

THE PALIVERSE PROJECT

The Universe of Buddha's Wisdom

Commentaries (Aṭṭhakathā)

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

5. Commentary on the Supplement (Parivāra) (5. Parivāra-
aṭṭhakathā)

The Five Chapters (Pañcavaggo)



PaliVerse

5. Commentary on the Supplement (Parivāra)

The Five Chapters

Commentary on the Chapter on Procedures

482. In the Chapter on Legal Acts, the distinction among the four legal acts has already been stated in the Section on Settlement. Although it has been stated, this determination of legal acts becomes clear when explained from the beginning; therefore, we shall explain here what should be said starting from the beginning. "Four" - this is a statement defining the number of legal acts. "Legal acts" - this is an indication of the defined legal acts. An act for which permission ought to be asked is a legal act to be carried out by purifying the Sangha present within the boundary, obtaining the consent of those eligible to give consent, and announcing three times with the approval of a united Sangha. A legal act at which a motion is put is a legal act to be carried out, in the manner already stated, with the approval of a united Sangha by means of a single motion. A legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by one proclamation is a legal act to be carried out, in the manner already stated, with the approval of a united Sangha by means of a single motion and a single proclamation - thus by a proclamation that is second to the motion. A legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by three proclamations is a legal act to be carried out, in the manner already stated, with the approval of a united Sangha by means of a single motion and three proclamations - thus by three proclamations that are fourth to the motion.

Therein, an act for which permission ought to be asked should be carried out only by asking permission, and should not be carried out by way of a legal act at which a motion is put and so forth. A legal act at which a motion is put also should be carried out only by putting a single motion, and should not be carried out by way of an act for which permission ought to be asked and so forth. However, a legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by one proclamation - there are some that may be carried out by asking permission, and some that may not.

Therein, the agreement on a boundary, the abolition of a boundary, the giving of the kaṭhina, the withdrawal of the kaṭhina, the authorisation of a site for a hut, and the authorisation of a site for a dwelling - these six legal acts are weighty and are not suitable to be carried out by asking permission; they should be carried out only by announcing the formal words of a legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by one proclamation. The remaining thirteen agreements, and the agreements for the assigner of lodgings, the distribution of robes of the dead, etc. - these are light legal acts and are suitable to be carried out even by asking permission; however, they should not be carried out by way of a legal act at which a motion is put or a legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by three proclamations. Some say that carrying them out by way of a legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by three proclamations makes them stronger, and therefore they should be so carried out. However, in that case there would be a mixing up of legal acts; therefore, it

should not be done - this has been rejected. But if there is a deficiency in syllables, or a deficiency in words, or a badly spoken word, it is suitable to repeat it again and again for the purpose of correcting it. This constitutes a strengthening of a valid legal act; in the case of an invalid legal act, it remains merely a legal act.

A legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by three proclamations should be carried out only by announcing the motion and the three formal statements of the legal act, and should not be carried out by way of an act for which permission ought to be asked, etc. "Fail in five ways" means they fail for five reasons.

483. "He performs an act requiring presence without presence - not a legally valid act, having failed regarding the case": here there are acts requiring presence; there are acts not requiring presence. Therein, acts not requiring presence are eightfold, namely: ordination by messenger, turning down the bowl, turning up the bowl, the designation of insanity for an insane monk, the designation of trainee status for trainee families, the supreme penalty for the monk Channa, the act of proclamation against Devadatta, and the act of non-salutation to be performed by the community of nuns against a monk who displays what is displeasing. All of these should be understood according to the method stated in each respective place. These eight kinds of acts, even when performed without presence, are properly performed and unimpeachable.

All remaining acts must be performed in the presence - they must be performed only by applying this fourfold settlement in the presence: the presence of the community, the presence of the Dhamma, the presence of the Vinaya, and the presence of the individual. For when performed thus, they are properly performed. But when not performed thus, because they are performed without this basis called settlement in the presence, they are said to have failed regarding the case. Therefore it was said - "He performs an act requiring presence without presence - not a legally valid act, having failed regarding the case."

In the cases of acts requiring questioning and so forth as well, the questioning and so forth itself is the case, and because they are performed without that case, the failure regarding the case of those too should be understood. But here this is merely a matter of wording. "He performs an act requiring questioning without questioning" means: what should be performed after questioning, charging, and reminding, he performs without questioning, without charging, and without reminding. "He performs an act requiring acknowledgement without acknowledgement" means: what should be performed by establishing the acknowledgement and according to the acknowledgement given, he performs by force upon one who does not acknowledge and who protests. "To one deserving the verdict of innocence" means: to one who is a destroyer of the taints, like the Elder Dabba Mallaputta. "To one deserving the verdict of past insanity" means: to one who is insane, like the monk Gagga. "To one deserving the decision for specific depravity" means: to one abounding in evil, like the monk Upavāḷa. This same method applies everywhere.

"He performs the Observance on a non-Observance day" means: he performs the Observance on a day that is not an Observance day. An Observance day means: excluding the month of Kattika, in the remaining eleven months, the day of reconciliation of a divided community, and the fourteenth and fifteenth days as

stated. Excluding these three kinds of Observance days, one who performs the Observance on another day is said to perform the Observance on a non-Observance day. For where those who dispute over a trifling matter concerning bowls, robes, and so forth postpone the Observance or the Invitation, therein, when that legal issue has been adjudicated, they are not permitted to perform a reconciliation Observance in between, thinking "We have become united"; those who do perform it are said to have performed the Observance on a non-Observance day.

"He invites to admonish on a non-Invitation day" means: he performs the Invitation on a day that is not an Invitation day. An Invitation day means: in the one month of Kattika, the day of reconciliation of a divided community, the day that has been postponed by deferral, and the two full-moon days. Excluding these four kinds of Invitation days, one who performs the Invitation on another day is said to invite to admonish on a non-Invitation day. Here too, upon the settling of a trifling dispute, they are not permitted to perform a reconciliation Invitation; those who do perform it have performed the Invitation on a non-Invitation day. Furthermore, it is also not a legally valid act, having failed regarding the case, when one gives full ordination to one who is under twenty years of age, or to one who has previously committed a definitive offence, or to any one of the eleven types of ineligible persons. Thus legal acts fail regarding the case.

484. Regarding the failure in the motion, "one does not refer to the case" means one does not refer to the person for whom one performs the act of ordination and so forth, one does not mention his name. When one should say "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. This Dhammarakkhita is a candidate for ordination under the Venerable Buddharakkhita," one says "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. A candidate for ordination under the Venerable Buddharakkhita." Thus one does not refer to the case.

"One does not refer to the Community" means one does not mention the name of the Community. When one should say "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. This Dhammarakkhita," one says "Let me hear, venerable sirs. This Dhammarakkhita." Thus one does not refer to the Community.

"One does not refer to the person" means one does not refer to the preceptor of the candidate for ordination, one does not mention his name. When one should say "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. This Dhammarakkhita is a candidate for ordination under the Venerable Buddharakkhita," one says "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. This Dhammarakkhita is a candidate for ordination." Thus one does not refer to the person.

"One does not refer to the motion" means one does not refer to the motion at all. In an act with a motion and one proclamation, having omitted the motion, one performs the proclamation act only twice by the formal act statement. In an act with a motion and three proclamations too, having omitted the motion, one performs the proclamation act only four times by the formal act statement. Thus one does not refer to the motion.

"Or one puts forward the motion afterwards" means having first performed the proclamation act by the formal act statement, saying "This is the motion," one says "The Community approves, therefore it is silent. Thus I hold it." Thus one puts forward

the motion afterwards. In this way, legal acts fail regarding the motion in these five ways.

485. Regarding failure in the proclamation, however, the basis and so forth should be understood in the manner already stated. Now, their non-fondling is as follows - When in the first proclamation "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs," or in the second and third proclamations "I say this matter a second time also, I say this matter a third time also, let the Community hear me, venerable sirs," when one should say "This Dhammarakkhita is a candidate for full ordination under the Venerable Buddharakkhita," but says "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs, of the Venerable Buddharakkhita" - this is called not fondling the basis. When one should say "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs, this Dhammarakkhita," but says "Let me hear, venerable sirs, this Dhammarakkhita" - this is called not fondling the Community. When one should say "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs, this Dhammarakkhita of the Venerable Buddharakkhita," but says "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs, this Dhammarakkhita is a candidate for full ordination" - this is called not fondling the person.

"One omits the announcement" means one does not make the proclamation of the formal act at all; in a formal act with one motion and one proclamation, one sets forth only the motion twice; in a formal act with one motion and three proclamations, one sets forth only the motion four times; thus one omits the proclamation. Also one who, in a formal act with one motion and one proclamation, having set forth one motion and proclaiming one formal act, drops a syllable or mispronounces a word - this one too indeed omits the proclamation. In a formal act with one motion and three proclamations, however, one who, having set forth one motion, makes the proclamation of the formal act only once or only twice, or who drops a syllable or a word, or who mispronounces - this one too should be understood as indeed omitting the proclamation.

"Mispronounces" - here, however, this is the determination: One who, when a certain syllable should be spoken, speaks another - this is called mispronouncing. Therefore, by a monk performing the formal act, that which is -

"Unaspirated and aspirated, long and short, heavy and light, and nasal;
Conjoined, separated, and released - tenfold is the classification of consonant understanding."

This stated classification should be well observed. Herein, "unaspirated" means the first and third in the five groups of consonants. "Aspirated" means the second and fourth in those same groups. "Long" means that which is to be pronounced with a long duration, such as ā and so forth. "Short" means that which is to be pronounced in half that duration, such as a and so forth. "Heavy" means just the long. Or that which is spoken by making what follows a conjunct consonant, as in "āyasmato buddharakkhitattherassa yassa nakkhamatī." "Light" means just the short. Or that which is spoken by making what follows a non-conjunct consonant, as in "āyasmato buddharakkhitatherassa yassa na khamatī." "Nasal" means that which is to be spoken by restraining the organs of articulation, not releasing them, with the mouth unopened, making it nasal. "Conjoined" means that which is spoken by joining with the following word, as "tuṇhissā" or "tuṇhassā." "Separated" means that which is

spoken by not joining with the following word, cutting it off, as "tuṇhī assā" or "tuṇha assā." "Released" means that which is spoken by not restraining the organs of articulation, releasing them, with the mouth opened, without making it nasal.

Therein, when one should say "suṇātu me," making the ta-sound into a tha-sound and saying "suṇāthu me" - this is called making the unaspirated into an aspirated. Likewise, when one should say "pattakallaṃ, esā ñattī," saying "patthakallaṃ, esā ñatthī" and so forth. When one should say "bhante saṅgho," making the bha-sound and gha-sound into ba-sound and ga-sound and saying "bante saṅgo" - this is called making the aspirated into an unaspirated. When one should say "suṇātu me" with the mouth opened, but says "suṇaṃtu me," or when one should say "esā ñattī" but says "esaṃ ñattī" with the mouth unopened making it nasal - this is called making the released into a nasal utterance. When one should say "pattakallaṃ" with the mouth unopened making it nasal, but says "pattakallā" with the mouth opened without making it nasal - this is called making the nasal into a released utterance.

Thus, using an aspirated consonant where an unaspirated one should be used, an unaspirated consonant where an aspirated one should be used, a nasal sound where a released sound should be used, and a released sound where a nasal sound should be used - these four consonant errors within the formal act of announcement corrupt the legal act. For one speaking thus utters a different syllable where another syllable should be uttered, and is said to make a mispronunciation. However, regarding the remaining six consonant distinctions, namely long and short and so forth, the formal act of announcement should be performed by one who pronounces each syllable in its proper place - long where long is required and short where short is required - without destroying the tradition handed down in succession. But if, without doing so, one says a short where a long should be uttered, or says a long where a short should be uttered; likewise, if one says a light where a heavy should be uttered, or says a heavy where a light should be uttered; or if one says a separated form where a conjoined form should be uttered, or says a conjoined form where a separated form should be uttered; even when spoken thus, the formal act of announcement is not invalidated. For these six consonant distinctions do not corrupt the legal act.

However, what the elders who are specialists in the discourses say - that the letter da becomes the letter ta, the letter ta becomes the letter da, the letter ca becomes the letter ja, the letter ja becomes the letter ca, the letter ya becomes the letter ka, the letter ka becomes the letter ya; therefore, when da and the rest should be uttered, the utterance of ta and the rest is not contradictory - that does not apply when it comes to the formal act of announcement. Therefore, one who bears the Vinaya should not make the letter da into the letter ta, etc. nor the letter ka into the letter ya. The formal act of announcement should be performed by one who, having purified the linguistic form according to the canonical text, avoids the faults stated regarding the tenfold consonant classification. For otherwise, one omits the announcement.

"Or one announces at the wrong time" means that at an improper time, in an improper occasion, without setting up the motion, one first performs the act of proclamation and afterwards sets up the motion. Thus, legal acts fail regarding the proclamation in these five ways.

486. Regarding the failure of the boundary, a too small boundary is one which does not accommodate twenty-one monks. In the Kurundī, however, it is said: "where twenty-one monks are unable to sit." Therefore, whatever boundary is of such a kind, even though authorised, it is unauthorised, being just like a village district, and any legal act performed therein is invalid. This method applies to the remaining boundaries as well. Here, however, a too large boundary is one which, even by the tip of a hair, exceeds three yojanas and is authorised. A broken sign means what is called an unconnected sign. Having proclaimed the sign in the eastern direction, one should proclaim in sequence in the southern, western, and northern directions, and then again in the eastern direction one should re-proclaim the previously proclaimed sign and establish it thus. In this way, it becomes an unbroken sign. But if, having brought them in sequence, one proclaims the sign in the northern direction and establishes it right there, it becomes a broken sign. Another broken sign is one which is authorised by making one sign in between, among things that cannot serve as signs, such as a tree with only bark-heartwood, or a stump, or a heap of earth or a heap of sand. A shadow sign is one which is authorised by making any shadow of a mountain shadow and the like as a sign. A signless boundary is one which is authorised without proclaiming signs at all.

One standing outside the boundary authorises a boundary means that, having proclaimed the signs, one standing outside the signs authorises it. One authorises a boundary in a river, in the sea, or in a natural lake - whatever one authorises in these rivers and so forth, even though thus authorised, it is as if unauthorised, because of the statement: "Monks, every river is without boundary, every sea is without boundary, every natural lake is without boundary." One overlaps a boundary with a boundary means one overlaps others' boundary with one's own boundary. One overpowers means one overpowers others' boundary with one's own boundary. Therein, how overlapping and overpowering occur, all that has been stated in the Uposatha chapter itself. Thus, all these eleven boundaries are non-boundaries, just like village districts, and any legal act performed while sitting in them is invalid. Therefore it is said: "By these eleven ways, legal acts fail regarding the boundary."

487-488. However, regarding the failure of legal acts with respect to the assembly, there is nothing that is unclear. Whatever characteristic of competence for legal acts and deserving of consent might need to be stated therein, that too has already been stated further on by the method beginning with "four monks of regular standing, competent for legal acts." Therein, "of regular standing, competent for legal acts" means: in a legal act requiring a group of four, four monks of regular standing, not suspended, not expelled, of purified virtue - four monks competent for legal acts, worthy of the legal act, suitable, masters of it. Without them that legal act is not performed, and their consent or declaration of purity does not apply. But the remainder, even if they number a thousand, if they are of the same communion, all are deserving of consent. Whether they come after giving their consent and declaration of purity or not, the legal act still stands. But the one for whom the Community performs a legal act such as probation and so forth, he is neither competent for legal acts nor deserving of consent. Moreover, since the Community performs the legal act having made that person the subject, therefore he is called "worthy of the legal act." The same method applies to the remaining legal acts as well.

489. The method beginning with "Again, four legal acts" is stated for the purpose of showing that paṇḍakas and others are not valid cases. The remainder here is clear in itself.

Discussion on the Procedure of Announcement

495-496. Now, in order to show the classification of those acts, he said beginning with "To how many states does an act for which permission ought to be asked go?" Therein, "An act for which permission ought to be asked goes to five states - reinstatement, expulsion, the shaving act, the supreme penalty, and the act-characteristic itself as the fifth" - here, "reinstatement, expulsion" is stated thus for smoothness of expression. But first there is expulsion, afterwards reinstatement. Therein, that which is the punishment of expulsion of a thorn-novice should be understood as "expulsion." Therefore, at present, if a novice speaks dispraise of the Buddha, or of the Dhamma, or of the Community, declares what is not allowable to be allowable, holds wrong view, is possessed of an extreme view, he should be restrained up to three times and made to relinquish that belief. If he does not relinquish it, the Community should be assembled and he should be told "Relinquish it." If he does not relinquish it, a competent monk should perform an act for which permission ought to be asked and expel him. And the act should be performed thus -

"Venerable sirs, I ask the Community - 'This novice named so-and-so speaks dispraise of the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Community, holds wrong view. That which other novices obtain - sharing a sleeping place with monks for two or three nights - his expulsion for the loss of that is agreeable to the Community.' For the second time also... For the third time also, venerable sirs, I ask the Community - 'This novice named so-and-so, of the Buddha... etc. is agreeable to the Community.' Go, wretch, be gone."

He, at a later time, asking for forgiveness thus: "Venerable sirs, through foolishness, through ignorance, through misfortune I acted thus; I ask the Community for forgiveness," having been made to request up to three times, should be reinstated by an act for which permission ought to be asked itself. And he should be reinstated thus: in the midst of the Community, a competent monk should announce with the Community's approval -

"Venerable sirs, I ask the Community - This novice named so-and-so spoke dispraise of the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Community, held wrong view. That which other novices obtain - sharing a sleeping place with monks for two or three nights - he was expelled for the loss of that. Now he is gentle, of humble conduct, has entered upon a sense of conscience, is established in moral shame and moral dread, has undergone the punishment, and confesses his transgression. The granting of communion in body and communal life to this novice as before is agreeable to the Community."

Thus it should be said three times. Thus an act for which permission ought to be asked goes to both reinstatement and expulsion. The shaving act has been stated in the commentary on the Great Chapter itself. The supreme penalty has been stated in the Chapter on the Five Hundred itself. However, it was not prescribed only for Channa; whatever other monk too is insolent, who dwells offending, abusing, and disparaging monks with harsh words, it should be given to him also. And it should be given thus: in the midst of the Community, a competent monk should announce with

the Community's approval -

"Venerable sirs, the monk named so-and-so is insolent, he dwells offending monks with harsh words. That monk may say whatever he wishes. The monk named so-and-so should neither be spoken to, nor admonished, nor instructed by the monks. Venerable sirs, I ask the Community - 'The giving of the supreme penalty to the monk named so-and-so is agreeable to the Community.' For the second time I ask, for the third time I ask - 'Venerable sirs, the giving of the supreme penalty to the monk named so-and-so is agreeable to the Community.'"

At a later time, when he has conducted himself properly and asks for forgiveness, the supreme penalty should be revoked. And it should be revoked thus: it should be announced by a competent monk in the midst of the Community -

"Venerable sirs, the community of monks imposed the supreme penalty on such-and-such a monk. That monk is gentle, of humble conduct, has entered upon the quality of conscience, is established in moral shame and moral dread, and having reflected, stands restrained for the future. Venerable sirs, I ask the Community: the revocation of the supreme penalty for that monk - is this agreeable to the Community?"

Having spoken thus up to three times, the supreme penalty should be revoked by an act of permission alone.

As for "the act-characteristic itself is the fifth" - that which was stated by the Blessed One in the Bhikkhunīkhandhaka: "Now at that time the monks of the group of six splashed the nuns with muddy water, thinking 'Perhaps they will become enamoured of us,' they exposed their bodies and showed them to the nuns, they exposed their thighs and showed them to the nuns, they exposed their private parts and showed them to the nuns, they made suggestive remarks to the nuns, they associated intimately with the nuns, thinking 'Perhaps they will become enamoured of us.' Having laid down an offence of wrong-doing for those monks in these cases, 'I allow, monks, a disciplinary act to be done against that monk.' Then this occurred to the nuns - 'What disciplinary act should be done?' They reported this matter to the Blessed One: 'That monk, monks, should be made one not to be saluted by the community of nuns.'" Thus the act of making one not to be saluted was permitted. That act-characteristic itself is the fifth state of this act of permission. For its characteristic is the act itself, not readmission and so forth; therefore it is called "act-characteristic." The procedure for it has been stated in that very place. However, in order to show it in detail together with its revocation, we state it here also. With the approval of the community of nuns assembled at the nuns' quarters, it should be announced by a competent nun -

"Noble ladies, the venerable one named such-and-such displays what is displeasing to the nuns. I ask the community of nuns whether the making of that venerable one as one not to be saluted is agreeable. For the second time also... for the third time also I ask the community of nuns."

Having announced thus three times, the act of making one not to be saluted should be done by an act of permission.

From that point onwards, that monk should not be saluted by the nuns. If, being not saluted, he establishes moral shame and moral dread and conducts himself properly, he should ask forgiveness of the nuns. When asking forgiveness, without going to the nuns' quarters, right at the monastery, having approached the Community or a group or a single monk, having sat down squatting on his heels, having raised his joined palms, he should ask forgiveness thus: "Venerable sirs, having reflected, I stand restrained for the future. I shall not again display what is displeasing. May the community of nuns forgive me." Then, either the Community or the group having sent a single monk, or a single monk having gone himself, the nuns should be told - "This monk, having reflected, stands restrained for the future. Having confessed his transgression, the community of nuns has been asked for forgiveness by him. May the community of nuns make him one to be saluted." He should be made one to be saluted. And he should be made thus: with the approval of the community of nuns assembled at the nuns' quarters, it should be announced by a competent nun -

"Noble ladies, this venerable one named such-and-such was made one not to be saluted by the community of nuns because he displayed what is displeasing to the nuns. He, having entered upon the quality of conscience, having reflected, standing restrained for the future, having confessed his transgression, asked forgiveness of the community of nuns. I ask the community of nuns whether the making of that venerable one as one to be saluted is agreeable."

It should be said three times. Thus, by an act of permission alone, he should be made one to be saluted.

This, however, is a determination of the act-characteristic that goes beyond the canonical text. For this act-characteristic was laid down based on the community of nuns, but it is also applicable to the community of monks. For whatever act of permission the community of monks performs at the distribution of tickets, the distribution of gruel, the distribution of meals, and the Uposatha hall - this too is indeed an act-characteristic. For those whose robes have been stolen, whose robes are worn out, or whose robes are lost, having assembled the Community, having announced up to three times by a competent monk, having performed an act of permission, it is proper to give a robe. However, for one making a robe, the one authorised to distribute minor items should give needles and such things of the kinds stated in the commentary on the *Senāsanakkhandhaka*, even without asking permission. In giving those, he himself is the authority; but one giving in excess should give after asking permission. For in giving in excess of that, the Community is the owner. Medicine for the sick should also be given by himself in the manner stated there. For one wanting more, it should be given after asking permission. And for one who is weak, or whose postures are impaired, or whose alms-round path is cut off, or who is seriously ill, when giving daily a measure or half a measure or even for one day five or ten measures of rice at the great monasteries from what arises there, it should be given only after performing an act of permission. It is proper to give by an act of permission even the debt-encumbrance for a good monk from what arises there, and even a lodging not to be vacated for a learned monk who carries the burden of the Community, and even food-wages for attendants and such who perform the Community's duties.

It is permissible to have a monastery belonging to the Community maintained from

the income arising from what has been given for the purpose of the four requisites. However, in order to cut short talk such as "This monk manages it by way of authority," he should have it maintained only after asking the Community at the ticket-hall and so forth or at an intermediate assembly. A monastery should also be maintained after seeking permission, even from the income arising from what has been specifically given for the purpose of robes and almsfood. It is permissible even without seeking permission. However, in order to cut short talk that has arisen such as "Indeed this monk is bold, having the monastery maintained from what was given for the purpose of robes and almsfood," he should have it maintained only after performing an act of seeking permission.

When making an umbrella, a railing, a Bodhi-tree shrine, or a seat-hall at a shrine that has not yet been made, or when repairing one that is old, or when doing plaster-work, it is permissible to have it done by encouraging people. If there is no one to do it, it should be done from the deposits belonging to the shrine. If there are no deposits either, it should be done from the income arising there after performing an act of seeking permission, or even from what belongs to the Community. For it is permissible to do shrine-work from what belongs to the Community after seeking permission. It is not permissible to do Saṅgha-work from what belongs to the shrine, even after seeking permission. However, it is permissible to take it temporarily and restore it to its original state.

However, when those doing plaster-work and so forth at the shrine, not obtaining sufficient sustenance from alms-round or from the Community, take just enough for sustenance from what belongs to the shrine and use it, it is permissible to carry out the duty; but it is not permissible to make a Community meal with fish, meat, and so forth saying "We are carrying out the duty." Regarding fruit trees planted in the monastery that have been claimed by the Community and receive maintenance, whose fruits they enjoy after striking the bell and distributing, no act of seeking permission need be performed for those. But for those that have not been claimed, an act of seeking permission should be performed for those. That may be done at the ticket-hall, the gruel-hall, the meal-hall, or at intermediate assemblies, and it is certainly permissible at the Uposatha hall. For there, even the consent and purity of those not present is conveyed, therefore it is well purified.

And it should be done thus: it should be announced by a competent monk with the approval of the Community of monks -

"Bhante, whatever roots, bark, leaves, shoots, flowers, fruits, edibles, and so forth belonging to the Community there are within the boundary of this monastery, that the enjoyment of all of that at pleasure by monks who have come and come again is agreeable to the Community - I ask the Community." This should be asked three times.

What is done by four or five monks is well done indeed. In a monastery where two or three persons dwell, what is done by them having sat down is just as if done by the Community. In a monastery where there is one monk, the agreement made by that monk having performed the preliminary duties and preliminary tasks on the Uposatha day and having sat down is just as if done by the Community.

However, it is permissible for the one making it to do it by fruit-season, or to do it having defined a period of four months, six months, or one year, or even without defining a period. When a period has been defined, after enjoying according to the defined period, it should be done again. When no period has been defined, it is permissible as long as the trees endure. Even for other trees planted from the seeds of those trees, the same agreement applies to them.

But if they are planted in another monastery, the Community of the very monastery where they are planted is the owner of them. Even for those planted later in the original monastery from seeds brought from elsewhere, a different agreement should be made for them. When an agreement has been made, those standing on personal grounds may enjoy fruits and so forth at pleasure. But if here they enclose various areas and make them into personal quarters and maintain them, they stand on the personal grounds of those monks. Others may not enjoy them, but they should be enjoyed by them after giving a tenth share to the Community. Even for one who protects a tree in the middle of the monastery by surrounding it with branches, the same method applies to him.

When fruits and non-fruits are brought for a respected monk who has gone to an ancient monastery, saying "The elder has arrived," if formerly a learned monk who mastered all the texts resided there, it should be consumed without scruple, thinking "Certainly a long-standing agreement must have been made here." Fruits and non-fruits in the monastery are allowable even for those who practise the alms-round ascetic practice; it does not violate the ascetic practice. Novices give many fruits to their own teachers and preceptors, and other monks who do not receive them complain; but this is merely a matter for complaint.

But if there is a famine, and as many as sixty people depend on a single jackfruit tree for their livelihood, at such a time the fruits should be divided and eaten for the benefit of all; this is the proper conduct. As long as the agreement is not rescinded, what is eaten by them is well and good. But when is the agreement rescinded? When the united Community, having assembled, announces "From now on, let them divide and eat." But in a monastery with a single monk, even when announced by one, the former agreement is indeed rescinded. If, after the agreement has been rescinded, the novices neither knock down fruits from the trees nor pick them up from the ground to give to the monks, but go about kicking the fallen fruits with their feet, a profit-share should be given to them, starting from a tenth up to half the fruit share. Certainly, out of desire for the profit-share, they will bring and give them. When times of plenty arise again, and attendants come and protect the trees by tying up branches and so forth, a profit-share should not be given to the novices; it should be divided and consumed.

People from surrounding villages come for the sake of the sick or pregnant women, saying "There are fruits and non-fruits in the monastery," and ask "Give us a coconut, give us a mango, give us a jackfruit." Should they be given or not? They should be given. For if not given, they become displeased. But the one giving should assemble the Community, announce it up to three times, and give only after performing an act of permission, or an agreement should be established. And it should be done thus: it should be announced by a competent monk with the approval of the Community -

"People come from surrounding villages and ask for fruits and non-fruits for the sake of the sick and others. That there be no obstruction for those taking two coconuts, two palmyra fruits, two jackfruits, five mangoes, five banana fruits, and no obstruction for those taking fruit from such-and-such a tree and such-and-such a tree - is this agreeable to the Community of monks?" This should be said three times.

From then on, those who come asking in the name of the sick and others should not be told "Take them," but the rule should be explained to them - "No obstruction has been made for those taking coconuts and so forth within this limit, and for those taking fruit from such-and-such a tree and such-and-such a tree." But one should not follow after them and say "This mango has sweet fruit, take from here." At the time of distributing fruits, half a share should be given to those who have come, by one who is appointed; if by one who is not appointed, it should be given after seeking permission.

If a destitute person, or a caravan leader travelling on the road, or any other person of authority comes and asks, it should be given only after seeking permission. One who takes by force and eats should not be prevented. For being angry, he might cut down the trees or cause other harm. When someone comes to a personal dwelling and asks from the village for a sick person, he should be told "It was planted by us for the purpose of shade and so forth; if there is any, you may decide for yourselves." But if the trees are laden with fruit, and they eat by tying up thorns and taking fruit in turn, it should be given without expecting anything in return. One who takes by force should not be prevented; the reason here is as stated before.

If the Community has a fruit garden and it does not receive maintenance, if someone tends it on a service basis, it remains the property of the Community. And also if the Community assigns the task to a capable monk, saying "Good man, tend this and give," and if he tends it on a service basis, even so it remains the property of the Community. But for one who expects a profit-share, the profit-share should be given as a third or a half. If, saying "It is a burdensome task," he is not willing with that much, then making everything his own property, he should also be told "Give a base share of a tenth and tend it." But because it is heavy property, it should not be given by way of cutting off the base. He, giving the base share and consuming, whether having made an unestablished dwelling or having tended an established dwelling, hands over the garden to his dependants; by them too the base share must be given. But when the monks are themselves able to tend it, then it should not be given to them to tend, and they should not be prevented during the time of tending, but should be prevented only at the time of taking up the tending. It should be said "Much has been consumed by you; now do not tend it, the Community of monks itself will tend it."

But if there is no one tending it on a service basis, nor on a profit-sharing basis, nor is the Community able to tend it, and one person, without asking permission, tends it and, having increased the profit share, expects a return, the profit share should be increased and given by an act of permission. Thus all of this is merely a characteristic of an act. An act of permission goes to these five states.

In the classification of the states of a legal act at which a motion is put, however: "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. So-and-so is a candidate for full ordination under the venerable so-and-so. He has been instructed by me. If the Community is ready, so-and-so may come - he should be told 'Come.'" Thus the inclusion of a candidate for full ordination is called inclusion.

"Let the venerable ones hear me. This monk so-and-so is a Dhamma speaker; neither the discourse nor the analysis of the discourse comes to him. Without discerning the meaning, he obstructs the meaning by the shadow of the letter. If the venerable ones are ready, having removed the monk so-and-so, the rest of us may settle this legal issue." Thus the exclusion of a Dhamma-speaking monk in a judicial investigation is called exclusion.

"Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. Today is the Uposatha day, the fifteenth. If the Community is ready, the Community may perform the Uposatha." Thus a motion set forth by means of the Uposatha act is called Uposatha.

"Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. Today is the Invitation day, the fifteenth. If the Community is ready, the Community may perform the Invitation." Thus a motion set forth by means of the Invitation act is called Invitation.

"Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. So-and-so is a candidate for full ordination under the venerable so-and-so. If it is the proper time for the Community, I would instruct the one of such and such a name." "If the Community is ready, so-and-so may instruct so-and-so." "If the Community is ready, I may question so-and-so on the obstructive matters." "If the Community is ready, so-and-so may question so-and-so on the obstructive matters." "If the Community is ready, I may question so-and-so on the Vinaya." "If the Community is ready, so-and-so may question so-and-so on the Vinaya." "If the Community is ready, I, being questioned on the Vinaya by so-and-so, may answer." "If the Community is ready, so-and-so, being questioned on the Vinaya by so-and-so, may answer." Thus a motion set forth for appointing oneself or another is called authorisation.

"Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. This robe of the monk so-and-so is to be forfeited and has been forfeited to the Community. If it is the proper time for the Community, the Community should give this robe to the monk of such and such a name." "If the venerable ones are ready, the venerable ones may give this robe to the monk so-and-so." Thus the giving of forfeited robes, bowls, and so forth is called giving.

"Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. This monk so-and-so remembers the offence, discloses it, makes it manifest, and confesses it. If it is the proper time for the Community, I would accept the offence of the monk of such and such a name." If the venerable ones are ready, I may accept the offence of the monk so-and-so." He should be told: "Do you see it?" "Yes, I see it." "You should restrain yourself in the future." Thus the acceptance of an offence is called acceptance.

"Let the venerable ones who are resident hear me. If it is the proper time for the venerable ones, we should now perform the Observance, we should recite the Pātimokkha, we should invite admonishment in the coming dark fortnight." If, monks, those monks who are makers of quarrels, makers of disputes, makers of contention,

makers of litigation, makers of legal issues in the Community were to remain for that dark fortnight, the resident monks should be informed by a competent and capable resident monk: "Let the venerable ones who are resident hear me. If the venerable ones are ready, we may now perform the Uposatha, recite the Pātimokkha, and perform the Invitation in the coming bright fortnight." Thus what is done is a postponement of the Invitation, and is called postponement.

All should assemble together, and having assembled, an experienced and competent monk should inform the Community: "Let the Community hear me, venerable sirs. While we were dwelling having fallen into quarrels, having fallen into disputes, having entered into contention, much that is unbecoming of a recluse has been committed and spoken about. If we deal with each other regarding these offences, that legal case might lead to hardness, fierceness, and schism. If the Community is ready, the Community should settle this legal case by the 'covering over as with grass' settlement, setting aside grave offences, setting aside those connected with householders." Thus, having performed the 'covering over as with grass' settlement, the very first all-inclusive motion is called the characteristic of a legal act.

Likewise, after that, making one in each half-month, two motions - thus, according to the classification stated: inclusion, exclusion, etc. The characteristic of a legal act itself being the ninth - thus the legal act at which a motion is put goes to these nine states.

In the classification of the states of a legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by one proclamation, the exclusion stated in the Khandhaka by means of the turning down of the bowl against Vaḍḍha the Licchavi is to be understood. And the inclusion stated by means of the turning up of the bowl for that same person is to be understood.

The authorisation of a boundary, the authorisation for non-separation from the three robes, the authorisation of a felt rug, the authorisations of a meal-designator, a lodging-assigner, a store-keeper, a robe-receiver, a robe-distributor, a gruel-distributor, a fruit-distributor, a hard-food-distributor, a distributor of small items, a cloth-collector, a bowl-collector, a monastery-attendant messenger, and a novice messenger - by means of these authorisations, authorisation is to be understood. By means of the giving of Kaṭhina robe and the giving of a deceased monk's robe, giving is to be understood.

By means of the removal of the Kaṭhina, removal is to be understood. By means of the designation of a hut-site and a dwelling-site, designation is to be understood. But setting aside the three motions - namely, the all-inclusive motion in the 'covering over as with grass' settlement and one motion in each half-month - again, one in one half-month and one in one half-month, two formal acts of a motion followed by one proclamation are stated; by means of those, the characteristic of a legal act is to be understood. Thus the legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by one proclamation goes to these seven states.

In the classification of the states of a legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by three proclamations, exclusion is to be understood by means of the seven legal acts beginning with the act of censure, and inclusion is to be understood by means of the rescinding of those same legal acts. Authorisation is to be understood by means

of the authorisation of a monk to admonish nuns. Giving is to be understood by means of the giving of probation and the giving of penance. Suppression is to be understood by means of the act of sending back to the beginning. By means of these eleven formal admonitions - "eight who follow one who has been suspended, and Ariṭṭha and Caṇḍakālī as those subject to the 'up to the third time' procedure, these are those subject to the 'up to the third time' procedure" - formal admonition is to be understood. But the characteristic of a legal act is to be understood by means of the act of higher ordination and the act of rehabilitation. Thus the legal act at which a motion is put and is followed by three proclamations goes to these seven states.

497. Having thus shown the legal acts, the failure of legal acts, and the classification of grounds for legal acts free from failure, now, in order to show the delimitation of the monastic community that performs those legal acts, he again stated the passage beginning with "in a legal act requiring a group of four." Its meaning should be understood in the same manner as stated in the description of the failure of legal acts regarding the assembly.

The explanation of the chapter on acts is finished.

Commentary on the Chapter on Reasons and Others

498. Now, in order to show the benefit in the laying down of those training rules which are the basis of those actions, the passage beginning with "dependent on two reasons" has been commenced. Therein, "for the restraint of enmity pertaining to the present life" means for the purpose of restraining, for the purpose of closing off, the five forms of enmity pertaining to the present life, beginning with the destruction of life. "For the warding off of enmity pertaining to the future life" means for the purpose of warding off, for the purpose of cutting off, for the purpose of preventing the arising of, enmity pertaining to the future life, which is reckoned as resultant suffering. "For the restraint of faults pertaining to the present life" means for the purpose of restraining those very same five forms of enmity. "Faults pertaining to the future life" means those very same resultant sufferings. For indeed resultant sufferings are here called "faults" because of their nature of being blameworthy. "Fears pertaining to the present life" means blame, censure, disciplinary actions such as the act of censure, suspension from the observance and invitation ceremonies, and the act of proclamation of ill-repute - these are called fears pertaining to the present life; for the purpose of restraining these. But fears pertaining to the future life are just resultant sufferings; for the purpose of warding off those. "Unwholesome states pertaining to the present life" means for the purpose of restraining unwholesome states classified as the five forms of enmity and the ten unwholesome courses of action. But resultant sufferings are called "unwholesome states pertaining to the future life" in the sense of being unbearable; for the purpose of warding off those. "Out of compassion for laypeople" means for the purpose of showing compassion to householders by way of protecting their faith. "For the arrest of the faction of those with evil desires" means the training rule on group meals was laid down for the purpose of breaking up the factional bonds of persons with evil desires. The remainder is clear everywhere. Whatever should be said here, all of that has been stated in the commentary on the first defeat.

The explanation of the training rules by way of purpose is finished.

499. Regarding the principal monastic code and so forth, the recitation of the principal monastic code is fivefold for monks and fourfold for nuns. Regarding the giving of probation and so forth, the involving being brought back has been laid down means the involving being brought back has been laid down for one who is practising among the eighteen or forty-three duties. The meaning is that the legal act by which one is brought back, that legal act has been laid down. The involving being sent away has been laid down means the legal act by which those who create quarrels and so forth are sent away, that legal act has been laid down - this is the meaning.

500. In the passage beginning with "what is not laid down" and so forth, "what is laid down when not laid down" means: the seven classes of offences - setting aside Kakusandha the Perfectly Enlightened One, Koṇāgamana, and Kassapa the Perfectly Enlightened One - what is laid down in a training rule not laid down by anyone in between is called "what is laid down." The discussion of precedents beginning with the case of the female monkey, when a training rule has been laid down, is called "what is additionally laid down." The remainder is clear everywhere.

The explanation of the chapter on benefits is finished.

501. Now, in order to show the ninefold classification of all training rules by each aspect, he said beginning with "nine classifications." Therein, "classification by subject matter" means classification by the subject matter. Thus the meaning of the terms in the remaining ones should also be understood. Here, however, this is the interpretation of meaning - since indeed not even a single training rule has been laid down without a subject matter, therefore all are classified by subject matter - thus the classification by subject matter should be understood.

Since two classes of offences are classified under failure in virtue, five classes of offences under failure in conduct, and six training rules are classified under failure in livelihood, therefore all are classified by failure - thus the classification by failure should be understood.

Since there is not even a single training rule free from the seven kinds of offences, therefore all are classified by offence - thus the classification by offence should be understood.

And since all were laid down in seven cities, they are classified by origin city - thus the classification by origin city should be understood.

Since not even a single training rule has been laid down in the absence of a transgressing individual, therefore all are classified by individual - thus the classification by individual should be understood.

All are classified by both the five and the seven classes of offences, and all do not arise without the six origins - thus they are classified by origin. And all, among the four legal cases, are classified under the legal case of offences. All reach settlement through the seven means of settlement - thus they are classified by settlement. Thus here the classifications by class, by origin, by legal case, and by settlement should also be understood. The remainder is the same as the method stated previously.

In the Samantapāsādikā, the commentary on the Vinaya,

the explanation of the chapter on the newly compiled is finished.

And the explanation of the terms with non-evident meaning in the Parivāra is finished.

Concluding Discussion

And to this extent -

The Protector, teaching the classification of the two Vibhaṅgas, the
Khandhakas, and the Parivāra;
Setting forth the Vinaya Piṭaka, which the Conqueror spoke for those to be
trained.

With a text of somewhat more than twenty-seven thousand;
The commentary is completed, named the Samantapāsādikā.

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

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

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

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

The commentary has proceeded regarding the Discipline, by one skilled in
taming those to be tamed;
Spoken by the Lord of the World, who had compassion for the world.

The Great Commentary, and the Mahāpaccarī,
And the Kurundī - these three are the Sinhalese commentaries.

Of the renowned and famous one named Buddhamitta,
A wise elder learned in the Vinaya, having heard in his presence.

The Great Monastery, established in the grounds of the Mahāmeghavana park,
Adorned with the great Bodhi tree of the Teacher.

That excellent meditation hall on its southern side,
Frequented by the community of monks of pure conduct and virtue.

Born of a noble family, always an attendant of the Community,
With untroubled faith, devoted to the Triple Gem.

The one renowned as the Lord of the Great Town had built there
That delightful mansion, furnished with a beautiful enclosure.

Endowed with trees of cool shade, with well-supplied reservoirs of water;
Dwelling there in the mansion, the lord of the great township.

Of pure conduct and virtuous behaviour, the elder named Buddhasiri;
Having dedicated to whom, this successful commentary on the Vinaya was
undertaken.

Of the king who protected the entire island of Laṅkā, free from troubles,
The king named Sirinivāsa, possessor of the Siripālaya.

In the peaceful twentieth victorious year, this
Was undertaken, and in the twenty-first, when it arrived, was completed.

Though there are troubles in families and in the world, this, free from troubles,
Was brought to completion in just one year.

Thus, may all endeavours for the whole world, accompanied by the Dhamma,
Swiftly reach completion, all free from troubles.

Whatever merit has been accumulated by me through making this
For the long endurance of the Dhamma, out of great reverence for the True
Dhamma,

By the power of all that, may all beings
Become partakers of the essence of the True Dhamma of the King of the
Dhamma.

May the true Dhamma endure long, may the rain long nourish the people in
due season;
May the king nourish with the Dhamma, and may he protect the earth.

This commentary on the Vinaya named Samantapāsādikā was composed by the elder known by the name Buddhaghosa, given by his teachers - who was adorned with supremely pure faith, wisdom, and energy; endowed with the accumulation of virtues such as moral conduct, good behaviour, uprightness, and gentleness; capable of plunging into the depths of his own tradition and other traditions; possessed of the distinction of wisdom and eloquence; of unimpeded power of knowledge in the Teacher's dispensation comprising the three Piṭakas together with their commentaries; a great expounder; endowed with the charm of sweet and noble speech flowing forth from the excellence of his literary skill; a speaker of what is fitting and apt; the foremost among debaters; a great poet; of vast and pure wisdom; an ornament to the lineage of the elders of the Mahāvihāra, those elders who were lamps of the Theravāda lineage, whose understanding was well established in the superhuman states adorned with qualities such as the six direct knowledges and other distinctions, attended by the analytical knowledges -

May it remain so long in the world, for those who seek to cross over the world;
Showing to sons of good family the method for purification of morality.

As long as even the name "Buddha" of such a one of pure mind;

The foremost of the world, the great sage, continues in the world.

The Samantapāsādikā,

the commentary on the Vinaya, 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. 5. Commentary on the Supplement (Parivāra). The Five Chapters 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