginger and so forth that have produced leaves and roots, having been placed in moist sand and so forth, is made.

Now, showing those seeds on account of being born from which trees and so forth are called "seed-species," he said beginning with "root-seed." Their summary is quite evident. In the exposition, regarding "or whatever others there are that are born from the root, are produced from the root," here the seed is shown by what is produced from the seed. Therefore, the meaning here should be understood thus: or whatever others there are - shrubs, creepers, trees and so forth that are born and produced from roots of the various kinds such as yams, lotus roots, blue lotuses, white lotuses, water lilies, tubers, and trumpet flower roots - those, and the root in which they are born and produced, and also the turmeric and so forth stated in the text - all this is called root-seed. The same method applies to stem-seed and so forth. Here, among

the additional stem-seeds, hog plum, sal tree, nuhī, pāḷi, bhadda, and kaṇikāra and so forth should be understood as stem-seeds; rootless creeper, four-cornered creeper, kaṇavīra and so forth as joint-seeds; makaci, great jasmine, jayasumana and so forth as cutting-seeds; and mango, rose-apple, jackfruit, breadfruit and so forth as seed-seeds.

92. Now, showing the distinction between offence and non-offence according to perception, and the distinction regarding the types of destruction, with respect to what was stated as "there is an offence requiring expiation for destroying plant life," he said beginning with "if one perceives a seed as a seed." Therein, just as in passages such as "if one eats rice-gruel," the gruel made from rice-grains is called "rice-gruel," so it should be understood that plant life arisen from a seed is referred to as "seed." However, the seed that is mentioned in passages such as "abstaining from damaging seed-life and plant life," which has been separated from plant life and set aside, that is a matter for an offence of wrong-doing. Alternatively, connecting with the opening phrase of the analysis of the training rule, namely "what is called plant life," the meaning here should be understood thus: whatever seed is called plant life, if one who perceives that seed as a seed takes a knife or the like and either cuts it oneself or causes another to cut it, takes a stone or the like and either breaks it oneself or causes another to break it, brings fire and either cooks it oneself or causes another to cook it, there is an offence requiring expiation. However, taking it literally, it should not be said that there is an offence requiring expiation for the destruction by cutting and so forth of a seed that is separated from plant life.

Here, this is the adjudication: For one who damages plant life, there is an offence requiring expiation; for one who damages any of the five kinds of seed-life that has been separated from plant life, there is an offence of wrong-doing. This seed-life and plant-life is of two kinds: there is that which stands in water, and there is that which stands on land. Therein, that which stands in water - mustard-like algae, varieties such as sesame seeds and the like, with leaves and without leaves, all types of water-weed, down to and including water-scum - should be understood as "plant life." Water-scum is hard on top and rough in colour, soft underneath and green in colour. Therein, whatever water-weed has roots that have grown down and are established in the earth, for that the earth is its base. Whatever moves about in the water, for that the water is its base. For one who damages that which is established in the earth anywhere, or who uproots it and moves it to another place, there is an offence requiring expiation. For one who damages that which moves about in the water, there is also an offence requiring expiation. However, it is allowable to push it aside with the hands here and there and bathe, for the entire water is its base. Therefore, by that much it has not been moved to another place. However, it is not allowable to deliberately lift it out of the water without water; it is allowable to lift it up together with water and put it back into the water. It passes through the strainer; water should be used only after having it made allowable. For one who pulls up from the water or damages right there aquatic creepers and grasses such as blue lotuses, red lotuses and the like, there is an offence requiring expiation. For one who damages those that have been uprooted by others, there is an offence of wrong-doing. For those come under the category of seed-life. Sesame seeds, mustard-like algae, and water-weed too, when lifted from the water and not withered, come under the category of shoot-seed. In the Mahāpaccarī and other texts it is stated that "endless sesame seeds,

water-scum and the like are matters for an offence of wrong-doing," but no reason for this is seen there. In the Andhaka Commentary it is stated that "it is not complete plant life, therefore it is an offence of wrong-doing," but that too does not agree, for an offence requiring expiation is stated for plant life, and an offence of wrong-doing is stated for seed-life. A third category called "incomplete plant life" has come neither in the canonical text nor in the commentaries. If then it would come under the category of seed-life, that too is not fitting, because such seed-life has no plant-life as its basis. Moreover, "in cases of heavy and light, one should stand by the heavy" - this is a characteristic of the Vinaya.

Regarding that which stands on land: The remaining green stump of felled trees is called a green stump. Therein, the stump of trees such as kakudha, karañja, piyaṅgu, panasa and the like grows upward; that is included under plant life. The stump of palm trees, coconut trees and the like does not grow upward; that is included under seed-life. However, the stump of a plantain that has not fruited is included under plant life; of one that has fruited, under seed-life. However, a plantain that has fruited, as long as it has green leaves, is included under plant life itself; likewise bamboo that has fruited. But when it begins to dry from the top, then it comes under the category of seed-life. Under which kind of seed-life? Under cutting-seed-life. What arises from it? Nothing. For if something were to arise, it would come under the category of plant life itself. When Indra's sal trees and the like are cut down and made into a heap, even though branches measuring a fathom or more sprout from the sticks in the heap, they come under the category of seed-life only. Therein, when they are planted in the ground for the purpose of a pavilion, or for a fence, or for training creepers, and when both roots and leaves have emerged, they again come under the designation of plant life. However, when only roots or only leaves have emerged, they are still included under seed-life only.

Whatever seeds have been placed in the ground or watered and set down, or placed in potsherds and the like with moist soil put in - all of them, even when only roots or only leaves have emerged, are still just seeds. Even if roots and a sprout above emerge, as long as the sprout is not green, they are still just seeds. However, when leaves have arisen in the case of mung beans and the like, or when in the case of rice and the like the sprout has become green, having the colour of a green leaf, they come to be included as plant life. In the case of palmyra stones, first a root emerges like a boar's tusk. Even when it has emerged, as long as a leaf-whorl has not emerged above, it is still just seed-life. In the case of a coconut, breaking through the husk, a sprout emerges like a tooth-pick; as long as there is no green leaf-whorl resembling a deer's horn, it is still just seed-life. Even when a root has not emerged, when such a leaf-whorl has arisen, it comes to be included as rootless plant life.

Mango stones and the like should be determined in the same way as rice and the like. A parasitic plant or any other plant that, having grown on a tree, spreads over the tree - the tree itself is its base; for one who damages it or uproots it from there, there is an offence requiring expiation. There is a certain rootless creeper that, like a finger-ring, winds around the stems of forest shrubs; for that too, this same determination applies. On doorways of houses, walls, railings, shrines and the like, there is green-coloured moss; as long as two or three leaves have not arisen, it comes to be included as tip-seed. When leaves have arisen, it is a matter for an

offence requiring expiation. Therefore, in such places it is not allowable even to apply a coat of plaster. It is allowable for one who is not fully ordained to apply a coat of oil on top of what has been plastered. If in the hot season dry moss remains, it is allowable to scrub it off with a broom and the like and remove it. Moss on the outside of drinking-water pots and the like is a matter for an offence of wrong-doing; on the inside it is of no consequence. Even mould on tooth-sticks, cakes and the like is of no consequence. For this was said: "If a wall treated with red ochre has become mouldy, a cloth should be moistened, wrung out, and used to wipe it."

Stone-lichen, stone-fungus, rock-moss, seleyyaka and the like, which are not green in colour and without leaves, are matters for an offence of wrong-doing. A mushroom, as long as it is in bud, is a matter for an offence of wrong-doing. From the time of flowering onwards, it is of no consequence. However, one taking a mushroom from a living tree damages the bark of the tree; therefore, in that case there is an offence requiring expiation. The same method applies also to tree-bark. But bark of sal trees, kakudha trees and the like that has come loose from the tree and remains detached - for one taking that, there is no offence. It is also allowable to take resin that has come loose from a tree and remains detached, or that is attached to a dead tree. From a living tree it is not allowable. The same method applies also to lac. For one who shakes a tree and causes yellowed leaves or mature kaṇikāra flowers and the like to fall, there is indeed an offence requiring expiation. The same method applies also to one who, through carelessness of the hands, cuts letters on soft sal-tree trunks and the like, or on palmyra leaves and the like growing thereon.

It is allowable to bend down a branch and give it to novices who are picking flowers. However, drinking water should not be scented with those flowers. One who wishes to scent drinking water should lift up a novice and have him pick them. A branch with fruit should not be bent down by one who wishes to eat it himself. One should lift up a novice and have him take the fruit. It is not allowable to take hold together with novices who are uprooting any bush or creeper and pull it. However, it is allowable to take hold of the top as if showing the manner of pulling without actually pulling, for the purpose of generating their enthusiasm. For trees whose branches take root, if a branch is taken without having it made allowable, for the purpose of fly-whisk seeds and the like, there is an offence of wrong-doing for one who scratches even with a fingernail on the bark or on the leaves. The same method applies to fresh ginger and the like. But if, after having it made allowable and placing it in a cool place, a root develops, it is allowable to cut the upper part. If a sprout develops, it is allowable to cut the lower part. When both a root and a green sprout have developed, it is not allowable.

"Cuts or causes to cut" means even while sweeping the ground with a sweeping stick, thinking "I shall cut the grasses," one either cuts them oneself or causes another to cut them. "Breaks or causes to break" means even while walking in meditation, deliberately stepping with the feet, thinking "let what is to be cut be cut, let what is to be broken be broken, I shall show the walking path," one either breaks grasses, creepers and the like oneself or causes another to break them. For even if grass or a creeper breaks while one is tying a knot, the knot too should not be made. On palm trees and the like, they nail wooden brackets and bind thorns for the purpose of preventing thieves from climbing; it is not allowable for a monk to do thus. If the

wooden bracket merely clings to the tree and does not press upon the tree, it is allowable. It is also allowable to say "Cut a tree, cut a creeper, uproot a tuber or a root," because it is unspecified. But having specified, it is not allowable to say "Cut this tree" and so forth. Even using a name, saying "Cut a mango tree, cut a four-cornered creeper, cut a yam tuber, cut muñja grass, cut the bark of such-and-such a tree, break, uproot" and so forth is still unspecified. For only a statement such as "This mango tree" and so forth is specified; that is not allowable.

"Cooks or causes to cook" means even one wishing to cook a leaf, deliberately making a fire on top of grasses and the like, either cooks oneself or causes another to cook - all this should be understood in the manner stated in the training rule on digging the earth. But it is allowable to say without specifying, "Cook mung beans, cook black beans" and so forth. It is not allowable to say "Cook these mung beans, cook these black beans."

Regarding "no offence, one who knows this" and so forth, the meaning should be understood thus: "Know this root-medicine, give this root or leaf, bring this tree or creeper, there is need for this flower or fruit or leaf, make this tree or creeper or fruit allowable." By this much, the releasing from plant life is done. But when consuming, the making allowable should be done again for the purpose of releasing from seed life.

And here the making allowable should be understood according to this discourse: "I allow, monks, fruit to be consumed by means of five ascetic allowances: damaged by fire, damaged by a knife, damaged by a fingernail, seedless, and with seeds removed as the fifth." Therein, "damaged by fire" means overcome by fire, burnt, touched - this is the meaning. "Damaged by a knife" means overcome by a knife, cut or pierced - this is the meaning. The same method applies to that damaged by a fingernail. Seedless and with seeds removed are allowable by themselves. When making allowable by fire, it should be made allowable with any kind of fire among wood fire, cow-dung fire and the like, even with a heated piece of metal. And that should be done by touching one spot and saying "allowable." When making allowable by a knife, it should be done by showing a cut or a piercing with the point or the edge of any metal knife, even of a needle or nail-cutter, and saying "allowable." When making allowable by a fingernail, it should not be done with a rotten fingernail. But the fingernails of humans, lions, tigers, leopards, monkeys and the like, and of birds are sharp; it should be done with those. The hooves of horses, buffaloes, pigs, deer, cattle and the like are not sharp; it should not be done with those, and even if done it is as if not done. But elephant nails are not hooves; with those it is allowable. With those that are allowable to use, whether still attached or extracted and taken, it should be done by showing a cut or a piercing and saying "allowable."

Therein, even if a mountain-sized heap of seeds, or a thousand trees cut down and bound together, or a great bundle of sugarcane tied up and placed, when one seed or one branch of a tree or one sugarcane is made allowable, all is made allowable. If sugarcane and pieces of wood are bound together, and intending to make the sugarcane allowable one pierces the wood, it is indeed permissible. But if one pierces the rope or creeper by which they are bound, it is not permissible. They bring a basket filled with pieces of sugarcane; when one piece is made allowable, all is indeed made allowable. They bring rice mixed with pepper fruits and the like; when

told "make it allowable," even if one pierces a grain of rice, it is indeed permissible. The same method applies to sesame seeds, rice grains, and the like. But those thrown into gruel do not remain bound together; therein each one must be pierced to make it allowable. Inside wood-apple fruits and the like, the seed moves about having released from the shell; it should be broken open and made allowable. It is bound together; it is permissible to do it even on the shell.

"Unintentionally" means: when one is rolling stones or trees, or pulling a branch, or striking the ground with a walking stick and going along, grasses are cut - since they were not cut having deliberately intended "I shall cut them," they are called cut unintentionally. Thus there is no offence for one who cuts unintentionally.

"Without mindfulness" means: being otherwise engaged, while discussing something with someone, one stands cutting grass or a creeper with one's toe or hand; thus there is no offence for one who cuts without mindfulness.

"For one who does not know" means: in this case one does not know whether it is seed-life or plant-life, nor does one know "I am cutting"; one merely places a stake, or a spade, or a hoe in a fence or a heap of straw for the purpose of storing, or being with a burning hand one drops fire - if therein grasses are cut or burnt, there is no offence. However, in the description of the pārajika concerning a human form, in all the commentaries it is said: "If a monk is covered by a tree, or has fallen into a pit, and it is possible to get out by cutting the tree or digging the ground, even for the sake of one's life it should not be done by oneself. But it is permissible for another monk to dig the ground, or cut the tree, or cut a stick from a green tree and roll that tree away to get him out; there is no offence." Therein no reason is seen. "I allow, monks, when a forest fire is burning, to set a counter-fire, to make a firebreak" - only this one sutta is seen. If in accordance with this, the distinction "it is not permissible for oneself, but it is permissible for another" cannot be obtained. If it is said that one acting for one's own sake acts with unwholesome mind through self-love, but another acts out of compassion, therefore there is no offence - This too is not a valid reason. For even with a wholesome mind one commits this offence. But since it is stated in all the commentaries, it cannot be rejected. The reasoning here should be investigated. Or one should proceed with faith in the commentary teachers. The remainder 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 an act of commission, released by perception, with consciousness, an offence by convention, a bodily action, a verbal action, with three types of consciousness, and with three types of feeling.

The training rule on plant life is the first.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning One Who Speaks Differently

94. In the second training rule - "Having engaged in misconduct" means having done what should not be done; it is said to mean having committed an offence through the doors of body and speech. "Evades the issue with another issue" means he evades one statement with another statement, conceals it, overwhelms it; now, showing that method of evasion, he said beginning with "Who has committed." Herein, this is the connection of the statements - having seen some transgression, when being

questioned about an offence in the midst of the Community thus: "Friend, you have committed an offence," he says "Who has committed?" When told "You, then," he says "What have I committed?" Then when told "A pācittiya or a dukkaṭa," asking about the matter, he says "In what have I committed?" Then when told "In such and such a matter," he asks "How have I committed? What was I doing when I committed?" Then when told "You committed while doing this," he says "Whom are you speaking of?" Then when told "We are speaking of you," he says "What are you speaking of?"

Moreover, here there is also a method of evasion with another issue that is outside the canonical text - when told by monks "A coin was seen in your bag, why do you do such an unsuitable thing?" saying "Well seen, venerable sir, but this is not a coin; this is a disc of tin"; or when told "You were seen drinking liquor, why do you do this?" saying "Well seen, venerable sir, but this is not liquor; it is ariṭṭha prepared for medicinal purposes"; or when told "You were seen sitting with a woman on a concealed seat, why do you do such an unsuitable thing?" saying "Whoever saw it, well seen, but is there not a wise second person here? Why was he not seen?"; or when asked "Was anything like this seen by you?" bringing his ear forward saying "I do not hear"; or when they ask at the ear-door, bringing forward his eye - this should be understood as evading the issue with another issue. "Let him impose evasion" means let him impose the charge of evasion; the meaning is let him establish it. "Let him impose obstruction" - herein too the same method applies.

98. In "for evasion and vexatious silence, there is an expiation," "speaks otherwise" means evasion; this is the designation for evading by speaking of one thing in place of another. "Vexes" means vexatious silence; this is the designation for remaining silent, in that evasion and vexatious silence. "There is an expiation" means a twofold expiation for the two cases is stated.

100. "When evasion has not been formally charged" means when evasion has not been formally charged by the formal act of the Community. "When vexatious silence has not been formally charged" - in this case too the same method applies.

101. In the passage beginning with "perceiving a legally valid act as a legally valid act," the meaning should be understood in this way: whatever act of evasion and vexatious silence has been carried out, if that is a legally valid act, and that monk, perceiving it as a legally valid act, engages in evasion and vexatious silence, then for that evasion and vexatious silence there is an offence requiring expiation.

102. "One not knowing asks" means one who does not know either the offence or the state of having committed it, asks "What are you saying? I do not know." "Or one who is sick does not speak" means there is such an illness in the mouth by which one is unable to speak. In "quarrel in the Community, etc.", the meaning should be understood in this way: when it is spoken in the midst of the Community, thinking "on account of that there will be quarrel or dispute or contention in the Community, let that not happen," one does not speak. The remainder 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 may be an act of commission, it may be an act of omission; for one who conceals one thing with another it is an act of commission, for one who causes distress by silence it is an act of omission; it is released by

perception, it is with consciousness, it is a worldly fault, it is bodily action, it is verbal action, it is unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling.

The training rule on evasive speech is the second.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Causing Irritation

103. In the third training rule - "Made the monks look down upon Dabba the Mallian" means that by saying such things as "Dabba the Mallian acts out of desire," they caused that venerable one to be despised by those monks, caused him to be regarded with contempt, or caused him to be thought of as inferior - this is the meaning. The grammatical characteristic here should be understood according to the science of grammar. "Ojjhāpentī" is also a reading. The meaning is the same. "Out of desire" means through desire, through partiality; the intention is that he prepares superior things for his own close friends and associates. "Criticised" means they made it known by saying such things as "Dabba the Mallian acts out of desire."

105. "For making someone look down upon another and for criticising, there is an expiation": herein, the speech by which they make someone look down upon another, that is "making someone look down upon another." And that by which they criticise, that is "criticising." In that making someone look down upon another and criticising. "There is an expiation" means a twofold expiation for the two cases is stated.

106. "Making someone look down upon another" means a fully ordained monk authorised by the monastic community as an appointer of lodgings or etc. or a dispenser of trifles - these terms are connected with "desiring to shame." However, by virtue of "desiring to bring disrepute upon, desiring to bring ill repute upon," in "a fully ordained monk" and so forth, the case ending should be changed to "of a fully ordained monk." As for "he makes someone look down upon another or criticises, there is an offence requiring expiation," here, although the matrix term "criticising means" has been extracted, the word analysis stated for the term "making someone look down upon another means" itself is to be stated, and there is no other distinction as in the training rule concerning one who speaks of another matter; therefore, it should be understood that without extracting it separately or analysing it separately, only the conclusion has been combined together. In "if it is a legally valid act, perceiving it as a legally valid act" and so forth, the meaning should be understood in this way: if the act of authorisation performed for that fully ordained monk is a legally valid act, and that monk, perceiving it as a legally valid act, engages in making someone look down upon another and in criticising, then for that making someone look down upon another and for that criticising, there is an offence requiring expiation.

As for "he makes one not fully ordained look down upon another or criticises," here the meaning is: he makes another who is not fully ordained look down upon a fully ordained monk authorised by the monastic community, causing them to despise him, or he criticises that authorised fully ordained monk in the presence of that one not fully ordained. "A fully ordained monk not authorised by the monastic community" means one not authorised by a formal act of the community, but merely one upon whom the community has placed the responsibility saying "this is your burden," or one who carries that burden himself for the comfortable dwelling of the monks, or

where two or three monks dwell, one who performs such duties there - this is the intention. As for "one not fully ordained, whether authorised or not authorised by the monastic community," here, although it is not proper to give the thirteen authorisations to one not fully ordained, however, one who received authorisation at the time of full ordination and later came to stand in the state of being not fully ordained - referring to such a one, "authorised by the monastic community" is stated. But referring to a capable novice upon whom the burden has been placed merely by the community or by a monk authorised by the community, saying "you perform this duty" - referring to such a one, "not authorised" is stated. 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 fault; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is painful feeling.

The training rule on criticising is the third.

4. Commentary on the First Training Rule Concerning Lodgings

108. In the fourth training rule - "In the winter season" means in the winter time, at the time of snowfall. "Drying their bodies" means seated on beds, chairs, and so forth, drying their bodies in the mild sunshine. "When the time was announced" means when the time for any of the meals such as gruel, rice, and so forth was announced. "Was rained upon" means it was rained upon and soaked by snow-rain.

110. "During the rainless period" means the eight months - four in winter and four in summer - when the rainy season months have not been designated as such. "In a pavilion" means in a branch-pavilion or a leaf-pavilion. "At the root of a tree" means beneath any tree whatsoever. "Wherever crows or hawks do not defecate" means wherever these crows, hawks, or other birds, dwelling permanently by making nests, do not soil that lodging - "I allow it to be set aside at the root of such a tree." Therefore, it is allowable to set aside at the root of a tree where birds going about for food rest and then depart. But at the root of a tree where they dwell permanently having made nests, it should not be set aside. Because of the statement "eight months," even in those regions where it does not rain during the rainy season, it is still not allowable to set aside for four months. Because of the statement "during the rainless period," wherever it rains in winter, it is not allowable to set aside in the open air even during winter. But in summer, everywhere the sky is clear and free from clouds; during such a time, for whatever reason, it is allowable to set aside a bed or chair in the open air.

The duty should also be known for one who stays in the open air; for if he has a personal bed, he should sleep on that very one. When taking one belonging to the Community, a bed strung with cane or bark should be taken. In the absence of that, an old bed should be taken. In the absence of that too, a newly woven one or a leather-covered one should be taken. However, having taken one, thinking "I am a superior tree-root dweller, a superior open-air dweller," without even making a robe-hut, it is not allowable to spread it out in the open air or at the root of a tree during

the improper season and lie down. But if a hut made even with a robe folded in four cannot protect what does not get wet, and there are seven-day allowances and the like, it is allowable because of the monk's being present there in person.

People with confident minds, inspired by the virtue of those dwelling in leaf-huts in the forest, give new beds and chairs saying "Use them for communal use by the Community." When those departing after having stayed should send them to like-minded monks in a neighbouring monastery and then go; in the absence of like-minded monks, they should set them aside in a rain-proof place and go; in the absence of a rain-proof place, they should hang them on a tree and go. Having taken a broom in the shrine courtyard, after sweeping and washing any one of the refectory courtyard, the Uposatha hall courtyard, the residence, the day-quarters, the fire hall, or the like, it should be placed back in the broom enclosure itself. The same method applies for one who, having taken it from any one of the Uposatha hall and the like, sweeps the remaining places.

But one who wishes to go while sweeping the alms-round path, having swept, if there is a hall along the way, it should be placed there. If there is none, having observed that clouds have not arisen, one who knows "It will not rain before I come out from the village" should set it aside anywhere, and upon returning, should place it in its usual place. If one who knows "It will rain" places it in the open air, it is an offence of wrong-doing - so it is stated in the Mahāpaccaṛī. But if a broom has been placed here and there for the purpose of sweeping, having swept each respective place, it is allowable to set it aside in each respective place. The duty should be known for one sweeping the seating hall. Herein, this is the duty - starting from the middle, the sand should be swept towards the place where the feet rest. Rubbish should be picked up by hand and thrown outside.

111. "Long bed" means made by boring holes in the bed legs and inserting crossbars therein. "Bed with slats" means made by having the crossbars bite into the bed legs, constructed in the manner of a couch frame. "Bed with curved legs" means made with legs resembling the feet of horses, rams, and the like. Or whatever bed has curved legs, that is called a bed with curved legs. "Bed with removable legs" means this is stated in the canonical text further on thus: "A bed with removable legs is one made by boring holes in the frame." Therefore, a bed made by boring holes in the crossbars, inserting the tops of the legs therein, and fixing a pin above, should be understood as a "bed with removable legs." The same method applies to chairs as well. "Having been wrapped inside and bound" means it is spread out at the bottom and top, contracted in the middle, made in the shape of a drum, and bound; they even make it covered with lion or tiger skin in the middle, it is said. There is no impermissible skin in this regard. For even a lodging made of gold is allowable; therefore it is of great value. "If he causes one not fully ordained to spread, it is that one's impediment" means it is the impediment of the one by whom it was caused to be spread. "For one going beyond a stone's throw, there is an offence requiring expiation" means there is an offence requiring expiation for one going beyond the stone's throw of a man of middling strength.

Now here is the adjudication: An elder, having finished his meal in the refectory, instructs a junior monk: "Go and set up a bed and chair in the day quarters." He, having done so, sits down. The elder, having wandered about as he pleases, goes

there and places his bag or upper robe; from that point onwards it is the elder's impediment. Having sat down and then going away himself, he neither removes nor has it removed - for going beyond a stone's throw, there is an offence requiring expiation. But if the elder, having placed his bag or upper robe there, while walking up and down says to the junior monk "You may go," the junior monk should inform him: "Venerable sir, here is the bed and chair." If the elder knows the duty, he should say: "You go, I shall restore it to its original state." If he is foolish and has not been instructed in the duty, he should simply admonish the junior monk: "Go, do not stand here; I give you leave neither to sit nor to lie down." The junior monk, having obtained permission by saying "Venerable sir, may you sleep well," should pay respects and depart. When he has gone, it is the elder's own impediment. And his offence should be understood in the same manner as before.

But if at the very moment of being instructed, the junior monk says "Venerable sir, I have some task to do such as washing my requisites," and the elder, having told him "You set it up and then go," leaves the refectory and goes elsewhere, he should be dealt with at the lifting of the foot. If he goes there and sits down, his offence for going beyond a stone's throw is in the same manner as before. But if the elder instructs a novice, even when the novice has set up the bed and chair there and is sitting, if the elder goes elsewhere from the refectory, he should be dealt with at the lifting of the foot. Having gone and sat down, at the time of departure again, he should be dealt with for the offence of going beyond a stone's throw. But if the one giving the instruction orders the novice to set up the bed and chair and sit right there, he is permitted to go wherever he wishes and return. But for one who goes without restoring it to its original state himself, for going beyond a stone's throw, there is an offence requiring expiation. At an intermediate assembly, those who have set up beds and chairs and sat down should, at the time of departure, tell the monastery attendants "Put these away." For those who go without saying so, for going beyond a stone's throw, there is an offence.

When there is a great Dhamma hearing, they bring beds and chairs from the uposatha hall and from the dining hall and set them up there. It is the impediment of the resident monks alone. If visiting monks take them saying "this is for our preceptor, this is for our teacher," from that point onwards it is their impediment alone. For those who go beyond a stone's throw at the time of departure without putting things back in order, there is an offence. In the Mahāpaccarī it is further stated - "As long as others have not sat down, it is the responsibility of those who set them up. When others have come and sat down, it is the responsibility of those who are seated. If they go without removing or having them removed, it is an offence of wrong-doing. Why? Because they were set up without being instructed." When a Dhamma seat has been set up, as long as the reciter or the Dhamma speaker has not come, it is the impediment of those who set it up; when he has come and sat down, it is his impediment. When the Dhamma hearing lasts the whole day and night, one reciter or Dhamma speaker rises, another sits down; whoever comes and sits down, it is that one's responsibility. But the one rising should say "this seat is your responsibility" and then go. Even if the one who sat down first rises and goes while the other has not yet come, and the other comes and sits down while still within the vicinity, the one who rose and left should not be made to incur an offence. But if the one who sat down first rises from the seat and goes beyond a stone's throw while the

other has not yet come, he should be made to incur an offence. And everywhere the method stated in the Mahāpaccarī is: "At the going beyond a stone's throw, an offence of wrong-doing at the first step, an offence requiring expiation at the second."

112. In the passage beginning with "a carpet or," a carpet is one made for the purpose of preserving the appearance of a floor that has been prepared with plaster and the like; having spread that underneath, they spread a rush mat on top. An upper cover is a covering to be spread over beds and chairs. A floor covering is an article such as a rush mat and the like to be spread on the floor. A straw-mat is a mat made of palm leaves or bark strips. A piece of leather is any leather whatsoever, even from among lion skin, tiger skin, leopard skin, hyena skin and the like. For in the commentaries, no leather is seen as prohibited for use in lodgings; therefore the prohibition should be understood as applying only to the carrying about of lion skin and the like. A mat for the feet is one made of cords or rags for the purpose of wiping the feet. A wooden chair is a chair made of planks. Or else, a plank and a wooden chair; by this, all wooden articles and the like are included. In the Mahāpaccarī, however, it is stated in detail - "A stand, a bowl-cover, a foot-stand, a palm-leaf fan-handle, a fan-leaf, any wooden article whatsoever, even down to a water ladle, a water conch - for one who goes away having left them in the open air, there is an offence of wrong-doing." In the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā, however, this method is shown in the second training rule. Having cooked dye in the open air, the dyeing vessel, the dyeing ladle, the dyeing trough - all should be put away in the fire-hall. If there is no fire-hall, it should be placed in a sheltered cave where rain does not enter. If that too is not available, it is proper to go even after placing them in such a spot where monks looking around can see them.

"Belonging to another individual" means there is an offence of wrong-doing regarding the belongings of one towards whom the presumption of consent does not hold. However, the belongings of one towards whom the presumption of consent holds are as if one's own individual property - so it is stated in the Mahāpaccarī and other texts.

113. "If one goes having asked permission" means: whoever - whether a monk, a novice, or a monastery attendant - is conscientious, regards it as an obstruction to oneself, whoever goes having asked such a person's permission, there is no offence for him. "If one goes drying it in the sun" means: one goes drying it in the sun, thinking "I shall come back and remove it." For one going thus, there is no offence. "If it is obstructed by anyone" means: the meaning is that the lodging is disturbed by someone. For if a more senior monk displaces and takes it, or if a yakkha or a departed spirit comes and sits down, or if some ruler comes and takes it, the lodging is obstructed; and even when lions, tigers, and the like come and stand in that area, the lodging is indeed obstructed. Thus, when it is obstructed by anyone, there is no offence for one who goes even without removing it. "In misfortunes" means: in dangers to life or to the holy life. 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 action and non-action; it is not release through perception; it is without mind; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is with three types of consciousness; it is with three types of feeling.

The first training rule on lodgings is the fourth.

5. Commentary on the Second Training Rule Concerning Lodgings

116. In the second training rule on lodgings - "Mattress" means either a bed-mattress or a chair-mattress. "Carpet" and the rest are of the same kind as stated in the previous training rule. "Sitting cloth" should be understood as the same. "Bed-sheet" - only this much has been stated: "a cloak or a blanket." "Grass spread" means a spread of any kind of grass whatsoever. The same method applies to "leaf spread." "For one going beyond the enclosure" - here, for one stepping over the first boundary, there is a wrongdoing; at the second transgression, there is an offence requiring expiation. For an unfenced one, the precincts means two stone-throws from the lodging.

"Or should go without asking permission" - here, when a monk is present, the monk should be asked permission. In his absence, a novice; in his absence, a monastery attendant; in his absence too, the one by whom the dwelling was built, that owner of the dwelling, or anyone in his family should be asked permission. In his absence too, having placed the bed upon four stones, having loaded the remaining beds and chairs onto the bed, having heaped up on top the tenfold sleeping equipment beginning with mattresses, having stored away the wooden articles and earthen articles, having closed the doors and windows, having fulfilled the duty for departing, one should go. But if the lodging is leaking, and grass or bricks have been brought for the purpose of roofing, if one is able, it should be roofed. If one is unable, wherever there is a place that does not leak, having deposited the beds, chairs and the rest there, one should go. If the whole place leaks, one who is able should deposit them in the houses of lay followers within the village. If they too do not accept, saying "Venerable sir, property belonging to the Community is burdensome; we fear fire and such dangers," it is proper to go even after placing the bed upon stones in the open, depositing the rest in the manner previously stated, and covering them with grass and leaves. For whatever remains there, even a single piece, that will be of benefit to other monks who come there.

117. In the passage beginning with "in the precincts of a dwelling-place," the precincts of a dwelling-place means the compound. "Assembly hall" means the refectory of the compound. "Pavilion" means the pavilion of the compound. "At the root of a tree" means at the root of a tree within the compound. This method, for now, was stated in the Kurundi Commentary. Although it was stated thus, nevertheless, "dwelling-place" should be understood as the inner chamber or any other fully enclosed, protected lodging. "In the precincts of a dwelling-place" means in a nearby open space outside of it. "Or in the assembly hall" means or in the refectory. "Or in a pavilion" means in an unenclosed or even an enclosed pavilion where many assemble. Regarding "at the root of a tree," there is nothing special to be said. "There is an offence of wrong-doing" means: since, for one who spreads the tenfold sleeping place of the kind described and departs, having laid it out in a protected place such as the inner chamber, both the sleeping place and the lodging are destroyed by termites and become merely a heap of ant-hills, therefore an offence of expiation was stated. But for one who spreads it outside in the assembly hall and such places and departs, only the sleeping place itself would be lost, not the lodging, because the place is unprotected; therefore a wrong-doing was stated here. Regarding "a bed or a chair," since a bed or chair cannot be quickly consumed by

termites, therefore even for one who spreads it in a dwelling-place and departs, a wrong-doing was stated. But in the precincts of a dwelling-place, even those wandering about on a tour of the dwelling-place, having seen it, will put it away.

118. "One goes having removed it" - here, one who goes having removed it should go having taken away all the beds, seats, and door panels, having gathered them together and hung them on the robe-pole. A monk who comes afterwards and dwells there, having set up a bed or seat and lain down, when going should do likewise. One who dwells having set up bedding from inside the walls to outside the walls should, at the time of departure, put it back in the very place from which it was taken. The same method applies also for one who, having brought things down from the upper storey, dwells in the lower storey. Even when one has set up beds and seats in the night quarters and day quarters, at the time of departure they should be placed back in the very place from which they were taken.

"One goes having asked permission" - here is the determination of what should be asked permission for and what need not be asked permission for: As for a long hall or a leaf-hut that is on the ground, or a dwelling made on tree posts that is a place where termites can arise, one departing from there should depart only after having asked permission. For if that is not looked after for several days, termite mounds will form. But as for a dwelling made on a stone surface or on stone pillars, or a mountain cave, or a dwelling plastered with lime, where there is no fear of termites, it is allowable for one departing from there to go whether having asked permission or without having asked permission; but asking permission is the proper practice. If even in such a dwelling termites climb up on one side, one should go only after having asked permission. But when a visiting monk, following a monk who has taken and is dwelling in a communal dwelling, dwells without taking a dwelling for himself, as long as he does not take it, that dwelling is the responsibility of the former monk alone. But when he takes the dwelling and dwells under his own authority, from that point onwards it is the responsibility of the visiting monk alone. If both take it having divided it, it is the responsibility of both. But in the Mahāpaccarī it is said: "If two or three set it up together, at the time of departure permission should be asked by all. Among them, if the one going first goes having made the consideration 'the last one will look after it,' it is allowable. There is no release for the last one by mere consideration. When many send one person to have the bedding spread, at the time of departure permission should be asked by all, or one should be sent to ask permission. Having brought beds, seats, and so forth from another place and having dwelt elsewhere, at the time of departure they should be taken back to that very place. If, while one is dwelling having brought things from another residence, another more senior monk arrives, he should not be refused; one should say: 'Venerable sir, I brought this from another residence; please restore it to its original state.' When he accepts saying 'I shall do so,' it is allowable for the other to go. Thus, even when having taken things elsewhere, if one uses them as communal property and they are lost, worn out, or taken by thieves, there is no liability; but if one uses them as personal property, there is liability. But when one uses another's bed or seat, whether as communal property or as personal property, if it is lost, there is indeed liability."

"It is obstructed by anyone" means the dwelling is obstructed by any among senior monks, those in authority, yakkhas, lions, wild animals, black snakes, and so forth. "Having gone with expectation and remaining there, one asks permission; one is obstructed by anyone" means one who goes with the expectation 'I shall come back this very day and look after it,' having gone to the other side of a river or to another village, and standing right there where the intention to go arose, sends someone to ask permission; or one is obstructed and afflicted by any among floods, kings, thieves, and so forth, and is unable to return - for one in such a condition too there is no offence. The remainder is according to the method stated in the first training rule, together with the origins and so forth.

The second training rule on lodgings is the fifth.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Intruding

119. Regarding the sixth training rule - "Blocking" means going there first, carrying over their bowl and robe, obstructing and standing there. "Evicting the elder monks" means seizing them by the hem of the robe, saying "This is allotted to us, friend," and evicting them. "Having intruded upon, they prepared their sleeping place" means "Venerable sirs, only the bed space is allotted to you, not the entire dwelling. Now this space is allotted to us" - thus having intruded, having set up a bed and chair, they sit down, lie down, and also do their recitation.

120. "Knowing" means knowing "this one cannot be made to get up"; therefore in its analysis it is said "he knows 'he is an elder'" and so forth. For an elder cannot be made to get up because of his seniority, a sick monk because of his illness, and the Community, considering the great helpfulness of the storekeeper, or the distinction in qualities of the Dhamma-teacher, the Vinaya-expert and others, or of the group-reciter teacher, designates and gives a dwelling for permanent residence; therefore one to whom it has been given by the Community, he too cannot be made to get up. Although here the Community itself gives a suitable lodging even to a sick monk, the sick monk is mentioned separately to show that "even one who has not been given a lodging by the Community, having informed, should not be harassed but should be treated with compassion."

121. "Vicinity" here means: firstly, for beds and chairs, in a large dwelling the vicinity is one and a half cubits all around; in a small one, one and a half cubits from wherever there is space; for one entering after washing the feet and for one going out to urinate, the path of one and a half cubits in width from the foot-washing stone placed at the door and from the urinating place to the bed or chair is called the vicinity. In that vicinity of a bed or a chair, when a monk is standing, entering, or leaving that vicinity, whoever, wishing to prepare a sleeping place by intruding, spreads out or causes to spread out bedding, there is an offence of wrong-doing.

"He sits down on or lies down on" - here, by the mere act of sitting down or by the mere act of lying down, there is an offence requiring expiation. But if he does both, there are two offences requiring expiation. For each attempt of sitting down or lying down repeatedly, there is an offence requiring expiation for each attempt.

122. Regarding "setting aside the vicinity, he spreads out or causes to spread out bedding" - in this and in the subsequent wrong-doing cases beginning with "in the precincts of a dwelling-place," just as here the classification of offences requiring expiation has been stated for the mere act of sitting down, the mere act of lying down, the doing of both, and the different modes of effort, so too should the classification of wrong-doing offences be understood. For there is no purpose in such an incompatible person dwelling in the same dwelling-place or in the same compound; therefore his residence is prohibited everywhere. Regarding "belonging to another individual" - here too, the personal belonging of one with whom one is on intimate terms is just like one's own personal belonging; therein there is no offence.

123. "In misfortunes" means if there is danger to the life or to the holy life of one dwelling outside, in such misfortunes whoever enters, for him too there is no offence. The remainder is clear in itself. It has the origin of the first pārājika, it is an act of commission, it has release through perception, it is with intention, it is a worldly fault, it is bodily action, it is with unwholesome consciousness, and it has painful feeling.

The training rule on intruding is the sixth.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Ejecting

126. In the seventh training rule - "With one effort, even if he makes him pass through many doors" means in the case of mansions of four or five storeys, or halls with six or seven gatehouses, or quadrangles, in such dwellings, having seized him by the hands or by the neck and placing him in between, he makes him pass through with one effort - there is only one offence requiring expiation. For one who makes him pass through by separate efforts, placing him down again and again, there are offences requiring expiation according to the number of doors. The same method applies also to one who, without touching him with the hand, throws him out by speech, saying "Get out!"

"He commands another" means here, at the mere command "Throw this one out!" there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he, having been commanded once, makes him pass through even many doors, there is one offence requiring expiation. But if he is commanded with a specification thus: "Throw him out through so many doors" or "Throw him out as far as the main door," there are offences requiring expiation according to the number of doors.

"His requisites" means whatever belongs to him, of the various kinds such as bowl, robe, water-strainer, blowing-tube, bed, chair, mattress, pillow, and so forth, down to even a dyeing rag; whoever throws them out or has them thrown out; there are offences of wrong-doing according to the number of items. But when they are tied firmly together and placed, there is only one offence - this was stated in the Mahāpaccaṇḍī.

127. "Belonging to another individual" - here too, what belongs to a trusted individual is just the same as what belongs to oneself as an individual. And as it is here; so it is everywhere. But where there will be a distinction, there we shall explain.

128. Regarding "throws out a shameless one" and so forth, one is permitted to throw out only a maker of quarrels and a maker of disputes from the entire monastery of the community, for having gained a faction, he might even split the community. However, shameless ones and the like should be thrown out only from their own dwelling place; it is not proper to throw them out from the entire monastery of the community. "For a mad man" means there is no offence for one who is himself mad. The remainder 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 fault; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is painful feeling.

The training rule on evicting is the seventh.

8. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning an Elevated Hut

129. Regarding the eighth training rule - "In an upper chamber" means in a two-storeyed building or a three-storeyed or higher building with an uncovered upper floor. "Hastily sat down on a bed" means having forcefully overwhelmed and pressed down upon the bed, he sat down. Or this accusative expression is used in the locative sense; the meaning is "he sat down on the bed." "Abhi" here is merely a prefix for the purpose of embellishing the word. "Having fallen off" means having fallen down or having come out. For no pin had been inserted above it, therefore it came out. "Let out a cry of distress" means he made an unpleasant sound of distress.

131. "An upper chamber, by name, is one that does not touch the head of a middling man" means one whose lowest beams do not touch the head of a man of middling stature. By this, the upper chamber intended here has been shown, not the characteristic of an upper chamber. For whatever hut with an uncut upper floor, whether two-storeyed or three-storeyed and so on, is called "an upper chamber." But here, one that does not touch the head is intended. Regarding sitting down and so on, the distinction of offences according to the effort should be understood in the same manner as stated before.

133. "For an upper chamber" means there is no offence in the case of leaf huts and the like built on the ground. For it is not possible to cause distress to others there. "Where the head touches" means where the head touches, there too is no offence. For it is not possible to move about in the lower storey without bending down, therefore, because it is not a place for walking about, there will be no distress to others. "Below is unfit for use" means where below is unfit for use because timber materials and the like have been stored there, there too is no offence. "Is covered with boards" means where the upper floor is thickly covered with wooden planks, or has been finished with plaster and the like, there too is no offence. "Pegs have been given" means pegs have been inserted at the tops of the legs of beds and chairs, where even when one sits down they do not fall out; there is no offence even in sitting on such beds and chairs. "Standing on that" means one standing on a bed or chair with removable legs takes a robe or something hung on wall-pegs and the like above, or hangs something else; for that too there is no offence. The remainder is clear in itself. The origin of the sheep's wool rule - It originates from body and from

body-and-mind; it is an act of doing; it is not release through perception; it is without consciousness; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it involves three types of consciousness; it involves three types of feeling.

The training rule on an upper-storey hut is the eighth.

9. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning a Large Monastery

135. Regarding the ninth training rule - "Up to the door-frame" - here, the door-frame means the space around the door-post equal to the width of the door-panel on all sides. In the Mahāpaccarī, however, it is said: "One and a half cubits starting from the door-post." In the Kurundī, however: "On both sides of the door, the measure of the door-panel." In the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā it is said: "A door-panel may be one and a half cubits, or two cubits, or two and a half cubits." That is well said. For it is with reference to that very point that the Blessed One also made this maximum specification: "Around the door-post, within arm's reach." "For fixing the door-bolt" means for fixing the door-fastening with its own panel; the meaning is: for the purpose of making the door-fastening with its own panel stable. "For fixing the door" - this word-analysis too is spoken with reference to this very meaning. Now here this is the intention - For a door-panel that turns easily strikes the wall when being opened, and strikes the door-fastening when being closed. By that striking, the wall shakes, and from that the plaster loosens, and having loosened, it either becomes loose or falls off. Therefore the Blessed One said: "Up to the door-frame, for fixing the door-bolt." Therein, although "this is to be done" is stated neither in the matrix nor in the word-analysis, yet from the origin story where it says "he had it roofed again and again, he had it plastered again and again," the meaning should be understood thus: up to the door-frame, for fixing the door-bolt, it should be plastered or caused to be plastered again and again.

Now as to what is said in the word-analysis: "Around the door-post, within arm's reach." Therein, for one whose door is in the middle and whose wall is high in the upper part, the surrounding area within arm's reach extends in three directions; for a small dwelling, the surrounding area extends in two directions. Even there, the wall which the door-panel strikes when being opened may have less than the full surrounding area. But by the maximum specification, plastering is permitted within arm's reach around in three directions for the purpose of making the door stable. If, however, there is also a space for plastering in the lower part of that door, it is proper to plaster that too. "For the preliminary work on the windows" - here, "windows" refers to the shutters of the ventilation openings; they too, when being opened, strike a section of wall of a span's measure or even more. The surrounding area here, however, is obtained in all directions; therefore, a space equal to the width of the shutter in all directions should be plastered or caused to be plastered for the purpose of the preliminary work on the windows - this is the intention here.

"White colour" and so forth is not a word-analysis of the matrix. For by this, it is permitted in the word-analysis itself that there is no such thing as excessiveness for a dwelling; therefore all of this may be done as one wishes.

Having thus shown what is to be done in the plastering work, in order to show what is to be done regarding the roofing, "two or three layers of roofing" and so forth is said. Therein, "two or three layers of roofing" means two or three layers of roofing;"layer" is called a covering; the meaning is that two coverings or three coverings should be determined. "Standing where there is little green vegetation" means standing where there is no green vegetation. "Green vegetation" - here, what is intended is early crops consisting of the seven kinds of grain, and later crops consisting of mung beans, black beans, sesame, horse gram, gourds, pumpkins, and so forth. Therefore he said - "Green vegetation means early crops and later crops."

As for "if standing on green vegetation he determines, there is an offence of wrongdoing," here, even in a field where sown seed has not yet sprouted, or will sprout when the rains have fallen, that too is reckoned as green vegetation. Therefore, even standing in such a field one should not determine; one should determine only while standing where there is no green vegetation. Therein too, this is the delimitation: sitting on the ridge-pole, or on the pinnacle of the gabled roof, or beside the finial above, looking down along the edge of the roofing eave, the ground area where one sees a person standing, and the ground area where a person standing sees the one seated above - in that place one should determine. Within that area, even standing where there is no green vegetation, it is not allowable to determine. Why? Because this is the area where the dwelling would fall.

136. "For one roofing by rows" - here, roofing by rows means roofing straight across without encircling; that is obtained with bricks, stones, and plaster. "Having determined two rows" - if the two rows are poorly roofed, it is permissible to remove them and roof again and again; therefore, as one wishes, having thus determined two rows, having commanded the third row saying "Now roof it in this way," one should depart. "By layers" means by encircling. Such roofing, however, is obtained with grass and leaves. Therefore, here too, as one wishes, having determined two layers, having commanded the third layer saying "Now roof it in this way," one should depart. If one does not depart, one should stand in silence. And all this roofing should be understood as roofing upon roofing. For they roof in this way thinking that a dwelling roofed layer upon layer will be free from leaking for a long time. "If beyond that" means upon the fourth row or layer, above the three rows or layers.

137. "For each bundle" means for each handful of grass. The remainder here is clear in itself. Six origins - it is an act, not release by cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action, verbal action, three types of consciousness, three types of feeling.

The training rule on a large monastery is the ninth.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Living Beings

140. Regarding the tenth training rule - "Knowingly, containing living beings" means knowing in whatever way that it contains living beings. "Should pour or have poured" means one should either pour that water oneself, or having commanded another, have it poured. However, in the canonical text, the meaning of such statements as "should pour means one pours oneself" should be understood according to the method stated previously.

Therein, for one pouring without breaking the stream, from one water pot there is only one offence. This method applies to all vessels. But for one who breaks the stream, there is an offence with each effort. If one directs a channel towards it, even if it flows for a whole day, there is only one offence. If one dams it here and there and diverts it from one place to another, there is an offence with each effort. Even if one throws grass amounting to a cartload into the water with a single effort, there is only one offence. For one throwing in each piece of grass or leaf, there is an offence with each effort. The same method applies to clay and also to other things such as sticks, cow dung, and so forth. However, this is not stated with reference to a large body of water; it should be understood as stated with reference to such water that becomes exhausted when grass or clay is thrown in, or becomes turbid, where living beings die. 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 correct perception; it is with consciousness; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it has three types of consciousness; it has three types of feeling.

The training rule on water containing living beings is the tenth.

The second chapter on lodgings is completed in the order of the exposition.

3. The Chapter on Exhortation

1. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Instruction

141-144. In the first training rule of the Chapter on Nuns - "They become gainers" - here the nuns neither give to them nor cause others to give to them, but daughters of good families who have gone forth from great families, when relatives and people who have come into their presence ask "From whom, noble ladies, do you receive instruction, recitation, and questioning?", having pointed out the eighty great disciples saying "Such and such an elder instructs," they speak, following the course of conversation, of those elders' existing virtues distinguished by virtue, learning, conduct, birth, clan, and so forth. For it is proper to speak of existing virtues of such a kind. Thereupon, people with confident minds brought great gains and honours of various kinds such as robes to the elders. Therefore it was said - "They become gainers of robes" etc. requisites."

"Having approached the nuns" - it seems that not even one nun among them came into their presence, but with hearts drawn by craving for gain, they went to the nuns' dwelling. With reference to that it was said - "Having approached the nuns." Those nuns too, due to their fickleness of mind, did as they said. Therefore it was said - "Then those nuns" etc. "sat down." "Pointless talk" - talk that is obstructive even to the path leading to heaven and the path, being manifold useless talk such as talk about kings and so forth. "Successful" means prosperous, with coherent meaning, profound, of many flavours, connected with the penetration of characteristics - this is the intended meaning.

145-147. Regarding "I allow, monks" - here, because those monks, being told "Do not, monks, exhort the nuns," not having seen the truth, might have bound resentment against the Truth-finder and become destined for the lower realms,

therefore the Blessed One, avoiding that destination to the lower realms for them, wishing to exclude them from the exhortation of nuns by another means, should be understood as allowing this authorisation of an exhorter of nuns. Thus, having allowed here with the wish to exclude them, and actually doing so further on, he said "I allow, monks, one possessed of eight factors" and so forth. For these eight factors had never existed even in a dream for the group of six monks.

Therein, "he has virtue" means virtuous. Now, showing what that virtue is and how it is said to exist in him, he said "restrained by the Pātimokkha restraint" and so forth. Therein, the Pātimokkha itself as restraint is the Pātimokkha restraint. "Restrained by the Pātimokkha restraint, possessed of it" is the meaning of "restrained by the Pātimokkha restraint."

"He dwells" means he lives. For this was said in the Vibhaṅga -

"Pātimokkha means virtue, foundation, beginning, conduct, self-control, restraint, the foremost, the chief, for the attainment of wholesome states; restraint means bodily non-transgression, verbal non-transgression, bodily and verbal non-transgression. Restrained means by this Pātimokkha restraint he is endowed, fully endowed, reached, fully reached, attained, fully attained, accomplished, possessed of it; therefore it is said 'restrained by the Pātimokkha restraint.' He dwells means he moves, lives, maintains, sustains, carries on, conducts himself, dwells; therefore it is said 'he dwells.'"

"Accomplished in conduct and resort" means accomplished with conduct that prevents wrong livelihood, not by conduct such as giving bamboo and so forth, and having abandoned improper resort such as prostitutes and so forth, accomplished with resort such as families endowed with faith and so forth. "Seeing danger in the slightest faults" means seeing danger in the smallest faults; the meaning is that he is one whose habit is to see those faults as dangers. "Having undertaken, he trains in the training rules" means that in the training rules established in three ways as the higher training in virtue and so forth, having undertaken each training rule, having properly undertaken it, having well grasped it, without abandoning it, he trains - this is the meaning. This is the summary here; but the detail, whoever wishes it, should take it from the Visuddhimagga.

"He has heard much" means one of great learning. "He retains what is heard" means a retainer of what is heard; that which is called his much learning is not merely hearing alone; rather, he retains it - this is the meaning. "What is heard is accumulated in me like a jewel in a casket" means one in whom learning is accumulated. By this, he shows that what he retains of what is heard, like a jewel stored and accumulated in a casket, is not destroyed even over a long period of time. Now, showing that learning in its own nature, he said "those teachings" and so forth; that is according to the method stated in the Verañja section. But here the conclusion is this - such teachings are well learned by him, therefore he is of great learning. He retains them, therefore he is a retainer of what is heard. Familiarised by speech, contemplated by mind, well penetrated by view; therefore he is one in whom learning is accumulated. Therein, "familiarised by speech" means made well-practised by

recitation. "Contemplated by mind" means examined by mind; for one who reflects, they are as if illuminated by a thousand lamps. "Well penetrated by view" means they are well penetrated by wisdom as to meaning and reason, made clearly evident.

Now, this learned one is of three kinds - one released from dependence, one who establishes an assembly, and an exhorter of nuns. Therein, for one released from dependence, within five years from higher ordination as the absolute minimum limit, two summaries must be made well-learned and recited by heart; from the discourses, four recitation portions for the purpose of hearing the Dhamma on observance days; one course of discourse similar to the *Andhakavinda*, *Mahārāhulovāda*, and *Ambaṭṭha* for the purpose of giving talks to those who have arrived; three rejoicings for the purpose of giving thanks at community meals, auspicious and inauspicious occasions; the determination of valid and invalid acts for the purpose of knowing the observance, invitation, and so forth; one meditation subject culminating in arahantship by way of either concentration or insight for the purpose of practising the ascetic's duty - this much should be learned. For to this extent one is learned and free to go in all four directions, able to dwell anywhere by one's own authority.

For one who establishes an assembly, within ten years from higher ordination as the absolute minimum limit, the two *Vibhaṅgas* must be made well-learned and recited by heart in order to train the assembly in the Discipline; if unable, they should be made capable of being reviewed with three persons; and the determination of valid and invalid acts and the *Khandhaka* procedures should be learned. For the purpose of training the assembly in the *Abhidhamma*, if one is a reciter of the *Majjhima*, the *Mūlapaṇṇāsaka* should be learned; by a reciter of the *Dīgha*, the *Mahāvagga*; by a reciter of the *Saṃyutta*, either the lower three sections or the *Mahāvagga*; by a reciter of the *Aṅguttara*, either the lower or upper half of the collection should be learned; if unable, it is suitable to learn from the Book of Threes downwards. In the *Mahāpaccarī*, however, it is said: "For one learning a single collection, it is suitable to take up either the Book of Fours or the Book of Fives." By a reciter of the *Jātaka*, the *Jātaka* together with its commentary should be learned; less than that is not suitable. It is also suitable to learn the *Dhammapada* together with its background stories - so it is said in the *Mahāpaccarī*. Is it suitable or not suitable to make a compilation from here and there amounting to the *Mūlapaṇṇāsaka*? "It is not suitable" - this is rejected in the *Kurundi Commentary*; in the others there is no discussion at all. It is not said that anything from the *Abhidhamma* should be learned. But for one who has mastered the *Vinaya Piṭaka* together with its commentary and the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*, yet does not have the prescribed text in the discourses, he is not permitted to establish an assembly. But one by whom the prescribed amount of text from the discourses and the *Vinaya* has been learned - this one is a learned one who establishes an assembly, a leader of a region, free to go wherever he wishes, and is permitted to establish an assembly.

For an exhorter of nuns, the three *Piṭakas* together with their commentaries should be learned; if unable, the commentary of one among the four *Nikāyas* should be made well-learned, for by means of one *Nikāya* one will be able to discuss questions in the remaining *Nikāyas* as well. Among the seven treatises, the commentary of the four treatises should be made well-learned, for by the method obtained therein one will be

able to discuss questions in the remaining treatises. The Vinaya Piṭaka, however, has diverse meanings and diverse reasons, therefore it must be made well-learnt together with its commentary. To this extent, an exhorter of nuns is called learned.

"Both for him" and so forth - since even when there is great learning in the entire ninefold teaching, without the Vinaya Piṭaka together with its commentary it is not suitable at all, therefore it is stated separately. Therein, "in detail" means together with the Ubhatovibhaṅga. "Well-mastered" means thoroughly learnt. To show how what has been learnt becomes well-mastered, "well-analysed" and so forth is stated. Therein, "well-analysed" means thoroughly analysed, free from the fault of confused and misplaced words and phrases. "Well-recited" means well-learnt and recited by heart. "Well-determined as to the discourses" means well-determined by way of the discourses to be drawn from the Khandhakas and Parivāra. "As to the syllables" means well-determined with completeness of syllables and words, unbroken and with letters not transposed. By this the commentary is indicated, for this determination comes from the commentary.

"Of pleasant speech" means endowed with well-rounded words and syllables, with urbane speech spoken according to the proper arrangement of soft and aspirated sounds and so forth, fluent, free from dribbling, and capable of conveying the meaning. "Of pleasant delivery" means sweet-voiced, for womenfolk delight in excellence of voice, therefore even speech with well-rounded words and syllables, if devoid of excellence of voice, they despise. "For the most part dear and agreeable to the nuns" means being dear to all is rare, but through the accomplishment of virtue and conduct one is dear and inspiring to the greater number of wise nuns. "Capable of exhorting the nuns" means showing both discourse and reasoning, having admonished with the fear of the round of existence, one is able to exhort the nuns and teach such Dhamma. "To one wearing the ochre robe" means to one clothed in ochre cloth. "A serious offence" means one who has not previously committed bodily contact with a nun or sexual intercourse with female probationers or female novices during the household life. For womenfolk, remembering what was done before, do not show respect for the Dhamma teaching even of one established in restraint. Or else they arouse the mind towards that very unwholesome act. "Of twenty years or" means of twenty years from higher ordination, or of more years than that. For one of such nature, even though repeatedly encountering unsuitable objects, does not suddenly reach the destruction of virtue like a young one, and having reflected upon one's own age, is capable of removing desire and lust in an improper situation; therefore it is said - "He is of twenty years or of more than twenty years."

Herein, "virtuous" and so on is the first factor, "learned" and so on is the second, "both of which" and so on is the third, "of pleasant speech and pleasant delivery" is the fourth, "loved and agreeable to the majority of nuns" is the fifth, "capable of exhorting nuns" is the sixth, "not however" and so on is the seventh, and "of twenty years' standing" and so on is the eighth - thus it should be understood.

148. "By a legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by three proclamations" means as already stated in the preceding matter. "With the rules of respect" means with weighty rules; for they are called "rules of respect" because they must be accepted by nuns with reverence. "One ordained unilaterally" means here, regarding one ordained unilaterally in the presence of nuns, whoever exhorts with a rule of

respect, for him there is an offence of wrong-doing. But regarding one ordained in the presence of monks, it is just as stated in the matter.

149. "Having swept the residential cell" means if in the morning it has not been swept, or even if it has been swept but has become soiled again with grass, leaves and the like, and sand has been scattered about by footsteps, it should be swept. For seeing it unswept, those nuns might become as if unwilling to listen, thinking "The venerable one does not engage even his own dependent junior monks in the practice of duties, but only teaches the Dhamma." Therefore it was said - "Having swept the residential cell." But nuns coming from within the village are thirsty and weary, and they expect drinking water and something to cool their hands, feet and face; and when these are not available, generating disrespect in the same manner as before, they become unwilling to listen. Therefore it was said - "Having set out drinking water and water for washing."

"Seat" means having prepared a seat of various kinds such as a low stool, a plank, a mat, a wicker chair and so forth, even a branch of a tree at the very least, thinking "This will be a seat for them." But a companion is to be desired for the purpose of freeing from offences in Dhamma teaching. Therefore it was said - "Having taken a companion, he should sit down." "Should sit down" means not at the edge of the monastery, but rather in the middle of the monastery, at the door of the Upasatha hall or the dining hall, at a place accessible to all, one should sit down. "Are you in unity" means "have all of you come" - this is the meaning. "Are being observed" means they are practised; the meaning is that they are well-learned and mastered verbally. "Should be handed over" means it should be conveyed. "Should be reinstated" means the text should be recited. "A nun who has been fully ordained for a hundred years" and so forth is a demonstration of the text to be recited.

Therein, "proper duties" means the fitting conduct such as giving way on the path, fanning, asking about drinking water and the like. And here, a nun's paying respect to a monk is to be done whether inside the village or outside the village, whether inside the monastery or outside the monastery, whether inside a house or on the street, even when a royal procession is taking place, even when it is raining, even on muddy ground, even when holding an umbrella and a fan, even when followed by elephants, horses and the like. Having seen them entering for the alms round in a single continuous line, it is proper to pay respect at one place saying "I pay respect, venerable sir." If they go leaving a gap of twelve cubits between them, respect should be paid to each one separately. When they are seated at a great assembly, it is proper to pay respect at just one place. This same method applies also to the salutation with joined palms. But wherever she is seated, rising up should be done, and each of those proper duties should be performed at the appropriate place and time for each respective duty.

"Having honoured" means having done it in such a way that what is done is well done. "Having respected" means having generated reverence therein. "Having revered" means having made it dear through esteem. "Having venerated" means having venerated by the performance of these very three duties. "Not to be transgressed" means it should not be violated.

"In a residence without monks" - here, if monks who give exhortation do not dwell within half a yojana from the nuns' dwelling, this is called a residence without monks. One should not spend the rains retreat here. For this was said: "A residence without monks means it is not possible to go for exhortation or for communal living." Nor is it possible to go beyond that distance, having gone after the meal, to hear the Dhamma and return. If nuns not wishing to spend the rains retreat there, and relatives or supporters speak thus - "Dwell here, noble ladies, we shall bring monks" - this is allowable. If, however, monks wishing to enter the rains retreat in the aforementioned area, having come, have stayed even in a leaf-branch pavilion for one night; not having been invited and wishing to go. Even to this extent it is a residence with monks, and it is allowable to enter the rains retreat here. And those entering should request the monks on the thirteenth of the fortnight itself - "We, venerable sirs, shall spend the rains under your exhortation." But when the dwelling place of monks is half a yojana by the direct road, and for those going by that road there is danger to life or danger to the holy life, and for those going by another road it is more than half a yojana, this remains in the category of a residence without monks. If, however, at a distance of a quarter yojana from there, there is another nuns' dwelling in a safe place, those nuns, having requested those monks, should go again and request the monks - "Venerable sirs, there is danger on our direct road, and by another road it is more than half a yojana. But on the road between, at a distance of a quarter yojana from our dwelling, there is another nuns' dwelling; we shall spend the rains under the exhortation received from the venerable sirs there." This should be accepted by those monks. Then those nuns, having come to that nuns' dwelling, should perform the Observance, or having seen those monks, it is also allowable to go to their own dwelling and perform it.

If, however, monks wishing to enter the rains retreat come to the monastery on the fourteenth, and being asked by the nuns "Will you spend the rains retreat here, venerable sirs?" having said "Yes," and then being told by them "Then, venerable sirs, we too shall spend the rains following your exhortation," on the second day, not seeing the prospect of almsfood in the village, they depart saying "It is not possible to dwell here." Then those nuns, having gone to the monastery on the Observance day, do not see monks - what should be done here? One should go to where monks are dwelling and enter the later rains retreat there. Or, having considered "They will come to enter the later rains retreat," one should dwell under the exhortation of those who have come. If, however, none come even for the later rains retreat, and on the road between there is fear of kings or fear of thieves or famine, there is an offence for one dwelling in a residence without monks, and there is an offence for one who goes having broken the rains retreat - she should be protected. For it has been said that there is no offence for one dwelling in a residence without monks in times of danger. If monks who have come and entered the rains retreat depart again for some reason, one should continue to dwell there. For this was said: "There is no offence if monks who have entered the rains retreat have departed, or have disrobed, or have died, or have gone over to another faction, or in times of danger, for one who is insane, or for one who is the original perpetrator." But when inviting, one should go to where monks are and invite there.

"Every half-month" means in each half-month. "Two things should be expected" means two things should be desired. "Asking as to the Observance" means the asking

about the Observance; therein, for a fifteenth-day Observance one should go on the fourteenth of the fortnight, and for a fourteenth-day Observance on the thirteenth, and ask about the Observance. But in the Mahāpaccarī it is said: "Having gone on the thirteenth of the fortnight itself, one should ask 'Is this Observance on the fourteenth or the fifteenth?'" On the Observance day one should approach for the purpose of exhortation. But from the first day of the fortnight onwards, one should go for the purpose of hearing the Dhamma. Thus the Blessed One, not giving opportunity for any other activity, laid down the continuous going of nuns to the presence of monks. Why? Because of the weak wisdom of womankind. For womankind is of weak wisdom, therefore constant hearing of the Dhamma is of great benefit. And this being so, not making conceit thinking "What we know, the venerable sirs also know," attending closely upon the community of monks, they will make the going forth fruitful; therefore the Blessed One acted thus. The nuns too, thinking "We shall practise as instructed," all of them continuously approached the monastery. For this was said:

Now at that time the entire community of nuns went for exhortation. People criticised, complained, and spread it about: "These are their wives, these are their mistresses, now they will enjoy themselves with them." They reported this matter to the Blessed One: "Monks, the exhortation should not be gone to by the entire community of nuns. If they should go, there is an offence of wrong-doing. I allow, monks, four or five nuns to go for exhortation." Again they criticised in the same way. Again the Blessed One said: "I allow, monks, two or three nuns to go for exhortation."

Therefore the community of nuns, having requested two or three nuns, should send them - "Go, ladies, request the community of monks for the approach for exhortation: 'The community of nuns, venerable sirs, etc. the approach for exhortation.'" Those nuns should go to the monastery. Then, having approached and paid respect to one monk who is the receiver of the exhortation, that monk should be addressed by one nun thus: "Venerable sir, the community of nuns pays respect at the feet of the community of monks and requests the approach for exhortation. May the community of nuns, venerable sir, obtain the approach for exhortation." By that monk, having approached the monk who recites the Pātimokkha, he should be addressed thus: "Venerable sir, the community of nuns pays respect at the feet of the community of monks and requests the approach for exhortation. May the community of nuns, venerable sir, obtain the approach for exhortation." By the Pātimokkha reciter it should be said: "Is there any monk authorised as an exhorter of nuns?" If there is any monk authorised as an exhorter of nuns, by the Pātimokkha reciter it should be said: "The monk named so-and-so is authorised as an exhorter of nuns. Let the community of nuns approach him."

If there is no monk authorised as an exhorter of nuns, the reciter of the Pātimokkha should say - "Which venerable one is willing to exhort the nuns?" If any monk is willing to exhort the nuns, and he is endowed with eight qualities, having authorised him, it should be said - "The monk named so-and-so is authorised as an exhorter of nuns. Let the community of nuns approach him."

If, however, no one is willing to exhort the nuns, by the Pātimokkha reciter it should be said - "There is no monk authorised as an exhorter of nuns. Let the community of nuns conduct itself in an inspiring manner." For by this much the teaching comprising the entire threefold training has been announced. By that monk, having accepted saying "Very well," on the first day of the fortnight the nuns should be informed. The community of nuns too should send those nuns: "Go, ladies, ask: 'Venerable sir, does the community of nuns obtain the approach for exhortation?' " By them, having accepted saying "Yes, ladies," having gone to the monastery, having approached that monk, it should be said thus - "Venerable sir, does the community of nuns obtain the approach for exhortation?" By him it should be said - "There is no monk authorised as an exhorter of nuns. Let the community of nuns conduct itself in an inspiring manner." By them it should be accepted saying "Very well, venerable sirs." This was said with reference to those who came together. Among them, however, by one nun it should be spoken and accepted, the other being her companion.

But if the community of nuns or the community of monks is not complete, or on both sides there is merely a group or merely an individual, or a single nun has been sent for the purpose of exhortation from several nuns' residences, herein this is the order of speech - "Venerable sir, the nuns pay respect at the feet of the community of monks, and request the approaching for exhortation. May the nuns, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation." "Venerable sir, I pay respect at the feet of the community of monks; and I request the approaching for exhortation. May I, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation."

"Venerable sir, the community of nuns pays respect at the feet of the venerable ones, and requests the approaching for exhortation. May the community of nuns, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation." "Venerable sir, the nuns pay respect at the feet of the venerable ones, and request the approaching for exhortation. May the nuns, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation." "Venerable sir, I pay respect at the feet of the venerable ones, and I request the approaching for exhortation. May I, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation."

"Venerable sir, the community of nuns pays respect at the feet of the venerable one, and requests the approaching for exhortation. May the community of nuns, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation." "Venerable sir, the nuns pay respect at the feet of the venerable one; and request the approaching for exhortation. May the nuns, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation." "Venerable sir, I pay respect at the feet of the venerable one, and I request the approaching for exhortation. May I, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation."

"Venerable sir, the community of nuns and the nuns and the nun pay respect at the feet of the community of monks, of the venerable ones, of the venerable one, and request the approaching for exhortation. May the community of nuns and the nuns and the nun, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation."

By that monk too, at the time of the Observance, it should be said thus - "Venerable sir, the nuns pay respect at the feet of the community of monks, and request the approaching for exhortation. May the nuns, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for

exhortation." "Venerable sir, the nun pays respect at the feet of the community of monks, and requests the approaching for exhortation. May the nun, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation."

"Venerable sir, the community of nuns, venerable sir, the nuns, venerable sir, the nun pays respect at the feet of the venerable ones, and requests the approaching for exhortation. May the nun, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation."

"Venerable sir, the community of nuns and the nuns and the nun pay respect at the feet of the community of monks, of the venerable ones, and request the approaching for exhortation. May the community of nuns and the nuns and the nun, venerable sir, obtain the approaching for exhortation."

By the reciter of the Pātimokkha too, if there is an authorised monk, it should be said in the former manner: "Let the nuns approach him, let the nun approach him, let the community of nuns and the nuns and the nun approach him." If there is none, it should be said: "Let the community of nuns and the nuns and the nun fulfil with what is inspiring."

By the receiver of the exhortation, having reported back on the first day of the fortnight, it should be said in the same way. But except for the ignorant, the ill, and the traveller, another monk, even if he is a forest-dweller, is not permitted to not accept the exhortation. For this was said by the Blessed One -

"I allow, monks, except for the ignorant, except for the ill, except for the traveller, the rest should accept the exhortation."

Therein, one who wishes to go on the Observance days of the fourteenth or fifteenth, or on the first day of the fortnight, he is a traveller. Even one going on the second day of the fortnight is not permitted to not accept it. He indeed incurs the offence stated as "Monks, the exhortation should not be not accepted. Whoever does not accept it, there is an offence of wrong-doing." And having accepted the exhortation, it is not proper to not announce it in the Observance hall or to not report it back to the nuns on the first day of the fortnight. For this was said:

"Monks, the exhortation should not be not reported. Whoever should not report, there is an offence of wrong-doing."

Furthermore it was said -

"Monks, the exhortation should not be not reported back. Whoever should not report back, there is an offence of wrong-doing."

Therein, an arrangement should be made by the forest-dwelling monk for the purpose of conveying back. For this was said: "I allow, monks, for a forest-dwelling monk to accept the exhortation, and to make an arrangement, 'I shall convey it back here.'" Therefore, if the forest-dwelling monk obtains almsfood in the village where the nuns reside, having walked for alms right there, having seen the nuns and informed them, he should go. If almsfood is not easily obtainable there for him, having walked for alms in a neighbouring village, having come to the nuns' village, the same should be done. If he has to go far, an arrangement should be made - "I shall go to such-and-such a meeting hall or pavilion or foot of a tree at the entrance

of your village; you should come there." The nuns should go there; not going is not allowable. For this was said: "Monks, a nun should not fail to go to the appointed place. Whoever should not go, there is an offence of wrong-doing."

Regarding "she should invite admonishment before both communities on three grounds" - herein, the nuns, having invited admonishment among themselves on the fourteenth, should invite admonishment before the community of monks on the Observance day. For this was said:

"I allow, monks, having invited admonishment today, to invite admonishment before the community of monks the following day."

And herein the decision should be understood in the same manner as stated in the Chapter on Nuns. For this was said:

"Now at that time the entire community of nuns, while inviting admonishment, created an uproar. They reported this matter to the Blessed One. I allow, monks, to authorise one nun who is competent and capable to invite admonishment before the community of monks on behalf of the community of nuns. And thus, monks, they should be authorised. First a nun should be requested, having requested, an experienced and competent nun should inform the Community -

'Let the community hear me, venerable ladies. If the community is ready, the community should authorise the nun named so-and-so to invite admonishment before the community of monks on behalf of the community of nuns. This is the motion.

'Let the community hear me, venerable ladies. The community authorises the nun named so-and-so to invite admonishment before the community of monks on behalf of the community of nuns. If the authorisation of the nun of such and such a name to invite admonishment from the community of monks for the benefit of the community of nuns is agreeable to the lady, she should remain silent; she to whom it is not agreeable should speak.

"The nun of such and such a name has been authorized by the Community to invite the community of monks to admonish on behalf of the community of nuns. It is agreeable to the Community, therefore they are silent, thus I remember it."

That authorised nun, taking the community of nuns, having approached the community of monks, having arranged the upper robe over one shoulder, having raised joined palms, should say thus - "The community of nuns, venerable sir, invites admonishment before the community of monks - by what is seen or by what is heard or by suspicion. Let the community of monks speak to the community of nuns out of compassion; seeing, it will make amends. For a second time, venerable sir, for a third time, venerable sir, the community of nuns etc. will make amends."

If the community of nuns is not complete, "The nuns, venerable sir, invite admonishment from the community of monks - by what is seen or by what is heard or by suspicion. Let the community of monks speak to the nuns out of compassion;

seeing, they will make amends." And "I, venerable sir, invite admonishment from the community of monks - by what is seen or by what is heard or by suspicion. Let the community of monks speak to me, venerable sir, out of compassion; seeing, I will make amends." Thus it should be said three times.

If the community of monks is not complete, "The community of nuns, venerable sirs, invites admonishment from the venerable ones - by what is seen or by what is heard or by suspicion. Let the venerable ones speak to the community of nuns out of compassion; seeing, it will make amends." And "The community of nuns, venerable sir, invites admonishment from the venerable one - by what is seen or by what is heard or by suspicion. Let the venerable one speak to the community of nuns out of compassion; seeing, it will make amends." Thus it should be said three times.

When neither is complete, "The nuns, venerable sirs, invite admonishment from the venerable ones - by what is seen or by what is heard or by suspicion. Let the venerable ones speak to the nuns out of compassion; seeing, they will make amends." And "The nuns, venerable sir, invite admonishment from the venerable one - by what is seen or by what is heard or by suspicion. Let the venerable one speak to the nuns out of compassion; seeing, they will make amends." And "I, venerable sirs, invite admonishment from the venerable ones - by what is seen or by what is heard or by suspicion. Let the venerable ones speak to me out of compassion; seeing, I will make amends." And "I, venerable sir, invite admonishment from the venerable one - by what is seen or by what is heard or by suspicion. Let the venerable one speak to me out of compassion; seeing, I will make amends." Thus it should be said three times.

The undertaking of penance and the seeking of full ordination will become clear in their respective places.

"By a nun by any method" means a monk should neither be reviled by the ten grounds of abuse nor by any other method, nor should he be reproached, nor should he be threatened with fear. "Closed" means shut off, barred, prohibited. Speech itself is the path of speech. "Not closed" means not shut off, not barred, not prohibited. Therefore, a nun, standing in a position of authority or in a position of seniority, should not by any method admonish or instruct a monk, saying "Go forward thus, go back thus, dress your lower robe thus, wear your upper robe thus." But having seen a fault, it is proper to point out the existing fault by such a method as "Formerly the great elders did not go forward thus, did not go back thus, did not dress their lower robes thus, did not wear their upper robes thus, did not wear such ochre robes, did not apply eye-ointment thus." But it is proper for monks to admonish and instruct a nun as they please, saying "This senior nun dresses her lower robe thus, wears her upper robe thus; do not dress your lower robe thus, do not wear your upper robe thus, do not do such things as decorative marks and leaf-work."

"When they say 'We are in unity, venerable sir'" means the community of nuns saying "We are in unity, venerable sir." "Speaks another teaching" means another discourse or Abhidhamma. For by the words "We are in unity, venerable sir" they expect the exhortation; therefore, setting aside the exhortation, for one who speaks another teaching, there is an offence of wrong-doing. "Without having handed over the exhortation" means without having said "This, sisters, is the exhortation."

150. In the passages beginning with "if it is not a legally valid act" and so forth, the act should be understood as the formal act of appointing an exhorter of nuns. Therein, in the case of a legally invalid act, there are eighteen offences requiring expiation by way of two sets of nine. In the case of a legally valid act, in the final case of the second set of nine there is no offence; in the remaining cases there are seventeen offences of wrong-doing.

152. "Giving a recitation" means reciting the text of the eight weighty rules. "Giving an interrogation" means explaining the commentary on that same well-learned text of the weighty rules - this is the meaning. "When being told 'Reinstate, venerable lady,' one reinstates" means when being told thus, one reinstates the text of the eight weighty rules - this is the meaning. Thus, one giving a recitation, one giving an interrogation, and whoever when told "Reinstate" recites the eight weighty rules, for that one there is no offence of *pācittiya*. For one reciting another teaching, there is no offence of wrong-doing. "One asks a question, when asked a question one speaks" means a nun asks a question based on the weighty rules or based on the aggregates and so forth; whatever monk speaks on that, for him too there is no offence. "Speaking for the benefit of another" means nuns approach and listen to a monk teaching the Dhamma to the fourfold assembly; in that case too there is no offence for the monk. "For a female trainee, for a female novice" means there is no offence for one teaching these as well. The remainder is of clear meaning.

The origination of the training rule - It arises from speech and from speech combined with mind; it is action; it is not release through perception; it is without mind-factor; it is an offence by convention; it is verbal action; it involves three types of consciousness and three types of feeling.

The training rule on exhortation is the first.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning After Sunset

153. In the second training rule - "By turns" means by rotation; the meaning is "in sequence." "Of higher mind" means of one possessing higher consciousness; the meaning is of one endowed with the arahant-fruit-consciousness, which is superior to all other consciousnesses. "Not negligent" means not being heedless; it is said to mean one endowed with the continuous practice of wholesome states through diligence. "Of the sage" - either through the understanding of both worlds, as stated "one who understands both worlds is thereby called a sage," or because "wisdom" is called "sagacity" (*mona*), and through being endowed with that wisdom, one with taints destroyed is called a sage; of that sage. "Training in the paths of wisdom" means of one training in the paths of wisdom termed the knowledge of arahantship, in the thirty-seven qualities belonging to enlightenment, or in the three trainings. And this is said with reference to the preliminary practice; therefore the meaning here should be understood thus: "of the sage" refers to one who, through training in the preliminary stage with this training, has attained the state of a sage. "Sorrows do not exist for such a one" means that within such a sage with taints destroyed, sorrows based on separation from the beloved and the like do not exist. Or alternatively, "such a one" means sorrows do not exist for such a sage who is endowed with the characteristic of such-likeness - this is the meaning here. "Who is at peace" means one who is at peace through the stilling of lust and the like. "Always mindful" means

one who, through having attained fullness of mindfulness, is never separated from mindfulness at any time. "In space, in the atmosphere" means in the space reckoned as the atmosphere, not in the kasiṇa-released space, nor in the delimitation of form. "He walked back and forth and stood" - having heard the talk of those nuns, thinking "These nuns look down on me, thinking 'This one knows only this much'; come now, I shall show them my own power," having aroused respect for the Dhamma, having attained and emerged from the fourth meditative absorption which is the basis for direct knowledge, he displayed such a marvel of psychic power - "In space, in the atmosphere, he walked back and forth, etc. and disappeared." Therein, "and disappeared" means he disappeared and also went out of sight - this is the meaning. "He recited that same inspired utterance and much other word of the Buddha" - the elder, it is said, in the presence of his own brother elder -

"Just as a lotus, a kokanuda, fragrant,
Would be in the morning, fully bloomed, its fragrance not faded;
See the Resplendent One shining,
Like the blazing sun in the sky."

Having had this verse recited to him, he studied it for four months. But he was unable to master it. Then the elder had him expelled from the monastery, saying "You are incapable in this dispensation," and he stood weeping at the gateway. Then the Blessed One, surveying beings amenable to guidance with the Buddha-eye, seeing him, as if going on a walk around the monastery, went to his presence and said "Cūḷapanthaka, why are you weeping?" He reported that matter. Then the Blessed One, giving him a clean piece of cloth, said "Rub this, saying 'dust-remover, dust-remover.'" He accepted saying "Very well," sat down in his own dwelling place, and rubbed one end of it; the rubbed area became soiled. He, thinking "Even such a pure cloth as this, depending on this body, has become soiled," having gained a sense of urgency, began insight meditation. Then the Blessed One, knowing his state of aroused energy, uttered this illuminating verse beginning with "Of higher mind." The elder attained arahantship at the conclusion of the verse. Therefore the elder naturally cherishes this verse; he recites that very verse to make known his cherishing of this verse. And bringing in much other word of the Buddha in between. Therefore it was said - "He recited that same inspired utterance and much other word of the Buddha."

156. "Ordained unilaterally" means ordained in the nun community; but for one who exhorts one ordained in the bhikkhu community, there is an offence requiring expiation. The remainder here is clear in itself. And this too has its origin in the initial step only.

The training rule on after sunset is the second.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning the Nuns' Quarters

162. In the third training rule - In the passage beginning with "exhorts except at the right time, there is an offence requiring expiation," it should be understood that there is an offence requiring expiation only when exhorting with the eight weighty rules, and an offence of wrong-doing when exhorting with another rule. "One ordained unilaterally" means one who has been fully ordained in the nun community; but for

one who exhorts one fully ordained in the bhikkhu community, there is indeed an offence requiring expiation. Henceforth too, wherever "one ordained unilaterally" is mentioned, this same meaning should be understood everywhere. The remainder is clear in itself.

The origin of the kaṭhina offence - it arises from body and speech, and from body, speech and mind; it is an act of commission; it is not release through perception; it is without mental factor; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it has three types of consciousness; it has three types of feeling.

The training rule on the nuns' quarters is the third.

Here, however, the following miscellaneous matter is stated in the Mahāpaccarī - If an unauthorised monk, after the sun has set, having approached the nuns' quarters, exhorts with the eight weighty rules, there are three offences requiring expiation. For one who exhorts with another rule, there are two offences of wrong-doing and one offence requiring expiation. How? An offence of wrong-doing based on being unauthorised, an offence of wrong-doing based on having gone to the quarters and exhorting with another rule, and an offence requiring expiation based on exhorting after the sun has set. For an authorised monk who, after the sun has set, having gone there, exhorts with the eight weighty rules, there is one non-offence and two offences requiring expiation. How? There is no offence because of being authorised; one offence requiring expiation based on exhorting after the sun has set, and one based on having gone and exhorting with the weighty rules - thus two offences requiring expiation. For that same monk who exhorts with another rule, there is one non-offence, one offence of wrong-doing, and one offence requiring expiation. How? There is no offence because of being authorised, an offence of wrong-doing based on having gone and exhorting with another rule, and an offence requiring expiation based on exhorting after the sun has set. But for one who goes during the day and exhorts, whether authorised or unauthorised, having removed the one offence requiring expiation based on exhorting at night, the remaining offences and non-offences should be understood.

The miscellaneous talk is completed.

4. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Material Gain

164. In the fourth training rule - "Do not hold in high regard" means they do not show respect; the intention is that they exhort without having made high regard for the Dhamma. The meaning of "wishing to disparage the exhorter of nuns" and so forth should be understood in the manner stated in the case of denigration.

Regarding "one who is fully ordained, not authorised by the Community" - here, "not authorised" should be understood as one who has not been appointed by being entrusted with the responsibility either by an authorised one or by the Community. Regarding "one not fully ordained, whether authorised or not authorised" - here, however, one who received authorisation during the time of being a monk and now stands on the ground of a novice is "authorised"; a learned novice who has been appointed by being entrusted with the responsibility either by an authorised one or by the Community is to be understood as "not authorised." The remainder is clear in itself since the method has been stated.

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 fault; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is painful feeling.

The training rule on material gain is the fourth.

5. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Giving a Robe

169. In the fifth training rule - "On a street" means on a road. "Goes for almsfood" means goes regularly by way of habitual wandering. "Acquaintances" means they became familiar friends. The rest here is clear in its wording; as to the determination, it should be understood in the same manner as stated in the training rule on accepting robes, together with the origins and so forth. For there the monk is the recipient, here the nun; this is the difference. The remainder is just the same.

The training rule on giving a robe is the fifth.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Sewing Robes

175. Regarding the sixth training rule - "Udāyī" means Lāḷudāyī. "Paṭṭho" means capable; it is said to mean both skilled and competent. "A certain nun" means his own former wife. "Paṭibhānacittaṃ" means a design made by his own inspiration. It is said that having dyed the robe, he made in its middle a figure of a man and woman engaged in sexual intercourse, in various colours. Therefore it was said - "Having produced an inspired design in the middle." "Yathāsaṃhaṭṭaṃ" means just as it was folded up.

176. "Robe" means that which is possible to wear as a lower garment or to wrap as an upper garment; for thus it is stated in the Mahāpaccaṛī and other texts. "Sews it himself" - here, there is a wrong-doing (dukkaṭa) for one who is considering "I shall sew" and also for one who is cutting, but for one who is sewing there is an expiation (pācittiya). "With each stitch" means with each insertion and withdrawal of the needle. But if, without withdrawing the whole needle, one pierces even a hundred times for the purpose of passing a long thread and then withdraws it, there is only one expiation. "Instructed once" means instructed once with "Sew the robe." "Even if he sews much" means even if he completes all the needle-work and finishes the robe, there is only one expiation. But if one who has been told "The work to be done on this robe is your responsibility" does it, for the one instructed there is one expiation with each stitch, and for the one who instructs, even many with a single command. However, when instructed repeatedly, there is nothing further to be said.

If, when teachers and preceptors are sewing robes for their own relatives, their dependants sew saying "We are fulfilling the duty towards teachers and preceptors or the kaṭhina duty," for them too there are offences according to the counting of stitches. When teachers and preceptors have robes for their own relatives sewn by their pupils, there is a wrong-doing (dukkaṭa) for the teachers and preceptors, and an expiation (pācittiya) for the pupils. When pupils have robes for their own relatives sewn by their teachers and preceptors, the same method applies there too. When the robe belongs to a relative of both the pupils and the teachers and preceptors, but the teachers and preceptors deceive the pupils and have them sew it, there is a wrong-

doing (dukkaṭa) for both. Why? Because the pupils sew with the perception that she is not a relative, and because the others engage them in what is improper. Therefore, one should have it sewn after informing them: "This is a robe for your mother, this is for your sister."

179. "Another requisite" means any sandals, bag, and so forth. The remainder is clear in itself. Six origins - it is an act, not release by cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action, verbal action, three types of consciousness, three types of feeling.

The training rule on sewing a robe is the sixth.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Making Arrangements

181. In the seventh training rule - "Thieves robbed those going afterwards" means thieves carried off the bowl and robe of those going afterwards. "Violated" means the thieves violated those nuns, the meaning is they brought about the destruction of their virtue.

182-183. "Having arranged" means having arranged together, having made an agreement at the time of going - this is the meaning. Regarding "kukkuṭasampāda": here, since a cock, having left a village, goes to another village just by walking, this is called "kukkuṭasampāda" (a cock's stride distance). Herein this is the meaning of the word - "Sampāda" means that in which they stride (sampadanti). Who stride? Cocks. The stride of cocks is "kukkuṭasampāda." Alternatively, "sampāda" means walking; "kukkuṭasampāda" is so called because the walking of cocks exists therein. There is also the reading "kukkuṭasampāta"; therein, when a cock, having flown up from the rooftop of a house in one village, alights on the rooftop of a house in another village, this is called "kukkuṭasampāta" (a cock's flight distance). The word analysis here should be understood in the same manner as stated above. Though described in two ways, such a village is very close, and no surrounding area is obtained. However, in a country full of villages where the sound of a cock crowing at dawn in one village is heard in the next village, in the Commentary it is said: "Between each village and village, there is an expiation." Although it is said "between each village and village there is an offence of expiation," even if a village is only a ratana's distance away, if it has a surrounding area established by people, there is indeed an offence for one entering it.

Therein, this is the determination of offences: At the time of arranging, if both stand in a nuns' quarters, or in a monastery, or in a sitting hall, or in a sectarians' lodging and arrange together, there is no offence, for it is allowable ground indeed. Therefore, here they do not speak of a dukkaṭa offence on account of the arranging; for one going, it is according to the basis only. But if within a village, at the door of a nuns' quarters, on a street, or at other places such as crossroads, junctions, elephant stables and the like, they arrange together, there is a dukkaṭa offence for the monk. Having thus arranged, they depart from the village; in departing there is no offence, but upon entering the surrounding area of the next village, there is an expiation for the monk. Therein too, in the Mahāpaccarī it is said: "At the first step, a dukkaṭa; at the second step, an expiation." But having departed from the village, as long as they do not enter the surrounding area of the next village, even if they arrange together in

the interval, there is a dukkaṭa for the monk; upon entering the surrounding area of the next village, the offence is in the same manner as before. If they wish to go far, at each entry into each village's surrounding area there is an offence; but in passing beyond each respective village there is no offence. But if a nun departs from her quarters thinking "I shall go to such-and-such a village," and a monk also, with that same village in mind, departs from the monastery thinking "I shall go to such-and-such a village," then both meet at the village gate and say "Where are you going? To such-and-such a village. And where are you going? We too are going there," and then arrange together saying "Come now, let us go" and go - there is no offence. Why? In the Mahāpaccaṛī it is said: because they had already departed with the intention of going. That accords neither with the canonical text nor with the rest of the Commentary.

Regarding "half a yojana by half a yojana": for one who is about to pass beyond each half-yojana, thinking "now I shall pass beyond" - at the first step, a dukkaṭa; at the second step, an expiation. For in this method, the offence is in passing beyond, not in entering.

184. A monk arranges means, having seen a nun at a city gate or at a street, he says: "Have you previously gone to such and such a village?" "I have not previously gone, venerable sir." "Come, let us go" or "Tomorrow I shall go, you too should come," he says. A nun arranges means, having seen a monk leaving from a village to go between villages for the purpose of paying homage at a shrine, she says: "Venerable sir, where are you going?" "To such and such a village for the purpose of paying homage at a shrine." "I too shall come, venerable sir." Thus only the nun arranges, not the monk.

185. "By a different rendezvous" means here: having said "we shall go before the meal," they go after the meal; or having said "we shall go today," they go the next day. Thus there is no offence only in a different rendezvous regarding time, but in a different rendezvous regarding the gate or in a different rendezvous regarding the road, there is still an offence. "In misfortunes" means: when there is a division of the kingdom, people mounted on vehicles wander through the countryside - in such misfortunes there is no offence. The remainder is clear in itself.

It has four origins - it originates from the body, from body and speech, from body and mind, and from body, speech, and mind; it is action, not liberation through perception, without mind, an offence by convention, bodily action, verbal action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The training rule on making arrangements is the seventh.

8. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Boarding a Boat

188. Regarding the eighth training rule - "Having arranged" means having arranged with the intention of amusement, through the influence of worldly pleasure, friendship and intimacy. "Going upstream" means going upstream against the current of the river. However, since one who amuses oneself on a boat sailing swiftly upstream is said to "board one going upstream." Therefore, in the word-analysis of that, to show just the meaning, "on a boat sailing upstream" was stated. "Going downstream" means going downstream with the current. However, since one who amuses oneself

on a boat sailing swiftly downstream is said to "board one going downstream." Therefore, in the word-analysis of that too, to show just the meaning, "on a boat sailing downstream" was stated. Therein, when they convey upstream or downstream for the purpose of reaching a ford, there is no offence. "For crossing across" - this is an ablative case used in the sense of the dative of purpose.

189. Regarding "between villages, between villages," here, in the case of a river where one bank is continuous with villages within a cock's flight and the other bank is a forest without villages, when travelling along the side of the bank with villages, there are offences requiring expiation by the counting of village intervals; when travelling along the side of the bank without villages, by the counting of half-yojanas. However, in the case of a river that is a yojana in width, even when travelling through the middle, offences requiring expiation should be understood by the counting of half-yojanas. Regarding "there is no offence for crossing across," here it is not only for a river; even for one who travels from a great port to Tāmalitti or to Suvaṇṇabhūmi, there is also no offence. For in all the commentaries, the offence has been discussed only in relation to a river, not in relation to the sea.

191. "By a different rendezvous" means here too there is no offence only by a different rendezvous regarding time, but for one going by a different rendezvous regarding the ford or by a different rendezvous regarding the boat, there is indeed an offence. The remainder is exactly as in the first training rule, together with the origins and so forth.

The training rule on boarding a boat is the eighth.

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

192. Regarding the ninth training rule - "When great elephants are present" - the accusative case is used in the locative sense; the meaning is "when great elephants are present." Alternatively, "when great elephants are present" should be seen as having the remainder of the reading "without seeing"; thus "without seeing the great elephants who are present." For otherwise the meaning does not fit. "Talk in between" means talk that has reached the middle point between the beginning and the end, without having reached the conclusion. "Not finished" means it was still being carried on. "Truly great elephants have been invited by you, householder" - looking sideways, having seen the elders entering, and knowing that they had heard, she spoke thus.

194. "Arranged by a nun" means prepared by a nun, brought about by making known his qualities; the meaning is "made so as to be obtained." In the word-analysis, however, in order to show the nun and the manner of her arranging, it is stated: "A nun means one fully ordained in both communities; 'arranges' means those previously unwilling to give," etc. In "except for an arrangement with a householder made beforehand," here "beforehand" means previously. "Arrangement" is said to mean "arranged"; this is a designation for what has been prepared. An arrangement of householders is "an arrangement with a householder." Whatever meal has been prepared by householders prior to the nun's arranging - apart from that, eating other almsfood constitutes an offence, but eating that does not constitute an offence; this is what is stated. In the word-analysis, however, since almsfood from relatives or

those who have given invitation, even though not arranged for the monk's benefit, is in meaning as if arranged, because it can be brought as one wishes, therefore, disregarding the letter and in order to show the meaning itself, it is stated: "An arrangement with a householder means they are either relatives or those who have given invitation."

195. "Ordinarily prepared" means it has been prepared in the ordinary course for the benefit of that very monk, thinking "We shall give it to the elder." In the Mahāpaccariya, however, without saying "for that other one," it is stated without distinction as "it has been prepared thinking 'We shall give it to the monks.'"

197. "Setting aside the five foods, everywhere there is no offence" means that regarding congee, hard food, fruits, and non-fruits, everywhere, even when arranged by a nun, there is no offence. The remainder is clear in itself. It has the origin of the first pārājika - it originates from body and mind, it is an act of commission, it is freed by perception, it is with intention, it is an offence by regulation, it is bodily action, it involves three types of consciousness, it involves three types of feeling.

The training rule on what has been prepared is the ninth.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Sitting in Private

198. Regarding the tenth training rule - all the meaning of the text and the judgement should be understood in the same manner as stated in the second indefinite rule. For this training rule forms one section together with the second indefinite rule and with the fourth training rule of Upananda above, but it was laid down separately by reason of the originating incident.

The training rule on sitting in private is the tenth.

The third chapter on nuns is completed in the order of the commentary.

4. The Chapter on Food

1. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Almsfood at a Dwelling Place

203. In the first training rule of the Food Chapter - "Meal in a public rest-house" means almsfood in a public rest-house. Having made a public rest-house that is enclosed all around, with beds and chairs arranged as appropriate for travellers, the sick, pregnant women, and those gone forth, with many rooms and entrances as divisions, therein out of desire for merit almsfood is laid down; the meaning is that rice gruel, cooked rice, medicines, and so forth - everything is placed for the purpose of giving to those various persons. "Tomorrow also" means the next day also. "Withdrew" means they departed. "People grumbled" means not seeing the sectarians, having heard "Where have the sectarians gone?" and "They left after seeing these ones," they grumbled. "Being anxious" means being troubled, the meaning is arousing the perception of what is improper.

206. "Is able to depart from that public rest-house" means he is able to go half a yojana or a yojana. "Is not able" means he is not able to go even that much. "Indefinitely" means without specifying one particular sect as "for these only" or "for only this many," it has been laid down for all. "As much as one likes" means without

limiting the food as "only this much," it has been laid down as much as one likes. "It may be eaten once" means it may be eaten for one day; from the second day onwards, there is an offence of wrong-doing in accepting, and with each swallowing, an offence requiring expiation.

Now here is the adjudication: Whether laid down by one family or by various families together, at one place or at various places, or at an unspecified place such as "today at one; tomorrow at one" - having eaten at one place for one day, it is not allowable to eat at that place or at another on the second day. However, when laid down by various families at various places, having eaten at one place for one day, it is allowable to eat elsewhere on the second day. But having exhausted the sequence, it is not allowable to eat again starting from the beginning - so it is stated in the Mahāpaccarī. The same method applies in the case of one group, various groups, one village, and various villages. That which has been laid down together by one family or by various families, if it is interrupted from time to time due to the absence of rice and other provisions, that too should not be eaten. But if, having discontinued it saying "we are not able to give," they begin to give again when a wholesome intention has arisen, it is allowable to eat that again for one day - so it is stated in the Mahāpaccarī.

208. "There is no offence for one who is sick" means there is no offence for one who is sick and eats while staying on. "One who is going" means one who is going eats for one day on the road and for one day at the place arrived at; for him too there is no offence. The same method applies to one who is coming. One who, having gone, is returning also is permitted to eat for one day on the road and for one day at the place arrived at. For one who, having eaten thinking "I shall go," has set out, and a river floods or there is danger from thieves and so forth, he, having turned back and knowing it to be safe, while going again is permitted to eat for one day - all this is stated in the Mahāpaccarī and other texts. "It has been laid down specifically" means it has been designated and laid down for the benefit of monks only. "Not as much as one likes" means it has not been laid down as much as one likes; it is obtained little by little; such may be eaten even regularly. "Setting aside the five foods, everywhere" means there is no offence everywhere in the various kinds such as gruel, hard food, fruits, and non-fruits. For gruel and so forth may be eaten even regularly. The remainder is clear in itself. The origin of the sheep's wool rule - it arises from body and from body-and-mind, it is functional, it is not liberation through cessation of perception, it is without consciousness, it is an offence by convention, it is bodily action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The training rule on almsfood at a rest house is the first.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Group Meals

209. In the second training rule - "Having fallen away from material gain and honour" means that he, it is said, even after having had the king killed by Ajātasattu, even after having deployed assassins, and even after having caused the drawing of blood, remained hidden and concealed. But when, in broad daylight, he set loose Dhanapālaka, then he became exposed. When the discussion arose, "How did Devadatta set loose the elephant?" he became exposed thus: "Not only did he set loose the elephant, he also had the king killed, he also sent assassins, he also hurled

a rock - Devadatta is wicked." And when it was said, "With whom did he do this deed?" they said, "With King Ajātasattu." Thereupon the townspeople rose up, saying, "How indeed could the king keep company with such a criminal, a thorn to the dispensation!" The king, knowing the agitation of the city, expelled Devadatta. From that point on, he cut off the five hundred dishes of food for him, he did not go to attend upon him, and other people too did not think anything should be given or done for him. Therefore it was said - "Having fallen away from material gain and honour." "Having asked again and again among families, was eating" means that, sustaining his following thinking "Let not my group break apart," having asked thus, "You give a meal for one monk, you for two," he together with his following was eating among families.

211. "Robes arose in small quantity" means they do not give robes to those who do not accept the meal, therefore robes arise in small quantity.

212. "Inviting monks who were making robes with a meal" means that, having seen them going for alms in the village and taking a long time to finish the robes, they invite them out of a desire for merit, thinking: "Having finished quickly in this way, they will make use of the robes."

215. "From various countries" means those who came from different kingdoms. "Nānāviraṃsake" is also a reading; the meaning is the same.

217-218. "Group meal" means a meal for a group. Here, a "group" means four monks as the minimum and monks beyond that are intended. Therefore, showing the absolute minimum limit, he said: "Where four monks... etc. this is called a group meal." Now, this group meal is committed in two ways: either through invitation or through making a request. How is it committed through invitation? Having approached four monks, one invites them by taking the name of any of the five foods, using whatever synonym or alternative expression, saying: "Venerable sirs, I invite you with rice; accept my rice, desire it, look upon it, consent to it, wait for it." Thus, those invited together, by a determined time, for today or for tomorrow, go together, receive together, eat together - it is a group meal, and there is an offence for all. Those invited together go either together or separately, receive together, eat separately - it is still an offence. For here, the receiving alone is the criterion. Those invited together go either together or separately, receive separately, eat either together or separately - there is no offence. Having gone to four residences or monasteries, those invited separately, or even while standing in one place, one invited by the son, one by the father - thus even those invited separately, whether they go together or separately, whether they eat together or separately, if they receive together, it is a group meal, and there is an offence for all. Thus far, it is committed through invitation.

How through making a request? Four monks, standing or sitting together, having seen a lay follower, might make a request saying: "Give food for all four of us," or having seen him individually, saying: "Give to me, give to me" - thus, whether having made the request together or separately, whether they go together or separately, whether having taken the food they eat together or separately, if they receive together, it is a group meal, and there is an offence for all. Thus it is committed through making a request.

"The feet are also cracked" means cracked such that the flesh is visible beyond the outer skin; thus cracked, they produce pain at the mere striking by sand or gravel, and it is not possible to walk for alms within the village. In such an ailment, one should eat on the grounds that it is "the time of illness"; one should not resort to a mere pretext of allowability.

"When a robe is being made" means when, having obtained cloth and thread, they make a robe; for separately there is no such thing as a time of robe-making. Therefore, whoever does any work there that needs to be done for the robe - for in the Mahāpaccaṛī it is said "even down to one who pierces with a needle" - on that account, one should eat on the grounds that it is "the time of robe-making." But in the Kurundī it is stated in detail. Whoever plans the robe, cuts it, sets the guide thread, places the bordering strip, sews the turned-back portion, binds the bordering strip, cuts the binding, presses it, mounts it, sews the turned-back portion therein, makes the thread, winds it, sets the button-loop, makes the turning over - all of these are said to be indeed making the robe. But whoever, sitting nearby, recites the Jātaka or the Dhammapada, this one is not a robe-maker. Except for this, for the rest there is no offence in a group meal.

"Half a yojana" means by one wishing to go even that much of a journey. But for one wishing to go far, there is nothing that needs to be said about that. "By one going" means by one going on a journey; it is allowable to eat even within a gāvuta of the half-yojana. "One who has gone should eat" means one who has gone should eat for one day. The same method applies also to embarking on a boat. But this is the distinction - in the Mahāpaccaṛī it is said that one who has embarked should eat even after going to the desired place, as long as he has not disembarked. "When a fourth has arrived" - this is the minimum limit; even when a fourth has arrived, where they cannot manage; that is a great assembly. But where a hundred or a thousand assemble, there is nothing that needs to be said about that. Therefore, at such a time, one should eat having determined it as "a great assembly." "Any wanderer who has arrived" means any one among those of the same faith or among sectarians; for when food has been prepared by any one of these, one should eat on the grounds that it is "the time of an ascetic's meal."

220. "There is no offence at the right time" means there is no offence at any one of the seven times. "Two or three eat together" means even those who, having accepted an improper invitation, take it together as two or three and eat, for them too there is no offence.

Therein, the decision should be understood by way of five groups of four: the fourth being uninvited, the fourth being an almsfood-eater, the fourth being unordained, the fourth being a bowl-sender, and the fourth being ill. How? Here someone invites four monks saying "Accept a meal." Among them, three went, one did not go. The lay follower asks "Where is the one elder, venerable sir?" "He has not come, lay follower." He then, having ushered in some other person who arrived at that moment, saying "Come, venerable sir," gives a meal for all four; there is no offence for all of them. Why? Because the one completing the group was uninvited. For only three who were invited accepted there; the group is not completed by them; and the one completing the group was uninvited; therefore the group is broken - this is the fourth being uninvited.

In the case of the fourth being an almsfood-eater - at the time of invitation, one is an almsfood-eater; he does not consent. But at the time of going, when told "Come, venerable sir," even though he does not come because he has not consented, they take him along saying "Come, you will receive almsfood"; he breaks that group. Therefore there is no offence for all of them.

In the case of the fourth being unordained - they are invited together with a novice; he too breaks the group.

In the case of the fourth being a bowl-sender - one, not going himself, sends his bowl; thus too the group is broken. Therefore there is no offence for all of them.

In the case of the fourth being ill - they are invited together with one who is ill; therein there is no offence only for the ill one, but for the others he serves as the one completing the group. For the group is not broken by one who is ill. Therefore for them there is indeed an offence. But in the Mahāpaccarī it is stated without distinction.

One who has obtained a right time is himself released, but for the rest he becomes one who creates an offence by completing the group. Therefore groups of four should be understood also by way of one who has obtained the time for giving robes, etc. But if, even among the four persons who have consented and gone, one wise monk, having said "I shall break your group, accept the invitation," and at the end of the gruel and hard food, not giving his bowl to those who are taking bowls for the meal, sits down saying "First feed these monks and dismiss them; I shall afterwards give the thanksgiving and go." When they have eaten and gone, having had the bowl taken by the lay follower saying "Give the bowl, venerable sir," when the meal is given, having eaten and given the thanksgiving, he goes; there is no offence for all of them. For in group meals there is no exemption only by way of the five foods. Even those invited with rice who accept barley gruel commit an offence. But those foods were not taken by them together. However, with gruel and so forth there is an exemption; those were taken by them together. Thus one wise monk creates non-offence for the others as well.

Therefore, if someone sent by one wishing to offer a meal to the Community comes to the monastery for the purpose of inviting and, without saying "Venerable sirs, please accept almsfood at our house tomorrow," says "Please accept a meal" or "Please accept a meal for the Community" or "Let the Community accept a meal," the meal-designator should be a wise one, and those who accept invitations should be freed from the group meal rule, and almsfood-collectors should be freed from the breaking of the ascetic practice. How? First, this should be said - "It is not possible tomorrow, lay follower." "The next day, venerable sir." "The next day is also not possible." Having put him off in this way for up to a fortnight, he should again be asked "What did you say?" If he again says "Please accept a meal for the Community," then, having created a diversion thus: "First, lay follower, make this flower allowable, this grass," he should again be asked "What did you say?" If he again says the same thing, he should be told: "Friend, you will not get the almsfood-collectors or the senior monks; you will get novices." And when he says "But, venerable sir, in such and such a village they fed the venerable ones, why do I not obtain the same?" - "They know

how to invite; you do not know." "How did they invite, venerable sir?" They said thus: "Please accept almsfood at our place, venerable sir." If he too says the same thing, it is allowable. But if he again says "Please accept a meal," he should be told: "Now, friend, you will not get many monks; you will get only three." "But, venerable sir, in such and such a village they fed the entire community of monks; why do I not obtain the same?" "You do not know how to invite." "How did they invite?" They said "Please accept almsfood." If he too says "Please accept almsfood," it is allowable. But if he again says "Just a meal," then he should be told - "Go, we have no need of your meal; this is our regular alms-resort, we shall walk for almsfood here." When he has said "Walk for alms, venerable sir" and has gone, they ask him - "Well, sir, did you obtain monks?" "What is there much to say about this? The elders said 'We shall walk for almsfood tomorrow.' Do not be negligent now." On the second day, the monks who have performed the shrine duties and are standing should be told by the senior monk of the Community - "Friends, an unwise person came to the neighbouring village regarding a meal for the Community; let us go and walk for almsfood in the neighbouring village." The monks should follow the elder's word, they should not be difficult to admonish, and they should walk for almsfood standing just at the village gate. When those people take their bowls, seat them, and serve them food, they should eat. If, having placed food in the rest hall, they go about in the streets announcing - "Please accept food in the rest hall, venerable sirs" - it is not allowable.

But if they take food and go here and there saying "accept the food," or bring it beforehand to the monastery and place it in a suitable spot and give it to those who come, this is called brought almsfood and is allowable. But if they prepare a donation in the dining hall and send to each dwelling saying "accept the food in the dining hall," it is not allowable. But those people who, having seen monks walking for almsfood, sweep the rest hall and seat them there and feed them, they should not be refused. But those who, having seen monks leaving the village without obtaining almsfood in the village, say "venerable sirs, accept the food," they should be refused, or one should not turn back. If they say "turn back, venerable sirs, accept the food," it is allowable to turn back at the word "turn back." If they say "turn back, venerable sirs, food has been prepared at the house, food has been prepared in the village," since food at a house or in a village could belong to anyone, it is allowable to turn back. If they say "turn back, accept the food" connecting the phrases together, it is not allowable to turn back. If, seeing them setting out from the rest hall to walk for almsfood, someone says "sit down, venerable sirs, accept the food," the same method applies. A regular meal means a permanent meal. If they say "accept the regular meal," it is allowable for even many to accept it together. The same method applies also for ticket meals and so forth. The remainder here is clear in itself.

The origin of the sheep's wool rule -it is an act of commission, not the liberation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, a bodily action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The training rule on group meals is the second.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Successive Meals

221. In the third training rule - "This will not be a trivial matter, the way these people are carefully preparing meals" means that by the manner in which these people are carefully preparing meals, it is understood - "This dispensation, or this offering to the Community headed by the Buddha, will not be trivial; it will certainly not be small or inferior." Regarding "Kirapatika," herein "Kira" is the name of that son of good family; but in the sense of authority, he is called "Kirapatika." He, it seems, being a lord and master, having given wages according to a fixed arrangement of months, seasons, and years, has labourers perform work. "Jujube fruits prepared" is said by way of conventional expression. "Mixed with jujube" means with jujube gruel.

222. "Was brought when the sun was up" means it was brought when the day was too far advanced.

226. "I give my expectation of a meal to such and such a person" - this assigning of a meal is applicable both in the presence and in the absence of the person. In the presence, having seen the person, one should eat after saying "I assign it to you"; not having seen the person, one should eat after saying to one of the five co-religionists "I assign it to such and such a person." However, in the Mahāpaccarī and other texts, only assigning in the absence of the person is stated. And since this is included under a Vinaya procedure, therefore it is not appropriate to assign it to the Blessed One. For even when the Blessed One is seated in the Fragrant Chamber or seated in the midst of the Community, whatever procedure is carried out by the Community having taken monks sufficient for a quorum is indeed well done; the Blessed One neither invalidates the procedure; nor does he complete it. He does not invalidate it because the Dhamma is sovereign; he does not complete it because he does not count towards the quorum.

229. "One eats two or three invitations together" means one puts two or three invitations into one bowl, mixes them, makes them into one, and eats - this is the meaning. Two or three families, having invited, seat one in one place and bring from here and there and heap up rice, heap up curry and side dishes, and it becomes one mixture; here there is no offence - this is stated in the Mahāpaccarī. But if the original invitation is at the bottom and each subsequent one is on top, for one eating from the top downwards, there is an offence. But if one inserts one's hand inside and lifts up even one morsel from the first invitation, from the time of eating, for one eating in whatever manner, there is no offence. If they also pour milk or broth there, by which the covered rice becomes of one flavour, for one eating from the top, there is no offence - this is stated in the Mahāpaccarī. But in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā it is stated: "Having received milk-rice or broth-rice, while one is seated there, others also pour milk-rice or broth-rice; for one drinking the milk or broth, there is no offence. But while eating, having first put into the mouth a piece of meat or a lump of rice that was received, it is allowable to eat from the top. The same method applies to ghee-porridge as well."

A great lay supporter invites a monk; when he has come to the family, the lay supporter and his sons, wife, brothers, sisters and others each bring their own portions and put them in the bowl. For one who, without eating what was first given by the lay supporter, eats what was received afterwards - "there is no offence" - this is stated in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā. But in the Kurundī Commentary it is stated that it is allowable. In the Mahāpaccarī: "If they cook separately and bring and give from their

own individually cooked rice, therein for one who eats first what was brought afterwards, there is a pācittiya offence. But if for all there is only one cooking, it is not successive eating" - this is stated. A great lay supporter, having invited, seats the monk; another person takes the bowl - it should not be given. "Why, venerable sir, do you not give it?" "Were we not invited by you, lay supporter?" "Let it be, venerable sir, eat whatever you receive" - he says; it is allowable to eat. When food is given by another having brought it, it is allowable to eat even after asking permission - this is stated in the Kurundī.

Having given the thanksgiving, as they are leaving, those wishing to hear the Dhamma all invite saying "Please come again tomorrow too, venerable sir"; having come the next day, it is allowable to eat whatever is received. Why? Because one has been invited by all. A certain monk, while walking for alms, receives food; another lay supporter, having invited him, seats him in his house, but the food is not yet ready. If that monk eats the food received while walking for alms, there is an offence. When, without having eaten, he is seated and is asked "Why, venerable sir, do you not eat?" and having said "Because I was invited by you," and being told "Eat whatever you receive, venerable sir," he eats - it is allowable.

"By the whole village" means for one who has been invited by the whole village together, for one eating anywhere, there is no offence. The same method applies to a guild as well. "When being invited one says 'I will take almsfood'" means when being invited saying "Take the meal," one says "I have no need of your meal, I will take almsfood." Here, however, the Elder Mahāpaduma said: "One speaking thus can make a non-invitation in this training rule, but since an opportunity has been made for the purpose of eating, one is freed neither from group eating nor from the successive meal rule." The Elder Mahāsuma said: "Inasmuch as one can make a non-invitation, to that extent it is neither group eating nor successive eating." The remainder is clear in itself.

The origin of the kāṭhina offence - it originates from body and speech, and from body, speech, and mind. Herein it involves action and non-action: eating is the action, not assigning is the non-action. It is not the liberation of perception, it is without consciousness, it is an offence by convention, it is bodily action, it is verbal action, it is with three types of consciousness, and with three types of feeling.

The training rule on successive meals is the third.

4. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Kāṇamātā

230. In the fourth training rule - "Kāṇā's mother" means the mother of Kāṇā. It is said that her daughter was beautiful; whoever saw her, they became blind (kāṇā) with lust, meaning they became blinded by passion. Therefore, because she caused others to become blind, she became known as "Kāṇā." On account of her, her mother too became well known as "Kāṇā's mother." "Coming" (āgataṃ) means arrival. "How can one" (kismiṃ viya) means what would it be like; the intention is that it would be shameful. "To go empty-handed" (rittahatthaṃ gantuṃ) means the hands are empty in this going, that is empty-handed; it is said that to go empty-handed would be shameful. "Came to utter elimination" (parikkhayaṃ agamāsi) means the female lay follower, being a noble disciple, having seen the monks, was unable not to give what

was available; therefore she kept giving until everything came to utter elimination. "With a talk on the Teaching" (dhammiyā kathāya) - here, Kāṇā too, listening to the Teaching being expounded for her mother's benefit, at the conclusion of the expounding became a stream-enterer. "Rose from his seat and departed" (uṭṭhāyāsanaṃ pakkāmi) means having risen from the seat, he left. That man too, having heard "It seems the Teacher went to the dwelling of Kāṇā's mother," brought Kāṇā back and established her in her former position.

231. However, in this case, when it had just arisen, while the training rule had not yet been laid down, the incident concerning provisions arose; therefore, in order to show this immediately after, "Now at that time" and so forth was stated. And that lay follower too, being a noble disciple, gave everything. Therefore it was said - "came to utter elimination."

233. "Whatever is prepared for the purpose of a gift" means whatever is prepared for the purpose of a present - all such things as sweetmeats, round cakes, crisp wafers and so forth are here reckoned simply as "cake." "Whatever is prepared for the purpose of provisions" means whatever is prepared for the purpose of the journey for those going on a road - all such things as bound flour-balls, unbound flour-balls, sesame, rice and so forth are here reckoned simply as "parched corn-flour." "If beyond that" means even if he takes a third bowl heaped up, there is an offence requiring expiation by the reckoning of cakes.

"Having accepted two or three bowlfuls" means having taken bowls filled level with the lower rim of the mouth. "Two or three bowlfuls have been accepted by me there" - herein, if two have been taken, he should say: "Two bowlfuls have been accepted by me here; you may take one." By that one too, having seen another, it should be said: "Two bowlfuls were taken by the one who came first, one by me; do not you take any." For the one by whom one was first taken, the same method applies in the successive informing. But by one who has himself taken three, having seen another, it should simply be said: "Do not accept here." "Having taken them out to the resting place" means having carried them to the sitting hall; and when going to the sitting hall, one should not go to a deserted hall. One should go where the great community of monks is sitting. But in the Mahāpaccarī it is said: "One should go to the sitting hall that is nearest to the place where they were received. Thinking 'I shall give to my own acquaintances or to my intimate friends or to those of the same sect,' it is not allowable to go elsewhere. But if he has a regular sitting place, it is permissible to go even far away."

"Should be shared" means if three bowlfuls have been taken, having kept one for oneself, two should be given to the community of monks. If two have been taken, having kept one for oneself, one should be given to the community; but it is not allowable to give according to friendship. By one who has taken one, nothing need be given unwillingly; he may do as he pleases.

235. "When the journey has been abandoned" means when the journey has been abandoned and discontinued in such a way as "We shall not send now, we shall not go," having seen danger along the road or through lack of need. "For relatives, for those who have invited to admonish" means there is no offence for one who accepts

even much given by them. However, in the commentaries it is said: "Even for them, only the measure prepared for the purpose of provisions or a gift is permissible." The remainder is clear in itself.

Six origins - it is an act, not release by cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action, verbal action, three types of consciousness, three types of feeling.

The training rule on Kāṇhamātā is the fourth.

5. Commentary on the First Training Rule Concerning Invitation to Stop

236. In the fifth training rule - "The monks, having eaten and been invited to admonish" means they were invited to admonish by the brahmin's invitation to take as much as they wished, saying "Take, venerable sirs, as much as you wish," thus by the invitation-to-take-as-much-as-desired, and by their own refusal, saying "Enough, friend, give just a little at a time," thus by the invitation-by-refusal. "To the neighbours" means to those dwelling in the surrounding houses.

237. "The sound of crows cawing" means the sound of crows cawing together; the sound of those crying out having gathered together. "This is enough for all" - here, without saying the "ti" particle, it is fitting to say just this much: "This is enough for all."

238-239. "Having eaten" means one who has eaten. And therein, since whoever has swallowed even a single grain of rice, whether having chewed it or without having chewed it, is reckoned as "one who has eaten," therefore in the word-analysis it is stated "one who has eaten means of the five foods" and so forth. "Invited to admonish" means one whose invitation has been made, whose refusal has been made. And since that too is not merely by refusal, but rather by means of five factors, therefore in the word-analysis it is stated "invited to admonish means eating is apparent" and so forth. Therein, since by the phrase "eating is apparent," one with incomplete food is said to be "invited to admonish." And one with incomplete food has eaten some and not eaten some, and what has been eaten - with reference to that, he is also reckoned as "one who has eaten," therefore we do not see any separate accomplishment of meaning by the expression "one who has eaten." However, just as in the cases of "two nights, three nights" and "six or five statements" and so forth, the expression "two nights" and so forth is used, so too it should be understood that this is stated as an accompaniment to the term "invited to admonish" for the sake of smoothness of expression.

In the phrases "eating is apparent" and so forth, incomplete food is seen, and the meaning is that this person is one who is eating. "Food is apparent" means food sufficient for invitation is seen. The meaning is that there is food to be refused, being one among rice and so forth. "Standing within arm's reach" means the donor, having taken food sufficient for invitation, is within a space of two and a half cubits - this is the meaning. "Offers" means that donor physically offers that food to him - this is the meaning. "Refusal is apparent" means refusal is seen; the meaning is that the monk refuses what has been offered either by body or by speech. Thus by means of five factors one is said to be "invited to admonish." And this too was said -

"Upāli, invitation to admonish is recognised by five aspects -eating is apparent, food is apparent, standing within arm's reach, offering, and refusal is apparent."

Herein this is the determination - In the phrases "eating" and so forth, what one eats and what food one refuses when offered by one standing within arm's reach, that should be understood as being one among these: rice, barley-meal, flour, fish, and meat. Therein, rice means - produced from the grains of seven kinds of grain: sāli rice, paddy, barley, wheat, millet, varaka, and kudrūsaka. Therein, "sāli" means all varieties of sāli rice, including even wild rice at the minimum. "Paddy" means all varieties of paddy. In "barley and wheat" there is no distinction. "Millet" means all varieties of millet, with distinctions of white, red, and dark. "Varaka" means all varieties of varaka of white colour, including even varaka-coraka at the minimum. "Kudrūsaka" means all varieties of grass-grain, both the dark and the liquid kinds, as well as those with distinctions such as sāmāka and so forth.

Nīvāra, varaka, and coraka are here called "grain-analogues." Whether they be grains or grain-analogues, having taken the husked grains of the seven kinds of grain of the aforementioned classification, whatever they may cook with the intention "we shall cook rice" or "we shall cook gruel" or "we shall cook one of the sour milk-rice and so forth," if when eating it hot or cold, at the time of eating, a boundary is discernible at the place where it is taken up, it falls under the category of cooked rice and generates an invitation to stop. If no boundary is discernible, it falls under the category of gruel and does not generate an invitation to stop.

Even milk-rice or sour gruel mixed with leaves, fruits, and shoots, which is still very hot having just been taken off the stove, which can be drunk by tilting, and which does not show a boundary even at the place grasped by the hand, does not generate an invitation to stop. But if, when the heat has gone and it has become cool, it becomes solid and shows a boundary, it again generates an invitation to stop. Its former thin state does not protect it. Even if, having added curd, buttermilk, and so forth, and having put in many leaves, fruits, and shoots, even just a fistful of husked grains has been put in, if at the time of eating a boundary is discernible, it generates an invitation to stop. At a non-gruel invitation, saying "we shall give gruel," they pour water, rice-water, milk, and so forth into the cooked rice and give it saying "take the gruel." Even though they are thin, they do indeed generate an invitation to stop. But if they put it into boiling water and so forth, cook it, and give it, it falls under the category of gruel only. Even when it has fallen under the category of gruel, whether in that or in another preparation where they put in fish and meat, if even a mustard-seed-sized piece of fish or meat or a sinew is discernible, it generates an invitation to stop.

But pure broth or broth-gruel does not generate it. Except for the husked grains of the aforementioned grains, food made with any other things such as bamboo rice and so forth, or with tubers, roots, and fruits, does not generate an invitation to stop, still less thick gruel. But if fish and meat are put into it, it generates it. In the Mahāpaccarī it is said: "Food for the purpose of fermenting also generates an invitation to stop." Food for the purpose of fermenting means husked grains that have been steamed by being put into boiling water for the purpose of making fermented food. But if they dry those

husked grains and eat them, it is allowable; they fall under neither the category of flour nor the category of cooked rice. Cooked rice made again from them does indeed bring about an invitation to stop. If they cook those husked grains in ghee, oil, and so forth, or make cakes, they do not bring about an invitation to stop. Flattened rice or flour, cooked rice, and so forth made from them do not bring about an invitation to stop.

Barley-meal means barley-meal made from barley. But barley-meal made from mung beans and so forth does not generate an invitation to stop. Flour means flour made from sālī rice, paddy, and barley. Even the heads of millet, varaka, and kudrūsaka, having been roasted and lightly pounded, having winnowed away the husks and chaff, they pound them firmly again and make powder. Even if, due to its moistness, it is bound together as one mass, it falls under the category of flour only. They pound and give the husked grains of paddy that has been roasted with hard cooking; that powder too falls under the category of flour only. But the husked grains of paddy or paddy chaff that has been roasted with even cooking, or roasted husked grains themselves, do not bring about an invitation to stop. But the powder of those husked grains and so forth does bring about an invitation to stop. The bran of paddy roasted with hard cooking also brings about an invitation to stop. But the bran of paddy roasted with even cooking or sun-dried does not bring about an invitation to stop. Puffed rice or cooked rice, flour, and so forth made from them do not bring about an invitation to stop. Roasted flour or any pure hard food does not bring about an invitation to stop. But hard food filled with fish and meat, or a flour ball, does bring about an invitation to stop. Fish and meat are well known. But this is the distinction - even if, to one drinking gruel, they give just two pieces of fish or two pieces of meat, each merely the size of a grain of gruel, whether in one vessel or in separate vessels, if without eating them he refuses any other food sufficient for an invitation to stop, he does not bring about an invitation to stop. If one of them has been eaten and one remains in the hand or in the bowl, and he refuses something else, he brings about an invitation to stop. If both have been eaten and not even a mustard-seed-sized amount remains in the mouth, even if he refuses something else, he does not bring about an invitation to stop.

One who is eating allowable meat and refuses allowable meat, is invited to stop. One who is eating allowable meat and refuses unallowable meat, is not invited to stop. Why? Because it is not a valid basis. For the invitation to stop occurs only when one refuses that which it is proper for a monk to eat. But in this case, one who knows refuses because of its unallowable nature, and even one who does not know refuses what is already in a position that should be refused; therefore, he is not invited to stop. But if one who is eating unallowable meat refuses allowable meat, he is invited to stop. Why? Because it is a valid basis. For what he has refused is a basis for the invitation to stop. But what he is eating, although it stands in a position that should be refused, being eaten it does not lose its nature as meat; therefore, he is invited to stop. One who is eating unallowable meat and refuses unallowable meat, is not invited to stop, by the same reasoning as before. One who is eating either allowable meat or unallowable meat and refuses any allowable food among the five foods, is invited to stop. One who refuses unallowable food that has arisen through wrong livelihood, produced by corrupting families, practising medicine, announcing superhuman states, acting as a go-between, handling money, and so forth - that

which is censured by the Buddha - is not invited to stop. Even one who is eating either allowable food or unallowable food and refuses allowable food, is invited to stop. One who refuses unallowable food is not invited to stop - the reason should be understood by the same method as stated everywhere.

Thus, regarding "the seat" and so forth, having known that one who refuses food brought by one standing within arm's reach while eating incurs the invitation to stop, now for the purpose of knowing how one incurs it, this is the determination - Here, regarding "the seat" and "food," firstly, one by whom even a single grain of rice has been swallowed, if there is any of the five foods anywhere in the bowl, mouth, or hands, and he refuses even one other of the five foods, he is invited to stop. If there is no food anywhere, and only a mere smell of food is discernible, he is not invited to stop. If there is no food in the mouth and hands, but there is in the bowl, and he does not wish to eat at that seat but wishes to enter the monastery to eat, or wishes to give it to another, and in the meantime he refuses food, he is not invited to stop. Why? Because the state of having unfinished food has been interrupted. Also, one who wishes to go elsewhere to eat, having swallowed the food in his mouth and taking the remainder, going along the way refuses other food, for him too the invitation to stop does not occur - thus it is stated in the Mahāpaccarī. And just as with the bowl; so too with the hands. Or even if there is food in the mouth, if one does not wish to swallow it, and at that moment refuses other food, he is not invited to stop. For the characteristic stated in one instance should be understood as applying everywhere. Moreover, this method has been shown in the Kurundī itself. For it is stated there: "The food in the mouth has been swallowed, the food in the hands he wishes to give to a scrap-eater, the food in the bowl he wishes to give to a monk - if at that moment he refuses, he is not invited to stop." Regarding "standing within arm's reach," here, if the monk is seated, starting from the back edge of the seat; if standing, starting from the heels; if lying down, starting from the far edge of the side on which he is lying down; and of the donor, whether seated, standing, or lying down, excluding the outstretched hand, whichever limb is nearest, delimiting by its near edge, two and a half cubits is to be understood as "arm's reach." The invitation to stop occurs only for one who refuses what is brought while standing within that distance, and not beyond it.

"He brings forward" means one standing within arm's reach offers it for the purpose of taking. But if a monk sitting next to him, without bringing forward the bowl placed in his hands, on his thighs, or on a support, says "Take the food," there is no invitation for the one who refuses that. The same principle applies even when one brings a food vessel and places it on the ground in front and says "Take it." But when one slightly lifts it up or moves it forward and says "Take it," there is an invitation for the one who refuses. An elder sitting in the elder's seat sends his bowl to a junior monk sitting far away, saying "Take rice from this." But the one who went and took it stands silently; the junior monk refuses, saying "It is enough for me" - he is not invited. Why? Because of the elder's being far away and because the messenger did not bring it forward. But if the monk who took it and came says "Take this food," there is an invitation for the one who refuses that.

During the serving, one person holds a rice vessel in one hand and a ladle in the other and serves the monks. If another comes and says "I will hold the vessel, you give the rice," and merely takes hold of it, but the server himself still holds it, therefore it is as if brought forward. Therefore there is an invitation for the one who refuses what is being taken with the intention of giving. But if it has merely been touched by the server, and the other one holds it, there is no invitation for the one who refuses what is being taken with the intention of giving from that. But when the food has been lifted with the ladle, there is. For the bringing forward by the ladle itself is the bringing forward in that case. It is stated in the Mahāpaccaṇḍī that even when both carry it equally, the one who refuses is indeed invited. When food is being given to the monk sitting next to him, the other covers his bowl with his hands - there is no invitation. Why? Because what was brought forward to another was refused.

"The refusal is apparent" - here, there is no invitation for one who refuses what was brought forward by speech. But it should be understood that there is an invitation for one who refuses by body or by speech what was brought forward by body.

Therein, refusal by body means one waves a finger, a hand, a fan, or a corner of the robe, or makes a gesture with the eyebrow, or looks angrily. Refusal by speech means one says "Enough," or "I do not take," or "Do not pour," or "Go away." Thus, by whatever manner one refuses by body or by speech, there is an invitation.

One, afraid of the invitation when food has been brought forward, withdraws his hand and says to the one repeatedly pouring rice into the bowl "Pour, pour, press it down and fill it up" - what is said here? The Elder Mahāsuma said: "Because it was said for the purpose of not pouring, there is an invitation." But the Elder Mahāpaduma said: "For one who says 'Pour, fill it up,' is there anyone's invitation?" and said "He is not invited." Another, having noticed a monk bringing forward food, says "Friend, will you take something from here too? I will give you something." There too, the Elder Mahāsuma said: "Because it was said meaning 'He will not come thus,' there is an invitation." But the Elder Mahāpaduma said: "For one who says 'Will you take?' is there anyone's invitation?" and said "He is not invited."

One brings forward broth containing meat and says "Take the broth." For one who, having heard that, refuses, there is no invitation. When one says "Fish broth, meat broth," there is for the one who refuses. Even when one says "Take this," there is indeed. Having separated the meat, one says "Take the meat broth." If therein there is even a mustard-seed-sized piece of meat, there is an invitation for the one who refuses that. But if it has been strained, the Elder Abhaya said "It is allowable."

When one asking about meat broth, the Great Elder, having said "Wait a moment," said "Friend, bring a bowl." How is this to be explained here? The Great Elder Suma said: "The going of the one bringing was first interrupted, therefore it constitutes an invitation to decline." But the Great Elder Paduma said: "Where is this one going? What kind of going is this? Even for one who is taking, is there an invitation to decline?" Having said this, he said "It does not constitute an invitation to decline." They cook meat mixed with bamboo shoots, jackfruit and so forth, and taking it they say "Take the bamboo shoot curry, take the jackfruit side dish" - even so, it does not constitute an invitation to decline. Why? Because it is stated by the name of what is not capable of producing an invitation to decline. But if they say "fish curry" or "meat

curry" or "take this," it constitutes an invitation to decline. There is what is called a meat mixture; even one wishing to give it says "Take the mixture" - it is allowable; it does not constitute an invitation to decline. But when "meat mixture" or "this" is said, it constitutes an invitation to decline. This same method applies in all cases of fish and meat mixtures.

But whoever, while eating at an invitation, refuses meat that has been brought forward, thinking "It was prepared specifically for me" - he has indeed been invited to decline, so it is stated in the Mahāpaccarī. The discussion on mixtures, however, is well stated in the Kurundī. For thus it was stated there - A monk who goes for alms-round, having brought gruel mixed with rice, says "Take the gruel" - it does not constitute an invitation to decline. When "Take the rice" is said, it constitutes an invitation to decline. Why? Because of the existence of that by which one was asked. Here this is the intention - He says "Take the gruel-mixture" - if there the gruel is greater or equal, it does not constitute an invitation to decline. If the gruel is thin and the rice is greater, it constitutes an invitation to decline. And since this is stated in all the commentaries, it cannot be rejected; however, the reason here is difficult to see. He says "Take the rice-mixture" - whether the rice is much, equal, or less, it constitutes an invitation to decline indeed. Without mentioning either rice or gruel, he says "Take the mixture" - if there the rice is greater or equal, it constitutes an invitation to decline. If less, it does not constitute an invitation to decline. And this should not be equated with a karambaka mixture. For a karambaka may be mixed with meat or without meat, therefore when "karambaka" is said, there is no invitation to decline. But this is exclusively a rice-mixture. The invitation to decline occurs in the very manner stated here. When in rice with much broth he separates the broth and gives it saying "Take the broth," or in rice with much milk the milk, or in a milk-rice pudding with much ghee the ghee saying "Take the ghee" - for one who refuses that, there is no invitation to decline.

But one who is invited to stop while walking, he is allowed to eat only while walking. Upon reaching mud or water, one who has stopped should have it made leftover. If a river in between is in flood, one should eat while walking around a thicket on the riverbank. But if there is a boat or a bridge, having boarded it, one should eat only while walking about; the going should not be interrupted. One who has been invited to stop while seated in a vehicle, or on the back of an elephant or horse, or in a moon-disc, or in a sun-disc, should eat only while seated, even while those are moving, until midday. One who is invited to stop while standing should eat only while standing; one who is invited to stop while sitting should eat only while sitting. One who changes that particular posture should have it made leftover. One who is invited to stop after sitting in a squatting position should eat only in that squatting position. But a straw seat or some kind of cushion should be given underneath him. One who has been invited to stop after sitting on a stool is allowed to eat while turning in the four directions without moving the seat. One who has been invited to stop after sitting on a bed is not allowed to move here or there. But if they lift him up together with the bed and take him elsewhere, it is permissible. One who has been invited to stop after lying down should eat only while lying down. While turning over, one should not go beyond the place of the side on which one was lying.

"Not leftover" means not leftover; the meaning is "not extra." But since that is either not done by the seven modes of Vinaya procedure beginning with making it allowable, or is not extra for one who is ill, therefore in the word-analysis "made not allowable" etc. is stated. Therein, "made not allowable" means whatever fruit or roots and tubers etc. therein has not been made allowable by the five ascetic allowances; and whatever is unallowable meat or unallowable food, that is called "not allowable." That which is not allowable, even though made leftover by saying "this is enough for all," should be understood as "made not allowable." "Made not received" means that which has not been received by a monk, made leftover in the same manner as before. "Made not lifted" means that which has not been even slightly lifted or moved aside by a monk who has come to make it allowable. "Made outside arm's reach" means made by one standing outside the arm's reach of the monk who has come to make it allowable. "Made by one who has not eaten" means one who makes it leftover by saying "this is enough for all," by whom food sufficient for invitation has not been eaten. "Made by one who has eaten, been invited to stop, and risen from his seat" - this is self-evident. "This is enough for all" - "not said" means making a distinction of speech, it has not been said thus. Thus, whatever has not been properly made leftover by these seven modes of Vinaya procedure, and whatever is not leftover for one who is ill, both of those should be understood as "not leftover."

But "leftover" should be understood by the opposite method of that very same. Moreover, here "made by one who has eaten" means it should be understood that even having eaten just one grain of rice or a strip of meat from the bowl of a fellow monk sitting nearby, it is made by one who has eaten. Regarding "by one who has not risen from his seat," here for the purpose of avoiding confusion, this is the determination: Two monks eating early in the morning have been invited to stop - one should remain seated right there, while the other, having brought a regular meal or a ticket meal, having poured half into that monk's bowl and having washed his hand, the remainder should be made allowable by that monk and then eaten. Why? For whatever is stuck to his hand, that is not allowable. But if the monk who was seated first himself takes from that one's bowl with his hand, there is no need for hand-washing. But if, while one is eating after having had it made allowable in this way, some curry or hard food is again poured into the bowl, the one by whom it was first made allowable is not allowed to do it again. By whom it was not done, by him it should be done. And what was not done, that should be done. "By whom it was not done" means by another monk by whom it was not first done, by him it should be done. "And what was not done" means even by the one by whom it was first made allowable, whatever was not done, that should be done. But it is not allowed to do it in the first vessel. For therein what is being done becomes done together with what was first done; therefore the intention is that it is permissible to do it in another vessel. But what has been thus done is permissible for that monk to eat together with what was first done.

And when making allowable, it should be done not only in the bowl, but also in a pot, a dish, or wherever, having placed it in front and in a tilted vessel. Even if a hundred monks have been invited to take more, it is permissible for all of them to eat, and it is permissible even for those who have not been invited to take more. But for the one by whom the allowable was made, it is not permissible. Even if they seat a monk who, having been invited to take more, has entered for alms-round, taking his bowl, at a

festive invitation where eating is obligatory, he should eat only after having had the leftover made. If there is no other monk there, the bowl should be sent to the assembly hall or the monastery to have it made. But when making allowable, it should not be done while it is in the hand of one who is not fully ordained. If there is an inexperienced monk in the assembly hall, one should go oneself, have the allowable made, bring it back, and eat.

Regarding "leftover of the sick" - here it is not merely what remains after a sick person has eaten that is leftover of the sick. Rather, whatever is brought designating a sick person, thinking "he will eat today or tomorrow or whenever he wishes" - all of that should be understood as "leftover of the sick." That which incurs a wrong-doing with each and every swallowing regarding the foods allowable for a watch-period and so forth, that is stated in terms of being unmixed. But if they are mixed with material food, for one who, having received them whether for the purpose of food or not for the purpose of food, swallows them, there is only an expiation.

241. "When there is a reason" means: in the case of day-long medicine, when there is thirst, for the purpose of quenching thirst; in the case of seven-day medicine and life-long medicine, when there is an illness that should be alleviated by that particular remedy, there is no offence for one who uses it for the purpose of alleviating that illness. The remainder here is clear in itself.

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

The first training rule on invitation is the fifth.

6. Commentary on the Second Training Rule Concerning Invitation to Stop

242. Regarding the sixth training rule - "Engaged in misconduct" means he commits a transgression of a rule. "He bore enmity" means generating ill-will, he bound his own anger towards that person; the meaning is that he repeatedly generated resentment. "The monk who bore enmity" means that monk who had generated ill-will.

243. "Should invite by bringing" means having brought, one should invite thus: "Come, monk, eat or consume." However, in the word-analysis, without extracting "Come, monks" and so forth, in order to show the meaning of inviting by bringing in a general manner, it is stated: "Take as much as you wish." "Knowing" means knowing the state of having been invited. But since that knowing of his occurs in three ways, therefore the word-analysis is stated by the method beginning with "knowing means either knowing by oneself." "Expecting to cause offence" means expecting to cause offence, reproof, the state of causing embarrassment.

"If he accepts, there is an offence of wrong-doing" means when the one to whom it was brought accepts, there is a wrong-doing for the monk who brought it. However, the entire classification of offences for the other was stated in the first training rule,

but in this training rule all offences should be understood as pertaining only to the one who brings. The remainder is evident since it was stated in the manner of the first training rule.

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 fault; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is painful feeling.

The second training rule on invitation is the sixth.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Eating at the Wrong Time

247. In the seventh training rule - "Mountain-top festival" means a chief festival on a mountain, or a festival at the peak area of a mountain. An announcement is made in the city that it will take place on the seventh day; outside the city, on a level piece of ground in the shadow of the mountain, a great crowd of people assembles; various kinds of dancing and theatrical performances take place; for viewing them, they set up platforms upon platforms. The group of seventeen, having been ordained while still young when the training rule had not yet been laid down, went there saying "Friends, we shall watch the theatrical performances." Then their relatives, with delighted hearts, saying "Our venerable ones have come," having bathed them, having anointed them, having fed them, also gave into their hands cakes, solid food, and the like. Referring to them it was said - "People, having seen the group of seventeen monks" and so forth.

248-249. "At the improper time" means when the proper time has passed. "Time" refers to the meal time for monks, and its ultimate limit is midday; the meaning is that it has passed beyond that. Therefore, in the word analysis it is said: "The improper time means from when midday has passed until the break of dawn." Even when midday is still present, it falls within the reckoning of the proper time. From that point onwards, however, one cannot eat solid food or soft food; one might be able to drink hastily, but one should not do so out of scrupulousness. And for the purpose of knowing the determination of the proper time, a time-post should be set up; the meal duty should be done within the proper time itself.

Regarding "the remaining solid food" here, as for that which is made of raw grain and prepared grain such as sugar-balls and sweetmeats, there is nothing to be said about that. That which is of the category of forest roots and so forth, being of a material nature, namely - root-edibles, tuber-edibles, rhizome-edibles, pith-edibles, trunk-edibles, bark-edibles, leaf-edibles, flower-edibles, fruit-edibles, seed-edibles, flour-edibles, and sap-edibles - this too falls under the reckoning of solid food.

Therein, for the purpose of discerning what is of a material nature, this is merely an introductory illustration - In the case of root-edibles, first: radish root, alkaline plant root, caccu root, tambaka root, taṇḍuleyyaka root, vatthuleyyaka root, vajakali root, jajjharī root - such roots of pot-herb leaves are of a material nature. Here, in the case of vajakali root, the old withered part is cut off and discarded; that is allowable for life. Anything else of such a kind should be understood by this same method. But it is said that even the old withered parts of radish, alkaline plant, and jajjharī roots are of a material nature. But those stated in the canonical text -

"I allow, monks, root medicines: turmeric, ginger, calamus, calamus root, aconite, kaṭukarohiṇī, vetiver, and cyperus grass; and whatever other root medicines there are that do not serve the purpose of solid food among solid foods, nor serve the purpose of soft food among soft foods" -

Those stated are allowable for life. When they are counted by the method of the lesser five roots, the greater five roots, and so forth, there is no end to the counting. Their characteristic, however, is precisely the absence of serving the purpose of solid food and soft food. Therefore, whatever root serves the purpose of solid food and soft food for people as ordinary nourishment in the various regions, that is allowable for the proper time; the other should be understood as allowable for life. Even though much has been said about these, one should stand by this very characteristic. When designations by name are given, those who do not know this or that name only become confused; therefore, without giving importance to designation by name, only the characteristic has been shown.

And just as with roots; so too with tubers and the rest, whatever characteristic has been shown, the determination should be understood by means of that very characteristic. And as for the eight kinds beginning with turmeric stated in the canonical text, it is said that all their trunks, bark, flowers, and fruits too are allowable for life.

In the case of tuber-edibles, there are two kinds of tubers - long and round: long ones such as lotus-fibre and kiṃsuka tubers, and round ones such as water-lily and kaseruka tubers, which they also call "knots." Therein, the old withered parts of all tubers, and the skin, and the fine roots are allowable for life. But the tender ones are easily edible: sālakalyāṇī shoot-tubers, kiṃsuka shoot-tubers, ambāṭaka tubers, ketaka tubers, māluva tubers, lotus and white-lotus tubers called lotus-fibres, piṇḍālu, masālu and the like, milk-creeper tubers, āluva tubers, drumstick tubers, palm tubers, tubers of blue lotuses, red lotuses, white lotuses, and fragrant lotuses, plantain tubers, bamboo tubers, kaseruka tubers - such tubers as these that serve the purpose of solid food and soft food for people as ordinary nourishment in the various regions are allowable for the proper time.

The milk-creeper tuber, unwashed, is allowable for life; washed, it is allowable for the proper time. However, tubers such as milk-tree, kākolī, jīvika, usabha, and garlic are allowable for life. These are in the canonical text - "or whatever other roots there are that are medicinal" - thus they are included under the category of root medicines.

Regarding fibrous root edibles, the lotus fibrous root is similar to the white lotus fibrous root. Eraka root, kandula root, and so forth - fibrous roots that in various regions serve for people as ordinary food fulfilling the purpose of solid food and soft food are allowable for the proper time. However, the fibrous roots of turmeric, ginger, makaci, four-sided creeper, ketaka, palmyra, fan-palm, kuntāla, coconut, areca tree, and so forth are allowable for life; all of these are in the canonical text - "or whatever other roots there are that are medicinal" - thus they are included under the category of root medicines.

Regarding shoot edibles, the shoots known as tender cores of palmyra, fan-palm, kuntāla, ketaka, coconut, areca tree, date palm, rattan, eraka, and banana; bamboo shoots, reed shoots, sugar-cane shoots, radish shoots, mustard shoots, asparagus

shoots, shoots of the seven grains, and so forth - the shoot of trees, creepers, and so forth that in various regions serves for people as ordinary food fulfilling the purpose of solid food and soft food is allowable for the proper time. The shoots of turmeric, ginger, vaca, makaci, and garlic, and the old cluster that has fallen after cutting from palmyra, fan-palm, kuntāla, and coconut shoots, are allowable for life.

Regarding trunk edibles, the trunk of sāla-kalyāṇī that has gone underground, the sugar-cane trunk, the trunks of blue lotus, red lotus, white lotus, and fragrant white lotus, and so forth - the trunk that in various regions serves for people as ordinary food fulfilling the purpose of solid food and soft food is allowable for the proper time. The leaf-stalks of lotus species, all the stalks of paduma species, kāravindaka stalks and the like, and all remaining trunks are allowable for life.

Regarding bark edibles, only sugar-cane bark alone is allowable for the proper time, and that too only when it has sap. All the rest is allowable for life. However, the inclusion of these three - shoots, trunks, and barks - should be understood in the canonical text under astringent medicines. For this was said:

"I allow, monks, astringent medicines: neem astringent, kuṭaja astringent, paṭola astringent, phaggava astringent, nattamāla astringent, or whatever other astringent medicines there are that do not serve the purpose of solid food among solid foods, nor serve the purpose of soft food among soft foods."

For herein the inclusion of these too is accomplished. And all the stated astringents should be understood as allowable.

Regarding leaf edibles, the leaves of radish, alkali plant, caccu, tambaka, taṇḍuleyyaka, papunnāga, vatthuleyyaka, vajakali, jajjharī, sellu, drumstick tree, kāsamaddaka, ummā, cīna-mugga, black gram, rājamāsa, and setting aside the large nipphāva, the remaining nipphāva, aggimanthā, sunisannaka, white varaṇa, nāḷikā, and ground-grown salt-plant - the leaves of these and others of such kind that in various regions serve for people as ordinary food fulfilling the purpose of solid food and soft food are definitely allowable for the proper time. But another salt-leaf plant, as large as a big fingernail, that climbs trees and bushes - its leaf is allowable for life. The island-dwellers say that brahmī leaf is allowable for the proper time. Mango sprouts are allowable for the proper time, but asoka sprouts are allowable for life.

Or whatever others are in the canonical text -

"I allow, monks, leaf medicines: neem leaf, kuṭaja leaf, paṭola leaf, basil leaf, cotton-plant leaf, or whatever other leaf medicines there are that do not serve the purpose of solid food among solid foods, nor serve the purpose of soft food among soft foods" -

Those stated are allowable for life. And not only the leaves alone, but their flowers, fruits, and so forth too are allowable for life. Among leaves, phaggava leaf, ajjuka leaf, phaṇijjaka leaf, paṭola leaf, betel leaf, lotus-plant leaf - thus by way of enumeration there is no end.

Regarding flower edibles, radish flower, alkali-plant flower, caccu flower, tambaka flower, vajakali flower, jajjharī flower, small nipphāva flower, large nipphāva flower, kaseruka flower, young flowers of coconut, palmyra, and ketaka, white varaṇa flower, drumstick flower, flowers of lotus and paduma species, just the pericarp, scentless flower, shoot flower, jīvantī flower, and so forth - flowers that in various regions serve for people as ordinary food fulfilling the purpose of solid food and soft food are allowable for the proper time. However, the flowers of asoka, bakula, kuyyaka, punnāga, campaka, jasmine, oleander, kaṇikāra, kunda, navamālikā, mallikā, and so forth are allowable for life; there is no end to their enumeration. However, their inclusion in the canonical text should be understood under astringent medicines.

Regarding fruit as hard food: the fruits of jackfruit, breadfruit, palmyra palm, coconut, mango, rose-apple, hog-plum, tamarind, citron, wood-apple, gourd, pumpkin, pussaphala, timbarūsaka, cucumber, vātiṅgaṇa, coca, banana, madhuka, and so forth - whatever fruits in the world serve the purpose of hard food and soft food for people as ordinary nourishment in the various regions, all of those are allowable for the proper time only. It is not possible to show their limit by way of counting names. But those stated in the canonical text -

"I allow, monks, fruits as medicines - bilanga, long pepper, pepper, yellow myrobalan, beleric myrobalan, emblic myrobalan, goṭṭha fruit, and whatever other fruits there are that are medicines that do not serve the purpose of hard food among hard foods, nor serve the purpose of soft food among soft foods" -

Those stated are allowable for life. Even their unripe ones, such as the fruits of acchi, bimba, varaṇa, ketaka, kāsmaṇī, and so forth, nutmeg, kaṭuka fruit, cardamom, takkola - thus it is not possible to show their limit by way of names.

Regarding seeds as hard food: breadfruit seeds, jackfruit seeds, hog-plum seeds, sāla seeds, the seeds of young fruits of date-palm, ketaka, and timbarūsaka, tamarind seeds, bimba fruit seeds, the seed-pods of lotus and water-lily species - such and similar seeds that serve the purpose of hard food and soft food for people as ordinary nourishment in the various regions are allowable for the proper time only. Madhuka seeds, punnāga seeds, the seeds of yellow myrobalan and so forth, mustard seeds, rājika seeds - such and similar seeds are allowable for life. Their classification in the canonical text should be understood through fruit medicines alone.

Regarding flour as hard food: first, the flour of the seven grains, of grain-substitutes, and of pulses, jackfruit flour, breadfruit flour, hog-plum flour, sāla flour, washed palmyra flour, and milk-creeper flour - such and similar flours that serve the purpose of hard food and soft food for people as ordinary nourishment in the various regions are allowable for the proper time only. Unwashed palmyra flour, milk-creeper flour, and flours of ashwagandha and so forth are allowable for life. Their classification in the canonical text should be understood through astringent medicines and root and fruit medicines.

Regarding sap as hard food: only sugarcane sap alone is allowable for seven days. The rest - "I allow, monks, resins as medicines - asafoetida, asafoetida resin, asafoetida bark-extract, exudation, leaf-exudation, frond-exudation, sajjulasa, and whatever other resins there are that are medicines" - thus the saps stated in the

canonical text are allowable for life. Therein, of those included by the 'whatever else' clause, mango sap, kaṇikāra sap - thus it is not possible to show their limit by way of names. Thus, among these root foods and so forth, whatever is allowable for the proper time only, all of that is included in this context as "the remaining hard food."

Regarding soft food, what should be said in connection with "soft food means the five foods" and so forth has already been stated. "I shall eat, I shall consume" - he receives: whatever monk receives this hard food and soft food at the improper time, in the very receiving there is an offence of wrong-doing. The remainder here is clear in itself.

The origin of the sheep's wool rule -It originates from body and from body-and-mind; it is an act of doing; it is not release through perception; it is without consciousness; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it involves three types of consciousness; it involves three types of feeling.

The training rule on eating at the wrong time is the seventh.

8. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Storing Up

252. Regarding the eighth training rule - Belaṭṭhasīsa was a great elder who had been among the thousand matted-hair ascetics. "Was staying in the forest" means he was dwelling in a residence at a meditation hall not far from Jeta's Grove. "Dry boiled rice" means boiled rice without curry or condiments. It is said that he, having eaten within the village, afterwards walked for almsfood and brought back such boiled rice, and that indeed out of fewness of wishes, not out of greed for requisites. It is said that the elder, having spent seven days in the attainment of cessation, upon emerging from the attainment, moistened that almsfood with water and ate it, and then again sat in the attainment for seven days. Thus, having spent even two, three, or four weeks, he entered the village for almsfood. Therefore it was said - "He entered the village for almsfood after a long time."

253. "Making," "doing," and "action" are one in meaning. "There is storing" means "storing" (sannidhikāraṃ); "storing" itself is "stored" (sannidhikārakaṃ). This is a designation for having received it and having let one night pass. Therefore in its word-analysis it is stated: "'Stored' means received today and kept until the following day."

"He receives, there is an offence of wrong-doing" - thus, in the case of one who takes any food-for-the-day or food-for-a-watch that has been stored, with the desire to consume it, there is first an offence of wrong-doing in the receiving. But in consuming, for each and every mouthful there is an expiation. Even if a bowl is badly washed, such that when rubbing with the finger a streak is discernible, or in a jointed bowl grease has entered between the joints, and when heating it in the sun it oozes out, or when hot gruel is taken it becomes visible - even in such a bowl, for one eating on the following day there is an expiation. Therefore, having washed the bowl, one should ascertain the grease-free state by either pouring clear water into it again or by rubbing with the finger. For if there is a greasy quality in the water or a finger-streak is discernible on the bowl, it is badly washed. But on an oil-coloured bowl a finger-streak is discernible; that is of no consequence. Whatever monks without attachment relinquish to novices, if the novices store it and give it back, all is

allowable. For what one has received oneself and has not relinquished is not allowable on the second day. For from that, even consuming a single grain of rice, there is indeed an expiation.

In the case of unallowable meats, with human flesh there is an expiation together with a grave offence; with the remaining ones, together with a wrong-doing. When there is a condition regarding food-for-a-watch, for one consuming it there is an expiation. For one consuming it for the purpose of nourishment, there is an expiation together with a wrong-doing. If, having been satisfied, one consumes what has not been made as surplus: in the case of ordinary food there are two expiations; with human flesh, two together with a grave offence; with the remaining unallowable meats, together with a wrong-doing; in the case of food-for-a-watch when there is a condition, for one consuming with food in the mouth there are two, with an empty mouth only one. For one consuming for the purpose of nourishment, in both alternatives a wrong-doing is added. If one consumes at the wrong time, in the case of ordinary food there are two expiations on account of the storing condition and the wrong-time-eating condition; in the case of unallowable meats, a grave offence and a wrong-doing are added. In the case of food-for-a-watch, there is no offence on account of the wrong-time condition; but on account of the non-surplus condition, at the wrong time there is no offence in all alternatives.

255. Regarding "seven-day medicine and life-long medicine for the purpose of food": for one who accepts it for the purpose of food, there is first an offence of wrong-doing on account of the acceptance; but when swallowing, if it is without food-material, with each swallowing there is an offence of wrong-doing. But if, having been accepted mixed with food-material, it has been stored, there is just an offence requiring expiation according to the basis.

256. There is no offence: in the training rule on eating at the wrong time, beginning with "food allowed until the proper time," the edible and consumable food is called "allowed until the proper time" (yāvakālika) because it is to be eaten up to the time reckoned as midday. The eight kinds of beverages together with the conforming drinks are called "allowed for a watch" (yāmakālika) because they are to be consumed up to the watch reckoned as the last watch of the night, the watch being the time. The five kinds of medicine beginning with ghee are called "allowed for seven days" (sattāhakālika) because they are to be stored for seven days, seven days being the time. Except for water, everything else is called "allowed for life" (yāvajīvaka) because it may be kept for life and consumed when there is a reason.

Therein, food allowed until the proper time (yāvakālika) received at the break of dawn - there is no offence for one who stores it even a hundred times and consumes it so long as the proper time has not passed; for food allowed for a watch (yāmakālika), one day and night; for food allowed for seven days (sattāhakālika), seven nights; for the other, when there is a reason, there is no offence even for one consuming it for life. The remainder here is clear in itself. However, in the commentaries, at this point the discussion on beverages, the discussion on what is conforming to the allowable, the discussion beginning with "Is it allowable to use what is allowed for a watch with what is allowed until the proper time?" and the discussion on allowable grounds have been elaborated; we shall discuss that at the relevant place.

The origin of the sheep's wool rule -It originates from body and from body-and-mind; it is an act of doing; it is not release through perception; it is without consciousness; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it involves three types of consciousness; it involves three types of feeling.

The training rule on storing up is the eighth.

9. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Superior Food

257. Regarding the ninth training rule - "Sumptuous foods" means superior foods. "For whom is good food not agreeable" means for whom is that which is endowed with excellence not dear. "Sweet" means flavoursome.

259. Regarding "Whatever monk, not being sick, having asked for such sumptuous foods for his own benefit, should eat them" - here, one who asks for and eats pure ghee and so forth does not incur an expiation, but incurs a wrong-doing for requesting curry and rice under the training rules. However, it should be understood that one who asks for and eats foods mixed with rice incurs an expiation. This indeed is the intention here. For that very reason, without saying "sumptuous things," "sumptuous foods" is stated in the rule. For if "sumptuous things" were said, it would refer only to ghee and so forth. But when "sumptuous foods" is said, the meaning becomes clear that foods produced from the seven grains mixed with sumptuous things are sumptuous foods.

Now, regarding "there is a wrong-doing in the effort of requesting" and so forth, this is the determination: When one requests saying "Give rice with ghee," "Sprinkle ghee and give," "Make it mixed with ghee and give," "Give it together with ghee," or "Give ghee and rice" - there is a wrong-doing for the request, a wrong-doing for the receiving, and an expiation for the swallowing. But when one says "Give ghee-rice," since there is no such thing as ghee-rice in the way there is rice-food; therefore it should be understood as merely a wrong-doing for requesting curry and rice.

But if, when one says "Give rice with ghee," the person gives the rice and then gives butter or milk or curds saying "Make ghee and eat," or gives money saying "Take ghee with this and eat" - it is according to the actual substance. But when one says "Give rice with cow's ghee," let them give with cow's ghee, or if cow's ghee is not available, following the previous method, let them give cow's butter and so forth, or even a cow, saying "Eat ghee from this" - it is according to the actual substance. But if, when asked for cow's ghee, one gives with goat's ghee and so forth, it is a divergence from the agreement. For in such a case, something different from what was asked for has been given, therefore there is no offence. The same method applies to cases such as "Give with goat's ghee" and so forth.

When one says "Give with allowable ghee" and the person gives with unallowable ghee, it is merely a divergence from the agreement. When one says "With unallowable ghee" and the person gives with unallowable ghee, there is merely a wrong-doing both in receiving and in using. When unallowable ghee is not available, following the previous method, one gives unallowable butter and so forth, saying "Make ghee and eat" - it is as if given with unallowable ghee itself. When one says "With unallowable ghee" and the person gives with allowable ghee, it is a divergence from the agreement. When one says "With ghee" and the person gives with one of

the remaining items such as butter and so forth, it is merely a divergence from the agreement. The same method applies to cases such as "Give with butter" and so forth. For whatever one makes a request for, when that thing or its source is obtained, that very thing is considered obtained.

But if they give something else, whether mentioned in the canonical text or not, it is a divergence from the agreement. Except for butter and so forth mentioned in the canonical text, there is a wrong-doing for one who requests with other kinds of butter and so forth. And just as when one says "Give ghee-rice," it has been said that there is merely a wrong-doing for requesting curry and rice, since ghee-rice does not exist in the way rice-food does. So too in cases such as "Give butter-rice" and so forth. For even if each case were to be explained in detail one by one in sequence, the same meaning would have to be stated, and that can be known even in brief - what is the need for elaboration? Therefore it was said - "The same method applies to cases such as 'Give with butter' and so forth."

But if, having requested with all kinds of ghee and so forth at one place or at different places, one pours what was obtained into a single vessel, makes it into a single flavour, and then places even a drop on the tip of the tongue with the tip of a blade of grass and swallows it, one incurs nine expiations. And this has been stated in the Parivāra:

"Bodily, not verbal,
All with different cases;
One would commit them simultaneously, neither before nor after,
This question was devised by the skilful."

261. Regarding "not sick but perceiving himself as sick," here, if even perceiving himself as sick he asks for the five medicines for the purpose of medicine, he should be dealt with under the Mahānāma training rule. However, when asking for the nine kinds of sumptuous food, he should be dealt with under this training rule. For nuns, however, these are matters requiring acknowledgement; in the case of asking for curry and rice, for both it is merely an offence of wrong-doing against a prescribed rule. The remainder here is clear in itself.

It has four origins - it originates from body, from body and speech, from body and mind, and from body, speech, and mind.

It is functional, not a liberation through cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action, verbal action, with three types of consciousness, and with three types of feeling.

The training rule on superior food is the ninth.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Tooth-Cleaning Sticks

263. Regarding the tenth training rule - One who uses only rag-robles for all four requisites, even down to a tooth-stick, everything being solely from refuse - this is "one who uses only rag-robles." He, it is said, making a vessel discarded in the cemetery as his bowl, making robes from rags discarded there, and taking beds and seats discarded there, he uses them. "Offerings left for the departed" - herein, "the departed" refers to deceased fathers and grandfathers. "Offerings left" refers to hard

and soft foods discarded in cemeteries and such places for their sake. People, it is said, in dedication to deceased relatives, whatever was dear to them during their lifetime, making it into portions, place it in these cemeteries and such places, thinking "May our relatives consume it." That monk took it and ate it, and did not wish for other food being given, even though it was excellent. Therefore it was said - "In the cemetery, at the foot of trees, and at thresholds, he himself took and consumed offerings left for the departed." "Elder" means firm, solidly built. "Fat" means stout. What is meant is that this monk is both stout and of solid body. "Methinks he eats human flesh" means we observe him thinking "he eats human flesh." For those who eat human flesh become like this - this is their intended meaning.

264. Regarding "were scrupulous about water and toothpicks," here those monks became scrupulous without properly discerning the meaning of the phrase "one might convey food that has not been given through the mouth-door." The Blessed One, however, in accordance with the matter that had arisen, like a father instructing his children, persuading those monks, laid down a supplementary rule.

265. "Not given" means not given by any one of the means - by body, by something connected to the body, or by relinquishing - to one who receives by body or by something connected to the body. For it is with reference to this very matter that in the word-analysis it is stated: "What is called 'not given' means what has not been formally received." However, in the second Pārājika it is stated: "What is called 'not given' means what is possessed by another." "Given" - this, however, is set forth for the purpose of showing the characteristic by way of the opposite of that very "not given." And in its exposition, when another is giving "by body, by something connected to the body, or by relinquishing," one standing within arm's reach receives by body or by something connected to the body - thus what is being given in this way, even as little as the dust of a chariot wheel, if one standing within the arm's reach as previously described receives it by body or by something connected to the body, what is thus received is called "given." It is not relinquished merely by such words as "Take this, let this be yours."

Therein, "by body" means by whatever bodily limb among the hands and so forth; even what is given by a toe is called given by body, and the same method applies to receiving as well. For whatever is taken by any bodily limb is indeed taken by body. Even if what is being given for nasal treatment is received by the nostril, or by one who is ill, by the mouth. For here mere attention is the measure - this method is stated in the Mahāpaccarī. "By something connected to the body" means what is given by any utensil among ladles and so forth is called given by something connected to the body. The same method applies to receiving as well. Whatever is taken by any object connected to the body, such as a bowl or dish, is indeed taken by something connected to the body. "By relinquishing" means having released from the body and from what is connected to the body, even what is being made to fall towards one standing within arm's reach, by body or by something connected to the body, is called given by the act of relinquishing. This is the explanation of the canonical text.

Now here is the determination beyond the canonical text - Receiving is valid with five factors - it is within the lifting capacity of a man of medium strength, arm's reach is discernible, the act of bringing forward is discernible, a deity or a human being or an

animal gives by body or by something connected to the body or by relinquishing, and the monk receives it by body or by something connected to the body. Thus receiving is valid with five factors.

Therein, the arm's reach for those standing, sitting, or lying down should be understood in the same manner as stated in the training rule on invitation. But if among the donor and the recipient one is in the air and one is on the ground, the measure of arm's reach should be determined by the nearer end of whichever limb is closest, excluding the outstretched hand of the one on the ground reaching up to give or take from the one in the air, measured from the head of the one on the ground. Even if one is in a well and one is on the edge of the well, or one is in a tree and one is on the ground, the measure of arm's reach should be determined in the same manner as stated. Standing within such arm's reach, even if a bird gives a flower or fruit with its beak, or an elephant having taken it with its trunk gives it, the receiving is valid. But if one is seated on the back of an elephant even seven and a half cubits tall, and takes what is being given by it with its trunk, it is indeed allowable.

If someone, having placed many vessels of rice and curry on his head, comes to the monk's presence and while standing says "Take," the act of bringing forward is not yet discernible, therefore it should not be taken. But if he bends down even slightly, the monk should extend his hand and receive the bottom vessel even by touching just a part of it. By that much all the vessels are received, and from then on, having taken them down or opened them, it is allowable to take whichever one wishes and eat. However, regarding a single vessel such as a basket with rice, there is nothing to be said; even if one carrying rice in a basket gives it by tilting the basket, it is allowable. There is a bamboo thirty hands long, with a pot of molasses tied at one end and a pot of ghee at the other; if one receives it, all is received. If one says "Take the juice flowing from the sugarcane-press trough," the act of bringing forward is not discernible, therefore it should not be taken. But if, having discarded the residue, one scoops it up repeatedly with the hand and gives it, it is allowable.

Many bowls are placed on a bed, a chair, a mat, a trough, or a plank. Standing where the donor is within arm's reach, having touched the bed and so forth even with a finger with the intention of receiving, whether standing, sitting, or lying down, whatever is given into those bowls, all of that is received. Even if one climbs onto the bed and so forth and sits down thinking "I shall receive," it is permissible indeed. But if one takes hold of the bed and so forth by hand and sits on the bed, there is nothing to be said.

On the ground, however, even if they are standing belly to belly, wherever one is sitting having touched with a finger or a needle, whatever is being given there is received. The statement "Receiving does not hold for bowls placed on large mats, hand-coverings, and so forth anywhere" should be understood as said with reference to being beyond arm's reach. But when within arm's reach, it is permissible anywhere, except for things growing there.

In the case of things growing there, however, it is not permissible on a lotus leaf or on a kimsuka leaf and so forth. For that does not count as connected to the body. And just as with things growing there, so too it does not hold for a bed and so forth tied to a post, an immovable plank, or a stone, for these too fall under the category of things

growing there. Receiving does not hold even for fine tamarind leaves and such spread on the ground, for they are not capable of supporting. But it holds for large lotus leaves and such. If one standing beyond arm's reach gives with a long-handled ladle, he should be told "Come and give." If, not hearing or disregarding the words, he simply pours into the bowl, it must be received again. The same method applies even when one standing far away throws a lump of food.

If when a bowl is being taken out from the bowl-bag there are dye-powders on the bowl, if water is available it should be washed; if not, the dye-powder should be wiped off, or having received it, one should go for alms. If dust falls while going for alms, having received it, alms-food should be taken. For one who takes without receiving, there is a Vinaya offence of wrong-doing. But for one who eats that again after receiving, there is no offence. But if, when told "Receive it and then give," not hearing or disregarding the words, they simply give alms-food, there is no Vinaya offence of wrong-doing; having received again, other alms-food should be taken.

If a strong wind causes dust to fall here and there, and it is not possible to take alms-food, having made the mental resolve with a pure mind "I shall give it to an unordained person," it is permissible to take it. Having thus gone for alms and gone to the monastery or the dining hall, having given it to an unordained person and then having received what is given by him, or on trust with him, it is permissible to eat.

If during the alms-round one gives a bowl with dust to a monk, he should be told - "Having received this, you should either take alms-food or consume it." He should do accordingly. If the dust floats on top, the liquid should be drained off and the remainder eaten. If it has entered inside, it should be received. When there is no unordained person present, without releasing it from the hand, it should be taken to where an unordained person is and received there. It is permissible to remove dust that has fallen on dry food and eat it. If it is extremely fine, it should be removed together with the food on top, or having received it, it should be eaten. When porridge or soup is placed in front and those stirring it cause drops to fly up from the vessel and fall into the bowl, the bowl should be received.

When those serving with a ladle bring and give, drops fall from the ladle into the bowl beforehand; they are well-fallen, and because they have been brought forward, there is no fault. Even if, when food is being poured with a small vessel, soot or ash falls from the small vessel, because it has been brought forward, there is no fault. What is being given to the next monk flies up from the bowl and falls into another monk's bowl; it is well-fallen. For that is indeed already received.

If, when splitting a jajjhari branch and the like and giving to one monk, splashes from the branch fall into another monk's bowl, the bowl should be formally received. When they split over a monk's bowl, and pieces fall into his bowl, because they have been brought forward with the intention of giving, there is no fault. They fill a bowl with milk-rice and give it; because of the heat, one cannot take it from below; it is permissible to take it even by the rim. If even so one cannot, it should be taken with a stand.

A monk who has taken his bowl and sat down in the dining hall has fallen asleep; he knows neither what is being brought nor what is being given; it is not received. But if he has sat down having given attention, it is permissible. Even if he releases the

stand with his hand and pushes it with his foot and sleeps, it is still permissible. But for one who receives by stepping on the stand with his foot, even if awake, it is a disrespectful reception; therefore it should not be done. Some say thus: receiving by means of a stand is receiving by what is connected to what is connected to the body, therefore it is not permissible. That is merely their assertion. But in meaning, all of this is indeed connected to the body. And this principle has been shown in the case of bodily contact as well. Whatever falls while being given to a monk, it is permissible to pick it up oneself and consume it. Herein this is the text:

"I allow, monks, whatever falls while being given, to pick it up oneself and consume it. That, monks, has been relinquished by the donors."

But this text is of indirect meaning. Therefore the intention here should be understood thus: Whatever, while being given, slips from the donor's hand and falls on clean ground or on a lotus leaf, cloth, reed mat, and the like, it is permissible to pick it up oneself and consume it. But whatever falls on dusty ground, that should be consumed after wiping off the dust, or washing it, or having it formally received. But if it rolls and goes near another monk, it is permissible even to have it brought by him. If he says to that monk "You yourself eat it," it is permissible for him too to eat it. But without being instructed, it should not be taken by him. Even without being instructed, it is permissible to take it thinking "I will give it to the other" - so it is said in the Kurundī. But why is it not permissible for the other monk to take it? Because it has not been permitted by the Blessed One. For by the Blessed One saying "one may pick it up oneself and consume it," permission to take and consume it, even though not formally received, was granted only to the one for whom it falls while being given. By the statement "That, monks, has been relinquished by the donors," the absence of another's ownership is indicated here. Therefore it is not permissible for another to pick it up himself and consume it, but it is permissible by the instruction of that one - this indeed is the intention here.

And since that is permitted because it is not formally received, therefore, even if it is covered by something and stored without being touched, just as it was placed, it is allowable to consume it even on the following day; there is no offence on account of storing. However, it should be consumed after formally receiving it. For the intention here is indeed that the permission to take it oneself and consume it is granted only for that same day, not beyond that.

Now the rule regarding what is negligible is stated - For when eating, teeth wear down, nails wear down, the colour of the bowl wears away - all this is negligible. Whatever impurity appears when sugarcane and the like are split with a knife, this is called newly arisen and should be consumed after formally receiving it. When the knife is washed and no impurity appears in what is split, there is only the mere smell of metal - that is negligible. Whatever is split with a knife that one carries about, the same rule applies. For they do not carry it about for the purpose of consumption. When grinding or pounding root-medicines and the like, the sitting cloth, the sitting cloth bag, the mortar, the pestle, and so forth wear away; when heating the carrying axe and putting it into buttermilk or milk for medicinal purposes, a bluish

discolouration appears there. The determination is the same as stated regarding the knife. However, one should not put them into raw buttermilk and the like oneself. If one does put them in, one is not freed from the offence of self-cooking.

When it is raining and one is walking for alms, dirty water from the body or from the robe falls into the bowl - that should be formally received. The same rule applies even when it falls while eating at the foot of a tree and the like. But if during seven days of rain the water is clean, or it falls from the open sky, it is allowable. When giving rice to a novice, one should give it without touching what is in his bowl. Or his bowl should be formally received. If, without formally receiving it, one touches the rice and then takes rice into one's own bowl, it becomes handled food.

But if, wishing to give, he says "Bring your bowl, novice, take the rice," and the other refuses saying "It is enough for me," and even when told "This has been relinquished by me to you," he says "I have no need of this." Even if he relinquishes it a hundred times, as long as it is in his own hand it remains formally received.

But if, being indifferent, he says "Take it" regarding what is placed on a stand, it should be formally received again. Being concerned, he places the bowl on a stand and says to the novice "Take cake or rice from here." The novice, having washed his hands, even if he takes a hundred times and puts it into his own bowl without touching what is in his own bowl, there is no further need for formal receiving. But if he touches what is in his own bowl and then takes from there, it becomes mixed with what belongs to the novice, and it should be formally received again. But some say "Even if what is being taken breaks off and falls in there, it should be formally received again." That should be understood as applying when it is said with a specific portion defined, such as "Take one lump of rice, take one cake, take such a portion of this lump of molasses." But here there is no specific portion defined. Therefore, whatever falls into the novice's bowl, that alone loses its formal receiving. But what is in the hand, as long as the novice does not decline saying "Enough" or the monk does not stop him, remains the property of the monk; therefore, it does not lose its formal receiving.

If one puts rice into a gruel-cooking vessel for one's own or the monks' benefit for someone's sake, one should say "Novice, place your hand over the vessel" and put it into his hand; for what falls from his hand into the vessel does not make the vessel improper on the following day, because it has been relinquished. If one puts it in without doing so, the vessel should be emptied of food like a bowl and then used for consumption. The donors have placed a gruel pot and gone; a young novice is unable to have it formally received; the monk brings his bowl near; the novice places the neck of the pot on the rim of the bowl and pours - the gruel that enters the bowl is formally received. Alternatively, the monk places his hand on the ground, the novice rolls it over and places it there - it is allowable. The same rule applies also to cake baskets, rice baskets, sugarcane bundles, and the like.

If two or three novices give a load that is suitable for formal acceptance, or if two or three monks take what has been lifted up by one strong person, it is allowable. If they hang a pot of oil, a pot of molasses, or a pot of butter on the leg of a bed or a chair, it is allowable for a monk to sit on the bed or the chair. It does not constitute something handled.

If two pots of oil are hung on a hat-rack or a hook, the upper one being formally accepted and the lower one not formally accepted, it is allowable to take the upper one. If the lower one is formally accepted and the upper one is not formally accepted, when one takes the upper one and then takes the other, the upper one becomes something handled. If there is an oil dish not formally accepted under a bed, and while sweeping one strikes it with a broom, it does not become something handled. If one takes what is not formally accepted thinking "I will take the formally accepted one," and upon realising, puts it back, it does not become something handled. If one takes it outside and then recognises it, one should leave it outside, carry it back, and place it in the same spot; there is no fault. But if it was previously placed uncovered, it should not be covered. It should be placed just as it was placed before. If one places it outside, it should not be touched again.

If while descending from the upper storey one recognises it in the middle of the stairway, since there is no proper place, it should be carried either up or down and placed there. When a crust forms on formally accepted oil and the like, or a thick powder forms on ginger and the like, that is merely something arisen from the same source; there is no further need for formal acceptance.

If one who has climbed a palmyra or a coconut palm lowers a bunch of fruits by a rope and while remaining above says "Take it," it should not be taken. If another person standing on the ground takes hold of the rope-loop, lifts it up, and gives it, it is allowable. If one has a large branch with fruits made allowable and formally accepts it, the fruits are already formally accepted; it is allowable to consume them at one's ease.

If standing inside a fence they cut through the fence and give sugarcane or wood-apple, it is allowable when within arm's reach. If what has come out through the fence stakes without being struck, it is allowable for one who takes it. Regarding what has come out by being struck, no fault has been shown in the commentaries. But we consider that what has been struck from that place has simply fallen of its own accord. Even if it does not remain there but moves on, it is fitting, like goods that have rolled out from a customs barrier. If they give something by tossing it over a fence or a wall, and if the wall is not thick, and the arm's reach suffices for one standing on the inner side and the outer side of the wall, it is allowable to take what has arrived even after going up a hundred hands' length.

If a monk carries a sick novice on his shoulder, and the novice sees fruits, takes them, and gives them while still seated on the shoulder, it is allowable. If another person carrying a monk gives to the monk seated on his shoulder, it is indeed allowable.

If a monk takes a fruit-bearing branch for the purpose of shade and goes along, and the desire to eat the fruits arises in his mind, it is allowable to eat them after having them formally accepted. If one has something made allowable and formally accepts it for the purpose of warding off flies, and if one wishes to eat it, only the original formal acceptance is valid; there is no fault in eating.

If a monk places goods requiring formal acceptance on a vehicle belonging to people and goes along the road, and the vehicle gets stuck in mud, and a young person takes hold of the wheel and lifts it up, it is allowable; it does not constitute something handled. If one places it on a boat and propels the boat with an oar or pulls it by

hand, it is allowable. The same method applies to a raft as well. Even if one places it in a pot or a basin and has an unordained person hold it, it is allowable to cross by holding the unordained person by the arm. Even in the absence of that, it is allowable to have an unordained person hold it and cross by holding that person by the arm.

Lay devotees give travel-rice to monks who are going on a journey. The novices, having taken the rice for the monks, are unable to take their own rice; the monks take their rice. When the rice taken by the novices themselves is exhausted, having cooked gruel with the other rice and having placed the bowls of all in order, they pour in the gruel. A wise novice, having taken his own bowl, gives it to the elder, and the elder's bowl to the next senior - thus he exchanges all of them. What is eaten by all is the novice's property; it is allowable.

Even if the novice is unwise and begins to drink the gruel in his own bowl himself, it is allowable to drink it even after the elders have requested in turn thus: "Friend, give me your gruel." What is eaten by all is indeed the novice's property; they incur no offence either on account of what is self-handled or on account of storing. Here, however, no distinction is seen between those carrying oil and the like for the benefit of parents, branches and the like for the purpose of shade, and these cases. Therefore the reason should be investigated.

A novice wishing to cook rice washes the rice grains but is unable to sift them. The monk should receive the rice grains and the vessel, wash and sift the rice grains, and place the vessel on the stove; he should not make a fire. When it is cooked, he should open it and ascertain that it is cooked. If it is undercooked, it is not allowable to cover it for the purpose of cooking. It is allowable for the purpose of preventing dust or ash from falling in; it is allowable to place it on the stove when cooked and also to eat it; there is no further act of receiving required.

The novice is capable of cooking, but he has no time and wishes to go somewhere. The monk should receive the vessel containing rice and water, place it on the stove, light the fire, and tell him: "You may go." From then on, it is allowable to do everything in the same manner as before.

A monk places a clean vessel on the stove and heats water for the purpose of gruel; it is allowable. The novice puts rice grains into the hot water; from that point on, the monk should not make a fire. It is allowable to drink the cooked gruel after receiving it.

A novice is cooking gruel; a monk who is restless with his hands, playing about, touches the vessel, touches the lid, breaks off the risen froth and removes it - it is not allowable for him alone to drink it; it is called improper conduct. If, however, having taken a ladle or a spoon, he stirs it without lifting it out, it is not allowable for anyone; it is both self-cooked and improperly handled. If he lifts it out, it also becomes self-handled.

A monk, having gone for alms, has placed his bowl on a stand. If there another greedy monk, playing about, touches the bowl or touches the bowl-lid, the food obtained from it is not allowable for him alone. If, however, he lifts up the bowl and puts it down, it is not allowable for anyone. If one shakes fruits growing in that place by grasping a branch or a creeper, the fruit obtained from there is not allowable for

him alone, and he commits an offence of wrongdoing for improper conduct. However, it is allowable to lean against a fruit tree or to tie a line there; it is not improper conduct - so it is stated in the Mahāpaccarī.

Having seen a mango fruit or the like fallen in the forest, it is allowable to bring it thinking "I shall give it to the novice" and give it. Even having seen a lion's leavings and the like, it is allowable to bring it, whether having received it or without having received it, thinking "I shall give it to the novice," and give it. If, however, one is able to purify one's intention, it is allowable even to eat what is obtained from there; one incurs no offence either on account of receiving raw meat or on account of what is self-handled.

When one who is going carrying oil and the like for the benefit of parents falls ill along the way, it is allowable to receive and consume whatever one wishes from that. If, however, it has been received at the outset as well, there is no further act of receiving required. One brings rice grains and gives them to the parents; they, having prepared gruel and the like from those very grains, give it to him - it is allowable; there is no fault either on account of storing or on account of what is self-handled.

A monk covers and heats water; it is allowable to consume it until it is exhausted. If, however, ash falls into it, it should be formally received. When one cooking oil while holding a pan with long tongs and ash falls in, it should be cooked without releasing it from the hand, taken down, and then formally received. If even embers or firewood have been formally received and stored, the original formal reception alone is sufficient.

A monk is eating sugarcane, and a novice says: "Please give some to me too." Told "Cut from here and take it," he takes it; for the remainder there is no further act of formal reception required. The same method applies also to one eating a lump of molasses. For the remainder after cutting and taking from the indicated place is indeed of unabandoned formal reception.

A monk distributing molasses formally receives it and makes portions; both monks and novices come and with a single taking each take one portion; the remainder after what has been taken is still formally received. If a greedy novice takes and takes and then puts it back, the remainder after what he has taken becomes not formally received.

A monk formally receives a smoking roll and inhales the smoke; his mouth and throat become as if smeared with red arsenic; it is allowable to consume food allowable for the period; there is no fault in the mixing of what is allowable for the period with what is allowable for life.

When one is cooking a bowl or dye, smoke enters through the openings of the ears, nose, and mouth; on account of illness one sniffs a flower or fruit; because it is negligible, it is allowable. A morsel of food strikes the palate and enters inside; because it is outside the scope, it is allowable. But if what has entered the mouth is swallowed at the wrong time, there is an offence. If the flavour of food stuck between the teeth enters, there is indeed an offence. If the food is subtle and the flavour is not discernible, it falls on the side of the negligible.

When the time is approaching, in a place without water, having eaten food, one

should rinse the mouth, drop two or three lumps of saliva, go to a place with water, and rinse the mouth. When sprouts emerge from ginger and such that have been formally received and stored, there is no further act of formal reception required. When there is no salt, it is allowable to use sea water for the purpose of salt. When salt water that has been formally received and stored becomes salt, or salt becomes water, or juice becomes treacle, or treacle becomes juice, the original formal reception alone is sufficient. Hailstones are to be treated as water. They clarify water with clearing nut wood used for maintenance; that is negligible; it is allowable together with food. What is clarified with wood-apple fruit and such, which have the nature of food, is allowable only before the meal.

In ponds and such, the water is thick; it is allowable. If, however, it clings to the mouth and hands, it is not allowable; it should be formally received and then consumed. In fields, at ploughed places, the water is thick; it should be formally received. If it flows and enters ravines and such and fills a river, it is allowable. There are kakudha pools and such, with water covered by flowers fallen from trees; if the flavour of the flowers is not discernible, there is no act of formal reception required. If the water is small in quantity and the flavour is discernible, it should be formally received. The same method applies also to water covered with dark-coloured leaves in mountain ravines and such.

If sareṇuka flowers or flowers with stalks and milk-sap have been placed in a drinking water pot, it should be received. Or the flowers should be received and then placed in. If pāṭali, campaka, or mallikā flowers have been placed in, only the fragrance remains - that is negligible; even on the second day it is allowable together with the food. If a novice takes drinking water from the flower-scented drinking water placed by a monk and pours back the remainder of what was drunk into the same vessel, it should be received. In lotus ponds and the like, it is allowable to push aside the flower pollen settled on the water with a pot and take the water. If there is a tooth-stick that has been made allowable, received, and kept, and if one wishes to drink its juice, the original reception alone is sufficient. If it has been kept without being received, it should be received. Even for one who does not know, if the juice has entered, there is indeed an offence. For this training rule is one without intention.

Regarding the great elements of the body, what is allowable and what is not allowable? Milk, to begin with, is allowable - whether it be milk of allowable-flesh animals or of unallowable-flesh animals, for one drinking it there is no offence. Tears, saliva, nasal mucus, urine, faeces, phlegm, tooth-tartar, eye-discharge, ear-discharge, and salt arisen on the body - all this is allowable. But whatever here, having fallen from its place, falls into the bowl or onto the hand, that should be received. What clings to a limb is as if already received. When one eating hot milk-rice has sweat that, flowing along the fingers, remains as a single stream and settles in the milk-rice, or when one going on alms-round has it descending from the hand to the rim of the bowl or to the bottom of the bowl, here there is no need for reception. Among cremated great elements of the body, there is nothing that is called not allowable; however, what is poorly cremated is not allowable. What is well cremated - even human bone, having been made into powder, is allowable to be applied in an electuary.

The four great loathsome substances, when there is no one to make them allowable,

are allowable to be taken by oneself and consumed. And here, even an unruly or incapable one who makes things allowable stands on the side of being absent. When there is no ash, dry wood should be burnt and ash should be taken. When there is no dry wood, it is allowable even to cut green wood from a tree and make it. However, this fourfold great loathsome substance is called time-specific - it is allowable only at the moment of being bitten by a snake. The remainder here is clear in itself.

The origin of the sheep's wool rule -It originates from body and from body-and-mind; it is an act of doing; it is not release through perception; it is without consciousness; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it involves three types of consciousness; it involves three types of feeling.

The training rule on tooth-cleaning sticks is the tenth.

The fourth chapter on food is completed in the order of the commentary.

5. The Chapter on Naked Ascetics

1. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning the Naked Ascetic

269. In the first training rule of the Acela Chapter, the ninth -"Food distribution" means the place of distribution. "One who has entered the wandering ascetic life" means one who has entered the going forth. "He gives, there is an offence of expiation" means he gives a bowl of gruel filled to the brim in a single effort, one expiation. If he gives by breaking it up and breaking it up, there is an expiation for each effort. The same method applies to cakes, cooked rice, and so forth. "Perceiving a sectarian as a non-sectarian" means one's mother or father goes forth among the sectarians; even for one who gives to them with the perception that they are one's mother or father, there is indeed an expiation. "He causes to give" means he causes one who is not fully ordained to give.

273. "Having deposited near, he gives" means having placed it in such a vessel, he deposits that vessel on the ground near them and gives, or having had them put down their vessel, he gives into it; even having placed the bowl on a stand or on the ground, it is proper to say "Take from here." If the follower of another sect says "This is my own property, do not pour into it here," one should still pour into it. Because it is his own property, it is not called giving with one's own hand. The remainder here is clear in itself.

The origin of the sheep's wool rule -it is an act of commission, not the liberation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, a bodily action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The training rule on the naked ascetic is the first.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Dismissal

274. In the second training rule - "Even at the assembly hall" means even at the seating hall. "Participation in a meal" means the meal procedure. "Did not obtain" means did not receive.

276. "Inappropriate conduct" means the remaining transgression through the doors of body and speech that has been stated. "For one leaving the region of sight or the region of hearing" - here, if one standing or sitting dismisses; the one who is dismissed, he leaves, and for him there is no offence. But even when that one leaves, in reality it is as though the other one has caused the leaving. Therefore, for the one who dismisses, this offence is his alone. Therein, if one foot is within the vicinity, it is a wrong-doing. When the boundary is transgressed, it is an offence requiring expiation. And here, the region of sight in the open is twelve cubits in extent, likewise the region of hearing. But if in between there are walls, doors, ramparts and the like, the state of being obstructed by them constitutes the transgression of the region of sight, and the offence should be understood accordingly. "There is no other reason" means apart from the inappropriate conduct of the kind stated, there is no other reason whatsoever.

277. "Imposes a message of anger" means "anger" is "kalī"; one imposes its message; one imposes the command of anger; having shown fault in standing, sitting and so forth through the power of anger, one speaks such disagreeable words as "Look, sirs, at this one's standing, sitting, looking forward, looking around - he stands like a stump, he sits like a dog, he looks here and there like a monkey," thinking "Perhaps, harassed by this too, he might depart." The remainder 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 is released by perception; it is with consciousness; it is worldly wrong; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is of three feelings.

The training rule on dismissing is the second.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Eating Together

279. In the third training rule - "In the sleeping-room" means in the bedroom. "Since almsfood has been given to the noble one" means since almsfood has been given, what was to be obtained by coming has been obtained by you; "go" is the intention. "Obsessed" means obsessed by lust; the meaning is with the intention of sexual intercourse.

280. "Together with both persons" means "with a married couple" (sabhojana); in that family with a married couple. Alternatively, "with a married couple" (sabhojana) means "with enjoyment" (sabhoga). For a man overcome by lust, a woman is his enjoyment, and for a woman, a man. Therefore, in the word-analysis of this - "there is both a woman and a man" and so forth is stated. "In a large house" means in a large sleeping chamber. "Having left the reach of a hand from the back-panel" means having left the reach of a hand from the back-panel of the inner room of that sleeping chamber; the meaning is that one sits in a place near the interior of the sleeping quarters. And such a sleeping chamber is found in large four-halled buildings and the like. "Having gone beyond the ridge-pole" - by this, going beyond the middle is shown. Therefore, the offence should be understood as occurring when one goes beyond the middle of a small sleeping chamber, however it may be constructed. The remainder here is clear in itself.

It has the origin of the first pārājika -it is action, release from perception, with consciousness, a worldly fault, bodily action, unwholesome consciousness, and with two feelings.

The training rule on eating together is the third.

284. Regarding the fourth and fifth training rules, whatever should be said, all of that is exactly as stated in the method given for the pair of undetermined rules. And just as with the training rule concerning food, so too these have their origin only in the first pārājika origin.

The training rule on being in private with a concealed place is the fourth; the training rule on sitting in private is the fifth.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Conduct

294. Regarding the sixth training rule - "Give us the meal, friends" - here, it is said that that meal had been brought, therefore they spoke thus. But when it has not been brought, it is not allowable to speak thus; it would be a prompted utterance.

295. "If so, monks, having accepted it, put it aside" - this, however, the Blessed One said for the purpose of safeguarding the faith of the family. If he were to say "divide it and eat it," there might be a change in the people's confidence. "Was put aside" means it was set aside; it is said that they took it and went back to the house itself.

298. "A monk who is present" - herein, to what extent is one present, and to what extent is one not present? Within the monastery, from the place where the thought of attending upon families has arisen in one who is standing, from that point onwards, one whom he sees in his line of sight or directly in front of him, to whom it is possible to inform by ordinary speech - this one is called "present." There is no duty to inform by searching here and there. For one who must be sought out in such a manner is indeed not present. Furthermore, having seen a monk within the boundary of the precincts and having gone thinking "I shall ask permission," whomever he sees there, that one should be asked permission from. If he does not see one, he is regarded as having entered without asking permission from a monk who is not present.

302. "To a monastery within the village" means there is a monastery inside the village, and one goes to it. "To a house of devotees" means a house to which one has been invited, or the house of donors of ticket-food and the like. "In misfortunes" means when there are dangers to life or to the holy life, it is proper to go. The remainder here is clear in itself.

The origin of the kaṭhina offence -it originates from body and speech, and from body, speech and mind; it is an act and 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; it is verbal action; it is of three types of consciousness; it is of three types of feeling.

The training rule on visiting is the sixth.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Mahānāma

303. In the seventh training rule - the one named Mahānāma was the son of the Blessed One's younger paternal uncle, older by a month, a noble disciple established in two fruits. "There was an abundance of medicine" means that the ghee brought and stored from the forest was plentiful.

306. "May be accepted" means that at that time, since there is no illness, it should not be refused; when there is illness, it should be consented to with the thought "I shall make a request." "I invite with this much medicine" means by name, with two or three among ghee, oil, and so forth, or by measure, such as a pattha, a nāḷi, or an āḷhaka. "He requests another medicine" means one who has been invited with ghee requests oil; one who has been invited with an āḷhaka requests a doṇa. "Who has no need for medicine" means if he is able to get by even with mixed food, there is no need for medicine.

310. "For those who have invited to admonish" means those who have been invited through their own personal invitation; there is no offence in making a request in accordance with their invitation. However, when invited on behalf of the Community, the limit should indeed be considered. The remainder is clear in itself.

Six origins - it is an act, not release by cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action, verbal action, three types of consciousness, three types of feeling.

The training rule on Mahānāma is the seventh.

8. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning a Mobilised Army

311. In the eighth - "Marched out" means marched forth; the meaning is that he departed from the city thinking "I shall go facing the opposing army." "Parading" means mobilised; the meaning is that it has departed from the village.

314. "An elephant has twelve men" means four riders, two foot-guards for each foot - thus there are twelve men. "A horse has three men" means one rider and two foot-guards - thus there are three men. "A chariot has four men" means one charioteer, one warrior, and two axle-guards - thus there are four men. "Four men with arrows in hand" means four men with weapons in hand - this, at the very minimum, is called an army possessed of four divisions. For one who goes to see such an army, there is an offence of wrong-doing at every step. "Having left the region of sight" means it is not visible, being either concealed by something or having descended into a hollow; the meaning is: "It cannot be seen standing here," so for one who goes to another place and sees, there is an offence requiring expiation for each attempt.

315. "Each one" means each one among the four divisions such as elephants and so forth; even down to a single elephant mounted by one man, or even a single man with a bow in hand. "Not parading" means the king goes to a park or a river; thus it is not parading.

316. "In misfortunes" means when there are dangers to life or to the holy life, there is no offence for one who goes thinking "I will go there and release him." The remainder here is clear in itself. The origin of the sheep's wool rule - it is action, not release through perception, without consciousness, worldly wrong, bodily action, unwholesome consciousness, three feelings.

The training rule on a mobilised army is the eighth.

9. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning an Army Camp

319. In the ninth - "When the sun has set, he stays with the army" means whether he stands, sits, lies down, or even if he assumes any posture in the air by means of psychic power, it is still an offence requiring expiation. "Or the army is blocked by a counter-army" means such that passage is cut off; thus it is blocked. "Obstructed" means blocked by an enemy or by a ruler. The remainder is clear in itself. The origin of the sheep's wool rule - it is an act of commission, not the liberation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, a bodily action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The training rule on an army encampment is the ninth.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning a Battlefield

322. In the tenth - "Having advanced and advanced, they fight here" - thus it is "uyyodhika" (battlefield); this is a designation for the place of combat. "They know the foremost of the forces here" - thus it is "balagga" (troops in array); the meaning is the place for counting the forces. The array of the army is "senābyūha" (massing of the army); this is a designation for the encampment of the army. "Three elephants constitute the last elephant unit" - the elephant previously stated as having twelve men, with that elephant there are three elephants. The same method applies in the remaining ones too. The remainder should be understood in the same manner as stated in the training rule on the mobilised army, together with the origins and so forth.

The training rule on a battlefield is the tenth.

The fifth chapter on the naked ascetic is completed in the order of the commentary.

6. The Chapter on Drinking of Strong Liquor

1. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Drinking Liquor

326. In the first training rule of the chapter on drinking liquor - "Bhaddavatikā" means a certain village; it received this name because it was endowed with a fine enclosure. "Wayfarers" means travellers. "Fire with fire" means the fire of the serpent by the power of his own fire. "Kāpotikā" means having a reddish lustre of the same colour as a pigeon's foot. "Clear" is a designation for the clear part of liquor. "Unsuitable, monks, for Sāgata" means it is said that for one possessing the five higher knowledges, the drinking of intoxicants is indeed not suitable.

328. Flower extract means made with the juice of madhuka flowers and so forth. Fruit extract means made by crushing grapes and so forth and with their juice. Honey extract means made with the natural juice of grapes; they say it is also made with bee honey. Molasses extract means it is made with sugarcane juice and so forth. Intoxicating liquor means flour-based with yeast added; they say that what is made with the juice of coconut and so forth is also reckoned as intoxicating liquor, and when the clear portion of that same yeast-added liquor is taken, it is reckoned as fermented liquor. "Even drinking with the tip of kusa grass at the very least" means

the meaning is that there is an offence requiring expiation for one who drinks this intoxicating liquor or fermented liquor even with the tip of kusa grass, starting from its initial preparation. However, for one who drinks much by a single effort, there is one offence. For one who drinks by interrupting again and again, there are offences according to the number of efforts.

329. "It is not an intoxicant but has the colour of an intoxicant, the odour of an intoxicant, the flavour of an intoxicant" means it is either salted sour gruel or fermented liquor. "In the cooking of lentil curry" means they cook curry having added a small amount of intoxicant for the purpose of imparting flavour; in that case there is no offence. In the cooking of meat, the same method applies. However, they cook oil together with intoxicant for the purpose of wind medicine; in that case too there is no offence only when the intoxicant has not exceeded the limit. But when the intoxicant has exceeded the limit, therein the colour, odour and flavour of the intoxicant are discernible, and in that case there is indeed an offence. "Medicinal spirit that is not an intoxicant" means whatever medicinal spirit is not an intoxicant, in that case there is no offence. They make medicinal spirit with the juice of emblic myrobalan and such fruits alone; it has the colour, odour and flavour of an intoxicant, yet it is not an intoxicant; this was stated with reference to that. But that which has fermentable ingredients added, that is an intoxicant; starting from the seed, it is not allowable. The remainder here is clear in itself. The origin of the sheep's wool rule - it is an act of commission, it is not release through non-perception, it is non-intentional, it is a worldly offence, it is bodily action, it is unwholesome consciousness, and it involves three feelings. Herein, the non-intentional nature should be understood as due to not knowing the substance, and the worldly offence nature as due to its being committed only through unwholesome consciousness.

The training rule on drinking intoxicants is the first.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Poking with a Finger

330. In the second - "By nudging with fingers" means poking with fingers at the armpits and so forth. "Exhausted" means becoming fatigued through excessive laughter. "Unable to breathe" means having had the movement of in-breathing and out-breathing cut off. Regarding "an unordained person, body with body," here a nun too stands in the position of an unordained person; for one who touches her with playful intent, there is an offence of wrong-doing. The remainder here is clear in itself.

It has the origin of the first pārājika - it is action, release from perception, with consciousness, a worldly fault, bodily action, unwholesome consciousness, and with two feelings.

The training rule on poking with a finger is the second.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Laughter

335. In the third - "Do not know what has been laid down" means they do not know what has been done and laid down by the Blessed One - this is the meaning.

336. "Playing in water" means water-play is spoken of. "Above the ankles" means to the extent of the upper part of the ankles. "With the intention of playing" means with the intention of sport. In "dives etc.", for one descending for the purpose of diving, at

each step there is a wrong-doing offence. In diving and surfacing, at each effort there is an expiation. For one who, having dived, moves under the water itself, in all hand-strokes and steps there is an expiation. "Floats" means swims across. For one swimming across with the hands, at each hand-stroke there is an expiation. The same method applies to the feet as well. With whatever limb one swims across, at each effort of that limb there is an expiation. If one falls into the water from the bank or from a tree, it is just an expiation. "Plays with a boat" means one who propels a boat with oars and the like, or pushes it up onto the bank, plays with a boat - there is a wrong-doing offence.

In "with the hand etc." as well, at each effort there is a wrong-doing offence. Some say there is a wrong-doing offence at each occasion of falling and rising of a ladle thrown into the water by hand; that should not be accepted. For therein, since it is a single effort, there is only one wrong-doing offence. Moreover, apart from the surfacing and the like stated regarding above the ankles, by any other manner whatsoever, whether entering the water or not entering the water, for one who plays the game of splashing, even taking as little as a drop of water standing anywhere - there is just a wrong-doing offence. However, it is permissible to write a letter that illuminates the meaning. This is the determination herein. The remainder here is clear in itself.

It has the origin of the first pārajika - it is action, exempt from perception, with consciousness, a worldly offence, bodily action, unwholesome consciousness, and of three feelings.

The training rule on laughing is the third.

4. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Disrespect

342. In the fourth - "How might this perish" means how might this tradition of the Dhamma perish. "Or not wishing to train in it" means not wishing to train in that which has been laid down, by which what has been laid down is spoken of. "By what has not been laid down" means by what has come in the Sutta or the Abhidhamma.

344. Regarding "Thus is the learning of our teachers," here a blameworthy teacher's learning should not be accepted; only the teacher's learning that has come down through tradition should be accepted. In the Kurundī, however, it is stated: "In the case of worldly offences, the teacher's learning is not applicable, but in the case of offences by enactment, it is applicable." In the Mahāpaccarī, it is stated: "For those who have learnt the discourses and what is in conformity with the discourses, the learning of the teachers is authoritative; the speech of those who do not know is without authority." All of that accords with what has come down through tradition. The remainder 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 fault; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is painful feeling.

The training rule on disrespect is the fourth.

5. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Frightening

345. In the fifth - The offering of forms and so forth should be understood in the same manner as stated in the case of the human figure. The remainder is clear in itself. The origins and so forth are similar to those of disrespect.

The fifth training rule on frightening.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Fire

350. In the sixth - "Bhaggas" is the name of the country. "Saṃsumāragira" is of the city. "Bhesakaḷāvana" is of the grove dependent on it. But that is called "Deer Park" because it was given for the comfortable dwelling of deer. "Having kindled" means having lit. "Attacked" means pursued.

352. "About lamps" means about the lighting of lamps. "About fire" means about making fire for cooking bowls, steaming treatments, and so forth. "For such a reason" means for a reason such as lamps and so forth.

354-355. "He kindles himself" - here, from the desire to kindle a fire, starting from the setting up of the fire-sticks until the flame does not arise, there is an offence of wrong-doing for all efforts. "He picks up a firebrand" means he picks up a burning firebrand that has fallen, and places it back in its original position - this is the meaning. Thus, for one who picks up an unignited one and throws it in, there is only an offence of wrong-doing; for one who causes an ignited one to blaze again, there is only an offence requiring expiation.

356. "For such a reason" means apart from lamps and so forth, there is no offence for one who kindles with any other such reason. "In misfortunes" means there is danger from fierce wild animals and non-humans; there too, there is no offence for one who kindles. The remainder is clear in itself. Six origins - it is an act, not release by cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action, verbal action, three types of consciousness, three types of feeling.

The sixth training rule on fire.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Bathing

364. In the seventh - "With bath powder or with clay": here, starting from the time of preparing the bath powder and clay, there is a wrong-doing for every effort.

366. "If going to the far shore one bathes" - here it is allowable to bathe even in pits dug by scooping out sand in a dry river. "In misfortunes" - it is allowable for one pursued by hornets and the like to plunge into water. The remainder here is clear in itself. The origin of the sheep's wool rule - it is an act of commission, not the liberation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, a bodily action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The seventh training rule on bathing.

8. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Discolouring

368-369. In the eighth - Regarding "now when a monk has obtained a new robe" (navaṃ pana bhikkhunā cīvaralābhena): here, "what was obtained" (alabhi) is "obtaining" (labho); the obtaining itself is the acquisition (lābho). What was obtained?

A robe. Of what kind? New. Thus, where "by the acquisition of a new robe" (navacīvaralābhena) should be said, it is stated as "navacīvaralābhena" without elision of the nasal; the meaning is "by means of a newly obtained robe." Now, "pana" is a particle standing between the two words in the middle. "By a monk" (bhikkhunā) is an indication of the one by whom it was obtained. However, in the word-analysis, disregarding the letter, in order to show what was obtained, it is stated beginning with "a robe means of the six robes." Regarding "robe" (cīvaraṃ) here, whatever can be worn as a lower garment or as an upper garment, that alone should be understood. For that very reason, "the last one eligible for assignment" (vikappanupagapacchima) is not stated. "Bronze-blue" (kaṃsanīla) means tanner's blue. But in the Mahāpaccarī it is stated: "Iron rust or copper rust - this is called bronze-blue." "Leaf-blue" (palāsanīla) means any blue-coloured leaf-juice. "A means of disfigurement is to be taken" - this is stated with reference to the marking dot (kappabindu); not the disfigurement of the entire robe with blue and so forth. And when taking that marking, having dyed the robe, one should apply it on four corners, or three, or two, or one corner, the size of a peacock's eye-circle or the size of a frog's back. In the Mahāpaccarī it is stated: "On a bowl or on a waistband, it is not allowable." But in the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā it is stated: "It is indeed allowable." However, the border-marking method, the ear-marking method, and so forth are prohibited everywhere; therefore, apart from a single round dot, the marking should not be made by any other alteration.

371. Regarding "for a patch" and so forth: these items such as patches, having been attached afterwards to a robe made allowable, there is no need for the act of making allowable. The remainder is clear in itself. The origin of the sheep's wool rule - action and non-action, not liberation by perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention; bodily action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The eighth training rule on discolouring.

9. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Assigning

374. In the ninth - "Not given by him" means not given after having said to the owner of the robe "use it or give it away or do with it as you wish." "Or without trust in him" means without the trust of the one with whom a Vinaya procedure has been carried out. However, there is no offence for one who uses what has been given by him or with his trust. The rest here is clear, as the method has been stated in the commentary on the thirty. The origin of the kaṭhina offence - It originates from body and speech, and from body, speech, and mind; it is action and non-action; it is not release through perception; it is without mind; it is an offence by convention; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is with three types of consciousness; it is with three types of feeling.

The ninth training rule on relinquishing.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Concealing a Robe

377-381. In the tenth - "Hide away" means having removed, they conceal. "With the intention of laughter" means with the purpose of amusement. "Another requisite" means a bowl-bag and so forth not mentioned in the canonical text. "Having given a

righteous talk" means having given a Dhamma talk thus: "It is not proper for a recluse to be one whose requisites are not put away" - there is no offence for one who puts them aside thinking "I shall give them back." The remainder here is clear in itself. It has three origins - it is action, exempt by perception, with consciousness, a worldly fault, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and of three feelings.

The tenth training rule on concealing robes.

The sixth chapter on drinking liquor is completed in the order of the commentary.

7. The Chapter on Containing Animate Beings

1. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Intentionally Destroying Life

382. In the first training rule of the chapter on living beings - "Was an archer" means during his lay life he was a teacher of archery. "Deprived of life" means separated from life.

"Would deprive" in the training rule means would separate. However, this is merely a conventional expression; for here, just as when a head ornament is separated, the head remains standing apart, so too when a living being is deprived of life, life does not remain standing separately - rather, it simply disappears. Therefore, to show that meaning, in the word analysis it is stated "cuts off the life faculty" and so forth. And in this training rule, "living being" should be understood as referring only to an animal. Whether one kills a small or a large one, there is no difference in the offence. However, in the case of a large one, because of the greatness of the effort, the unwholesomeness is great. "Perceiving a living being in a living being" means even when cleaning a bed or chair, if one perceives a living being even in a beetle larva, and without compassion crushes and removes it, it is a pācittiya offence. Therefore, in such situations, having established compassion, one should carry out one's duties with diligence. The remainder should be understood in the same manner as stated regarding the human form, together with the origins and so forth.

The first training rule on intentional killing of living beings.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Living Beings

387. In the second - "Containing living beings" means containing those living beings that die through use; for one who knowingly consumes such, there is an offence of pācittiya with each act of use. Even if one drinks a bowlful without interruption in a single act, there is one offence. For one who rinses and washes a bowl containing food with such water, or for one who cools a hot gruel-bowl in such water, or for one who bathes by taking that water with the hand or with a ladle, there is an offence of pācittiya with each act of use. Also for one who, having entered a water tank or a lotus pond, raises waves for the purpose of coming out. Those who are cleaning a tank or a lotus pond should pour the water taken from there back into the water itself. When there is no water nearby, one should pour eight or ten pots of allowable water onto a place where water can remain, and then pour it there. Water should not

be poured onto a hot stone, thinking "It will roll off and fall into the water." However, it is allowable to cool the stone with allowable water and then pour it. The remainder here is clear in itself.

It has three origins - it is action, exempt from wrong perception, with consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action,

verbal action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling. And here, the nature of being an offence by convention should be understood thus: just as in the lighting of a lamp, even though one knows of the falling of moth-like creatures, because of the purity of one's intention, so too, even though one knows of the presence of living beings, it is to be consumed with the perception of water.

The second training rule on water containing living beings.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Reopening

392. In the third training rule - "Reopen" means going to each and every monk and saying "the action was not done" and so forth, they unsettle it; they do not allow it to remain in its established state.

393. "According to the rule" means: whatever rule has been stated for the settling of whatever legal case, by that very rule - this is the meaning. "A legal case that had been settled" means a legal case that has been concluded; a legal case that has been settled by the very rule stated by the Teacher - this is the meaning.

395. "If it is a legally valid act, perceiving it as a legally valid act" means: by whatever act that legal issue was settled, if that is a legally valid act, and this one, perceiving that legally valid act as a legally valid act, reopens it, the meaning is that he commits an offence requiring expiation. By this method the remaining terms should also be understood. This is the summary here, but the detailed explanation is stated in the Parivāra by the method beginning with "how many reopenings are there of these four legal issues?" In the commentaries, all of that has been brought together and its meaning explained. We, however, shall explain it in that very place. For if it were brought here and explained, there would be even greater confusion, therefore we have not explained it here. The remainder here is clear in itself. It has three origins - it is an act of commission, freed by right perception, with consciousness, a worldly offence, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling.

The third training rule on reopening.

4. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Grave Offence

399. In the fourth - "Coarse means an offence": here the four expulsions are shown by way of extracting the meaning, but the offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community is what is intended; for one who conceals it, there is an offence requiring expiation. "At the mere moment of laying down the responsibility" means at the mere moment of laying down the responsibility. Even if, having laid down the responsibility, one informs afterwards, it does not protect; it is said that there is an offence requiring expiation at the mere moment of laying down the responsibility. But if, having thus laid down the responsibility, one informs another for

the very purpose of concealing, and that one also informs another - by this method, even a hundred ascetics or a thousand ascetics incur an offence, so long as the chain is not broken. But when is the chain broken? The Elder Mahāsūma says - "The one who has committed the offence informs one person, and that person, turning back, informs that very same one; thus the chain is broken." But the Elder Mahāpaduma said - "This is indeed the person concerned in the case. The one who has committed the offence informs one monk, this one informs another, and that one, turning back, informs the very one by whom he was informed; thus, when the third person informs the second, the chain is broken."

400. "A non-coarse offence" means the remaining five categories of offences. "He conceals a coarse or non-coarse transgression of one not fully ordained" - here, for one not fully ordained, emission of semen and physical contact - this is called a coarse transgression. The remainder here is clear in itself. It has its origin in the abandonment of responsibility - it originates from body, speech and mind; it is non-action; it is released by perception; it is with consciousness; it is a worldly fault; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is painful feeling.

The fourth training rule on a gross offence.

5. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Less Than Twenty Years

402. In the fifth training rule - "His fingers will become painful" means they thought that his fingers will become painful from writing letters. "His chest will become painful" means that one learning arithmetic has to think much, therefore they thought his chest will become painful. "His eyes will become painful" means that one learning money-changing has to examine coins by turning them over and over again, therefore they thought his eyes will become painful. Among "gadflies and so forth," "gadflies" means tawny flies. "Painful" means suffering. "Sharp" means intense. "Rough" means piercing. "Severe" means harsh; or similar to a bitter taste due to being disagreeable. "Disagreeable" means unpleasant. "Life-threatening" means taking away life.

404. "Authorises a boundary" means he establishes a new boundary. However, in the Kurundī, an offence of wrong-doing is stated even for delimiting by a water-throwing distance. "One of complete twenty years" means one of complete twenty years reckoned from the moment of conception-linking; for even one who is twenty years including the time in the womb is counted as one of complete twenty years. As he said -

"Now at that time, the Venerable Kumārakassapa had been fully ordained at twenty years including the time in the womb. Then this occurred to the Venerable Kumārakassapa: 'It has been laid down by the Blessed One that a person of less than twenty years should not be given full ordination. And I was fully ordained at twenty years counting from conception. Am I fully ordained or am I not fully ordained?' They reported this matter to the Blessed One. Monks, from when the first mind arose in the mother's womb, the first consciousness appeared, reckoning from that is his birth. I allow, monks, that one who is twenty years including the time in the womb may be given full ordination."

Therein, one who, having dwelt twelve months in the mother's womb, was born at the Great Pavāraṇā, from that time onwards until the Great Pavāraṇā in the nineteenth

year, having passed beyond that, should be given full ordination on the first day of the fortnight. By this method, the decrease and increase should be understood.

But the Elder teachers of old give full ordination to a novice of nineteen years on the first day of the fortnight after passing the full-moon day of Kattika. Why is that? It is said - In one year there are six fourteenth-day Uposatha days. Thus in twenty years, four months are lost. Kings in every third year add an intercalary month. Thus in eighteen years, six months are gained; then, removing the four months lost by reason of the Uposatha, two months remain. Taking those two months, the twenty years become complete - thus, being free from doubt, they give full ordination on the first day of the fortnight after passing the full-moon day of Kattika. Here, however, with reference to one who will be of twenty years after having completed the Pavāraṇā, the term "one of nineteen years" is stated. Therefore, one who dwelt twelve months in the mother's womb is of twenty-one years. One who dwelt seven months is of twenty years and seven months. But one born at six months does not survive.

406. "There is no offence if one perceives one less than twenty years as a full twenty years" - here, although there is no offence for the one giving full ordination, the person however remains unordained. If, however, after the lapse of ten years he gives full ordination to another, and if the assembly is complete after releasing that one, he is well-ordained. And as long as he does not know, there is for him neither an obstacle to heaven nor an obstacle to liberation, but upon knowing, he should be fully ordained again. The remainder is clear in itself.

It has three origins - it is action, exempt from wrong perception, with consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action,

verbal action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The fifth training rule on one under twenty years of age.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Travelling with a Caravan of Thieves

407. In the sixth - "Paṭiyāloka" means facing the sunlight; the meaning is "the western direction." "Kammiyā" means the toll collectors at the toll station.

409. "They go stealing from the king" means having stolen from the king, having deceived him, having taken something belonging to the king, they go thinking "Now we shall not give it to him."

411. "By a different rendezvous" means there is no offence for one who goes by a different time-rendezvous or a different day-rendezvous. But by a different route-rendezvous or a different wilderness-rendezvous, there is indeed an offence. The remainder here is clear in meaning, as the method has been stated in the chapter on nuns. The origin of the thief-caravan rule - it originates from body and mind, and from body, speech and mind; it is an act of commission; it has release through perception; it is with consciousness; it is an offence by regulation; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it has three types of consciousness; it has three types of feeling.

The sixth training rule on travelling with a caravan of thieves.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Making Arrangements

412. In the seventh - "Sat down brooding" means he sat down grieving and reproaching himself. "That monk, sir, did not take me away" means this noble monk did not make me leave; the meaning is he did not take me and go. The remainder here should be understood in the same manner as stated in the training rule on arranging together with a nun, together with the origins and so forth.

The training rule on making arrangements is the seventh.

8. Commentary on the Training Rule concerning Ariṭṭha

417. In the eighth - "They killed vultures" means vulture-killers; "His former men were vulture-killers" means "formerly a vulture-killer"; the meaning is "of that one formerly a vulture-killer, who was born into a family of vulture-slayers."

"They create obstacles to heaven and deliverance" means obstructions. They are fivefold by way of action, mental defilement, result, insult, and transgression of command. Therein, the five heinous deeds are called kamma-obstructions. Likewise the act of seducing a nun; that, however, creates an obstacle only to deliverance, not to heaven. States of wrong view with fixed bad rebirth are called obstructions by mental defilement. The conception states of eunuchs, animals, and those of dual sex are called obstructions by result. Reproaching noble ones is called reproach-obstruction; but that is only so long as one has not asked forgiveness of the noble ones, not beyond that. Offences committed deliberately are called command-transgression-obstructions; but these too are only so long as one either claims the status of a monk, or has not been rehabilitated, or has not confessed - not beyond that.

Herein, this monk was very learned, a preacher of the Teaching; he knew the remaining obstructions, but through not being skilled in the monastic discipline, he did not know the obstructions by transgression of regulations. Therefore, having gone to a private place, he thought thus - "These householders, while enjoying the five strands of sensual pleasure, become stream-enterers, once-returners, and non-returners; monks too see agreeable forms cognisable by the eye... etc. They experience tangible objects cognisable by the body, they use soft bed-sheets, coverings, and so on; all this is proper. Why then are female forms... etc. Female tangibles alone not allowable? These too are allowable." Thus, having compared one enjoyment with another, making enjoyment with desire and lust and enjoyment without desire and lust into one - as if trying to weave an extremely fine thread together with coarse fibres, as if comparing Mount Sineru with a mustard seed - having generated an evil wrong view, thinking "Why was the first pārājika laid down by the Blessed One as if damming the great ocean, with great effort? There is no fault in this" - conflicting with omniscient knowledge, cutting off the hope of those capable of attainment, he struck a blow at the Conqueror's wheel of command. Therefore he said - "Thus I understand the Teaching taught by the Blessed One" and so on.

In the passage beginning with "the simile of a skeleton," the simile of a skeleton is in the sense of little gratification. The simile of a piece of meat is in the sense of being shared by many. The simile of a grass torch is in the sense of burning. The simile of a pit of burning charcoal is in the sense of great scorching. The simile of a dream is in the sense of brief manifestation. The simile of borrowed goods is in the sense of

being temporary. The simile of tree fruits is in the sense of breaking all limbs and minor limbs. The simile of a butcher's block is in the sense of cutting. The simile of a stake of spears is in the sense of piercing through. The simile of a snake's head is in the sense of being fraught with anxiety and fear - this is the summary here. But the detailed explanation should be taken from the Papañcasūdanī, the commentary on the Majjhima. "Evaṃbyākho" means "indeed thus." The rest here is clear, as it has been explained in the manner stated before.

The origin of the formal admonition - it originates from body, speech and mind; it is non-action; it is released by perception; it is with consciousness; it is a worldly fault; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is painful feeling.

The eighth training rule on Ariṭṭha.

9. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Shared Communion with One Who Has Been Suspended

424-425. In the ninth - "Against whom the act of conformity with the Teaching has not been done" means: the act of conformity is called the reinstatement made after observing the conduct in accordance with one who has been suspended by the Dhamma, by the Vinaya, by the Teacher's instruction, for not acknowledging an offence, or for not making amends, or for not relinquishing a wrong view. He for whom that act of conformity, reckoned as reinstatement, has not been done - this is called "against whom the act of conformity with the Teaching has not been done"; the meaning is "together with such a one." Therefore, in the word-analysis of that, it is said: "Against whom the act of conformity with the Teaching has not been done means one who has been suspended and not reinstated."

"He gives or receives" means: by a single act, even though giving or receiving much, there is one expiation. For one who gives and one who receives by interrupting again and again, there are expiations according to the number of acts. The remainder here is clear in itself. It has three origins - It is action, release from perception, with consciousness, an offence by rule, bodily action, verbal action, with three types of consciousness, with three types of feeling.

The ninth training rule on associating with one who has been suspended.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Kaṇṭaka

428. In the tenth - "A wrong view had arisen" means it arose in him too, like Ariṭṭha, as he was emerging unwisely. "Let him remove" - here there are three kinds of removal: removal from communion, removal of status, and removal by disciplinary action. Therein, suspension for not seeing an offence and so forth is called removal from communion. "The corrupter should be removed" and "remove the nun Mettiyā" - this is called removal of status. "From this day forth, friend novice, that Blessed One is not to be cited by you as Teacher" - this is called removal by disciplinary action. This is what is intended here. Therefore he said - "And thus, monks, he should be removed, etc. be gone!" Therein, "go" means depart. "You outsider" means other, not one of ours. "Be gone" means perish; go where we do not see you.

429. "Should entice" means should win over. "Should cause to attend" means should

have him perform attendance upon oneself. The remainder should be understood in the same manner as stated in the training rule concerning Ariṭṭha, together with the origins and so forth.

The tenth training rule on Kaṇṭaka.

The seventh chapter on living beings is completed in the order of the commentary.

8. The Chapter on Legitimate

1. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning What Is in Accordance with the Dhamma

434. In the first training rule of the Sahadhammika Chapter - "In this training rule" means: what has been stated in this training rule, that I will not train in for the time being. "There is an offence of expiation" - here, however, the offence should be understood as arising with each utterance. "By a monk who is training, monks" means: having accepted the admonition respectfully, being one who wishes to train, one should understand, inquire, and examine. The remainder here should be understood in terms of word meaning in the same manner as stated in the training rule on being difficult to admonish. From the standpoint of judgement, it is clear.

It has three origins - it is an act of commission, freed by right perception, with consciousness, a worldly offence, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling.

The first training rule on a legitimate act.

2. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Scratching

438. In the second - "Speaks about the talk on monastic discipline" means: the talk on monastic discipline is talk connected with what is allowable and what is not allowable, offence and non-offence, restraint and abandonment; he speaks that. "Praises the monastic discipline" means: the praise of the monastic discipline is the exposition by way of word-analysis, having laid down the matrix by way of the five or seven classes of offences; he speaks that. "Praises the learning of the monastic discipline" means: he speaks of the praise, the virtue, the benefit rooted in the learning of the monastic discipline for those who are learning the monastic discipline. For one who bears the monastic discipline in mind obtains five benefits, six benefits, seven benefits, eight benefits, nine benefits, ten benefits, and eleven benefits rooted in the learning of the monastic discipline; he speaks of all of them - this is the meaning. Which five benefits does he obtain? Those beginning with the good guarding of one's own aggregate of virtue. For this was said:

"Monks, there are these five benefits for a person who bears the monastic discipline in mind - one's own aggregate of virtue is well guarded and well protected, one is a refuge for those afflicted by remorse, one speaks with confidence in the midst of the Community, one restrains adversaries well with the Dhamma, and one is practising for the endurance of the true Dhamma."

How is one's own aggregate of virtue well guarded and well protected? Here a certain monk, when committing an offence, commits it in six ways - through shamelessness, through ignorance, through being afflicted by remorse, through perceiving what is not allowable as allowable, through perceiving what is allowable as not allowable, and through confusion of mindfulness.

How does one commit an offence through shamelessness? While knowing full well that it is not allowable, one overrides it and commits a transgression. And this too was said -

"One deliberately commits an offence, one conceals an offence;
And one follows a wrong course - such a one is called a shameless person."

How does one commit an offence through ignorance? For an ignorant person, being dull and confused, not knowing what should and should not be done, does what should not be done and fails in what should be done; thus one commits an offence through ignorance.

How does one commit an offence through being afflicted by remorse? When remorse has arisen regarding what is allowable and what is not allowable, having asked one who bears the monastic discipline in mind, if it is allowable it should be done, if it is not allowable it should not be done; but this one, overriding it thinking "it is permissible," simply transgresses; thus one commits an offence through being afflicted by remorse.

How does one commit an offence through perceiving what is not allowable as allowable? One eats bear meat thinking it is pork, one eats leopard meat thinking it is deer meat, one eats food that is not allowable thinking it is allowable food, one eats at the wrong time with the perception that it is the right time, one drinks a beverage that is not allowable thinking it is an allowable beverage; thus one commits an offence through perceiving what is not allowable as allowable.

How does one commit an offence through perceiving what is allowable as not allowable? One eats pork thinking it is bear meat, one eats deer meat thinking it is leopard meat, one eats allowable food thinking it is food that is not allowable, one eats at the right time with the perception that it is the wrong time, one drinks an allowable beverage thinking it is a beverage that is not allowable; thus one commits an offence through perceiving what is allowable as not allowable.

How does one commit an offence through lapse of mindfulness? One commits an offence through lapse of mindfulness on account of sharing a sleeping place, being separated from robes, medicines, robes, and exceeding the time limit; thus here a certain monk commits an offence in these six ways.

But one who is expert in the monastic discipline does not commit an offence in these six ways. How does he not commit an offence through sense of shame? For he does not commit an offence even out of guarding against this censure by others: "Look, sirs, this one, while knowing what is allowable and what is not allowable, transgresses the rules." Thus he does not commit an offence through sense of shame. Even if he

has committed an offence inadvertently, having confessed what is remediable by confession and having rehabilitated from what is remediable by rehabilitation, he becomes established in purity. Thereupon -

"He does not deliberately commit an offence, he does not conceal an offence; He does not follow a wrong course - such a one is called a person with a sense of shame."

He is established in just this state of having a sense of shame.

How does he not commit an offence through knowledge? For he knows what is allowable and what is not allowable, therefore he does only what is allowable and does not do what is not allowable; thus he does not commit an offence through knowledge.

How does he not commit an offence through being free from remorse? For when remorse has arisen regarding what is allowable and what is not allowable, having examined the case, having examined the matrix, the word-analysis, the intermediate offence, the offence, and the non-offence, if it is allowable he does it, if it is not allowable he does not do it; thus he does not commit an offence through being free from remorse.

How does he not commit an offence through not having the perception of allowable regarding what is not allowable and so forth? For he knows what is allowable and what is not allowable, therefore he does not have the perception of allowable regarding what is not allowable, nor the perception of not allowable regarding what is allowable; and his mindfulness is well established - what should be determined he determines, what should be assigned he assigns. Thus he does not commit an offence in these six ways. Not committing an offence, he is one of unbroken virtue, of purified virtue; thus his own aggregate of virtue is well guarded and well protected.

How is he a refuge for those afflicted by remorse? Monks in distant kingdoms and distant regions, in whom remorse has arisen, having heard that "in such and such a monastery, it seems, an expert in the monastic discipline dwells," come from afar into his presence and ask about their remorse. He, having examined the case of the action done by them, having ascertained the distinction between offence and non-offence, grave and light, and so forth, having made them confess what is remediable by confession, having rehabilitated them from what is remediable by rehabilitation, establishes them in purity; thus he is a refuge for those afflicted by remorse.

"He speaks with confidence in the midst of the Sangha" - for when one who is not expert in the monastic discipline speaks in the midst of the Sangha, fear and timidity overcome him; for one who is expert in the monastic discipline, that does not occur. Why? "Speaking in this way there is a fault; speaking in this way there is no fault" - because he speaks having known thus.

"He restrains opponents with a well-restrained restraint by means of the true Dhamma" - here, opponents are of two kinds: personal opponents and opponents of the dispensation. Therein, the monks Mettiya and Bhummajaka and Vaḍḍha the Licchavi made a baseless accusation regarding a matter entailing defeat - these are called personal opponents. And whatever others too are of bad conduct and evil

nature, all of them are personal opponents. But those of perverted views - the monk Ariṭṭha, the novice Kaṇṭaka, the Vesālian Vajjiputtakas, those holding doctrines of self-adornment, ignorance, doubt, and instruction by others, the Mahāsaṅghikas and others who, having declared what is not the Buddha's dispensation to be "the Buddha's dispensation," promoted it - these are called opponents of the dispensation. He restrains all of them with a well-applied restraint by means of the true Dhamma, by reasoned speech, so that they are unable to establish that false dhamma.

"He is one who practises for the endurance of the true Dhamma" - here, the true Dhamma is threefold by way of learning, practice, and realisation. Therein, the three baskets of the Buddha's word is called the true Dhamma of learning. The thirteen ascetic qualities, the fourteen Khandhaka duties, and the eighty-two Great Duties - this is called the true Dhamma of practice. The four paths and their fruits - this is called the true Dhamma of realisation.

Therein, some elders, citing the sutta "That Dhamma and Discipline, Ānanda, which I have taught and laid down for you, that shall be your teacher after my passing," say "learning is the root of the dispensation." Some elders, citing the sutta "If these monks, Subhadda, were to live rightly, the world would not be empty of arahants," said "practice is the root of the dispensation," and said "as long as five monks practising rightly are found, so long the dispensation endures." But the other elders said "when learning has disappeared, even for one who practises well there is no penetration of the Dhamma." If five monks are guardians of the four rules of defeat, they, having given the going forth to faithful sons of good family and having given the full ordination in the outlying districts, having completed a group of ten, will also perform the full ordination in the central districts, and by this means, having completed a Community of a group of twenty, having also performed the act of rehabilitation for themselves, they will bring the dispensation to growth, increase, and abundance. Thus this bearer of the Vinaya is one who practises for the long endurance of the threefold true Dhamma - thus it should be understood that this bearer of the Vinaya obtains these five benefits.

What six benefits does he obtain? Dependent upon him are the Uposatha, the Pavāraṇā, the act of the Community, the going forth, the full ordination; he gives dependence and looks after novices.

These nine Uposatha observances - the fourteenth-day, the fifteenth-day, the Uposatha of harmony, the Uposatha by the Community, the Uposatha by a group or individual, the recitation of the sutta, the declaration of purity, and the Uposatha by resolution - all of these are dependent upon the bearer of the Vinaya.

And these nine Pavāraṇā observances - the fourteenth-day, the fifteenth-day, the Pavāraṇā of harmony, the Pavāraṇā by the Community, the Pavāraṇā by a group or individual, the three-statement, the two-statement, and the Pavāraṇā of those of equal rains - these too are dependent upon the bearer of the Vinaya alone, they belong to him, he is their master.

And these four acts of the Community - the act by announcement, the act with a motion, the act with a motion and one proclamation, and the act with a motion and three proclamations - these are dependent upon the bearer of the Vinaya.

And the going forth and the full ordination that are to be performed for sons of good family by being a preceptor - this too is dependent upon the bearer of the Vinaya alone. For not even another who is a bearer of two baskets is permitted to do this. He alone gives dependence, he alone looks after novices. Another is neither permitted to give dependence nor to look after novices. However, one who wishes to look after a novice may, having had him take a preceptor in the presence of a bearer of the Vinaya, be permitted to carry out the duties and practice. And here, the giving of dependence and the looking after of novices count as one factor.

Thus, among these six benefits, the former five together with one become six, together with two become seven, together with three become eight, together with four become nine, together with five become ten, together with all of them become eleven - thus it should be understood that a person who is a bearer of the Vinaya obtains five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, and eleven benefits. Thus it should be understood that the Blessed One, showing these benefits, praises the learning of the monastic discipline.

"Repeatedly" means having determined again and again, having distinguished separately. "He praises the Venerable Upāli" means that, on account of the learning of the monastic discipline, he speaks of, commends, and praises the virtues of the Elder Upāli. Why? Perhaps, having heard my praise, the monks might think that the monastic discipline should be taken up and learned in the presence of Upāli; thus this dispensation will be long-lasting and will endure for five thousand years.

"Those many monks therein" means: having heard this praise by the Blessed One, thinking "these benefits are obtained neither by those versed in the discourses nor by those versed in the Abhidhamma," many monks - elders, newly ordained, and those of middle standing - being filled with enthusiasm for the attainment of the benefits as described, learned the monastic discipline in the presence of the Venerable Upāli. This is the meaning here. "Herein" is merely a particle.

439-440. "Being recited" means when the teacher is reciting to the pupil. However, since he who retains it when the teacher is reciting of his own accord, or when the pupil, having requested the teacher, causes him to recite, or when that one is doing recitation - this is called "being recited," therefore the word-analysis is stated as "when reciting, or when causing to recite, or when doing recitation." "Lesser and minor" means lesser and minor. "Only" is a word delimiting the extent to which they conduce. This is what is meant - For those who recite these, cause them to be recited, or do recitation, they conduce to the extent that remorse reckoned as worry - "Is it allowable or is it not allowable?" - vexation, and mental distress reckoned as doubt, indeed arise. Alternatively, "only" is a determination of excess; the connection is with "they conduce to that," and what is meant is that they conduce exceedingly to worry, vexation, and perplexity. "Disparages the Vinaya to one who is fully ordained" means that, wishing to arouse doubt in him regarding it, in the presence of one who is fully ordained, he disparages, censures, and reproaches the Vinaya. The remainder here is clear in itself.

It has three origins - it is an act of commission, freed by right perception, with consciousness, a worldly offence, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Bewildering

444. In the third - "Fortnightly" means every half-month in regular succession; but since it is recited on the Uposatha day, therefore "every Uposatha" is stated in the word-analysis. "Being recited" means while it is being recited. But since it is called "being recited" when the Pātimokkha reciter is reciting it, therefore "while reciting" is stated in the word-analysis. "And whatever offence he has committed therein" means whatever offence he has committed when that misconduct has been practised. "He should be dealt with according to the rule" means there is no release from that offence because it was committed through not knowing, but he should be dealt with in accordance with how the Dhamma and Vinaya stand. The meaning is: if he has committed an offence requiring confession, he should be made to confess; if one requiring rehabilitation, he should be made to undergo rehabilitation. "Thoroughly" means well. "Having given attention" means having made a state of interest; it is said to mean "having become interested."

447. In "legally valid act" and so forth, the act of charging with confusion is intended. The remainder here is clear in itself. It has three origins - it is an act of commission, freed by right perception, with consciousness, a worldly offence, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling.

The third training rule on confusing.

4. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Striking

449. In the fourth - "They strike" means having said such things as "Friend, set out a seat, bring foot-washing water," they strike those who do not do accordingly.

451. "He gives a blow, there is an offence requiring expiation" - here, when a blow is given with the desire to strike, even if he dies, it is only an offence requiring expiation. If by the blow a hand or a foot is broken, or the head is split, it is only an offence requiring expiation. "I shall make him such that he does not shine in the midst of the Sangha" - thus, with the intention of disfiguring, he cuts off an ear or a nose, it is an offence of wrong-doing.

452. "To one who is not fully ordained" means: if one gives a blow to a householder, or to one gone forth, or to a woman, or to a man, or even to an animal, it is an offence of wrong-doing. But if one with a lustful mind strikes a woman, it is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Community.

453. "Being harassed by someone" means being harassed by a human being or by an animal. "With the intention for release" means desiring one's own release from that. "He strikes a blow" means he strikes a blow with one of the body-connected relinquishable objects; there is no offence. If, moreover, having seen along the way a robber or an enemy wishing to harass, having said "Lay follower, stand right there, do not come," and when he comes disregarding the words, having struck him with a club or a knife saying "Go away!" he goes on his way - if that person dies from that blow, there is no offence whatsoever. The same method applies also in the case of wild animals. The remainder here is clear in itself. Its origin and so forth are similar to the first pārājika, but this concerns painful feeling.

5. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Raising the Palm of the Hand

454. In the fifth - "Raised their palms in threat" means having shown the manner of striking, they raise the body or what is attached to the body. "They, accustomed to blows, wept" means they, familiar with blows, having received blows before and thinking that now too blows would be given, wept - this is the meaning. Some recite "pahārassa mucchitā"; therein the meaning is "afraid of blows."

457. "Raises, there is an offence requiring expiation" - here, if having raised it, one misses and delivers a blow, the blow falls suddenly upon one who is unable to hold firm, since it was not given with the desire to strike, it is an offence of wrong-doing. If by that blow anything among the hands and so forth is broken, it is merely an offence of wrong-doing.

458. "With the intention for release, he raises his palm in threat" - here, in the cases stated previously, there is no offence for one who raises his palm in threat in the same manner as before. Even if, having missed, he strikes a blow, there is still no offence. The remainder is the same as before, together with the origins and so forth.

The fifth training rule on raising the palm of the hand.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Groundless Accusation

459. In the sixth - "Accused" means that they, being themselves full of faults, thinking "In this way monks will neither admonish us nor remind us," making self-protection, preemptively accused monks with an unfounded charge of an offence entailing initial and subsequent meetings of the Community. The rest here is clear, as it has been stated in the same manner in the unfounded training rule, the thirteenth.

It has three origins - it is an act of commission, freed by right perception, with consciousness, a worldly offence, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling.

The sixth training rule on groundless accusation.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Deliberate Action

464. In the seventh - "They cause" means they produce. "One causes remorse, an offence of pācittiya" - with each utterance there is an offence. "To one not fully ordained" means to a novice. If one causes remorse by such a method as "I think you were sitting alone with a woman, lying down, eating, drinking, and doing this and that in the midst of the Community," with each utterance there is an offence of wrong-doing. The remainder here is clear in itself. The origin and so forth are similar to those of the groundless case.

The seventh training rule on intentional act.

8. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Eavesdropping

471. In the eighth - "Having a legal case arisen" means of those who have a dispute-legal case arisen through these quarrels and so forth. "Listening in" means near the sound; the meaning is: where, having stood, it is possible to hear their words, there. "He goes, there is an offence of wrong-doing" means here, at each step there is a wrong-doing. "Consulting" means when one is consulting with another about something else; or the reading is "mantente," the meaning is the same.

473. "I will be appeased" means I will go to peace, I will not make a quarrel. "I will free myself" means having declared my state of non-involvement, I will free myself. The remainder here is clear in itself.

The origin of the thief-caravan rule - It originates from body and mind, and from body, speech, and mind. It may be an act of commission, by way of going out of desire to hear; it may be an act of omission, by way of not making known to those who come to one's standing place and deliberate. These three training rules - silver, evasive speech, and eavesdropping - are of one category. They involve a perceived liberation, are intentional, are worldly wrong, are bodily action, are verbal action, are of unwholesome mind, and are of painful feeling.

The eighth training rule on eavesdropping.

9. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Obstructing a Formal Act

474. In the ninth - "If we had known" means if we had known; the particle "ca" is merely an indeclinable particle. "Of legally valid" means because they are made in accordance with the Dhamma, the Vinaya, and the Teacher's instruction, there are dhammas in them, thus they are legally valid; of those legally valid four Community acts. "One who criticises commits an offence of pācittiya" - here, with each utterance there is a pācittiya. The remainder is clear in itself. It has three origins - it is an act of commission, freed by right perception, with consciousness, a worldly offence, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling.

The ninth training rule on objecting to an act.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Leaving Without Giving Consent

481. In the tenth - "Either a case has been reported" means the accuser and the accused have each stated their account, an investigator has been appointed; even to this extent, the case itself has been reported. The remainder here is clear in itself.

It has its origin in the abandonment of responsibility - It originates from body, speech and mind; it is action and non-action; it is released by perception; it is with consciousness; it is a worldly offence; it is bodily action; it is verbal action; it is unwholesome consciousness; it is painful feeling.

The tenth training rule on leaving without giving consent.

11. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning the Weak

484. In the eleventh - "According to friendship" means by way of friendship; it is said that one gives to whoever is a friend. This same method applies in all terms. The remainder is clear in meaning, as it has been stated in the method explained in the

section on causing offence and so forth.

It has three origins - it is an act of commission, release from perception, with consciousness, a worldly offence, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and painful feeling.

The eleventh training rule on the weak.

12. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Diverting Gains

489. In the twelfth - whatever should be said, all of that is according to the method stated in the thirtieth training rule on diverting. This alone is the distinction - therein, because of diverting to oneself, it is an offence of relinquishment with expiation; here, because of diverting to an individual, it is a mere offence of expiation.

It has three origins - it is action, exempt by perception, with consciousness, a worldly fault, bodily action, verbal action, unwholesome consciousness, and of three feelings.

The twelfth training rule on diverting.

The eighth chapter on the co-religionist is completed in the order of the commentary.

9. The Chapter on Valuables

1. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning the Inner Palace

494. In the first training rule of the King Chapter - "Oraka" means inferior. "Gone up to the upper terrace of the palace" means gone to the upper part of the excellent palace. "Ayyānaṃ vāhasā" means on account of the masters; because they made it known, it is said "I know."

497. "Desires the father" means having seen an opportunity, he wishes to kill him. In "the royal inner palace is crowded with elephants" and so forth, "crowded with elephants" means a place where there is crowding by elephants; the meaning is "congested with elephants." The same method applies to the term "crowded with horses and chariots" as well. Some read "sammatta"; that should not be accepted. There is also the reading "crowding of elephants in the king's inner palace"; therein, the meaning is that the crowding of elephants is "elephant-crowding," and it is said that there is elephant-crowding in the king's inner palace. This same method applies to the remaining terms as well. "Enticing" means such forms and so forth in that inner palace.

498. "Properly anointed on the head" means anointed on the head. "The king has not departed" thus "while the king has not departed," in that state where the king has not departed; the meaning is "from the bedchamber." "Jewel" is said to mean the chief queen, "gone out" means departed, "the jewel has not gone out" thus "while the queen has not gone out," in that state where the queen has not gone out; the meaning is "from the bedchamber." The remainder here is clear in itself.

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

2. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Jewels

502-503. In the second - "Vissaritvā" means having forgotten. "Puṇṇapattaṃ" means a constant gift of five kaḥāpaṇas. "Kyāhaṃ karissāmi" means "what shall I do?" "Having removed the ornament" means having taken off the ornament called mahālatā, worth ninety million.

504. "Attendant" means a servant.

506. "The precincts of an unfenced one" - here, "precincts" means two stone-throws from the monastery - "But for a dwelling, the distance of a winnowing fan's throw or a pestle's throw" - this was stated in the Mahāpaccarī. "Should take, there is an offence requiring expiation" - here, for one who takes or has taken gold and silver for one's own benefit, there is an offence requiring forfeiture and expiation; for the benefit of the Community, a group, an individual, a shrine, or new construction, there is an offence of wrong-doing; for the remaining valuables such as pearls, etc., for one who takes or has them taken for one's own benefit or for the benefit of the Community, etc., there is an offence of wrong-doing. Whether it is an allowable item or a non-allowable item, even down to a palm-leaf ear ornament belonging to one's mother, for one who stores away goods belonging to householders under the heading of a storekeeper, there is indeed an offence requiring expiation.

But if allowable goods belonging to one's parents must necessarily be stored away, they should be taken for one's own benefit and stored away. But when it is said "Store this away and give it," it should be refused saying "It is not allowable." If they say "Store it away," put it down and leave, it becomes an obstruction, and it is allowable to store it away. Carpenters and others or royal favourites doing work in the monastery say regarding their tools or bedding "Store these away and give them back" - this should not be done either out of desire or out of fear; but it is allowable to show a safe place. And when they have put things down by force and gone, it is allowable to store them away.

"Within a monastery or within a dwelling" - here, if there is a great monastery like the Mahāvihāra, in a compound enclosed by a wall where the suspicion arises that it might be taken by monks or novices, in just such a place it should be picked up or had picked up and deposited. But in places frequented by the general public, such as the Great Bodhi Tree gateway, the entrance hall, and the mango courtyard, it should not be picked up; there is no obstruction. But in the Kurundī it is stated: "One going along a road sees some goods in a deserted place; even when the place becomes crowded with people, the people suspect that very monk; therefore, one should step off the road and sit down. When the owners come, it should be pointed out to them. If one does not see the owners, one should do what is appropriate."

"Having made a mark by appearance or by sign" - here, "appearance" means the goods inside the package; therefore, having opened the package and counted, it should be ascertained whether there are so many coins or gold and silver. "Sign" means a seal and so forth; therefore, regarding a sealed package, everything should be ascertained - whether it is a clay seal or a lac seal, or whether the package is made with blue cloth or made with white cloth, and so on.

"Suitable monks" means conscientious ones who have scruples. For it is not permissible to place it in the hands of those who are greedy by nature. But one who neither departs from that residence nor sees the owners, even by him it should not be used as the basis for one's own robes and the like; but something permanent - a dwelling or a shrine or a pond - should be constructed. If after a long period of time the owner comes, he should be told: "Lay follower, this particular thing was made with your property; please rejoice in it." If he rejoices, that is well; if he does not rejoice and presses the claim "Give me my wealth," having encouraged another, it should be given.

507. In the phrases "he takes what is considered a valuable on trust" and so forth, this is stated with reference to what is allowable to touch only. What is not allowable to touch is simply not permissible. The remainder here is clear in itself. Six origins - it is an act, not release by cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action, verbal action, three types of consciousness, three types of feeling.

The training rule on treasures is the second.

3. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Entering a Village at the Wrong Time

508. In the third - "Pointless talk" means talk that is obstructive to the noble path. "Talk about kings" means talk connected with kings. The same method applies to "talk about thieves" and so on.

512. Regarding "a monk who is present" - what is to be said here has already been stated in the training rule on proper conduct. If several monks enter a village for some task, "I ask permission for entering a village at the improper time" - this should be asked by all of them from one another. If that task is not accomplished in that village and they go to another village, even if it be a hundred villages, there is no need to ask permission again. But if, having abandoned the effort, while going back to the monastery they wish to enter another village along the way, permission must be asked again.

Having finished the meal at a family house or at a dining hall, if one wishes to go about for alms of oil or alms of ghee, if a monk is in sight, one should go after asking permission. When none is present, one should go thinking "there is none." If, having gone down to the street, one sees a monk, there is no need to ask permission; one may go about even without asking permission. If a road goes through the middle of a village, and while going along it the thought arises "I shall go about for alms of oil and such," if a monk is in sight, one should go about after asking permission. But for one going about for alms without leaving the road, there is no need to ask permission. The vicinity of an unfenced village should be understood in the same manner as stated regarding the taking of what is not given.

515. Regarding "if one goes to a monastery within the village" and so forth, there is no offence not only for one who goes without asking permission, without tying the waistband, and without putting on the outer robe. "In misfortunes" means a lion or a

tiger comes, or a storm arises, or some other danger occurs - there is no offence. In such misfortunes, it is allowable to enter the interior of a village from outside the village. The remainder here is clear in itself.

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

The training rule on entering a village at the wrong time is the third.

4. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning a Needle Case

517-520. In the fourth - breaking itself is "fit to be broken"; that belongs to it, thus it is "fit to be broken" indeed. "Araṇṇike" means in the fire-stick bow. "Vidhe" means in the piercing instrument. The remainder here is clear in itself. Six origins - it is an act, not release by cessation of perception, without consciousness, an offence by convention, bodily action, verbal action, three types of consciousness, three types of feeling.

The training rule on the needle case is the fourth.

5. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning a Bed

522. In the fifth - "requiring cutting off" is according to the method already stated.

525. Regarding "cuts it and uses it," here, if one does not wish to cut it, one buries it in the ground and shows the proper measure above, or having spread it flat, uses it, or having lifted it up and placed it on a weighing frame, having folded it, uses it - all is allowable. The remainder here is clear in itself. It has six origins.

The training rule on the bed is the fifth.

6. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning Cotton-Stuffed Mattresses

526. In the sixth - "Cotton-stuffed" means cotton is wrapped herein; it is said that having inserted cotton, it is wrapped over with a cover. The remainder here is clear in itself. It has six origins.

The training rule on cotton-stuffed mattress is the sixth.

7. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning a Sitting Cloth

531-534. In the seventh - "The sitting cloth had been permitted" - where was it permitted? In the Cīvarakkhandhaka, in the matter of superior food. For it is said there - "I permit, monks, a sitting cloth for the protection of the body, for the protection of the robe, and for the protection of the lodging." "Like an old leather-worker" - the meaning is: like an old hide-worker. For just as a leather-worker, thinking "I shall spread out the hide," pulls and stretches it here and there; so too did he with that sitting cloth. Therefore the Blessed One said thus - "A sitting cloth is called 'with a fringe'" means: having spread it out like a spread, in a space of one span by the Fortunate One's span at one end, splitting it in two places, three fringes are made; by those fringes it is called "with a fringe." The remainder here is clear in itself. It has six origins.

The training rule on the sitting cloth is the seventh.

8. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning an Itch-Covering Cloth

537. In the eighth - "The scab cloth had been permitted" - where was it permitted? In the Cīvarakkhandhaka, in the account of Belaṭṭhasīsa. For it is said there - "I permit, monks, for one who has an affliction of scabies, or boils, or discharge, or severe itching, a scab cloth."

539. "For one who has below the navel and above the knee-cap" means for a monk below the navel and above the knee-caps. "Itch" means scab. "Boils" means small boils with blood-tipped heads. "Discharge" means the oozing of impurity by way of haemorrhoids, fistula, diabetes and the like. "Severe scab affliction" means it is called an affliction of large boils. The remainder here is clear in itself. It has six origins.

The training rule on the itch-covering cloth is the eighth.

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

542. In the ninth - "The cloth for the rains had been permitted" - where was it permitted? In the Cīvarakkhandhaka, in the account of Visākhā. For it is said there - "I permit, monks, the cloth for the rains." The remainder here is clear in itself. It has six origins.

The training rule on the rains-bathing cloth is the ninth.

10. Commentary on the Training Rule Concerning the Elder Nanda

547. In the tenth - "Four finger-breadths shorter" means of a measure less by four finger-breadths. The remainder is clear in itself. It has six origins.

The training rule on the Elder Nanda is the tenth.

The ninth chapter on treasures is completed in the order of the commentary.

"Have been recited" etc. is stated in the manner already explained.

In the Samantapāsādikā, the commentary on the Vinaya,

the commentary on the minor rules is completed.

The Section on Expiation 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. 2. Commentary on the Expiation. 5. The Section on Expiation 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