



BUDDHIST NUNS

THE BIRTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF A WOMEN'S MONASTIC ORDER

MOHAN WIJAYARATNA

Buddhist Nuns

The Community of Buddhist Nuns is one of the oldest women's organizations in human history. In this book Dr. Wijyaratna explains how this community was started by the Buddha in the 5th century BCE, and how it developed gradually. To show the motivation and the way of life of these ordained women, the author uses the oldest texts of the Pali canon. Several chapters of this book discuss the position of Buddhist nuns in the field of the three famous monastic themes: poverty, chastity and obedience. This book describes in detail the structure of the organization of their Community, their day-to-day practices, and the virtues and mental discipline through which they strove to attain the sublime goal, Nibbāna.

Author

Dr Mohan Wijyaratna, a Sri Lanka born anthropologist and translator living in France, is well known among francophone readers for his many works on various aspects of Buddhism as well as for his translations from the Pali Canon, including the complete *Dīgha* and *Majjhima Nikāya*. In 1980, he obtained his Doctorate from the University of Paris-Sorbonne, which in 1986 conferred on him the highest academic title of French State, *Docteur d'Etat*.

His book on the life of Buddhist monks was translated from French into English and published in 1990 by Cambridge University Press as *Buddhist Monastic Life: According to the Texts of the Theravada Tradition*.

ISBN: 978-955-24-0345-3

BPS

Buddhist Publication Society Inc.

P.O. Box 61, 54, Sangharaja Mawatha, Kandy, Sri Lanka

Tel: +94 81 2237283 Fax: +94 81 2223679

E-mail: bps@sltnet.lk Website: <http://www.bps.lk>

Buddhist Nuns

The Birth and Development
of a Women's Monastic Order

Bouddhologie
www.bouddhologie.org

Buddhist Nuns

The Birth and Development
of a Women's Monastic Order

Mohan Wijayaratna

Bouddhologie
www.bouddhologie.org

Buddhist Publication Society

Buddhist Publication Society
54 Sangharaja Mawatha
PO Box 61
Kandy
Sri Lanka
<http://www.bps.lk>

First Edition: 2001
Revised BPS Edition: 2010

© Mohan Wijayaratna, Paris, 2010

National Library and Documentation Centre—
Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Buddhist Nuns: The Birth and Development of a Women's
Monastic Order/ Edited by Mohan Wijayaratna.-Kandy:
Buddhist Publication Society Inc., 2010
BP 605S.-250p., 14x21.5cm
ISBN 978-955-24-0345-3
i. 294.3657 DDC 22 ii. Title
iii. Wijayaratna, Mohan ed.
1. Buddhist Nuns

ISBN 978-955-24-0345-3

Printed by
Creative Printers & Designers,
Bahirawakanda, Kandy.

CONTENTS

Contents	v
Preface	vii
Note to Second Edition	ix
Abbreviations	x
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Beginning of a Community	9
Chapter 2: The First Members	21
Chapter 3: Regulation of Entry	30
Chapter 4: The Role of the Monks	47
Chapter 5: Obedience	64
Chapter 6: Poverty	87
Chapter 7: Sexual Relations	117
Chapter 8: Spiritual Progress	130
Post-Script	143
Some Reflections on the Disappearance of the Community of Nuns	143
Appendix no. 1: Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha Translation	157
Introduction	159
Pārājikā	160
Saṅghādisesā	162
Nissaggiyā Pācittiyā	168
Pācittiyā	173
Pāṭidesanīyā	189
Sekhiyā	189
Adhikaraṇa-Samathā	194
Conclusion	195
Appendix no. 2: Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha Pali Text	197
Bhikkhunīpātimokkha	199
Index of Proper Names	233
Index of Subject Matter	236

Atthi pana bhoto Gotamassa eka bhikkhunī pi sāvīkā āsavānaṃ khayā cetovimuttiṃ paññāvimuttiṃ diṭṭhe va dhamme sayamaṃ abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajja viharatī ti?

Na kho Vaccha ekaṃ yeva satamaṃ na dve satāni na tīni satāni na cattāri satāni na pañca satāni atha kho bhīyyo va yā bhikkhuniyo mama sāvīkā āsavānaṃ khayā anāsavaṃ cetovimuttiṃ paññāvimuttiṃ diṭṭhe va dhamme sayamaṃ abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajja viharantī ti.

Does the honourable Gotama have among the nuns at least one female disciple who has attained liberation of mind and liberation through wisdom, having destroyed the mental taints through her own superhuman knowledge so that she, in this very life, can enter and abide in these mental states that are free of taints?

O Vaccha, I have not just one hundred, two, three, four or five hundred, but a very great number of nuns, my female disciples, who have attained liberation of mind and liberation through wisdom, having destroyed the mental taints through their own superhuman knowledge so that they, in this very life, can enter and abide in these mental states that are free from taints.

From *Sutta* no. 73 of the *Majjhima-nikāya* (M I 490)

PREFACE

In this book, I have tried to examine how Buddhist nuns were organized at the very beginning of their community life and how their code of discipline gradually developed. The various chapters are devoted to such subjects as: the rules to be followed before entering monastic life: poverty, chastity, etc. In these different areas, it is sometimes necessary to study the differences and similarities between monks and nuns.

To make this clear, I have pointed out the rules that correspond to given disciplinary measures each time this has proved necessary. In this regard, scholars may wish to find direct references to the original text of the nuns' code of discipline, the *Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha*. This text has not been accessible to Westerners in the past as it has not been published in Roman characters.¹ For this reason I include the complete Pali text with an English translation in an appendix. In preparing this transcription, I have consulted manuscripts from Sri Lanka, Thailand and Burma as well as the edition prepared by the Sixth Council (Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana) that took place in Rangoon in 1954–

1. The text of the *Bhikkhunī-Pātimokkha* must not be confused with the text of the *Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga*. The latter has been published in Roman script (cf. Vin IV); it contains both a detailed exposition of the disciplinary rules that nuns must follow and explanations about the legal proceedings that derive from these rules. Unfortunately, this text is incomplete: only four of the eight *pārājika* rules are given, only ten of the seventeen *Saṅghādisesa* rules, twelve of the thirty *Nissaggiya-pācittiya* rules and eighty-six of the one hundred and sixty-six *Pācittiya* rules. The reason for these omissions is obvious: the text has been copied and recopied for many centuries without the inclusion of the rules that are common to both monks and nuns in order to avoid repetitions in the *Bhikkhu-vibhaṅga* and the *Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga*. In the first edition of the latter text in Roman script (London, 1882), the editor, Hermann Oldenberg, had no other choice but to follow the traditional manuscripts from Burma and Sri Lanka.

56. I have found no important differences in these manuscripts, apart from a few words that have been spelled differently over the centuries in these countries. Variants are indicated in footnotes to the text. I hope that this text will be useful to scholars who wish to compare it with the *Pātimokkha* of other Buddhist schools, in Sanskrit or other languages.

First of all, I would like to thank Prof. Steven Collins of Chicago University who called my attention to the need for a book on Buddhist nuns, as the subject is not well understood in the West. I am grateful to my teacher, the late Prof. André Bareau (1921–1993) of the College de France, who encouraged me in many different ways.

I would also like to thank my friends, especially Miss Brigitte Carrier and Miss Marie-Therese Drouillon who read various chapters of the original French version of this book (*Les Moniales bouddhistes: naissance et développement du monachisme féminin*, Les Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1991) and made many valuable suggestions, and Mr Douglas Ferdinand and Mr U Than, who sent me several indispensable documents. I should also like to take this opportunity to thank the staff of the library of the College de France, for their kind assistance.

Concerning this English version, today, my thanks are due to Dr. William Pruitt and to Dr. John Canti who helped me at the beginning of the work and to Rev. Dr. Oswald B. Firth who went through the whole text very carefully in order to correct proofs.

Mohan Wijayaratna
February 15, 2001
Paris, France

NOTE TO SECOND EDITION

At this time when there is much interest in and debate concerning the re-establishing of the Order of Bhikkhunīs it is important to know who bhikkhunīs are and how they are supposed to live. This book by Dr. Wijyaratna fulfils this need.

In 2001 this book was published by a small publisher in Sri Lanka and it did not get the attention it deserved, moreover, the first edition contained many typing errors, especially in the Pali, which have hopefully all been corrected in this new edition.

Mrs. Judy Caughley assisted with the proofreading of the English text. I proofread the Pali text of the *Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha* and compared it with Sinhala-printed editions. The Pali text as given in the first edition was based on the text given in Ven. Rerukānē Chandavimala's *Ubhaya Prātimokṣaya*. The three older Sinhala editions I consulted often have different readings from Chandavimala's text, and I added these readings in footnotes.

Bhikkhu Nyanatusita
Editor
Buddhist Publication Society

ABBREVIATIONS

A	Aṅguttara-nikāya, PTS, 1885–1910
A-a	<i>Aṅguttara-nikāya-aṭṭhakathā</i> , 5 vols, PTS, 1924–1975
BML	<i>Buddhist Monastic Life</i> (by Mohan Wijayaratna), Cambridge, 1990
D	Dīgha-nikāya, 3 vols, PTS, 1889–1910
D-a	<i>Dīgha-nikāya-aṭṭhakathā</i> , 3 vols, PTS, 1886–1932
Dhp	Dhammapada, PTS, 1914
Dhp-a	<i>Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā</i> , 4 vols, PTS, 1906–1914
Dhs	Dhammasaṅgaṇī, PTS, 1885
It	<i>Itivuttaka</i> , PTS, 1948
J	Jātaka, 7 vols, PTS, 1877–1896
Kkh	<i>Kaṅkhāvaitaraṇī</i> , PTS, 1981
lit.	literally
M	Majjhima-nikāya, 3 vols, PTS, 1888–1902
M-a	<i>Majjhima-nikāya-aṭṭhakathā</i> , 5 vols, PTS, 1892–1938
PTS	Pali Text Society, London
S	Samyutta-nikāya, 5 vols, PTS, 1884–1898
S-a	<i>Samyutta-nikāya-aṭṭhakathā</i> , 3 vols, PTS, 1829–1937
Skt	Sanskrit
Sn	Sutta-nipāta, PTS, 1913
Sn-a	<i>Sutta-nipāta-aṭṭhakathā</i> , 3 vols, PTS, 1883
Th	Theragāthā, PTS, 1883
Th-a	<i>Theragāthā-aṭṭhakathā</i> , 3 vols, PTS, 1940–1959
Thī	Therīgāthā, PTS, 1883
Thī-a	<i>Therīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā</i> , PTS, 1893
Ud	Udāna, PTS, 1885
Ud-a	<i>Udāna-aṭṭhakathā</i> , PTS, 1926
v(vv.)	verse(s)
Vin	Vinaya-piṭaka, 5 vols, PTS, 1879–1883
Vin-a	<i>Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā</i> (<i>Samantapāsādikā</i>), PTS, 7 vols, 1924–1947
Vism	<i>Visuddhimagga</i> , Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1950

INTRODUCTION

The Buddhist Order of Nuns (*bhikkhunī-saṅgha*¹) studied in this monograph is not only one of the oldest monastic communities in the world but also one of the oldest movements in which women have struggled for their liberation: liberation in the most noble sense of the word. Its history goes back to the fifth century BCE, a period during which the valley of the Ganges saw the blossoming of spiritual activity opposed to the traditional religions of the priests, especially the Brahmin clergy.

However, Buddhist nuns were not the only female ascetic group at the time. According to the Buddhist canonical reports, there were other groups of renunciators belonging to different religious traditions. For example, there were the Paribbājikās, female members of the Community of Paribbājakas, the Ājivikās, female members of the Community of the Ājivakas whose leader was the famous Makkhalī Gosāla, and the Jain nuns who followed the Jina Mahāvira known in the Buddhist texts as Nigaṇṭha Nāthaputta. The Buddhist texts also speak of women ascetics without mentioning the community to which they belonged. These probably lived alone, away from any religious community, or were members of small groups under the direction of an influential leader. Mention is also made of women who lived in forest hermitages with their ascetic husbands. We cannot be sure whether all these women followed ascetic practices or whether they were there as assistants or servants to their elderly husbands who, having lived an ordinary married life for many years, went forth as ascetics.

1. *Bhikkhunī* (Skt. *bhikṣuṇī*): literally, “female ascetic who begs for food.” In Buddhist monasticism, the term *bhikkhunī*, like the word *bhikkhu*, refers to being detached from worldly possessions rather than to begging or poverty, which are consequences of the monks’ and nuns’ renunciation. The *bhikkhus* and *bhikkhunis* did not beg in the sense of asking for anything. This subject will be discussed more fully in Chapter 6.

The Paribbājikās and the Ājivikās did not outnumber the male members of their respective communities. The Jain nuns, who were probably the largest group of nuns at that time, met often in the Vajjin country, especially near the town of Vesāli, where several of them probably followed rigorous and austere practices. There is very little information available concerning the origins of these various communities of women. Early texts give scarcely any detail about their daily life or how they were organized. Even if we do not know exactly how these communities functioned, one thing is certain: none of them was widely spread. Nor did these female ascetic communities have much influence on the general public or the social elite. Had they done so, or had women's organizations been widespread, the foundation of the Community of Nuns by the Buddha would have been much less difficult than it proved to be.

From an early date, the Buddhists were in the habit of keeping alive in their memory the various stories of events in their Teacher's life and in their community. It is especially in the *Vinaya-piṭaka* that details are given of the creation of the Order of Monks and the Order of Nuns. Important stories about the nuns are also told in various texts in the *Sutta-piṭaka*. These stories show how their community developed and how it gradually reached maturity as a well structured institution. These stories also show that the Community of Nuns was well organized, with established procedures such as how new members were to be admitted, the requirements to be met by trainees, the rights and duties of fully ordained nuns, sanctions for members who transgressed the rules, etc.

According to these procedures, candidates could not be admitted without prior approval of the members of the Community. A member who was guilty of an offence could not be punished unless this was sanctioned by the other members, nor could a nun be made to leave the Community, even temporarily, without the advice and approval of the other members at a formal meeting. All the activities of the Community were very democratic. For example, before a given project could be undertaken, the Community had to be formally informed about it. At the meeting, the project was put to the Community in the form of a motion that had to be repeated three times to allow any objections to be raised. If all the members remained silent, that silence meant the Community had approved the project, and at

this point it could be announced as having been formally approved by the Community. This procedure, known as *ñatti-catuttha-kamma*², had to be followed if any important decision taken by the Community was to be considered valid.

For many important questions, the decision had to be unanimous; but there were other cases for which the Community could accept a majority opinion. However, if a project approved by the majority proved to be incompatible with the Doctrine (*dhamma*), each member of the Community had the right to criticize it. In other words, every project, every idea or decision, had to be consistent with the Doctrine³. This is why each nun necessarily had to possess a certain degree of knowledge both of the established Discipline (*vinaya*) and of the Doctrine taught by the Master.

Like the Community of Monks, the Community of Nuns had a very precise judicial system. For example, before giving the various rules of discipline, the *Vinaya-piṭaka* presents the context in which that rule was established. Next, the rule laid down on that occasion is given. And then if the initial rule was later modified, the rulings pronounced in different circumstances are included in order to show why, if such was the case. It is only then that the final version of the rule is presented—the version that is to be part of the code of discipline, the *Patimokkha*.⁴ With each rule of discipline, we find the sanctions that should be taken and the conditions that must be met for there to have been no offence. Lastly, as is consistent with a true code of law, the *Vinaya-piṭaka* gives the definition of the technical terms used after each rule.⁵ Through all these details, it is clear that Buddhist monasticism

2. *Ñatti-catuttha-kamma*: a “formal act with the declaration as the fourth element” after presenting the motion three times. Less important formal acts were called *ñatti-dutiya-kamma*: a “formal act with the declaration as the second element” after presenting the motion once.

3. For example, the Community could never inflict corporal punishment on its members because this type of punishment went against the Doctrine, which emphasizes non-violence and teaches that all actions and words rooted in hatred and anger are to be avoided.

4. See note 8.

5. This canonical glossary was known as *padabhājana* in the Commentaries on the *Vinaya*.

attached great importance to the structure of its institutions.

We might ask, then, whether this sort of organization was really necessary for nuns (or for monks), since their objective was to attain inner progress, culminating in being liberated from mental stains and *dukkha*. Was it necessary to impose such a constrictive discipline on women for them to benefit from this spiritual liberation? It is true that such a structured organization is not indispensable for a person to attain one of the stages (= *sotāpatti*, *sakadāgāmi*, etc.) of inner progress. Moreover, these stages were not limited to monks and nuns. Lay people, both men and women, could attain them too. On the other hand, it was considered easier to attain these stages if a person left household life with all its problems and family responsibilities and became a renouncer. So the *Vinaya* texts say that a religious community was automatically formed as people left their homes and followed the Buddha. Little by little, it proved necessary to organize this community through specific rules. Right from the beginning, the various aspects of religious life in Buddhism and its Doctrine were founded on an important principle: “for the well-being of many people, for the happiness of many people” (*bahujana-hitāya, bahujana-sukhāya*).⁶ The Teaching and the benefits derived from it would not be limited to a few people or a few recluses. If this principle was to become a reality, it was necessary for the monks and nuns to live with other people. It is important to note that this approach sets Buddhist monastic life apart from that of most of the other ascetic communities of the day.

In this way, the Buddha was one of the rare religious leaders at that time to steer homeless life away from the maze of austere practices and to break with the notion of individual isolation. He had his disciples interact with the lay community so that leading a contemplative life would no longer be a marginal phenomenon or something followed by a group of people rejected by society. Thus, monastic life for Buddhist renouncers was more a communal affair than an individualistic one. When the Community of Nuns was established, it was necessary to take into consideration not only the needs of the members of the Community but also lay people’s opinion concerning their conduct—just as it had been when the

6. Vin I 22; see also It 111.

Introduction

rules of the Community of Monks were set down. In other words, day-to-day life was organized for both communities after taking into consideration the criticism and appreciation of both male and female lay disciples. These lay followers then became the defenders and supporters on whom the survival of the communities depended. This systematic, inescapable dependence of monks and nuns on lay disciples was another innovation established by Buddhist monasticism compared to most of the other monastic communities of that time.

In the following chapters, we will examine how the Buddhist Community of Nuns was established and the milieu in which it developed. The main source of information for the code of discipline is the *Vinaya-piṭaka*, in which the Buddha is presented as a true legislator. According to the stories in the *Vinaya*, it was the Buddha who established or gave the order to establish each rule in the code of discipline. However, it is possible that many events that led to rules being established happened when the Buddha was not present, and that some rules of discipline together with their modifications were part of a gradual evolution, very probably even many years after the Buddha's *parinibbāna*. But we will not try to determine whether a given rule was established by the Buddha or by the members of the Community—an impossible task in any case. The important question for us is the conduct of the Community. A religious community's conduct is not contained in texts but rather in the community's tradition. In other words, texts reflect the wishes behind the tradition and the tradition reflects the wishes of the community. Therefore, we must try to see the tradition as a whole and accept it for what it is. In this connection, I need only repeat what I have said in the study I published several years ago on Buddhist Monks⁷: whenever a rule is attributed to the Buddha, we can conclude that at the time the code of discipline was given its definitive form, either that rule was considered to be a precept given by the Buddha himself, or the disciples at that time needed to present the rule or consider it as having come from the Buddha. Whether or not a given rule was laid down by the Buddha, the important thing for us is the interpretation given by the

7. Mohan Wijayaratna, *Le Moine bouddhiste selon les textes du Theravāda*, Les Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1983. p.15.

members of this monastic tradition and the way they felt about it as the tradition was handed down from one generation to the next.⁸

With time, there was considerable geographic expansion of Buddhist monasticism. As it spread to different regions, it came to be divided into several schools. There were monks and nuns belonging to each of these traditions, and the *Vinaya-piṭaka* of each school shows how the members appreciated and accepted a given article in the code of discipline. While all the various schools agree on the main rules and on the provisions for and ways of conducting formal acts in the Communities, there have always been differences in interpretation of the minor rules. We see certain schools that dropped some rules that they doubtless considered to be of no use or which they thought detrimental to their community. Nor is the order of the rules in the texts of the *Vinaya-piṭaka* the same for each school. The *Vinaya-piṭaka* of the Theravāda school, for example, has four sections,⁹ but the *Vinaya-piṭaka* of the Mahāsaṅghika tradition

8. *Ibid.* 14–15; see also Mohan Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life* (hereafter BML), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990, Introduction, p.xviii.

9. The *Vinaya-piṭaka* of the Pali canon is divided into the following four sections: 1. *Bhikkhu-vibhaṅga* (*Mahā-vibhaṅga*); 2. *Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga*; 3. *Khandhaka* (A. *Mahāvagga*, B. *Cullavagga*); and 4. *Parivāra*. The *Bhikkhu-vibhaṅga* and *Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga* contain, in addition to the rules, the case histories explaining why the rules were enacted and modified, and a glossary (*padabhājanī*) for each rule. The two texts in the *Khandhaka*, *Khandhaka*, the *Mahāvagga* and *Cullavagga*, contain various permissions and regulations designed to be useful to the monks and nuns in dealing with food, clothing, shelter and medicine, as well as instructions for conducting formal meetings in the two communities. The *Parivāra* contains minutiae and a summary of the *Vinaya-piṭaka*. Where, one may ask, is the *Pātimokkha*? The term *Pātimokkha* has two meanings: one is to designate monastic virtue globally (*pātimokkha-saṃvara-sīla*), the other meaning is the name for the collection of the rules as recited by the communities, so these two collections are named the *Bhikkhu-pātimokkha* and the *Bhikkhunī-pātimokkha*. Both *Pātimokkhas* contain the code of rules extracted from the *Bhikkhu-vibhaṅga* and the *Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga*. Both *Pātimokkhas* were formulated very early in the history of the monastic traditions and were recited as the Code of Discipline for the respective Communities during their meetings on *Uposatha* Days.

Introduction

is divided into only two main sections: the *Bhikṣu Vinaya* and the *Bhikṣuṇi Vinaya*. Different schools also include explanations and stories in different places.¹⁰ For some incidents there are slight variations in the proper names. Such differences are only natural when we take account of the evolution of these schools over considerable time and space with no authority at their head to impose orthodoxy.¹¹ Some schools, however, were more concerned about the tradition of the Elders than others.

In this book we will not go into the similarities and differences between the various schools of Buddhist monasticism,

10. The *Vinaya-piṭaka* of the Pali canon, for example, includes the story about the beginning of the Community of the nuns in the *Khandhaka* section, in the tenth chapter of the *Cullaovagga*; but the Sanskrit *Vinayapiṭaka* of the Lokottaravādins has the same incident (including more or less the same details, with different names of the places) in the *Bhikṣuṇi Vinaya*. (See R. ROTH, ed., *Bhikṣuṇi Vinaya, including Bhikṣuṇi Prakīrnaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu Prakīrnaka of the Ārya Mahāsaṃghika Lokottaravādins*, Patna, 1977, p.245.)

Other comparative studies of the *Vinaya-piṭaka* include: J. DHIRASEKARA, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, Colombo, 1982; N. DUTT, *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*, Calcutta, 1924-5; S. DUTT, *Early Buddhist Monasticism*, London, 1924; E. FRAUWALLNER, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginning of Buddhist Literature*, Rome, 1956; A. HIRAKAWA, *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns: An English Translation of the Chinese Text of Mahāsaṃghika-Bhikṣuṇi-Vinaya*, Patna, 1982; I.B. HORNER, *The Book of the Discipline* (a translation of the *Vinaya-piṭaka* Pali), London, 1949-66; N.A. JAYAWICKRAMA, (transl.) *The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna*, London, 1986; J.W. de JONG, "Notes on the Bhikṣuṇi-Vinaya of the Mahāsaṃghikas" in *Buddhist Studies in Honor of I.B. Horner*, ed. by L. Cousins, A. Kunst and K.R. Norman, Boston, 1974; C. KABILSINGH, *A Comparative Study of Bhikkunī Pātimokkha*, Varanasi, 1984; C. KABILSINGH, *The Bhikkhuni Patimokkha in the Six Schools*, Bangkok, 1991; E. NOLOT, *Règles de discipline des nonnes bouddhistes: Le bhikṣuṇi vinaya de l'École Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, Paris, 1991; W.P. PACHOW, *A Comparative Study of the Prātimoksa on the Basis of Its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pali Versions*, Calcutta, 1955; C. PREBISH, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: the Sanskrit Prātimokṣa Sūtras of the Mahāsaṃghikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins*, London, 1975; ṬHĀNISSARO BHIKKHU (Geoffrey de Graff), *The Buddhist Monastic Code I and II*, Valley Center, 2007; V. TRIPITAKA, *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns*, Patna, 1982.

nor compare the various *Vinaya-piṭaka(s)*, or tackle philological questions. We will confine our investigation to the development of the monastic community for women in the canonical texts of the Theravādins—the Pali *Sutta-piṭaka* and the *Vinaya-piṭaka*. First of all, we will try to piece together the history of the Buddhist nuns using information scattered here and there in the canonical texts. Then we will try to discuss in several chapters the position of Buddhist nuns on the famous three monastic themes: poverty, chastity and obedience.

11. On the expansion of Buddhism, see E.W. ADIKARAM, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, 1953; A. BAREAU, *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petite Véhicule*, Saigon, 1955; A. BAREAU, *Les Premiers Conciles bouddhiques*, Paris, 1966; H. BECHERT and R. GOMBRICH, *The World of Buddhism*, London, 1984; R. GOMBRICH, *Theravāda Buddhism: A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*, London, 1988; E. LAMOTTE, *History of Indian Buddhism*, Louvain, 1988; W. RAHULA, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon: The Anuradhapura Period*, Colombo, 1956.

CHAPTER 1

THE BEGINNING OF A COMMUNITY

Even though the Community of Nuns was established some time after the beginning of the Community of Monks, the Buddha taught the Doctrine to both men and women from the very beginning of his teaching career, and numerous female disciples—such as Visākhā Migāra-Mātā, Bandula-Mallikā, Khujjuttarā, Veḷukaṇṭhakī Nanda-Mātā, etc.—supported his religious movement as very dedicated lay disciples. One might ask, therefore, why the Buddha waited so long before agreeing to set up a monastic order for women. A long anecdote in the *Vinaya* and the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* gives the background. The following is a brief account of the incident:

At one time the Buddha was in Kapilavatthu¹ and his step-mother, Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī, asked permission to go forth into the homeless life.² The Buddha refused, saying, “No, Gotamī, do not wish for women to enter homeless life in this Doctrine and Discipline that has been taught by the Tathāgata.” Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī made the same request on two other occasions, but the Buddha gave a negative answer each time, and Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī was very disappointed. On a later occasion, when the Buddha was residing in Vesālī,³ Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī, Rāhula-Mātā, and a large group of Sākyan ladies cut their hair, dressed themselves in ascetic

1. The town of the Buddha’s birth, the main city of the Sākya country.

2. See S II 18–19. According to the Commentaries, this incident took place when the Buddha went to the Sākya country to reconcile two groups, the Sākyans and Koliyans. They were quarrelling over the use of the water of the river Rohiṇī (see S-a 672; Dhṛ-a III, 254–56; J V 412). This was after the death of the Buddha’s father, Suddhodana, chief of the Sākyans.

3. The capital of the country of the Vajjins.

clothes, and went as a group to Vesāli, travelling the long distance (more than three hundred kilometres) on foot to show their profound determination. At the end of their journey, they gathered together weeping outside the gate of the place where the Buddha was residing. Seeing Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī and her group, Āyasmanta Ānanda made a new request on their behalf. This time, the Buddha gave permission to Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī to enter the homeless life “in this Doctrine and Discipline” on condition that she would accept the Eight Great Conditions.⁴

We may ask why the Buddha hesitated so much when it came to authorizing the foundation of a religious community for women, for he was full of compassion for everyone. To understand his “hesitation,” let us come back to the initial anecdote. We can see here the Buddha taking two contradictory positions. First of all he refuses to give permission to his step-mother to enter homeless life, but later he even accepts to set up a monastic community for women.

First of all, we must note that, strictly speaking, Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī did not request that a Community of Nuns (*bhikkhunī saṅgha*) be established. She only asked that she and her group be allowed to enter homeless life in “this Doctrine and this Discipline.” We can see that two possibilities were open to the Buddha. He could allow these ladies to enter the Community of Monks, which had already been established, or he could set up a community open only to women—a community that would exist alongside the Community of Monks. The first possibility, however, was not feasible. Allowing men and women to live in such close proximity would have undermined the very principle of renunciation. The second possibility was no doubt the best solution, but when the first requests were made, conditions were not yet favourable for establishing a Community of Nuns. A certain amount of time had passed, no doubt, between the first request made by Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī and her visit to Vesāli to meet the Buddha. So when she came to Vesāli, the Buddha chose the second solution and presented a number of pre-conditions in order to draw a demarcation line between the Community of

4. Vin II 253–54; A IV 272–77; see also Thī-a 141 and Vin IV 52.

The Beginning of a Community

Monks and the Community of Nuns. Thus, in agreeing to found a Community of Nuns, the Buddha offered Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī more than she had asked for.

In order to understand why the Buddha could not make this offer when Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī first asked to go forth, we must examine the Buddha's attitudes to social problems and especially his kind and sensitive character. The canonical texts show that the Buddha sometimes changed his mind depending on what people requested, just as he would adapt his discourse to the aptitude of those listening to him. At times he would accept certain requests, if they were repeated several times. One day, for example, when the Buddha was at Rājagaha, he happened to meet a naked ascetic named Kassapa as he was walking in the town. Kassapa said to the Buddha, "If the honourable Gotama would permit me, if he would like to give me an opportunity to hear his answer, I would like to question him about a certain matter." The Buddha answered, "This is not the moment to ask questions, O Kassapa, we are among houses."⁵ The naked ascetic repeated his request and the Buddha refused a second time. Then the naked ascetic said, "It is not an important matter we wish to ask, O honourable Gotama." Then the Buddha said, "You may ask whatever you like, O Kassapa." And they had an important discussion.⁶ This episode shows how responsive the Buddha was to someone who was insistent with a request. The canonical texts reports many similar incidents.⁷ It is probable that, for the Buddha, it was necessary for the person making the request to persevere when it was an important matter.⁸ "Tenacious adherence to a good cause" is classified in the Doctrine as belonging to the category of good effort (*sammā vāyāma*), which the Buddha praised from the very beginning of his first sermon. Similarly, we can see in the story of

5. The expression "we are among houses" (*antaraghare*) means "we are in a village or in a town to receive food."

6. S II 18–19/SN 12:17; cf. Udāna, pp. 6–9/Ud 1.10.

7. Even in the *Mahā-Parinibbāna-sutta*, concerning the possibility of postponing his *parinibbāna*, the Buddha said to Āyasmanta Ānanda "If you had insisted, the Tathāgata might have rejected the appeal even the second time, but the third time he would have accepted it": *Sace tvaṃ Ānanda Tathāgatṃ yāceyyāsi, dve vā te vā ca Tathāgato paṭikkhipeyya, atha tatiyakam adhiṅgaseyya*—D II 116–18.

the founding of the Community of Nuns that the Buddha took into account Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī's and Venerable Ānanda's insistence.

The other important point to be considered in this connection is the manner in which the Buddha made decisions. The texts in the *Vinaya-piṭaka* show that the Buddha only laid down a given rule when it was evident that it would be of use to others, when the occasion arose and when it proved to be thoroughly needed. In the beginning, for example, when the chief disciple Śāriputta requested that he establish an explicit code of discipline for the Community of Monks, the Buddha did not agree to provide a set of rules drawn up in the abstract. The Buddha only formulated rules when the need arose because, he said, the Community's situation changed with time (*rattaññū-mahatta*), due to an abundance of material goods accruing to the Community (*lābhagga-mahatta*), due to the dispersal of its members (*vepulla-mahatta*) and due to an increase in various types of knowledge on the part of its members (*bāhusacca-mahatta*).⁹

The approach of "waiting for the right moment" is found throughout the *Vinaya* as the Buddha established the rules of the discipline, and, more often, as he gave modifications and amendments to the rules. This, at any rate, is the impression that every page of the *Vinaya* texts gives. Thus, in the case of the request made by the women who wanted to enter the religious life, it seems that the Buddha was in no hurry to found a Community of Nuns as part of his new movement for those who were giving up the household life. He probably foresaw the difficulties that would arise if a Community of Nuns were set up too soon. In other words, the Buddha could not establish a Community of Nuns before there were enough donors to support it as a monastic institution. For him, a monastic community should not be far removed from the lay community; it should be

8. According to tradition, the Buddha began to teach the Doctrine only after Brahmā Sahampati requested him to do so (Vin I 6-7; M I 168; S I 137-38). Symbolically, a story such as this shows that others must request to hear the Doctrine and that it is only afterwards that the Buddha speaks. He does not impose his Doctrine and Discipline, but only teaches after being requested to do so!

9. See Vin III 9-10.

The Beginning of a Community

an institution necessarily supported and protected by lay people. The Community of Monks had already been set up according to those principles. The question is: would the Community of Nuns have received wide support from the lay community if it had been established at the same time as the Community of Monks? The answer is no.

We must remember that when a number of young men left their families to enter the Buddhist monastic order at the time it was started, the followers of the Brahmins in Rājagaha and the Brahmins themselves were angry, saying, "This ascetic Gotama is on the path that deprives us of children; this ascetic Gotama is on the path that destroys families."¹⁰ So we see that in the beginning, the Buddha and his first male disciples encountered difficulties when faced with the traditional beliefs of a society dominated by Brahmins. Under such conditions, we cannot imagine that lay people would have tolerated the sight of their women (even unmarried women) leaving their families. Indeed, Brahmin traditions confined women to the home. Brahmins would not have wanted the religious leader Gotama to destroy their "homes"!

Moreover, there were several obstacles to the Buddha's accepting the request to found a community for nuns. For one thing, the Buddha's Teachings were not yet widespread; for another, there were not many people to support those who had gone forth in this new "religion." Finally, even the Community of Monks was not yet organized according to precise rules of discipline. These conditions meant that the time was not yet ripe to establish a Community of Nuns. There were probably some male disciples, especially in that early period, who thought that a Community of Nuns would be unnecessary, or even detrimental, at least for the time being.

Very probably, there was also the question of how to organize such a community for women along the same lines as the monks' community. In the early days, there were relatively few disciples of the Buddha, and they travelled from one district to another, from one country to another, alone or in groups, teaching the Doctrine.¹¹ They wore monastic clothes made from rags¹² and

10. Vin I 43.

11. Vin I 21.

went from house to house each day on their alms-rounds begging for food. As there were still no monastic buildings everywhere, they had to spend the night in public gardens, in a potter's workshop,¹³ etc. It may be that the Buddha thought that women, especially those who came from well-to-do families, would not be able to follow such a difficult way of life, and that there might even be scandals if those women from noble families adopted the practices of a wandering life only appropriate for men. Thus, it seems that, just as for the question of the monk's monastic clothes,¹⁴ the Buddha waited until a certain number of material problems were resolved before giving his consent to the founding of the Community of Nuns so that women would be able to follow the monastic life effectively.

The Buddha knew no doubt that there would be other difficulties for women in a monastic institution—especially their security. Even after the Community of Nuns was established, the security of its members was always a serious problem, especially in regions where there were few Buddhists. On several occasions, young nuns on their own were raped in deserted byways, in forests, and even on boats.¹⁵ This is why, even later, after their community was well established, the nuns were restricted to living only in areas where Buddhism was well established. It is therefore only to be expected that the Buddha would wait until there were a number of such safe areas before founding the Community of Nuns.

In the story about the origins of the Community of Nuns, we find another important point: it is interesting that the first request to go forth to lead a religious life comes not from Brahmin women, but from the Sākya, a number of whose husbands had become monks under the Buddha. If the Buddha had immediately accepted the Sākya women's request, such a rapid decision would have been considered scandalous by those who opposed the Buddha's teachings. The orthodox Brahmins and some Paribbājakas, who constantly criticized the theories and practices of the Buddha, could have said, "The ascetic Gotama has

12. BML, pp.32–34.

13. Places such as the potter's workshop (*kumbakāra sālā*) were open for renouncers who were coming in to the town even late at night (cf. M III 237).

The Beginning of a Community

finally arranged for the Sākya women to live close to their ex-husbands. Are they true ascetics? Look how those shaven headed Sākya women and men live together. Is there any use in giving food, etc., to these false renouncers?" Remarks such as these are not just hypothetical. Indeed, later on, when the Community of Nuns was established, the nuns went into the streets with the monks, and there were people who said, "Those are their wives, those are their mistresses,"¹⁶ etc. It is true that criticism such as this did not have much effect then because there were people who were well informed about the Community and who knew the truth about how they lived. But if the Community of Nuns had been founded before the number of lay disciples was sufficiently great, this sort of criticism could have been an obstacle to the propagation of the new doctrine.

Finally, the most remarkable aspect of this story is the answer

14. For the first twenty years of the existence of the Community of Monks, Buddhist monks only wore religious robes (*paṃsukūla cīvara*) made of rags (Vin I 280). Then, following a suggestion made by a well-known physician, Jivaka Komārabhacca, the Buddha allowed the monks to accept robe-material and robes given by lay people. The Buddha himself started the practice by accepting an expensive piece of cloth from the doctor. It is clear that the Buddha and his followers waited until donors invited them to wear monastic robes made from material given by lay disciples. It is important to understand why the Buddha and his disciples did not wear robes made of new cloth in the beginning. The reason is obvious: in the society of the Buddha's day, members of other ascetic communities were not in the habit of accepting robes or robe-material given by lay people, and, what is more, many lay people greatly admired the practice of going naked as followed by some ascetics. This meant that if the Buddha and his disciples had started in the beginning to look for and accept clothes and monastic robes made from new cloth, the question of what they wore would have become an obstacle to their being accepted by lay people. After twenty years, a sufficient number of lay disciples knew that wearing robes made of new material would not be an obstacle to a monk's mental development. Finally, the lay disciples themselves requested that the Buddha and his disciples wear the robes that they gave, or robes made from new material given by them. Thus, for the Buddha, the time had come to begin accepting robe-material or new robes (see BML, pp.33–35).

that the Buddha gave to Āyasmanta Ānanda when he interceded on behalf of Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī. Āyasmanta Ānanda had requested that the Buddha give permission for her to enter homeless life. Twice the Buddha refused. Then Āyasmanta Ānanda broached the subject from a different angle. He asked if women were incapable of attaining the various stages of liberation should they enter homeless life in this Doctrine and this Discipline. The Buddha answered, "O Ānanda, women who renounce household life and enter homeless life that has been taught and established by the Tathāgata are capable of attaining the stages: *Sotāpatti*, *Sakadāgāmi*, *Anāgāmi* and *Arahant*."¹⁷ The Buddha's reply is very clear. We might well ask however, whether Ānanda's question was pertinent as there were already lay women who had attained stages such as *Sotāpatti*, *Sakadāgāmi* and *Anāgāmi*. I think that Āyasmanta Ānanda probably wanted to ask the following: "Is it not easier, O Blessed One, for women to attain these stages of liberation after entering homeless life in this Doctrine and this Discipline?" And I also think that the main point of the question attributed to Āyasmanta Ānanda was to obtain a positive answer from the mouth of the Buddha concerning women's ability to attain the state of perfection of Arahant hood and to abide in that state as nuns.¹⁸

Even so, the Buddha's answer is sufficient for us to understand that his initial refusal had not been based on considerations of the spiritual or intellectual capabilities of women but had rather been for other reasons, such as institutional problems: administration, security, etc. Āyasmanta Ānanda immediately followed up the Buddha's answer with a request: "Then, O Blessed One, permit Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī to enter homeless life in this Doctrine and this Discipline. She was the

15. It was because of incidents like these that it was forbidden for nuns to live in the forests or woods. See p.107–108, 123.

16. See pp.47,51.

17. Vin II 254–55.

18. Theravāda Buddhism acknowledges that a layman or laywoman can attain Arahant hood, but says that he or she would not continue to live unless he or she renounces household life (Vin I 17; Thī-a 126; Dh-p-a III, 78–84; Milinda, p.264; and also BML, p.172).

The Beginning of a Community

Blessed One's maternal aunt. She was the Blessed One's foster mother. She nursed him when the Blessed One's mother passed away." Then the Buddha accepted his disciple's request. This is how Buddhist women came to have a monastic community of their own. Later on, the nuns were very grateful to Āyasmanta Ānanda.¹⁹

The whole problem does not end then and there. According to the story, after the Buddha had given permission for the foundation of the Community of Nuns, he told Āyasmanta Ānanda, "If women had not gone forth in this Doctrine and this Discipline, the pure doctrine would last for a thousand years, but since they have gone forth, it will only last for five hundred years. When women go forth in any doctrine and discipline it is a factor that diminishes the longevity of that doctrine and discipline. It is like a house where there are many women and few men: thieves find it easy to enter there. It is like the contagious disease that destroys a crop of sugar cane (...)"²⁰ How could the Buddha have expressed such a harsh idea? This can be interpreted in several ways: some scholars think that this is an expression of regret by the Buddha; others see it as an attitude foreign to the Buddha's thought and that misogynist monks added it to the text. From the doctrinal point of view, however, the Buddha cannot feel regret. In other words, mental states such as regret about the past, being worried about the future, etc., cannot arise in a Buddha. Moreover, the monks who reported these words cannot be said to have been

19. However, later some monks were critical of Ānanda's intercession for the nuns. Perhaps they thought that by supporting the women's request, he contributed to the decline of the pristine purity of their monastic order. They probably found proof that they were right in some of incidents that happened to the nuns. These monks, who probably came from Brahman families, did not act during the Buddha's lifetime, but later, at the first council, four months after the Buddha's passing away, the *parinibbāna*, they complained publicly, telling Ānanda to confess his fault and asking him to beg the monks assembled there to pardon him. Āyasmanta Ānanda did not accept that he had committed a fault, but said, "I do not see that I have done a wrong thing. Even so, out of respect in the venerable ones, I ask pardon"—Vin II 289.

20. Vin II 256.

misogynist, because misogynists would not have had the Buddha say that women were capable of attaining Arahant hood. Nor should the words of the Buddha about the duration of the religious life be seen as a prediction. Indeed, the Buddha never acted as a prophet. Perhaps he simply wanted to say that if the nuns did not act correctly, if they gave in to their womanly tendencies, the duration of his Teaching would last only half as long. Finally, in this dialogue, the Buddha said to Āyasmanta Ānanda that he gave the eight important conditions (see below) to avoid this curtailing of the duration of the religious life.²¹

In my opinion, this episode about the beginning of the Community of Nuns, like a number of stories in the *Vinaya-piṭaka*, should be considered the equivalent of a case that serves as a legal precedent.²² Every element in this episode contains an important message that the founders of the *Vinaya-piṭaka* wanted to communicate to future generations of this monastic tradition.

First of all, this anecdote emphasizes that the foundation of the Community of Nuns was not an automatic event but rather the result of an insistent request coming from serious women who had a strong desire to lead a religious life.

Second, by showing that the Buddha refused at first, the founders of *Vinaya* wanted to show that the Community of Nuns was only set up by the Buddha after serious reflection. In this way, they emphasized the determination that had to be present as the very basis of this new community. At the same time they wanted to insist on the fact that the Community of Nuns was created under difficult conditions, so that this organization had to be carefully protected by future generations of nuns.

Third, in reporting the Buddha's words concerning the ability of women to attain the highest stage of liberation, the founders of *Vinaya* wanted to encourage nuns to attain that stage through entering this new women's movement.

Fourth, the possible disappearance of the pure doctrine is mentioned as an alarm calling for extreme vigilance in both

21. Vin II 256; A IV 272–77.

22. We must not forget that all these stories were intended to be recited again and again before a number of listeners (*sāvaka*s and *sāvikā*s), and that in every story there is a message that compilers of the texts wanted to transmit indirectly.

The Beginning of a Community

communities. Indeed, the physical attractiveness of some nuns could become an attachment to the sensual world for monks who had not yet attained one of the stages of liberation. Therefore, those monks would have to be very careful. Moreover, the nuns would have to be conscientious, not only in conducting themselves properly but also in maintaining their community, for if the religious life should become tainted later on, they would be responsible for that. The words attributed to the Buddha were also a challenge to the nuns to prove that they were capable of overcoming their weaknesses, that is to say, the mental habits of women.

Fifth, this story specifies that the new community was to conform to the norms of the society of the day; that is, it was to grant a certain degree of priority to the monks. This last point is clearly stated in the Eight Great Conditions (*aṭṭha garu-dhammā*) that the Buddha presented to Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī, namely:

1. A nun, even though she has been ordained for a hundred years, must greet a monk respectfully, even if he was ordained that very day. She must rise from her seat with her joined hands raised in salutation and pay him the honour due to him.²³
2. Nuns may not spend the rainy season retreat in a region where monks do not reside.
3. Every fortnight, the nuns must make two requests to the Community of Monks: they must consult them about (i) the date of the formal act of *Uposatha*²⁴ and (ii) the date that the monks would come for the exhortation.
4. At the end of the rainy season retreat, the nuns must make a triple invitation to both Communities: that any monk or nun accuse them of a fault if he or she has (i) seen, (ii) heard, or (iii) had cause to suspect that they are guilty of offence.
5. A nun who has committed a serious fault must undergo a period of *mānatta*²⁵ of half a month before both Communities.

23. We will discuss at pp. 55–58 the reason behind such procedures.

24. Cf. *infra* p.72–74.

25. Cf. *infra* p.78–79.

6. The Higher Ordination should not be requested from both Communities until a postulant has spent two years of training observing the six precepts.²⁶
7. A nun should on no account rebuke or abuse a monk.²⁷
8. Nuns do not have the right to teach monks, but monks have a duty to teach nuns.

The imposing of these Eight Great Conditions by the Buddha is unique in the history of Buddhist monasticism. Except in this case, the Buddha never established or altered rules on his own initiative. He established a rule when some event made it necessary; he modified or improved the same rule when some other event called for it. He did not hesitate to modify a rule that he had laid down himself. He did not impose conditions on others. Even so, he set his step-mother not one or two conditions, but eight. This was the first and last time that he imposed rules *a priori*.

The Buddha specified that the purpose of the Eight Great Conditions was to protect the Community of Nuns and he had imposed them just as a man who was building a dyke would not want the water in the reservoir to overflow. Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī was very happy when she was presented with these conditions and said that she would accept them with great joy, just as a young man or young woman would accept a bouquet of lotus or jasmine flowers on his or her head.²⁸

This is how, according to the *Vinaya* reports, a monastic order for Buddhist women was founded in the 5th century BCE, and it was known as *Bhikkhuni-saṅgha*. If we take this story as symbolic, it shows us how things evolved during the time between the initial idea of founding a community for nuns and its realization, despite a number of cultural and social difficulties.

26. We will discuss these six precepts in Chapter 3.
27. Even to encourage him on the path of liberation.
28. Vin II 255–56.

CHAPTER 2

THE FIRST MEMBERS

The Sākya ladies who went to Vesālī to lead a homeless life were ordained and became nuns. They did not return to their native country.¹ Some time later, they settled in Sāvattī, in the country of the Kosalans, where a large number of lay benefactors of the new monastic community lived. Later, some nuns no doubt went to other cities such as Rājagaha, Sāketa, etc. Even so, almost all the incidents that led to the establishment of rules of discipline for nuns took place in Sāvattī.² This explains why that city rapidly became the most important centre for the new community. It was there that the nuns benefited from the great generosity of wealthy ladies such as Visākhā Migāra-Mātā.³

The Kosalans and the Magadhans spoke of the Buddhist nuns as “the female ascetics, the daughters of the Sākyans” (*samaṇīyā sākya-dhītārā*),⁴ which was an adequate designation for them because the first members of their Community were Sākya ladies. However, the Community of Nuns was not limited for very long to the Sākya women from Kapilavattu. Very soon, women who belonged to other countries and all levels of society, even some Brahmin women, entered the Community and became “Sākya daughters.” There are, for example, a number of nuns in the canonical texts from Brahmin families: Muttā (Thī 11; Thī-a 13–15), Mettikā (Thī 29–30; Thī-a 35–36), Bhaddā Kāpilānī (Thī 63–66; Thī-a 67–75), Guttā (Thī 163–168; Thī-a 157–159), Subhā

1. Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī Therī probably went to Kapilavattu once or twice later on.

2. For example, four rules in the *Pārājika* category, thirteen rules in the *Saṅghādisesa*, twelve rules in the *Nissaggiya Pācittiya*, ninety-six of the *Pācittiya* and eight of the *Pāṭidesanīya* rules were established due to incidents that took place at Sāvattī. But these numbers are different in the *Vinaya-piṭaka* of Mahāsaṅghika Lokuttaravādins.

3. Vin I 290–94.

Jivakambavanikā (Thī 366–395; Thī-a 245–260), etc. The nun Somā's father was a Brahmin councillor to King Bimbisāra of the Magadhas (Thī 60–62; Thī-a 66–67). The nun Rohinī was the daughter of a very rich Brahmin from the city of Vesālī (Thī 271–290; Thī-a 214–220). As for the nun Sundarī, she was the only daughter of a famous Brahmin from the country of Kāsi (Thī 312–337; Thī-a 228–236).

A number of nuns came from well to-do families. The nun Uttamā, for example, was the daughter of a rich merchant in the city of Sāvattthī (Thī 42–44; Thī-a 46–49). The father of the nun Sukkā ('White') was a merchant in the city of Rājagaha (Thī 54–56; Thī-a 46–49). The nun Anopamā's father was an important banker in the city of Sāketā (Thī 151–156; Thī-a 138–139). The nun Uppalavaṇṇā was the daughter of a merchant in the city of Sāvattthī (Thī 227–235; Thī-a 182–189). The nuns who speak of the vanity of riches and sensual pleasures in the verses in the *Therīgāthā* show that they have reflected deeply on the vanity of the luxurious life that they led in their families before they became nuns.

There were also, of course, nuns who came from a humble background. The nun Kisā Gotamī, for example, came from a poor family in Sāvattthī (Thī 213–223; Thī-a 174–175). The nun Puṇṇikā was born into a family of slaves belonging to the principal treasurer of the city of Sāvattthī. During her youth, she had an opportunity to hear the Buddha teach and was converted to Buddhism. Later, Puṇṇikā was freed by a Brahmin who

4. *Samaṇīyā sākya-dhītārā*: this name for them in Pali means "the Sākyan female ascetics" or simply, "the Sākyan ladies." In Buddhist literature, the term 'son' (*puttā*) and 'daughter' (*dhītā*) are used to indicate membership of a family, of a social group, or of a country: e.g. *devaputta*, *kulaputta*, *rājaputta*, *Mallaputta*, etc. Thus, Buddhist monks were called "the ascetics, the sons of Sākyans" (*samaṇā sākya-puttiyā*). The people also saw the Buddha as "a Sākyan son." The following formula is found in many passages in the Canon: "This ascetic Gotama, a son of the Sākyans, who has gone forth abandoning the household life of Sākyans" (*ime samaṇo Gotamo sakyaputto, sakyakulā pabbajito* (cf. D I 87, 127, 150, 224, 236, etc.; M I 285, 400, 502; II 54, etc.). This phrase shows that at the beginning, the Sākyan people were better known than the young religious leader they gave to the world.

appreciated her intelligence. Afterwards, she took up the life of a nun (Thī 236–251; Thī-a 199–206). Finally, we should mention Candā, a young girl from a Brahmin family. As her parents had been the victims of an epidemic, she had lost everything and found herself without a home. One day, as the nun Paṭācārā was eating, Candā came towards her. The nun gave her food, taught her the doctrine, and had her enter the Community of Nuns. As a nun, after following the practices leading to mental development, she became an Arahant (Thī 122–126; Thī-a 120).

Most of the women who came from the Sākyan country were from aristocratic families. Some of their servants, however, also became nuns. Vaḍḍhesī, for example, who had been Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī's servant, entered the religious life with her mistress and later became a well-known nun (Thī 67–71; Thī-a 75–76). Nuns like Jentā Therī (Thī 21–22; Thī-a 75–76), Sumedhā Therī (Thī 448–552; Thī-a 272–301) and Selā Therī (Thī 57–59; Thī-a 61–65) came from royal families. The nun Khemā was the former wife of King Bimbisāra of the Magadhans (Thī 139–144; Thī-a 126–136). The nun Sihā was the niece of a Vajjin military leader, Siha Senāpati (Thī 77–81; Thī-a 77–78).

As for the age of these nuns, it is certain that most of them were relatively young and in good health when they became nuns. For example, the first group of women went on foot from Kapilavatthu to Vesāli, a distance of some three hundred kilometres. Mahā-Pajāpatī-Gotamī Therī, who founded the Community, was about sixty years old, but the other Sākyan ladies who accompanied her were not yet fifty. Among them were some young women such as Abhirūpī-Nandā (Thī 19–20; Thī-a 24–27), Janapadakalyāṇī Sundarī Nandā (Thī 80–86; Thī-a 78–80), etc., who were proud of their beauty. Later, the Buddha had to give them detailed advice so that they could get rid of their "narcissistic" tendencies.

This newly founded community made it possible for many young women to take up religious life. Before Buddhism began, we know that there were very few young people living as ascetics, except some Paribbājakās who were not exclusively contemplative. The general attitude was that it was a waste to take up the ascetic life when one was still young; so old age was considered the best time to practice a life of renunciation. Even so, non-Brahminic religious trends, including Buddhism, did much

to change this idea.⁵ From that time on, young women who had renounced their families could be found in the Community of Nuns. However, at times they were made fun of. One day, for example, when some young nuns were bathing in the river Aciravati, some courtesans who were also bathing near by laughed at them, saying, "What's the use, venerable ladies, of practising celibacy when you are young? Isn't it better to give yourselves up to sensual pleasures and to wait until you're old before taking up religious life."⁶

When some young women entered the Community of Nuns, they had to renounce a marriage that had been arranged for them. The story of the princess Sumedhā from the city of Mantāvati may serve as an example to show how difficult it was for at least some young ladies to obtain their parents' permission to go forth.⁷ Even though she refused, Sumedhā's parents organized her engagement. She tried to convince her parents to give her permission to enter the religious life, while her would-be husband tried to persuade her to start family life with him in his luxurious palace. Sumedhā's determination did not falter. She constantly talked about the vanity of sensual pleasures while everyone around her praised the happiness of household life. Finally, to show her determination, she cut off her long hair and threw it down before her parents and her fiancé. Only then could she obtain permission from her parents to become a nun (Thī 488–522; Thī-a 270–300).⁸ Nuns such as Cālā, Ūpacālā and Sisūpacālā, three sisters of Āyasmanta Sāriputta, and nuns like Dantikā, Selā, and Anopamā, mentioned above, entered monastic life when they were still young girls.

Meanwhile, there were some young women who could not enter the Community of Nuns because their parents or husbands

5. cf. A III 67, 77.

6. Vin IV 278.

7. On this question of permission to join the Community, see *infra* pp.42–43.

8. There were some parents of young nuns who repeatedly asked them to return to family life. The *Therīgāthā* contains an example of one of these discussions between Subhā Therī and her parents. Subhā Therī categorically rejected her parents' proposition that she return to lay life (Thī 341–65; Thī-a 236–345).

would not give them permission. The nun Sumanā, the sister of king Pasenadi of the Kosalans, was an old woman when she became a nun because she had had to take care of her grandmother. So she had to wait until her grandmother died (Thī 16; Thī-a 22–23). Dhammā, a young woman from Sāvattihī, wanted to enter the Community of Nuns, but her husband did not want to let her go. She had to wait until he died (Thī 17; Thī-a 23–24).

There were also some courtesans who wanted to give up their profession and enter the ascetic life. The nun Aḍḍhakāsī, for example, had been a famous courtesan in the city of Kāsi (Thī 25–26; Thī-a 30–33). The nun Vimalā was the daughter of a rich prostitute in the city of Vesālī. As she was a very beautiful young woman, Vimalā followed her mother's footsteps in the same city. One day, she happened to encounter Āyasmanta Mahā-Moggallāna and tried to seduce him, but without success⁹. Vimalā listened to a sermon preached by Mahā-Moggallāna and was converted to Buddhism. Later, she entered the Community of Nuns (Thī 72–76; Thī-a 76–78).

Ambapālī was another famous courtesan who later became a well-known nun. Her conversion to Buddhism is recounted in great detail in the *Vinaya*¹⁰ and the *Therīgāthā* Commentary. She was the most beautiful young woman in the country of the Vajjins. The reputation of her elegance spread as far as the neighbouring countries. A number of princes from her own country and from other countries fell in love with her, and each prince wanted to marry her. This led to political problems and the Vajjin leaders in order to avoid possible quarrels, named Ambapālī the country's principal courtesan. Aristocrats and rich merchants visited her. She became soon rich and influential, and owned a large estate near the city of Vesālī. Her only son, the young Vimala Koṇḍañña, converted to Buddhism and became a monk. Ambapālī went to see the Buddha during the last year of his life, when he was

9. The commentary of the *Therīgāthā* (p.77) says that young Vimalā tried to seduce Āyasmanta Mahā-Moggallāna in order to help enemies of Buddhism and thereby destroy the good reputation of Buddhist monastic community. There were some individuals belonging to other religious orders of the day who were jealous of Mahā-Moggallāna (Jātaka V 125–127; Dh-p-a III 65–67).

10. Vin I 231–233; cf. D II 95–98.

travelling to Kusinārā, and became his disciple. Later, after hearing a discourse given by her son, Ambapālī became a nun (Thī 252–70; Thī-a 206–14).

The famous nun named Abhaya Mātā was probably the former courtesan known by the name Padumāvati. She came from the city of Ujjenī, an important commercial centre. She was exceedingly beautiful and had a son named Abhaya by the king of the country of the Magadhans. The boy grew up in the royal palace. Later, having heard the Doctrine taught by the Buddha, he became a monk and was known as Abhaya. One day, as the monk Abhaya was giving a discourse, his mother, who was in the audience, decided to renounce household life and enter the Community of Nuns (Thī 33–34; Thī-a 39–40).

There were some ladies who entered the religious life as Buddhist nuns because of painful experiences in lay life that led them to search for spiritual comfort. A woman named Sāmā from the city of Kosambī, for example, became a nun after the death of a friend (Thī 37–38; Thī-a 44–45). The nun Ubbarī was a rich woman, but sorrowful due to the death of her daughter. She was in the habit of going to the cemetery to cry at her daughter's tomb. One day she happened to meet the Buddha and his words to her inspired her to join the Community of Nuns (Thī 51–53; Thī-a 53–57). Before entering the monastic life, Vāseṭṭhī had also been a despairing mother who had lost her only child (Thī 133–38; Thī-a 228–30).

The story of the nun Paṭācārā is even sadder. She was born into a rich family in the city of Sāvattthī. As a young woman she fell in love with a servant in her parents' household and fled with him to live in a faraway village. They had a child. When she was pregnant with their second child, she wanted to return to her parents in Sāvattthī. During the long trip, which they undertook during the rainy season, she gave birth to the child, but her husband and both children died in tragic accidents. When she arrived in Sāvattthī, all alone, she learned that during a storm her parents and her only brother had been killed when their huge house fell in. She went crazy and began to wander around the streets without any clothes, not knowing where she was going. Then she stumbled across the place where the Buddha was staying. His words comforted her, and, completely cured, Paṭācārā was able to enter the Community of Nuns a few days later (Thī 112–116; Thī-a 108–117).

Isidāsī's misfortune was very different from Paṭācārā's. Isidāsī was born in a well-to-do family. When she grew up, she married a rich young man, following her parents' proposal. Even though she was very beautiful and obedient to her husband, he did not love her, so she returned to her parents' home. Isidāsī accepted their advice for a second time and married another man, but once again she was treated with scorn and neglected by her husband. She returned to her parents' house once again. By this time, the two disagreeable experiences had given her a strong dislike for household life. She turned to the teaching of the Buddha, and following the advice of the learned nun Jinadattā, she entered the Community of Nuns. In time, she was well-known among the nuns.

Soṇā, an old woman from Sāvattī, experienced the sadness of family life in a different way. She had ten children and her family was prosperous. When the children grew up, their father left home to become an ascetic. From then on, the responsibility for the family fortune was in the hands of her sons. The old lady was treated very badly by her daughters-in-law and by her own sons; so she decided to take up the monastic life (Thī 102–106; Thī-a 95–99).

These sad stories do not mean that those women who became nuns were unhappy or that they were continuously nagging and crying in their monastic communities. It would be more accurate to say that they entered the Community of Nuns after obtaining a good understanding of the reality of existence: the impermanence and instability of all things. Unpleasant experiences had not only led them to listen to the teaching of the Buddha, but also helped them to understand it deeply. Thus, they already had a great deal of spiritual maturity when they entered the religious life.

Some of the young women were lay disciples of the Buddha even before entering the Community of Nuns. They had had the opportunity on one or more occasions to meet the Buddha when he taught in a city or when he came with his disciples to partake of a meal offered by a generous lay disciple. Other women encountered the Buddha in different circumstances. Sakulā, for example, was a young woman from Sāvattī who converted to Buddhism when she heard the Buddha give a discourse at the ceremony for the inauguration of the monastery given by Anāthapiṇḍika (Thī 97–101; Thī-a 136–138). Sujātā, a young

woman from a rich merchant family in Sāketa, came across the Buddha as she was returning home after participating in an annual festival. She listened to the Buddha, converted to Buddhism, and a few days later left her husband to become a nun (Thī 146–150; Thī-a 136–138).

We do not know what the original religion had been of each of the women entering the new community. They were no doubt members of the religion of their parents. So, the women who came from Brahmin families abandoned Brahminism and its practices in order to assimilate the Teaching of the Buddha. There were also some women who had been members of the Jain nuns' community before becoming Buddhist nuns. Bhaddā Kuṇḍalakesā, for example, was a nun in the Jain community as well as a celebrated preacher of that religious organization. She was defeated by Āyasmanta Sāriputta in a public debate. As a consequence, she converted to Buddhism and became a nun (Thī 107–111; Thī-a 87–89). Nanduttarā, a young woman from a Brahmin background, had converted to Jainism, was a member of the monastic community led by Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta (Jina Mahāvira) and followed severe ascetic practices. After hearing a sermon preached by Āyasmanta Mahā-Moggallāna, however, Nanduttarā left the Jain community and became a Buddhist nun (Thī 87–91; Thī-a 87–89).

We can see, then, that a great number of the women who entered the Community of Nuns were well-educated. Coming from urban families, most of them were capable of organizing communal life. The canonical texts cite a number of nuns who attained Arahanthood¹¹. This, of course, does not mean that all the members of the Community of Nuns reached that state of perfection.

However, very soon, women who lacked discipline entered the Community. Nuns such as Thulla Nandā, Caṇḍakālī, etc., and the nuns in the "group of six" (*chabbaggiyā bhikkhunī*) were notorious.¹² These nuns also rendered an indirect service to the Community of Nuns by creating disorder. Because of such circumstances, it was necessary to establish new rules or to bring special amendments to the rules already enacted.¹³ Each page of

11. See Chapter 8, p.130ff.

the *Vinaya-piṭaka* shows that if these various incidents had not occurred, the Buddha would not have established the rules associated with them. The Master did not proscribe a fault until someone had committed it. Thus, we can see a line of evolution in the rules of this organization. By presenting the rules of training in this way, the *Vinaya-piṭaka* gives the impression that the Buddha wanted to have the monks and nuns appreciate the need for and the utility of a given rule. It seems the Buddha wanted the community to make progress on its own, based on the conduct of its members.

12. “The nuns of the group of six” were an emblematic gang who misbehaved on various occasions. At times, they were encouraged by a group called “the monks of the group of six” (*chabbaggiyā bhikkhū*). A number of rules of discipline were established because of these two groups. These monks and nuns do not seem to have broken any of the rules that were already established. They were cunning enough to do something very similar to a forbidden action without going against the letter of the law. These cases led to the actions covered by rules to be extended or to new rules.

13. In the rules of the Community of Nuns, the nuns in “the group of six” were responsible for: one of the rules leading to expulsion (*Pārājikā*); one of the rules requiring confession of the fault and forfeiture (*Nissaggiya Pācittiya*); fourteen of the rules requiring confession (*Pācittiya*); and eight rules that lead to a declaration (*pāṭidesanīya*). Incidents involving the nun Thulla-Nandā also led to a number of rules being established: one of the rules leading to expulsion (*pārājikā*); four of the rules requiring a formal meeting of the Community (*saṅghādisesa*); and six of the rules requiring confession of the fault and forfeiture (*Nissaggiya Pācittiya*).

CHAPTER 3

REGULATION OF ENTRY

As we have noted before, the rise of the new community took place when Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī accepted the Eight Great Conditions (*aṭṭha garu-dhammā*). She immediately raised the question of how to ordain the Sākyan ladies accompanying her. The Buddha said that they should be ordained by the monks.¹ Thus, the Community of Monks was responsible for ordaining woman at the beginning. Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī, however, benefited from a special favour: her acceptance of the Eight Great Conditions was to be considered her ordination.² Thus she became the most senior member of the newly established community. We can assume that the nun Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī helped the other Sākyan women to obtain ordination from the Community of Monks.

We may ask whether the ordination of the Sākyan ladies accompanying Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī was in accordance with the sixth of the Eight Great Conditions, which says: “The Higher Ordination should not be requested from both Communities until a postulant has spent two years observing the six precepts.” The Sākyan women who had just been ordained had not been postulants, nor had they trained for two years in the six precepts. Moreover, they had not been ordained by both Communities. At first sight, there would seem to be a difference between theory and practice. But the difference is only an apparent one, as the ordination of the first women candidates must be considered an exceptional case. Moreover, the Eight Great Conditions were not commandments that had to be immediately executed; they were, rather, obligations imposed on an organization that would be set up in time. The necessary conditions for fulfilling the rules were not present at the beginning. For example, there were no

-
1. Vin II 256–57.
 2. Vin II 255.

preceptors to educate the postulants. As long as the Community of Nuns did not exist, there could not be any action taken by both Communities. The only alternative was to have the Community of Monks confer ordination on the first nuns. As for the Eight Great Conditions, they were meant for a Community of Nuns already well established, whereas the foundations of such a community were still being laid.

In the beginning, the nuns were given only the Higher Ordination (*upasampadā*). For the first women candidates wishing to lead a monastic life, there was no Lower Ordination, called *pabbajjā*. We should remember that for monks too, in the beginning there was only one ordination. It was only later that higher and lower ordinations were elaborated in the Community of Monks.³

After ordaining the Sākyan women, the monks taught them how they were to conduct formal acts of the Community (*saṅgha kamma*). From then on, the new Community began to develop as a monastic organization. First of all, let us look at how that evolution took place in terms of ordination.

The procedure used for women candidates who wished to enter the Community of Nuns, unlike that for male candidates, did not demand questions about their physical and mental aptitude. Due to this “open door” policy, a number of undesirable candidates entered the Community of Nuns. There were, for example, women who resembled men, persons who had been castrated, hermaphrodites, etc. There were also people with diseases such as leprosy, eczema, epilepsy, etc.⁴ The *Vinaya* says that when the Buddha was informed of this, he prescribed that the monks question candidates concerning these stumbling blocks.⁵ Each candidate was to be personally questioned before the assembly of the Community in the following manner: “Are you without sexual characteristics? Are you a eunuch? Are you hermaphrodite? (...) Do you have leprosy? Do you have eczema?” etc.

3. See BML, pp.117–20.

4. Concerning people who are not permitted to enter the Buddhist monastic community, see BML, pp.120–21.

5. The stumbling blocks (*antarāyikā dhammā*): “characteristics that are hindrances,” i.e. preventing a male or female candidate from entering the Community of Monks and Nuns.

When they were questioned thus by the monks, some of the women candidates were unable to answer correctly because they hesitated or because they were shy or even afraid. Informed of this, the Master gave the following instructions, "Monks, I allow ordination by the Community of Monks only after [the woman candidate] has been ordained [by the Community of Nuns] and has cleared herself [with regard to the stumbling blocks] before the Community of Nuns."⁶

This new stage was very important in the process of the developing responsibility of the Community of Nuns regarding new candidates. Following this decision, a woman's ordination took place in two consecutive stages: first, ordination was given by the nuns after they had verified the physical and mental aptitude of the candidate; second ordination was then conferred by the Community of Monks. This second ordination seems to have been simply a confirmation of the first one. In this way, the nuns were finally able to honour the obligation laid down in the sixth item of the Eight Great Conditions. From that time onwards, the two formal acts by the two monastic orders were called "the ordination by both sides of the community."

According to this arrangement, the nuns had to question new candidates concerning the stumbling blocks. The case arose, however, where candidates who had not been properly instructed beforehand were not able to answer correctly during public questioning. When the Buddha was informed of this, he gave the following mandate: "I allow you to instruct each candidate beforehand concerning the stumbling blocks and then to question her afterwards." When this was done, it happened that some of the candidates were only informed just before being questioned. As they had not been properly instructed, they were not able to answer correctly. So the Master expanded his instructions, "Instruct the candidates elsewhere, then afterwards question them before the assembly of the Community of Nuns."

Even when this was done, there were still candidates who could not answer correctly, as they had been instructed by nuns who were inexperienced or incompetent. When the Master learned of this, he advised, "Candidates should orally be instructed by an

6. Vin II 271.

experienced, competent nun." Next, there were competent nuns who instructed the candidates, but those nuns had not had the prior approval of the Community of Nuns to do so. Told of this, the Buddha said, "Nuns who have not been given the approval of the Community of Nuns beforehand should not instruct the candidates." From then on, a nun who was to be an instructor (*anusāsikā*) had to have formal permission from the Community of Nuns to do so. To obtain this formal accord, the nun in question had to present herself before the assembly of Community of Nuns and say, "May the Community listen to me! O noble ladies, the person named N is a candidate under the guidance of the noble lady named M. If it seems right to the Community, I can instruct the person named N." Otherwise, some other nun could inform the assembly in the name of the nun in question, saying "May the Community listen to me! O noble ladies, the person named N is a candidate for ordination under the guidance of the noble lady named M. If it seems right to the Community, the nun named S could instruct the person named N."⁷

In this way, the procedure for conferring ordination evolved very rapidly. The nun who was the instructor gave the candidate her monastic clothing⁸ and, if necessary, designated a nun who would take responsibility for her. She also explained how she was to behave before the meeting of the Community of Nuns during the formal act that would constitute her ordination. The instructor had to inform the Community about the new candidate just before she was presented to the assembly. The *Vinaya* gives the following details concerning this. Both [the instructor and the candidate] must arrive together, but they must not appear before the meeting of the Community together. The instructor, who is to appear first, must speak as follows: "May the Community listen to me! Noble ladies, the person named N is a candidate for ordination through the noble lady named M. If it seems right to the Community, let the person named N enter here."

After permission is granted, the candidate is to enter with her joined hands on her forehead and squat down in homage before the Community. She should make her request with the

7. Vin II 172.

8. See *infra* p.154, note 29.

following words: "I request the Community to give me ordination, O noble ladies. May the Community, O noble ladies, raise me up out of compassion for me." This supplication is to be repeated a second and a third time by the candidate.

After this request, the assembly must be informed by an experienced, competent nun as follows: "May the Community hear me! O noble ladies, this person named N is a candidate for ordination under the guidance of the noble lady named M. If it seems right to the Community, I will question her concerning the stumbling blocks." Then the nun starts to question the candidate:

"Listen carefully, you, who bear the name N. This is the moment for you to tell the truth. This is the time for you to answer according to the facts. When I question you, you must answer 'Yes' with regard to the facts. You must answer 'No' with regard to what is not a fact. Now give your answers: Are you without sexual characteristics? Are you a eunuch? Are you a hermaphrodite? Do you have leprosy, boils, eczema, consumption or epilepsy? Are you a human being? Are you a woman? Are you without debts? Are you not of the king's service? Do you have your parents' permission? Do you have your husband's permission? Are you twenty years of age? Do you have a complete set of robes (*cīvara*) and a begging-bowl? What is your name? What is the name of your preceptor?"

After this questioning, the assembled Community should be informed by the competent nun:

"May the Community hear me! O noble ladies, this person named N is a candidate for ordination through the noble lady named M. This person is completely pure with regard to the stumbling blocks. She has a complete set of robes and a begging-bowl. This person named N requests the Community to ordain her. If it seems right to the Community to ordain the person named N who is under the guidance of the noble lady named M, may the noble ladies remain silent. If anyone among you does not find this acceptable, let her speak." [The competent nun must repeat this formula three times].

If all the participating nuns remain silent, the competent nun finally declares on behalf of the Community:

“May the Community hear me! O noble ladies, the Community is about to confer ordination on this person named N who is under the guidance of the noble lady named M. It is pleasing to the Community. That is why the ladies are silent. Thus do I understand it.”⁹

After the ordination by the Community of Nuns, the second stage of the procedure takes place: the new nun, with some other nuns must approach the Community of Monks, squat in the *ukkuṭṭika* posture before the assembled monks, paying respect with joined hands, and say, “Venerable ones, I, the nun N, under the guidance of the nun named M, wish to be ordained. I have been ordained in the Community of Nuns. I am pure with regard to the stumbling blocks.”

In this way, she requests to be ordained by the Community of Monks. The procedure for this ordination is the same as the one just given in detail, except that it is a monk who presents the motion. This second ordination must take place, even if the nun in question has to be ordained by proxy, which could happen if she was unable to go before the assembly of monks due to dangers on the highways or in the forest that she would have to go through.

Aḍḍhakāsi, the former courtesan (cf. *supra* p.25), for example, who had been ordained by the nuns, wanted to receive her second ordination in the Buddha’s presence. She could not come to Sāvattihī, however, because the road was too dangerous for her as she was so famous. When the Master was informed of her difficulty, he told the monks to confer Addhakāsi’s second ordination by proxy. The monks conferred the ordination by proxy, but the messenger was a monk. Because of some critics, the Buddha modified the procedure. From then on, the messenger should not be a monk or a male novice (*sāmaṇera*), but a competent and experienced nun. She first had to present herself

9. According to the procedure given in the *Vinaya* (II 274), immediately after the ordination, the sun’s shadow should be measured (i.e. the time of day) and the position of the constellations should be noted in order to determine the time and date of the ordination. Then the newly ordained nun is reminded of the three resources (see *infra* p.107, note 70) and the eight things that should not be done (see *infra* p.68).

before to the assembly of the Community of monks. She was to squat in the *ukkuṭika* posture with her hands joined, and she was to speak as follows: “The noble lady named N, under the guidance of the noble lady named M, is a candidate for ordination. She has been ordained by the nuns and is pure with regard to the stumbling blocks. If she has not come here, it is only because of the danger involved for her. The noble lady N requests the Community of Monks to ordain her. May the Community lift up the noble lady named N out of compassion for her.” The nun had to repeat the same words a second and a third time.

Then the assembly of monks was to be informed by a competent, experienced monk as follows: “May the Community hear me! Venerable ones, the person named N, under the guidance of the noble lady named M, is a candidate for the ordination. She has already been ordained by the nuns and is pure with regard to the stumbling blocks. If she has not come here, it is only because of the danger involved. The noble lady N requests the Community to ordain her.” Then the competent monk was to present the motion to the Community: “If it seems right to the Community to ordain the person named N, may the venerable ones remain silent. If anyone among you does not find this acceptable, let him speak.” After repeating it three times, if all the assembled monks remained silent, he declares: “May the Community hear me! Venerable ones, the Community confers ordination on the person named N who is the pupil of the person named M. It is pleasing to the Community. That is why the venerable ones are silent. Thus do I understand it.”¹⁰ That is how the second ordination could be conferred by proxy.

Three important factors are to be seen in the procedure concerning Higher Ordination: (1) ordination in the Community of Nuns had to be conferred by “both sides of the Community”; (2) the candidate was presented to the assembled Community of Nuns by a competent nun; and (3) each candidate came to the Community only through the sponsorship of a nun of some standing. This sponsoring nun is called *pavattanī* in *Vinaya* texts. Little by little, the *pavattanī* seems to have become a permanent preceptor.¹¹

10. Vin II 277–78.

Let us look in more detail at why a female preceptor was needed in connection with the ordination of women. We know that the Sākyan ladies who first entered the Community of Nuns did not have a preceptor. The situation changed rapidly, however, due to the presence of young candidates who were undisciplined. Moreover, there were elder nuns who were not prudent when they chose candidates for ordination, and dissipated young women obtained ordination by taking advantage of the good faith of pious nuns. In order to avoid this situation, it was necessary to make things clear to each candidate before she entered the Community. Several rules of discipline were established with regard to this. The candidate was to be known as a *sikkhamānā*,¹² that is, a “trainee.” The nun responsible for her was called *upajjhā* (literally, “female preceptor”). The *upajjhā*’s authority was limited by a number of the rules of discipline.

From that time onwards, nuns did not have the right to present a candidate for ordination until she had trained for two years in the six precepts.¹³ In this way, the sixth clause of the Eight Great Conditions entered the *Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha* in the form of a specific rule: “If a nun ordains a postulant who has not trained in the six precepts for two years, she is guilty of a fault of the *Pācittiya* category.”¹⁴ In addition, *Pācittiya* rules nos. 67 and 73 forbid the nuns to train a postulant who has not already obtained the prior approval of the Community of Nuns.¹⁵ In my opinion, this approval was equivalent of having to register one’s name before being permanently incorporated into an organization.

The procedure¹⁶ for becoming a postulant required the candidate to present herself to the assembly of the Community of Nuns. She was to squat in the *ukkuṭṭika* posture with her hands joined, paying her respect. She then made the following formal declaration three times:

11. The word *pavattanī* is defined as *upajjhā* (female preceptor)—Vin IV 326.

12. Vin IV 318–321, 332–35, 342; cf. *Pācittiya* rules nos. 63, 64, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 91.

13. See *infra* p.178.

14. Vin IV 318–320

15. Vin IV 323–324.

16. Vin IV 317–319.

Buddhist Nuns

“O noble ladies, I am named N. I am a postulant under the guidance of the noble lady named M. I request that the Community give me approval to follow the training in the six precepts for two years.”

The assembly of the Community of Nuns was then to be informed as follows by a competent experienced nun:

“May the Community hear me! O noble ladies, this person named N, a postulant under the guidance of the noble lady named M, requests the Community to give her their approval to follow the training in the six precepts for two years.”

Next, the competent nun had to present the motion to the Community of Nuns, repeating three times:

“May the Community hear me! O noble ladies, this person named N, who is a postulant under the guidance of the noble lady named M, requests the Community to give her their approval to follow the training in the six precepts for two years. If it seems right to the Community to grant approval, may the noble ladies remain silent. If someone among you does not find this acceptable, let her speak.”

Finally, if and when everyone remained silent, the competent nun declared in the name of the Community:

“May the Community hear me! O noble ladies, the Community gives its approval to this person named N, a postulant under the guidance of the noble lady named M, to undertake the training in the six precepts for two years. It is pleasing to the Community. That is why the ladies are silent. Thus do I understand it.”

As soon as the postulant had obtained permission in this way, she had to repeat in a clear voice after the competent nun the formula for undertaking the six precepts:

“I undertake the observation of the precept to abstain from killing any living being. I undertake the observation of the precept to abstain from taking what is not given. I undertake the observation of the precept to abstain from sexual relations. I undertake the observation of the precept to abstain from lying. I undertake the observation of the precept to abstain from intoxicating drinks that lead to bewilderment

and lack of attention. I undertake the observation of the precept to abstain from taking a meal at the wrong time.”¹⁷

Because of this procedure, the beginning of the two-year training appears as a sort of ‘mini ordination’ carried out by the Community of Nuns. However, it was never given the name ‘Lower Ordination’ (*pabbajjā*). The procedure made it clear that Higher Ordination and the beginning of the training period leading up to Higher Ordination were two quite distinct steps.

Now, one might ask what the difference was between a male novice (*sāmaṇera*) in the Community of Monks, and a female postulant (*silkkhamānā*) in the Community of Nuns. Of course, both the male novice and the female postulant were aiming to obtain higher ordination eventually. The male novice, however, did not have to go to the Community of Monks for permission to obtain Lower Ordination (*pabbajjā*).¹⁸ Moreover, that lower ordination for male novices was not a formal act carried out by the Community of Monks. But, as we have seen, giving permission to start the two-year period of training of a female postulant was a formal act carried out by the Community of Nuns. Thus it is clear that candidates for the Community of Nuns were more carefully monitored.

The two-year period of training for female postulants was a sort of probationary period. No such probation was required for male novices.¹⁹ On the other hand, the probationary period for female postulants was much simpler than the religious life followed by male novices. Male novices, for example, kept ten precepts:

1. To abstain from killing any living being
2. To abstain from taking what is not given
3. To abstain from sexual relations
4. To abstain from lying
5. To abstain from taking intoxicating drinks that lead to bewilderment and lack of attention.

17. “The wrong time” is between noon and sunrise of the next day.

18. The monks could train their novices without first obtaining the Community of Monks’ consent. See MB 149–51.

19. There was a probationary period of four months, however, for former members of other monastic systems who wished to enter the Buddhist monastic community. See BML, p.120.

6. To abstain from taking a meal after the right time (between noon and sun rise of the next day).
7. To abstain from dancing, singing, and attending shows
8. To abstain from using garlands and perfumes
9. To abstain from using high, luxurious seats and beds
10. To abstain from accepting gold and money.

Meanwhile, female postulants (*sikkhamānā*) kept only six precepts. So they were not obliged to abstain from dancing, singing, playing musical instruments and attending shows (precept no. 7 in the Ten Precepts); they did not have to abstain from using garlands, perfumes, unguents, and objects that beautify the body (precept no. 8); they did not have to abstain from using high, luxurious seats and beds (precept no. 9) and they did not have to abstain from accepting and using gold and silver, that is to say, money (precept no. 10). The male novice (*sāmaṇera*), however, had to follow the ten precepts until the time of his Higher Ordination.

There were also some other differences between the female postulant (*sikkhamānā*) in the Community of Nuns and the male novice (*sāmaṇera*) in the Community of Monks.²⁰ Male novices lived with their preceptors at all times. The *Vinaya* does not say, however, that female postulants were obliged to live with their preceptor-nuns nor does the *Vinaya* specify that postulants had to shave their heads before the beginning of the two-year training period, unlike the male novices who shaved their heads as soon as they entered the noviciate. There is no mention in the *Vinaya* that

20. A woman could also receive the lower ordination and become a novice (*sāmaṇerī*). So the term *sāmaṇerī* is found in a number of passages of the *Vinaya* (I 135, 139–42, 146, 172, 320–21; III 34, 40, 107–108, 207, 209–10, 236; IV 53, 55, 60–62, 68, 92, 121–22, 177–78, 224, 303, 304, 327–28, 343), but the female novices are rarely mentioned in the numerous case histories found in these texts (Vin II 277; III 40; IV 342–343). It would seem that during the first few centuries of Buddhism, the Community of Nuns did not have a strong tradition of ordaining female novices. It may be that the postulant stage was considered to be more reasonable and convenient for new candidates. However, female novices are included in the five types of fellow practitioners (*pañca sahadhammikā*): monks (*bhikkhu*), nuns (*bhikkhunī*), male novices (*sāmaṇerā*) female novices (*sāmaṇerī*) and female postulants (*sikkhamānā*)—Vin II 204, 268, 277; IV 92, 121–22, 224, 285.

female postulants had to wear monastic robes, whereas male novices wear ochre-coloured monastic clothes (*kāsāyāni vatthāni*). In fact, according to *Nikāya* texts, such clothes symbolized the homeless life.²¹

It is true that the beginning of the two-year training period for the female postulants was sanctioned by a formal act carried out by the Community of Nuns, but the postulants' status was not exactly monastic. It was more an intermediate position between family life and the Community of Nuns they hoped to enter some day. In this way, a female postulant had two years during which she could follow the six precepts and reflect on the next step before taking a final decision. Should she find that the training was not useful to her or that it was not the right time in her life, she could give up her training without presenting herself as a candidate for Higher Ordination. This two-year training period following the six precepts can therefore be seen as a period for reflection. This does not mean that all postulants lived outside the convent. It is more likely that a number of postulants lived with their preceptor-nuns as they were being trained by them. In such cases, the preceptor-nuns also had at least two years in which to observe the aptitude of their candidates for Higher Ordination.

The *Vinaya* says that there were some female postulants who did not conduct themselves properly during their two-year training period. The *Pācittiya* rule no. 79 was made with reference to such undisciplined candidates. This rule states that nuns are not to confer Higher Ordination on a postulant who frequents with men and boys.²² Through the case history of this rule, we can see that some postulants did not live all the time with the nuns.

On the other hand, it was not required that women who wished to become postulants obtain permission to do so from their parents or their husband. This was a prerequisite only for Higher Ordination. Cases such as these show us in an indirect manner that female postulants could stay with their families during the two-year training period; they could stay with their parents at least from time to time. All these factors bring us to this

21. DI 60, 61, 63, 115; M II 67, etc.

22. Vin IV 333–35. It was also against the rules to give Higher Ordination to a woman who was pregnant or to a woman whose child was not weaned (*Pācittiya* nos. 61 and 62). See *infra* p.178.

conclusion: the beginning of the two-year training period of a female postulant was neither a Lower Ordination (*pabbajjā*) in the particular sense of the word, nor a “going forth” (*pabbajjā*)²³ in the literal sense of the word. So the status of the female postulant was different from the position of a male novice. But both were eventual candidates for Higher Ordination.

The *Vinaya* gives the following requirements to be met by a female candidate for Higher Ordination if she had never been married:

1. She had to have a preceptor-nun.
2. She had to obtain the prior approval of the Community to undertake the two-year training period in the six precepts (*Pācittiya* no. 63)
3. She had to complete the two-year training period in the six precepts (*Pācittiya* no. 72)
4. She had to have her parents’ consent to enter the Community of Nuns (*Pācittiya* no. 80)
5. She had to be at least twenty years old (*Pācittiya* no. 71)
6. She had to obtain the approval of the Community to receive Higher Ordination (*Pācittiya* no. 73).

However, if a young woman had been married and had gone to live with her husband, the minimum age for Higher Ordination was twelve. *Pācittiya* no. 65 states: “If a nun confers Higher Ordination on a married woman who has not reached the age of twelve, she is guilty of a fault of the *Pācittiya* category.”

It may seem questionable as to whether a twelve-year-old could function as a fully ordained nun. Some scholars, including I.B. Horner,²⁴ suggest that the twelve years mentioned here refer to the number of years the women had to have been married and not to her actual age. The purpose of this rule, according to this interpretation, was to protect conjugal life. But this would mean that a woman who had her heart set on becoming a nun would have to endure many years of married life, even if her parents and her husband were willing to consent to her going forth!

I think, on the contrary, that this rule allowed young women who were very unhappy in their married life, or unhappy with

23. See BML, pp.14–15.

24. See *The Book of Discipline*, III, pp. xlix-liii, 369.

their in-laws, to take up monastic life even at a very early age. In support of this interpretation, we can point out that there is no rule in the nuns' *Pātimokkha* corresponding to the monks' *Pācittiya* no. 65, which says: "If a monk consciously confers Higher Ordination on a candidate who is under the age of twenty, he is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category. The Higher Ordination of that candidate is null and void. The monks who participated in that formal act are also blameworthy."²⁵

Not only the absence of such a rule in the *Bhikkhūnī Pātimokkha*, but also the presence of some other rules on this matter, clearly indicate that the minimum age was twenty for female candidates who had been not married,²⁶ and twelve for female candidates who had been married.²⁷

Yet the question remains as to whether a twelve-year-old was mature enough to become a fully ordained nun. We need to keep in mind that the rule does not mention a twelve-year-old girl, but rather a twelve-year-old young woman. If a young woman was already married and already lived with her husband, no matter how young she was, was she not already an adult? We also must take into consideration the social context of the time: people frequently got married at a very early age during the time the Buddha lived. This was especially true in well-to-do urban families. Apart from some very rare cases, most marriages were arranged by the parents. No doubt there were also many young women who had married soldiers and whose husbands had died in battle. In such cases, if an unfortunate young woman wished to enter the Community of Nuns, with her parents consent, she was allowed to do so if she was at least twelve years old and fulfilled the other conditions for obtaining ordination. For such young women, even if only twelve years old, no one could say that the Buddhist nuns were corrupting minors. On the other hand, in any

25. *Yo pana bhikkhu jānaṃ ūnavatsavoassaṃ puggalaṃ upasampādeyya, so ca puggalo anupasampanno, te ca bhikkhū gāryhā, idaṃ tasmim̐ pācittiyaṃ.*

26. *Pācittiya* no. 71. See p.179.

27. *Pācittiya* no. 65. This rule is also found in non-Theravādin Buddhist rules for nuns. For example, compare *Pācittika* (Pali *Pācittiya*) rule no. 100 to the *Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya* of the Lokottaravādins: *Yā pana bhikṣuṇī ūna-dvādasavarṣām gihi-caritām upasthāpayet pācittikam.* See. R. ROTH, *op. cit.*, p.103.

case, the *Pācittiya* rule no. 65 does not mean that just any twelve-year-old young woman would immediately enter the Community of Nuns. It would appear that they also had to complete the two-year training period in the six precepts and fulfil several other important conditions.

Finally, here are the conditions that a young married woman had to fulfil to enter the Community of Nuns:

1. She had to have a preceptor-nun
2. She had to obtain the prior approval of the Community to undertake the two-year training period in the six precepts (*Pācittiya* no. 63)
3. She had to complete the two-year training period in the six precepts (*Pācittiya* no. 66)
4. She had to have her parents' and her husband's consent to enter the Community of Nuns (*Pācittiya* no. 80)
5. She had to be at least twelve years old (*Pācittiya* no. 65)
6. She had to obtain the prior approval of the Community of Nuns to receive Higher Ordination (*Pācittiya* no. 67).

In this list we can see that rule *Pācittiya* no. 80 stipulates that nuns could not ordain a young wife who had not obtained her husband's consent (if he was still alive). We should not think that this rule was made in order to emphasize a wife's submission to her husband. In any case, the marriage is never a sacrament in Buddhism. While there is no stigma attached to a person separating from a partner with whom conjugal life is intolerable, Buddhist monasticism as an organization could not go against social customs and civil law. It therefore had to recognize a husband's rights over his wife. If a married woman had entered the Community of Nuns without her husband's approval, that could have created difficulties for the nuns. The credibility of Buddhist monasticism as an institution would have been brought into question. A rule such as *Pācittiya* no. 80 was therefore appropriate in order to avoid any misunderstanding.

There were cases where husbands first gave their wives permission to enter the Community but changed their minds when they became nuns. This was especially liable to happen when young wives had just entered the Community of Nuns. This was why their preceptor-nuns were supposed to have their young charges move elsewhere in order to avoid their former husbands.

Regulation of Entry

The *Vinaya* mentions a case where a former husband forcibly abducted a young nun. The rule *Pācittiya* no. 70 was laid down after that event: "Whatever nun, having ordained [the postulant] who lives with her, should neither withdraw her nor have her withdrawn to [a distance of] five or six *Yojanas*, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category."²⁸

According to the rule *Saṅghādisesa* no. 2,²⁹ a candidate for higher ordination must not be a woman escaped from prison, or a woman condemned to a heavy penalty unless a pardon has been received from a king, from a governing group, or from a guild, and a woman who had belonged to another religious community must not be given Higher Ordination unless the permission of that community has been obtained.

Not only does the code of discipline for nuns give the qualities the candidate must possess, it also specifies the required qualities of the preceptor who gives the ordination. For example, *Pācittiya* no. 74³⁰ states that a nun had to have received Higher Ordination at least twelve years before to become the preceptor of a candidate for Higher Ordination. She also had to obtain the approval of the Community of Nuns to become a preceptor by approaching the assembly of the Community of Nuns. She was arrange her upper robe over one shoulder, honour the feet of the senior nuns, squat in the *ukkuṭṭika* posture, and with her joined hands raised make the following request three times:

"May the Community hear me! O noble ladies, my name is M, and I am a nun of at least twelve years' standing. I request the Community's permission to ordain."³¹

The *Vinaya* gives details of the necessary qualities a nun must possess before she is given approval to ordain candidates: Such a nun should be tested by the Community thinking "whether this nun is experienced or not; whether this nun is conscientious or not. If she is both ignorant and unconscientious [permission to ordain] should not be given. If she is conscientious, but not experienced, permission should not be given. If she is experienced

28. Vin IV 326–27.

29. Vin IV 225–27.

30. Vin IV 329.

31. Vin IV 330.

but not conscientious, permission should not be given. If she is both experienced and conscientious, then only should permission be given.”

These regulations show that it was not possible for just any nun to ordain candidates. There were other restrictions as well. For example, *Pācittiya* no. 83 states that a nun who is a preceptor cannot present two candidates for Higher Ordination in the same year.³² *Pācittiya* no. 82 forbids a nun to ordain candidates every year consecutively.³³ The introductory story for this rule gives the following reason for these restrictions: “Now at that time³⁴ nuns conferred ordination every year, and there were insufficient dwellings [for the newly ordained]. People became unhappy and started to criticize saying, “How can these nuns confer ordination every year? Dwellings are not sufficient.” Nuns listened to these people who spoke of this, and those who were modest nuns spoke of it more saying “How can these nuns ordain every year?” When the Master was informed of this, he said, “How can nuns confer ordination every year? It is not something that pleases those who are not yet pleased, nor something that increases the number of those who are pleased, but is something that displeases both those who are not yet pleased and those who are pleased (...). And thus, monks, let the nuns set forth this rule of training: “Whatever nun should ordain every year, she is guilty of a fault of the *Pācittiya* category.”³⁵

Such rules show an important aspect of the organization of Buddhist monasticism. Since both communities depended economically on the generosity of lay people, the Community of Nuns had to conduct their affairs in such a way that the entry of new candidates into the Community did not give lay people any reason to be disappointed.

32. Vin IV 337.

33. Vin IV 336.

34. This probably happened during the early days of the Community of Nuns.

35. We should remember that if the Communities of Monks and Nuns were not authorized to admit lepers, epileptics, etc. (see *supra* p.34), this was not only to ensure the smooth running of the Communities but also to avoid criticism coming from lay people (Vin I 72–76, 83, 85–89).

CHAPTER 4

THE ROLE OF THE MONKS

At the very beginning, nuns naturally had to learn the various procedures of community life, and the help and co-operation of the monks proved to be indispensable in this domain. They taught the nuns how to recite the *Pātimokkha*,¹ how to participate in the formal act of *Uposatha*, etc. However, things also gradually evolved in response to the reactions of lay people. At first, for example, the monks recited the *Pātimokkha* for the nuns, who then recited it themselves. But some lay people did not like to see the monks reciting the *Pātimokkha* for the nuns. There were even some who said, "The nuns are their wives, the nuns are their mistresses. They are amusing themselves." When the Master was informed of this criticism, he advised the monks to stop reciting the *Pātimokkha* for the nuns. From that time on, he said, the nuns should do their own reciting. If some of them did not know how to recite the *Pātimokkha* correctly, they should ask the monks to teach them.²

The same thing happened with regard to the confession of faults and the formal acts carried out by the Community. At first, the nuns confessed their faults to the monks. But when this was criticized by lay people, the Master advised the nuns to confess their faults to each other.³ As for the monks, they were to teach the nuns how to confess their faults formally. In the beginning, the monks intervened when verbal disputes arose from time to time between some of the nuns who were not very serious. The monks gave decisions to resolve the disputes. Very soon, however, the nuns took over these matters themselves.

-
1. There was most probably no complete *Pātimokkha* for nuns at that time, so its recitation meant reciting the code of discipline that existed in the early days of their community.
 2. Vin II 259.
 3. We will discuss the confession in the next chapter.

We can see, then, that little by little the nuns were taking responsibility for the various activities of their Community. Even so, the monks' responsibilities regarding the nuns remained. Several of the Eight Great Conditions (*aṭṭha garu dhammā*) mentioned above stipulated that the nuns maintain an important link with the monks. The second clause of that list, for example, states that the nuns cannot spend the rainy season retreat in a region where no monks are living. Clauses four, five and six require that nuns have the Community of Monks participate in some of the formal acts concerned with nuns' discipline.⁴ The third clause says, "Every two weeks, the nuns must approach the monks concerning two points: they should consult them about the date of the act of *Uposatha* and request the exhortation"⁵ According to the *Pācittiya* no. 58 of the nuns' *Pātimokkha*, nobody, except a nun who is ill, has the right to be absent from the bi-monthly exhortation and from the formal meetings of the Community.⁶

In this way, the nuns had to go before the Community of Monks twice a month. This might at first resemble some sort of 'police control', requiring the guilty party to report to the authorities every two weeks! On closer examination, however, we find that the twice monthly visits were not meant to subjugate the nuns to the authority of the monks but to improve their understanding of the Doctrine (*dhamma*) and the Discipline (*Vinaya*). The monks, for their part, were obliged in this way to help the nuns broaden their understanding.

Thus, the bi-monthly exhortation became an important part of the education of nuns who had just entered the Community and an important obligation for the monks with regard to the newly created Community.⁷ That is why a monk who was invited by the nuns to give the exhortation did not have the right to refuse. Even monks who lived in the forest were supposed to come to help nuns in this domain.⁸ Only a monk who was sick or

4. Cf. *infra* p.80.

5. Vin IV 315 (cf. *Pācittiya* no. 59).

6. Vin IV 314–15.

7. The commentary on the *Pātimokkha* states that before carrying out the formal act of *Uposatha*, one of the two obligations of the monks was to exhort the nuns. See Kkh 12.

8. Vin II 264–65.

ignorant could be excused from carrying out this obligation.

Inevitably, there were cases of incompetent monks who went to exhort the nuns. So it was necessary to introduce several rules in the *Pātimokkha* to take care of such cases. One day, for example, the monks of the “group of six” exhorted the nuns, but instead of speaking about the Doctrine and the Discipline, they spoke of frivolous subjects.⁹ After listening to this so-called exhortation, the nuns went to see the Buddha and told him of their dissatisfaction. In this way, the need arose to make rules about the exhortation. The Buddha had the monks add the following rule: “If a monk exhorts the nuns without the approval of the Community of Monks, he is guilty of a fault of the *Pācittiya* category.”¹⁰

From that time on, any monk who went to exhort the nuns had to obtain the formal approval of the Community of Monks. The procedure for obtaining approval was as follows. First, the monk was asked if he wanted to exhort the nuns. Then the assembly of Monks had to be informed by a competent, experienced monk, “May the Community hear me! Venerable ones, the monk named S wishes to exhort the nuns. If the Community considers this to be proper, may the Community give its approval for the monk named S to exhort the nuns.” Next, the monk presented a motion, “May the Community hear me! Venerable ones, the Community gives its approval for the monk named S to exhort the nuns. If the Community considers that to be acceptable, may the venerable ones remain silent. If anyone among you considers that this approval inappropriate, let him speak.” This motion is repeated by the monk three times. Finally, if there is no objection, the competent monk declares, “May the Community hear me! Venerable ones, the Community gives approval for the monk named S to exhort the nuns. The Community approves this. That is why the venerable ones remain silent. Thus do I understand it.”¹¹ He repeats this declaration three times.

9. Subjects that have no relationship to the religious life. Such talks were classed under the name ‘animal talk’ (*tiracchāṇa kathā*). See D I 7, 178; III 54; Vin I 188, etc.

10. Vin IV 49–50. See *Pācittiya* no. 21 of the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha*.

11. Vin IV 51.

This formal designation of the monks who were to exhort the nuns did not, however, resolve all the problems that arose. For example, in that procedure, the qualities that should be possessed by the monk doing the exhortation were not specified. At times, the Community of Monks naïvely, though in good faith, gave approval to monks who were not competent to carry out the exhortation. Some monks who had not attained any progress in their spiritual development wanted to exhort the nuns in order to increase their own material profit.¹² So the need arose to specify the essential qualities that should be possessed by the monk who went to exhort the nuns. The *Vinaya* states that the Community of Monks meeting in assembly should make sure that the monk in question possessed the following qualities:

1. He must be of good moral character
2. He must be a person who follows the discipline of the rules of the *Pātimokkha*
3. He must be of good conduct, a person of high moral standards, considering even the most minor infraction of the rules to be dangerous
4. He must be a person who has heard much (*bahussuta*) and has committed to memory what he has heard
5. He must be a person who knows the Doctrine through his own experience, and he must know the discipline including the *Pātimokkha* in detail
6. He must be a person of pleasant speech, liked by the nuns, and competent to exhort them
7. He must not be guilty of a serious fault¹³
8. He must be a person who has received higher ordination at least twenty years before.

12. They would preach to increase their popularity among the nuns, so that nuns would propagate the reputation of a monk among the lay people saying “This monk is very clever in preaching. Please do give food, robes and shelter for this monk” etc. The popularity itself is considered as a material profit (*āmisahetu*). See Pācittiya no. 24 of the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha*.

13. A monk who was undergoing a period of probation (*parivāsa*) because he had committed one of the faults in the *Saṅghādisesa* category had no right to exhort the nuns (Vin II 5).

After this arrangement, the chosen monks were highly qualified to exhort the nuns. Virtuous and learned, they were Noble Ones who had attained the highest stages of the path of liberation. Some of them, however, were lacking in common sense and a sense of appropriateness and this led to some disagreeable incidents. One day, for example, the well-known monk Āyasmanta Cūḷa-Panthaka¹⁴ exhorted the nuns who were very pleased with his discourse. But he gave his exhortation outside the city, and did not finish until after the sun had set. As the city gates were already closed, the nuns could not return to their nunnery that evening. They were obliged to spend the night outside the city and return early the next morning. Some people who saw them said, "Look, these nuns, daughters of Sākyaans, do not keep to celibacy (*brahma-carīyā*). After spending the night in the monastery with the monks, here they are coming back in the early morning." The monks heard these criticisms and reported them to the Master. He told them to add a new rule to their *Pātimokkha*: "If a monk exhorts the nuns after sundown, even if he has formal permission to exhort the nuns, he is guilty of a fault of the *Pācittiya* category."¹⁵

At first, the monks did not go to the nunneries to exhort the nuns. This may have been considered inappropriate. One day, the monks of the "group of six" went to the nunnery to give a discourse, and the people began to criticize them. This incident gave rise to the following rule: "If a monk exhorts nuns in their residence, he is guilty of a fault of the *Pācittiya* category." Later, however this rule was modified to accommodate nuns who were ill. The *Vinaya* reports the touching story concerning this special amendment: When the nun Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī fell ill, several of the leading disciples gathered at her bedside. Even though they were invited to give a sermon, they were reluctant to do so, saying, "Sister, we do not have the right, for the rule states that a monk must not exhort a nun in her residence." Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī Therī was disappointed. The next morning, the Buddha visited the nun. She told him what the monks had said the evening before, and said that she wished to hear the Doctrine.

14. He was foremost among the monks with supernormal powers (A I 24).

15. *Pācittiya* no. 22 in the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha* (Vin IV 54–55).

Because of this incident, the Buddha had the monks modify the rule as follows: "If a monk exhorts the nuns in their residence other than at the correct time, he is guilty of a fault of the *Pācittiya* category. In this case, the 'correct time' is when a nun is ill."¹⁶

The exhortations of all monks were not received with the same enthusiasm by all nuns. One day, for example, after listening to Āyasmanta Mahā-Kassapa's exhortation, the nun Thulla Nandā and her friends were very displeased with him.¹⁷ On the other hand, many nuns liked to listen to exhortations by Āyasmanta Ānanda. Several monks, including Āyasmanta Nandaka,¹⁸ were highly qualified as preachers. The Buddha asked them to exhort the nuns from time to time and gave them advice on how to do so. The monks who were capable of doing so had to take turns to exhort the nuns. The *Nandakovāda-sutta* (M III 270–277) reports the following story. One day, Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī Therī, together with a large group of nuns, visited the Buddha, and said that she wished to listen to the Doctrine. It was Āyasmanta Nandaka's turn, and he went with a fellow monk to exhort the nuns. After listening to Nandaka's discourse, the nuns were very satisfied with it, but there were still some points they did not understand in his profound discourse. So the Buddha told Nandaka to repeat the same sermon to the nuns the next time. That time, after hearing it again, the nuns correctly understood the important points made in Nandaka's discourse and attained various stages of liberation.

The monks had the right to forbid a nun to listen to their exhortations if she did not behave correctly. For example, when some nuns behaved badly in the exhortation hall, the Buddha advised the monks to temporarily stop exhorting them.¹⁹ Later, it became necessary to lay down several rules to cover this subject. Not just any monk had the right to institute a ban; only monks who were competent and experienced could do so.²⁰ Once a ban

16. *Pācittiya* no. 23 of in the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha* (Vin IV 54–57).

17. S II 215.

18. He was foremost among the monks for his ability to teach the monks (A I 25).

19. According to the *Vinaya*, this ban was prescribed because the nuns of the "group of six" conducted themselves badly by throwing water and mud at some monks to get their attention (Vin II 262).

had been imposed, the monk who had imposed it should not leave on a journey without lifting the ban. In other words, before leaving the region, the monk was to resolve the problem concerning the nun in question.

As we have noted above, according to the nuns' *Pātimokkha*, they were all obliged to go to listen to the exhortation, unless they were sick.²¹ When the nuns arrived at the place of exhortation, the monk who had been appointed to exhort them had to begin by asking two questions, "Are all the nuns present? Have you all kept the Eight Great Conditions?" If the nuns answered, "Yes, Venerable One, we have kept the Eight Great Conditions," the monk was to begin the exhortation. If they answered, "No, Venerable One, we have not kept the Eight Great Conditions," the monk was to remind them of those Eight Conditions and only then should he start the exhortation.²²

In the beginning, the invitation to a monk to give the exhortation was made by a large group of nuns who went to see the monks while they were meeting to carry out the formal act of *Uposatha*. After some lay people's criticisms, the Master forbade the nuns to go in large groups to invite the monks; they should send a small delegation of two or three nuns to invite them. The procedure for the invitation is spelled out in detail in the *Vinaya*: Having approached a monk and having paid respect with joined hands, they should say in the name of the Community of Nuns, "Venerable One, the Community of Nuns pays respect to the monks. Venerable One, may the Community of Monks send a monk for the exhortation." Then the monk responsible for reciting the *Pātimokkha* should seek a monk, saying, "Is there a monk who has the approval of the Community to exhort the nuns?" If there is one, he should tell the nuns, "The monk so-and-so has already been appointed to exhort the nuns. May the Community of Nuns approach him." If no monk had already been approved, the monk reciting the *Pātimokkha* should seek one by asking, "Is there a monk who is qualified to exhort the nuns?" If there is one, he should be given official approval and the nuns should be

20. Vin II 263.

21. Vin IV 314–15.

22. Vin IV 52.

informed as follows, "The monk so-and-so has just been approved to exhort the nuns. May the Community of Nuns approach him." If there is no qualified monk, he should tell the nuns, "None of the monks has received approval to exhort the nuns. May the Community of Nuns continue in the right path and be content."²³

The nuns were to try to benefit from exhortation by the monks, even during the rainy season. With that in mind, they were to take into consideration whether monks were available in the region where they intended to spend the rainy season retreat. Once, when a group of nuns spent the rains retreat in a region where there were no monks, virtuous nuns criticized them: "How can those nuns spend time in a region where there are no monks to exhort them?" This incident gave rise to the rule *Pācittiya* no. 56 in the nuns' *Pātimokkha*: "If a nun spends the rainy season retreat in a region where monks are absent, she is guilty of a fault of the *Pācittiya* category." This rule is the same as the second clause of the Eight Great Conditions.

At the end of the rainy season, the nuns were to end their retreat with the triple invitation not only to the Community of Nuns but also to the Community of Monks.²⁴ A nun was to be appointed by the Community of Nuns to take the invitation to the assembly of the Community of Monks. She was to pay respects to the monks and address them, saying, "Venerable Ones, the Community of Nuns invites the Community of Monks to reveal any fault committed by the nuns if any such fault has been seen or heard of or if there is any suspicion that any such fault has been committed by the nuns. Venerable Ones, may the Community of Monks do this out of compassion for the Community of Nuns. Being aware of their faults, the nuns will make amends for them." The nun should repeat the same invitation three times. The *Bhikkhunī-Pātimokkha* states, "If a nun, after spending the rainy season in retreat, does not make the triple invitation to both Communities, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category."²⁵ All

23. Vin II 264.

24. The rule states that they have to make the invitation first to the Community of Nuns and, the next afternoon, to the Community of Monks (Vin II 275).

25. Vin IV 313–14.

these details show how important it was for the nuns to seek the help of the monks.

As for the monks, they were to do as much as possible to encourage the nuns to lead the religious life in a suitable manner. The *Vinaya* states that the monks had the right to leave their residences, even during the rainy season retreat, to aid a nun in need.

“If a nun is discouraged with regard to the religious life, she should send a messenger, saying, ‘I am discouraged. May the monks come; I would like the monks to come.’ In such a case, a monk should go to see this nun, with the thought, ‘I will dissipate her discouragement,’ or with the thought, ‘I’ll teach her the Doctrine.’ He should return within seven days [to the place where he is spending his rainy season retreat].”²⁶

This permission was also valid for a monk who had received a message from a nun wanting to obtain a probation period of *mānatta*, from a nun who was ill and wanted to hear the Doctrine, from a nun who was having regrets, from a nun whose understanding of the Doctrine was incorrect, from a female postulant who was ill, from a female postulant who was discouraged, from a female postulant who was having regrets, from a female postulant whose training had been interrupted, or from a female postulant who wished to obtain higher ordination.²⁷

All these aspects of collaboration required a certain amount of respect for the monks on the part of the nuns. Moreover, as a new Community that still had a great deal to learn, the nuns needed to cultivate a humble, respectful attitude toward the monks. The first, seventh and eight clauses of the Eight Great Conditions indicate how the nuns were to act in this domain. In addition, all these conditions that were incumbent on the nuns show clearly how far the founders of the *Vinaya* went to conform to the prevailing norms of contemporary society—a society in

26. Vin I 144. He is to return to the place where he is spending the rainy season retreat. Thus, a monk had the right to go to a district that was far away to fulfil this obligation since he had a week in which to get there and return.

27. Vin I 145–46.

which male ascetics never paid respects to a female ascetic, while female ascetics always paid respects to male ascetics.

Some nuns however tried to have changes made in the conditions governing the respect they were supposed to render the monks. Were some of the older nuns too proud to respect young monks? Among the nuns from the country of the Sākya, there were probably some who had not yet rid themselves of their former pride.²⁸ Perhaps they thought that they felt themselves worthy of veneration because of their age, following Sākyan custom in family life. The following incident is recorded in the *Vinaya*.

One day, Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī Therī approached Āyasmanta Ānanda and said, “Venerable One, I wish to request a favour of the Blessed One. It would be good if the Blessed One were to allow the expression of marks of respect such as paying homage, remaining standing as a sign of respect, salutation with joined hands, and the carrying out of duties associated with respect [bringing water to wash the feet, etc.], between monks and nuns according to their age.” In other words, Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī Therī wanted the Master to do away with the first item of the Eight Great Conditions so that the ‘older’ nuns could be venerated by the young monks.²⁹

It is rather difficult to understand why Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī who had enthusiastically accepted the Eight Great Conditions initially, wanted such a change later on. Was she perhaps expressing a wish formulated by some of the older nuns? Whatever the reason, shortly thereafter Āyasmanta Ānanda communicated Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī’s request to the Master. But the Master rejected her request saying that it was not acceptable—such a situation did not exist in other monastic communities, even those that were poorly guided by their leaders.³⁰ If the Buddha had advised the monks to show respect to older nuns, there would no doubt have been much criticism, not only from members of other religions, but also from lay people who supported the Buddhist monastic communities.

There was also a more practical reason for keeping the two lines of seniority separate—the necessity to keep both Communities as separate as possible. If the monks were obliged to

28. The Sākyaans of Kapilavatthu were renowned for their advanced culture but also for their pride.

show respect to older nuns, these would have obtained priority in walking along on the road, taking seats in a refectory and obtaining lodging facilities. Such a system would have created unnecessary intermixture between monks and nuns. For example, a monk would have to sit down next to an older nun and a nun would have to sit down next to an older monk, etc. The Buddhist monasticism which emphasized the value of celibacy could not have tolerated such a system. The only solution to avoid such a hotchpotch was keeping the two lines of seniority separate.

However, reverence shown to monks by nuns was not unconditional. Nuns were not required to venerate monks who misbehaved. For example, they were not expected to honour the monks in the "group of six." The *Vinaya* reports that soon after the Community of Nuns was founded, these "monks" began to misbehave in order to attract the nuns' attention. One day, they threw water on them. On another occasion, they exhibited their private parts. When the Master was informed of their actions, he ordained a penalty for these monks, saying, "such monks should be declared as outside those towards whom the nuns should show respect."³¹

29. The question of age for the monks and nuns was not based on when they were born but on how long it had been since they had received the higher ordination. This could usually be calculated by counting how many rainy season retreats the monk or the nun in question had done. This meant that a monk who had received higher ordination ten years ago was older than a monk who had received it nine years ago. The first monk had done ten rainy season retreats, and the second monk only nine. The "younger" monk had to respect the "older" one and give him priority at all times, unless the "younger" monk was sick or was in necessities such as using the toilet. "Older" monks were to be venerated, respected and served by "younger" monks. The same conditions applied between nuns. "Older" nuns were to be venerated, respected and served by "younger" nuns. But the situation for nuns with regard to monks was very different. All nuns were considered to be "younger" than all monks; even those monks who had received higher ordination that very day were considered "older" than nuns who had obtained higher ordination a very long time ago.

30. Vin II 257–58.

31. Vin II 261–62.

In addition, *Pārājikā* rule no. 7 stipulates that a nun must not welcome a monk who has been expelled by unanimous decision of the Community of Monks.³² The rule says, “A nun who sympathizes with such a monk must be warned up to three times by the other nuns to give up this collaboration. Once she has been warned, if she abandons him, it is good. If she does not abandon him after being warned up to a three times, she becomes a person who is defeated.³³ She is no longer worthy to associate with the Community.” This rule was established because the nun Thulla Nandā agreed with the monk Ariṭṭha, who said that sensual desires are not an impediment to progress on the path of liberation. He was expelled from the Community of Monks.³⁴ There were other nuns who also stayed on to the wrong path because of such undisciplined monks. The nun Mettiyā, for example, was the accomplice of the monks Mettiya and Bhummajaka. She went so far as to falsely accuse the monk Dabbamallaputta, saying she had been raped by him. The Community of Monks followed the prescribed judicial procedure and decided that the nun had made the false accusation at the instigation of Mettiya and Bhummajaka, who were jealous of Dabbamallaputta.³⁵

If there was dissension among the monks, the nuns should not take sides without thoroughly examining the Doctrine and Discipline. When the monks of the town of Kosambi were divided over a question concerning a disciplinary matter, Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī Therī asked the Buddha how the nuns should act towards the monks of Kosambi when they arrived in Sāvattihī. The Buddha said, “O Gotamī, listen to the doctrine preached by both parties and accept the opinions presented by the monks who speak according to the Teaching.”³⁶

The *Kakacūpama-sutta* (M I 122) tells us in an ironic way how the excessive friendship between the monk Moliya-Phagguṇa and

32. This is by the formal act called *ukkhepaniya-kamma* (the formal act of suspension) (cf. *infra* p.84).

33. The faults entailing defeat: see *infra* p.68, 75–78.

34. Vin IV 218–20; cf. Vin II 25–26; IV 133–36. In the *Alagaddūpama-sutta* (M I 130–32) the Buddha criticized the opinion of Ariṭṭha.

35. Vin II 78–79; III 163–66.

36. Vin I 355.

a group of nuns became an obstacle to the serenity of the Communities. "If anyone spoke despairingly about the nuns in Moliya-Phagguṇa's presence, he showed his displeasure, grew angry, and complained. Similarly, if anyone spoke ill of Moliya-Phagguṇa around the nuns, they showed their displeasure, grew angry, and complained." The Buddha advised Moliya-Phagguṇa to end his close relationship with nuns as such conduct was not becoming to an ascetic.³⁷

Some of the limits placed on relationships between nuns and monks in the rules of discipline were designed to avoid obstacles to the life of renunciation, but others are there in order to avoid the displeasure of lay people. Monks, for example, should not go on a journey together with nuns. This ban was laid down due to an occasion when monks of the 'group of six' went on a trip with some nuns.³⁸ People who saw them criticized them saying, "These ascetics, sons of the Sākyans, travel with nuns just like we go with our wives." When the Master was informed of their criticism, he told the monks to avoid such journeys with nuns. But he did not hesitate to modify the ban for monks when nuns were in need of protection on isolated highways or byways. After this modification, the rule was presented as follows in the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha*:

"If a monk, having made an appointment with a nun, travels with her, even between two villages, except at the right time, he is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category. In this case, "the right time" means that the route is considered so dangerous and frightening that one should travel it only with a trading caravan."³⁹

It was also forbidden for a monk to travel in a boat with a nun if they had made a prior appointment to do so.⁴⁰ This ban was imposed because lay people criticized the monks of the "group of six" for going in a boat with some nuns to amuse themselves. But

37. Later on, Moliya-Phagguṇa left the Community of Monks (S II 50).

38. Vin IV 62.

39. See *Pācittiya* no. 27 in the *Pātimokkha* of monks. A monk can go with a nun along a road or street on condition that they had not made a rendezvous to do so.

40. Vin IV 64.

after an incident occurred in which nuns needed help, this ban was modified to state that they could cross (but not travel along) a river in the same boat with monks.⁴¹ However, monks and nuns could travel together on a river, or even cross the ocean, as long as they had not made a rendezvous to do so.⁴²

The nuns' *Pātimokkha* stipulates that nuns should not enter the residence of monks without first obtaining permission, but they could do so if monks were not present.⁴³ *Pācittiya* no. 94 states that a nun should not sit down in front of a monk without first obtaining permission.⁴⁴ And *Pācittiya* no. 95 forbids nuns to question a monk unless they obtain permission from him to do so.⁴⁵ *Pācittiya* no. 6 says it was neither an obligation nor permissible for a nun to serve a monk when he was having his meal.⁴⁶ The *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha* forbids the monks to eat a meal prepared by a nun unless an arrangement had been made by lay people.⁴⁷ *Pāṭidesanīya* no. 2 in the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha* forbids the monks to allow a nun to organize their meal if they were already partaking of a meal at the invitation of a family. If a nun is standing by when a meal is being served to monks and begins to give orders such as, 'Give some rice to this monk; give curry to that monk,' etc., then a monk should say to the nun, "Keep yourself aside, sister, while the monks eat." If none of the monks speaks to the nun in this manner, all the monks present are guilty of a fault of *Pāṭidesanīya* category.⁴⁸ *Pācittiya* no. 30 of the monks *Pātimokkha* makes it a fault for monks to be seated along with a nun in an enclosed place.⁴⁹

The code of discipline allows some personal ties between monks and nuns on condition that they are relatives. But in no

41. Vin IV 66.

42. Cf. the *Pācittiya* no. 28 (in the monks' *Pātimokkha*).

43. Vin IV 306–308 (the *Pācittiya* no. 51 in the nuns' *Pātimokkha*).

44. Vin IV 343–44.

45. Vin IV 344.

46. Vin IV 263–64.

47. Vin IV 66–68.

48. Vin IV 177–78.

49. Vin IV 68–69.

case was a former spouse considered to be a relation.

The *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* rule no. 4 in the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha* allows a monk to have a nun wash his robe if she is a relation. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 5 says a monk can accept something appropriate from a nun who is a relation.⁵⁰ If a monk accepted anything offered by a nun to whom he was not related, he had to give her even some small thing in exchange.⁵¹ *Pācittiya* no. 25 says a monk can offer a nun something (such as cloth for a monastic robe) if she is related to him.⁵² *Pācittiya* no. 26 even allows a monk to sew a monastic robe or to have it sewn for a nun if she is a relation of his.⁵³ While in a village or town (on the alms round), a monk could accept food directly from the hand of a nun on condition that she is related to him.⁵⁴

The permissions given in these rules must be understood in the social context of that time. The *Vinaya* defines relatives as those who are related either on the father's or on the mother's side.⁵⁵ Such a relationship was not considered to pose any threat to the purity of religious life. Lay people were not likely to criticize the contacts mentioned above as long as the monks and nuns were of the same family. In a civilized society, between family members there would no question of unsuitable relationship; there would rather be profound respect for one another and actions done in good faith to further each others' spiritual progress. The texts say that during the time of the Buddha, several members of the same family were often among the Community of Monks and the Community of Nuns. Some of the Sākyan nuns probably had several brothers and cousins who were monks. In the nuns' Community, there were several mothers whose sons were monks: for example, the monk Kumāra-Kassapa and his mother,⁵⁶ the monk Vaḍḍha and his mother,⁵⁷ the monk Abhaya and his

50. Vin III 205–06.

51. Vin III 207–10.

52. Vin IV 59–60.

53. Vin IV 60–62.

54. Vin IV 176.

55. Vin III 206.

56. Dh-p-a III 147; Jātaka I 148.

57. Th 335–39; Th-a I, 413; Thī 204–12; Thī-a 171.

mother,⁵⁸ and the monk Rāhula and his mother.⁵⁹ All the brothers and sisters of Āyasmanta Sāriputta became monks and nuns. Contact among them with regard to the necessities of the religious life was not a fault or a vice. So no purpose was served in forbidding such innocent contacts between members of the same family. The canonical texts and commentaries show, however, that the monks and nuns did not often profit from the various contacts permitted between relatives.

Any attachment between monks and nuns was strongly discouraged as any form of affection was an obstacle to the path of liberation. There are many stories in Buddhist literature that show how a monk and a nun should act even when their relationship is close: One day, for example, the young monk Kumāra-Kassapa was in a street in Rājagaha. His mother, who had become the nun Kumāra-Kassapa-Mātā Therī, saw her son there on that day for the first time for many years. She walked behind him, hoping he would speak to her. The text says that her love for her son was so strong that her blouse was soaked with milk. Āyasmanta Kumāra-Kassapa was thoroughly aware of his mother's love, but he also knew that this attachment called maternal love was a great obstacle to his mother's progress on the path of liberation. Wanting to discourage her, he deliberately spoke to her in a disparaging way. The nun was at first very sad to hear her son speak to her in an 'impolite' manner. Then she tried to overcome her feelings; she made more effort in developing her mind and, as a result, in a short time she attained the stage of Arahant.⁶⁰ The case was different for the nun Vaḍḍha Mātā and her son. Vaḍḍha Mātā soon attained the stage of Arahant after becoming a nun. She explained to her son, who had become a monk, how to make effort in order to attain the highest levels of

58. Thī 33–34; Thī-a 32–33.

59. The commentaries recount the following story: One day, Rāhula-Mātā Therī had a stomach trouble. Āyasmanta Rāhula knew that while his mother was still a lay woman, she had been cured by taking mango juice when such a trouble arose. Rāhula explained her case to his preceptor, Āyasmanta Sāriputta. He, in turn, dropped a hint to King Pasenadi of Kosalans and the king had mango juice sent to the nuns' monastery on a regular basis. *Jātaka*. II 392–95, 433.

60. D-a I 172; Dh-p-a III 147; *Jātaka* I 148.

liberation. By following his mother's advice, the young monk Vaḍḍha lost no time in practising mental development.⁶¹

Bouddhologie
www.bouddhologie.org

61. Thī 204–212; Thī-a 171–174; however, the *Āṅguttara-nikāya* reports a case of incest between a nun and her son, who was himself a monk (A III 67–68). The text says that such a deplorable incident took place because of frequent meetings of those two persons. Rare episodes of this type were to be taken as severe warnings against too much contact even among close relatives who were in both Communities.

CHAPTER 5

OBEDIENCE

First of all, it must be noted that obedience is not considered a virtue in itself in Buddhist monasticism. Unconditional devotion or complete surrender to a religious hierarchy are concepts quite strange to early Buddhism. From the point of view of the doctrine, giving up one's own will was not a matter of obedience but rather of knowledge and comprehension. This is why the Noble Eightfold Path (*ariya-aṭṭhaṅgika-magga*) does not begin with obedience or devotion but with right view (*sammā-ditṭhi*)¹ which leads to right emancipation (*sammā-vimutti*) through right insight (*sammā-paññā*).²

Even though in the Buddhist monastery, obedience did not have a doctrinal value, it was considered as an institutional necessity. First of all, there is the postulant's obedience to her preceptor; next, there is the obedience of both the postulant and preceptor to the code of discipline, the *Pātimokkha*.

In Chapter 3, we discussed the relationship between the postulant (*sikkhamānā*) and her preceptor-nun (*upajjhā*). Each postulant, in order to obtain Higher Ordination, presented herself before the Community as the student of a particular nun. We see, then, that right from the beginning, a woman who wanted to lead a monastic life had to submit to a competent nun with regard to her own training.

As we said earlier, the postulant was free to return to her parents from time to time, but not all the candidates would have done so. Some postulants, young girls especially, lived with their preceptor-nuns most of time. In the *Vinaya*, these postulants are said to be *sahajīvanī* (one who lives with a preceptor).³ This term is synonymous with *saddhivihārīnī*⁴ which means literally, "one who

-
1. Vin I 110–12; S V 420–24.
 2. M III 71–78; cf. S V 384; A V 244–48.
 3. Vin IV 291, 325–26.

shares the same cell.” In fact, they did not live in the same dwelling. The reason was this. According to the *Pācittiya* rule no. 101, a nun could not lie down in the same lodging for more than two or three consecutive nights with a woman who has not obtained the Higher Ordination.⁵ So we can think that the postulants lived in another building at the same residence complex where their preceptors lived.

The relationship between the female postulant (*sikkhamānā*) and her preceptor (*upajjhā*) was more or less the same as that between a male novice (*sāmaṇera*) and his preceptor (*upajjhāya*).⁶ The most important aspects of their relationship were the respect and obedience the postulant owed her preceptor-nun and the good will and attention the preceptor-nun owed her charge.⁷

In general, disciplinary problems concerning postulants did not require a formal meeting of the Community. A preceptor-nun was able to resolve such problems according to the circumstances. But the Community was directly consulted before a postulant presented herself as a candidate for the Higher Ordination. Its prior approval was necessary for her to present herself as a candidate to the Higher Ordination. Moreover, any member of the Community could oppose her candidature, provided that the objection was reasonable and well founded. If the objection proved to be just, the Community could refuse to grant Higher Ordination to the candidate in question. The Community could also expel postulants who were judged unworthy.

The most important task of the preceptor-nun was to prepare the postulant to become a fully ordained nun. As we have already

4. *Saddhivihārinī* (masculine *saddhivihārika*). See BML, p.138.

5. In this prohibition, there is permission to share the same dwelling on at least two or three consecutive nights (e.g. the rule *pācittiya* no. 148). While travelling, a nun and her postulant could share the same room when they obtained the hospitality of a lay household.

6. See BML, pp.118–19, 137–40.

7. Several rules in the *Pātimokkha* specify the duties of a preceptor with regard to the student living with her. According to *Pācittiya* no. 34, if the preceptor does not care for, or does not try to care for, a postulant living with her who is ill, the nun is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category. This rule was established when the nun Thulla-Nandā did not care for, or even try to care for, a student of hers who was ill (Vin IV 291).

noted, this required at least two years of training. The postulant presented herself for Higher Ordination in the name of her preceptor-nun. Moreover, the relationship between the preceptor and the postulant did not end after the postulant's Higher Ordination. *Pācittiya* no. 68 emphasizes this very important point: after the postulant's higher ordination, her preceptor-nun was to instruct her for another two years. The rule says: "If a nun, after having had Higher Ordination conferred on a postulant who lives with her, does not help her [with the Teachings], or if she does not arrange for someone else to help her [with the Teachings], she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category."⁸

The rule *Pācittiya* no. 69 states that a nun who has just received the Higher Ordination must stay with her preceptor-nun for two more years.⁹ This period of two years can be seen as the minimum time required to study the Doctrine and Discipline. Before this rule was established, of course, there were some newly ordained nuns who left their preceptors soon after their ordination, and as a result did not know what was permitted and what was not permitted in the code of discipline.

Although the rule states that after the required two year period the nun could leave her preceptor-nun's residence and go live to with other nuns, this does not mean that the relationship between the preceptor nun and her student had ended. For the rest of her life, the nun would be considered the student of the same preceptor-nun and the preceptor-nun would be known as the nun's teacher (*upajjhā*). It was thus a permanent link. Young Candā, for example, entered the religious life under the guidance of the famous nun Paṭācārā,¹⁰ and Candā Therī always regarded Paṭācārā Therī with great respect as her preceptor-nun, even after attaining Arahantship.

Some nuns had difficulties with their charges. A young nun who was one of the Bhaddā-Kāpilānī Therī's students ran away after quarrelling with her fellow students and people had to be sent out to find her. She was finally found in a village at her parents' house.¹¹ The nun Caṇḍakālī, who was Thulla Nandā's

8. Vin IV 324–25.

9. Vin IV 325–26.

10. Cf. *supra* p.23.

11. Vin IV 227, 268–69.

student, was mean, violent and loved to quarrel.¹² She also associated too much with heads of families and their sons.¹³ Later, when Caṇḍakālī wanted to become the preceptor-nun of several candidates, the Community did not give its consent.¹⁴ Several of Thulla Nandā's students did not respect the discipline of the Community and were expelled.¹⁵

The preceptor-nun's duty was not only to advise her postulants about proper conduct but also to guide their spiritual progress. If she was not able to do that herself, she was to send her postulants to a nun more competent at guiding people on the path. The canonical texts say that many students of Paṭācārā Therī attained Arahantship under her guidance.¹⁶ Several of the first nuns, such as Dhammadinnā Therī¹⁷ and Jinadattā Therī¹⁸ were later to become famous teachers, and they taught their students to reach the highest level of liberation. Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī Therī had a number of students.¹⁹

For the Community, both the preceptor-nun and her student were disciples of the Buddha, and the Doctrine and Discipline established by the Buddha were the same for both. Both the preceptor-nun and her student were members of the Community and had to obey the same disciplinary code.

12. Vin IV 230–31, 237, 309–10.

13. Vin IV 293–95.

14. Vin IV 331.

15. Vin IV 239.

16. Among the students of Paṭācārā Therī, there were Uttamā Therī (Thī-a 47), Uttarā Therī (Thī-a 161) and many other nuns mentioned in *Therīgāthā* (vv. 127–32). Paṭācārā Therī is mentioned in the Canon (A I 26) as foremost among the nuns who were specialists in the code of discipline, so we can deduce that many young nuns must have studied the *Vinaya* under her.

17. Thī-a 59.

18. Thī-a 261.

19. Among the students of Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotamī Therī were the following nuns: Muttā Therī (Thī-a 8), Puṇṇā Therī (Thī-a 9–12), Cittā Therī (Thī-a 33), Mettikā Therī (Thī-a 38), Dantikā Therī (Thī-a 51–53), Bhaddā Kāpilāni Therī (Thī-a 68–69), Guttā Therī (Thī-a 157), Subhā Therī (Thī-a 237) and Subhā Jivakambavaṇikā Therī (Thī-a 246).

The Disciplinary Rules

The postulant had only six precepts to follow. As we have noted above, those precepts were not commandments but rather training principles (*sikkhāpada*) that the postulant freely accepted to observe. She had to keep these precepts for two years before obtaining Higher Ordination. After obtaining Higher Ordination, she became a full member of the Community of Nuns and had to follow the code of discipline set out in the *Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha*.

Each disciplinary rule in the *Pātimokkha* is named after the type of fault committed when it is transgressed. The most serious faults are covered by the eight *Pārājikās* rules (faults entailing defeat). These faults were to be avoided at all costs because a nun who was found guilty of a fault of this category could not be rehabilitated. She was considered to have excluded herself forever from the Community. The eight faults falling into this category are as follows:

1. Sexual intercourse.²⁰
2. Theft.
3. Murder, including helping or even verbally encouraging someone to commit suicide or to have an abortion.
4. Boasting of unfactual superhuman perfections.²¹
5. Consenting to being caressed, etc., by a man who is also filled with desire.²²
6. Not denouncing a nun who has committed a fault of *Pārājikā* category, while knowing fully that she has done so.
7. Maintaining contact with a monk who has been formally sent away by unanimous decision of the Community of Monks.

20. We will come back to this subject in Chapter 7.

21. If a nun bragged that she possessed superhuman achievements that she did not actually have, but sincerely believed herself to possess, she was not guilty of a *Pārājikā* offence (Vin I 92). On the other hand, if a nun (or a monk) spoke to anyone who had not received higher ordination about superhuman attainments that they had achieved, that was a fault of *Pācittiya* category (*Pācittiya* no. 104 for nuns and no. 8 for monks).

22. We will discuss this subject in Chapter 7.

8. Consenting to physical contact with a man who is also filled with desire, or going to a rendezvous with such a man.

Next come the seventeen *Saṅghādisesa* faults that must be judged by a formal meeting of the community. These were also considered serious faults. Transgressing them did not lead to permanent expulsion, but to suspension, a probation period after which rehabilitation was possible. There were two sorts of *Saṅghādisesa* faults: the nine rules where the fault occurs when the rule is transgressed (*paṭhamāpattika*); and rules ten through seventeen, where the fault occurs only if the nun does not give up her wrong doing (or wrong idea) after being admonished three times (*yāvataṭṭiyaka*) by other nuns.

The third category of rules in the *Pātimokkha* includes thirty *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* rules. These rules require confession and a forfeiture of what has been improperly obtained. The rules specify objects that a nun should not accept and how a nun should dispose of something she should not have accepted.

The fourth category consists of the one hundred and sixty-six *Pācittiya* rules, which concern faults requiring confession (in front of some other nun, or a group of nuns). These are less serious faults, for which the guilty nun was required to confess her wrong-doing and undertake not to repeat the fault.

The fifth group of rules contains eight *Pāṭidesanīya* rules, and these concern faults requiring a public declaration in front of the assembled Community. These rules cover the consumption of improperly obtained food. For example, if a nun has ordered and eaten special food unless she was ill, she is guilty of a fault of *Pāṭidesanīya* category. She must declare her fault before the assembled Community, saying, "O noble ladies, I have fallen into a fault that is worthy of blame, that is not beneficial, and that should be confessed; therefore, I confess it."

The sixth section of the *Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha* includes the seventy-five *Sekhiyā-dhammā* (lit. precepts of good behaviour). These are the same rules as those for monks. The first twenty-six of these rules govern how a nun should appear in public: she should be correctly dressed in her robes; she should go about a village or along a street without laughing loudly, without swinging her body, head or hands. Rules 27–30 describe the dignified manner in which

a nun was to accept food in her begging-bowl when going on her daily alms round. Rules 31–56 describe how the nun should eat: without making any noise, without licking her hands, without filling her mouth full of rice, without licking her lips, without whistling. Rules 57–72 indicate how a nun should preach the Doctrine, to whom she could preach it, and when she could not. The last three rules (73–75) explain how a nun must conduct herself properly when urinating, defecating and spitting. These seventy-five rules, then, were meant to train the nuns to act properly and to show good example in society.

The last section of the code of discipline consists of seven rules to be used in settling legal issues by resolving conflicts arising from various circumstances.

The following table gives an overview of the code of discipline for monks and nuns:

Category of Rules	Number of rules	
	for the nuns	for the monks
1. <i>Pārājikā</i> : faults entailing defeat	8	4
2. <i>Saṅghādisesā</i> : faults that must be judged by a formal meeting of the Community	17	13
3. <i>Aniyatā</i> : faults of undetermined classification (to determine such a fault the Community must call a very pious woman as a witness)		2
4. <i>Nissaggiyā-Pācittiyā</i> : faults requiring confession and forfeiture of what has been improperly obtained	30	30
5. <i>Pācittiyā</i> : faults requiring confession	166	92
6. <i>Pāṭidesanīyā</i> : faults requiring a public declaration	8	4

7. <i>Sekhiyā-dhammā</i> : precepts of training	75	75
8 <i>Adhikaraṇa-samathā</i> : procedural rules for resolving conflicts	7	7
Total number of rules	311	227

Some differences between the *Pātimokkha* of monks and that of nuns are clear from this chart. The first point to be made is that the two undetermined faults (*aniyatā*) do not appear in the nuns' code.²³ The second noticeable difference is in the total number of rules in the two codes of discipline. Why such a difference? The additional rules for nuns came about because most of the rules already established for monks applied to nuns as well. For example, of the 166 *Pācittiya* rules for nuns, only 96 were specifically formulated for them. The other 70 rules were already established for monks and integrated into the nuns' *Pātimokkha*. In this connection, it must be noted here what the Buddha told Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī in answer to a question she put to him: "O Gotamī, with regard to the rules of discipline that have been established for bhikkhunis and that are the same as rules for bhikkhus, you must respect those rules as bhikkhus respect them. As for the rules of discipline established only for bhikkhunis, which are not the same as those for bhikkhus, you must respect them just as they were laid down."²⁴

How could it be known whether such and such a nun had transgressed or had not transgressed the rules established? In the Buddhist monastic system, there were no supervisors. It was each nun's (and each monk's) duty to make sure she (or he) acted according to the rules of the *Pātimokkha*. At the same time, every nun had the right to accuse others when they transgressed a major rule, provided that her accusation was true, was supported with real facts, and that it was motivated by good will. Concealing one another's faults was considered complicity. But, according to

23. Both rules called *aniyata* were applicable only to monks; in order to judge the offence involved, the Community was to call a pious lay woman as witness. See BML, pp.141–42.

24. Vin II 258.

Buddhist jurisprudence, the culprit nun herself should be her own accuser. In other words, a nun who had committed an offence had to acknowledge her misconduct. Not declaring one's own fault amounted to an intentional lie, which was another offence. This means that the life of the Community was based on being truthful and honest to others and to oneself. There was no place for hypocrisy or for privacy. If the offending member was sincere, the accusation would come from her. This is related to the "declaration of purity" that each nun had to make immediately before recitation of the *Pātimokkha*, at the Community's formal gathering called the 'act of *Uposatha*' (*Uposatha-kamma*).

Let us try to understand what this 'act of *Uposatha*' was. According to the Eight Great Conditions initially imposed on the nuns at the beginning of their Community, they were to gather twice a month. These meetings were to coincide with the days of the full moon and new moon, and the main purpose was the recitation of the *Pātimokkha*.²⁵ At the act of *Uposatha*, a competent nun recited the *Pātimokkha* while the others listened. This was an opportunity for them to reflect on all the rules in their code of discipline and to examine themselves to see if they had committed any offences that needed to be confessed. The act of *Uposatha* also had another important purpose: the recitation ensured that the nuns would not forget the rules or the category to which each rule belonged. Each nun was required to know well and remember the rules of the *Vinaya*. *Pācittiya* no. 151 specifies that ignorance of a given rule is no excuse for the person who breaks it.

The procedure of the act of *Uposatha* was as follows. When all the nuns were gathered together and seated,²⁶ a competent nun appointed for the task speaks:

"May the Community hear me! O noble ladies, this is the *Uposatha* day, the fifteenth day of the first fortnight.²⁷ If the

25. There was also the possibility of holding this meeting on some other day when required. For example, the act of *Uposatha* was held in order to reconcile members of the Community who had been in conflict with one another or who had had a verbal dispute. In this situation, it was called 'the act of *Uposatha* of concord' (*sāmaggi-uposatha*), and was a sort of emergency meeting to recite the *Pātimokkha* to mark the agreement. Such a *sāmaggi-uposatha* could be held at any time when needed.

Community is ready, let the Community do the act of *Uposatha*; let the Community recite the *Pātimokkha*. What must the Community do first? It must declare its purity. I am going to recite the *Pātimokkha*. All of us who are here should listen and pay close attention.

“If anyone has committed a fault, let her declare it. Anyone who has not committed a fault should remain silent. By your silence, O noble ladies, I conclude [in the name of the Community] that you are pure. Just as an individual person asked a question three times should answer, so too should it be in an assembly like this when the question is asked three times. If any nun is guilty of a fault, remembers it, and does not confess it when the question is repeated three times, that nun is guilty of an intentional lie. [You know] O noble ladies, that the Blessed One has said that intentional lying is a hindrance to religious life. This is why a nun who has committed a fault, who remembers it, and who wishes to be pure herself should declare her fault. When she has declared her fault, it will be a comfort for her.”

If everyone remains silent, it means that all the nuns are ‘pure’ with regard to the offences. Next, the competent nun recites the code of discipline (*Pātimokkha*). At the end of each group of rules (*Pārājikā*, *Saṅghādisesā*, etc.) the nun who is reciting the *Pātimokkha* asks:

“O noble ladies, I have just recited the [such and such] group of offences. I ask you [on behalf of the Community], are you pure with regard to those offences?”

The question is asked three times. If the assembly remains silent, that signifies that all the nuns are ‘pure’ with regard to that group of offences. Then the reciting nun declares:

26. Before the nuns sat down, a number of preliminary functions were first dealt with: for example, bringing the “declaration of purity” and the votes of nuns unable to attend the meeting; announcing the date; and counting the members present. Cf. *infra* p.197.

27. *Ajjuposatho paṇṇaraso*. The wording would vary according to whether it was a full moon or new moon day. For the ‘act of *Uposatha* of concord’, the wording would be *ajjuposatho sāmaggī* (“today is the day of the act of *Uposatha* of concord”).

“O noble ladies, I conclude [on behalf of the community] that you are pure with regard to these offences. That is why you are silent. Thus do I understand it.”

In this way, the nun recites the whole *Pātimokkha* in the gathering of the Community.²⁸ These procedures show that the ‘act of *Uposatha*’ was not just a simple reading or recitation of the code of discipline, nor was it any empty monastic rite. It was rather a deep examination of conscience—a self-inspection held twice a month.

Faced with this self-examination, a nun who had committed a fault had two choices: she could either avoid taking part in the act of *Uposatha*, or she could go to the meeting and declare her fault. But it was an offence in itself not to attend the act of *Uposatha* unless a nun was ill or suspended. Even nuns who were ill had to send their “declaration of purity” through another nun, who would proclaim it on her behalf before the meeting of the Community. It was also possible for a sick nun to be carried to the meeting if she wished. If the nun was too sick to be moved, the Community could meet at her bedside. Unlike some other religions, Buddhism included no notion of women being impure during the period of menstruation. So nuns, even when they were ill, were free to participate in the formal meetings of the Community.

Sanctions and Penalties

Because each rule was grouped according to its category in the code of discipline, it was very easy to determine the degree of gravity of each fault. With regard to determining the guilt of a nun, we can trace five important principles in the *Vinaya*. First of all, according to the definition of each rule of the *Pātimokkha*, “there is no offence if the wrong-doer was insane at the time the action was committed.” Secondly, in each case, the first person (*ādīkammikā*) who acted in such a way and thus created the need for such a rule to be set down was not considered guilty of breaking the rule. In other words, none of the rules in the code of discipline was retroactive. Thirdly, in many cases—especially when it was a

28. In exceptional cases, the nuns had the right to recite the *Pātimokkha* in an abbreviated version.

question of food—the nun was not bound by the rule if she was ill. For example, she could eat during the afternoon if her doctor asked her to. If a nun was ill, asking for a special food was not a fault according to *Pāṭidesanīya-āpatti*.²⁹ Fourthly, as we have noted earlier, ignorance of the rule was no excuse.³⁰ Fifthly, repentance was not part of the discipline in Buddhist monasticism. Regret and remorse were considered an obstacle on the path of mental development. The way to avoid regret was to not commit any fault in the first place. If a rule was broken, it had to be publicly acknowledged and the offender had to resolve not to repeat the offence.³¹ As the *Pātimokkha* clearly indicates, the purpose of publicly acknowledging one's fault is to obtain tranquillity of mind.

As for rulings and sanctions, the sole authority was the Community acting during a duly assembled meeting. A nun guilty of an offence could not contest a decision handed down by a unanimous assembly of the Community. On the other hand, the Community could not condemn anyone in her absence. Moreover, each decision had to conform to both the Discipline (*vinaya*) and the Doctrine (*dhamma*). Thus, there was no corporal punishment in Buddhist monasticism, and it was explicitly forbidden to deprive anyone of food under the guise of a punishment.

The Categories of Rules

As we have said earlier, the most serious offences for a nun who had received Higher Ordination were those in the *Pārājikā* category. In the Pāli tradition, they were called *pārājikā dhammā*, because these faults were considered as “cases of defeat.” By transgressing these rules, a nun (or a monk) becomes somebody who is defeated.³² “Defeated” here is used as a metaphor describing the unfortunate situation of the guilty person. The

29. Cf. *supra* p.70.

30. It was the preceptor's duty to teach her students the code of discipline and the way to recite it for a period of two years (cf. *Pācittiya* no. 68). See *supra* p.66.

31. Once the Buddha said to Āyasmanta Ānanda: “The aim and the advantage of good actions and the precepts, Ānanda, is the absence of regrets”—A V 1.

32. *Pārājiko ti parājito, parājayamāpanno* [...] Kkh 21.

expression “this person has fallen into an offence entailing defeat” means the person has not been able to resist temptation and had been defeated by the defilement (*kilesa*). From the institutional point of view of the Community, she [or he] is defeated once and for all. *Ipsa facto*, such a person becomes unworthy of belonging to the Community.

We can define the *Pārājikā* as the rules concerning faults entailing a definitive expulsion from the Community. However, there was no real condemnation, punishment or banishment for these faults on the part of the Community because the very act of committing a *Pārājikā* offence automatically meant that the offending nun had excluded herself from the Community.³³ How could the Community punish or discipline someone who was no longer a member? It is true that a nun could accuse another nun of having transgressed a *Pārājikā* rule. But in this case, the Community was faced with two difficulties: (1) most of the offences in this category involved actions done in private; in other words, the *Pārājikā* rules concern actions that could be done in secret and passed over in silence, in which case the Community could not take action; and (2) even if someone else testified against a guilty nun, the Community could not take any action until the nun in question acknowledged what she had done. For example, a nun who had stolen something (cf. *Pārājikā* no. 2) and who had not said a word about it, could not be judged by the Community. But if she confessed that she had stolen something, there was still no reason to judge her because she was *ipsa facto* no longer a member of the Community. So, whether the Community formally pronounces a judgement or not, the nun in question is not a member of the Community, by the very terms laid out in the rule itself.³⁴

A nun who was aware that she had committed an offence of the *Pārājikā* category knew that she no longer had the right to consider herself a member of the Community, so continuing to present herself as a nun was an act of usurpation. It was not the Community’s place to intervene by judging her, but it was the conscience of the guilty nun that should spur her to leave the Community at once. However, if she had any doubt about

33. See BML, p.94.

34. Ibid. pp.143–45.

whether she was guilty of one of these serious offences, she could always request the Community to judge her case according to the facts and information that she and others gave.

A nun who was certain that another nun had committed a *Pārājikā* offence had the duty to denounce her. *Pārājikā* no. 6 of the nuns' *Pātimokkha* says:

“Any nun who, knowing that a fellow nun has fallen into a fault involving defeat, neither herself reproves her, nor speaks to the group,³⁵ but when the [guilty] nun remains, or is expelled or gone away [to join another religious group], or is deceased, and afterwards the [first] nun says, “Noble ladies, I knew before that this sister had committed such-and-such a fault, but I did not denounce her, I did not speak to the group,” then she also is one who is defeated; she cannot any longer live with the nuns.”³⁶

If there was a scandal, virtuous nuns might not take part in any meeting attended by the guilty nun. In that case, the Community could try to investigate. For example, it could try to find out whether the nun in question was out of her mind when the offence was committed, or whether she was insane at the moment the investigation was being carried out. If the investigation revealed that the nun was not insane in either case, and that she was guilty, there were two courses of action that could be taken if she still remained in the Community: (1) the nun could be advised to leave the Community straight away, or (2) the Community could refuse to allow her to take part in formal meetings. Neither of these actions, however, would be efficacious if the nun herself had not acknowledged that she was guilty, because such a nun who did not accept the authority of the established rules could go to a far away region or another country, pass herself off as a nun in good standing, and participate in the formal meetings of the local Community there. This is why the handing down of judgements is usually avoided in the *Pārājikā* rules. Whether a nun had been judged or not, whether the judgement was favourable to her or not, whether she had been

35. Group of nuns to which the accusing nun belongs.

36. Vin IV 216–17. Words in brackets are from the canonical glossary (*Padabhājanī*) of the *Vinaya*.

accused or not, if a nun was guilty of one of those eight offences, she was supposed to leave voluntarily both her local group and the Community as a whole. In other words, from the moment that she transgressed a *Pārājikā* rule, she should not take part in a formal meeting of the Community, whether it might be held in the country of the Kosalans, the country of the Magadans, the country of the Vajjins, or anywhere else.

The eight *Pārājikā* rules were to be kept very strictly, but this did not mean that the nuns had to make solemn vows; they made no perpetual promises or oaths. At the time of Higher Ordination, the Community simply instructed the new member concerning the *Pārājikā* offences and the consequences if she transgressed any of these rules. If she found she could not avoid breaking a rule involving defeat, she could either leave the Community and return to lay life before committing the fault, or she could return to lay life immediately after committing the fault. She was not obliged to declare her weakness or her guilt in public in either case.

For all the other rules, judgements were handed down, and punishments, suspensions, and also rehabilitations were determined.

The *Saṅghādisesa* rules had to be judged and acted upon by three separate meetings of the Community: (1) a meeting to investigate and to give a judgement; (2) a meeting at the beginning of the period of punishment; and (3) a meeting to rehabilitate the nun at the end of the period of punishment. That is why, according to Pali tradition, these rules were called *saṅghādisesa* (*saṅgha + ādi + sesā*).³⁷ For this category of rules, there was a distinct difference in the sanctions taken against offending monks and those against offending nuns. A monk guilty of a *Saṅghādisesa* offence had to undergo a probationary period called *parivāsa*.³⁸ After he had completed the probationary period, if he admitted that his conduct was still not satisfactory, he had to request another period of 'probation' called *mānatta*,³⁹ lasting six days. But, for nuns there was no probation period (*parivāsa*). A nun who

37. *Na h'ettha ekaṃ pi kammaṃ vinā saṅghena sakkā kātuṃ iti saṅgho ādimhi c'eva sese ca icchitabbo assā'ti saṅghādisesā* (Now, with regard to this, no formal act can be held without the Community. At the beginning, and later on, [meetings of] the Community are to be desired. That is why these faults are called *Saṅghādisesa*)—Kkh 35; Vin-a II 522.

was guilty of breaking one of the *Saṅghādisesa* rules underwent a fifteen-day period of *mānatta*. For a monk, the probationary period was prolonged for a number of days equal to the number of days he had spent without declaring his fault. But a guilty nun's period of *mānatta* was limited to only fifteen days. Thus we can see that for these rules the punishment for nuns was less stringent than that for monks.

However, the restrictions imposed on a nun during the period of *mānatta* were analogous to those for a monk undergoing a period of *parivāsa*. A nun spending a period of *mānatta* could not leave the monastery; she could not ordain a candidate; she could not participate in formal acts of the Community; she had to be content with taking the last bed, and the last seat in the dining hall; she must not hide the fact that she was spending a period of *mānatta*, but rather inform any visiting nun that she was doing so. During a period of *mānatta*, the nun's rights as a full member of the Community were suspended, but she was not entirely excluded from the Community as she was still subject to the rules and regulations in the *Vinaya*.

It is important to note that it was not the Community that imposed the period of *mānatta*; it was up to the guilty nun to come voluntarily before a formal meeting of the Community, to formally declare what she had done, and to request a period of

38. There were three types of probation for monks. (1) *Paṭicchanna-parivāsa*: when a monk transgressed a *Saṅghādisesa* rule but did not confess his fault, he had to undergo a period of probation equal to the number of days he had hidden the misconduct. (2) *Suddhanta-parivāsa*: when a monk had transgressed several of the *Saṅghādisesa* rules but did not remember the offence, nor the nature of the offence, he had to undergo a period of probation equal to the time elapsed between his higher ordination and the date the penalty was imposed. (3) *Samodhāna-parivāsa*: when a monk who was undergoing a period of probation, transgressed another *Saṅghādisesa* rule, he had to add on a second probation period equal to the time elapsed between the first and second offence.

39. *Mānatta*: fifteen days during which the punished nun must behave in a very respectful manner toward other nuns and toward the Community and should follow conscientiously all the obligations of this probationary period.

mānatta. This was done as follows: she goes to the meeting of the Community of Nuns, squats down in the *ukkuṭika* position and pays respect with her hands joined together, and says, "O noble ladies, I have committed an offence that I must expiate. I request the Community to give me a period of *mānatta* for half a month so that I may expiate my offence." The nun makes this request three times. Then, a competent elder nun says to the Community:

"Let the Community hear me! O noble ladies, the nun named N has committed an offence that she needs to expiate. She requests the Community to give her a period of *mānatta* for half a month so that she may expiate her offence. If the Community considers that to be acceptable, may the Community grant her a period of *mānatta* for half a month."

Again, the same nun proposes the following motion:

"Let the Community hear me! O noble ladies, the nun named N has committed an offence that she needs to expiate. She requests the Community to give her a period of *mānatta* for a half a month so that she may expiate her offence. The Community will grant a period of *mānatta* to the nun named N, who wants to expiate her offence. If the Community considers that it is acceptable to grant a period of *mānatta* to the nun named N, may the noble ladies remain silent. If anyone does not consider this acceptable, let her speak."

This motion is proposed three times by the nun presenting it. If all those present remain silent, the competent nun declares the Community's decision:

"Let the Community hear me. The Community grants a period of *mānatta* for the nun named N, who wishes to expiate her offence. This is acceptable to the Community. This is why the noble ladies remain silent. Thus do I understand it.

Then comes the second step of the procedure: the guilty nun together with a few other nuns, approaches a meeting of the Community of Monks [during their meeting] to inform them of the matter and to request the period of *mānatta* from them as well. This requirement is analogous to the second ordination required for nuns. Requesting the period of *mānatta* before both Communities was the fifth clause of the Eight Great Conditions.⁴⁰

Nuns benefited from a concession with regard to the period

of *mānatta* that the monks did not enjoy. During the period of *mānatta*, if a nun felt too isolated, too abandoned, she could request that another nun stay near her. The Community was to accept such a request.⁴¹ If it was necessary, a nun could interrupt her period of *mānttta* (for one night, for example), provided she informed a fellow nun.

A nun spending a *mānatta* period could obtain rehabilitation by making a formal request to the Community. The formal act of rehabilitation (*abbhāna-kamma*) required a meeting of the Community with a quorum of twenty nuns. The *Vinaya* specifies: "If the nun is rehabilitated by a meeting of less than twenty nuns, the rehabilitation is null and void. The nuns who participate in the meeting are blameworthy."⁴²

As for the *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* rules, they do not involve any punishment; objects improperly acquired are simply given up. They may be given up at a formal meeting of the Community, or before a group of nuns, or before an individual nun. For example, suppose that a nun who already had an outer cloak (*saṅghāṭi*) accepted another one from a lay disciple. Now this nun was guilty of a fault of an offence, because nuns were not allowed to keep or use two outer cloaks. The nun therefore had to formally give up the second outer cloak. If she wished to do this at a formal meeting of the Community, she had to respectfully present herself at the meeting and say, "O noble ladies, I have accepted an extra outer cloak. I give it up to the Community." After giving up the outer cloak, the nun had to confess her offence and have it acknowledged by an experienced competent nun. Then this competent nun would return the outer cloak to the guilty nun with these words addressed to the Community: "Let the Community hear me! O noble ladies, the outer cloak that was to be given up has been given up to the Community by the nun named N. If it seems right to the Community, let the Community return this outer cloak to the nun named N." In this way, finally, the outer cloak returns to the guilty nun.

The last phase of this procedure may seem strange. Why must the Community return the outer cloak to the guilty nun?

40. Cf. *supra* p.18.

41. Vin II 280.

42. Vin IV 242.

Has the nun the right to accept it if she is not allowed to accept or use two outer cloaks? The reason is simple. The Community returns the outer cloak to the nun because it cannot take possession of the outer cloak, since the Community is not its owner. Moreover, the cloak is something that had been given to the nun by a lay disciple, so in terms of civil law, she is its rightful owner. But after the procedure of giving up the outer cloak, when the Community returns it to the nun, she has the right and duty either to give the outer cloak to a nun who needs one or deposit it in the storeroom of the nunnery as communal property. So it is clear that this forfeiting of an object improperly acquired was a symbolic gesture that became a lesson to the erring nun. This kind of symbolic giving up is applied to all improper possessions except for a begging-bowl⁴³ and money.⁴⁴

The *Pācittiya* rules were less severe. They involved confessing one's fault and resolving to avoid repeating the offence. Confession could be made to the entire Community in a formal meeting, or to a group of [two or three] nuns, or to an individual nun. Confession generally took the form of a short dialogue such as the following, in which a nun of longer standing is confessing to a nun of shorter standing:

1st nun: Sister, I declare the *Pācittiya* faults to you.

2nd nun: Noble lady, recall your faults.

1st nun: Yes, sister, I recall my faults.

2nd nun: Noble lady, you must restrain yourself in the future.

43. There was a special regulation concerning begging-bowls. A nun could not acquire a new begging-bowl until the one she was using became worn out; that is to say, until it had five holes. The regulation was the same for monks and for nuns. (cf. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 24 for the nuns, nos. 21 & 22 for the monks). If a nun accepted a new begging-bowl before her old one was thoroughly worn out, she had to give it to the Community. It was then given to the first nun in order of seniority who gave her bowl to the next nun in seniority. Thus each nun passed on her bowl to the nun who was ordained next after her until the most recently ordained nun was reached. As a result, a guilty nun was taught a lesson in humility, since it was the bowl of the most junior nun which came down to her with the following words: "Here is your begging-bowl, keep it until it is no longer fit to be used."

44. For the rules concerning money, see *infra* p.110ff.

You must make an effort to be prudent in the future.

1st nun: Yes, sister, I shall restrain myself.

2nd nun: Very good, noble lady.

As usual, this dialogue was to be repeated three times. The same dialogue was used when a nun of shorter standing confessed to a nun of longer standing, except that the terms of address were different. A younger nun addressed an elder nun with the vocative “noble lady” (*ayye*), and the elder nun used “sister” (*bhagini*) when addressing a younger nun.

It is clear that the confession practised in Buddhist monasticism had three functions: (1) it served as an institutional regulation, since each nun had to be “pure” with regard to the rules of the institution before she could take part in a formal meeting of the Community; (2) it underlined how open each nun’s life had to be in a community that did not allow privacy; and (3) it served to give the nun a clear conscience, an important consideration, as a person with a guilty mind would not be able to progress in her mental development.

Finally, the nuns’ *Pātimokkha*, like the *Pātimokkha* of the monks, ended with the seven procedures to resolve judicial problems (*adhikaraṇa samathā*) that came before the Community and thereby restore appeasement. These are:

1. A verdict “in the presence of” (*sammukha-vinaya*): the way to judge a conflict by bringing together four parties: (i) the nun presumed to have committed an offence, (ii) the Community of Nuns, (iii) the Doctrine, and (iv) the Discipline.

2. A verdict of “being mindful” (*sati-vinaya*): the way to judge the case of a nun who had been fully conscious of her actions and who knew she did not commit an offence. For example, a nun who was an Arahant was incapable of consciously transgressing rules, including lying about what she had or had not done.

3. A verdict of “no longer being insane” (*amūlha-vinaya*): the way to judge the case of a nun who was formerly insane.

4. A verdict with the nun’s “acknowledgment” (*paṭiññā*): the way to judge a case based on the acknowledgment of the offending nun.

5. A verdict made by deciding “by the majority vote” (*yebhuyyasikhā*): the way to judge a case by taking into consideration the opinion of the majority of nuns.

6. A verdict made by judging the “obstinate offender” (*tassa-*

pāpiyyasikā): the way to judge the case of a nun who denies an offence, then acknowledges it, then denies it again, then avoids the question by asking other questions, or who tells conscious lies.

7. A verdict made by “covering over as with grass” (*tiṇavatthārakā*): the way to judge a case that might lead to new problems (debates, disputes, conflicts) as it is being considered. In such cases, the Community was not supposed to continue; all involved were to stop with the consent of both parties, and the case was closed, just as “rubbish is hidden by covering it with grass.”

The Community could decide cases at its meetings and hand out various punishments according to the circumstances involved. For example, a formal act of suspension (*ukkhepanīya kamma*) was passed against nuns in the following cases: when they did not confess their offences; when they did not expiate their offences; and when they did not renounce false views. The act of suspension meant that the nun kept herself apart, away from the others, and a number of things were forbidden to her.⁴⁵ The suspension was valid until such time as the nun renounced her wrong views and asked the Community to grant her pardon.

The *Vinaya*⁴⁶ reports that this punishment was given at one time to a student of Thulla Nandā, the nun Caṇḍakālī who stirred up a great deal of trouble in the Community. Thulla Nandā protested when she learned that her student was being punished. She assembled a quorum of nuns to vote a formal act that would rehabilitate Caṇḍakālī. Virtuous nuns criticized Thulla Nandā for her arrogant attitude, and this incident gave rise to the following rule:

“If a nun restores a nun who has been suspended by a complete Community without first obtaining permission from the Community that carried out the proceedings in accordance with the rule, in accordance with the Discipline, in accordance with the Master’s instruction, that nun is guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She is liable to be temporarily kept away.”⁴⁷

45. These were more or less the same things forbidden to monks undergoing a probation period after transgressing a *Saṅghādisesa* rule.

46. Vin IV 230–32.

The *Saṅghādisesa* no. 11 states that no nun can contest a judgement handed down by a unanimous meeting of the Community.

If a nun who has had a judgement handed down against her is angry and displeased and speaks thus, “the nuns are acting out of favouritism, out of hatred, out of fear, and out of delusion,” that nun should be admonished by other nuns as follows, “Noble lady, do not say the nuns are acting out of favouritism ... By using such criticism, it is you who are acting out of favouritism, hatred, fear and ignorance.” If the nun persists after being spoken to in this way, she should be admonished three times to change her mind. If she does so, that is good. If she does not, after the third admonishment, she becomes guilty of an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Community and one that involves being temporarily separated [from the Community].⁴⁸

Finally, it should be noted that a quorum was indispensable if a formal act of the Community (*saṅgha-kamma* or *vinaya-kamma*) was to be valid. A quorum for a Community meeting was normally four nuns. But that number was not sufficient for all the important formal acts of the Community. For example, a quorum of four nuns could endorse all formal acts except the following three: (1) the act of Higher Ordination (*upasampadā kamma*); (2) the formal act of the triple invitation that ends the rainy season retreat (*pavāraṇā kamma*); and (3) the formal act of rehabilitating a nun guilty of an offence (*abbhāna-kamma*). A quorum of five nuns could endorse all formal acts except the act of higher ordination and the formal act of rehabilitating a nun guilty of an offence. A quorum of ten nuns could carry out all formal acts except the act of rehabilitating.⁴⁹ There was no formal act that could not be carried out by a meeting of twenty nuns.

The nuns maintained their unanimity and the discipline while living in groups (*parisa, gaṇa*) that were far apart in different regions. The groups themselves did not have different identities.

47. *Saṅghādisesa* no. 4.

48. Vin IV 237–38.

49. Generally, the act of the higher ordination (*upasampadā kamma*) required a quorum of ten nuns, but according to a special amendment of the *Mahāvagga* of the *Vinaya* (Vin I 195), a quorum of five nuns is sufficient for such an act.

Buddhist Nuns

Each group followed the same rules which applied to all nuns alike. Their disputes and problems were resolved in each region by the local Community. When two or more local groups or local communities met together, they automatically became one united Community with one nun elected to preside on that occasion. The code of discipline makes no provision for nuns to appoint superiors in monasteries. In Buddhist monasticism, there was no post equivalent to that of an abbess.

These examples serve to show that Buddhist nuns belonged to an organization without an individual leader. All the nuns simply obeyed the code of discipline that was incumbent on all members of the Community. This Discipline (*vinaya*), of course, was never supposed to go beyond the limits suggested by the Doctrine (*dhamma*), which laid emphasis on compassion and non-violence as well as on wisdom and common sense.

CHAPTER 6

POVERTY

The first members of the Community of Nuns, as we noted above, were for the most part from well-to-do families of an urban background. Accepting an ascetic life, they naturally had to renounce their comfortable lifestyles. They did not bring their possessions with them to share with the other members of the Community; rather, they abandoned all their belongings to lead a life without home, family, or private property.¹ However, they took no vow of poverty. They gave up material goods not because poverty was considered a virtue but because wealth was considered to be an obstacle to inner progress. So poverty is not laid down as a religious virtue in Buddhist doctrine nor in its discipline. Its monasticism emphasises the modesty and simplicity and that are characteristic of being contented with little (*santuṭṭhitā-appicchā*).² In many passages in the *Vinaya*, virtuous nuns are identified with the famous expression: “nuns with few needs” (*appicchā bhikkhunī*).

Another important aspect of Buddhist monasticism is its approach to earning a living. Any work done for profit was strictly forbidden to monks and nuns. They were not to partake in any money-making work, directly or indirectly. They were not even allowed to weave or make the material used for their ascetic clothes.³

So how did the nuns live? How did they supply their needs? The organization of Buddhist monasticism is completely dependent on the generosity of lay people. Clothing, food, lodging and medicine—for all these, the nuns, like the monks,

1. However, about her personal property, see p.95.

2. D III 115; M I 13; S II 202, 208; A I 12, etc.

3. They could, however, sew their own monastic clothes and patch torn robes, and in order to do this they could own needles and thread. They had no right to wear torn robes.

depended on the men and women who were lay disciples of the Buddha.

We may ask how a life without work was justified in Buddhism, and why nuns and monks should enjoy what was given to them free of charge. First of all, it must be noted that in monastic Buddhism, all activity related to material production (e.g. investing in order to make a profit, etc.) was considered incompatible with a life of contemplation because such activity could result in worry and in personal or collective attachment to material possessions.⁴ This is why the right livelihood (*sammā ājīva*) for those who had renounced lay life was considered to be the accepting of freely offered food, clothing, etc. The *Dasadhamma-sutta* mentions several principles that a monk or nun should never forget. The first two principles are: (1) a person who has renounced home [i.e. a monk or a nun] must always keep in mind that his [or her] life has changed [with regard to his or her place in society]; and (2) a person who has renounced home must always keep in mind that his [or her] life depends on others.⁵ The advantages of living in this way are explained in another discourse.⁶

A person who has renounced lay life must always keep in mind that his [or her] life depends on others. Having such a mentality, he [or she] obtains seven benefits. 1. The moral rules are observed. 2. Inner progress is achieved. 3. No harm is done to anyone. 4. Pride is overcome. 5. The ascetic ideal is kept in mind. 6. Only that which is truly necessary to maintain life is sought. 7. Courage is maintained.

Thus, nuns and monks had to depend on lay people. The Buddhist lay community in turn—both men and women—were ready to support them by giving not only food, but also monastic

4. The canonical texts say that Buddha often reminded the monks and nuns of the danger of seeking material profits. In many of his discourses he reproached religious groups that had renounced lay life to make a living through incorrect means. (See, for example, *Brahmajāla-sutta* (D I 1–46); *Sāmaññaphala-sutta* (S I 47–86), *Tevijja-sutta* (D I 235–53), etc.)

5. *Vevanñiyamhi ajjūpagato'ti pabbajitena abhiñhaṃ paccavekkhitabbaṃ. Parapaṭibaddhā me jīvika'ti pabbajitena abhiñhaṃ paccavekkhitabbaṃ.*

6. A V 210.

clothes, lodging and medication. The nuns and monks could use these donations in good conscience, provided that they remained in good standing with their respective communities, and fulfilled their obligations under the code of discipline. The lay people, in fact, took into consideration the honesty of these nuns and monks when it came to making donations to them. If a nun accepted donations from lay people, but was not pure in her conduct, she was a fraud, taking advantage of the good faith of the lay people and passing herself off as a nun when she was not a true nun. There is also the idea that a monk or nun who has not yet attained the highest level of inner progress, Arahantship, goes into debt when accepting lay people's offerings. Only someone who is beyond all thoughts of self-interest, etc., is free of debts. However, a nun or a monk who respected the code of discipline is considered to be a worthy recipient, so it is the nuns' and monks' good conduct that gives them the right to consume food etc. given by lay people.

It is to be noted that the Buddhist lay community did not look on the nuns as poor beggars. They saw the nuns as worthy of gifts because their religious aim was so noble, and they lived such a pure life. So their feeling for the nuns was not one of pity but rather one of respect. To express it more clearly, lay people gave things to the nuns not out of compassion but out of respect.⁷ In this case, lay people were inspired by a very special mentality. For example, they thought that helping somebody to do a good thing was itself a good thing. In other words, if somebody is incapable of leading a contemplative life, his duty is to give material help to someone who is leading such a pure life. Thus, at the time of the Buddha, many people venerated and helped those who led virtuous lives. On the other hand, the founders of the *Vinaya* wanted to make lay people participate as much as they could in this new religious enterprise. As a result, the Buddhist lay community was given this heavy responsibility of defender, donor supporter and protector. According to the way in which the code of discipline was arranged, Buddhist monasticism could

7. From the point of view of Buddhist psychology, there are two types of gift: (1) gifts made out of pity to poor people who are begging (*yācaka*) or to those who are sick; and (2) gifts made out of respect to people who have renounced the worldly life.

never exist without the help of lay people.

This close relationship between lay people and monasticism in day-to-day life made it necessary to establish rules of conduct in order to avoid misunderstandings on both sides. As we have shown above, many of the disciplinary rules were established and modified by taking into account critical remarks made by lay people. The life of the nuns and monks had to be simple and modest so that they conformed to the ascetic ideal and would not become a burden on the Buddhist lay community.

Now let us look at how the nuns organized their lives with regard to food, clothing and shelter. First of all, we have to consider clothing (*cīvara*),⁸ as it is given first priority in Buddhist monasticism.

Monastic Clothing

Great importance is attached to the question of clothing in the nun's *Pātimokkha*. There are more rules of discipline concerning clothing than either food, lodgings or medication. For example, fifteen rules of the *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* and sixteen rules of the *Pācittiya* deal directly with nuns' monastic attire.

The *Vinaya* clearly depicts the background to the development of the rules concerning monks' robes (*cīvara*). At first they wore a robe made out of rags, called *paṃsukūla-cīvara* (lit. "robe made of rags from a dust heap"). Around twenty years later, the rules were relaxed, and from then on the monks could accept robes, or cloth to make robes from lay people.⁹ As the Community of Nuns was founded after the modification of the rules concerning robes, the nuns were never limited to wearing *paṃsukūla-cīvara*, although both monks and nuns were free to wear such robes if they wanted to. The *Therīgāthā* tells us that there were some nuns who wore robes made out of rags.¹⁰

Nuns' clothing comprised five articles: (1) an outer robe (*saṅghāṭi*), (2) an upper robe (*uttarāsaṅga*), (3) a lower robe (*anatarāvāsaka*), (4) a vest (*saṃkacchikā*), and (5) a bathing cloth (*udakasāṭikā*). With the exception of the vest, they were all

8. *Cīvara*: the word used for the monastic clothing of a monk or a nun.

9. Cf. *supra* p.p. 15 note 14.

10. *Thī* 1, 16, 349.

rectangular and made of a number of smaller pieces of cloth sewn together.¹¹ The outer robe was double thickness and served as a cloak. Whenever a nun went outside her monastery, she was to take her outer robe with her. The bathing cloth was worn when bathing. When travelling, nuns could wear it under their *antarāvāsaka* as an undergarment.¹²

The outer robe, upper robe and lower robe of the nuns were similar to those worn by monks. It would appear that in the beginning, these three pieces were obligatory for nuns, but not the other two. However, the need for a vest and bathing cloth seem to have been quickly felt. The story behind the rule regarding the vest is rather amusing. One day, a nun was going through a village, and her upper robe was blown by the wind. The people in the street cried, "What lovely breasts this nun has!" much to her embarrassment. When she returned to the monastery, she told the other nuns what had happened at the village. When the Master was informed by monks, he advised to establish the following rule: "A nun who goes into a village without a vest is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category."¹³ From that time on, the nuns had to wear a vest when they went outside their monastery.

The use of a bathing cloth as an item of personal clothing was started after a group of young nuns were made fun of when bathing nude alongside prostitutes at a ford in the river Aciravati. The rich laywoman Visākhā-Migāra-Mātā was very sad to hear of nuns bathing nude in the river, so she went immediately to see the Buddha and said that she was ready to provide bathing clothes for the monks and nuns for the rest of her life. The Master approved this good idea of the lady donor.¹⁴ After that incident, the following rule was given: "A nun who bathes nude is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category."¹⁵

11. The outer cloak (*saṅghāṭi*) was approximately 2.27 by 1.85 metres. The upper robe (*uttarāsanga*) was worn wrapped around the upper body. It measured approximately 2.27 by 1.50 metres. The lower robe (*antarāvāsaka*) was worn around the waist and measured approximately 1.97 by 1.05 metres.

12. Vin II 272.

13. *Pācittiya* no. 96: Vin IV 344–45.

14. Vin I 293.

15. *Pācittiya* no. 21: Vin IV 278.

In addition to the five articles mentioned above, there were some other items of clothing that the nuns were either obliged to wear or that they could wear when the need arose. Like the monks, they were to use a cloth belt (*kāya-bandhana*) to attach their lower robe. If a nun had a skin disease, she could wear a cloth called *kaṇḍupaṭicchādi*. *Pācittiya* no. 165 fixes the dimensions of this bandage at approximately 0.95 by 0.45 metres. Another piece of cloth, called *āvasatha-cīvara*, was to be used during the period of menstruation.¹⁶ According to the *Vinaya*, this cloth was not the nun's personal property; she was to wash it and keep it for the use of a nun who needed it. *Pācittiya* no. 47 was established to ensure that this cloth was not used for a long period of time, more than four days: "A nun who constantly uses the *āvasatha-cīvara* without giving it up even after the fourth day, was guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category."¹⁷ The *Vinaya* prescribed several other pieces of cloth for the use of nuns in their period of menstruation: a small thigh cloth (*āṇicolaka*), a loin cloth (*samvelliya*), and a waist string (*kaṭṭisuttaka*) to hold the menstruation pad in place. After some nuns began to wear this string all the time, they were told to wear it only when they were menstruating.¹⁸

From time to time, the nuns of the "group of six" gave in to the temptation to add items to what they were allowed to wear. One time, for example, they wore long belts with tassels; on another occasion they wore leather straps with tassels. Whenever they added ornaments to their clothing, lay people showed their disapproval. "These nuns, the daughters of Sākyans, are following the latest fashion just like laywomen who love sensual pleasures," they said. Hearing of this criticism, the modest nuns informed the Master about it. He condemned the conduct of the nuns of the "group of six" and advised the nuns to avoid all kind of ornaments and decorations.¹⁹ The Commentary on the *Vinaya* says moreover that a nun must not wear lay clothes. If she puts on such clothes deliberately, unless there is a danger to her life, she is no longer a member of the Community of Nuns.²⁰ *Pācittiya* no. 87 forbids nuns

16. Vin II 271; IV 303.

17. Vin IV 303; See *infra* p.177.

18. Vin II 271.

19. Vin II 266.

20. Vin-a 515.

to wear women's ornaments (jewellery, for example).²¹ The mirror never became a monastic article. Since the nuns shaved their heads, of course, they did not need combs, hair pins, etc. They were not to allow their hair to grow longer than two inches. This was all part of renouncing the trappings of lay life.

The monks and nuns did not wear badges or any ostentatious marks. There were no ceremonial clothes nor any decorations nor any marks indicating hierarchy or seniority. Everyone wore the same kind of robes, from the oldest nun to the most recently ordained.

As we have already mentioned, lay people furnished the nuns with robes. They also wanted to provide different sorts of cloth to be used in making robes: cotton, silk, wool, coarse linen and hemp. Even though some of these types of cloth were considered valuable, the nuns could accept them and use them on condition that they cut them into small pieces to remove their commercial value. They made their *saṅghāti*, *uttarāsaṅga* and *antaravāsaka* in the same way the monks made theirs: cutting up cloth into pieces that were then sewn together.²² Dyeing the finished robe also reduced any value the cloth might have had in the lay community.

Several rules regarding religious attire helped to maintain the principle of renunciation for nuns and to avoid the abuse of lay people's generosity. A nun could not accept or possess more than one complete set of the five *cīvaras*. This was made clear in more than one rule: *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 13 specifies that an extra robe can only be used by a nun for maximum of ten days. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 15 forbids a nun to keep a piece of cloth with her for more than thirty days without making it into a robe.

At the end of each rainy-season retreat, the nuns in each monastery received a cloth from lay people, the *kaṭhina-vatttha*²³, and made a new *cīvara* from it. This new robe known as *kaṭhina-cīvara* was sewn to the same dimensions as an outer robe or upper robe.²⁴

21. Vin IV 340.

22. See BML, p.37.

23. The word *kaṭhina* means 'hard.' According to the traditional definition, the gift of this cloth was an act of merit "as hard as diamond."

Even though the Community of Nuns depended on the generosity of the lay community, a nun could not personally ask anyone for a robe. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 16 stipulates that if a nun needed a new robe, she could only ask a relative for one. She could ask a non-relative only in the following circumstances: if her robe had been stolen, or if it had been completely destroyed. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 17 sets the limits: “If a layman or laywoman who is not a relative gives several robes to a nun, she may accept at most two robes to use as an *antarāvāsaka* and *uttarāsanga*. If she accepts more, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.”

The nuns were discouraged from trying to obtain the type of robe they preferred by making hints. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 27 forbids a nun to have a cloth made by weavers who are not her relatives or to ask people who are not her relatives for thread to weave cloth, even if she needs it. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 28 presents another aspect of the same issue: “If a householder, either male or female, has cloth made by weavers with the intention of giving it to a nun; if, before she receives it, the nun goes to the weavers and says, ‘The cloth you are weaving is for me; make it larger; make it longer; use a lot of threads and spread them out evenly; make it soft and thick in the middle; I will give you something too’; and saying this, later that if the nun gives even a little of the food received in her begging-bowl, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.”

Nuns could receive blankets, but for reasons of modesty, the blankets could not be of great value. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* nos. 11 and 12 stipulate that if a nun looks for a winter blanket (*garupāvourana*: “heavy blanket”), it should not be worth more than ten *kahāpaṇas*. If a nun uses a blanket worth more than that, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.²⁵ Nuns could not accept money instead of cloth or any other object—we will discuss this in more detail below.

A nun had no right to give a monastic robe to a layman, a laywoman or to a member of another religious order. This prohibition was established because of a curious incident

24. BML, p.38.

25. Vin IV 255–257.

involving the nun Thulla Nandā, who had never attained any stage of inner progress but who was always looking for prestige. She gave robe-materials to dancers, to musicians, and to drummers, and asked them to praise her in public. So they went around saying, “The lady Thulla Nandā is very learned. She can recite texts. She is wise. She is skilled in giving talks on the Doctrine. Give to this nun. Make *cīvaras* for this nun.” When modest nuns heard this, they were embarrassed and informed the Master. He criticized Thulla Nandā’s conduct and asked them to establish this rule: “If a nun gives religious attire (*samaṇa cīvara*) to a layman or to a laywoman or to a Paribbājaka or Paribbājikā, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.”²⁶ But in case of necessity, a nun had the right to give a *cīvara* or *cīvara* material to her mother or father or to someone who was in urgent need of wearing something temporarily.²⁷

The costume (of five pieces) of each nun was considered her personal property.²⁸ The rule *Pācittiya* no. 139 specifies that a nun should place a mark on her robes so that she could identify them. According to the rule *Pācittiya* no. 24, a nun had a right to obtain a robe from another nun for temporary use, but she must return it in due time. However, according to the rule *Pācittiya* no. 25, a nun must not take a robe of some other nun while she is absent. In other words, a nun has not the right to use a robe of somebody else without the owner’s permission. The rule *Pācittiya* no. 26 permits nuns to offer a robe to a nun who is in need, but the given robe must not be taken back because of anger or some other reason. According to the rule *Pācittiya* no. 14, each nun should

26. *Pācittiya* no. 28: Vin IV 285.

27. This exception with regard to a nun’s (or monk’s) parents extended to giving food and medicine also, if they were poor and had no one else to provide for them. But, when a nun died, her personal belongings (her begging-bowl, robes, etc.) automatically became the property of the Community. They were then to be given to the nun (or nuns) who had taken care of the late nun while she was still alive.

28. Several texts mention the ideal way of religious simplicity: “Just as a bird takes its wings with it wherever it flies, so the ascetic takes his robes and his begging-bowl with him wherever he goes; he is content with robes for his body and a begging-bowl for his stomach”—D I 71; M III 35; A II 209.

keep her clothing of five pieces with her wherever she is. If she wants to be separated from such and such a piece, she must inform other nuns about it.

The rule *Pācittiya* no. 140 states that a nun must not keep for herself a robe that has been attributed by the Community (when *cīvāra* material is being distributed) to a monk, another nun, a male novice or a female postulant. If she wishes to take such a robe, she first has to have the Community annul the original attribution. *Pācittiya* no. 141 stipulates that a nun must not hide another nun's robe or robe material, even as a jest. When a layman or laywoman donates robe clothes as common property of the Community, a nun should not hinder the gift (*Pācittiya* no. 26). And a nun should not oppose formal distribution of robe material by the Community (*Pācittiya* no. 27).

Nuns' religious attire was to be of the ochre (*kāsāya*) colour used by most of the other groups of ascetics at that time. However, this colour, generally accepted as suitable for those who had abandoned lay life, was not made obligatory by any of the rules in the *Pātimokkha*. The nuns of the "group of six" started to wear blue clothes on one occasion and black clothes on another. People criticized them for dressing up like laywomen who indulge in sensual pleasures, so the Master told the nuns to avoid those colours, and white as well.²⁹ The *Vinaya* specifies the appropriate dyes to be used for religious attire, and this aided in removing all commercial value from the clothes.

Food

As with clothing, a number of the rules about food that had first been made for the monks were subsequently incorporated into the nuns' code of discipline. For example, in the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha*, the rule *Pācittiya* no. 40 says that no monk is to eat food that he has not received from someone else. The same rule for nuns is found in *Pācittiya* no. 122 of the *Bhikkhunī-Pātimokkha*: "If a nun conveys to her mouth an edible not given by someone else, with the exception of water and tooth-cleaning sticks, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category." This prohibition brings us to the heart of the problem. It embodies the essential element in

29. Vin II 267.

the regulation regarding food. We can see in this rule how dependent the monks and nuns were on lay people: they could not procure their own food. In other words, even if there was plenty of food in front of them, they had no right to take some and eat it. They could not pluck a fruit or even pick a fruit up off the ground. It was prohibited for them to dig the earth in order to take out yams or roots (*Pācittiya* no. 106). In brief, they could only eat what laymen and laywomen offered to them.

How did lay people give food to the nuns? There were three ways: (1) by giving it to the nuns as they went from house to house on their alms round; (2) by inviting them to their houses for a meal; and (3) by taking food to the dining hall of the nunnery.

The usual way for a nun to obtain food was to go on her alms round with her begging-bowl. However it should be noted clearly that this 'begging' prescribed by Buddhist monasticism was completely different from the begging of vagabonds or tramps. The special nature of this noble mendicancy can be seen through several factors. First, the nuns and monks went on alms round only to search for food. It was expressly forbidden for them to beg, to ask for or to accept money.³⁰ Second, they stopped their alms round as soon as they had obtained enough food. In other words, their begging round took around half an hour, or at most one hour, provided that donors houses were situated close by the nunnery. The alms round was done only before noon, as nuns had to finish eating before midday. Moreover, after midday, they were not to keep any leftover food in their begging-bowls or elsewhere. Third, if they were not given any food on their alms round, they were not to feel upset or have any dislike towards the lay people who had not given anything. Fourth, they went on alms rounds with a compassionate heart, as they were to be mindful of the spiritual welfare of lay people. The fifth reason is very symbolic, in that this mendicancy was a manifestation of loving-kindness (*mettā*) towards others, as the monks and nuns were to go by lay people's houses without any favouritism, or any discrimination concerning their caste, class or sex. The great value of this openness towards the external world should be understood in the social context of the time which was dominated by brahmanical

30. We will discuss this matter later in this chapter.

thinking, and in which many high-caste people thought it preferable to die of hunger and thirst than to live by eating food given by someone of inferior caste or someone unknown.

We do not know how easy it was at first for those ladies of respectable families to go on their begging round from house to house in order to collect their daily food. However, it was simplified by the fact that as all the nuns, apart from one or two exceptional cases, lived in towns where there were enough Buddhist lay people ready to support them.

Buddhist monasticism regulated minutely the mendicancy of its members. The procedure followed by nuns on their alms round was the same as that of the monks. On her begging round, a nun was not to ask for anything. She was simply to stand silently at the entrance of a potential donor's house with her begging-bowl in hand. If food was put in her bowl, she was to accept it without examining what it was. If she received nothing, she was not to feel frustrated or think badly about the people who had given nothing. She was to walk on her alms round with all her senses under control, attentive to all her thoughts. She was not to sit in a house or talk with the lay donors unless someone was ill or there was an emergency. She had to be correctly dressed in her robes and her robes had to be clean.

However, a nun was never expected to go on her alms round alone. In fact, it was recommended that a nun should go with somebody else. Nuns could go in a group, in a single file one after the other. Even though they were together, the important thing to remember was to remain silent during the alms round. The stories found in the *Vinaya* show that two or three nuns often went on their alms round together in a village or in a street of a town.³¹

These details do not mean that the nuns were obliged to go in search of food every day. They could accept an invitation to eat at the home of lay disciples. However, the lay people were not supposed to invite a specific nun but rather to invite the Community of Nuns to send one or more nuns. In this way the

31. Bodhi Therī and Isidāsi Therī, for example, went together on their alms round one day, and after eating their meal while seated under a tree, Isidāsi Therī explained in detail why she had become a nun. See Thī 400–47.

Community was shown respect, and it was up to the Community to choose the nuns to be sent to specific houses. Nuns could not accept personal invitations, but the Community could send a nun to the same house on many occasions if she was considered to be the spiritual adviser of that family.

Some families wanted to invite a specific group of nuns for a meal from time to time, but such a 'group meal' (*gaṇa-bhojana*)³² was not allowed unless certain conditions were present. The rule specifies: "If a nun takes part in a group meal, except at the right time, she is guilty of fault of *Pācittiya* category. Here, 'the right time' means: when one is ill, when robes are being distributed, when robes are being prepared, when on a trip, when on a boat, when there is a famine, when there is a meal for ascetics" (*Pācittiya* no. 118).

During the rainy season, nuns, like monks, were supposed to avoid going out in the streets, or into the village.³³ We can assume, therefore, that many monks and nuns did not go out in search of food at that time. Similarly, during times of drought or other natural calamities, nuns were not to go from house to house, even to the houses of their closest lay disciples. At such difficult times, lay people brought cooked food directly to the nunnery. Several stories in the *Vinaya* tell how the lay people distributed food to the nuns in the dining hall of their convent.³⁴ Sometimes the lay people brought provisions for the nuns to prepare their own meals. In fact, in difficult times, the nuns (and monks) had the right to cook food. On such occasions, if the monks had received more than enough food for themselves, they had the right to send leftovers to the nuns,³⁵ and the nuns had the right to send any of their extra food to the monks.³⁶ There is a touching story of how the famous nun Uppalavannā cooked a dish and sent some of it to the Master. However, he did not receive the nun's gift as he was

32. *Gaṇa bhojana*: a meal prepared for a group of two or three nuns.

33. Cf. *Pācittiya* no. 39. Of course, this rule concerns the voyages during the rainy season. But we cannot forget the *raison d'être* of this rule: to avoid harming small living beings and plants.

34. Vin IV 232–34.

35. Vin II 270.

36. Vin IV 176. On the alms round, however, a monk was not to accept food from a nun who was not his relative. Cf. *supra* p.60.

already on his alms round in a nearby village.³⁷

Nuns, like the monks, were permitted to take a meal at a public distribution point where food was being given to the poor people and to travellers. The rule says: "If a nun eats in such a place more than once, unless she is sick, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category" (*Pācittiya* no. 117; for monks *Pācittiya* no. 31). That is to say, nuns had the right to eat in such a place at least once. Without doubt, such permission, even to eat only once, was useful for the monks and nuns who were travelling in difficult areas where there were no Buddhist lay people to provide food. On the other hand, the prohibition to eat regularly in such places shows that in Buddhist monasticism it was not thought desirable for monks and nuns to eat frequently in public places meant for other people. Buddhist lay people probably preferred that nuns and monks should not eat in places where they might seem to be simple beggars.

Like monks, nuns were encouraged to eat only once a day.³⁸ *Pācittiya* no. 120 states: "If a nun eats hard or soft food at the improper time, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category." The 'improper time' (*vikāla*) is defined in the *Vinaya* as from noon and to next morning's sunrise.³⁹ This rule limited the time the nuns could spend in connection with meals, and made the lay community's task easier.

A number of rules had to be added to restrain certain nuns from taking advantage of the lay people's generosity. For example, *Pācittiya* no. 7 forbids nuns from obtaining grain, preparing it and eating it.⁴⁰ This rule was established because some nuns asking for grain at harvest time became a burden for the cultivators. *Pācittiya* no. 1 forbids nuns to eat garlic.⁴¹ The nun Thulla Nandā was behind this rule. The story goes as follows. A lay disciple who was a farmer offered to supply the nuns with garlic. He ordered the keeper of his field to give two or three bundles of garlic to nuns if they came looking for some. Thulla Nandā, however, took

37. Vin III 207–09.

38. BML, pp.68–69.

39. Vin IV 86.

40. Vin IV 264.

41. Vin IV 258–59.

a large quantity of garlic, and the keeper of the field criticized her for her lack of moderation. As a result, the rule against eating garlic was laid down. However, a number of exceptions are included: garlic can be eaten if it is in a broth, in a meat dish, in a concoction of oil, in a salad or a titbit.

Food items given by lay people were supposed to be accepted in moderation. For example, *Pācittiya* no. 119 says, "If a nun goes to a house and the people offer her cakes and biscuits, she may accept two or three bowlfuls. If she accepts more than that, she is guilty of a faulty of *Pācittiya* category. Having accepted only two or three bowlfuls, she should take them back [to the convent] and share them with the other nuns. This is the proper way to act in this matter." *Pācittiya* no. 54 makes it an offence for a nun to eat any hard or soft food once she has finished a meal to which she had been invited, even if she receives an invitation from elsewhere to eat.⁴² This rule was established because some nuns who ate at a Brahmin house then went to eat somewhere else. When the Brahmin householder heard about this, he started to criticize the nuns. In formulating the rule, the Buddha wanted to avoid not only such criticisms but also the gluttony of some nuns.

Nuns, like the monks, were discouraged from eating too much, and they were not to relish their food. Several sermons advised them to cultivate the 'perception of impurity of material food' (*āhāre paṭikkūlasaññā*).⁴³ Moreover, each nun was supposed to think as follows while eating:

"I am not taking this food to amuse myself, or to be strong, or elegant, or to beautify myself; I am only taking this food to maintain my body in good health, to avoid illness, and to make it possible to lead this religious life. Thus, through the use of this food, I eliminate the illness that I have, I avoid illness that might arise, and in this way I am in comfort [to lead this religious life]."⁴⁴

However, there was no minimum or maximum for quantities of food to be eaten by nuns and monks. No rule forbade them to eat delicious food when they received it. Apart from alcohol⁴⁵ and

42. Vin IV 310–11.

43. D III 89, 291; S V 132; A IV 49.

44. M I 10; III 2; S IV 104; A II 40; III 388.

the meat of animals expressly killed to feed the monks and nuns,⁴⁶ they could eat the same food as lay people. Moderation in eating is praised and practised to avoid two disadvantages: not only can eating itself be a sensual pleasure which eventually becomes a hindrance to inner progress, but also eating too much can lead to bad results such as obesity, laziness, sleepiness, etc. Self-mortification, on the other hand, was also disapproved. Even the rule not to eat a meal after noon was established not for reasons of austerity, but to help keep the individual healthy and to avoid sluggishness.⁴⁷

Certain substances could be eaten at any time, even after noon, as they were considered to have medicinal properties. These included clarified butter (ghee), fresh butter, oil,⁴⁸ honey and molasses.⁴⁹ *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 25 allows a nun who is ill to consume these medicines; she can keep them in her cell for a week. Normally, a nun could not request a favourite food or eat anything received as the result of a request. Several rules cover this area. But a nun who was ill was excused from these rules. For example, the eight *Pāṭidesaniya* rules forbid nuns to eat ghee, oil, honey, molasses, fish, meat, milk or curds if they have asked for them, but nuns who are ill are not covered by those prohibitions.⁵⁰ Finally, we can note that the rules concerning drinks and medicines were the same for nuns as for monks.⁵¹

Lodgings

At the beginning of the Community, nuns' lodgings were limited to urban areas such as Rājagaha, Sāvattī and Sāketa. Even in Sāvattī, the 'capital' of Buddhism, the question of where nuns could live was not easy to resolve in the early days of the Community. As we have noted above, when the preceptors started to confer higher ordination on new candidates each year, some lay

45. For nuns *Pācittiya* no. 132.

46. On the question of being vegetarian, see BML, pp.69–71.

47. M I 473.

48. At the Vin III 251 and IV 348, oil is defined as including sesame oil, mustard oil, oil containing honey, castor oil and oil from tallow.

49. Vin I 199; BML, p. 69.

50. Vin IV 346–48.

51. See BML, pp.73–75.

people were displeased and began to criticize them. They said that the nuns did not have adequate lodgings for so many newcomers.⁵²

The monks already had monasteries on the outskirts of the cities mentioned above. The *Vinaya* allowed the monks to give lodgings to the nuns temporarily when they had more than they needed.⁵³ This probably did not happen very often, however, as the lay people built nunneries without much delay.

Later, in Sāvattī, the monks lived in their monasteries outside the city,⁵⁴ and the nuns resided inside the city.⁵⁵ I think that having the nuns' convents inside the cities served two purposes: on one hand, the nuns were safe in such an area, and on the other, a certain distance was kept between their residences and the monasteries of monks.

The monasteries of monks seem to have been larger and more numerous than the nunneries. The *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha* contains two rules concerning the size of cells or large buildings (*Saṅghādisesa* nos. 6 and 7).⁵⁶ These rules specify the size limits, how a monk should set about construction, and the way in which the Community of Monks was to give its consent. But these two rules are not found in the nuns' *Pātimokkha*. This means, I think, that the nuns had more freedom in choosing how their monastic residences were to be constructed. However, some restrictions were imposed on nuns when having a large dwelling⁵⁷ constructed. We can see this in *Pācittiya* no. 115: "When a large dwelling-house is being built for a Bhikkhunī... she must determine (supervise) these works while herself standing at a place where no grass grows. If she 'determines' (supervises) the

52. Vin IV 336.

53. Vin II 270.

54. According to the texts, these monasteries were "neither too far from nor too near to" the city of Sāvattī—Vin I 39; II 158.

55. Vin IV 54. There is mention of cells being given to nuns by a guild in that city—Vin IV 251–53.

56. See BML, p.24.

57. Large dwelling (*mahallaka vihāra*). The *Vinaya* defines this to mean a dwelling sponsored by a lay follower (Vin IV 47). To build such a dwelling, the nun (or monk) has the right to organize the work employing labourers sent by the lay sponsor.

building work standing in a place where grass grows, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.⁵⁸

The aim of this insistence is very clear: there should be a grass-free ground around the dwelling. This is not only an ecological precaution to avoid harming any living thing (i.e. grass or plants on the building site), but also to avoid public criticism⁵⁹. That is not all. The rule also forbids the nun to have the walls of her dwelling plastered again and again, (or to have it covered with roofing material again and again). Such a prohibition avoided unnecessary difficulties for donors, and encouraged nuns to be simple and modest.

The nuns were permitted to have monasteries built and repaired for the Community's use. Cells could be constructed for the use of individual nuns, and these cells were considered to be personal residences.⁶⁰ Lay people helped keep the cells in good repair as we can see from the case of the nun Thulla Nandā. When people noticed that her cell was falling to pieces, they collected what was needed to repair it.⁶¹ There were also nuns who were capable of supervising the construction of dwellings: the nun Sundarī Nandā, for example, supervised the construction of a building given by Sālha, the grandson of Migāra, a rich merchant of Sāvattihī.

At times the nuns' lay supporters gave other sorts of buildings. For example, at one time a rich man wanted to have a storehouse (*uddosita*) built for the Community,⁶² and the Master approved the donor's idea. On another occasion, the son of a lay disciple who had given a storeroom to the Community of nuns wanted to reclaim it after his father's death. The nuns contested. The case was taken to the chief ministers and they decided in

58. The same rule is found in the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha*, *Pācittiya* no. 19 (Vin IV 47–48).

59. Here we must recall the public criticisms when the monks travelled during the rainy season: "How is it that these ascetics, the sons of the Sākyans, keep on travelling during the summer, winter and also the rainy season? They tread on young plants and damage them, and destroy many small living creatures." Vin I 137.

60. Vin II 278.

61. Vin IV254.

62. Vin II 278.

favour of the nuns.⁶³

The nuns' lodgings were usually small cells. In areas where there were large groups of nuns, no doubt they had large dwellings. Some nuns had separate buildings with windows and a door. These were called *āvasatha* (lit. dwellings), and in the *Pātimokkha*, there is only one rule directly related to them: "A nun who goes away on a journey without handing over her dwelling (*āvasatha*) is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category."⁶⁴ This rule was established because the nun Thulla Nandā's dwelling burned down while she was away on a journey.⁶⁵

There were other problems associated with personal lodgings. The learned nun Bhaddā Kāpilānī wanted to go to stay in Sāvattī, so she sent a message to the nun Thulla Nandā, asking if she could stay for a time in the latter's residence. Thulla Nandā said yes, and Bhaddā Kāpilānī went to Sāvattī. When lay people visited Bhaddā Kāpilānī first, because they considered her a very learned and effective teacher of the Doctrine, Thulla Nandā became jealous, so much so that she threw out her visitor. After this incident, *Pācittiya* no. 35 was laid down: "A nun who gives lodgings to another nun, and then becomes angry and displeased, and throws her out or has her thrown out, is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category."⁶⁶

The rule *Pācittiya* no. 102 forbids nuns to reside in a house where there is a man. This is the equivalent of *Pācittiya* no. 6 in the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha* forbidding monks to reside in a house where there is a woman.⁶⁷ Even when travelling, nuns had to take care

63. The nun Thulla Nandā was very actively against the man who reclaimed the storehouse. Because of her aggressive attitude, the following rule was laid down: "If a nun disputes with a householder, or with the son of a householder, or with a slave or with a labourer or even with a Paribbājaka, from that instance she is guilty of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She is deserves to be temporarily kept away" (Vin IV 223–24).

64. *Pācittiya* no. 48; Vin IV 304.

65. As she had not handed over her dwelling, the other nuns did not want to take out what was in the dwelling for fear that Thulla Nandā would hold them responsible for everything that was destroyed.

66. Vin IV 292–293.

67. Vin IV 17–19.

when looking for a place to spend the night. There was the case, for example, of a group of nuns who were going through Kosalan districts on their way to Sāvattḥi. They arrived in a village one evening and requested permission to stay the night in a Brahmin household. The lady of the house asked them to wait until the head of the household came back. But the nuns prepared sleeping places, and some of them sat down while others lay down. When the Brahmin came home later at night, he was displeased and ordered, "Throw out these shaven-headed strumpets." Even though it was a late hour, the nuns had to withdraw themselves into the open air. The result was *Pācittiya* no. 17: "A nun who approaches families at the wrong time, or spreads or has spread out a sleeping place without asking the owner of the house for permission, and then sits down or lies down on it, is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category." This type of problem may have been avoided later as a result of nuns' being more careful, and also because there were more nunneries in different districts where they could spend the night safely.

Many monastic residences were the property of the Community of Nuns and were founded by lay followers, both men and women. Such nunneries were called "residences belonging to the Community" (*saṅghika-vihāra*). The rules governing these were along the same lines as the rules given for the monks. Nuns who came to a nunnery were to conduct themselves properly. They were free to enter and stay. *Pācittiya* no. 112 says that a nun who arrives in a nunnery must not take up a space reserved for others, especially if it is reserved for nuns who are old or ill. *Pācittiya* no. 113 forbids any nun to throw another nun out of a nunnery or to have her thrown out. And nuns who came to a nunnery were to be welcomed with all courtesy by the resident nuns.

The furnishings of the nunneries were very simple. The nuns could not use large beds or luxurious seats. Nor could they use four types of bed and five types of mattress: beds that were long, with slats, with curved legs, and with detachable legs;⁶⁸

68. *Pācittiya* no. 114 suggests that nuns using a bed with detachable legs should do so with caution. Bedding can include "a mattress, a carpet, a bed-cover, ground-covering, a straw mat, a piece of cloth for sitting on, a sheet, a grass mat, a leaf mat."—Vin IV 41.

mattresses made of wool, cotton cloth, barks, straws or leaves. Nuns could sit on chairs, benches, stools, or cloth mats (*nisīdana*). Rugs were also permitted, but only those made of cotton. Nuns could not have large cushions, couches, bedspreads with long tassels or of wool with painted flowers, or cotton bedspreads with pictures of animals, bedside rugs, etc. These same articles were forbidden to monks as well.

These furnishings were considered common property. The nuns could make use of them, but they were to do so carefully. Several rules remind visiting nuns of their duty before leaving the monastery. For example, *Pācittiya* no. 110 says that before leaving the monastery, a visiting nun had to put any bed, chair, mattress or stool that she had put out in the open air back inside. If she could not do so herself, she had to get someone else to do so. According to the rule *Pācittiya* no. 111, a nun had to arrange everything correctly and clean the monastery before leaving it.

Concerning monks, we know that some of them lived in the forest, except during the rainy season, and even during rains they could live in forest areas if they stayed in suitable huts. They obtained their food each day from the neighbouring villages and regularly participated in the formal meetings of the Community of monks. In the beginning, nuns were able to live in the forest,⁶⁹ but this did not last long because they were without proper protection there. The *Vinaya* reports the deplorable incident of some nuns who while living in the forest were raped by some brigands. After this incident the forests were prohibited for the nuns.⁷⁰ This why there are no rules in the nuns' *Pātimokkha* corresponding to the rules for monks residing in the forest (*vanavāsīn*). Even woods were not always safe for the nuns. One

69. Nuns mention living on mountains or in forests in Thī 27, 29, 30, 50, 108 etc.

70. Vin II 278. Choosing the foot of trees (*rukhamūla*) as a dwelling was not a "resource" (*nissaya*) prescribed by the Community to newly ordained nun (Vin II 278), but it was a one of the four resources prescribed to monks (Vin I 58). The other three "resources," namely (1) to wear a robe made out of rags (*pamsukūla-cīvara*), (2) to eat food received in the begging-bowl (*piṇḍapāta-bhojana*) and (3) to use the medicinal product called *pūtimutta-bhesajja*, were common to monks and nuns.

day the nun Uppalavaṇṇā was raped by a young man when she was dwelling in the daytime at the wood called Andhavana.⁷¹ Because of this incident, the nuns were forbidden to stay in the woods. The commentary of the *Dhammapada* says that when the King Pasenadi of Kosalans learned of what had happened to the nun Uppalavaṇṇā, he wanted to built a nunnery. Following the Master's advice, he had it built in the city of Sāvathī.⁷² This story, I think, indicated to lay followers of later generations that monasteries for nuns should not be built just anywhere, for there was no protection for them in isolated places.

Travelling

Nuns did not travel as much as monks, nor did they go on such long journeys. Monks travelled often. The canonical texts give no indication that nuns accompanied monks going from one country to another, often crossing forests. The nuns, however, were not shut up in their monasteries. Of course, they could not travel during the rainy retreat,⁷³ but after that was over they were required to go on a journey of at least a short distance. *Pācittiya* no. 40 says, "If a nun who has completed the rainy season retreat does not go on a journey at least five or six *yojanas*, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category."⁷⁴ Exceptions were to be made, however, if there was an obstacle to her leaving or if she could not find a suitable travelling companion.

Nuns generally travelled around the region where they lived. Sometimes they travelled in a group, or a nun travelled with one or more female postulants, but they were not to travel alone. *Saṅghādisesa* no. 3 says that a nun must always have a companion nun even when going from one village to another, or when crossing a river, or wherever she spends the night. The stories told with this rule show that it was laid down to ensure the nuns' safety.⁷⁵

If nuns needed to go to a faraway district for an important reason, they could do so, but they had to take precautions. For

71. Vin III 35.

72. Dhpa II 54.

73. Nuns' *Pacittiya* no. 39 (Vin IV 296–97).

74. Vin IV 297.

75. Vin IV 227–30; cf. *infra* p.123.

example, they had to travel with a caravan of merchants. Two rules were made in connection with this prescription after nuns had been attacked by some brigands. *Pācittiya* nos. 37 and 38 say: “If a nun starts to travel without joining a caravan of merchants,⁷⁶ when she goes on a journey in her own region, or outside her own region, when those regions are considered to be dangerous and frightening, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.”⁷⁷

One may ask why nuns were advised to go with commercial caravans? Like Jainism, Buddhism was supported for a long time by the merchants, who made up one of the important classes of society at the time of the Buddha. Especially important were the *seṭṭhis* (Skt *śeṭhi*), who were heads of guilds, treasurers, bankers and traders maintaining contacts in important cities and in foreign countries. Many of them actively helped to spread the new religion. For this reason, one of the safest ways for monks and nuns to go from one province to another was to join a caravan of merchants. These usually consisted of around twenty carts and as many men and women. The nuns who travelled with them were protected and also be assured of receiving food.

76. *Asatthikā* (“Without joining a caravan of merchants”). I.B. Horner translates *asatthikā* as “without a weapon” (*The Book of Discipline*, Ch.3, pp.317–19). Similarly, she translates *satthagamanīyā* as “where one ought to go with a weapon”—*ibid* Ch.2, p.289. But the Commentary on the *Pātimokkha* says: *satthagamīyā’ti satthena saddhim gantabbo* (“[where] one ought to go with a caravan” means “going with a caravan”)—Kkh p.90, and *asatthikā cārikan’ti vinā satthena gacchantiyā* (“travelling separate from a caravan” means “going without a caravan”)—Kkh p.185. It would not have been appropriate for monks and nuns to travel with weapons, nor is it in accord with the spirit of Buddhism which calls for giving up arms—even sticks (*nihita daṇḍo, nihita sattho* “[use] neither stick nor weapon”)—D I 63; A II 208. The word *sattha* is used in the sense of “caravan” in other passages of the *Vinaya*. For example *tena kāho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu satthena gantukāmo hoti ... satthe vassam upetī’ti* (“at that time, a certain monk wanted to go with a caravan... [the Buddha said:] I allow you to enter on the rainy season retreat in a caravan”)—Vin I 152; *Theyyasatthena saddhim samvidhāya ekaddhānamaggam* (“having arranged together with a thieving caravan [and going along] the same main road”)—Vin IV 131.

77. Vin IV 295–96.

Nuns were not to travel with just any caravan, however. They had to be prudent, for some caravans were engaged in dishonest practices such as avoiding payment of tax which meant that they would be pursued by the authorities. There was an incident when a monk knowingly travelled with a caravan of dishonest men. When they were seized, the monk was taken as well, but the authorities later released the monk after criticizing him. As a result *Pācittiya* no. 66 for monks was established.⁷⁸ The equivalent was included as *Pācittiya* no. 145 for nuns: "If a nun should make arrangements with a thieving caravan and knowingly goes along with it, even between two villages, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category." The reason for this rule is obvious: monks and nuns must not be thought to be party to such illegal practices. The rule also indicates that they should find out in advance about the caravan they intended to travel with.

There were several concessions for nuns on a journey. During the trip, for example, they had the right to accept an invitation to eat even if the invitation was to a group of three or four nuns.⁷⁹ Nuns and monks could even spend two or three days at a military camp if there was a valid reason for doing so,⁸⁰ but they had no right to stay longer than that (*Pācittiya* no. 49 for the monks, *Pācittiya* no. 130 for nuns). While at a military camp, however, they should not go to watch military manoeuvres or parades (*Pācittiya* no. 50 for the monks; *Pācittiya* no. 131 for nuns). One important exception made for nuns when they travelled had to do with their protection. Generally speaking, nuns did not have the right to arrange to travel with monks, even from one village to the next. But if the region was dangerous, travelling together was permitted (*Pācittiya* nos. 27 and 28 in the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha*).

Money

When the rich young lady Subhā renounced family life, she said: "Silver and gold are not conducive to awakening or peace. Gold and silver are not proper for ascetics. This is not the wealth of the

78. Vin IV 131–32.

79. The *Vinaya* called it 'a group meal' (*gaṇa bhojana*); see *Pācittiya* rule no. 118 (the same rule in the monks' *Pātimokkha* is *Pācittiya* no. 32).

80. Vin IV 106–07.

Noble Ones.”⁸¹ Women who entered the Community of Nuns had already given up their money. Once the women became nuns, they depended on the generous support of the lay people for their livelihood and had no reason to go in search of money or to try to earn any. From the Buddhist monastic perspective, if a person renouncing lay life has not given up money his renunciation is not complete, because money represents all the sensual pleasures of the world.⁸²

First of all it should be noted here that there was no need to lay down new rules for nuns in this area. Several rules were simply incorporated into the *Pātimokkha* of the nuns from the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha*. The second important point to be noted is that there are relatively very few rules concerning this subject which covered three main areas: (1) a prohibition to accept ‘gold and silver’ (*jātarūpa-rajata*);⁸³ (2) a prohibition on engaging in commercial trade; and (3) a prohibition on engaging in barter. For this last point, of course, several rules were set up specifically for nuns. We will return to them later.

First let us take the *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 21 which forbids the accepting of money (gold and silver): “A nun who takes gold and silver, or who has someone else take it (for her), or who consents to have it deposited for her, is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.” The important point is to know the attitude the Community regarding money unduly accepted. The canonical glossary (*padabhājana*)⁸⁴ of the *Vinaya* explains how nuns (and monks) should handle such a case.

“Consents to have it deposited for her” means: if a donor says to her “let this money be for the noble lady,” and if the nun agrees, the money must be forfeited in the midst of the Community. This is the way any money acquired should be forfeited: The nun must come before the assembly of the

81. Thī 342.

82. Vin II 297; S IV 325–27. For a long discussion on money, see BML, pp.87–88.

83. The phrase ‘gold and silver’ denotes any monetary unit or means of exchange, as well as precious metals.

84. Vin III 238.

Community. Having arranged her upper cloak over one shoulder, having honoured the feet of the senior nuns, having kneeled down in the *ukkuṭika* posture, with joined palms, she must say: "I, noble ladies, have accepted gold and silver. This is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit it to the Community." After forfeiting it, she should confess the fault. Then the fault confessed should be acknowledged by an experienced, competent nun. If a monastery-servant or a lay follower comes there, he or she should be told: "Friend, do what you want with this money." If he or she asks "What should be bought with this?" he or she should not be told, "Bring this, or bring that," but substances such as oil or ghee or honey or molasses may be mentioned as allowable. Once the money has been used to buy whatever goods are permitted, and once the goods have been brought in, everyone is allowed to make use of them, except the nun who has accepted the money. If it happens this way, all is well. But if the monastery-servant or lay follower cannot use the money in this way, he or she must be told: "Friend, take this money away." If he or she does so, all is well. Otherwise, a nun who possesses the five qualities is to be appointed by the Community as a "remover of money." She must remove the money and then throw it away without making any sign (as to the place where the money falls). If she makes a sign when she throws it away, she is guilty of an offence of the category of "wrong doing."

We can see through this explanation that there were some lay people who wished to give money to the monks and nuns rather than monastic clothing or food. So why was there such a categorical prohibition on accepting money? Although nuns and monks were to live on what was given by others, they were not to accept just anything that was offered. They should only accept things that were necessary and appropriate for an ascetic life. It should also be noted that they were not consumers in the economic sense of the word. They could not accept money, so they did not buy things; in other words, they did not buy things, so they did not need money.

Lay donors were not deterred, however, from making gifts of money, so Buddhist monasticism had to resolve the problem that arose when people deposited money that was to be used to buy a

monastic robe or some other acceptable item for a nun or monk. The solution is found in the nuns' *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 20.

"If a king, or someone in his service, or a Brahmin, or a householder should send money to buy a robe saying, 'Exchange this money for a robe and give it to the nun so-and-so', then if this messenger should approach the nun and say, 'O noble lady, this money has been sent to the noble lady so she can buy a robe; may the noble lady accept the money', the nun should answer the messenger thus: 'Friend, we do not accept money to buy robes, but we do accept a robe if it is right time and if it is suitable.' If the messenger says to the nun, 'Noble lady, is there a servant [I could ask]?' then the nun who is in need of a robe should point out a servant—either a monastery-servant or a lay disciple—and say, 'This is a servant of the nuns.' If this messenger gives instructions to the servant and then approaches the nun and says, 'Noble lady, I have given instructions to the person you pointed out as a servant; may the noble lady approach [that person] at the right time, [and] that person will give you a *cīvara*.' Afterwards, when the nun needs a robe, she should approach that person and remind that person two or three times, saying, 'Friend, I need a robe.' If by saying this and reminding [the servant] two or three times, she succeeds in obtaining that robe, all is well. If she does not obtain it, she should stand there in silence four or five times, or six times at most. If she succeeds in obtaining the robe [in this way], all is well. If she makes additional effort and succeeds in obtaining the *cīvara*, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category. If she does not succeed in obtaining it, she should either go herself to where the money to buy the robe originally came from, or send a messenger there to say, 'Friend, that money to buy a *cīvara* that you sent for a nun is not being used by that nun. Make use of the money yourself. Do not let your own things be lost.' This is the proper course in this case."

This rule, which is the longest in the nuns' *Pātimokkha* (and also in the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha*) includes several important points. First, there were some rich people who sent money to the nuns. Second, the nuns could have servants in their monasteries, or a lay

disciple could prepare a robe using the money sent for this purpose. Third, the nun had the right to ask for the robe up to six times, but she was not to quarrel with the person if the robe was not supplied. Fourth, we can see that the nuns did not have the right to have any connection with money, either directly or indirectly, nor did they have the right to express their preferences for the robe being made in exchange for the money given on their behalf.

But, regarding the purchase of certain medicines through an appropriate person, for the nuns there was a special concession which did not exist in the monks' code of discipline. For example, when a donor deposited money for a nun who was ill, the nun had the right to have someone else buy the medicine that had been indicated to the donor. However, she could not have a different medicine bought with it.⁸⁵ Nuns were not allowed to exchange things again and again. The nun Thulla Nandā frequently committed such faults. Once she was ill, and a lay disciple offered help, saying, "Noble lady, I will deposit a *kahāpaṇa* at the shop of the merchant so-and-so. You can buy whatever you wish there." Then Thulla Nandā sent a postulant to buy some oil from the merchant. When the oil was brought to her, Thulla Nanda said, "I don't need oil, I need ghee." The postulant went back and asked the merchant to exchange the oil for ghee, but he said, "Noble lady, if we take back the goods that have been bought, when will we ever sell our goods? Oil was taken and paid for. Give the price of the ghee and you shall have ghee." The disappointed postulant began to weep, and when the modest nuns saw her and asked her why, she explained what had happened. When the Master was informed, he advised to establish the rule: "A nun who obtains one thing through an exchange and then gets something else through another exchange, she is guilty of a fault *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category." (*Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 5).⁸⁶ We can think that the postulants sometimes could serve as "helpers who make things suitable" (*kappiya-kāraka*),⁸⁷ that is to say, they were somebody who could accept money from lay people and use it to buy things for nuns.

85. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 4 (Vin IV 247–49).

86. Vin IV 249–50.

87. On *kappiya-kāraka*, see BML, pp.79–80.

Since the postulants only followed six precepts, they were not forbidden to handle money, and so there was no difficulty in their carrying out such tasks.

As we said earlier, in accord with the Buddhist concept of renunciation, any activity that led to material profit was to be avoided. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 22 forbids nuns to engage in business: "A nun who engages in various transactions in which gold and silver are used is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category."⁸⁸ According to a rule of the same type, nuns were not allowed to exchange goods: "A nun who exchanges in various kinds of things is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category."⁸⁹ However, the nuns were permitted to exchange things among themselves and, under certain conditions, with the monks.⁹⁰

Several rules were given in the nuns' *Pātimokkha* to avoid unsuitable exchanges being made. For example, according to *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* nos. 6 and 7, a nun had no right to exchange one thing for another that was put on deposit for the Community by lay people.⁹¹ Even if the object was given to a group of nuns by lay people, a nun could not exchange it against anything else, including medicine. The *Vinaya* reports the following incident: once, some members of a guild who had a group of nuns living in cells that belonged to the guild, deposited the ingredients for rice gruel with a shop keeper at a time when the nuns were short of food. They informed them of what they had done: "Noble ladies, the shop keeper so-and-so has the ingredients for rice gruel laid aside for you. Have husked rice brought from there, have rice gruel prepared, and make use of it (whenever you need it)." But, the nuns exchanged the rice for medicine, and the donors were very unhappy and criticized the nuns' conduct. As a result the following rule was laid down: "A nun who, having obtained something given to a group of nuns, with the idea of making something from it, exchanges it for some other thing, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category" (*Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 8).⁹²

88. Equivalent to the monks' *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 19 (Vin IV 239–40).

89. *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 23; equivalent to the monks' *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* no. 20 (Vin IV 240–41).

90. Cf. *supra* p.61.

91. Vin IV 250–51.

As rigorous as all these rules may seem, the code of discipline always included exceptions to rules and specific cases where permission was granted in order to facilitate the nuns' daily life. For example, as we mentioned above, a nun could ask for essential objects such as monastic robes or medicine from members of her family. Under certain conditions, lay disciples who were not members of her family could also be asked. If a layman or laywoman who was faithful to the Triple Gem⁹³ said to a nun, "Tell me, noble lady, when you needed a robe (or medicine, etc.); I will offer it you; do not hesitate to let me know what you need," then the nun had the right to take up this 'invitation' as she was free to ask for anything that was consistent with the ascetic life.

All these examples show that the 'economic life' of the Buddhist nuns was to be modest, simple and above reproach.

92. Vin IV 252–53.

93. Triple Gem: The Buddha, the Dhamma and the Saṅgha. Here *Saṅgha* means the community of all disciples (lay or monastic) who have attained one of four stages of the liberation.

CHAPTER 7

SEXUAL RELATIONS

As we mentioned earlier, a number of the founding members of the Community of Nuns were married women. To become nuns, they had to give up married life. Unmarried young women gave up any possibility of eventually marrying when they joined the Community. All postulants had to abstain from any sexual act during the two years leading up to being qualified for the Higher Ordination.¹ We have seen that a married woman could enter the Community as a nun at the age of twelve if she had obtained permission from her husband and her parents, and if she had completed the two year training period following the six precepts as a candidate. Unmarried young ladies had to wait until they were twenty to become nuns. Thus, Buddhist monasticism seems not to have encouraged young women to become nuns as early as possible, but to have left them enough time to take up married life if they wanted to. That does not mean however, that the Buddhist monasticism encouraged sexual relations.²

Naturally, as a movement for ascetics who renounced family life, Buddhist monasticism had nothing to do with the sanctification of marriage or any moralisation of sexual contacts. It simply recommended that its members abstain totally from sexual relations.³ This strictness was justified from the doctrinal as from the institutional point of view. On the one hand, Buddhist

1. The third precept among the six observed by female postulants. See *supra* p.38.

2. According to *Saṅghādisesa* no. 7, nuns are prohibited from making marital arrangements. The rule specifies: "Whatever nun should act as a go-between, conveying a woman's intention to a man or a man's intention to a woman, proposing marriage or an affair—even if only for a momentary liaison—she is guilty of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be temporarily kept away." This rule is the nuns' equivalent of monks' *Saṅghādisesa* no. 5 (Vin III 135–44).

monasticism considered conjugal life, even an ideal marriage, as an obstacle for the proper functioning of its organization, because wedlock would involve inevitable needs such as children, a home, resources, etc. All of these would be a threat to an organization that depended entirely on the generosity of lay people. No laymen or laywomen would be ready to welcome “monks” coming with their wives, or the pregnant “nuns” or “nuns” coming with their babies! On the other hand, if there were free sexual relationships in the monasteries between monks and nuns, that would have been a practice outside legal matrimony. But Buddhism could not approve this because it classified such acts as ‘illicit sexual practices’ (*kāmesu-micchācārā*) from which even earnest Buddhist lay people would have abstained.⁴ Thus, from the organizational point of view, the existence of conjugal life, whether well-regulated or not, was impossible inside Buddhist monasteries.

From the doctrinal point of view, the aim of this categorical prohibition of sexual life was to remove many possible obstacles on the path of inner progress, for sexual contacts lead to social and family responsibilities, and therefore to mental preoccupation that could be a great hindrance to contemplation. Moreover, sexual activity is necessarily connected with sensual desire which is the main antagonist of ascetic life. According to the doctrine of monastic Buddhism, monks and nuns should not be slaves to sensuality; they should strive to free themselves from it as soon as possible. That is why, from the point of view of the Doctrine, one should renounce sexual relationships.

Apart from being essential to the smooth running of monastic communal life and the need to avoid anything that would hinder mental freedom, there were no other mystical interpretations hidden behind the rule against sexual relations. In other words, nowhere in Buddhist doctrine or its discipline do we

3. This does not mean that the nuns were forced to live perpetually in abstinence. If a nun was not able to master her sexual impulses, if she could not control her thoughts, she was always free to give up the monastic life. For that she did not need any approval from the Community of Nuns.

4. The third among the five precepts observed by Buddhist lay people. See BML, p.166.

find any praise of perpetual virginity, or any notion such as physical saintliness or ecclesiastical celibacy. Moreover, Buddhism does not attach any importance whatsoever to sacred ritual, nor does it search for any ritual purity through abstaining from sexual relations. Attaching a sense of spiritual value to the human body was foreign to Buddhism. So if total abstinence was prescribed in Buddhist monasticism, it was in order to attain a certain degree of freedom from mental stains, and to create a suitable atmosphere of institutional harmony, so that individuals could lead a contemplative life together in peace. We should also note that with regard to abstinence, Buddhist nuns never had a notion such as "giving one's life completely to a divine spouse," nor were they tied to a "spiritual marriage."

In the Community of Nuns, the prohibition of heterosexual relations was covered by several rules. The very first rule of their *Pātimokkha* says:

"A nun who intentionally indulges in sexual intercourse, even with a male animal, commits an offence entailing defeat. She can no longer live together with the nuns."⁵

In fact this rule was simply adapted, with some modifications, for the nuns' *Pātimokkha* from monks' code of discipline.⁶ However, this rule was not enough for the Community of Nuns to regularize all the aspects of the complicated subject of sexual relations. It was necessary to add at least two more rules to their code of discipline especially because of the misconduct of some nuns. Concerning this, the *Vinaya* reports several incidents. Once, a rich young man called Sālha who was having a residence built for nuns, fell in love with the beautiful nun Sundarī Nandā. She knew his feelings towards her and, at first, she tried to avoid temptation. But she was too feeble to control herself and one day she let Sālha have sexual intercourse with her. An old sick nun who was in the nunnery at that moment, having seen this, started to criticize Sundarī Nandā's conduct.⁷ The scandal came to the ears of the modest nuns who informed the Master. He advised then to establish the following rule:

5. *Pārājikā* rule no. 1.

“If a nun who is filled with desire consents to fondling or being fondled, to taking hold of or touching or pressing against a male person who is filled with desire, or if she consents to his pressing her body below the collarbone and above the knees, she commits an offence entailing defeat. She can no longer live together with the nuns.”⁸

We can see a remarkable difference between the first rule and the second. The first rule deals with an active participation in the sexual act. But the second is about a passive participation. In regard to the conduct of women in ancient societies, I think that this second rule was more appropriate than the first, as very often the woman was a victim of the initiatives taken by the man. However, the passivity of the female does not mean that she is always mentally inert. Of course in the case of Sundarī Nandā she was only a victim of Sāḷha⁹. At first sight, it might seem she had no active role. All the initiatives were taken by the young man. However, from the point of view of the monastic rule, the nun was not mentally passive. The evidence is that she consented to the young man’s fondling, stroking, etc.

6. The rule for the monks is as follows: “If a monk who has accepted the discipline, without rejecting it, without pronouncing his inability to continue (religious life), has sexual intercourse, even with a female animal, he commits an offence entailing defeat [He becomes somebody defeated]. He can no longer live together with the monks” (Vin III 23). Thus, we can see that the monks’ rule is slightly different compared to the nuns’ rule in which this phrase “without rejecting the discipline, without pronouncing the inability to continue [religious life]” does not exist. In fact, to leave the Community a nun did not need to make a formal declaration. If some wrong thing was going to happen, she could leave the Community without saying anything. But a monk did not have that freedom. To leave the Community, a monk had to make known his intention to abandon religious life and formally reject the discipline before the assembly of the Community, or before a group of monks or before an individual monk who had obtained higher ordination, or at least before a layman who can understand what the monk says.

7. Vin IV 211–15.

8. *Pārājikā* rule no. 5.

9. Sundarī Nandā became pregnant and she left the monastic life.

In this rule, the verb 'consent' (*sādiyati*) is very important. According to a judicial definition of the *Vinaya*, in this case, the fault depended on the consent of the nun in question. In other words, according to this rule, if a nun does not consent to such and such (fondling, pressing, etc.) by a man who is filled with desire, she commits no offence. For example, a nun who was raped would not be guilty, providing she did not consent [to the act]. For this, we can refer to a very significant judgement in the *Vinaya*: When, one day, Uppalavaṇṇā Therī had been raped by a young man in the Andhavana wood, the question arose in the Community of Monks: "Is the nun Uppalavaṇṇā guilty or not?" The reply attributed to the Buddha is very important: "No, monks, she is not guilty, because she did not consent" (*anāpatti bhikkhave, asādiyantiyā'ti*).¹⁰ It should be noted here that the reason she did not consent was not because she was afraid or upset; it was because she no longer harboured any sensual desire. She had attained Arahant hood, the highest level of liberation, and so all latent tendencies to attachment to sensual desire were eradicated in her, as were mental disturbances such as fear and regret.

Psychologically, 'to consent' does not mean simply 'to give in' or 'to let things go' or 'to give way to.' It means 'to agree with,' 'to approve,' and particularly in the case of *Pārājikā* no. 5, to accept (and actively indulge in) the pleasures that are felt, that have been felt, and that are going to be felt. This sort of indulgence is totally foreign to the mental state of an Arahant as she or he has got rid of all mental stains. An ordinary person, however, who has not attained any of the stages of liberation, might wind up consenting to sensual pleasures if she or he cannot resist external or internal prompting.

So we can see that the rule (*Pārājikā* no. 5) we have just cited does not refer merely to the physical acts but to the mental state of the individual nun. Under this condition, a nun who was raped would be guilty of breaking this rule if she, even in spite of herself, consented to the act of rape at any moment as it was happening. To avoid such an incident which could happen to any member, the nuns had to organize their conduct so as to keep away from any unnecessary rendezvous. In other words, to

10. Vin III 35.

prevent such unforeseen events, it was necessary to take strict precautions. For example, when the nuns of the 'group of six' had a curious meeting with some young men, even though they did not indulge in sexual relations with those men during their rendezvous, the time had come to lay down the following rule:

"If a nun, filled with desire, for the sake of following this unsuitable desire, should consent to be by a male person who is filled with desire taking hold of her hand, or should consent to his taking hold of the edge of her outer cloak (*saṅghāṭi*), or should stand close to him, or should talk with him, or should go to a rendezvous with him, or should consent to his coming in front of her, or should enter [with him] into a covered place or should dispose her body for him, she commits an offence entailing defeat. (She becomes somebody defeated). She can no longer live with the nuns."¹¹

How far can the *Vinaya* justify such a strict rule? Was it correct to condemn a nun simply because she had a rendezvous with a man filled with desire, or because her outer cloak had been touched by such a man? It should be noted here that this rule does not deal with a simple encounter between a nun and a male person, but with a deliberate meeting between a nun who is filled with desire and a man filled with desire. Since both are filled with desire, their every physical movement or gesture (holding hands, or taking hold of the outer cloak, etc.) would necessarily tend towards sexual indulgence. Without doubt, the founders of the *Vinaya* were aware of the strictness of this rule, but such severity was necessary not only to avoid nuns having unnecessary contact with men, but also to keep nuns from being possible victims of seducers.

In this domain, there were other precautions to be taken. Particularly, when the number of nuns increased, and what's more, when there were young and beautiful nuns among them, the *Vinaya* could not neglect the fact that the nuns' security was sometimes at risk. Thus the solitude easily practised by monks was not so suitable a virtue for nuns, because on several occasions nuns were attacked while they were in solitude or in isolated places. The *Vinaya* reports some of these incidents. One day, two

11. *Pācittiya* rule no. 8 (Vin IV 220–22).

young nuns were on their way from Sāketa to Sāvattthī. When they came to a river that had to be crossed, they asked a boatman to take them across. He said he could not take them both at once, and took them one by one. Both nuns were raped while they were separated.¹² On another occasion, several nuns were travelling through the country of Kosalans on their way to Sāvattthī. At one stage, a nun stayed behind because she wanted to relieve herself, and she was raped by more than one man.¹³ On another occasion, several nuns who were travelling came to a village to spend the night. Among the nuns, one was a very beautiful and young, and a village man fell in love with her. This man prepared lodgings for the nuns and showed them where they were to sleep. He gave the beautiful nun a place apart from the others. She realized why the man had done this and went to spend the night with another family in the village, without saying anything to her fellow nuns. Thus the young nun escaped the danger to her religious life. However, she did not manage to avoid scandal, for in the night when she could not to be seen some nuns concluded that she had gone off with somebody. Taking into consideration all these deplorable incidents, the following rule was enacted:

“Whatever nun should go into villages alone, or should go to the other side of the river alone, or should be away for a night alone, or should stay behind her group alone, she is guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be temporarily kept away.”¹⁴

This rule can be summarized as ‘Please do not go out of the monastery alone, under any pretext.’ Thus each nun was obliged to move with another nun or with a postulant, or in a group of nuns.¹⁵

Furthermore, it was necessary to avoid all risks that could come from male persons. *Saṅghādisesa* no. 5, for example, says that a nun is not to accept food given to her by a man full of desire. The

12. Vin IV 228.

13. Vin IV 229.

14. *Saṅghādisesa* rule no. 3.

15. It should be noted here that, even as a group, the nuns were not to travel if the region was considered dangerous. In such cases they had to travel under the protection of a commercial caravan. Cf. *supra* p.108.

rule specifies: “If any nun who is full of desire should accept or eat hard food or soft food given by a man full of desire, she is at once guilty of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be temporarily kept away.”¹⁶ The next rule adds that a nun should not tell another nun: “Whether he is full of desire or not, it does not matter to you. Do not worry, sister, since you have no desire. Please accept with your own hand and eat or partake of the hard food or soft food given to you by this man.” If a nun says so, she is at once guilty of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be temporarily kept away.”¹⁷

Pācittiya no. 60 specifies the following: “Whatever nun, without having informed and obtained permission from the Community of her group (of nuns), should together with a man, the one with the other, burst it or break a boil or a scab that has formed somewhere on the lower part of the body (between the collar-bone and the knees), or let it be washed or smeared or bound up or unbound, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.”¹⁸ This prohibition was established because of an incident in which a nun was raped by a man who came to take care of a pustule that had formed on the lower part at her body.

The aim of all these severe restrictions was to help nuns avoid situations that would threaten their ascetic life. It is necessary to remember here that the nuns were not locked up in their convents. They had to go out every day on their alms round, and so meeting people—both men and women—was inevitable; in the street or at the nunnery, they often had to talk to them. They also had to travel and in doing so encountered both men and women. This is why they needed strict regulations setting the limits of their social contacts. Thus, in the *Pātimokkha*, there is a series of rules prohibiting nuns from maintaining private contacts with men. For example, according to *Pācittiya* no. 11, a nun should not stay talking to a man in a place where there is no light.¹⁹ According to *Pācittiya* no. 12, a nun should not stay talking to a man in an isolated place.²⁰ *Pācittiya* no. 13 forbids nun to stay talking to a

16. Vin IV 232–33.

17. Vin IV 234–35.

18. Vin IV 316.

19. Vin IV 268–69.

20. Vin IV 269–70.

man in an open space such as a flower garden or a public park.²¹ *Pācittiya* no. 14 says a nun should not whisper to a man. The rule specifies: "Whatever nun should talk to a man on a main road, in a cul-de-sac, or at a cross-road, should discuss with him, or should whisper in his ear, or should send away her companion nun [in order to talk with that man alone], she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category."²² According to *Pācittiya* no. 103, a nun should not even preach more than five or six sentences the Doctrine to a man alone, unless a woman who can understand what is being said is present.²³

All these rules mean that nuns were to keep a certain distance from men, especially with regard to private contacts. That distance was necessary, on the one hand, to prevent personal contacts and, on the other hand, to avoid the scandals that could have jeopardized the good name of the Community of Nuns. We have already noted that the different rules of the *Bhikkhu Pātimokkha* required monks and nuns to keep their distance from one another. They could participate in religious activities together, but any questionable behaviour was to be avoided.²⁴

Virtuous nuns tended not to have any blameworthy contacts with men, of course. Almost all the disciplinary rules in this domain were established with regard to ordinary nuns who had not attained any of the stages of liberation. The canonical texts tell of some nuns who even had emotional problems. To change their state of mind, suitable advice was necessary. For example, a nun fell in love with Āyasmanta Ānanda. She sent a message to him saying that she was sick and she wished to see him. The rule permitted Āyasmanta Ānanda to visit her (cf. *supra* p.51–52), but

21. Vin IV 270.

22. Vin IV 270–71.

23. This is the nuns' rule that is equivalent to the monks' *Pācittiya* no. 7 (Vin IV 17–23).

24. The monks did not have the right to give even lower ordination (*pabbajjā*) to a man who had seduced a nun. The Commentary on the *Vinaya* says, "A person who did not abstain from illicit sexual practices can be ordained on condition that he decides to conduct himself properly in the future, but a person who has seduced a nun cannot be ordained" (Vin-a 1015). According to *Vinaya*, a male novice (*sāmaṇera*) who seduced a nun was to be expelled from the noviciate (Vin I 85).

on seeing the 'ill' nun, he quickly understood what was happening. He started to speak to the nun of the dangers inherent in sensual pleasures, especially in sexual relations. As she listened to his discourse, she understood how wrong her thoughts had been and asked for Ānanda to pardon her. Āyasmanta Ānanda said, "Sister, in this noble discipline, progress means accepting and declaring one's fault as a fault, and resolving not to commit this fault again." The advice helped to the sick nun in controlling her mind and continuing on the path of inner progress.²⁵

On the other hand, there were a number of young nuns who had attained the highest stages of liberation, and so were capable of responding correctly to any external temptation with a perfect mastery of their reactions. No man could tempt them with seduction. Subhā Jivakambavanikā Therī, for example, was approached by a young man who tried to persuade her to go with him. He talked of her beauty, especially praising her beautiful eyes with which he had fallen in love. But she explained to the young man what was wrong with sensual pleasures and how impermanent they were. As he did not listen much to her, she even went so far as to pluck out one of the eyes he had praised so highly and gave it to him—a very dramatic way of showing how fragile sensual pleasures are.²⁶

In many of his discourses, the Buddha speaks of the dangers in the psychological phenomenon called the "attraction" between women and men.

"Monks, I do not know of any other physical form that enslaves the thoughts of a woman like the physical form of a man. The physical form of a man completely obsesses the thoughts of a woman. I do not know of any other sound that enslaves the thoughts of a woman like the sound of a man's voice. The sound of a man's voice completely obsesses the thoughts of a woman. I do not know of any other odour that enslaves the thoughts of a woman like the odour of a man. The odour of a man completely obsesses the thoughts of a woman. I do not know of any other taste that enslaves the thoughts of a woman like the taste of a man. The taste of a

25. A II 146.

26. Thī 366–99; Thī-a 245–60.

man completely obsesses the thoughts of a woman. I do not know of any other physical contact that enslaves the thoughts of a woman like the physical contact of a man. Physical contact of a man completely obsesses the thoughts of a woman."²⁷

Thus, in general, for both men and women a member of the opposite sex embodies the five areas of sensual pleasures: physical appearance, the sound of the voice and other things that are attractive and loved. From the doctrinal point of view, the real problem is not the attraction, but being enslaved by the attachment and obsession that are the result of being attracted. The Master did not want to see a man being any woman's slave nor a woman being any man's slave. In his teaching of liberation, there was no difference between the liberation of a man and that of a woman. In fact, he saw that in this slavery both were enchained by desire. Whether man or woman, neither could be liberated as long as they were interested in the giving of pleasure and the taking of pleasure. When trying to seduce, not only the victim but also the seducer would be reduced to this enslavement. Finally, there would be mutual exploitation which would cause mutual conflict. This is why people leading a contemplative life had to guard against attracting others, as well as against being attracted.

Nuns, then, were to abstain from any form of seduction. They should not provoke any sensual desire in others through their conduct. For example, *Pācittiya* no. 87 forbids nuns to wear ornaments or jewellery.²⁸ According to *Pācittiya* nos. 88 and 89, a nun should not use perfumes or bathing ointments.²⁹ These were considered usages for laywomen. One day, when the nuns of the "group of six" were bathing without cloths, some courtesans who were in the same place at the river started to make fun of them, saying, "How can these nuns remove the hair from private parts, just like us lay women who enjoy sensual pleasures." Because of this incident, the rule *Pācittiya* no. 2 was enacted forbidding nuns

27. A I 2. The Buddha also explained that the same thing holds true for men regarding women. See BML, p.99.

28. Vin IV 340.

29. Vin IV 341.

to shave or remove the hair in their armpits and on other parts of the body.³⁰ Nuns were also not to bathe away from a proper bathing site in a river, and they were not to bathe at the same spot where men bathing. This prohibition was established when some young nuns were annoyed by several men who were entertaining themselves by watching the scene of nuns bathing in the river.³¹

If entrance to the Community of Nuns was closed to some people such as eunuchs, hermaphrodites, etc., it was not only to keep up the good reputation of the Community, but also to avoid any sexual perversion that could be provoked by such persons. Similarly, on the occasions where a sexual change happened to a member of the Community, the case had to be dealt with in a strict manner, but with compassion for the person in question. Once, for example, masculine genitals appeared on a nun, and according to *Vinaya*, she no longer had the right to live with nuns. In order to become a monk she then had to obtain the higher ordination from the Community of Monks. On another occasion, a monk turned into a woman; she had to obtain the higher ordination in the Community of Nuns.³² Why, one may ask, did the *Vinaya* report all these rare incidents? As a true book of law containing the rules and legal proceedings for monks and nuns, the *Vinaya* wanted to explain how such complicated situations were to be dealt with in the future.

Several rules were enacted to avoid sexual perversions. For example, according to *Pācittiya* nos. 3 and 4, masturbation, homosexuality (lesbianism), and the use of things such as a dildo, are offences to be confessed.³³ *Pācittiya* nos. 90, 91, 92 and 93 forbid nuns to be rubbed or massaged by another nun, or by a postulant, or by a female novice or by a lay woman.³⁴ *Pācittiya* nos. 31 and 32 forbids nuns to share the same bed or the same blanket.³⁵ The *Vinaya* reports that these two rules were given after lay people started to criticize some young nuns who were sharing beds and blankets.³⁶ It is possible that in these incidents, the nuns

30. Vin IV 259–60.

31. Vin II 280.

32. Vin III 35.

33. Vin IV 260–61.

34. Vin IV 342–42.

35. Vin IV 289.

were completely innocent. But from the point of view of lay people, two young nuns sharing one bed was not proper. Each time such a thing happened, lay people started to criticize it, saying "How can these nuns, the daughters of Sākya, do this or that, just like lay women who enjoy sensual pleasures." Thus, it was better for nuns not to place themselves open to such criticism.

Finally, it should be noted that in Buddhism, from its doctrinal point of view, sex is only one part of the larger domain of sensual craving (*kāma-taṇhā*).³⁷ As people who had renounced sensual pleasures, nuns and monks were supposed to strive to free themselves not only from sexual desires, but from all sensual cravings. A code of discipline would not get rid of craving, for thoughts cannot be controlled by institutional laws. That is why the majority of discourses of the canonical texts are about how to control the sense faculties by means of appropriate mental exercises. These exercises would lead to mental development and eventually result in displeasure (*nibbidā*) in sensual objects and detachment (*virāga*) with regard to sensual desires. The detachment would lead to the liberation (*vimutti*). It should be noted, however, that displeasure or detachment did not include refusal, disdain, frustration or hatred for oneself or for others. While cultivating detachment, at the same time, nuns and monks had to reach an equilibrium by practising the Four Sublime Abidings (*cattāro brahma-vihāra*) systematically prescribed in the sermons of the Master, namely, loving kindness (*mettā*), compassion (*karuṇā*), altruistic joy (*muditā*), and equanimity (*upekkhā*).

36. Cf. *supra* p.46.

37. See BML, pp.101–06.

CHAPTER 8

SPIRITUAL PROGRESS

In the preceding chapters we have seen the circumstances that led to the development of the nuns' code of discipline. Since some of the nuns misbehaved themselves, it was necessary to establish more and more rules of conduct. Some nuns such as Thulla Nandā and Sundarī Nandā could never adapt to the Doctrine and Discipline and they end up by leaving the Community of Nuns.¹

Generally, the regulations were useful for the proper functioning of the Community, and for the welfare of each member of that community. Through its rules, the *Vinaya* indicates not only the duties but also the rights of the members of this monastic organization. Each nun had to be courteous, cooperative, and sensitive to the well-being of the other members. Thus the rules were enacted according to the timeliness, necessity, comfort and welfare of the nuns. At the beginning of each rule of the code of discipline, the *Vinaya* indicates ten reasons for which such and such rule had been established: (1) to protect the Community; (2) to comfort the Community; (3) to restrain ill-intentioned nuns; (4) to ease well-behaved nuns; (5) to eradicate the mental stains which have arisen; (6) to avoid the mental stains which have not yet arisen; (7) to please those who are not (yet) pleased; (8) to increase the number of those who are pleased; (9) to establish the Discipline itself; and (10) to follow the rules of restraint.

Most of these ten reasons for the rules deal with social relationship among the nuns inside the Community and between the nuns and the Buddhist lay community. Only the fifth and sixth reasons are related directly to inner progress. It is obvious that the main objective of the *Vinaya* was not the mental development of the nuns, but their external behaviour. Religious training for a nun did not have as its principal goal the observation of monastic rules or taking care of the monasteries; the nun's goal was to discipline

1. Vin IV 216; S II 219-21.

the mind in order to attain the highest liberation.² The things to be abstained from that are given in the *Vinaya* are only one aspect of monastic life and are given because abstaining from them is helpful in pursuing in the path of inner progress. Concerning this, the doctrinal procedure is as follows. The good conduct (*sīla*) through precepts is the foundation of the mental discipline leading to concentration (*samādhi*). The concentration achieved through mental discipline is the foundation of insight knowledge (*paññā*). Insight knowledge leads to liberation (*vimutti*).³ As the famous nun Dhammadinnā explained in her discussion, the eight factors of Noble Eightfold Path are included in these three domains—*sīla*, *samādhi* and *paññā*.⁴ In these three areas, the principles and practices were the same for monks and for nuns. There was no difference between the results obtained by a monk or a nun. Both were trying to attain the same *summum bonum* called *nibbāna*.

As we noted earlier, many of the women who became nuns had a certain level of understanding of the Buddha's teaching even before joining the Community. Many of them had met the Buddha and listened to him teaching. Some others had learned of the Doctrine through discourses given by leading members of both Communities. Moreover, certain ladies such as Sumedhā had obtained a high stage of mental concentration while still at home.⁵ Some others had already attained the first stage of liberation (*sotāpatti*) even before becoming nuns. We can cite for example the following names: Puṇṇikā, the daughter of a slave in the household of Anāthapiṇḍika;⁶ Rohiṇī, the daughter of a rich

2. The Buddha says in *Mahā-Sāropama-sutta*: "The goal of this pure life is not to gain material profit, nor to win veneration, nor to reach higher morality, nor to be capable of the highest concentration. But the ultimate end of this pure life is the unshakeable liberation of the mind. This is the essence. This is the destination"—M I 197.

3. D II 81; M I 197.

4. M I 301. Dhammadinnā Therī specified in her discussion that the Noble Eightfold Path is included in *sīla*, *samādhi* and *paññā*, but that these three are not limited to Noble Eightfold Path.

5. Sumedhā, a princess from Manthāvati, could attain and spend time in the first *jhāna* when she was still a young woman. Cf Thī 480.

6. Thī 200. Cf. *supra* p.23.

Brahman in Vesālī;⁷ and Subhā Kammāradhītā, the daughter of a very rich jeweller in Rājagaha.⁸ All these three attained the stage of *sotāpatti* while they were still very young. Anopamā, who was the daughter of a rich merchant of Sāketa, had already attained the third stage of liberation (*anāgāmi*) before being ordained.⁹ After becoming nuns, these women attained the highest stage of liberation in a short time. Two persons, Khemā and Sujātā, even reached the Arahant hood before becoming nuns.¹⁰

Meanwhile, some women had not attained any high stage while in lay life, but they had such a deep understanding that they were able to reach the highest level of mental development as soon as they became nuns. Dhammadinnā Therī and Isidāsī Therī, for example, became Arahants only a few days after entering the Community.

These stories do not mean that all nuns achieved the various stages of liberation without any difficulty. In Buddhism, inner progress on the path of liberation is not a boon given by a higher religious authority nor is it a divine gift. It is a personal achievement that depends on earnest effort in developing one's mind. That is why the mental discipline of concentration is one of the most important elements of religious training in Buddhism. Some ladies, even though they were very courageous, had difficulties, especially in concentrating their minds. They needed proper advice and encouragement to advance on the path of inner progress. One such nun explained what her difficulty was:

*Twenty five years have passed
Since I went forth from home to the homeless life.
[But] I had not been able
To concentrate my mind
Even for the duration of a snap of the fingers;
I was soaked in desire.
[One day], throwing up my arms and weeping
I returned to my cell.
[Without delay], I approached*

-
7. Thī 214.
 8. Thī 338–39.
 9. Thī 138.
 10. Thī-a 128, 137.

Spiritual Progress

*A nun whom I could trust.
She taught me the Doctrine,
Explained to me the [basic] factors of existence
The sense-bases and the elements.
Having heard the Doctrine
I sat down [to meditate] (...)*

*I have obtained
The eradication of mental stains.
I have realized
The six supernormal knowledges
[Thus] I have done
What the Buddha asked to be done.*

Thī 67–71

Similarly, two nuns who had the same name, Sāmā, had to try hard over many years before they could overcome their difficulties in mental concentration.¹¹ But through diligence and by following the Master's advice, they were able to proceed on the path and successfully attain the final goal. The young nun, Sihā, even though she entered the Community with much enthusiasm, could not overcome her attachment to sensual things for seven years. Finally, she became so desperate that she took a rope and went into the wood with the intention of hanging herself.¹² Two nuns named Uttamā and Vijayā were also completely discouraged with their lack of progress for many years, but a little later, they were able to practice correctly their mental exercises and eventually reached Arahant hood.¹³

The young nun Cittā who had entered the religious life, leaving her parents behind, spent a very long time practising mental exercises in order to eradicate stains, but it was only when she was old and feeble that she finally attained her goal.¹⁴ Mittakālī was inspired to become a nun after hearing the Buddha teach the Greater Discourse on Mindfulness (*Mahā-Satipaṭṭhāna-*

11. Thī 44–46.

12. She even put the noose around her neck before releasing her mind from being attached. Cf. Thī 77–81.

13. Thī 42, 169; Thī-a 47.

14. Thī 27; Thī-a 33–35.

sutta),¹⁵ but for a long time she could not attain any stage of liberation. What was her problem? She explains:

*I went forth in faith
From home to homeless life
[but] I wandered here and there;
Greedy for gain and honour
Setting aside the highest goal
I pursued the lowest one
The defilements mastered me
I neglected the goal of the religious life.
[Finally one day],
I experienced a sense of dispassioned dismay
I sat in my cell, thinking,
"I have entered the wrong path
I have been mastered by craving
My life is short
Old age and sickness are destroying it.
Before this body is broken up
There is not [much] time for me to be careless"
Observing
The arising and passing away of all elements of existence
As they are in reality
I stood up
With my mind completely released.
Thus, I have done
What the Buddha asked to be done.*

Thī 92–96

The principal obstacle for some nuns was their own pride. The two young nuns, Abhirūpi-Nandā¹⁶ and Janapadakalyāṇī Sundarī Nandā¹⁷ were enraptured with their own beauty. Abhirūpi-Nandā had been forced to get ordained by her parents after her fiancé died. Janapadakalyāṇī Sundarī Nandā was a member of the aristocratic household of Kapilavatthu where many of her relatives took ordination. She decided that she would

15. M I 55–63.

16. Thī 19–20.

17. Thī 82–86.

do so as well, not out of faith in the Doctrine, but out of love for her relatives.¹⁸ It may seem surprising that people who were not properly motivated were allowed to ordain, but it should be noted that many people who became nuns and monks for the wrong reasons were able to attain the final goal of liberation, because the Master knew the right approach to use when teaching them. For these nuns who were infatuated with their own beauty, the Buddha used a similar technique. For example, when the nun Janapadakalyāṇī Sundarī Nandā was at the assembly of listeners with other nuns, with his psychic power the Buddha made the form of a beautiful woman appear. At first, the image was more beautiful than Sundarī Nandā herself. Then gradually the beautiful woman became aged and ugly, and after death her body discoloured, being even covered with maggots and smelling badly. Seeing this, Sundarī Nandā became profoundly aware of how frightful the body is and how impermanent physical beauty is. She was able to realize that all conditioned phenomena are impermanent (*anicca*), unsatisfactory (*dukkha*) and without any permanent entity (*anatta*). She attained the first stage of liberation (*sotāpatti*) and with further instructions from the Master attained Arahantship. A modern psychiatrist easily could conclude that the Buddha had used a type of mental therapy to treat the nun's narcissistic complexes!

Without doubt, not only stories like this as told in the monastic texts and the discourses concerning the impermanence of the body, but also the declarations of some old nuns such as Ambapālī (Thī 250–270) and Vimalā (Thī 72–76) talking about their vanished beauty, were useful to the young nuns who had the same problem as Janapadakalyāṇī Sundarī Nandā.

Women who had painful experiences in lay life were highly motivated when they became nuns to make much effort on the path of liberation. Ubbirī lost her only daughter; Vāseṭṭhī, her son; and Paṭācārā her entire family: mother, father, brother, husband and two children. Having heard the Doctrine, these women were able to overcome their sorrows, and later, as nuns, they succeeded in uprooting the real cause of all suffering. Later Vāseṭṭhī Therī expressed what happened to her:

18. Thī-a 24–25

Buddhist Nuns

*Agonizing over my son [who was dead],
With disturbed mind, out of my senses,
Naked and with disordered hair
I was wandering here and there.
I dwelt on debris in the byways
I dwelt in a graveyard and on highways.
Bearing hunger and thirst,
I roamed around for three years.
Then [one day]
I saw the Blessed One,
The tamer of untamed [people]
The Awakened One,
Who had no fear from anywhere.
He was going to the city of Mithilā.
Recovering my senses,
I paid homage to him and sat down.
With pity [for me]
Gotama preached the Doctrine.
Hearing his Doctrine
I went forth into the homeless life.
Applying myself to the Teacher's words
I realized the blissful state.
All sorrows have been cut out
They have been driven out and ended.
[Thus] I have understood the ground
From which comes the origin of sorrows.*

Thī 133–138

Later, Ubbirī Therī also expressed her gratitude to the Master who had removed all her sorrows.¹⁹ As for Paṭācārā Therī, she attained Arahanthood, and became famous as the specialist in disciplinary (*vinaya*) matters; later among her students, there were many women who had lost children before becoming nuns.²⁰ In this domain, the story of Kisā-Gotamī is especially moving. She came from a poor family in Sāvattthī and was looked down upon by her husband's family because of her social background. But when she had a son, she was treated with more respect. One day,

19. Thī 51–53.

20. Thī 117–21; Thī-a 118–20.

her son died while he was playing. The young mother took him on her hip and went around asking for medicine to cure him, and when people told her he was dead she could not understand. Finally, a man told her to go and ask the Buddha. When she did so, the Buddha instructed her to obtain a handful of mustard seeds from a house where there had never been any death. Kisā-Gotamī went to find the seeds, but everywhere she visited the people explained to her how many persons had died in such and such a house. Finally she understood the omnipresence of death and took the child's body to cemetery, then returned to the Buddha. Having heard the Doctrine she attained the first stage of Liberation. She entered the Community of Nuns and was able to reach Arahant hood in a short time.²¹

For Buddhist nuns to overcome their mental difficulties or to realise liberation, there were no prayers to say, either commonly or privately. They did not have any God to whom prayer was to be addressed. So prayers or hymns played no part in their monastic life. The only thing they had to do in order to reach inner calm and liberation was to develop their minds. That was the most important task of their religious life. Numerous discourses by the Master and his advanced disciples were full of advice on how to overcome the difficulties on the path of inner progress. Moreover, each nun had the help of a competent teacher-nun, and of experienced fellow nuns. At the beginning of the Community, while some nuns were in solitude, they sometimes found encouragement from what they saw around them. The nun Dantikā, for example, explains a scene that helped her to understand about taming the mind:

*While I was on Mount Gijjha
Coming out of my daytime dwelling
I saw an elephant
On the bank of the river
Who came out after plunging in.
A man, taking a hook,
Gave orders: "Give me your foot."
The elephant stretched out its foot
The man mounted on the animal.*

21. Thī 213–23; Thī-a 174–82; Dhṃ-a I 270.

*Seeing this untamed tamed
And come under the mastery of men
I concentrated my mind.
For that very purpose
I had entered into the wood.*²²

Thī 48–50

Another aspect of the Buddhist nuns' spiritual life was the concept of freedom. The starting point of the path leading towards this freedom was to give up both the duties and rights of domestic life. Some of the women who became nuns gave up their luxurious lifestyle, while others left secular life after various painful experiences. For example, Muttā gave up lay life and declared herself released of three crooked things: the mortar, the pestle, and her husband.²³ Another nun whose name has not come down to us spoke of how she has been released from her pestle and from the shameless husband she found disgusting.²⁴ Such reactions show how dissatisfied some wives were with their husbands, and how unhappy they were with their household duties. For these women, the Community of Nuns represented a way to be released from all that—somewhat similar to what today we call women's liberation.

Women in Buddhism were thus able to give up family life in order to pursue a more noble cause. This is a very important point when we think of the ideas of the Brahmins of the time and remember how they maintained that the only place for a woman was in the home—under the authority of her father during childhood and adolescence, under the authority of her husband after marriage, and finally in old age under the authority of her sons.

However, from the Buddhist point of view, the sole objective of liberation was not simply to be released from domestic obligations or from male domination, nor was it to find a refuge in a monastery in order to spend the rest of one's life in tranquillity.

22. These verses of Dantikā Therī can be considered as a summary of the discourse entitled *Dantabhūmi-sutta* (M I 128–37) in which the controlling of the mind is compared to taming a wild elephant.

23. Thī 11.

24. Thī 25.

Physically running away from an unsatisfactory situation was not considered true release because there was always the risk of being reborn in the same situation, or a worse condition. The only solution was to find complete release from the cycle of rebirths (*saṃsāra*), which means true freedom from femininity as well as from masculinity; from human as well as from divine bonds. Many nuns after their release expressed this idea in their joyful declarations: "Journeying-on from birth to birth has been completely stopped; there is now no renewed existence."²⁵ These words are completely in line with the declaration of the Buddha:²⁶ "This is last birth. After this, there is no more further becoming" (*ayam-antimā jāti, natthidāni punabbhavo*). Similarly, the nun Nanduttarā put it in this way: "I have cut out all existences, and wishes and longings too. Unfettered from all ties, I have attained peace of mind."²⁷

Many nuns said in their declarations that they had annihilated all mental stains. Particularly, eradication of 'thirst' (*taṇhā*) was announced by several nuns. Uttarā Therī said that she had cut down all cravings concerning existence in the human or celestial worlds.²⁸ The different mental stains were frequently designated by the symbolic term 'bonds' (*saṃyojana*), the connotation being that one is a slave to them. The nuns who had attained Arahant hood were able to say that they had broken all their bonds, whether human or divine.²⁹ This release was also described using other metaphors. For example, Uttarā Therī and Abhayā Therī said that they had become cool and been quenched, that a burning fever had been eliminated by the extinction of fire.³⁰ In this case, it should be noted that the word 'fire' is used metaphorically to indicate the mental stains: desire, aversion and

25. Jenti Therī (Thī 22), Aḍḍakāsi Therī (v. 26), Uttarā Therī (v. 47), Guttā Therī (v. 168), etc.

26. Vin I 67.

27. Thī 91.

28. Thī 47.

29. Tissā Therī (Thī 4), Bhaddā Kuṇḍalakesā Therī (v. 111), Subhā Therī (vv. 360, 364), etc.

30. Thī 15, 34; Sumanā Therī (v. 16), Sakulā Therī (v. 101), Saṅghā Therī (v. 18), Nandā Therī (v. 86).

illusion.³¹ Nibbāna as experienced in the present life is not anything other than the extinction of these three harmful elements.

From Buddhist perspective, liberation is also a release from ignorance (*avijjā*) which is considered a principal source not only of the all sort of mental stains, but also of all types of sufferings. In fact, ignorance is the cause of bonds. Ignorance itself is a bond. That is why, according to Buddhism, right comprehension or knowledge (*vijjā*) is synonym of liberty. Having attained Arahant hood, each nun could say: "I have torn asunder the dark mass of ignorance."³²

Several nuns³³ speak of their deliverance in terms of having attained the three sciences (*te-vijjā*; *Skt tri-vidyā = trayi vidyā*). These were: (1) the knowledge which permits one to see one's past lives (*pubbenivāsānussati-ñāṇa*); (2) the knowledge which permits one to know where and why beings are reborn after death (*cutūpapāta-ñāṇa*); and (3) the knowledge which permits one to be sure that all mental stains have been eliminated (*āsava-kkhaye-ñāṇa*).³⁴ The concept of these three sciences was also found in Brahminism, but with a very different meaning. In Brahminism, these three knowledges refer to erudition of the three Vedas, and the knowledge of these three were limited only to men of high castes. But Buddhism brought a new connotation to the word *vijjā* (*Skt vidyā = knowledge or science*) and used it in its texts with a new idea.³⁵ Thus, when Buddhist texts say that the nuns had attained "three knowledges," it must have seemed a critique of the traditional Brahminical attitude according to which no women of any caste whatsoever was considered capable of attaining the

31. Vin I 36–37; S IV 19–20.

32. Uttarā Therī (Thī 44), Selā Therī (v. 59), Somā Therī (v. 62), Khemā Therī (v. 142), Vijayā Therī (vv. 173, 173), Cālā Therī (v. 188), Ūpacālā Therī (v. 195), Sisūpacālā Therī (v. 203), Uppalavaṇṇā Therī (v. 235).

33. Aḍḍhakāsī Therī (Thī 203), Mettikā Therī (v. 30), several students of Paṭācārā Therī (v. 121), Candā Therī (v. 126), Sujātā Therī (v. 150), Uttarā Therī (v. 181), Vaḍḍha Mātā Therī (v. 209), Sundarī Therī (v. 323), Subhā Therī (v. 363), Isidāsī Therī (v. 433).

34. A I 163–166. Cf. Vin II 87; S I 146; A I 105; It 98.

35. In a sermon, the Buddha specifies that: "in the noble discipline, the three knowledges mean something different than the three knowledges of the brahmins."—A I 163–166; M II 144.

three knowledges.³⁶ Very probably, the early Buddhists wanted to say to the brahmins: "Look gentlemen, in this doctrine and discipline, women of any caste or any family, can attain the three knowledges, on condition that they follow the correct path. These three sciences, of course, are not divine gifts, nor revelations coming from on high, but are to be developed by each person by exercising his or her own inner capacity."

Not only among many orthodox Brahmin priests, but also among some other misogynists, there was always the question of whether a woman was capable of attaining the high summits of spirituality. In *Samyutta-nikāya* (and in *Therīgāthā*), the verse attributed to the nun *Somā* is a good example of how women were viewed at the time of the Buddha and of the way that Buddhism considered them capable of the highest attainments. One day, when *Somā Therī* was under a tree, *Māra* wishing to distract her, came up and said: "That state so hard to gain, which should be attained by seers, cannot be attained by a woman with two-finger intelligence." *Somā Therī* rebuffed *Māra* by replying:

*What harm could womanhood do to us
When the mind is well-concentrated,
When knowledge is present
For someone who has rightly attained
Insight into the Doctrine?
Everywhere slain is delight
The mass of darkness shattered.
In this way, Evil One,
You should know that you are destroyed.*

Thī 60–62; cf. S I 129

With words such as this attributed to those venerable nuns, Buddhism constantly encouraged women to practice mental discipline in order to obtain true liberation.

Whether in the field of spiritual understanding or in superhuman capacities, the place of nuns was as remarkable as

36. In the canonical texts, attaining the three knowledges is synonymous to attaining Arahantship. Cf. M I 21–23, 183–184, 278–279, 347–348; II 20–21, 226–227, etc. Numerous disciples who attained Arahantship said that they had obtained the three knowledges.

that of monks. The *Āṅguttara-nikāya* (A I 26) records a list of famous nuns who were leading women disciples. They were well-known in different domains: for example, Khemā Therī was foremost among the nuns who possessed great wisdom; Bhaddakaccā Therī was foremost among the nuns who attained supernormal knowledges;³⁷ Paṭācārā Therī was foremost among the nuns with regard to knowledge on the code of discipline; and Nandā Therī was foremost among the nuns who developed their mind.

Several nuns were well-known for their ability to preach: Khemā Therī, Kajaṅgalā Therī, Vajirā Therī, Sukkā Therī, Dhammadinnā Therī, etc. The lay disciple Visākha told the Buddha what the nun Dhammadinnā had said in answer to the questions put to her, and the Buddha said, “Visākha, the nun Dhammadinnā is very wise. She is very intelligent. If you had asked me the same questions you asked her, I would have answered just as she did. Her answers are in harmony with my Teachings. So, Visākha, keep in mind what she told you.”³⁸ This praise is sufficient to measure the high regard in which the Buddha held learned nuns like Dhammadinnā.

Finally, we can say that the presence of many discussions and sermons by nuns in Canonical texts itself is a great honour for womankind in any epoch anywhere in the world. Thus Buddhism dignified womankind by recording and remembering up to today their spiritual achievements.

37. According to the *Āṅguttara-nikāya* commentary, Bhaddakaccā was another name for Rāhula-Mātā Therī—A-a I 198.

38. M I 305.

POST-SCRIPT

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE DISAPPEARANCE OF THE COMMUNITY OF NUNS

The Community of Nuns continued to prosper for many centuries. Inscriptions show that these venerable ladies belonged to different schools and that they lived in different regions of India.¹ However, like the Community of Monks and other Buddhist institutions, the Community of Nuns eventually disappeared from the soil where it had originated as a result of various factors.

Today, some schools of Buddhism in several countries still have a Community of Nuns. For example, in South Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan, the monastic tradition for women has been passed down from generation to generation.

As for the nuns of the Theravāda school, their most important centre was in Sri Lanka. The Community of Nuns was established there in the third century BCE by Saṅghamittā Therī. According to Pali chronicles, Saṅghamittā was a daughter of the Emperor Asoka (268–233 BCE), and she came to Sri Lanka as part of a Buddhist mission organised by her father.² She was also the younger sister of Mahā-Mahinda Thera, who had established Buddhism in this country in 247 BCE. They are both held in great veneration, even today.

The Pali chronicles say that King Devānampiya Tissa (257–207 BCE) welcomed Saṅghamittā Therī who was accompanied by the nuns Uttarā, Hemā, Pasādapālā, Aggimittā, Dāsikā, Pheggu, Pabbatā, Mattā, Dhammadāsī, Mahādevī, Padumā, Unnalā, etc.³

1. B.C. LAW, "Bhiksunis in Indian Inscriptions," *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. 25, 1940, pp.31–34; G. SCHOPEN, "On Monks, Nuns and 'Vulgar Practices': The Introduction of the Image Cult into Indian Buddhism," *Artibus Asiae*, vol. XLIX/2, 1989, pp.153–68.

2. *Mahāvamsa*, XVIII, 23.

3. *Dīpavamsa*, XVIII, 11–13.

They also brought with them a shoot from the Bodhi Tree⁴ in Bodh-Gayā, to be planted at Anurādhapura. According to the Pali commentaries and Chronicles, all those nuns were Arahants, and all learned. They resided in Anurādhapura, the capital of that time, taught the *Vinaya-piṭaka* and *Sutta-piṭaka* to the women of Sri Lanka and established several convents for nuns.⁵

Saṅghamittā Therī attained *parinibbāna* in 197 BCE, at the age of seventy-nine, several years after the *parinibbāna* of her elder brother, Mahā-Mahinda Thera. The King Devānampiya Tissa's successor, King Uttiya (207–197 BCE), had a sumptuous funeral ceremony performed, giving Saṅghamittā Therī the highest royal honours.⁶ A stupa was built on the site of the place where her body was cremated.

The first Ceylonese women to be attracted to join the nuns' community were members of the royal household. Anulā Devī, the king's wife, ordained under Saṅghamittā Therī.⁷ Next, a number of women from well-to-do families entered the Community of Nuns. Many details of the early days of the women's Community are given in the Chronicles of the country.⁸ The nuns benefited from the kings' patronage for many centuries,⁹ and also from the material support of women of the aristocracy. The Chronicles of the country says that at the times of great Sinhalese kings such as Duṭṭhagāmaṇi (101–77 BCE) nuns

4. The Bodhi Tree (bot. *Ficus religiosa*): This tree became an object of cult worship in Sri Lanka, replacing the pre-Buddhist cult centred around the banyan tree (bot. *Ficus bengalensis*) and the Borasse tree (bot. *Borassus flabellifer*), etc. where people made sacrifices (*Mahāvamsa*, X, 89). The Buddhist missionaries seem only to have tried to change the object of worship rather than attempt to wipe out this practice altogether by giving the people a symbol to worship in the new religion. Even today, Buddhists pay respects to the Bodhi tree as an object that was used by the Buddha (*pāribhogika cetiya*) under which he attained his Awakening, and because it serves to remind them of the Buddha (*uddesika cetiya*). In Buddhist art, the Bodhi tree symbolises the Buddha's Awakening.

5. *Dīpavamsa*, XVIII, 19–20; Vin-a I 92.

6. *Mahāvamsa*, XX, 48–53.

7. *Ibid.*, XIX, 65; Vin-a 1.101.

8. *Mahāvamsa*, XVIII–XX.

participated actively in religious activities of the country.

During periods of famines or when there were foreign invasions, the nuns, like monks, had to seek asylum in other provinces or in other countries. When the situation was once again favourable, they returned. Chinese documents report that a Sinhalese nun named Devasārā went to China with a group of nuns and founded a Community of nuns there in 436 CE.¹⁰ Inscriptions indicate that the Community of Nuns still existed in Sri Lanka as late as the tenth century.¹¹ As R.A.L.H. Gunawardhana mentioned in his admirable study, according to Burmese inscriptions there were Buddhist nuns in Upper Burma until the 12th century.¹² Very probably those nuns belonged to a powerful Tāntric school.¹³ As Gunawardhana affirmed, those nuns were not considered sufficiently “orthodox” in their views and practices by Buddhists in Sri Lanka.

Thus there is no evidence that nuns of the Theravāda tradition existed after the 10th Century. One may ask why their Community disappeared there and then, while the Community of Monks still existed in Sri Lanka and other Theravāda countries. Let us consider some of the reasons for the disappearance of the nuns’ Community from Sri Lanka. First of all, it should be noted that at several stages in the history of Buddhism in this country, the Community of Nuns was weakened because of dissension

9. *Dīpavamsa*, XVIII, 14–20; 38–39; *Mahāvamsa*, XIX, 76–84; XX, 20–23; XXVI, 15; XXIX, 68–69, 77–84; XXXIII, 82; XXXIV, 6–8; XXXVII, 43; *Cūlavamsa*, XXXIX, 43; ILI, 47; ILIV, 10; ILIX, 26–27.

10. *History of Ceylon* (ed. University of Ceylon), vol. I, Colombo, p.17.

11. *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, I, 75; II, 22, 25, 34; V, 334; G.P. MALALASEKERA, *The Pali Literature of Ceylon*, Colombo, 1958, pp.165–166; R.A.L.H. GUNAWARDHANA, *Robe and Plough: Monasticism and Economic Interest in Early Medieval Sri Lanka*, (Uni. of Arizona Press, 1979), pp. 39, 280; W. RAHULA, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, 1956, p. 152.

12. R.A.L.H. GUNAWARDHANA, *op.cit.*, p.280.

13. N.R. RAY, *Sanskrit Buddhism in Burma*, Amsterdam, 1936 reprinted: Bangkok 2006, pp. 65–66; *Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma*, Tr. Pe Mounng TIN & G. H. LUCE, 1923, p. 71; Ch. DUROISELLE, “The Ari of Burma and Tantric Buddhism” in *Annual Report of Archaeological Survey of India*, 1915–16, pp. 79–93.

among the monks. This dissension led to the monks' being divided into different schools from the first century onwards. Each of these schools had its own Community of Monks and its Community of Nuns. When a school lost its influence or disappeared, the nuns of that school disappeared too. In the 4th century, for example, there was a school of monks called Sāgaliya Nikāya, supported by the king.¹⁴ When the monks of this fraternity disappeared for various reasons, its Community of Nuns also disappeared. As we have noted, the Eight Great Conditions initially imposed on the nuns made them dependent on the Community of Monks. The monks could continue without any nuns, but the reverse was not possible. It seems that early Buddhism did not programme for an independent existence for the Community of Nuns.

In my opinion, another factor leading to the end of the Community of Nuns may have been a lack of active support on the part of certain monks. Perhaps this could have been due to monks' negative attitude towards women. G.P. Malalasekera has suggested that some monks were jealous of the nuns.¹⁵ Sometimes, the relationship between two Communities in some regions was not very smooth, probably due to improper or arrogant behaviour of some monks. As the generosity of the kings increased, some monks became too fat and too lazy to proceed on the path of inner progress. It is possible that the virtuous nuns did not feel like respecting such monks, and so there was a general conflict between them. Moreover, here and there, although very rarely, some monks and nuns gave in to romantic feelings.¹⁶ Such incidents scandalized their fellow monks and nuns, and lay people too. Sometimes bad rumours encouraged virtuous monks to be very reserved with regard to nuns, and this would have been to the nuns' disadvantage.

In some periods of history, there were nuns who received higher ordination only from the Community of Nuns and did not receive the second ordination from the Community of Monks. This second ordination, of course, was part of the Eight Great Conditions laid down for nuns at the very beginning of their Community.¹⁷ The Pali commentaries speak of such nuns as

14. *Cūlavamsa*, XXXIX, 43.

15. G.P. MALALASEKERA, *op.cit.*

“nuns who are ordained on one side [only]” (*ekato-upasampannā bhikkhuniyo*).¹⁸ Perhaps these nuns were hoping to obtain the second ordination very soon, but without obtaining an opportunity.

Moreover, the monks who lived in forests (*vanavāsi*) did not seem to manifest any enthusiasm when it came to helping the nuns. It is possible that from the very beginning, they found the Community of nuns an unnecessary element or even a hindrance to an ardent ascetic life. We do not know whether the conduct of some libertine nuns might have justified such reluctance. However, in periods where the forest dwelling monks became very influential in the country, sometimes even with royal admiration, it is sure that they did not encourage the existence of the Community of Nuns, nor did they advise political leaders to take the necessary steps to ensure the safety of that Community.¹⁹ It is also possible that sometimes the bad reputation earned by some nuns disturbed the faith of lay people in the nuns' Community. Under such conditions it was not surprising that the Community lost material support.

But the most important factor for the disappearance of the Community of Nuns, in my opinion, was the political troubles

16. Several cases are cited by the Pali commentator of the 5th century as a warning of the danger of too much contact between monks and nuns. We can mention the following incident reported in the *Majjhima-nikāya* commentary: A large number of monks, nuns and lay people came together for the dedication ceremony of the Maricavaṭṭi-cetiya built by the great king Duṭṭhama (101–77 BCE) at Anurādhapura. One day during the week-long festivities, as a young male novice was carrying a bowl full of hot rice gruel, a young female postulant came to help him. Much later, when there was a drought in the country, many monks and nuns went to Buddhist centres in India. The male novice was now a monk of sixty years old. In India, he met an old nun from Sri Lanka, and as they were talking together, it turned out that the nun was the female postulant who had helped him so many years ago when he was still a young novice. They recognized each other, and were so moved by this surprise meeting that they abandoned the religious life and were married. M-a II 145.

17. Cf. *supra* p.33–36.

18. Kkh pp.64, 98–101.

that the country had to face from time to time. Especially detrimental to Buddhism in Sri Lanka were the invasions that frequently came from South India. As to the security of the nuns, we cannot suppose that the monks could play a very important role, except to accompany nuns when they were travelling through a dangerous region. Even under such conditions, the monks could not go to fight to ensure the security of the nuns. Neither monks nor nuns had the right to arm themselves or fight with enemies. Indeed, from the doctrinal point of view, they were supposed to maintain their calm in all circumstances, even when they were physically attacked, or even when the nuns were raped or harassed by foreign soldiers.²⁰ When there were difficulties, only the lay community could protect the monks and nuns. Yet when a war occurred, lay Buddhists would not always be able to defend the monasteries. So it would have been difficult for the monks and nuns to maintain the smooth running of their Communities while a war was being fought.

At the end of the 10th century CE, the rulers of Sri Lanka were too weak to protect Anurādhapura, which was not only the capital city but also the religious centre of the country. Around 1014, there were serious defeats at the hands of Coḷas invaders who came from South India. As ardent Śaivites, they were anti-Buddhist and destroyed monasteries and other Buddhist sites.²¹ The wealth of these institutions was brought to Tanjor to build Hindu Kovils. During the period of foreign occupation, the monks' Community was completely corrupted, and records make

19. It is necessary to remember here that the Community of Nuns had nothing to do with forests or woods. So there were no *vanavāsī* nuns. In other words, their residences were necessarily situated in the cities, towns and villages (cf. *supra* pp. 107–108). But in the Community of Monks there were two types of members: monks who lived in the forests (*araññavāsī* alias *vanavāsī*) and those who lived in monasteries situated near villages or towns (*gāmaavāsī*). Cf. *supra* p.107 note 70.

20. M I 122–23; The *Kakacūpama-sutta* gives this advice to the monks: “When thieves carve one limb from limb with a double-handled saw, yet even then whoever sets his mind at enmity, he for this reason, is not a doer of my teaching.” (M I 129).

21. *Cūlavamsa*, LIX, 66–68; *History of Ceylon* (ed. University of Ceylon), II, 563.

no mention of a community of Nuns. The country was completely destroyed. This situation lasted until a Sinhalese prince named Kitti freed the country and became king under the name of Sri-Saṅghabodhi Vijayabāhu (1056–1111).²² He rehabilitated many Buddhist institutions and organized the bringing of ordained monks from Lower Burma together with some Sinhalese monks who had gone there during the time of occupation, thus succeeding in re-establishing higher ordination in order to revive the Community of Monks.²³ However, the Chronicles do not say whether he or his successor, Parākramabāhu I (1153–1186), tried to bring nuns from other countries like Burma in order to re-establish the Community of Nuns. Even if those kings wanted to re-establish the nuns' Community, we cannot suppose that they could have done it, for the simple reason that there may have been no more credible Theravādin nuns in Burma or anywhere else.

Some scholars today have misinterpreted the reasons for the disappearance of the Community of Nuns. Hans Küng, for example, says:

“Another fact of Buddhist and Christian life that we still see today is the discrimination against women. I shall mention only two characteristic symptoms of this. Although the Buddha finally permitted the ordination of nuns, it has not been practised among the Theravāda Buddhists of Southeast Asian since CE 456 for not very convincing reasons. In the Christian world, as everyone knows, only some Protestant denominations (and, in part, the Anglican Church) ordain women, while Catholicism and Orthodoxy continue to refuse to do so. Behind this intransigence, on both sides we find dogmatically hardened patriarchal notions of the inferiority of women. In Christianity, there is the idea of the intrinsic masculinity of the Redeemer (and “Son” of God) and his priesthood, in Buddhism the idea that a being can become a Buddha only when it has been born, or reborn, in “the form of a man.” It was not until much later that the Mahāyāna school accepted female Bodhisattvas and even came to venerate

22. *History of Ceylon* (ed. University of Ceylon), vol. I, prt.II, p.454; K.A. NILAKANTA SASTRI, “Vijayabahu I—the liberator of Lanka,” *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, (Ceylon Branch), New Series. IV (1955), pp.45–71.

23. *Cūḷavamsa*, LX, 5–8; *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, II, i, 253–54.

the male Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara as a female figure too, a “Madonna” (Chinese Kuan-yin, Japanese Kannon).²⁴

This is a very superficial comparison. Buddhism and Christianity have very different points of view concerning women in general and ordained women in particular. There is no priesthood in Buddhism, and being “ordained” as a Buddhist nun and being ordained as a priest or a minister in a Christian congregation are not comparable. However, Hans Küng aims at as central a target as possible, saying that a woman cannot become a Buddha. But he forgets to say that a woman can become an Arahant. From the doctrinal point of view, there is not much difference between Buddhahood and Arahant-hood. For example, the factors for Awakening (*bodhi-aṅgā = bojjhaṅgā*) are the same for the Buddha and for an Arahant. There is no difference in high attainment of concentration such as *saññāvedayita-nirodha-samāpatti* of the Buddha and that of Arahant. The “three sciences” (*tevijjā*) attained by the Buddha and those attained by an Arahant are same (cf. *supra* p.140). There is no difference between the *parinibbāna* of a Buddha and that of an Arahant. As for liberation (*vimutti*) both attain the same freedom. Once the Buddha said to his disciples: “I have been liberated from all human and divine bonds. You also have been liberated from all human and divine bonds.” (Vin I 21). Thus, in some way, we can say that all Arahants are Buddhas. On the other hand, all Buddhas are Arahants.²⁵

However, there are two main differences between the Buddha and an Arahant: The first is the manner of their attaining liberation. The Buddha attained it without any guide, without relying upon teaching from anyone else, but by developing his own comprehension. An Arahant has attained the same liberation, but as a disciple of the Buddha through following the Teacher’s path and his advice. The second difference is that, as the Teacher, the Buddha has several important capacities attained through his practices of the perfections (*pāramitā*): for example, a Buddha is uniquely capable of knowing a person’s capabilities and so can always choose the appropriate approach to his

24. Hans KÜNG, *Christianity and the World Religions*, Collins, London, 1987, p. 351. By the same author: *Le Christianisme et les Religions du monde*, Seuil, 1896, pp. 480–81.

25. See Vin I 37; D I 49, III 124, 128; M I 37, 69, 267, 290, 356 etc.

teachings in a way that is suitable for each person. But an Arahant has no such a capacity.

However, in Buddhist countries no woman cultivates an inferiority complex thinking that she cannot become a Buddha. They all know very well that a Buddha is not someone who has been sent, or named, or ordained, or appointed or chosen by a high divine authority, or somebody elected by a majority. In fact, "becoming a Buddha" is the ultimate result of fulfilling of the perfections (*pāramī* = *pāramitā*) practised by a Bodhisatta (Skt Bodhisattva) during a long period of time with great courage and wisdom. So attainment of Buddhahood is a very rare outcome in human history. The proof? For the last 2500 years, there has only been one Buddha! Such an exceptional event cannot be taken as an example of discrimination in Buddhism. On the other hand, according to the Theravāda as well as the Mahāyāna, any woman can be a bodhisatta if she wants to be. That is to say, any woman has the right to practise the perfections, and the final result of such practices is the same for a man and for a woman. Finally, according to the courage and wisdom employed, under suitable conditions the one as well as the other can attain Buddhahood.²⁶ This high spiritual position is beyond all masculine and feminine tendencies. Thus, the Buddha has nothing to do with a 'dogmatically hardened patriarchal notion.'

There is another important fact to be noted here. From the point of view of the millions of Asian Buddhists, even physically the Buddha is not solely a masculine figure. The result of this general appreciation is in images (in paintings and in statues); the physical appearance of the Buddha bears many feminine features. Moreover, when talking of the Buddha, the Sinhalese Buddhists are used to give him this epithet: *amā meniyan vahanse* (lit. the mother who gives the elixir of immortality). All these facts show that, for the Buddha, this debate concerning masculine superiority is quite irrelevant.

Hans Küng's affirmation concerning the epoch (420 CE) in which the Theravāda Community of Nuns disappeared is not correct. As I have noted above, according to the inscriptions, Theravāda nuns existed in Sri Lanka until the 10th Century CE. On the other hand, it is curious that this author knows nothing of the existence of Buddhist nuns in non-Theravādin countries such as Taiwan. If nuns of the Theravāda tradition do not exist today in

Asian countries, it is not due to discrimination but to a judicial problem directly connected to the nuns' own system of rules. In this context, it is important to remember that according to the disciplinary measures of the *Vinaya*, the monks have no right to confer lower or higher ordination on women if and when the Community of Nuns is absent. Moreover, a woman can be ordained only when a minimum of ten nuns is present.²⁷ When we say the Community of Nuns disappeared in the 10th Century, it means that from that time on, the quorum required for an important formal act of the Community (*saṅgha-kamma*) such as conferring higher ordination no longer existed. Consequently no new candidates could be admitted.

26. It is true that some later texts say that only a man can attain Buddhahood. What is the logic of such a statement? When one considers some social and psychological facts, for example, the numerous difficulties that a single woman has to face, we can find the basis of such a conclusion. First of all there is the question of volition. In any society or epoch where social freedom is limited and a woman is condemned to domestic work alone, nobody can expect that many women will be interested in high spiritual attainments. The second fact is woman's incapacity to renounce the world. In a society or epoch where a woman has no independence, even if she wanted to it would not be possible for her to renounce her family, home, husband, or a possible marriage, her duties of married life, in order to go and practise mental exercises to attain high spiritual positions like Buddhahood. The third fact is her inaptitude to practise austerities. We know that Bodhisatta Gotama, before his Awakening, engaged in rigorous practices (cf. M I 91-95). Sometimes he lived in solitude, even in very dangerous forests (cf. M I 77-81). It is true that those mortifications were not necessary for him attain Buddhahood, but it is through those arduous practices that Bodhisatta Gotama gradually understood the futility of those extreme practices just as a scientist comes to the right path after making many unnecessary experiments. In a society or epoch where the woman is educated to be a "woman," nobody can imagine that she will go to a dangerous forest to live for many years in solitude or to practise austerities to attain Buddhahood or to attain some other spiritual height. Thus, unfortunately, in the world and in most societies, whether in East or West, in many epochs, if a woman does not easily find the possibility and opportunity to acquire an intellectual lighting-up and to attain spiritual plenitude, that is due to many social and psychological factors.

Actually, in Theravāda countries such as Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos and Sri Lanka, there are a certain number of women who wear white or ochre-coloured clothes and observe ten precepts.²⁸ They live apart from the world of domestic life, residing in their convents. Except for very rare cases, they do not pretend to be nuns (*bhikkhunīs*) and are not supported by any major institution. In Sri Lanka, they are called *Sil māniyo* or *dasa-sil mātāvo* (lit. mothers of ten precepts). These 'ten precept mothers' and the lay people who support them are perfectly aware that the Community of Nuns has disappeared, and they certainly regret this very much.

We might ask, then, why they do not appeal for help from the nuns in Hong Kong or Taiwan in order to re-establish the nuns' Community. They do not do so because nuns in Taiwan or Hong Kong do not belong to the Theravāda tradition. The handing down from generation to generation of both the knowledge of the Doctrine and the Discipline (*ācariya paramparā*) and also the succession of monastic robes (*cīvara-paramparā*)²⁹ are very important in the monastic tradition whether Theravāda or Mahāyāna. As to the Theravāda nuns, this succession was broken for ever at the end of the 10th Century.

27. Cf. *supra* p.86.

28. P.K.R. ARAI, *Women Living Zen, Japanese Soto Buddhist Nuns*, Oxford University Press, 1999; T. BARTHOLOMEUZ, *Women under the Bo Tree, Buddhist nuns in Sri Lanka*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994; L. BLOSS, "The Female Renunciants of Sri Lanka: the Dasasilmatawa," in *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, X/1, 7–31; R. M. GROSS, *Buddhism after Patriarchy, A Feminist History*, Suny Press, Albany, 1993; I. JORDT, "Bhikkhuni, Tailashin, Mae-chii," in *Crossroads*, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University, IV/1, 31–39; C. KABILSINGH, "The future of the Bhikkhuni Sangha in Thailand" in *Speaking of Faith: Global Perspectives on Women, Religion, and Social Change*. Ed. by D. L. ECK and D. JAIN, Philadelphia, New Society Publishers, 1987; E. NISSAN, "Recovering Practice: Buddhist Nuns in Sri Lanka," in *South Asian Research* IV/1, 32–49; DIANA Y. PAUL, *Women in Buddhism: Images of the Feminine in Mahāyāna Tradition*, Asian Humanities Press, Berkeley, 1985; *Sākyadhītā: Daughters of the Buddha*, Snow Lion Publications, New York, 1988; M. SHAW, *Passionate Enlightenment; Women in Tantric Buddhism*, Princeton University Press, 1994.

In Tibetan Buddhism too, the Community of Nuns disappeared very long ago.³⁰ To re-establish it, some tried to seek the help of the nuns of Hong Kong. On the advice of some learned Lamas, European and American Buddhist postulants have gone to Hong Kong to obtain higher ordination. Let us imagine that some 'ten precept mothers' from Thailand wanted to go to Taiwan or Hong Kong in order to obtain higher ordination from those nuns. Inevitably, several questions would arise: If the candidate is ideologically attached to the Theravāda tradition, how could she receive higher ordination from another school? How could she accept the validity of such a higher ordination? etc. However, no Buddhist lady from Ceylon or Thailand is forbidden to obtain higher ordination from the nuns of Taiwan or Hong Kong or South Korea. There is no excommunication in Buddhism. There is no hostility between different schools. Each school simply tries to maintain its traditions which come from generation to generation, with its proper interpretation of the Doctrine and Discipline. Under these conditions, if some "ten precept mothers" obtained higher ordination from a Buddhist school in Taiwan or Hong Kong, these new nuns would belong to the school in which they were ordained. If there were many in their group, some day they would be able to re-establish the Community of nuns in Sri Lanka and in Thailand. But inevitably, they would have to face some questions: Would they observe the Eight Great Conditions that were initially imposed for nuns?

29. The succession of monastic robes (*cīvara-paramparā*). During ordination, the candidate receives a set of monastic robes from the preceptor's hands. When this new nun becomes a preceptor later on, she can give a set of monastic robes to her student (or students). This custom was not an initiation or an esoteric practice. It was simply an indication of the relationship between the teacher and the pupil and a manifestation of the continuation of that monastic family.

30. B. de GIVE, "Le Monachisme féminin dans le bouddhisme tibétain," *Collectanea Cisterciensia*, 49 (1987), 260–77; H. HAVNEVIK, *Tibetan Buddhist Nuns*, Norwegian University Press, 1990; A. HERRMANN-PFANDT, "Dakinis, Zur Stellung und Symbolik des Weiblichen im tantrischen Buddhismus," *Indica et Tibetica* n° 20, Bonn, 1992; K.L. TSOMO, "Tibetan Nuns and Nunneries," in *Feminine Ground: Essays on Women and Tibet*. Ed. By J.D. WILLIS, Ithaca, New York, 1987, pp.118–34.

Would they respect the rules of the Pali *Pātimokkha* in all its details? Or would they respect a *Pātimokkha* different from the Pali tradition? As to their monastic clothes, would they be like those of ancient Theravāda nuns, or to those of nuns in Taiwan, Hong Kong or Japan? Would monks from Taiwan or Hong Kong arrive to help these new nuns? What would be the attitude of the monks in Sri Lanka or in Thailand towards this new generation of nuns who would be outside the Theravāda tradition? etc, etc.

Finally, as Richard Gombrich has correctly remarked, there would be a question of public approval.³¹ The lay people who are used to the Theravāda tradition and its history, would not be ready to accept at once these new nuns belonging to another tradition. They would not be ready to accept these new nuns as direct descendants of Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī Therī or Saṅghamittā Therī. Even if some support were to be forthcoming from broad-minded people, it would probably take a long time for general public approval to be obtained.

However, for several decades, there has been some enthusiasm for the idea of trying to re-establish the Community of Nuns in Sri Lanka and in Thailand. This need is sometimes used by some feminist movements. Probably, in the future a non Theravādin Community will be established in these countries. The success of such a movement depends not only on its capacity to organize things correctly, and on the exemplary conduct of new nuns, but also on their capacity to resist the numerous objections and criticisms coming from a society that does not like to see “modern elements” in religion. However, whether it belongs to Theravāda or not, I think that such a new monastic community would provide for the welfare and happiness to thousand of women in these countries.

Meanwhile, the Theravāda Buddhists—monks and lay people—maintain their positive memories of the Community of Nuns which disappeared ten centuries ago. The importance of that Community to the Theravāda tradition can be seen in the way the texts that deal with it are still maintained today, just as they have been throughout all the centuries since it disappeared. For example, even to-day in Thailand or in Sri Lanka, whenever the

31. R. GOMBRICH, *Theravāda Buddhism: A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*, London, 1988, pp.16–17, 208–09.

Pātimokkha of the monks is published, it is always printed together with the nuns' *Pātimokkha*.³² This traditional practice demonstrates two important facts: the first is the special Theravāda attitude which never drops or changes an important Pali text, even if it is no longer applicable. The second is the great respect shown towards the Community of Nuns, even though it disappeared halfway through the long history of Buddhism.

Bouddhologie
www.bouddhologie.org

32. These two *Pātimokkhas* are commonly called *Ubhaya Pātimokkha* (the two-fold 'code of discipline').

APPENDIX NO. 1

BHIKKHUNĪ PĀTIMOKKHA TRANSLATION

Twice a month, each nun had to participate in the formal meeting of the local community to which she belonged. The meeting was known as the Act of Uposatha (*Uposatha-kamma*). Reading the *Pātimokkha* was an indispensable part of these bi-monthly meetings. At the assembly of the community, a competent nun read the Pali text and the other nuns listened to it attentively. We present here the complete translation of the Pali text of the *Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha* followed by the Pali text itself.

Bouddhologie
www.bouddhologie.org

INTRODUCTION

Homage to the Blessed One, the worthy and fully enlightened one.

Sweeping, preparing lamps
Preparing the water and preparing seats
These things are called
The necessary preliminaries of the act of *Uposatha*.
Giving consent and declaring of purity,
Pointing out the season,
Counting the number of Bhikkhunīs
Obtaining the exhortation
These things are called
The preliminary duties of the act of *Uposatha*.

The presence of the day of *Uposatha*, the presence of a certain number of Bhikkhunīs eligible to carry out the act [of *Uposatha*], the absence of bhikkhunīs who have fallen into collective offences and the absence of Bhikkhunīs who should be kept away [from the Community]—when these things are come together, that is called the proper time.

Having fulfilled the necessary preliminaries and the preliminary duties, with the permission of the Community of Bhikkhunīs, which is harmonious and which has revealed offences, I invite you to recite the *Pātimokkha*.

May the Community hear me! O noble ladies, today is the fifteenth [day of the half month], the *Uposatha* day. If it seems the right time to the Community, the Community may carry out the act of *Uposatha*; it may recite the *Pātimokkha*. What must the Community do first? Let the noble ladies declare purity. I will recite the *Pātimokkha*. Let all of us present here listen to it and pay close attention. If anyone has committed a fault, let her declare it. Anyone who has not committed a fault should remain silent. By your silence, O noble ladies, I conclude [in the name of the Community] that you are pure. Just as an individual person who is asked a question should answer, so too should it be in an

assembly like this when the question is put three times. If any Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault, remembers it, and does not confess it when the question is repeated three times, she is guilty of an intentional lie. Now the Blessed One has said that intentional lying is a hindrance to religious life, noble ladies. This is why a Bhikkhunī who has committed a fault, who remembers it, and who wishes to purify herself, should declare her fault. When she has declared it, it will be a comfort to her.

O noble ladies, the introduction has been recited. I ask the noble ladies: I hope that you are quite pure?

And a second time I ask: I hope that you are quite pure? And a third time I ask: I hope that you are pure? The noble ladies are quite pure. That is why they are silent. Thus do I understand this.

Here ends the first recitation section: the introduction.

PĀRĀJIKĀ

Here these eight conditions of defeat come up for recitation:

[1] Whatever Bhikkhunī who has taken on the training of the religious life should indulge in sexual intercourse, even with a male animal, she becomes one who is defeated. She cannot live any more with the other Bhikkhunīs.

[2] Whatever Bhikkhunī should by means of theft take from an inhabited area or from the jungle what has not been given to her, in such a way of taking as kings arresting a thief in the act of stealing would flog her or imprison her or banish her, saying, 'you are a robber, you are foolish, you are wrong, you are a thief,' even so, that nun, who has taken what is not given, becomes one who is defeated. She cannot live any more with the other Bhikkhunīs.

[3] Whatever Bhikkhunī should intentionally deprive a human being of life or should search for an assassin for that human being, or should praise death, or should incite [anyone] to death saying, "My friend, what use this evil, miserable life to you? Death is better for you than life," or with such an idea in mind, should deliberately in various ways praise death or should incite [anyone] to death, she becomes one who is defeated. She cannot live any more with the other Bhikkhunīs.

[4] Whatever Bhikkhunī should boast, with reference to herself, of a state of superhuman knowledge, a truly noble

knowledge and vision, and though not knowing it, should say: 'I know this, I see this,' then if later on, she, being pressed, crossed-examined or not, fallen, with the desire to be purified and should say: 'Noble lady, I said that I know what I did not know, I said that I saw what I did not see, I spoke idly, falsely, vainly,' then unless it was overestimation, she becomes a one who is defeated. She cannot live any more with the other Bhikkhunīs.

[5] Whatever Bhikkhunī filled with desire should consent to rubbing, or rubbing up against, or taking hold of or touching or pressing against a male person who is filled with desire, below the collar-bone and above the circle of the knees, she becomes one who is defeated. She cannot live any more with the other Bhikkhunīs. This condition of defeat is called *Ubbhajānumaṇḍalikā*.

[6] Whatever Bhikkhunī, knowing that another nun has fallen into a matter involving defeat, should neither herself reprove her, nor speak to her group, but, when she may remaining [in the Community] or deceased or expelled or withdrawn, should afterwards speak thus: 'Noble ladies, before I knew this Bhikkhunī, she was a sister like this and like that, but I did not denounce her; I did not inform to the group,' then she also becomes one who is defeated. She cannot live any more with the other Bhikkhunīs. This condition of defeat is called *Vajjapaṭicchādikā*.

[7] Whatever Bhikkhunī should side with a Bhikkhu suspended by a complete assembly, who is disrespectful towards the rule, who is unfriendly towards the discipline, who is disrespectful towards the Teacher's message, that Bhikkhunī should be spoken to thus by other Bhikkhunīs: 'Noble lady, this Bhikkhu, suspended by a complete assembly, is disrespectful towards the rule, is disrespectful towards the discipline, is disrespectful towards the Master's message. Do not side with this Bhikkhu.' And if this nun, being spoken to thus by other Bhikkhunīs, should persist as before, she should be admonished by other Bhikkhunīs up to the three times to abandon her conduct. If, being admonished up to three times, she should abandon it, all is well. But if she should not abandon it, she also becomes one who is defeated. She cannot live any more with the other Bhikkhunīs. This condition of defeat is called *Ukkhittānuvattikā*.

[8] Whatever Bhikkhunī, filled with desire, for the sake of following this unsuitable act, should consent to a male person

who is filled with desire, taking her hand, or should consent to his taking hold of even the edge of her outer cloak (*saṅghāṭī*), or should stand, or should talk or should go to a rendezvous, or should consent to a man's coming towards her or should enter a covered place, or should dispose her body for such a purpose, she becomes one who is defeated. She cannot live any more with the other Bhikkhunīs. This condition of defeat is called *Aṭṭhavadatthukā*.

O noble ladies, the eight conditions of defeat have been recited. A Bhikkhunī having fallen into one or other of these [eight faults] cannot live any more with other Bhikkhunīs. After she has been guilty of such a fault, her situation is that of a laywoman. She is somebody who is defeated. She cannot live any more with the other Bhikkhunīs. With regard to these faults, I ask the noble ladies: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? The noble ladies are quite pure in this matter. That is why they are silent. Thus do I understand this.

Here ends the second recitation section: the conditions of defeat.

SAṄGHĀDISESĀ

Now, noble ladies, these seventeen matters involving formal meetings of the Community (*Saṅghādisesa*) come up for recitation:

[1] Whatever Bhikkhunī should spend her time quarrelling with a householder, or with a householder's son, or with a slave or with a labourer, or even with a wandering ascetic, that Bhikkhunī becomes guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[2] Whatever Bhikkhunī should knowingly ordain a woman found to merit the death penalty, without having obtained permission from a king or a community, or a group, or a guild, or a company, unless she is allowable [in a lawful situation], that nun becomes guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[3] Whatever Bhikkhunī should go from one village to the other alone, or should cross a river alone, or should be away for a night alone, or should stay behind the group alone, that Bhikkhunī becomes guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa*

category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[4] Whatever Bhikkhunī—without having obtained permission from the Community who carried out the proceedings in accordance with the rule, in accordance with the discipline, in accordance with the Master's instructions, not having learnt the group's opinion—should rehabilitate a Bhikkhunī suspended by a complete assembly of the Community, that Bhikkhunī becomes guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[5] Whatever Bhikkhunī, filled with desire, should accept with her own hand any solid food or soft food given by a man filled with desire, and should eat it or partake of it, that Bhikkhunī becomes guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[6] Whatever Bhikkhunī should speak thus [to another Bhikkhunī]: 'Whether this man is filled with desire or not, what can he do to you, O noble lady, since you are not filled with desire? Please, noble lady, accept of the solid or soft food given by this man to you, eat it and partake of it.' The Bhikkhunī who speaks like this becomes guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[7] Whatever Bhikkhunī engages in conveying a man's intentions to a woman or a woman's intentions to a man, proposing marriage or an affair—even if only for a momentary liaison—she becomes guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[8] Whatever Bhikkhunī, malignant, malicious and angered, should defame another Bhikkhunī with an unfounded offence of *Pārājikā* category, [thinking], 'thus surely may I drive her away from this religious life,' then, if afterwards, whether she is cross-examined or not, the legal case turns out to be unfounded, and if she confesses her malice, she becomes guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[9] Whatever Bhikkhunī, malignant, malicious and angered, should defame another Bhikkhunī with an offence of *Pārājikā* category, taking up some point as a pretext in a legal case really belonging to some other category [of offences], thinking, 'thus, surely may I drive her away from this religious life,' then if afterwards, whether she is cross-examined or not, the legal case turns out to belong to some other category [of offences], and if the

Bhikkhunī then confesses her malice, she becomes guilty at once of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[10] Whatever Bhikkhunī, angry and displeased, should speak thus: 'I repudiate the Buddha, I repudiate the Dhamma, I repudiate the Saṅgha, I repudiate the Training. What indeed are these Bhikkhunīs who are Bhikkhunīs, daughters of the Sākyans? For there are other Bhikkhunīs, conscientious, scrupulous, desirous of training; I will lead the religious life among those Bhikkhunīs,' the other Bhikkhunīs should tell her: 'Do not, noble lady, angry and displeased, speak thus: 'I repudiate the Buddha, (...) I repudiate the Training.' Be happy, noble lady, the Dhamma is well preached; lead the religious life for the utter ending of suffering.' And if that Bhikkhunī, being spoken to thus by her fellow Bhikkhunīs, persists as before, she should be admonished by her fellow nuns up to three times to give up that [course]. If, being admonished up to three times, she should give it up, all is well. If she should not give it up, she becomes guilty at the third admonishing of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[11] Whatever Bhikkhunī, being overthrown in some issue, angry and displeased, should speak thus: 'The nuns are following a wrong course through desire, through hatred, through stupidity, and through fear,' the other Bhikkhunīs should tell her: 'Do not, noble lady, overthrown in some issue, angry, displeased, speak thus: "The Bhikkhunīs are following a wrong course through desire, (...) through fear." The noble lady herself may be going wrong from desire, from hatred, from stupidity or from fear.' And if this Bhikkhunī after being spoken to thus by other Bhikkhunīs persists as before, she should be admonished up to three times to give up that idea. If, being admonished up to a third time, she should give it up, all is well. If she should not give it up, she becomes guilty at the third admonishing of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[12] In case Bhikkhunīs live in a company of evil habit, of evil repute, of evil ways of living, vexing the Community of Bhikkhunīs, concealing one another's faults, the other Bhikkhunīs should tell them: 'Do not, sisters, live in a company of evil habit, concealing one another's faults. Let the noble ladies desist. The Community praises the seclusion in sisters.' And if these Bhikkhunīs being spoken to thus by the other nuns persist as

before, they should be admonished up to three times to give up that course. If, being admonished up to a third time, they should give it up, all is well. If they should not give it up, those Bhikkhunīs become guilty at the third admonishing of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. They deserve to be kept away temporarily.

[13] Whatever Bhikkhunī should speak thus: ‘Noble ladies, live in company, do not live separately. For there are in the Community other Bhikkhunīs of such habit, of such repute, of such ways of living, vexing the Community of Bhikkhunīs, concealing one another’s faults; the Community does not say anything to these. It is to you alone that the Community, out of disrespect, out of contempt, out of impatience, in gossiping, on poor evidence, says this: “The sisters are living in a company, of evil habits, of evil repute, of evil ways of living, vexing the Community of Bhikkhunīs, concealing one another’s faults. Let the noble ladies desist. The Community praises the seclusion of the sisters”’—the other Bhikkhunīs should tell her: ‘Do not, noble lady, speak thus: “Noble ladies, live in company, ... The Community praises the seclusion of the sisters.”’ And if that nun, after being spoken to thus by other Bhikkhunīs, should persist as before, she should be admonished by the other Bhikkhunīs up to three times to give up that course. If being admonished up to three times, she should give it up, all is well. If she should not give it up, she becomes guilty at the third admonishing of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[14] Whatever Bhikkhunī should agitate for a schism of the harmonious Community, or should persist in taking up some issue leading to a schism, the other nuns should tell that nun: ‘Do not, noble lady, agitate for a schism of the harmonious Community, or persist in taking up some issue leading to a schism. Let the noble lady be harmonious with the Community, for a Community that is harmonious, on friendly terms, not quarrelsome, dwells comfortably together having the same recitation.’ And if that Bhikkhunī, being spoken to thus by the other Bhikkhunīs, should persist, she should be admonished up to three times by other Bhikkhunīs to give up that course. If being admonished up to three times, she should give it up, all is well. If she should not give it up, she becomes guilty at the third admonition of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She is deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[15] If a Bhikkhunī has some Bhikkhunīs—one or two or three—who throw in their lot with her or take her side, saying: ‘Do not, noble ladies, say anything against this nun; she is somebody who speaks according to Dhamma, according to *Vinaya*, and this nun adopting our desire and objective, gives expression to them; she knows what she says for us seems also good to us.’ The other Bhikkhunīs should tell them: ‘Do not, noble ladies, speak thus. This Bhikkhunī does not speak according to Dhamma, she does not speak according to *Vinaya*. Noble ladies, please do not approve a schism in the Community. Let the noble ladies be harmonious with the Community; for a Community that is harmonious, on friendly terms, not quarrelsome, dwells comfortably together having the same recitation.’ If these nuns having being spoken to thus by the other Bhikkhunīs should persist, then they should be admonished up to three times by other Bhikkhunīs to give up their course. If these Bhikkhunīs, after being admonished up to three times, should give it up, all is well. If they should not give it up, they become guilty at the third admonition, of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. They are deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[16] If a Bhikkhunī is somebody who is difficult to speak to, and if and when herself is spoken to by the other Bhikkhunīs according to the Dhamma concerning the courses of training included in the exposition, she reckons herself as somebody not to be spoken to, saying, ‘Noble ladies, do not say anything to me, either good or bad, and I will not say anything to the ladies, either good or bad; refrain, noble ladies, from speaking to me’—the other Bhikkhunīs should tell her: ‘Noble lady, do not consider yourself as somebody not to be spoken to; let the noble lady speak to the Bhikkhunīs in accordance with Dhamma, and the Bhikkhunīs will speak to the noble lady in accordance with Dhamma. Thus is the multitude increased for the Exalted One, that is to say by speaking to one another, by assisting one another.’ And if that Bhikkhunī, being spoken to thus by the other Bhikkhunīs, should persist, she should be admonished up to three times by other Bhikkhunīs to give up that course. If being admonished up to three times, she should give it up, all is well. If she should not give it up, she becomes guilty at the third admonition of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She is deserves to be kept away temporarily.

[17] If a Bhikkhunī lives depending on a certain village or a small town, and is one who corrupts families and is of depraved conduct, and if her evil conduct is seen and heard, and families corrupted by her are also seen and heard, the other nuns should tell her: 'The noble lady is somebody who corrupts families, and is of depraved conduct. The noble lady's depraved doings are seen and heard, and families corrupted by the noble lady are also seen and heard. Let the noble lady depart from this residence; you have lived here long enough.' And if this Bhikkhunī having been spoken to thus by the Bhikkhunīs should say to these Bhikkhunīs: 'These Bhikkhunīs are following a wrong course through favouritism, through hatred, through stupidity and through fear; they banish some for such offences, they do not banish others,' this Bhikkhunī should be spoken to by other Bhikkhunīs: 'Noble lady, do not speak thus: "these Bhikkhunīs are following a wrong course through favouritism, (...) they banish some for such an offences, they do not banish others."' The noble lady is somebody who corrupts families and is of depraved conduct. The noble lady's depraved doings are seen and heard, and families corrupted by the noble lay are also seen and heard. Let the noble lady depart from this residence; you have lived here long enough.' If this Bhikkhunī, being spoken to thus by the other Bhikkhunīs, should persist as before, she should be admonished up to three times by other Bhikkhunīs to give up that course. If after being admonished up to three times by the Bhikkhunīs, she should give it up, all is well. If she should not give it up, she becomes guilty at the third admonition of a fault of *Saṅghādisesa* category. She is deserves to be kept away temporarily.

Noble ladies, the seventeen matters that are offences entailing formal meetings of the Community, that is to say, nine that are offences at once, and eight on the third admonition, have been recited. A Bhikkhunī having fallen into one or other of these faults shall spend a fortnight in *mānatta* discipline before both Communities. If, when the Bhikkhunī has performed the *mānatta* discipline, and the Community of Bhikkhunīs should number twenty, then that Bhikkhunī may be rehabilitated. But if the Community of Bhikkhunīs, numbering less than twenty even by one, should rehabilitate that nun, she is not rehabilitated, and those Bhikkhunīs are blameworthy. This is the proper course concerning this matter.

With regard to these faults, I now ask the noble ladies: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? The noble ladies are quite pure in this matter. That is why they are silent. Thus do I understand this.

Here ends the recitation section: the matters that require a formal meeting of the Community.

NISSAGGIYĀ PĀCITTIIYĀ

Now, noble ladies, these thirty rules for offences of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category come up for recitation:

[1] Whatever Bhikkhunī should make a hoard of begging-bowls, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[2] Whatever Bhikkhunī should allot a robe-material given at the wrong time or should have it distributed, thinking that it is given at the right time, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[3] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having exchanged a robe with a Bhikkhunī, should afterwards speak thus: 'Noble lady, take your robe, give this to me. That which is yours is yours, that which is mine is mine. Give this to me, take away your own,' and should tear it away or should cause someone else to tear it away, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[4] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having had one thing asked for [without being satisfied with it], should have another thing asked for, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[5] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having got one thing in exchange, should get another thing in exchange, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[6] Whatever Bhikkhunī should get something in exchange for that which was necessary and was appointed for something else, was destined for something else, and belongs to the Community, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[7] Whatever Bhikkhunī should get something in exchange for what was necessary and was appointed for something else, was destined for something, and belongs to the Community, and that she herself asked for, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[8] Whatever Bhikkhunī should get something in exchange for what was necessary and was appointed for something else, was destined for another thing, and belongs to the group [of nuns], she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[9] Whatever Bhikkhunī should get something in exchange for what was necessary and was appointed for something, was destined for something else, and belongs to the group [of nuns], that she herself asked for, she is guilty of fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[10] Whatever Bhikkhunī should get something in exchange for what was necessary and was appointed for something else, was destined for something else, belongs to an individual, and that she herself asked for, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

The first division: on begging-bowls.

[11] If a Bhikkhunī asks for a heavy blanket, she may ask for a blanket worth at most four *kahāpaṇas*. If she obtains one worth more than that, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[12] If a Bhikkhunī asks for a light blanket, she may ask for a blanket worth at most two and half *kahāpaṇas*. If she obtains one worth more than that, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[13] When the robe-material is settled, when a Bhikkhunī's *kaṭhina* privileges have been removed, an extra robe may be used for at most ten days. If she exceeds that period, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[14] When the robe material is settled, when a Bhikkhunī's *kaṭhina* privileges have been removed, if this Bhikkhunī should be away, separated from her five robes even for one night, except when authorized by the Bhikkhunīs, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[15] When the robe material is settled, when a Bhikkhunī's *kaṭhina* privileges have been removed, if out-of-season robe material accrues to her, she may accept it if she so wishes. Having accepted it, she should make it quickly. If the robe material is not sufficient (to make a robe), it may be laid aside for a month at most, should she have any expectation that the deficiency may be supplied. If she should lay it aside for longer than that (even when

the expectation of the deficiency being supplied), she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[16] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ask for a robe from a man or woman householder who is not related to her, except at the right time, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category. The right time in this case is if a Bhikkhunī is one whose robe has been stolen or whose robe has been destroyed. In this case this is the right time.

[17] If an unrelated man or woman householder presents a Bhikkhunī with many robes, then the Bhikkhunī can accept at most an inner robe and an upper robe. If she should accept more than that, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[18] In case a robe-fund comes to be set up by a man or woman householder for the sake of an unrelated Bhikkhunī, thinking, 'I will present the Bhikkhunī so-and-so with a robe, having got the robe in exchange for this robe-fund.' Then if that Bhikkhunī, out of desire for a fine robe, approaching (the donor) before being invited, should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe, saying, 'Indeed it would be well to let the lady (or gentleman), having got a robe like this or like that in exchange for this robe-fund, present it to me,' she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[19] In case a robe-fund comes to be set up by two women householders or two men householders for the sake of an unrelated Bhikkhunī, thinking, 'we will present the Bhikkhunī so and so with robes, having got various robes in exchange for the various robe-funds,' and then, if that Bhikkhunī, out of desire for a fine robe, approaches (the donors) before being invited, should put forward a consideration with regard to a robe, saying, 'Indeed it would be well to let the ladies (or gentlemen), having got a robe like this or like that in exchange for the various robe-funds, present it to me, the two together as one,' she becomes guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[20] In case a king or somebody in the service of a king, or a Brahmin, or a householder, should send a robe-fund for a Bhikkhunī by messenger, saying, 'Having got a robe in exchange for this robe-fund, present the Bhikkhunī so-and-so with a robe,'; then if this messenger, approaching that Bhikkhunī, should say, 'Noble lady, this robe-fund was brought for you; let the noble lady accept this robe-fund,' then the messenger should be spoken to thus by this Bhikkhunī: 'Sir, we do not accept a robe-fund, but we

accept a robe if it is at the right time and if it is allowable.' If this messenger should ask, 'But is there someone who is the noble lady's attendant?', then an attendant—either one who is engaged in the monastery or a woman lay-follower—should be pointed out by the Bhikkhunī who is in need of a robe, saying, 'This is the Bhikkhunīs' attendant.' If the messenger, after giving instructions to the attendant, approaching the Bhikkhunī, should speak thus: 'Noble lady, I have instructed the person whom the noble lady pointed out as an attendant; let the noble lady approach at the right time, and she will present you with a robe' then, if that Bhikkhunī is in need of robe, approaching that attendant, she should prompt and remind her two or three times, saying 'Friend, I am in need of a robe' and while standing there and reminding her two or three times, she succeeds in obtaining the robe, that is good. If she does not succeed in obtaining it, she should stand silently for four times, five times, six times at the most. If she succeeds in obtaining the robe, standing silently, four times, five times, six times at the most, that is good. If she, exerting herself further than that, succeeds in obtaining the robe, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category. If the Bhikkhunī does not succeed in obtaining it, she should either herself go to where the robe-fund was brought from for her, or a messenger should be sent to say, 'The robe-fund that you, sirs, sent for a Bhikkhunī, is not of any use to that Bhikkhunī. Let the gentlemen make use of their own; let your own things be not lost.' That is the proper course in this case.

The second division: on robes.

[21] Whatever Bhikkhunī should accept gold and silver, or should get someone to accept it in her stead, or should consent to have it deposited for her, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[22] Whatever Bhikkhunī should engage in various transactions in which gold and silver is used, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[23] Whatever Bhikkhunī should engage in various kinds of bartering, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[24] Whatever Bhikkhunī should get another new begging-bowl in exchange for a begging-bowl mended in less than five places, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category. That begging-bowl should be forfeited by the guilty Bhikkhunī to the

Community of the Bhikkhunīs, and whatever is the last begging-bowl belonging to that Community of Bhikkhunīs, that should be given to the Bhikkhunī with the words: 'Bhikkhunī, this is a bowl for you; it is to be kept until it breaks.' That is the proper course in this case.

[25] Those medicines which may be partaken of by ill Bhikkhunīs—that is to say, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses, accepting these, they may be used and can be kept at most seven days. The Bhikkhunī who exceeds that period is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[26] Whatever Bhikkhunī, herself having given a robe to another Bhikkhunī, angry and displeased, should tear it away or should cause it to be torn away, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[27] Whatever Bhikkhunī, herself asking for yarn, should have robe-material woven by weavers, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[28] A man or a woman householder who is not a relative to a nun may cause robe-material to be woven by weavers for that Bhikkhunī. Then if that Bhikkhunī, before being invited, going up to the weavers, should put forward a consideration with regard to the robe-material, saying, 'Now sirs, this robe-material is being specially woven for me. Make it long and wide and rough, and make it evenly woven and well scraped and well combed. If you do so we could give you something or other in addition.' And if the Bhikkhunī, speaking thus, should give something or other in addition, even as little as the contents of a begging-bowl, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[29] If an extra robe should accrue to a Bhikkhunī ten days before the full-moon day of the first Khattika (...), three months of the rainy season having passed, it may be accepted by the Bhikkhunī if she thinks of it as an extra robe; having accepted it, it should be laid aside until the robe-season. But if she should lay it aside longer than that, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

[30] Whatever Bhikkhunī should knowingly divert to herself the gains that had been intended to the Community, she is guilty of a fault of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category.

The third division: on gold and silver.

Noble ladies, the thirty rules for the faults of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category have been recited.

With regard to these faults, I now ask the noble ladies: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? The noble ladies are quite pure in this matter. That is why they are silent. Thus do I understand this.

Here end the rules of Nissaggiya Pācittiya.

PĀCITTIYĀ

Now, noble ladies, these one hundred and sixty-six rules for *Pācittiya* faults come up for recitation:

[1] Whatever Bhikkhunī should eat garlic, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[2] Whatever Bhikkhunī should remove her body hair, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[3] In slapping the palms of her hands [on the private part of the body], a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[4] In an application of lac [on the private part of the body], a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[5] If a Bhikkhunī takes an ablution of water, she may take at most a measure of two square inches. The Bhikkhunī who exceeds this, is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[6] Whatever Bhikkhunī should stand by with drinking-water for a Bhikkhu, or fanning a Bhikkhu while he is eating, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[7] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having asked for raw grain or having had it asked for, or having roasted it or having caused it to be roasted, or having pounded it or having caused it to be pounded, or having cooked it or having caused it to be cooked, should eat it, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[8] Whatever Bhikkhunī should throw out or should cause another to throw out excrement or urine or rubbish or remains of food over a wall or over a fence, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[9] Whatever Bhikkhunī should throw out or should cause another to throw out excrement or urine or rubbish or remains of food on to crops, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[10] Whatever Bhikkhunī should go to see dancing or singing or music, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The first division: on garlic.

[11] Whatever Bhikkhunī should stand together with or should talk to a man, the one with the other, in the dark of the night when there is no light, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[12] Whatever Bhikkhunī should stand together with or should talk to a man, the one with the other, in a secluded place, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[13] Whatever Bhikkhunī should stand together with or should talk to a man, the one with the other, in an open place, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[14] Whatever Bhikkhunī should stand together with or should talk to a man, the one with the other, on a carriage road or in a cul-de-sac or at a cross-roads, or should whisper in his ear, or should dismiss the nun who is her companion, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[15] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having approached families before midday and having sat down on a seat, should depart without informing the house owner, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[16] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having approached families after mid-day, should sit down on a seat or should lie down without asking the house owner for permission, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[17] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having approached families at the wrong time, having spread a sleeping place, or having caused a sleeping-place to be spread, without asking the house owner for permission, should sit down on it or should lie down on it, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[18] Whatever Bhikkhunī, because of a misapprehension, or because of a misunderstanding, should malign another, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[19] Whatever Bhikkhunī should curse herself or another with hell or with the religious life, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[20] Whatever Bhikkhunī should weep, having struck herself again and again, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The second division: on the dark.

[21] Whatever Bhikkhunī should bathe naked, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[22] When a bathing cloth is being made for a Bhikkhunī, it must be made to a proper measure. This is the proper measure: in length four spans according to the accepted span, in width two spans. If a Bhikkhunī exceeds this measure, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[23] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having unsewn or having made another unsew a Bhikkhunī's robe, if she does not afterwards either sew it or make an effort to get it sewn, for four or five days, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[24] Whatever Bhikkhunī should wear an outer cloak belonging to another Bhikkhunī for more than five days, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[25] Whatever Bhikkhunī should take and wear an outer cloak without the permission of the owner, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[26] Whatever Bhikkhunī should put an obstacle in the way of the group's receiving robes, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[27] Whatever Bhikkhunī should hold back a legally valid distribution of robe material, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[28] Whatever Bhikkhunī should give robe material belonging to the nuns to a householder, or to a Paribbājaka, or to a Paribbājikā, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[29] Whatever Bhikkhunī, when there is an expectation of a weak robe-material, should let the robe season pass, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[30] Whatever Bhikkhunī should hold back a legally valid removal of the *kaṭhina* privileges, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The third division: on nudity.

[31] Whatever two Bhikkhunīs should share one couch, they are guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[32] Whatever two Bhikkhunīs should share one blanket, they are guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[33] Whatever Bhikkhunī should intentionally cause discomfort to a Bhikkhunī, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya*

category.

[34] Whatever Bhikkhunī should fail to attend to an ailing postulant who lives with her, or try to organize an attendance, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[35] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having given quarters to another Bhikkhunī, should be angry, displeased, throw her out or have her thrown out, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[36] Whatever Bhikkhunī should keep company with householders or with householders' sons, the other nuns should tell her: 'Do not, noble lady, keep company with householders or with householders' sons. Seclude yourself, noble lady. The Community praises seclusion in a sister.' But, if this Bhikkhunī, being spoken to thus by the other Bhikkhunīs, should persist as before, she should be admonished up to three times by other Bhikkhunīs to give up that course. If after being admonished up to three times by the Bhikkhunīs, she should give it up, all is well. If she should not give it up, she becomes guilty at the third admonition of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[37] Whatever Bhikkhunī should set out on a journey without joining a caravan of merchants within her own region when this is agreed upon as dangerous, risky, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[38] Whatever Bhikkhunī should set out on a journey without joining a caravan of merchants outside of her own region when this is agreed upon as dangerous, risky, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[39] Whatever Bhikkhunī should set out on a journey during the rainy season, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[40] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having kept the rainy season retreat, should not set out on a journey, for at least five or six *yojanas*, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The fourth division: that on sharing.

[41] Whatever Bhikkhunī should go to see a king's pleasure-house or a picture gallery or a park or a pleasure grove or a lotus pond, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[42] Whatever Bhikkhunī should make use of a sofa or of a divan, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[43] Whatever Bhikkhunī should spin yarn, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[44] Whatever Bhikkhunī should do household work, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[45] Whatever Bhikkhunī, being spoken to by another Bhikkhunī, saying, 'Do come, noble lady, and settle this legal case,' and having answered, 'Very good,' should neither settle it nor make an effort to get it settled, when there is no hindrance, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[46] Whatever Bhikkhunī should give with her own hand solid food or soft food to a householder or to a Paribbājaka, or a Paribbājikā, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[47] Whatever Bhikkhunī, not having given up her dwelling robe, should make use of it continually, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[48] Whatever Bhikkhunī, not having handed over her dwelling, should set out on a journey, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[49] Whatever Bhikkhunī should acquire worldly knowledge, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[50] Whatever Bhikkhunī should teach worldly knowledge, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The fifth division: on picture galleries.

[51] Whatever Bhikkhunī should knowingly enter a monastery where Bhikkhus live, without asking them for permission, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[52] Whatever Bhikkhunī should revile or abuse a monk, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[53] Whatever Bhikkhunī, being quick-tempered, should abuse a group of Bhikkhunīs, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[54] Whatever Bhikkhunī, being invited [or being satisfied [having eaten somewhere]], should eat or partake of solid food or soft food [somewhere else], she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[55] Whatever Bhikkhunī should be one who is grudging as to families, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[56] Whatever Bhikkhunī should spend the rainy season retreat in an area where there are no Bhikkhus, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[57] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having kept the rainy season

retreat, should not invite both Communities in respect of three matters: what was seen, or heard, or suspected, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[58] Whatever Bhikkhunī should not go to hear the exhortation or to participate in the act of *Uposatha*, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[59] Every half month, a Bhikkhunī should desire two things from the Community of Bhikkhus: the asking as to the date of the *Uposatha* day and their coming for exhortation. If a nun transgresses this, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[60] Whatever Bhikkhunī, without having obtained permission from the Community or from her group, should together with a man, the one with the other, make burst or break a boil or a scab on the lower part of her body, or let it be washed or smeared or bound up or unbound, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The sixth division: on monasteries.

[61] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a pregnant woman, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[62] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a woman giving suckle, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[63] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a postulant who has not trained for two years in the six precepts, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[64] Whatever nun should ordain a postulant who has trained for two years in the six precepts, but who has not obtained the formal approval of the Community, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[65] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a married woman under twelve years of age, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[66] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a married woman of the age of twelve years, but who has not trained for two years in the six precepts, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[67] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a married woman of the age of twelve years and who has trained for two years in the six precepts, but who is not been authorized by the Community, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[68] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having ordained the postulant

Appendix no. 1

who lives with her, for two years neither helps [to learn] nor should get her helped [to learn through a competent Bhikkhunī], she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[69] Whatever Bhikkhunī for two years should not wait upon her preceptor Bhikkhunī, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[70] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having ordained the postulant who lives with her, should neither withdraw her nor have her withdrawn a distance of at least five or six *yojanas*, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The seventh division: on pregnant women.

[71] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a maiden under twenty years of age, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[72] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a maiden who is twenty years of age [or more], but who has not trained for two years in the six precepts, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[73] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a maiden who is twenty years of age [or more] and who has trained for two years in the six precepts, but who has not been authorized by the Community, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[74] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain somebody, while she herself is of less than twelve years standing [from the year of her higher ordination], she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[75] Whatever Bhikkhunī who is of twelve years of standing [or more], but without being authorized by the Community, should ordain somebody, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[76] Whatever Bhikkhunī, on being told, 'You have ordained sufficiently, noble lady, for the time being,' and having answered, 'Very good,' should afterwards engage in criticism, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[77] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having said to a postulant, 'If you, lady, will give me a robe, then I will ordain you,' yet, even without any hindrance should neither ordain her nor should make an effort to get her ordained, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[78] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having said to a postulant, 'If you, lady, will wait upon me for two years, then will I ordain you,' yet when there is no hindrance, should neither ordain her nor should

make an effort to get her ordained, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[79] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a postulant who keeps company with men, who keeps with youths, who is violent, or who causes grief, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[80] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a postulant without the consent of her parents and husband, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[81] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain a postulant by showing favouritism, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[82] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain postulants in consecutive years, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[83] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ordain two postulants in the same year, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The eighth division: on maidens.

[84] Whatever Bhikkhunī who is not ill should use a parasol and sandals, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[85] Whatever Bhikkhunī who is not ill should travel in a vehicle, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[86] Whatever Bhikkhunī should wear a petticoat, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[87] Whatever Bhikkhunī should wear women's ornaments, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[88] Whatever Bhikkhunī should bathe with scent and skin lotions, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[89] Whatever Bhikkhunī should bathe with scented ground sesame, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[90] Whatever Bhikkhunī should cause herself to be rubbed with ointment or massaged by a nun, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[91] Whatever Bhikkhunī should cause herself to be rubbed with ointment or massaged by a postulant, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[92] Whatever Bhikkhunī should cause herself to be rubbed with ointment or massaged by a female novice, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[93] Whatever Bhikkhunī should cause herself to be rubbed with ointment or massaged by a woman householder, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

Appendix no. 1

[94] Whatever Bhikkhunī should sit down on a seat in front of a Bhikkhu without asking for permission, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[95] Whatever Bhikkhunī should ask a question from a Bhikkhu who has not given permission, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[96] Whatever Bhikkhunī should enter a village without her vest, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The ninth division: on parasols.

[97] In telling a conscious lie, a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[98] In insulting speech, a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[99] In malicious tale-bearing among Bhikkhunīs, a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[100] Whatever Bhikkhunī should recite Dhamma line by line together with someone who has not obtained higher ordination, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[101] Whatever Bhikkhunī should lie down in the same lodging for more than two or three consecutive nights with a woman who has not obtained higher ordination, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[102] Whatever Bhikkhunī should lie down in the lodging where a male person lives, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[103] Whatever Bhikkhunī should teach Dhamma to a man in more than five or six sentences, unless a knowledgeable woman is present, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[104] Whatever Bhikkhunī should speak of her super-human knowledge to a person who has not obtained higher ordination, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[105] Whatever Bhikkhunī, without the agreement of the other Bhikkhunīs, should speak of another Bhikkhunī's important wrong-doing to a person who has not obtained higher ordination, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[106] Whatever Bhikkhunī should dig the soil or have it dug, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The tenth division: on lying.

[107] In destruction of vegetable growth, a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[108] In evasion without replying correctly, in vexing [the Community], a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[109] In maligning or complaining [about a Community official], a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[110] Whatever Bhikkhunī, spreading or having made to be spread in the open air a couch or a chair or a mattress or a stool belonging to the Community, should neither replace it nor have it replaced when she departs, or should depart without informing anyone [that she is leaving the place], she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[111] Whatever Bhikkhunī, spreading a bed or having it spread in a dwelling house belonging to the Community, when she departs, should neither replace it nor have it replaced, or should depart without informing anyone [that she is leaving the place], she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[112] Whatever Bhikkhunī, knowingly lying down in a dwelling belonging to the Community so as to bother a Bhikkhunī who arrived there first, thinking 'If she finds it too crowded she may go away,' and if she does it for this purpose and not for another, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[113] Whatever Bhikkhunī, angry and displeased, should throw out a Bhikkhunī or cause her to be thrown out from a dwelling belonging to the Community, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[114] Whatever Bhikkhunī, in a lofty cell in the upper part of a dwelling house belonging to the Community, should sit down or lie down without due attention, on a couch or a chair with removable legs, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[115] When a large dwelling-house is being built for a Bhikkhunī, it should be applied only two or three layers facing to the area around the window frame, and the area around the door frame reinforced; she must determine (supervise) these works while herself standing at a place where no grass grows. Should she determine works more than that, even while herself standing in a place where no grass grows, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[116] Whatever Bhikkhunī, knowing that water contains living beings should pour it on grass or on clay, or should have it

poured on grass or on clay, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The eleventh division: on vegetable growth.

[117] One meal only in a public alms centre may be eaten by a Bhikkhunī who is not ill; if she should eat more than that, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[118] If she eats in a group meal, except at the right time, a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category. In this case, the right time is a time of illness, a time of distributing robes, a time of making robes, a time of going on journey, a time of embarking in a boat, a time when many Bhikkhunīs are assembling together, and a time when lay people are organising a meal for Bhikkhunīs. These occasions comprise the right time in this case.

[119] When a Bhikkhunī visits a family, if she is presented with cakes or biscuits, she may accept two or three bowls full if she likes. Should she accept more than that, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category. Having accepted two or three bowls full, and having taken them away, she may share them together with other Bhikkhunīs. This is the proper course in this case.

[120] Whatever Bhikkhunī should eat or partake of either solid or soft food at the wrong time, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[121] Whatever Bhikkhunī should eat or partake of either solid or soft food that was stored, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[122] Whatever Bhikkhunī should convey to her mouth an edible that has not been given, except water and tooth cleaning stick, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[123] Whatever Bhikkhunī, saying to another nun, 'Come, noble lady, let us enter the village, or town for alms round,' and then, whether or not she has had food given to her, should dismiss her, saying, 'Go away, noble lady; it is troublesome for me to sit or talk with you. I prefer to be alone' if doing so just to send her away, without any other good reason, that Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[124] Whatever nun, intruding upon a house where a husband and wife are fondling each other, should sit down and wait, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[125] Whatever Bhikkhunī should sit down and wait in

private on a secluded seat with a man, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[126] Whatever Bhikkhunī should sit down and wait together with a man, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The twelfth division: on food.

[127] Whatever Bhikkhunī, being invited for a meal, without informing a [resident] Bhikkhunī, should visit families before or after the meal, except at the correct time, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category. Here the correct is a time of robe distribution, or a time of robe making. These comprise the correct time in this case.

[128] Any Bhikkhunī, without being ill, may accept an invitation to obtain the requisites for four months. Should she accept more than that, except in case of a renewed invitation or a permanent invitation, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[129] Whatever Bhikkhunī should go to see an army parade, unless there is good reason for it, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[130] If there is a reason for a Bhikkhunī to visit an army, she may stay with it for two or three consecutive nights. Should she stay longer than that, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[131] Whatever Bhikkhunī, staying with an army for two or three consecutive nights, should go to a battlefield, a roll call, troops in battle formation, or to see a review of military units, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[132] In drinking fermented liquor, a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[133] In tickling with her fingers, a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[134] In the act of playing in the water, a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[135] In disrespect, a Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[136] Whatever Bhikkhunī should frighten another Bhikkhunī, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The thirteenth division: on visiting families.

[137] Whatever Bhikkhunī, unless she is ill, seeking to warm herself, should kindle a fire or should cause a fire to be kindled,

unless there is a suitable reason, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[138] Whatever Bhikkhunī should bathe at intervals of less than half a month, except at the right time, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category. In this case, the right times are: the last month and a half of the hot season, and the first month of the rainy season, these two and a half months being a time of warmth, a time of sweating, a time of illness, a time of work, a time of travelling, a time of wind and rain. These are the proper times in this case.

[139] Whatever Bhikkhunī obtains a new robe, one of the three means of discolouring is to be applied in order to discolour it: green, brown or black. If the Bhikkhunī should make use of a new robe without applying any of the three means of discolouring, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[140] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having herself assigned a robe to a Bhikkhu, or to a Bhikkhunī, or to a female postulant, or to a male novice, or to a female novice, should make use of that robe without formally rescinding it, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[141] Whatever Bhikkhunī should hide or should cause to hide another nun's begging-bowl or robe or the piece of cloth to sit upon or needle-case or belt, even as a joke, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[142] Whatever Bhikkhunī should intentionally deprive a living being of life, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[143] Whatever Bhikkhunī should knowingly make use of water with living beings in it, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[144] Whatever Bhikkhunī knowingly agitates for the re-examination of a judgement that has been rightfully dealt with, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[145] Whatever Bhikkhunī, knowingly, by arrangement with a caravan of thieves, should go along the same road even between one village and the next, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[146] Whatever Bhikkhunī should speak thus: 'Certain things are called stumbling-blocks by the Blessed One, but as I understand the Doctrine taught by him, when pursuing them I do not see that they are really stumbling-blocks,' the other

Bhikkhunīs should admonish her thus: ‘Do not, noble lady, speak thus; do not misrepresent the Blessed One, for it is not good to misrepresent him. The Blessed One would not say anything like that. In many ways, noble lady, the Blessed One has described the stumbling-blocks and when pursuing them they become real stumbling-blocks.’ And if that Bhikkhunī, when she has been spoken to thus by the Bhikkhunīs, should persist as before, that Bhikkhunī should be admonished by the other Bhikkhunīs up to three times. If being admonished up to the three times, she should give it up, it is good. But if she should not give it up, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The fourteenth division: on kindling fires.

[147] Whatever Bhikkhunī should knowingly eat together with, or be in communion with, or lie down in the same lodging with, a Bhikkhunī professing a view not in compliance with the rule, and who has not abandoned that wrong view, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[148] If a female novice should speak thus: ‘Certain things are called stumbling-blocks by the Blessed One, but as I understand the Doctrine taught by him, when pursuing them I do not see that they are really stumbling-blocks,’ the other Bhikkhunīs should admonish her thus: ‘Do not, lady novice, speak thus; do not misrepresent the Blessed One, for it is not good to misrepresent him. The Blessed One would not say anything like that. In many ways, noble lady, the Blessed One has described the stumbling-blocks and when pursuing them they become real stumbling-blocks.’ And if that female novice, when she has been spoken to thus by the Bhikkhunīs, should persist as before, that female novice should be addressed by the Bhikkhunīs as follows: ‘From this day forth, lady novice, you are not to claim the Blessed One as your teacher, nor are you to have the opportunity that the other novices have, such as sharing lodgings even for two or three nights with Bhikkhunīs. Get away with you, depart.’ Whatever Bhikkhunī should knowingly encourage or should support or should eat with or should share lodgings with a female novice thus expelled, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[149] Whatever Bhikkhunī, being spoken to by other Bhikkhunīs in accordance with a rule, should say: ‘Noble ladies, I will not follow this rule until I have enquired about it myself by

consulting another Bhikkhunī who is experienced and learned in the Discipline,' she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[150] Whatever nun, when the *Pātimokkha* is being recited, should speak thus: 'Why are these lesser and minor training rules recited when they lead only to anxiety, vexation and confusion?' in criticism of the disciplinary rules, that Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[151] Whatever Bhikkhunī, when the *Pātimokkha* is being recited every half-month, should speak thus: 'Only now I have heard that this case, too, is handed down in the *Pātimokkha*, is included in the *Pātimokkha*, and comes up for recitation every half-month,' and if the other Bhikkhunīs know that the Bhikkhunī in question has already sat through two or three recitations of the *Pātimokkha*, not more than that, then the nun is not entitled to be exempted for being ignorant. Whatever the fault she has committed, she is to be dealt with in accordance with the rule. In addition, her ignorance is to be exposed, saying, 'It is a disadvantage for you, noble lady, it is ill-done, that when the *Pātimokkha* is being recited, you do not pay proper attention, you do not take it to heart.' In this case the ignorant Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[152] Whatever Bhikkhunī, angered and displeased, should deliver a blow to another Bhikkhunī, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[153] Whatever Bhikkhunī, angered and displeased, should raise her hand against another Bhikkhunī, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[154] Whatever Bhikkhunī should defame another nun with the unfounded charge of an offence of *Saṅghādisesa* category, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[155] Whatever Bhikkhunī should intentionally provoke remorse in another Bhikkhunī, thinking, 'By this way, even just for a moment, she will have no peace,' if this is done for just this reason and no other, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[156] Whatever Bhikkhunī should stand by overhearing Bhikkhunīs as they are arguing, quarrelling and disputing, thinking, 'I will hear what they say,' and if this is done for just this reason and no other, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

The fifteenth division: on false opinions.

[157] Whatever Bhikkhunī, having given her consent to a formal act carried out in accordance with the rule, should afterwards criticize that act, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[158] Whatever Bhikkhunī, when the Community is engaged in a decisive judgement, should depart without having given her consent, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[159] Whatever Bhikkhunī, together in concord with the Community, having given a robe to another Bhikkhunī, should criticize afterwards, saying, 'These Bhikkhunīs apportion the Community's gains according to friendship,' she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[160] Whatever Bhikkhunī should knowingly divert to an individual the gains that had been allocated for the Community, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[161] Whatever Bhikkhunī, should pick up or cause someone to pick up a valuable thing, or anything considered valuable, except within a monastery or within a dwelling, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category. But a Bhikkhunī can pick up or cause someone to pick up a valuable thing or anything considered valuable within a monastery or within a dwelling house on condition that it should be laid aside, thinking: 'Whoever owns it will come and fetch it.' This is the proper course in this case.

[162] Whatever Bhikkhunī should have a needle-case made that is made out of bone or ivory or horn, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[163] Whatever Bhikkhunī should have made for her a new couch or chair, the legs should be made eight finger-breadths high according to the Sugata finger-breadth, and not counting the lower edge of the frame. In exceeding this measure, the nun is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[164] Whatever Bhikkhunī should have a couch or a chair upholstered, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category. That upholstery is to be torn off.

[165] Whatever Bhikkhunī should have an itch-cloth made for her, it is to be made to the accepted measurement. In this case the acceptable measure is: four spans, according to the Sugata span, in length, two spans in width. In exceeding this measure, the Bhikkhunī is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya* category.

[166] Whatever Bhikkhunī should have a robe made the size of the Sugata robe or larger, she is guilty of a fault of *Pācittiya*

Appendix no. 1

category. The robe is to be cut down. In this case, the size of the Sugata robe is this: nine spans, using the Sugata span, in length; six spans in width. This is the size of the Sugata's Sugata robe.

The sixteenth division: on legitimate acts.

Noble ladies, the one hundred and sixty-six rules for faults of the *Pācittiya* category have been recited. With regard to these faults, I now ask the noble ladies: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? The noble ladies are quite pure in this matter. That is why they are silent. Thus do I understand this.

Here end the one hundred and sixty-six rules of Pācittiya category.

PĀṬIDESANĪYĀ

Now, noble ladies, these eight rules for offences that ought to be declared come up for recitation:

[1] Whatever Bhikkhunī, who is not ill, having had ghee asked for, should eat it, it should be declared by that Bhikkhunī, saying, 'Noble ladies, I have fallen into a blameworthy matter, unsuitable, which ought to be declared. I confess it.'

[2–8] Whatever Bhikkhunī, who is not ill, having had (2) oil, (3) honey, (4) molasses, (5) fish, (6) meat, (7) milk, (8) curds, asked for, should eat it, it should be declared by that Bhikkhunī, saying, 'Noble ladies, I have fallen into a blameworthy matter, unsuitable, which ought to be declared. I confess it.'

Noble ladies, the eight rules for the faults of the *Pāṭidesanīya* category, have been recited. With regard to these faults, I now ask the noble ladies: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? The noble ladies are quite pure in this matter. That is why they are silent. Thus do I understand this.

Here end the eight rules of the offences of Pāṭidesanīya category.

SEKHIYĀ

Now, noble ladies, these rules of training come up for recitation:

[1] "I will wear the inner robe all around me" is a training to

be observed.

[2] "I will wear the upper robe completely all around me" is a training to be observed.

[3] "I will go well-covered in inhabited areas"¹ is a training to be observed.

[4] "I will sit well-covered in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[5] "I will go well-restrained in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[6] "I will sit well-restrained in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[7] "I will go with eyes lowered in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[8] "I will sit with eyes lowered in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[9] "I will not go with robes hitched up in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[10] "I will not sit with robes hitched up in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

First division: on covering oneself all round.

[11] "I will not go laughing loudly in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[12] "I will not sit laughing loudly in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[13] "I will go speaking with lowered voice in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[14] "I will sit speaking with lowered voice in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[15] "I will not go swinging my body in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[16] "I will not sit swinging my body in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[17] "I will not go swinging my arms in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[18] "I will not sit swinging my arms in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[19] "I will not go swinging my head in inhabited areas" is a

1. *antaraghare* (lit. amidst houses) in a village or a town.

Appendix no. 1

training to be observed.

[20] "I will not sit swinging my head in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

Second division: on not laughing loudly.

[21] "I will not go with arms akimbo in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[22] "I will not sit with arms akimbo in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[23] "I will not go with my head covered in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[24] "I will not sit with my head covered in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[25] "I will not go tiptoeing or walking just on my heels in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[26] "I will not sit holding up my knees in inhabited areas" is a training to be observed.

[27] "I will receive alms food attentively" is a training to be observed.

[28] "I will receive alms food with my attention focused on the begging-bowl" is a training to be observed.

[29] "I will receive alms food with bean curry in proper proportion" is a training to be observed.

[30] "I will receive alms food level with the edge of the begging-bowl" is a training to be observed.

Third division: on not having one's arms akimbo.

[31] "I will eat alms food attentively" is a training to be observed.

[32] "I will eat alms food with attention focused on the begging-bowl" is a training to be observed.

[33] "I will eat alms food methodically" is a training to be observed.

[34] "I will eat alms food with bean curry in proper proportion" is a training to be observed.

[35] "I will not eat alms food when I have not chosen from the top (of the rice)" is a training to be observed.

[36] "I will not hide bean curry and foods with rice out of a desire to obtain more" is a training to be observed.

[37] "I will not eat rice or bean curry that I have requested for my own sake, unless I am ill" is a training to be observed.

[38] "I will not look at another's begging bowl (while eating) intent on finding fault" is a training to be observed.

[39] "I will not take an extra-large mouthful" is a training to be observed.

[40] "I will make a rounded mouthful" is a training to be observed.

Fourth division: on attention.

[41] "I will not open my mouth before bringing the food up to it" is a training to be observed.

[42] "I will not put my whole hand into my mouth while eating" is a training to be observed.

[43] "I will not speak with my mouth full of food" is a training to be observed.

[44] "I will eat from lifted balls of food" is a training to be observed.

[45] "I will eat nibbling at portions of food" is a training to be observed.

[46] "I will not eat stuffing out my cheeks" is a training to be observed.

[47] "I will not eat shaking food my hand" is a training to be observed.

[48] "I will not eat scattering rice about" is a training to be observed.

[49] "I will not eat sticking out my tongue" is a training to be observed.

[50] "I will not eat smacking my lips" is a training to be observed.

Fifth division: on mouthfuls.

[51] "I will not eat making a slurping noise" is a training to be observed.

[52] "I will not eat licking my hands" is a training to be observed.

[53] "I will not eat licking the begging bowl" is a training to be observed.

[54] "I will not eat licking the lips" is a training to be observed.

[55] "I will not accept a water vessel with a hand soiled by food" is a training to be observed.

Appendix no. 1

[56] "I will not, in an inhabited area, throw away bowl-rinsing water that has grains of cooked rice in it" is a training to be observed.

[57] "I will not teach the Doctrine to a person with a parasol in his hand, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[58] "I will not teach the Doctrine to a person with a staff in his hand, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[59] "I will not teach the Doctrine to a person with a knife in his hand, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[60] "I will not teach the Doctrine to a person with a weapon in his hand, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

Sixth division: on not making a slurping noise.

[61] "I will not teach the Doctrine to a person wearing wooden footwear, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[62] "I will not teach the Doctrine to a person wearing leather footwear, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[63] "I will not teach the Doctrine to a person in a vehicle, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[64] "I will not teach the Doctrine to person lying down, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[65] "I will not teach the Doctrine to a person who sits holding up his knees, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[66] "I will not teach the Doctrine to a person wearing headgear, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[67] "I will not teach the Doctrine to a person whose head is covered with a robe or scarf, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[68] "Sitting on the ground, I will not teach the Doctrine to a person sitting on a seat, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[69] "Sitting on a low seat, I will not teach the Doctrine to a person sitting on a high seat, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[70] "Standing, I will not teach the Doctrine to a person sitting, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[71] "Walking behind, I will not teach the Doctrine to a person walking ahead, unless he is ill" is a training to be observed.

[72] "Walking beside a path, I will not teach the Doctrine to a

person walking on the path unless he is ill” is a training to be observed.

[73] “Unless I am ill, I will not defecate or urinate while standing” is a training to be observed.

[74] “Unless I am ill, I will not defecate, urinate, or spit on living crops” is a training to be observed.

[75] “Unless I am ill, I will not defecate, urinate, or spit in water” is a training to be observed.

Seventh division: on footwear.

Noble ladies, the seventy-five precepts for training have been recited. With regard to these faults, I now ask the noble ladies: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? The noble ladies are quite pure in this matter. That is why they are silent. Thus do I understand this.

Here end the seventy-five precepts for training.

ADHIKARAṆA-SAMATHĀ

Now, noble ladies, these seven methods for the settlement of legal cases come up for recitation:

For deciding, for settling legal problems that may arise from time to time: (1) a verdict “in the presence of” may be given; (2) a verdict of innocence may be given; (3) a verdict of past insanity may be given; (4) a verdict can be carried out with the acknowledgement of the offender Bhikkhunī; (5) a verdict can be given according to the opinion of the majority; (6) acting in accordance with the accuser’s further misconduct; (7) covering up the whole case as with grass.

Noble ladies, the seven methods for the settlement of legal cases have been recited. With regard to these faults, I ask now the noble ladies: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a second time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? And a third time I ask: I hope you are quite pure in this matter? The noble ladies are quite pure in this matter. That is why they are silent. Thus do I understand this.

Here end the methods for the settlement of legal cases.

CONCLUSION

Noble ladies, the introduction has been recited, the eight rules of the *Pārājikā* category have been recited; the seventeen rules of the *Saṅghādisesa* category have been recited; the thirty rules of *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* category have been recited; the one hundred sixty-six rules of *Pācittiya* category have been recited; the eight rules of *Pāṭidesanīya* category have been recited; the precepts for training (*sekhīyā dhammā*) have been recited; the seven methods for the settlement of legal cases (*adhikaraṇa samathā*) have been recited.

So much of the sayings of the Blessed One, handed down in clauses, contained in clauses, comes up for recitation every half month. All should train therein in harmony, on friendly terms, without contention.

Here ends the Pātimokkha for Bhikkhunīs.

APPENDIX NO. 2

BHIKKHUNĪ PĀTIMOKKHA PALI TEXT

Abbreviations

CS: *Dvemātikāpāli, Bhikkhunīpātimokkhapāli*, Sixth Council edition, preceding the *Kaṅkhāvitaranī* on the Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana CD-ROM, Version 3.0, Vipassana Research Institute, Igatpuri, 1999.

Cv: Rerukānē Chandavimala Thera, *Ubhaya Prātimokṣaya*, Colombo, 1956.

Mun: G. F. Munasingha, *Bhikṣuprātimokṣaya saha Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣaya*, Hunupitiya, 1914.

Per: W.S. Perera, *Bhikṣuprātimokṣaya saha Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣaya*, Brandiyawatta, 1895.

Pruitt: *The Pātimokkha*, Pali text edited by William Pruitt, Oxford, 2001.

Se Vibh: *Bhikkhunī Vibhaṅga*, Royal Thai edition as given on Budsir IV CD-ROM, Bangkok, 1997.

Sug: *Sanna Sahita Bhikṣu Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa Deka*, Suguṇasāra Thera, Colombo, 1924.

BHIKKHUNĪPĀTIMOKKHA

Namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa

Sammajjanī padīpo ca, udakaṃ āsanena ca
Uposathassa etāni, pubbakaraṇaṃ ti vuccati.
Chandapārisuddhi-utukkhānaṃ, bhikkhuṇīgaṇaṇa¹ ca ovādo
Uposathassa etāni, pubbakiccaṃ ti vuccati.
Uposatho yāvaticā ca bhikkhuniyo kammappattā
Sabhāgāpattiyo ca na vijjanti
Vajjanīyā ca puggalā tasmim̐ na honti
Pattakallaṃ ti vuccati.

Pubbakaraṇapubbakiccāni samāpetvā desitāpattikassa
samagghassa bhikkhuṇīsāṅghassa anumatiyā pātimokkhaṃ
uddisituṃ ārādhaṇaṃ karomi.²

[*Nidānuddeso*]³

Suṇātu me ayye saṅgho. Ajjuposatho paṇṇaraso. Yadi saṅghassa
pattakallaṃ saṅgho uposathaṃ kareyya, pātimokkhaṃ uddiseyya.

Kim̐ saṅghassa pubbakiccaṃ? Pārisuddhiṃ ayyāyo ārocetha.
Pātimokkhaṃ uddisissāmi. Taṃ sabbāva sādhuṃ suṇoma,
manasikaroma. Yassa siyā āpatti sā āvikareyya. Asantiyā āpattiyā
tuṇhī bhavitabbaṃ. Tuṇhībhāvena kho panayyāyo⁴ parisuddhā ti
vedissāmi. Yathā kho pana paccekapuṭṭhāya⁵ veyyākaraṇaṃ hoti,
evam̐ eva⁶ evarūpāya parisāya yāvatiyaṃ anusāvitaṃ hoti, yā pana
bhikkhunī yāvatiyaṃ anusāvīyamāne saramānā santiṃ āpattiṃ

-
1. Per & Mun: bhikkhuṇī-. (Throughout the text.)
 2. CS: karoma.
 3. Only in CS. No introductory heading in Sinhalese editions, so too for the other rule sections below. These headings appear to be a recent Burmese introduction. They are not found in manuscripts and are not recited during Pātimokkha recitals. The CS edition also includes rule headings for each rule, which likewise are a recent Burmese addition and not recited.
 4. CS, Cv: panāyyāyo. (Throughout the text.)
 5. CS: paccekapuṭṭhassā.
 6. CS: evamevaṃ.

nāvikareyya sampajānamusāvādassā hoti. Sampajānamusāvādo kho panayyāyo antarāyiko dhammo vutto bhagavatā. Tasmā saramānāya bhikkhuniyā āpannāya visuddhāpekkhāya santī āpatti⁷ avikātabbā. Avikatā hissā phāsu hoti.

Uddiṭṭhaṃ kho ayyāyo nidānaṃ. Tatthayyāyo⁸ pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Dutiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Tatiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Parisuddhetthayyāyo,⁹ tasmā tuṅhī; evametaṃ dhārayāmi ti.

*Nidānuddeso.*¹⁰

*[Pārājikuddeso]*¹¹

Tatṛime¹² aṭṭha pārājikā dhammā uddesaṃ āgacchanti.

[1] Yā pana bhikkhunī chandaso methunaṃ dhammaṃ paṭisevya,¹³ antamaso tiracchānagatena pi, pārājikā hoti, asaṃvāsā.

[2] Yā pana bhikkhunī gāmā vā araṇṇā vā adinnaṃ theyasaṅkhātāṃ ādiyeyya, yathārūpe adinnādāne rājāno coriṃ gahetvā haneyyumaṃ vā bandheyumaṃ vā pabbājeyyumaṃ vā corāsi bālhāsi mūlhāsi thenāsī ti, tathārūpaṃ bhikkhunī adinnaṃ ādiyamānā, ayam pi pārājikā hoti, asaṃvāsā.

[3] Yā pana bhikkhunī sañcicca manussaviggahaṃ jīvītā voropeyya, satthahārakaṃ vāssa pariyeseyya, maraṇavaṇṇaṃ vā saṃvaṇṇeyya, maraṇāya vā samādapeyya, “Ambho purisa, kiṃ tuyhiminā pāpakena dujjivitena, matan te jīvītā seyyo” ti, iti cittamanā cittasaṅkappā anekapariyāyena maraṇavaṇṇaṃ vā saṃvaṇṇeyya, maraṇāya vā samādapeyya, ayam pi pārājikā hoti, asaṃvāsā.

[4] Yā pana bhikkhunī anabhijānaṃ¹⁴ uttarimanu-ssadhammaṃ attupanāyikaṃ alamariyañāḍassanaṃ samudācareyya, iti jānāmi,

7. CS: āpatti.

8. CS: tatthāyyāyo. (Throughout.)

9. CS, Mun, Cv: -etthāyyāyo. (Throughout.)

10. CS: Nidānaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ. Cv, Burmese v.l. in Pruitt: Nidānuddeso paṭhamo.

11. Only in CS. See footnote 3.

12. CS, Cv: tatṛime.

13. Sug, Mun, Per: paṭisevya.

14. Sug, anabhijānantī. (Cf. Pār 6, Pāc 112, 116: jānantī; Pāc 111: pakkamantī; Sekh 71–2: gacchantī.)

iti passāmi ti, tato aparena samayena samuggāhiyamānā vā asamānuggāhiyamānā vā āpannā visuddhāpekkhā,¹⁵ evaṃ vadeyya, ajānam evaṃ¹⁶ ayye avacaṃ jānāmi, apassaṃ¹⁷ passāmi, tucchaṃ musā vilapin ti, aññatra adhimānā, ayam pi pārājikā hoti, asaṃvāsā.

[5] Yā pana bhikkhunī avassutā avassutassa purisapuggalassa adhakkhaṃ¹⁸ ubbhajāṇumaṅgalaṃ āmasanaṃ vā parāmasanaṃ vā gahaṇaṃ vā chupanaṃ vā paṭipīlanaṃ vā sādīyeyya, ayam pi pārājikā hoti, asaṃvāsā ubbhajāṇumaṅgalikā.

[6] Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ¹⁹ pārājikaṃ dhammaṃ ajjhāpannaṃ bhikkhuniṃ nevattanā paṭicodeyya, na gaṇassa āroceyya, yadā ca sā ʒhitā vā assa cutā vā nāsītā vā avasaṭā²⁰ vā, pacchā evaṃ vadeyya, pubbevāhaṃ ayye aññāsiṃ etaṃ bhikkhuniṃ evarūpā ca evarūpā ca sā bhagini ti, no ca kho attanā paṭicodessaṃ, na gaṇassa ārocessan ti, ayam pi pārājikā hoti, asaṃvāsā vajjapaṭicchādikā.

[7] Yā pana bhikkhunī samaggena saṅghena ukkhittaṃ bhikkhuṃ dhammena vinayena satthusāsanena anādaraṃ appatikāraṃ akatasahāyaṃ tam anuvatteyya, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi evaṃ assa vacanīya, eso kho ayye bhikkhu samaggena saṅghena ukkhitto dhammena vinayena satthusāsanena, anādaro appatikāro akatasahāyo, māyye etaṃ bhikkhuṃ anuvatti ti. Evaṃ ca sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyya, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi yāvataṭiyāṃ samanubhāsītā tassa paṭinissaggāya. Yāvataṭiyāṃ ce samanubhāsīyamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyya, iccetāṃ kusalaṃ. No ce paṭinissajjeyya, ayam pi pārājikā hoti, asaṃvāsā ukkhittānūvattikā.

[8] Yā pana bhikkhunī avassutā avassutassa purisapuggalassa hatthaggaṇaṃ²¹ vā sādīyeyya, saṅghāṭikaṃ naggahaṇaṃ²² vā sādīyeyya, santiṭṭheyya vā, sallapeyya vā, saṅketāṃ vā gaccheyya, purisassa vā abbhāgamaṇaṃ sādīyeyya, channaṃ vā anupaviseyya, kāyaṃ vā tadatthāya upasaṃhareyya, etassa asaddhammassa

15. = Mun & Per v.l. All eds.: visuddhāpekkhā (Cf. –apekhā in Pāc 137, 141).

16. Sug: ajānantevaṃ.

17. Sug: apassanti.

18. CS, Se Vibh: adhakkhakaṃ.

19. Sug: jānanti.

20. CS, Cv: avasaṭa.

21. Sug, Se Vibh: hatthaggaṇaṃ.

22. Se Vibh: -gahaṇaṃ.

paṭisevanatthāya, ayam pi pārājikā hoti, asaṃvāsā aṭṭhavatthukā.

Uddiṭṭhā kho ayyāyo aṭṭha pārājikā dhammā. Tesam bhikkhunī aññataram vā aññataram va āpajjitvā na labhati bhikkhunīhi saddhiṃ saṃvāsam yathā pure tathā pacchā, pārājikā hoti, asaṃvāsā. Tatthayyāyo pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Dutiyaṃpi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Tatiyaṃpi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Parisuddhetthayyāyo, tasmā tuṅhī; evametam dhārayāmi ti.

*Pārājikuddeso.*²³

[Saṅghādisesuddeso]²⁴

Ime kho panayyāyo²⁵ sattarasa saṅghādisesā dhammā uddesaṃ āgacchanti.

[1] Yā pana bhikkhunī ussayavādikā vihareyya gahapatinā vā gahapatiputtana vā dāsenā vā kammakarena²⁶ vā antamaso samaṇaparibbājakenā pi, ayam bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[2] Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ²⁷ coriṃ vajjhaṃ viditaṃ²⁸ anapaloketvā rājānaṃ vā saṅghaṃ vā gaṇaṃ vā pūgaṃ vā seṇiṃ vā aññatra kappā vuṭṭhāpeyya, ayam pi bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[3] Yā pana bhikkhunī ekā vā gāmantaraṃ gaccheyya, ekā vā nadipāraṃ gaccheyya, ekā vā rattiṃ vippavaseyya, ekā vā gaṇamhā ohīyeyya,²⁹ ayam pi bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[4] Yā pana bhikkhunī samaggena saṅghena ukkhittaṃ bhikkhuṇiṃ dhammena vinayena satthusāsanena, anapaloketvā kāraṇasaṅghaṃ, anaññāya gaṇassa chandaṃ, osāreyya, ayam pi bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[5] Yā pana bhikkhunī avassutā avassutassa purisapuggalassa hatthato khādanīyaṃ vā bhojanīyaṃ vā sahatthā paṭiggahetvā

23. CS: Pārājikaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ. Cv, Burmese v.l. in Pruitt's ed: Pārājikuddeso dutiyo

24. Only in CS. See footnote 3.

25. CS: panāyyāyo. (Throughout.)

26. CS: kammakārena.

27. Sug: jānantī.

28. Se Vibh: vajjhaviditaṃ.

29. CS, Cv, Mun, Per: ohīyeyya.

khādeyya vā bhūñjeyya vā, ayam pi bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[6] Yā pana bhikkhunī evaṃ vadeyya: Kiṃ te ayye eso purisapuggalo karissati avassuto vā anavassuto vā, yato tvaṃ anavassutā, ingha ayye³⁰ yaṃ te eso purisapuggalo deti khādanīyaṃ vā bhojanīyaṃ vā, taṃ tvaṃ sahatthā paṭiggahetvā khāda vā bhūñja vā ti, ayam pi bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[7] Yā pana bhikkhunī sañcarittaṃ samāpajjeyya itthiyā vā purisamatīṃ purisassa vā itthimatīṃ, jāyattena vā jārattena vā tañkhanikāya³¹ pi, ayam pi bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[8] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniṃ duṭṭhā dosā appatitā amūlakena pārājikena dhammena anuddhamseyya, appevanāma naṃ imamhā brahmacariyā cāveyyan ti, tato aparena samayena samanuggāhiyamānā vā, asamanuggāhiyamānā vā amūlakaṃ ceva taṃ adhikaraṇaṃ hoti, bhikkhunī ca dosaṃ patiṭṭhāti, ayam pi bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[9] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniṃ duṭṭhā dosā appatitā aññabhāgiyassa adhikaraṇassa kiñci desaṃ lesamattaṃ upādāya pārājikena dhammena anuddhamseyya, appeva nāma naṃ imamhā brahmacariyā cāveyyan ti, tato aparena samayena samanuggāhiyamānā³² vā asamanuggāhiyamānā vā amūlakaṃ ceva taṃ adhikaraṇaṃ hoti, koci deso lesamatto upādinno, bhikkhunī ca dosaṃ patiṭṭhāti, ayam pi bhikkhunī paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[10] Yā pana bhikkhunī kupitā anattamanā evaṃ vadeyya: Buddhaṃ paccakkhāmi,³³ dhammaṃ paccakkhāmi, saṅghaṃ paccakkhāmi, sikkhaṃ paccakkhāmi, kin nu mā va samaṇīyo yā samaṇīyo sakyadhītarō, santaññā pi samaṇīyo lajjino kukkucikā sikkhākāmā, tāsāhaṃ santike brahmacariyaṃ carissāmī ti. Sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi evamassa vacanīyā, Māyye kupitā anattamanā evaṃ vadeyya: Buddhaṃ paccakkhāmi, dhammaṃ paccakkhāmi, saṅghaṃ paccakkhāmi, sikkhaṃ paccakkhāmi, kin nu mā va samaṇīyo yā samaṇīyo sakyadhītarō, santaññā pi samaṇīyo

30. CS: ingh'ayye.

31. Mun, Per, Cv: taṃ khaṇikāya.

32. CS: -hiyamānā. (Also below)

33. CS: paccācikkhāmi. (Throughout.)

lajjino kukkucckā sikkhākāmā, tāsāhaṃ santike brahmacariyaṃ carissāmī ti. Abhiraṃmayye,³⁴ svākkhāto dhammo, cara brahmacariyaṃ sammā dukkhassa antakiriyaṃ ti. Evañca sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyya, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi yāvatiyaṃ samanubhāsītā tassā paṭinissaggāya. Yāvatiyañce samanubhāsīyamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyya, iccetaṃ kusalaṃ. No ce paṭinissajjeyya, ayaṃ pi bhikkhunī yāvatiyakāṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[11] Yā pana bhikkhunī kismiñcīdeva adhikaraṇe paccākatā kupitā anattamanā evaṃ vadeyya: Chandagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo dosagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo mohagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo bhayagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo ti. Sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi evamassa vacanīyā: Māyhe kismiñcīdeva adhikaraṇe paccākatā kupitā anattamanā evaṃ avaca: Chandagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo dosagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo mohagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo bhayagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo ti. Ayyā kho chandā pi gaccheyya, dosā pi gaccheyya, mohā pi gaccheyya, bhayā pi gaccheyyā ti. Evañca sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyya, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi yāvatiyaṃ samanubhāsītā tassā paṭinissaggāya. Yāvatiyañce samanubhāsīyamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyya, iccetaṃ kusalaṃ. No ce paṭinissajjeyya, ayaṃ pi bhikkhunī yāvatiyakāṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[12] Bhikkhuniyo paneva saṃsaṭṭhā viharanti pāpācārā pāpasaddā pāpasilokā bhikkhunisaṅghassa vihesikā aññamaññissā vajjapaṭicchādikā,³⁵ tā bhikkhuniyo bhikkhunīhi evaṃ assu vacanīyā: Bhaginiyo kho saṃsaṭṭhā viharanti pāpācārā pāpasaddā pāpasilokā bhikkhunisaṅghassa vihesikā aññamaññissā vajjapaṭicchādikā; viviccathayye,³⁶ vivekaññeva bhaginīnaṃ saṅgho vaṇṇeti ti. Evañca tā bhikkhuniyo bhikkhunīhi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyyuṃ, tā bhikkhuniyo bhikkhunīhi yāvatiyaṃ samanubhāsītā tassā paṭinissaggāya. Yāvatiyañce samanubhāsīyamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyyuṃ, iccetaṃ kusalaṃ. No ce paṭinissajjeyyuṃ, imā pi bhikkhuniyo yāvatiyakāṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[13] Yā pana bhikkhunī evaṃ vadeyya: Saṃsaṭṭhā va ayye tumhe

34. CS, Cv: abhiraṃmayye.

35. CS: -ppaṭicchādikā. (Also below)

36. CS, Cv: -ayye. Also below in next rule.

viharatha, mā tumhe nānā viharittha, santi saṅghe aññā pi bhikkhuniyo evācārā evaṃsaddā evaṃsilokā bhikkhunīsaṅghassa vihesikā aññamaññissā vajjapaṭicchādikā, tā saṅgho na kiñci āha, tumhaññeva saṅgho uññāya paribhavana akkhantiyā vebhassiyā³⁷ dubbalyā evam āha: Bhaginiyo kho saṃsaṭṭhā viharanti pāpācārā pāpasaddā pāpasilokā bhikkhunīsaṅghassa vihesikā aññamaññissā vajjapaṭicchādikā; viviccathayye, vivekaññeva bhaginīnaṃ³⁸ saṅgho vaṇṇeti ti. Sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi evam assa vacanīyā: Māyye evaṃ avaca saṃsaṭṭhā va ayye tumhe viharatha, mā tumhe nānā viharittha, santi saṅghe aññā pi bhikkhuniyo evācārā evaṃsaddā evaṃsilokā bhikkhunīsaṅghassa vihesikā aññamaññissā vajjapaṭicchādikā, tā saṅgho na kiñci āha, tumhaññeva saṅgho uññāya paribhavana akkhantiyā vebhassiyā dubbalyā evamāha: Bhaginiyo kho saṃsaṭṭhā viharanti pāpācārā pāpasaddā pāpasilokā bhikkhunīsaṅghassa vihesikā aññamaññissā vajjapaṭicchādikā; viviccathayye, vivekaññeva bhaginīnaṃ saṅgho vaṇṇeti ti. Evañca sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyya, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi yāvatatiyaṃ samanubhāsītābā tassa paṭinissaggāya. Yāvatatiyañce samanubhāsīyamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyya, iccetaṃ kusalaṃ. No ce paṭinissajjeyya, ayaṃ pi bhikkhunī yāvatatiyakaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ

[14] Yā pana bhikkhunī samaggassa saṅghassa bhedāya parakkameyya bhedanasaṃvattanikaṃ vā adhikaraṇaṃ samādāya paggayha tiṭṭheyya, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi evam assa vacanīyā: Māyye³⁹ samaggassa saṅghassa bhedāya parakkami, bhedanasaṃvattanikaṃ vā adhikaraṇaṃ samādāya paggayha aṭṭhāsi, sametayyā⁴⁰ saṅghena, samaggo hi saṅgho sammodamāno avivadamāno ekuddeso phāsuviharaṭi ti. Evañca sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyya, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi yāvatatiyaṃ samanubhāsītābā tassa paṭinissaggāya. Yāvatatiyañce samanubhāsīyamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyya, iccetaṃ kusalaṃ. No ce paṭinissajjeyya, ayaṃ pi bhikkhunī yāvatatiyakaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[15] Tassāyeva kho pana bhikkhuniyā bhikkhuniyo honti anuvattikā vaggavādikā ekā vā dve vā tisso vā, tā evaṃ vadeyyuṃ: Māyyāyo evaṃ bhikkhunīnaṃ kiñci avacuttha, dhammavādinī cesā

37. Se Vibh: vebhassā.

38. Per v.l.: bhikkhunīnaṃ.

39. CS: māyyā.

40. All except Sug: sametāyyā.

bhikkhunī, vinayavādinī cesā bhikkhunī, amhākaṃ cesā bhikkhunī chandaṃ ca ruciṃ ca ādāya voharati, jānāti no bhāsati, amhākaṃ petaṃ khamati ti. Tā bhikkhuniyo bhikkhunīhi evaṃ assu vacanīya: Māyyāyo evaṃ avacuttha. Na cesā bhikkhunī dhammavādinī, na cesā bhikkhunī vinayavādinī, mā ayyānaṃ pi saṅghabhedo rucittha, sametayyānaṃ⁴¹ saṅghena, samaggo hi saṅgho sammodamāno avivadamaṃno ekuddeso phāsuviharati ti. Evañca tā bhikkhuniyo bhikkhunīhi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyyuṃ, tā bhikkhuniyo bhikkhunīhi yāvatatiyaṃ samanubhāsitaṃ tassa paṭinissaggāya. Yāvatatiyañce samanubhāsiamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyyuṃ, iccetaṃ kusalaṃ. No ce paṭinissajjeyyuṃ, imā pi bhikkhuniyo yāvatatiyakaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[16] Bhikkhunī paneva dubbacajātikā hoti uddesapariyāpannesu sikkhāpadesu bhikkhunīhi sahadhammikaṃ vuccamānā attānaṃ avacaniyaṃ karoti: Mā maṃ ayyāyo kiñci avacuttha kalyāṇaṃ vā pāpakaṃ vā, ahaṃ⁴² pāyyāyo na kiñci vakkhāmi kalyāṇaṃ vā pāpakaṃ vā, viramathayyāyo⁴³ mama vacanāyā ti. Sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi evamassa vacanīyā: Māyyā attānaṃ avacaniyaṃ akāsi, vacanīyaṃ eva ayyā attānaṃ karotu, ayyā pi bhikkhuniyo vadetu⁴⁴ sahadhammena, bhikkhuniyo pi ayyaṃ vakkhanti sahadhammena, evaṃ saṃvaddhā⁴⁵ hi tassa bhagavato parisā yadidaṃ aññamaññavacanena, aññamaññavutthāpanenā ti. Evañca sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyya, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi yāvatatiyaṃ samanubhāsitaṃ tassa paṭinissaggāya. Yāvatatiyañce samanubhāsiamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyya, iccetaṃ kusalaṃ. No ce paṭinissajjeyya, ayaṃ pi bhikkhunī yāvatatiyakaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

[17] Bhikkhunī paneva aññataraṃ gāmaṃ vā nigamaṃ vā upanissāya viharanti kuladūsikā pāpasamācārā; tassa kho pāpakā samācārā dissanti ceva suyyanti⁴⁶ ca; kulāni ca tāya duṭṭhāni dissanti ceva suyyanti ca. Sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi evamassa vacanīyā: Ayyā kho kuladūsikā pāpasamācārā; ayyāya kho pāpakā samācārā dissanti ceva suyyanti ca; kulāni cayyāya⁴⁷ duṭṭhāni dissanti ceva

41. All except Sug: sametāyyānaṃ.

42. Cv, Mun, Per: ahaṃ.

43. All except Sugunasāra: viramathāyyāyo.

44. CS: vadatu.

45. Per v.l.: saṃvaḍḍha.

46. Mun: sūyanti & suyyanti. Per: suyyanti.

suyyanti ca. Pakkamatayyā⁴⁸ imamhā āvāsā; alan⁴⁹ te idha vasenā ti. Evañca sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi vuccamānā tā bhikkhuniyo evaṃ vadeyya: Chandagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo, dosagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo, mohagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo, bhayagāminiyo ca bhikkhuniyo, tādisikāya āpattiyā ekaccaṃ pabbājenti, ekaccaṃ na pabbājenti ti. Sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi evamassa vacanīyā: Māyye⁵⁰ evaṃ avaca. Na ca bhikkhuniyo chandagāminiyo, na ca bhikkhuniyo dosagāminiyo, na ca bhikkhuniyo mohagāminiyo, na ca bhikkhuniyo bhayagāminiyo. Ayyā kho kuladūsikā pāpasamācārā; ayyāya kho pāpakā samācārā dissanti ceva suyanti ca; kulāni cayyāya duṭṭhāni dissanti ceva suyanti ca. Pakkamatayyā imamhā āvāsā, alan te idha vāsenā ti. Evañca sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyya, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi yāvatatiyaṃ samanubhāsītābba tassa paṭinissaggāya. Yāvatatiyañce samanubhāsiyamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyya, iccetaṃ kusalaṃ. No ce paṭinissajjeyya, ayaṃ pi bhikkhunī yāvatatiyakaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇīyaṃ saṅghādisesaṃ.

Uddiṭṭhā kho ayyāyo sattarasa saṅghādisesā dhammā, nava paṭhamāpattikā, aṭṭha yāvatatiyakā. Yesaṃ bhikkhunī aññataraṃ vā aññataraṃ vā āpajjati, tāya bhikkhuniyā ubhatosaṅghe pakkhamānattaṃ caritābbaṃ. Ciṇṇamānattā bhikkhunī yattha siyā vīsatiṅgaṇo bhikkhunisaṅgho, tattha sā bhikkhunī abbhettābba. Ekāya pi ce ūno vīsatiṅgaṇo bhikkhunisaṅgho taṃ bhikkhunim abbheyya, sā ca bhikkhunī anabbhitā, tā ca bhikkhuniyo gārayhā. Ayaṃ tattha sāmīci.

Tatthayyāyo pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Dutiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Tatiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Parisuddhetthayyāyo, tasmā tuṅhi; evametaṃ dhārayāmi ti.

*Saṅghādisesuddeso.*⁵¹

[Nissaggiyā Pācittiyā]

Ime kho panayyāyo tiṃsa nissaggiyā pācittiyā dhammā uddesaṃ āgacchanti.

[1] Yā pana bhikkhunī pattasannicayaṃ⁵² kareyya, nissaggiyaṃ

47. CS cāyyāya. (Also below)

48. CS: pakkamatāyyā. (Also below)

49. CS, Cv: alaṃ. (Also below)

50. CS: māyyā.

51. CS: Saṅghādiseso niṭṭhito. Per, Mun: Saṅghādisesā niṭṭhitā. Burmese v.l. in Pruitt's ed: Saṅghādisesuddeso tatiyo.

pācittiyaṃ.

[2] Yā pana bhikkhunī akālacīvaraṃ kālacīvaran ti adhiṭṭhahitvā bhājāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[3] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā saddhiṃ cīvaraṃ parivattetvā sā pacchā evaṃ vadeyya: Handayye⁵³ tuyhaṃ cīvaraṃ, āharam etaṃ cīvaraṃ, yaṃ tuyhaṃ tuyham evetaṃ, yaṃ mayhaṃ mayham evetaṃ, āhara metaṃ, sakaṃ pacchāharā ti acchindeyya vā acchindāpeyya vā, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[4] Yā pana bhikkhunī aññaṃ viññāpetvā, aññaṃ viññāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[5] Yā pana bhikkhunī aññaṃ cetāpetvā, aññaṃ cetāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[6] Yā pana bhikkhunī aññadatthikena parikkhārena aññuddisikena⁵⁴ saṅghikaṃ aññaṃ cetāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[7] Yā pana bhikkhunī aññadatthikena parikkhārena aññuddisikena saṅghikena saññācikena⁵⁵ aññaṃ cetāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[8] Yā pana bhikkhunī aññadatthikena parikkhārena aññuddisikena mahājanikena aññaṃ cetāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[9] Yā pana bhikkhunī aññadatthikena parikkhārena aññuddisikena mahājanikena saññācikena aññaṃ cetāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[10] Yā pana bhikkhunī aññadatthikena parikkhārena aññuddisikena puggalikena saññācikena aññaṃ cetāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

Pattavaḅḅo paṭhama.

[11] Garupāpuraṇaṃ⁵⁶ pana bhikkhuniyā cetāpentiyā catukkaṃsaparamaṃ cetāpetabbaṃ; tato ce uttariṃ⁵⁷ cetāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[12] Lahupāpuraṇaṃ pana bhikkhuniyā cetāpentiyā aḍḍhateyyakaṃsaparamaṃ cetāpetabbaṃ; tato ce uttariṃ cetāpeyya,

52. Per Burmese v.l.: -sanniccayaṃ

53. CS: handāyye.

54. Per v.l.: aññuddisikena. (Throughout.)

55. Cv: saṃyācikena (Throughout.)

56. CS, Cv: -pāvuraṇaṃ. (Also in next rule)

57. CS: uttari. (Throughout.)

nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[13] Niṭṭhitacīvarasmim̐ pana bhikkhuniyā⁵⁸ ubbhata-smim̐ kaṭhine dasāhaparamaṃ atirekacīvaraṃ dhāretabbaṃ; taṃ atikkāmentiyā, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[14] Niṭṭhitacīvarasmim̐ pana bhikkhuniyā ubbhata-smim̐ kaṭhine ekarattaṃ pi ce bhikkhunī pañcahi⁵⁹ cīvarehi vippavaseyya, aññatra bhikkhunīsammutiyaṃ, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[15] Niṭṭhitacīvarasmim̐ pana bhikkhuniyā ubbhata-smim̐ kaṭhine bhikkhuniyā paneva akālacīvaraṃ uppajjeyya, ākaṅkhamānāya bhikkhuniyā taṃ paṭiggahetabbaṃ; paṭiggahetvā khippaṃ eva kāretabbaṃ; no cassa pāripūri, māsaparamaṃ tāya bhikkhuniyā taṃ cīvaraṃ nikkhipitabbaṃ, ūnassa pāripūriyā satiyā paccāsāya; tato ce uttariṃ⁶⁰ nikkhipeyya satiyā pi paccāsāya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[16] Yā pana bhikkhunī aññātakam̐ gahapatiṃ vā gahapatāniṃ vā cīvaraṃ viññāpeyya aññatra samayā, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ. Tatthāyaṃ samayo: acchinnacīvarā vā hoti bhikkhunī naṭṭhacīvarā vā. Ayaṃ tattha samayo.

[17] Tañce aññātakam̐ gahapati vā gahapatāniṃ vā bahūhi cīvarehi abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya, santaruttaraparamaṃ tāya bhikkhuniyā tato cīvaraṃ sādītābbaṃ; tato ce uttariṃ sādīyeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[18] Bhikkhuniṃ paneva uddissa aññātakassa gahapatissa vā gahapatāniyā vā cīvaracetāpannaṃ⁶¹ upakkhaṭaṃ hoti: Iminā cīvaracetāpannena cīvaraṃ cetāpetvā itthannāmaṃ⁶² bhikkhuniṃ cīvarena acchādessāmi ti, tatra ce sā bhikkhunī pubbe appavāritā upasaṅkamitvā cīvare vikappaṃ āpajjeyya: Sādhu vata maṃ āyasmā iminā cīvaracetāpannena evarūpaṃ vā evarūpaṃ vā cīvaraṃ cetāpetvā acchādehi ti kalyāṇakamyataṃ upādāya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[19] Bhikkhuniṃ paneva uddissa ubhinnaṃ aññātakānaṃ gahapatīnaṃ vā gahapatānīnaṃ vā paccekacīvaracetāpannāni upakkhaṭāni honti: Imehi mayaṃ paccekacīvaracetāpannehi paccekacīvarāni cetāpetvā itthaṃ nāmaṃ bhikkhuniṃ cīvarena

58. CS: niṭṭhitacīvarasmim̐ bhikkhuniyā. (Also in next two rules). Niṭṭhitacīvarāya (BBPm v.l.)

59. CS: ticīvarena.

60. CS: uttari. (Throughout.)

61. CS: cīvaracetāpannaṃ. (Throughout.)

62. Cv: itthaṃ nāmaṃ. (Throughout.)

acchādessāmī ti, tatra ce sā bhikkhunī pubbe appavāritā upasaṅkamtivā cīvare vikappaṃ āpajjeyya: Sādhu vata maṃ āyasmanto imehi paccekacīvaracetāpannehi evarūpaṃ vā evarūpaṃ vā cīvaraṃ cetāpetvā acchādeṭṭha, ubho va santā ekenā ti, kalyāṇakamyataṃ upādāya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[20] Bhikkhuniṃ paneva uddissa rājā vā rājabhoggo vā brāhmaṇo vā gahapatiko vā dūtena cīvaracetāpannaṃ paṇeṇya: Iminā cīvaracetāpannena cīvaraṃ cetāpetvā itthaṃ nāmaṃ bhikkhuniṃ cīvarena acchādehī ti. So ce dūto taṃ bhikkhuniṃ upasaṅkamtivā evaṃ vadeyya: Imaṃ kho ayye ayyaṃ uddissa cīvaracetāpannaṃ ābhaṭṭaṃ, paṭiṅṅhātu ayyā⁶³ cīvaracetāpannaṃ ti. Tāya bhikkhuniyā so dūto evaṃ assa vacanīyā: Na kho mayaṃ āvuso cīvaracetāpannaṃ paṭiṅṅhāma, cīvaraṃ ca kho mayaṃ paṭiṅṅhāma kālena kappiyaṃ ti. So ce dūto taṃ bhikkhuniṃ evaṃ vadeyya: Atthi panāyyāya⁶⁴ kāci veyyāvaccakara⁶⁵ ti. Cīvaratthikāya bhikkhave bhikkhuniyā veyyāvaccakara⁶⁶ niddisitabbā, āramikā vā upāsikā vā:⁶⁷ Esā kho āvuso bhikkhuniṃ veyyāvaccakara ti. So ce dūto taṃ veyyāvaccakaraṃ saññāpetvā, taṃ bhikkhuniṃ upasaṅkamtivā, evaṃ vadeyya: Yaṃ kho ayye ayyā veyyāvaccakaraṃ niddisi, saññattā sā⁶⁸ mayā, upasaṅkamatayyā⁶⁹ kālena cīvarena taṃ acchādessati ti. Cīvaratthikāya bhikkhave bhikkhuniyā veyyāvaccakara upasaṅkamtivā dvattikkhattuṃ codetabbā sāretabbā⁷⁰: Attho me āvuso cīvarena ti. Dvattikkhattuṃ codiyamānā sāriyamānā⁷¹ taṃ cīvaraṃ abhinipphādeyya, iccetāṃ kusalaṃ; no ce abhinipphādeyya, catukkhattuṃ pañcakkhattuṃ chakkhattuparamaṃ tuṅṅhībūtāya uddissa ṭṭāṭṭabbaṃ,⁷² catukkhattuṃ pañcakkhattuṃ chakkhattuparamaṃ tuṅṅhībūtā uddissa tiṭṭhamānā taṃ cīvaraṃ abhinipphādeyya, iccetāṃ kusalaṃ; tato ce uttariṃ vāyamamānā taṃ cīvaraṃ abhinipphādeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ. No ce abhinipphādeyya, yatassa

63. CS: paṭiṅṅhātāyā. Sug: paṭiṅṅhātu.

64. CS: panāyyāyo.

65. CS: koci veyyāvaccakaro.

66. CS: veyyāvaccakaro. (Also below)

67. CS: veyyāvaccakaro niddisitabbo, āramiko vā upāsiko vā.

68. CS: saññatto so.

69. CS: upasaṅkamatāyā.

70. CS: codetabbo sāretabbo.

71. CS, Sug: codayamānā sāriyamānā.

72. This whole clause is missing in Mun and Cv.

cīvaracetāpannaṃ ābhaṭaṃ tattha sāmaṃ vā gantabbaṃ, dūto vā pāhetabbo: Yaṃ kho tumhe āyasmanto bhikkhuniṃ uddissa cīvaracetāpannaṃ pahinīṭṭha, na taṃ tassā bhikkhuniyā kiñci atthaṃ anubhoti, yuñjantāyasmanto sakaṃ, mā vo sakaṃ vinassā ti. Ayaṃ tattha sāmīci.

Cīvaravaggo dutiyo.

[21] Yā pana bhikkhunī jātarūparajataṃ uggaṇḥeyya vā uggaṇḥāpeyya vā upanikkhittaṃ vā sādiyeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[22] Yā pana bhikkhunī nānappakāraṃ rūpiyaṃvohāraṃ samāpajeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[23] Yā pana bhikkhunī nānappakāraṃ kayavikkayaṃ samāpajeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[24] Yā pana bhikkhunī ūnapañcabandhanena pattena aññaṃ navaṃ pattaṃ cetāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ. Tāya bhikkhuniyā so patto bhikkhunīparisāya nissajitabbo,⁷³ yo ca tassa bhikkhunīparisā pattapariyanto so tassa bhikkhuniyā patto padātabbo: Ayaṃ te bhikkhunī patto, yāva bhedanāya dhāretabbo ti. Ayaṃ tattha sāmīci.

[25] Yāni kho pana tāni gilānaṃ bhikkhunīnaṃ paṭisāyanīyāni bhesajjāni, seyyathidaṃ⁷⁴: sappi, navanītaṃ, telaṃ madhuphānītaṃ, tāni paṭiggahetvā sattāhaparamaṃ sannidhikāraṃ paribhuñjītabbāni; taṃ atikkāmentiyā, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[26] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā sāmaṃ cīvaraṃ datvā kupitā anattamaṇā acchindeyya vā, acchindāpeyya vā, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[27] Yā pana bhikkhunī sāmaṃ suttaṃ viññāpetvā tantavāyehi cīvaraṃ vāyāpeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[28] Bhikkhuniṃ paneva uddissa aññātaṃ gahapati vā, gahapatāni vā, tantavāyehi cīvaraṃ vāyāpeyya, tatra ce sā bhikkhunī pubbe appavāritā tantavāye upasaṅkamitvā cīvare vikappaṃ āpajeyya: Idaṃ kho āvuso cīvaraṃ maṃ uddissa vīyati,⁷⁵ āyatañca karoṭha, vitthatañca appitañca suvitañca suppayāyitañca suvilekhitāñca suvitacchitañca karoṭha, appeva nāma mayaṃ pi āyasmantaṇaṃ kiñcimattaṃ anupadajjeyyāma ti. Evañca sā bhikkhunī vatvā kiñcimattaṃ anupadajjeyya antamaso

73. CS: nissajjitabbo.

74. CS: seyyathidaṃ.

75. CS: vīyati.

piṇḍapātāmattam pi, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[29] Dasāhānāgatam kattikatemāsipuṇṇamam⁷⁶ bhikkhuniyā paneva accekacivaraṃ uppajjeyya, accekaṃ maññamānāya bhikkhuniyā paṭiggahetabbaṃ, paṭiggahetvā yāva cīvarakālasamayaṃ nikkhipitabbaṃ; tato ce uttariṃ⁷⁷ nikkhipeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[30] Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ saṅghikaṃ lābhaṃ pariṇataṃ attanā pariṇāmeyya, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

Jātarūpavaggo tatiyo.

Uddiṭṭhā kho ayyāyo tiṃsa nissaggiyā pācittiyā dhammā. Tatthayyāyo pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Dutiyaṃpi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Tatiyaṃpi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Parisuddhetthayyāyo, tasmā tuṅhi; evametaṃ dhārayāmi ti.

*Nissaggiyā pācittiyā.*⁷⁸

[Suddhapācittiyā]

Ime kho panayyāyo chasatṭhisatā pācittiyā dhammā uddesaṃ āgacchanti.

[1] Yā pana bhikkhunī lasuṇaṃ khādeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[2] Yā pana bhikkhunī sambādhe lomāṃ saṃharāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[3] Talaghātake, pācittiyaṃ.

[4] Jatumaṭṭake,⁷⁹ pācittiyaṃ.

[5] Udakasuddhikaṃ pana bhikkhuniyā ādiyamānāya dvaṅgulapabbaparamaṃ ādātābbaṃ; taṃ atikkāmentiyā pācittiyaṃ.

[6] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhussa bhuñjantassa pānīyena vā vidhūpanena vā upatiṭṭheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[7] Yā pana bhikkhunī āmakadhaññaṃ viññatvā vā viññāpetvā vā⁸⁰ bhajjitvā vā bhajjāpetvā vā koṭṭetvā vā koṭṭāpetvā vā pacitvā vā pacāpetvā vā bhuñjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[8] Yā pana bhikkhunī uccāraṃ vā passāvaṃ saṅkāraṃ vā viḅhāsaṃ vā tirokuḍḍe vā tiropākāre vā chaḍḍeyya vā chaḍḍāpeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[9] Yā pana bhikkhunī uccāraṃ vā passāvaṃ vā saṅkāraṃ vā

76. CS: -māsikapuṇṇamaṃ.

77. CS: uttari.

78. CS: Nissaggiyapācittiyā. Per, Mun: Nissaggiyā pācittiyā niṭṭhitā.

79. CS, Se Vibh: jatumaṭṭhake.

80. Se Vibh: viññāpetvā vā viññāpāpetvā vā.

vighāsaṃ vā harite chaḍḍeyya vā chaḍḍāpeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[10] Yā pana bhikkhunī naccaṃ vā gitaṃ vāditaṃ vā dassanāya gaccheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

Lasuṇavaggo paṭhamo.

[11] Yā pana bhikkhunī rattandhakāre appadīpe purisena saddhiṃ ekenekā santiṭṭheyya vā sallapeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[12] Yā pana bhikkhunī paṭicchanne okāse purisena saddhiṃ ekenekā santiṭṭheyya vā sallapeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[13] Yā pana bhikkhunī ajjhokāse purisena saddhiṃ ekenekā santiṭṭheyya vā sallapeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[14] Yā pana bhikkhunī rathikāya⁸¹ vā byūhe⁸² vā siṅghātake vā purisena saddhiṃ ekena santiṭṭheyya vā sallapeyya vā nikaṇṇikaṃ vā jappeyya, dutiyikaṃ vā bhikkhuniṃ uyyojeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[15] Yā pana bhikkhunī purebhattaṃ kulāni upasaṅkamitvā āsane nisīditvā sāmike anāpucchā pakkameyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[16] Yā pana bhikkhunī pacchābhattaṃ kulāni upasaṅkamitvā sāmike anāpucchā āsane abhinisīdeyya vā abhinipajjeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[17] Yā pana bhikkhunī vikāle kulāni upasaṅkamitvā sāmike anāpucchā seyyaṃ santharivā vā santharāpetvā vā abhinisīdeyya vā abhinipajjeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[18] Yā pana bhikkhunī duggahitena⁸³ dūpadhāritena⁸⁴ paraṃ ujjhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[19] Yā pana bhikkhunī attānaṃ vā paraṃ vā nirayena vā brahmacariyena vā abhisapeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[20] Yā pana bhikkhunī attānaṃ vadhitvā vadhitvā rodeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

Rattandhakāravaggo⁸⁵ dutiyo.

[21] Yā pana bhikkhunī naggā nahāyeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[22] Udaśāṭikaṃ pana bhikkhuniyā kārayamānāya pamāṇikā kāretabbā, tatridaṃ pamāṇaṃ: dīghaso catasso vidatthiyo sugatavidatthiyā, tiriyaṃ dve vidatthiyo; taṃ atikkāmentiyā chedanakaṃ, pācittiyaṃ.

81. Se Vibh: rathiyāya.

82. All Sinhalese eds.: byuhe.

83. CS: duggahitena.

84. Mun and Per: dūpadhāritena.

85. Cv: andhākaravaggo.

[23] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā cīvaram visibbetvā vā visibbāpetvā vā sā pacchā anantarāyikini neva sibbeyya na sibbāpanāya ussukkaṃ kareyya aññatra catūhapañcāhā, pācittiyaṃ.

[24] Yā pana bhikkhunī pañcāhikaṃ saṅghāṭicāraṃ⁸⁶ atikkāmeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[25] Yā pana bhikkhunī cīvarasaṅkamaṇiyaṃ dhāreyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[26] Yā pana bhikkhunī gaṇassa cīvaralābhaṃ antarāyaṃ kareyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[27] Yā pana bhikkhunī dhammikaṃ cīvaravibhaṅgaṃ paṭibāheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[28] Yā pana bhikkhunī agārikassa⁸⁷ vā paribbājakassa vā paribbājikāya vā samaṇacīvaram dadeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[29] Yā pana bhikkhunī dubbalacīvarapaccāsāya cīvarakālasamayaṃ atikkāmeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[30] Yā pana bhikkhunī dhammikaṃ kaṭhinuddhāraṃ paṭibāheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

Naggavaggo tatiyo.

[31] Yā pana bhikkhuniyo dve ekamañce tuvaṭṭeyyuṃ, pācittiyaṃ.

[32] Yā pana bhikkhuniyo dve ekattharaṇapāpuraṇā⁸⁸ tuvaṭṭeyyuṃ, pācittiyaṃ.

[33] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā sañcicca aphāsuṃ kareyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[34] Yā pana bhikkhunī dukkhiṭaṃ sahaḷviniṃ neva upaṭṭheyya⁸⁹ na upaṭṭhāpanāya ussukkaṃ kareyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[35] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā upassayaṃ datvā kupitā anattamaṇā nikkadḍheyya vā nikkadḍhāpeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[36] Yā pana bhikkhunī saṃsaṭṭhā vihareyya gahapatinā vā gahapatiputtana vā, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunihi evam assa vacaniyā: Māyye saṃsaṭṭhā vihari gahapatinā pi gahapatiputtana⁹⁰ pi, viviccāyye,⁹¹ vivekaññeva bhikkhuniyā saṅgho vaṇṇeti ti. Evañca⁹²

86. Siamese v. l. in Cv, Se Vibh: -vāraṃ.

87. Se Vibh: agārikassa.

88. CS, Cv: -pāvuraṇā.

89. CS: upaṭṭhaheyya.

90. Se Vibh: gahapatiputtana.

91. CS, Cv: viviccāyye.

92. Cv: evañca pana.

sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyya, sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi yāvatatiyaṃ samanubhāsītābā tassa paṭinissaggāya. Yāvatatiyañce samanubhāsīyamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyya, iccetaṃ kusalaṃ. No ce paṭinissajjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[37] Yā pana bhikkhunī antoraṭṭhe sāsāṅkasammate sappatibhaye asatthikā cārikaṃ careyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[38] Yā pana bhikkhunī tioraṭṭhe sāsāṅkasammate sappatibhaye asatthikā cārikaṃ careyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[39] Yā pana bhikkhunī antovassaṃ cārikaṃ careyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[40] Yā pana bhikkhunī vassaṃ vutthā⁹³ cārikaṃ na pakkameyya antamaso chappañcayojanāni pi, pācittiyaṃ.

Tuvaṭṭavaggo catuttho.

[41] Yā pana bhikkhunī rājāgāraṃ vā cittāgāraṃ vā ārāmaṃ vā uyyānaṃ vā pokkharāṇiṃ vā dassanāya gaccheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[42] Yā pana bhikkhunī āsandiṃ vā pallaṅkaṃ vā paribhuñjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[43] Yā pana bhikkhunī suttaṃ kanteyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[44] Yā pana bhikkhunī gihīveyyāvaccam⁹⁴ kareyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[45] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhunīyā: Ehāye⁹⁵ imaṃ adhikaraṇaṃ vūpasamehī ti vuccamānā: Sādhū ti paṭissuṇitvā, sā pacchā anantarāyikīni neva vūpasameyya, na vūpasamāya ussukkaṃ kareyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[46] Yā pana bhikkhunī agārikassa vā paribbājakassa vā paribbājikāya vā sahatthā khādaniyaṃ vā bhojanīyaṃ vā dadeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[47] Yā pana bhikkhunī āvasathacīvaraṃ anissajitvā⁹⁶ paribhuñjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[48] Yā pana bhikkhunī āvasathaṃ anissajitvā cārikaṃ pakkameyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[49] Yā pana bhikkhunī tiracchānavijjaṃ pariyāpuṇeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[50] Yā pana bhikkhunī tiracchānavijjaṃ vāceyya, pācittiyaṃ.

93. Burmese v.l. in Cv: vassaṃ vutṭha.

94. CS, Cv, Se Vibh: gihi-.

95. CS, Cv: ehāye.

96. CS: anissajitvā. Cv: anissajitvā.

Cittāgāravaggo pañcama.

[51] Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ⁹⁷ sabhikkhukaṃ āramaṃ anāpucchā paviseyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[52] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuṃ akkoseyya vā paribhāseyya va, pācittiyaṃ.

[53] Yā pana bhikkhunī caṇḍikatā⁹⁸ gaṇaṃ paribhāseyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[54] Yā pana bhikkhunī nimantitā vā pavāritā vā khādanīyaṃ vā bhojanīyaṃ vā khādeyya va bhuñjeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[55] Yā pana bhikkhunī kulamaccharinī⁹⁹ assa, pācittiyaṃ.

[56] Yā pana bhikkhunī abhikkhuke āvāse vassaṃ vaseyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[57] Yā pana bhikkhunī vassaṃ vutthā ubhato saṅghe tihi ṭhānehi nappavāreyya¹⁰⁰ diṭṭhena vā sutena vā parisāṅkāya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[58] Yā pana bhikkhunī ovādāya vā samvāsāya vā na gaccheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[59] Anvaddhamāsaṃ¹⁰¹ pana bhikkhuniyā¹⁰² bhikkhusaṅghato dve dhammā paccāsiṃsittabā¹⁰³: uposathapucchakanañca, ovādūpasankamanañca. Taṃ atikkāmentiyā, pācittiyaṃ.

[60.] Yā pana bhikkhunī pasāke jātaṃ gaṇḍaṃ vā rucitaṃ¹⁰⁴ vā anapaloketvā saṅghaṃ vā gaṇaṃ vā purisena saddhiṃ ekenekā bhedaṭṭeyya vā phālāṭṭeyya vā dhovāṭṭeyya vā limpāṭṭeyya vā bandhāṭṭeyya vā mocāṭṭeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

Ārāmaṃvaggo chaṭṭho.

[61] Yā pana bhikkhunī gabbhinīṃ vuṭṭhāṭṭeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[62] Yā pana bhikkhunī pāyantiṃ vuṭṭhāṭṭeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[63] Yā pana bhikkhunī dve vassāni chasu dhammesu asikkhitasikkhaṃ sikkhamānaṃ vuṭṭhāṭṭeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[64] Yā pana bhikkhunī dve vassāni chasu dhammesu

97. Sug: jānantī.

98. CS, Cv, Se Vibh: caṇḍī-.

99. Sug, Per, Mun: -maccharinī.

100. CS, Cv: na pavāreyya.

101. Se Vibh: anvaddhamāsaṃ.

102. CS: anvaddhamāsaṃ bhikkhuniyā.

103. CS, Cv: paccāsiṃsittabā.

104. CS: rudhitaṃ. Se Vibh: ruhitaṃ. (Ee/PTS Vibh: rūhitaṃ.)

sikkhitasikkhaṃ sikkhamānaṃ saṅghena asammatam vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[65] Yā pana bhikkhunī ūnavādasavassaṃ gihigataṃ vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[66] Yā pana bhikkhunī paripuṇṇadvādasavassaṃ gihigataṃ¹⁰⁵ dve vassāni chasu dhammesu asikkhitasikkhaṃ vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[67] Yā pana bhikkhunī paripuṇṇadvādasavassaṃ gihigataṃ dve vassāni chasu dhammesu sikkhitasikkhaṃ saṅghena asammatam vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[68] Yā pana bhikkhunī sahajiviniṃ vuṭṭhāpetvā dve vassāni neva anuggaṇheyya na anuggaṇhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[69] Yā pana bhikkhunī vuṭṭhāpitaṃ pavattiniṃ dve vassāni nānubandheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[70] Yā pana bhikkhunī sahajiviniṃ vuṭṭhāpetvā ne vūpakāseyya na vūpakāsepeyya antamaso chappañcayojanāni pi, pācittiyaṃ.

Gabbhinīvaggo¹⁰⁶ sattamo.

[71] Yā pana bhikkhunī ūnavāsisavassaṃ kumārībhūtam¹⁰⁷ vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[72] Yā pana bhikkhunī paripuṇṇavāsisavassaṃ kumārībhūtam dve vassāni chasu dhammesu asikkhitasikkhaṃ vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[73] Yā pana bhikkhunī paripuṇṇavāsisavassaṃ kumārībhūtam dve vassāni chasu dhammesu sikkhitasikkhaṃ saṅghena asammatam vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[74] Yā pana bhikkhunī ūnavādasavassā vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[75] Yā pana bhikkhunī paripuṇṇadvādasavassā saṅghena asammatā vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[76] Yā pana bhikkhunī: Alaṃ tāva¹⁰⁸ te ayye vuṭṭhāpitenā ti vuccamānā: Sādhū ti paṭissuṇitvā, pacchā khiyyanadhammam¹⁰⁹ āpajjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[77] Yā pana bhikkhunī sikkhamānaṃ: Sace me tvam ayye

105. CS, Cv, Se Vibh: gihi-. Also in next rule.

106. CS, Cv: Gabbhani-.

107. CS, Cv: kumāri-.

108. Se Vibh: alantāva.

109. Se Vibh: khīyana-. Cv, Mun: khīyana-.

cīvaraṃ dassasi, evāhan taṃ¹¹⁰ vuṭṭhāpessāmī ti vatvā sā pacchā anantarāyikinī neva vuṭṭhāpeyya na vuṭṭhāpanāya ussukkaṃ kareyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[78] Yā pana bhikkhunī sikkhamānā: Sace maṃ tvaṃ ayye dve vassāni anubandhissasi, evāhan taṃ vuṭṭhāpessāmī ti vatvā sā pacchā anantarāyikinī neva vuṭṭhāpeyya na vuṭṭhāpanāya ussukkaṃ kareyya, pācittiyaṃ

[79] Yā pana bhikkhunī purisasamsaṭṭhaṃ kumārakasamsaṭṭhaṃ caṇḍiṃ sokāvāsaṃ sikkhamānaṃ vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[80] Yā pana bhikkhunī mātāpituhi vā sāmikena vā ananuññātaṃ sikkhamānaṃ vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[81] Yā pana bhikkhunī pārivāsikachandadānena sikkhamānaṃ vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[82] Yā pana bhikkhunī anuvassaṃ vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[83] Yā pana bhikkhunī ekaṃ vassaṃ dve vuṭṭhāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

Kumāribhūtavaggo¹¹¹ aṭṭhamo.

[84] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā chattūpāhanaṃ¹¹² dhāreyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[85] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā yānena yāyeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[86] Yā pana bhikkhunī saṅghāṇiṃ dhāreyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[87] Yā pana bhikkhunī itthālaṅkāraṃ¹¹³ dhāreyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[88] Yā pana bhikkhunī gandhavaṇṇakena nahāyeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[89] Yā pana bhikkhunī vāsitakena piññākena nahāyeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[90] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā ummaddāpeyya vā parimaddāpeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[91] Yā pana bhikkhunī sikkhamānāya ummaddāpeyya vā parimaddāpeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[92] Yā pana bhikkhunī sāmaṇeriyā ummaddāpeyya vā parimaddāpeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[93] Yā pana bhikkhunī gihiniyā ummaddāpeyya vā parimaddāpeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

110. Cv: evāhaṃ taṃ. Also in next rule.

111. CS, Cv: kumāri-.

112. CS, Cv: -upāhanaṃ.

113. Cv, Mun, Per: itthālaṅkāraṃ.

Appendix no. 2

[94] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhussa purato anāpucchā āsane nisideyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[95] Yā pana bhikkhunī anokāsakatam bhikkhum pañham puccheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[96] Yā pana bhikkhunī asaṅkacchikā¹¹⁴ gāmaṃ paviseyya, pācittiyaṃ.

Chattavaggo¹¹⁵ navamo.

[97] Sampajānamusāvāde, pācittiyaṃ.

[98] Omasavāde, pācittiyaṃ.

[99] Bhikkhunīpesuññe, pācittiyaṃ.

[100] Yā pana bhikkhunī anupasampannaṃ padaso dhammaṃ vāceyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[101] Yā pana bhikkhunī anupasampannāya uttarim¹¹⁶ dirattatirattaṃ sahaseyyaṃ kappeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[102] Yā pana bhikkhunī purisena sahaseyyaṃ kappeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[103] Yā pana bhikkhunī purisassa uttarim chappañcavācāhi dhammaṃ deseyya aññatra viññunā itthiviggahena, pācittiyaṃ.

[104] Yā pana bhikkhunī anupasampannāya uttarimanussadhammaṃ āroceyya bhūtasmiṃ, pācittiyaṃ.

[105] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā duṭṭhullaṃ āpattim anupasampannāya āroceyya aññatra bhikkhunī sammutiyā, pācittiyaṃ.

[106] Yā pana bhikkhunī paṭhaviṃ¹¹⁷ khaṇeyya vā khaṇāpeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

Musāvādavaggo dasamo.

[107] Bhūtagāmapātavyatāya,¹¹⁸ pācittiyaṃ.

[108] Aññāvādake vihesake, pācittiyaṃ.

[109] Ujjhāpanake khiyanake,¹¹⁹ pācittiyaṃ.

[110] Yā pana bhikkhunī saṅghikaṃ mañcaṃ vā piṭhaṃ vā bhisiṃ vā¹²⁰ kocchaṃ vā ajjhokāse santharivā vā santharāpetvā vā

114. Sug, Per, Mun, Cv: asaṅkacchikā.

115. CS, Se Vibh, Cv: chattupahanavaggo.

116. CS, Cv: uttarim. (Throughout.)

117. CS, Cv: pathaviṃ.

118. CS: bhūtagāmapātabyatāya.

119. CS: khiyyanake.

120. Sug, Per and Mun add in parenthesis: (bimbohaṃ vā).

taṃ pakkamantī neva uddhareyya na uddharāpeyya anāpucchaṃ vā gaccheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[111] Yā pana bhikkhunī saṅghike vihāre seyyaṃ santharitvā vā santharāpetvā vā taṃ pakkamantī neva uddhareyya na uddharāpeyya anāpucchaṃ vā gaccheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[112] Yā pana bhikkhunī saṅghike vihāre jānaṃ¹²¹ pubbūpagataṃ¹²² bhikkhuniṃ anupakhajja seyyaṃ kappeyya, “Yassā sambādho bhavissati, sā pakkamissati” ti, etadeva paccayaṃ karitvā anaññaṃ, pācittiyaṃ.

[113] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniṃ kupitā anattamaṇā saṅghikā vihāre nikkadḍheyya vā nikkadḍhāpeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[114] Yā pana bhikkhunī saṅghike vihāre uparivehāsakuṭiyā āhaccapādakaṃ mañcaṃ vā piṭṭhaṃ vā abhinisideyya vā, abhinipajjeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[115] Mahallakaṃ pana bhikkhuniyā vihāraṃ kārayamaṇāya yāva dvārakosā aggalatṭhapanāya¹²³ ālokasandhiparikammaṃ dvatticchadanassa pariyāyaṃ appaharite tṭhitāya adhiṭṭhātabbaṃ; tato ce uttariṃ appaharite pi tṭhitā adhiṭṭhaheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[116] Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ¹²⁴ sappānakaṃ udakaṃ tiṇaṃ vā mattikaṃ vā siñceyya vā siñcāpeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

Bhūtagāmaṃ ekādasamo.

[117] Agilānāya bhikkhuniyā eko āvasathapiṇḍo bhuñjitabbo; tato ce uttariṃ bhuñjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[118] Gaṇabhojane aññatra samayā, pācittiyaṃ. Tatthāyaṃ samayo: gilānasamayo, cīvaradānasamayo, cīvarakārasamayo, addhānagamasamayo, nāvābhirūhanasamayo,¹²⁵ mahāsamayo, samaṇabhattasamayo. Ayaṃ tattha samayo.

[119] Bhikkhuniṃ paneva kulaṃ upagataṃ pūvehi vā manthehi vā abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya, ākaṅkhamānāya bhikkhuniyā dvattipattapūrā paṭiggahetabbā; tato ce uttariṃ paṭiggaṇheyya, pācittiyaṃ. Dvattipattapūre paṭiggahetvā tato niharitvā bhikkhunihi saddhiṃ saṃvibhajitabbā. Ayaṃ tattha sāmīci.

[120] Yā pana bhikkhuni vikāle khādaniyaṃ va bhojaniyaṃ vā khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

121. Sug: jānantī.

122. CS, CJ: pubbugataṃ.

123. CS: aggaḷa.

124. Sug: jānantī.

125. CS, Sug: -ruhaṇa-.

[121] Yā pana bhikkhunī sannidhikāraṃ khādaniyaṃ vā bhojanīyaṃ vā khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā, pācittiyaṃ.

[122] Yā pana bhikkhunī adinnaṃ mukhadvāraṃ āhāraṃ āhareyya aññatra udakadantaponā, pācittiyaṃ.

[123] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniṃ evaṃ vadeyya:¹²⁶ Ehāyye,¹²⁷ gāmaṃ vā nigamaṃ vā piṇḍāya pavissāmā ti, tassa dāpetvā vā adāpetvā vā uyyojeyya: Gacchāyye,¹²⁸ na me tayā saddhiṃ kathā vā nisajja vā phāsu hoti, ekakāya me kathā vā nisajja vā phāsu hoti ti, etadeva paccayaṃ karitvā anaññaṃ, pācittiyaṃ.

[124] Yā pana bhikkhunī sabhojanakule anupakhajja nisajjaṃ kappeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[125] Yā pana bhikkhunī purisena saddhiṃ raho paṭicchane āsane nisajjaṃ kappeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[126] Yā pana bhikkhunī purisena saddhiṃ ekenekā raho nisajjaṃ kappeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

Bhojanavaggo dvādasamo.

[127] Yā pana bhikkhunī nimantitā sabhattā samānā santiṃ bhikkhuniṃ anāpucchā purebhattaṃ vā pacchābhattaṃ vā kulesu cārittaṃ āpajjeyya aññatra samayā, pācittiyaṃ. Tatthāyaṃ samayo: cīvaradānasamayo, cīvarakārasamayo. Ayaṃ tattha samayo.

[128] Agilānāya bhikkhuniyā catumāsappaccayapavāraṇā sādītābā aññatra punapavāraṇāya aññatra niccapavāraṇāya, tato ce uttariṃ sādiyeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[129] Yā pana bhikkhunī uyyuttaṃ senaṃ dassanāya gaccheyya aññatra tathārūpappaccayā, pācittiyaṃ.

[130] Siyā ca tassa bhikkhuniyā kocideva paccayo senaṃ gamanāya dirattatirattaṃ taya bhikkhuniyā senāya vasitabbaṃ; tato ce uttariṃ vaseyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[131] Dirattatirattaṃ ce bhikkhunī senāya vasamānā uyyodhikaṃ vā balaggaṃ vā senābyūhaṃ¹²⁹ vā anikadassanaṃ¹³⁰ vā gaccheyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[132] Surāmerayapāne, pācittiyaṃ.

[133] Aṅgulipatodake, pācittiyaṃ.

[134] Udale hassadhamme,¹³¹ pācittiyaṃ.

126. CS, CJ omit evaṃ vadeyya.

127. CS: ehāyye.

128. CS: gacchāyye.

129. CS, Cv, Mun: senābyūhaṃ

130. Mun & Per: aṅikadassanaṃ

[135] Anādariye, pācittiyaṃ.

[136] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniṃ bhimsāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

Cārittavaggo terasamo.

[137] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā visibbanāpekhā¹³² jotim samādaheyya vā samādahāpeyya vā aññatra tathārūpapaccayā, pācittiyaṃ.

[138] Yā pana bhikkhunī orenaddhamāsaṃ nahāyeyya aññatra samayā pācittiyaṃ tathāyaṃ samayo: diyaddho māso seso gimhānan ti vassānassa paṭhamo māso, iccete aḍḍhateyyamāsā uḥhasamayo, pariḷhasamayo, gilānasamayo, kammamayo, addhānagamasamayo, vātavuṭṭhisamayo. Ayaṃ tattha samayo.

[139] Navaṃ pana bhikkhuniyā cīvaralābhāya tiṇṇaṃ dubbaṇṇakaraṇānaṃ aññataraṃ dubbaṇṇakaraṇaṃ ādātabbaṃ: nilaṃ vā kaddamaṃ vā kālasāmaṃ¹³³ vā, anādā ce bhikkhunī tiṇṇaṃ dubbaṇṇakaraṇānaṃ aññataraṃ dubbaṇṇakaraṇaṃ navaṃ cīvaraṃ paribhuñjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[140] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhussa vā bhikkhuniyā vā sikkhamānāya vā sāmaṇerassa vā sāmaṇeriyā vā sāmaṃ cīvaraṃ vikappetvā appaccuddhāraṃ¹³⁴ paribhuñjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[141] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā pattamaṃ vā cīvaraṃ vā nisīdanaṃ vā sūciḡharaṃ vā kāyabandhanaṃ vā apanidheyya vā apanidhāpeyya vā antamaso hassāpekhā¹³⁵ pi, pācittiyaṃ.

[142] Yā pana bhikkhunī sañcicca paṇaṃ jivitā voropeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[143] Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ¹³⁶ sappanaṃ udakaṃ paribhuñjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[144] Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ¹³⁷ yathādhammaṃ nihatādhikaraṇaṃ punakammāya ukkoṭeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[145] Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ¹³⁸ theyyasatthena saddhiṃ saṃvidhāya ekaddhānamaggaṃ paṭipajjeyya antamaso gāmantaraṃ pi, pācittiyaṃ.

131. CS: hāsa-.

132. Sug: visīvanāpekhā. CS, CJ: visibbanāpekkhā.

133. Sug, Mun, Per: kāla-.

134. CS, Cv: appaccuddhāraṇaṃ.

135. Per, Mun: hassāpekho. Cv: hassāpekkho. CS: hassāpekkhā.

136. Sug: jānantī.

137. Sug: jānantī.

138. Sug: jānantī.

[146] Yā pana bhikkhunī evaṃ vadeyya: Tathāhaṃ bhagavatā dhammaṃ desitaṃ ajānāmi yathā ye me antarāyikā dhammā vuttā bhagavatā te paṭisevato nālaṃ antarāyāyā ti sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi evaṃ assa vacanīyā: Māyye evaṃ avaca mā bhagavantam abbhācikkhi na hi sādhu bhagavato abbhakkhānaṃ na hi bhagavā evaṃ vadeyya anekapariyāyena ayye¹³⁹ antarāyikā dhammā antarāyikā vuttā bhagavatā alañce pana te paṭisevato antarāyāyā ti. Tañce pana sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyya sā bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi yāvataṭṭhiyaṃ samanubhāsitabbā tassa paṭinissaggāya, yāvataṭṭhiyaṃ ce samanubhāsiyamānā taṃ paṭinissajjeyya iccetaṃ kusalaṃ, no ce paṭinissajjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[147] Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ¹⁴⁰ tathāvadīniyā bhikkhunīyā akatānudhammāya¹⁴¹ taṃ diṭṭhiṃ appaṭinissaṭṭhāya saddhiṃ sambhuñjeyya vā saṃvāseyya vā saha vā seyyaṃ kappeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[148] Samaṇuddesā pi ce evaṃ vadeyya: Tathāhaṃ bhagavatā dhammaṃ desitaṃ ajānāmi, yathā ye me antarāyikā dhammā vuttā bhagavatā te paṭisevato nālaṃ antarāyāyā ti sā samaṇuddesā bhikkhunīhi evamassa vacanīyā: Māyye samaṇuddese¹⁴² evaṃ avaca mā bhagavantam abbhācikkhi na hi sādhu bhagavato abbhakkhānaṃ na hi bhagavā evaṃ vadeyya anekapariyāyena ayye¹⁴³ samaṇuddese antarāyikā dhammā antarāyikā vuttā bhagavatā alañca pana te paṭisevato antarāyāyā ti evañce sā samaṇuddesā bhikkhunīhi vuccamānā tatheva paggaṇheyya sā samaṇuddesā bhikkhunīhi evaṃ assa vacanīyā: Ajjatagge te ayye samaṇuddese na ceva so bhagavā sathā apadisitabbo yam pi caññā samaṇuddesā labhanti bhikkhunīhi saddhiṃ dirattatirattam sahasseyyā sā pi te natthi cara pare¹⁴⁴ vinassā ti.

Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ¹⁴⁵ tathānāsitaṃ samaṇuddesaṃ upalāpeyya vā upaṭṭhāpeyya vā sambhuñjeyya vā saha vā seyyaṃ kappeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

*Jotivaggo catuddasamo.*¹⁴⁶

139. CS: anekapariyāyenāyye

140. Sug: jānantī.

141. CS: akatānudhammāya

142. Mun and Per v.l.: mā samaṇuddese.

143. CS: anekapariyāyenāyye

144. CS, CJ: pire

145. Sug: jānantī.

[149] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhunīhi sahadhammikaṃ vuccamānā evaṃ vadeyya: Na tāvāhaṃ ayye etasmim sikkhāpade sikkhissāmi yāva na aññaṃ bhikkhuniṃ byattaṃ vinayadharaṃ paripucchāmi ti pācittiyaṃ. Sikkhāmānāya bhikkhave bhikkhuniyā aññātabbaṃ paripucchitabbaṃ paripaṇhitabbaṃ. Ayaṃ tattha sāmīci.

[150] Yā pana bhikkhunī pātimokkhe uddissamāne evaṃ vadeyya: Kim panimehi khuddānukhuddakehi sikkhāpadehi uddiṭṭhehi, yāvadeva kukkucāya vihesāya vilekhāya saṃvattanti ti sikkhāpadavivaṇṇake,¹⁴⁷ pācittiyaṃ.

[151] Yā pana bhikkhunī anvaddhamāsaṃ pātimokkhe uddissamāne evaṃ vadeyya: Idāneva kho ahaṃ ājānāmi¹⁴⁸ ayam pi kira dhammo suttāgato suttapariyāpanno anvaddhamāsaṃ uddesaṃ āgacchanti ti. Tañce bhikkhuniṃ aññā bhikkhuniyo jāneyyumaḥ: Nisinnapubbaṃ imāya bhikkhuniyā dvattikkhattuṃ pātimokkhe uddissamāne kho pana vādo bhīyyo ti¹⁴⁹ na ca tassā bhikkhuniyā aññānakeṇa mutti atthi yañca tattha āpattiṃ āpannā tañca yathāddhammo kāretabbo¹⁵⁰ uttariṃ cassā moho āropetabbo: Tassā te ayye alābhā tassā te dulladdhaṃ yaṃ tvaṃ pātimokkhe uddissamāne na sādhukaṃ atthikatvā¹⁵¹ manasikarosi ti idaṃ tasmīṃ mohanake,¹⁵² pācittiyaṃ.

[152] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā kupitā anattamanā pahāraṃ dadeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[153] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā kupitā anattamanā talasattikaṃ uggireyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[154] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniṃ amūlakena saṅghādisesena anuddhaṃseyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[155] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniyā sañcicca kukkucaṃ upadaheyya: itissā muhuttaṃ pi aphāsu bhavissati ti etadeva paccayaṃ karitvā anaññaṃ. pācittiyaṃ.

[156] Yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhuniṃ bhaṇḍanajātānaṃ kalahajātānaṃ vivādāpannānaṃ upassutiṃ tiṭṭheyya. Yaṃ imā bhaṇissanti taṃ sossāmi ti etadeva paccayaṃ karitvā anaññaṃ, pācittiyaṃ.

Diṭṭhivaggo¹⁵³ paṇṇarasamo.

146. CS, Cv, Mun put this conclusion after rule 146. CJ: cuddasamo.

147. CS, Cv: sikkhāpadavivaṇṇake

148. CS, CJ: jānāmi.

149. CS, Cv omit ti. Cv, Per, Mun: bhīyyo.

150. Sug: kāretabbā.

151. CS, Cv: atthikatvā.

152. Sug: tassaṃ mohanakāya.

[157] Yā pana bhikkhunī dhammikānaṃ kammānaṃ chandaṃ datvā pacchā khiyyanadhammaṃ¹⁵⁴ āpajjeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[158] Yā pana bhikkhunī saṅghe vinicchayakathāya vattamānāya chandaṃ adatvā utthāyāsanaṃ pakkameyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[159] Yā pana bhikkhunī samaggena saṅghena cīvaraṃ datvā pacchā khiyyanadhammaṃ¹⁵⁵ āpajjeyya yathāsanthutaṃ bhikkhuniyo saṅghikaṃ lābhaṃ pariṇāmenti ti, pācittiyaṃ.

[160] Yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ saṅghikaṃ lābhaṃ pariṇataṃ puggalassa parināmeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[161] Yā pana bhikkhunī ratanaṃ vā ratanasammatam vā aññatra ajjhāramā vā ajjhāvasathā vā uggaṇḥeyya vā uggaṇḥapeyya vā pācittiyaṃ. Ratanam vā pana bhikkhuniyā ratanasammatam vā ajjhārāme vā ajjhāvasathā vā uggahetvā vā uggaṇḥāpetvā¹⁵⁶ vā nikkhipitabbaṃ: Yassa bhavissati, so harissati ti. Ayaṃ tattha sāmīci.

[162] Yā pana bhikkhunī aṭṭhimayaṃ vā dantamayaṃ vā visāṇamayaṃ va sūcigharaṃ vā kārāpeyya, pācittiyaṃ.

[163] Yā pana bhikkhuniyā mañcaṃ vā piṭhaṃ va kārayamānāya aṭṭhaṅgulapādakaṃ kāretabbaṃ sugataṅgulena aññatra heṭṭhimāya aṇaniyā taṃ atikkāmentiyā chedanakaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[164] Yā pana bhikkhunī mañcaṃ vā piṭhaṃ vā tūlonaddhaṃ¹⁵⁷ kārāpeyya uddālanakaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[165] Kaṇḍupaṭicchādiṃ pana bhikkhuniyā kārayamānāya pamānikā kāretabbā. Tatridaṃ pamānaṃ dighaso cataso vidatthiyo sugatavidatthiyā tiriyaṃ dve vidatthiyo taṃ atikkāmentiyā chedanakaṃ pācittiyaṃ.

[166] Yā pana bhikkhunī sugatacīvarappamānaṃ cīvaraṃ kārāpeyya atirekaṃ vā chedanakaṃ pācittiyaṃ. Tatridaṃ sugatassa sugatacīvarappamānaṃ: dighaso nava vidatthiyo sugatavidatthiyā, tiriyaṃ cha vidatthiyo. Idaṃ sugatassa sugatacīvarappamānaṃ.

Dhammikavaggo soḷasamo.

Uddiṭṭhā kho ayyāyo chasaṭṭhisatā pācittiyā dhammā. Tatthayyāyo pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Dutiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha

153. Per: saṃvāsavaggo.

154. CS, Cv: khiyana-.

155. CS, Cv: khiyana-.

156. CS, Cv: uggahāpetvā.

157. CS, Cv: tūlonaddhaṃ.

parisuddhā? Tatiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā?
Parisuddhetthayyāyo, tasmā tuñhi; evametaṃ dhārayāmi ti.

Chasaṭṭhisatā pācittiyā niṭṭhitā.

[Pāṭidesanīyā]

Ime kho panayyāyo aṭṭha pāṭidesanīyā dhammā uddesaṃ
āgacchanti.

[1] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā sappiṃ viññāpetvā bhuñjeyya,
paṭidesetabbaṃ tāya bhikkhuniyā: Gārayhaṃ ayye dhammaṃ
āpajjiṃ asappāyaṃ pāṭidesanīyaṃ, taṃ paṭidesemī ti.

[2] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā telaṃ viññāpetvā bhuñjeyya,
paṭidesetabbaṃ tāya bhikkhuniyā: Gārayhaṃ ayye dhammaṃ
āpajjiṃ asappāyaṃ pāṭidesanīyaṃ, taṃ paṭidesemī ti.

[3] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā madhuṃ viññāpetvā bhuñjeyya,
paṭidesetabbaṃ tāya bhikkhuniyā: Gārayhaṃ ayye dhammaṃ
āpajjiṃ asappāyaṃ pāṭidesanīyaṃ, taṃ paṭidesemī ti.

[4] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā phāṇitaṃ viññāpetvā bhuñjeyya,
paṭidesetabbaṃ tāya bhikkhuniyā: Gārayhaṃ ayye dhammaṃ
āpajjiṃ asappāyaṃ pāṭidesanīyaṃ, taṃ paṭidesemī ti.

[5] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā macchaṃ viññāpetvā bhuñjeyya,
paṭidesetabbaṃ tāya bhikkhuniyā: Gārayhaṃ ayye dhammaṃ
āpajjiṃ asappāyaṃ pāṭidesanīyaṃ, taṃ paṭidesemī ti.

[6] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā maṃsaṃ viññāpetvā bhuñjeyya,
paṭidesetabbaṃ tāya bhikkhuniyā: Gārayhaṃ ayye dhammaṃ
āpajjiṃ asappāyaṃ pāṭidesanīyaṃ, taṃ paṭidesemī ti.

[7] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā khīraṃ viññāpetvā bhuñjeyya,
paṭidesetabbaṃ tāya bhikkhuniyā: Gārayhaṃ ayye dhammaṃ
āpajjiṃ asappāyaṃ pāṭidesanīyaṃ, taṃ paṭidesemī ti.

[8] Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā dadhiṃ viññāpetvā bhuñjeyya,
paṭidesetabbaṃ tāya bhikkhuniyā: Gārayhaṃ ayye dhammaṃ
āpajjiṃ asappāyaṃ pāṭidesanīyaṃ, taṃ paṭidesemī ti.

Uddiṭṭhā kho ayyāyo aṭṭha pāṭidesanīyā dhammā. Tatthayyāyo
pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Dutiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha
parisuddhā? Tatiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā?
Parisuddhetthayyāyo, tasmā tuñhi; evam etaṃ dhārayāmi ti.

Pāṭidesanīyā niṭṭhitā.¹⁵⁸

158. Cv: aṭṭha pāṭidesanīyā niṭṭhitā. Sug: pāṭidesanīyā.

[*Sekhiyā*]

Ime kho panayyāyo sekhiyā dhammā uddesaṃ āgacchanti

[1] Parimaṇḍalaṃ nivāsesāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[2] Parimaṇḍalaṃ pārupissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[3] Supaṭicchannā antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[4] Supaṭicchannā antaraghare nisīdissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[5] Susaṃvutā antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[6] Susaṃvutā antaraghare nisīdissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[7] Okkhittacakkhunī¹⁵⁹ antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[8] Okkhittacakkhunī antaraghare nisīdissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[9] Na ukkhittakāya antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[10] Na ukkhittakāya antaraghare nisīdissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

Parimaṇḍalavaggo paṭhamo.

[11] Na ujjagghikāya antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[12] Na ujjagghikāya antaraghare nisīdissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[13] Appasaddā antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[14] Appasaddā antaraghare nisīdissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[15] Na kāyappacālakaṃ antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[16] Na kāyappacālakaṃ antaraghare nisīdissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[17] Na bāhuppacālakaṃ antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[18] Na bāhuppacālakaṃ antaraghare nisīdissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[19] Na sisappacālakaṃ antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[20] Na sisappacālakaṃ antaraghare nisīdissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

Ujjagghikavaggo dutiyo.

[21] Na khambhakatā antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[22] Na khambhakatā antaraghare nisīdissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[23] Na oḡuṅṅhitā antaraghare gamissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

159. Sug: -cakkhūni. Per, Mun: -cakkhu.

- [24] Na oḡuṅṅhitā antaraghare nisīdissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[25] Na ukkuṭikāya antaraghare gamissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[26] Na pallatthikāya antaraghare nisīdissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[27] Sakkaccaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ paṭiggahessāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[28] Pattasaññī¹⁶⁰ piṇḍapātaṃ paṭiggahessāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[29] Samasūpakaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ paṭiggahessāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[30] Samatittikaṃ¹⁶¹ piṇḍapātaṃ paṭiggahessāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

Khambhakatavaggo tatiyo.

- [31] Sakkaccaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[32] Pattasaññī¹⁶² piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[33] Sapadānaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[34] Samasūpakaṃ piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[35] Na thūpato¹⁶³ omadditvā piṇḍapātaṃ bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[36] Na sūpaṃ vā vyañjanaṃ¹⁶⁴ vā odanena paṭicchādessāmī bhīyyokamyataṃ upādāyā ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[37] Na sūpaṃ vā vyañjanaṃ vā¹⁶⁵ odanaṃ vā agilāno attano atthāya viññāpetvā bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[38] Na ujjhānasaññī¹⁶⁶ paresaṃ pattaṃ olokessāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[39] Nātimahantaṃ kabalaṃ¹⁶⁷ karissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[40] Parimaṇḍalaṃ ālopaṃ karissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

Sakkaccavaggo catuttho.

- [41] Na anāhaṭe kabale mukhadvāraṃ vivarissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[42] Na bhuñjamāno sabbhaṃ hatthaṃ¹⁶⁸ mukhe pakkhipissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

160. CS: -saññinī.
161. CS: -tittikaṃ
162. CS: -saññinī.
163. CS: thūpakato.
164. CS: byañjanaṃ.
165. CS omits: vyañjanaṃ vā.
166. CS: saññinī.
167. CS: kabaḷaṃ.
168. CS: sabbahatthaṃ.

- [43] Na sakabalena mukhena byāharissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[44] Na piṇḍukkhepakam bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[45] Na kabalāvachedakam bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[46] Na avagaṇḍakārakam bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[47] Na hatthaniddhūnakam¹⁶⁹ bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[48] Na sitthāvakārakam bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[49] Na jivhānicchārakam bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[50] Na capucapukārakam bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

Kabalavaggo pañcamo.

- [51] Na surusurukārakam bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[52] Na hatthanillehakam bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[53] Na pattanillehakam bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[54] Na oṭṭhanillehakam bhuñjissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[55] Na sāmisenā hatthena pāṇiyathālakam paṭiggahessāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[56] Na sasitthakam pattadhovanaṃ antaraghare chaḍḍessāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[57] Na chattapāṇissa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmī¹⁷⁰ ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[58] Na daṇḍapāṇissa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[59] Na satthapāṇissa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[60] Na āyudhapāṇissa¹⁷¹ agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

Surusuruvaggo chaṭṭho.

- [61] Na pādūkārūḥassa¹⁷² agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[62] Na upāhanārūḥassa¹⁷³ agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[63] Na yānagatassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.
[64] Na sayanagatassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmī ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

169. CS: -niddhunakam.

170. CS: desessāmī. (Throughout.)

171. CS: āvudha-.

172. Per, Mun: -rūḥassa.

173. Per, Mun: -rūḥassa.

karaṇīyā.

[65] Na pallatthikāya nisinnassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[66] Na veṭṭhitasīsassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[67] Na oḅuṅṭhitasīsassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[68] Na chamāya¹⁷⁴ nisīditvā āsane nisinnassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[69] Na nice āsane nisīditvā ucce āsane nisinnassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[70] Na ṭhitā nisinnassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[71] Na pacchato gacchantī purato gacchantassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[72] Na uppathena gacchantī pathena gacchantassa agilānassa dhammaṃ desissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[73] Na ṭhitā agilānā uccāraṃ vā passāvaṃ vā karissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[74] Na harite agilānā uccāraṃ vā passāvaṃ vā khelaṃ¹⁷⁵ vā karissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

[75] Na udake agilāno uccāraṃ vā passāvaṃ vā khelaṃ vā karissāmi ti sikkhā karaṇīyā.

Pādukāvaggo sattamo.

Uddiṭṭhā kho ayyāyo sekhiyā dhammā. Tatthayyāyo pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Dutiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Tatiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Parisuddhetthayyāyo, tasmā tuṅhī; evam etaṃ dhārayāmi ti.

Sekhiyā¹⁷⁶ niṭṭhitā.¹⁷⁷

[Adhikaraṇasamathā]

Ime kho panayyāyo satta adhikaraṇasamathā¹⁷⁸ dhammā uddesaṃ āgacchanti,

Uppannupannānaṃ adhikaraṇānaṃ samathāya vūpasamāya [1]

174. CS: chamāyaṃ

175. CS: khelaṃ. (Also in next rule.)

176. Mun, Sug: sekhiyā.

177. Sug: Sekhiyā. Cv: Pañcasattati sekhiyā niṭṭhitā.

178. Mun, Per: sattādhikaraṇasamathā.

sammukhāvinayo dātabbo, [2] sativinayo dātabbo, [3] amūlavinayo dātabbo, [4] paṭiññāya kāretabba¹⁷⁹ [5] yebhuyyasikā, [6] tassapāpiyasikā,¹⁸⁰ [7] tiṇavatthārako ti.

Uddiṭṭhā kho ayyāyo satta adhikaraṇasamathā¹⁸¹ dhammā. Tatthayyāyo pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Dutiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Tatiyampi pucchāmi, kaccittha parisuddhā? Parisuddhetthayyāyo, tasmā tuṇhī; evametaṃ dhārayāmi ti.

Adhikaraṇasamathā niṭṭhitā¹⁸²

Uddiṭṭhaṃ kho ayyāyo nidānaṃ; uddiṭṭhā aṭṭha pārājikā dhammā; uddiṭṭhā sattarasa saṅghadisesā dhammā; uddiṭṭhā tiṃsa nissaggiyā pācittiyā dhammā; uddiṭṭhā chasaṭṭhisatā pācittiyā dhammā; uddiṭṭhā aṭṭha paṭidesaniyā dhammā; uddiṭṭhā sekhiyā¹⁸³ dhammā; uddiṭṭhā satta adhikaraṇasamathā¹⁸⁴ dhammā—

ettakaṃ tassa bhagavato suttāgataṃ suttapariyāpannaṃ anvaddhamāsaṃ uddesaṃ āgacchati. Tattha sabbāheva samaggāhi sammodayānāhi avivadamānāhi sikkhitabban ti.

*Vitthāruddeso.*¹⁸⁵

Bhikkhunīpātīmokkhaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ.

179. Sug: kāretabbo.

180. CS: -pāpiyasikā. Per, Mun: pāpiyasikā.

181. Mun, Per: sattādhikaraṇasamathā.

182. Sug, just: adhikaraṇasamathā.

183. Sug, Mun, Per: (pañcasattati) sekhiyā.

184. Mun, Per: sattādhikaraṇasamathā.

185. CS: vitthāruddeso catuttho.

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

A

- Aḍḍhakāsi Therī 140f.
Abhaya (*Āyasmanta*) 26, 61
Abhayā Therī 139
Abhaya-Mātā Therī 26
Abhirūpi Nandā Therī 134
Aciravatī (river) 24, 91
Aggimittā Therī 143
Alagaddūpama-sutta 58f.
Ambapālī Therī 25–26, 135
Ānanda (*Āyasmanta*) 52, 56,
75f., 125
Anāthapiṇḍika 27, 131
Andhavana 108, 121
Anopamā Therī 22, 24, 132
Anulā Devī of Sri Lanka 144
Anurādhapura 144, 147f., 148
Ariṭṭha Bhikkhu 58, 58f.
Asoka Emperor 143
Avalokiteśvara 150

B

- Bandula-Mallikā 9
Bhaddā Kāpilāni Therī 67f.
Bhaddā Kuṇḍalakesā Therī 28,
139f.
Bhaddakacchā Therī 142f.
Bhikkhu Pātimokkha 49f., 50f.,
51f., 52f., 59–61, 96, 103,
104f., 105, 110–111, 113,
125
Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha 37, 43,
68–69, 157, 197
Bhikkhunī-vibhaṅga 6f.
Bhikkhu-vibhaṅga 6f.
Bhummajaka Bhikkhu 58

- Bimbisāra (King of the
Magadhans) 22–23
Bodh-Gayā 144
Bodhi Therī 98f.
Brahmā Sahampati 12f.
Brahmajāla-sutta 88f.
Burma 145f., 149, 153

C

- Cālā Therī 140f.
Cambodia 153
Candā Therī 66, 140f.
Caṇḍakālī 28, 66–67, 84
Cittā Therī 67f.
Cūla-Panthaka (*Āyasmanta*) 51
Cullavagga 6f., 7f.

D

- Dabbamallaputta (*Āyasmanta*)
58
Dantabhūmi-sutta 138f.
Dantikā Therī 24, 67f., 137,
138f.
Dasadhamma-sutta 88
Dāsikā Therī 143
Devānampiya Tissa (King of Sri
Lanka) 143–144
Devasārā Therī 145
Dhammā Therī 25
Dhammadāsī Therī 143
Dhammadinnā Therī 67, 131,
131f., 132, 142
Duṭṭugemuṇu (King of Sri
Lanka) 147f.

G

- Guttā Therī 67f., 139f.