

Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 23 • Number 1 • 2000

- JIKIDO TAKASAKI
In memoriam Prof. Hajime Nakamura 1
- DANIEL BOUCHER
On *Hu* and *Fan* Again: the Transmission
of “Barbarian” Manuscripts to China 7
- ANN HEIRMAN
What Happened to the Nun Maitreyī? 29
- CHARLES B. JONES
Mentally Constructing What Already Exists:
The Pure Land Thought of Chan Master
Jixing Chewu (1741-1810) 43
- JAN NATTIER
The Realm of Akṣobhya: A Missing Piece
in the History of Pure Land Buddhism 71
- REIKO OHNUMA
The Story of Rūpāvātī:
A Female Past Birth of the Buddha 103
- BHIKKHU PĀSĀDIKA
A Hermeneutical Problem in
SN 42, 12 (SN IV, 333) and AN X, 91 (AN V, 178) 147
- OSKAR VON HINÜBER
Report on the XIIth Conference of the IABS 155
- Accounts of the XIIth IABS Conference 161

What Happened to the Nun Maitreyī?

One of the precepts for Buddhist monks¹ stipulates that a monk commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offense² if he accuses another monk of an unfounded *pārājika* offense.³ The introductory story preceding the precept⁴ relates why this precept has been laid down: two monks are angry with the venerable monk Darva Mallaputra (Pāli: Dabba Mallaputta) and they want to see him removed. They convince the nun Maitreyī (Pāli: Mettiyā) to help them, whereupon she accuses Darva of having an impure conduct and of having raped her (= a violation of the first *pārājika* precept). The Buddha, however, does not believe her and, after having heard Darva's defense, he starts an investigation against the two monks. Thereupon, the two admit to have incited Maitreyī to accuse Darva. The Buddha then lays down a precept whereby he stipulates that a monk who accuses another monk of an unfounded *pārājika*, commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*. The question what happened to the nun Maitreyī remains however. She too accused a monk of an unfounded *pārājika*.

The introductory story preceding the above precept in the Pāli *Vinaya* says that the Buddha wanted Mettiyā to be expelled: “*tena hi bhikkhave Mettiyaṃ bhikkhuniṃ nāsetha*” (*Vin*, Vol.III, pp.162,38-163,1). This statement created many discussions as to how to interpret it. U. HÜSKEN (1997: 96-98)⁵ points to the fact that the procedure of expulsion cannot have been based on any fixed rule of the *Vinaya* since, until the precept had been laid down, no regulation prohibiting monks or nuns from accusing another of having committed a *pārājika* offense existed. The

1. *saṃ*. 8 for monks: Pāli *Vinaya*, H. OLDENBERG, *Vin*, Vol.III, p. 163,21-26; *Mahī*, p. 16a29-b3; *Mahā*, p. 280c3-6; *Dharma*, p. 588b22-26; *Sarva*, p. 23a21-25; *Mūla*, p. 697c2-5.
2. *saṃghāvaśeṣa*, Pāli *saṃghādisesa*, and variants: an offense leading to a temporary exclusion from the Buddhist order.
3. *pārājika*, and variants: an offense leading to a definitive exclusion from the Buddhist order.
4. The introductory story is analogous in all the *Vinayas*, except for the *Mahā*.
5. U. HÜSKEN (1997), “The Application of the *Vinaya* Term *nāsanā*”, *JABS* 20.2: 93-111.

first wrong-doer is not punished, but only induces the Buddha to formulate a new precept. Moreover, the expulsion of Mettiyā is, in any case, not (legally) justified since a false accusation constitutes a *saṃghādisesa* offense and not a *pārājika* (leading to an expulsion). Therefore, U. HÜSKEN concludes that her expulsion “must be regarded as an exception, made possible through the personal intervention of the Buddha.” The term ‘*nāsetha*’ is thus not used as a technical term. U. HÜSKEN (1997: 102-105) further refers to the *Samantapāsādikā*, a commentary on the Pāli *Vinaya*,⁶ *Sp* 582,30-584,9. The passage concerned reports a controversy between the Abhayagirivāsins and the Mahāvihāravāsins on the actual reason of Mettiyā’s expulsion. Was it because of her (false) statement (Abhayagiri) or because of another reason (Mahāvihāra). According to the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*, experts considered the latter view to be the right one. In that case, the question remains, however, what kind of offense Mettiyā was actually accused of. According to the *Samantapāsādikā*, it cannot have been a *saṃghādisesa* offense since the precept on the false accusation is valid only for nuns with respect to other nuns⁷ and for monks with respect to other monks, but not for nuns with respect to monks. Nor did she violate one of the *pārājika* precepts. In this way, she only can have committed an offense that is not sanctioned with an expulsion. Yet, she has been expelled. To this, the *Samantapāsādikā* says that she has been expelled because of her bad character, of which she herself was aware. The latter explanation is considered by U. HÜSKEN “to be a provisional solution.”

Also O. VON HINÜBER (1997: 87-91)⁸ gives an account of the controversy between the Abhayagirivāsins and the Mahāvihāravāsins. He too indicates that “at least at the time of the *Samantapāsādikā*, there was no

6. Although attributed to Buddhaghosa, the commentary is probably written by a different author in the fourth or the fifth century AD (O. VON HINÜBER 1996), *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 2), pp. 103-109).
7. *saṃ.* for nuns: Pāli tradition, M. WIJAYARATNA, *Moniales*, p. 174, *saṃ.* 8; *Mahī*, p. 79a21-25, *saṃ.* 2; *Mahā*, p. 517c4-8, *saṃ.* 2; *Dharma*, p. 718b12-15, *saṃ.* 2; Sarvāstivādins, T.1437, p. 480a29-b3, *saṃ.* 2; *Mūla*, p. 933c20-23, *saṃ.* 2.

The Pāli *Vinaya* and the *Sarva* do not mention those precepts that nuns have in common with the ones for monks. These precepts are, however, enumerated in the respective *bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣas* (*Moniales* and T.1437).

8. O. VON HINÜBER (1997), “Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda *Vinaya* (II): Some Additions and Corrections,” JIABS 20.2: 87-92.

tangible legal argument in the *Vinaya* by which Mettiyā could have been expelled(!).” He further points to *Sp* 583,17 and *Sp* 584,3-5 that state that a monk who accuses a nun, and a nun who accuses a monk commit a *dukkāṭa* (Skt. *duṣkṛta*).⁹

The aim of this paper is to investigate (1) whether the other *Vinaya* traditions¹⁰ equally lead to a similar discussion and (2) whether, throughout the *Vinayas*, a monk who has offended (a monk or) a nun, and a nun who has offended (a nun or) a monk are judged analogously to the above outlined case?

1. *What happened to Maitreyī in the Vinaya traditions that have survived in their Chinese translation?*

All the *Vinayas* have a precept saying that a monk who accuses another monk of an unfounded *pārājika* offense, commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offense.^{1*} In all the *Vinayas*, except for the *Mahā*, the precept is introduced by the story of the two monks who, with the help of the nun Maitreyī, falsely accuse Darva Mallaputra of having had sexual intercourse with her. The *Mahā* does not mention a nun helping the angry monks.

In the *Mahī*, Maitreyī hesitates to help the monks, since she is afraid that she will be expelled after having confessed.¹¹ It is not explicitly mentioned what she would confess (the sexual intercourse or the false accusation), but it seems to be the act of sexual intercourse since the two monks answer her that they will testify that Darva did wrong and not she, so that there is no reason to expel her. Nevertheless, Maitreyī still hesitates. She stays afraid that Darva’s expulsion will imply also her expulsion. Yet, she accuses him in order to help the two angry monks. Although the Buddha knows that she is telling a lie, he questions Darva about it. When Darva denies, the Buddha believes him. Whereas no

9. i.e. ‘wrong doing,’ a light offense.

10. Five *Vinayas* have survived in a Chinese translation: the *MahīśāsakaVinaya* (T.1421, *Mahī*), the *MahāsāṃghikaVinaya* (T.1425, *Mahā*), the *DharmaguptakaVinaya* (T.1428, *Dharma*), the *SarvāstivādaVinaya* (T.1435, *Sarva*) and the *MūlasarvāstivādaVinaya* (T.1442 up to and including T.1451, *Mūla* [because of its size, the *MūlasarvāstivādaVinaya* is not edited in one work, but consists of a number of different works]). Of the latter *Vinaya*, there is also a Tibetan translation.

11. *Mahī*, p.15c8: 僧必當作自言擯我.

punishment is thus imposed on him, the nun Maitreyī is definitively expelled from the order with a *jñāpticaturtha karman*¹² (*Mahī*, p.15c25-26). She is expelled for having said that Darva had intercourse with her (*Mahī*, pp.15c26-16a3). When the two monks keep on saying that Darva had intercourse with Maitreyī, Darva is again questioned, and again he denies. Thereupon, the Buddha stipulates that a monk who accuses another monk of an unfounded *pārājika*, commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*. The commentary following upon the precept adds that a monk who accuses a nun, a probationer or a (male or female) novice commits a *duṣkṛta*, that a nun who accuses a monk commits a *pācittika*,¹³ and that a nun who accuses a probationer or a (male or female) novice commits a *duṣkṛta* (*Mahī*, p.16b14-17).

The above account leads to a discussion similar to the one mentioned in the *Samantapāsādikā*: there is no legal argument to expel only Maitreyī when she confesses that she has had sexual intercourse with Darva. If it is true, she and Darva should both be expelled (on account of the first *pārājika*). As the Buddha does not believe her, he, consequently, does not expel Darva. However, Maitreyī is expelled. This cannot be on account of her false accusation since, before the precept has been laid down, she cannot be punished. The first wrong-doer is never sanctioned. Moreover, once the precept has been laid down, if a nun falsely accuses a monk, her act constitutes a *pācittika* offense, which is never sanctioned with an expulsion.

The *Dharma* only mentions that Darva denies having committed a *pārājika* offense. It does not say what happened to the nun Maitreyī. No sanction is mentioned. Consequently, it is very doubtful that a discussion arose on the interpretation of a sanction imposed on her.

Finally, in the *Sarva*, the Buddha states that Maitreyī has to be expelled by means of a formal procedure because she herself says that she has committed a (*pārājika*) offense: 是彌多羅比丘尼自說作罪故應與滅羯磨 (p.22c9). In the *Mūla*, we find a similar statement: 友女苾芻尼自言犯罪應當滅擯 (p.696c26). In these two *Vinayas*, Maitreyī is thus expelled after having confessed a *pārājika* offense, even if the

12. A *jñāpticaturtha karman* is a formal act consisting of one motion (*jñāpti*), three propositions (*karmavācānā*) that concern the acceptance of the motion by the assembly of monks or nuns, and a conclusion.

13. *pācittika*, Pāli *pācittiya*, and variants: an offense that must be expiated.

believed to be untrue. In this way, there seems to be no legal argument for the expulsion.

In addition, all the *Vinaya* traditions equally contain a precept saying that a nun who accuses another nun of an unfounded *pārājika* offense, commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offense.^{7*} The question what happens to a nun who accuses a monk of an unfounded *pārājika* offense, or to a monk who accuses a nun remains. In the *Samantapāsādikā*, it is said that a nun who accuses a monk, and a monk who accuses a nun commit a *dukkāṭa* (Skt. *duṣkṛta*) (*Sp* 583,17 and *Sp* 584,3-5). The *Mahī*, p.16b14-17, states that a monk who accuses a nun commits a *duṣkṛta*, but that a nun who accuses a monk commits a *pācittika*. The *Mahā*, p.281a2-3, says that a monk who accuses a nun of a *pārājika* or of a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* commits a *pācittika*. There is no information on a nun who accuses a monk. The *Dharma*, p.589a26-28 – i.e. in the commentary following upon the precept on the false accusation of a monk by another monk – says that a monk who accuses a nun of an unfounded *pārājika* (also) commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*.¹⁴ It adds that (also) a nun [in a similar situation] commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*: 比丘尼僧伽婆尸沙 (p.589b6). In my view, the latter statement is to be interpreted as ‘a nun who accuses a nun [or a monk] of an unfounded *pārājika*, commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*.’¹⁵ This interpretation is confirmed by a precept for nuns: *Dharma*, p.718b12-15, *saṃghāvaśeṣa* 2: if a nun accuses **someone** of an unfounded *pārājika* offense, she commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*. The *Sarva* and the *Mūla* do not give any information on a monk who accuses a nun, or on a nun who accuses a monk.

We thus see that, although there seems to be no legal argument to expel Maitreyī, most *Vinayas* state that she is to be expelled. The *Dharma* does not impose a punishment upon her.

The above mentioned facts also show that

- only two *Vinayas* indicate which offense a nun commits when she accuses a monk: according to the *Mahī*, it is a *pācittika*; according to the *Dharma*, it is a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* (just as when she accuses a

14. *Dharma*, p. 589a26-28: 以八無根波羅夷法謗比丘尼說而了了僧伽婆尸沙。

15. See also A. HEIRMAN (1998), *Disciplinaire voorschriften voor boeddhistische nonnen, Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga van de dharmaguptaka's* (T.Vol.22, Nr.1428, pp. 714-778) (Ph.D. Universiteit Gent), Deel 2, Vol.1, pp. 53-55, note 288.

monk). The *Samantapāsādikā* supports the opinion that a nun commits a *dukkata*.

- the Pāli tradition, the Mahīśāsakas and the Mahāsāṃghikas judge a monk who accuses a monk and a monk who accuses a nun in a different way. This is not the case for the Dharmaguptakas for whom gender has no influence: regardless whether a monk accuses a monk or a nun, he commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*.

2. *Is a monk who has offended a nun, and is a nun who has offended a monk judged analogously to the above outlined case throughout the Vinayas?*

In order to answer this question, I will consider the other *Vinaya* precepts that (1) regard misbehavior towards a monk or a nun, with the exclusion of the precepts that involve a sexual relation between the two parties,¹⁶ and on which (2) relevant information is found concerning the judgment of a monk for having offended a monk, and of a nun for having offended a nun *versus* the judgment of a monk for having

16. A first investigation of the *Dharma* reveals that the category of precepts that involve sexual or physical contact is to be considered as a separate category with a proper logic: a monk sexually or physically involved with a woman is committing a more serious offense than a monk involved with a man; and a nun sexually or physically involved with a man is committing a more serious offense than a nun involved with a woman. There is one exception: a monk who has sexual intercourse with a man or with a woman commits a *pārājika* in both cases (*bhikṣuvibhaṅga*, *pār.* 1, p. 571a21-24; p. 571c11-12, 21-22). See *bhikṣuvibhaṅga*, *saṃ.* 2: a monk commits a *saṃ.* if he has physical contact with a woman (p. 580b28-29); he commits a *duṣkṛta* if he has physical contact with a man (p. 581a14); *saṃ.* 3: a monk commits a *saṃ.* if he talks about indecent items [the genital zone] to a woman (p. 581c1-2); he commits a *duṣkṛta* if he talks to a man (p. 581c25-26); *saṃ.* 4: a monk commits a *saṃ.* if he incites a woman to offer her body to him (p. 582b8-11); he commits a *duṣkṛta* if he incites a man (p. 582c1-2); *saṃ.* 5: a monk commits a *saṃ.* if he acts as a go-between between a man and a woman, or vice versa (p. 583a16-18); if he acts as a go-between between men, he commits a *duṣkṛta* (p. 584a1-2); *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*, *pār.* 1: a nun commits a *pār.* if she has sexual intercourse with a man (p. 714a14-15); there is no penetration possible between women who have a sexual relation, but the *Dharma* says that nuns who slap on one another's vagina commit a *pāc.* (p. 738c11-12); *pār.* 5: a nun commits a *pār.* if she has physical contact with a man (p. 715b6-10); she commits a *duṣkṛta* if she has contact with a woman (p. 715c23-24); *saṃ.* 8: a nun commits a *saṃ.* if she accepts things from a man who is filled with desire (p. 721c22-24); she commits a *duṣkṛta* if she accepts things from a woman who is filled with desire (p. 722a6-7).

offended a nun, and of a nun for having offended a monk. In this way, we can examine four precepts:

1. a monk commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* if he uses a minor event¹⁷ to accuse a monk of an unfounded *pārājika*; a nun commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* if she uses a minor event to accuse a nun of an unfounded *pārājika*

The precept and the commentary following upon this precept are similar to the above mentioned case on the accusation of an unfounded *pārājika*:

- Pāli tradition: – a monk who accuses a monk commits a *saṃ*. (*Vin*, Vol.III, pp.167,38-168,7); the Pāli tradition does not give any further commentary; it is not unlikely, however, that the commentary on the preceding precept on the accusation of an unfounded *pār*. also applies here.
 - *bhikkhunīpātimokkha*: a nun who accuses a nun commits a *saṃ*. (*Moniales*, p. 174).
- Mahīśāsakas: – a monk who accuses a monk commits a *saṃ*. (*Mahī*, p.16c10-14); the commentary refers to the commentary following upon the preceding *saṃ*. (*Mahī*, p.16c20) – thus: a monk who accuses a nun commits a *duṣkṛta*; a nun who accuses a nun commits a *saṃ*.; a nun who accuses a monk, commits a *pāc*..
 - *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who accuses a nun commits a *saṃ*. (*Mahī*, p.79a29- b5)
- Mahāsāṃghikas: – a monk who accuses a monk commits a *saṃ*. (*Mahā*, p.281b21-24); the commentary refers to the commentary following upon the preceding *saṃ*. (*Mahā*, p.281c8-9) – thus: a monk who accuses a nun commits a *pāc*..
 - *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who accuses a nun commits a *saṃ*. (*Mahā*, p.517c8-12).
- Dharmaguptakas: – a monk who accuses a monk commits a *saṃ*. (*Dharma*, p.589c12-16); the commentary adds that a monk who accuses a nun (also) commits a *saṃ*. (*Dharma*, p.590a27-29); it further says that (also) a nun [in a similar situation] commits a *saṃ*. (p.590b8).¹⁸ The latter commentary is possibly to be interpreted as: a nun who accuses a nun [or a monk] commits a *saṃ*..
 - the *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*, however, only mentions that a nun who accuses another nun, commits a *saṃ*. (*Dharma*, p.718b19-24).
- Sarvāstivādins: – a monk who accuses a monk commits a *saṃ*. (*Sarva*, p.23c10-14).

17. A minor event that has no relation with a *pārājika* offense is deliberately misinterpreted in order to falsely accuse an innocent monk.

18. *Dharma*, p. 590b8: 比丘尼僧伽婆尸沙.

- *bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa*: a nun who accuses a nun commits a *saṃ*. (T.1437, p.480b4-8).
- Mūlasarvāstivādins: – a monk who accuses a monk commits a *saṃ*. (*Mūla*, p.699c24-28).
- *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who accuses a nun commits a *saṃ*. (*Mūla*, p.934a9-13).

Similar conclusions can be drawn as with the preceding precept on the accusation of an unfounded *pārājika* offense:

- only two *Vinayas* indicate which offense a nun commits when she accuses a monk: according to the *Mahī*, it is a *pāc.*; according to the *Dharma*, it – possibly – is a *saṃ*. (just as when she accuses a monk).
- the Mahīśāsakas and the Mahāsāṃghikas (and possibly the Pāli tradition) judge a monk who accuses a monk and a monk who accuses a nun in a different way. This is not the case for the Dharmaguptakas for whom gender has no influence: regardless whether a monk falsely accuses a monk or a nun, he commits a *saṃ*.

2. a monk commits a *pācittika* offense if he slanders someone/a monk; a nun commits a *pācittika* offense if she slanders someone/a nun

The different schools further display the following information:

- Pāli tradition: – a monk who slanders someone commits a *pāc.* (*Vin*, Vol.IV, p.6,5); the commentary adds that a monk who slanders a non-ordained person commits a *dukkāṭa* (Skt. *duṣkṛta*) (*Vin*, Vol.IV, pp.10,29-11,2). *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*,¹⁹ (D. Maskell (ed.), London, Pāli Text Society) p. 83, says that here also a nun has to be seen as a non-ordained person. This implies that a monk who slanders a nun commits a *dukkāṭa*.
- *pātimokkha* for nuns: a nun who slanders commits a *pāc.* (*Moniales*, p.185: *omasavāde, pācittiyaṃ*).
- Mahīśāsakas: – a monk who slanders a monk commits a *pāc.* (*Mahī*, p.38a11); the commentary adds that a monk who slanders a nun commits a *duṣkṛta* and that a nun who slanders a nun or a monk commits a *pāc.* (*Mahī*, p.38a15-17).
- *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who slanders a nun commits a *pāc.* (*Mahī*, p.85b11-12).

19. An anonymous commentary on the Pāli *Pātimokkha*, ascribed to Buddhaghosa (fourth-fifth century) (see O. VON HINÜBER (1996), op. cit., pp. 109-111).

- Mahāsaṃghikas: – a monk who slanders someone commits a *pāc.* (*Mahā*, p.325b28-29); the commentary adds that a monk who slanders a nun commits a *sthūlātyaya*²⁰ (*Mahā*, p.326b4-5).
– *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who slanders commits a *pāc.* (*Mahā*, p.527b18: only the key-word ‘to slander’).
- Dharmaguptakas: – a monk who slanders **someone** commits a *pāc.* (*Dharma*, p.635b10 and following); the commentary adds that (also) a nun [in a similar situation] commits a *pāc.* (*Dharma*, p.636a5).²¹
– the above corresponds to the *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* that says that a nun who slanders (**someone**) commits a *pāc.* (*Dharma*, p.734c12).²²
- Sarvāstivādins: – a monk who slanders someone commits a *pāc.* (*Sarva*, p.64b21-22); the commentary adds that a monk who slanders someone who is not a monk (and thus, theoretically, also a nun) commits a *duṣkṛta* (*Sarva*, p.65c28-29).
– *prātimokṣa* for nuns: a nun who slanders a nun commits a *pāc.* (T.1437, p.482c16).
- Mūlasarvāstivādins: – a monk who slanders **someone** commits a *pāc.* (p.765b27 and following); the commentary does not give any further information.
– *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who slanders **someone** commits a *pāc.* (p.970a10 and following); the commentary adds many details on a nun who slanders a nun, but not on a nun who slanders a monk.

The above reveals that

- three *Vinayas* indicate which offense a nun commits when she slanders a monk: according to the *Mahī*, to the *Dharma* and to the *Mūla*, it is a *pāc.*. Yet, the commentary in the *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* of the *Mūla* only gives details on a nun who slanders a nun.
- the Pāli tradition, the Mahīśāsakas, the Mahāsaṃghikas and the Sarvāstivādins judge a monk who slanders a monk and a monk who slanders a nun in a different way. This is not the case for the Dharmaguptakas and for the Mūlasarvāstivādins for whom gender seems to have no influence: regardless whether a monk slanders a monk or a nun, he commits a *pāc.*.

20. lit. ‘a grave offense,’ an offense considered to be slightly lighter than a *pārājika* or a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*.

21. *Dharma*, p. 636a5: 比丘尼波逸提.

22. *Dharma*, p. 734c12: 若比丘尼毀訾語波逸提.

3. a monk commits a *pācittika* offense if he tells about someone's/a monk's grave offense [*pārājika/saṃghāvaśeṣa*] to a non-ordained person; a nun commits a *pācittika* offense if she tells about someone's/a nun's grave offense

The different schools further display the following information:

- Pāli tradition:
 - a monk who tells about a monk's grave offense commits a *pāc.* (*Vin.*, Vol.IV, p.31,12-14);
 - *bhikkhunīpātimokkha*: a nun who tells about a nun's grave offense commits a *pāc.* (*Moniales*, p.186).
- Mahīśāsakas:
 - a monk who tells about a monk's grave offense commits a *pāc.* (*Mahī*, p.41a17-18); the commentary adds that a monk who tells about a nun's grave offense commits a *duṣkṛta* and that a nun who tells about a nun's or a monk's grave offense commits a *pāc.* (*Mahī*, p.41a21-22).
 - *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who tells about a nun's grave offense commits a *pāc.* (*Mahī*, p.85b19-21).
- Mahāsāṃghikas:
 - a monk who tells about a monk's grave offense commits a *pāc.* (*Mahā*, p.338a8-10); the commentary adds that a monk who tells about a nun's grave offense commits a *sthūlātyaya* (*Mahā*, p.338a25-26).
 - *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who tells about a grave offense commits a *pāc.* (*Mahā*, p.527b20: only the key-words 'to tell about a grave offense').
- Dharmaguptakas:
 - a monk who tells about **someone's** grave offense commits a *pāc.* (*Dharma*, p.639b26-28); since the commentary that follows upon the precept states that in case a monk tells about a grave offense of a person who is not a monk or a nun, he does not commit a *pāc.*, but a *duṣkṛta* (*Dharma*, p.639c6-7), we can deduce that the term 'someone' mentioned in the precept has to be interpreted as 'a monk or a nun.' The commentary further adds that (also) a nun [in a similar situation] commits a *pāc.* (*Dharma*, p.639c9-10).²³
 - the above corresponds to the *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* that says that a nun who tells about **someone's** grave offense, commits a *pāc.* (*Dharma*, p.734c19-20).
- Sarvāstivādins:
 - a monk who tells about **someone's** grave offense commits a *pāc.* (*Sarva*, p.72c10-11); the commentary only gives details on a monk who tells about a monk's grave offense.
 - *bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa*: a nun who tells about a nun's grave offense commits a *pāc.* (T.1437, p.482c22-23).
- Mūlasarvāstivādins:
 - a monk who tells about a monk's grave offense commits a *pāc.* (*Mūla*, p.773b28-29);

23. *Dharma*, p. 639c9-10: 比丘尼波逸提。

– *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who tells about a nun's grave offense commits a *pāc*. (*Mūla*, p.972b20-21).

The above reveals that

- only two *Vinayas* indicate which offense a nun commits when she tells about a monk's grave offense: according to the *Mahī* and to the *Dharma*, it is a *pāc*.. Consequently, there is no difference between a nun who tells about a monk's grave offense and a nun who tells about a nun's grave offense.
- the *Mahīśāsakas* and the *Mahāsāṃghikas* judge a monk who tells about a monk's grave offense and a monk who tells about a nun's grave offense in a different way. This is not the case for the *Dharmaguptakas* for whom gender has no influence: regardless whether a monk tells about the grave offense of a monk or of a nun, he commits a *pāc*..

4. a monk commits a *pācittika* offense if he accuses someone/a monk of an unfounded *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offense; a nun commits a *pācittika* offense if she accuses someone/a nun of an unfounded *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offense

This precept is very similar to the one on the accusation of an unfounded *pārājika* offense. The different schools further display the following information:

- Pāli tradition:
 - a monk who accuses a monk commits a *pāc*. (*Vin*, Vol.IV, p.148,5-6); the Pāli tradition does not give any further commentary; it is not unlikely, however, that the commentary on the precept on the accusation of an unfounded *pār*. offense also applies here.
 - *bhikkhunīpātīmokkha*: a nun who accuses a nun commits a *pāc*. (*Moniales*, p.190)
- *Mahīśāsakas*:
 - a monk who accuses a monk commits a *pāc*. (*Mahī*, p.67b12-13); the commentary adds that a monk who accuses a nun commits a *duṣkṛta* and that a nun who accuses a monk or a nun commits a *pāc*. (*Mahī*, p.67b13-15).
 - *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who accuses a nun commits a *pāc*. (*Mahī*, p.86b14-15).
- *Mahāsāṃghikas*:
 - a monk who accuses a monk commits a *pāc*. (*Mahā*, p.395a8-9); the commentary adds that a monk who accuses a nun commits a *sthūlātyaya* (*Mahā*, p.395a25-26).
 - *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who accuses commits a *pāc*. (*Mahā*, p.527c12: only the key-words 'to falsely accuse of a *saṃ*.').

- Dharmaguptakas: – a monk who accuses (**someone**) commits a *pāc.* (*Dharma*, p.689a21-22)²⁴; the commentary does not say whether ‘someone’ is a monk or a nun; given the above mentioned commentary on the precept on the accusation of an unfounded *pār.*, however, it is likely that we have to interpret ‘someone’ as ‘a monk or a nun’. The commentary further says that (also) a nun [in a similar situation] commits a *pāc.* (*Dharma*, p.689b12-13).²⁵
- the above corresponds to the *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* that says that a nun who accuses (**someone**) commits a *pāc.* (*Dharma*, p.736b19-20).
- Sarvāstivādins: – a monk who accuses a monk commits a *pāc.* (*Sarva*, p.115b7-8).
- *bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa*: a nun who accuses a nun commits a *pāc.* (T.1437, p.484a11-12).
- Mūlasarvāstivādins: – a monk who accuses a monk commits a *pāc.* (*Mūla*, p.852a9-10).
- *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*: a nun who accuses a nun commits a *pāc.* (*Mūla*, p.991b13-14).

The above reveals that

- only two *Vinayas* indicate which offense a nun commits when she accuses a monk: according to the *Mahī* and to the *Dharma*, it is a *pāc.*. Thus, in these two traditions, a nun commits a *pāc.* regardless whether she accuses a nun or a monk.
- the *Mahīśāsakas* and the *Mahāsāṃghikas* (and possibly the Pāli tradition) judge a monk who accuses a monk and a monk who accuses a nun in a different way. This is not the case for the Dharmaguptakas for whom gender has no influence: regardless whether a monk falsely accuses a monk or a nun, he commits a *pāc.*.

We can conclude that

- only two *Vinayas* indicate which offense a nun commits when she offends a monk. The *Mahī* says that a nun commits a *pācittika* if she uses a minor event to accuse a monk of an unfounded *pārājika* (whereas she commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* if she accuses a nun). This is analogous to the first precept on a false accusation. Also with regard to the other precepts, a nun commits a *pācittika* if she offends a monk. In these cases, however, there is no difference with

24. *Dharma*, p. 689a21-22: 若比丘瞋恚故以無根僧伽婆尸沙謗者波逸提。

25. *Dharma*, p. 689b12-13: 比丘尼波逸提。

a nun who offends a nun. The *Dharma* makes no difference between a nun who offends a monk and a nun who offends a nun.

- the Mahīśāsakas and the Mahāsāṃghikas (and possibly the Pāli tradition) judge a monk who offends a monk and a monk who offends a nun in a different way. This is not the case for the Dharmaguptakas for whom gender has no influence: regardless whether a monk offends a monk or a nun, he commits the same offense.

Consequently, throughout the *Vinayas*, a monk who has offended a nun, and a nun who has offended a monk are judged analogously to the above outlined case on the accusation of an unfounded *pārājika* offense.

List of abbreviations

<i>Dharma</i>	T.1428, 四分律, trans. Buddhayaśas and 竺佛念 Zhu Fonian (<i>DharmaguptakaVinaya</i>).
<i>Mahā</i>	T.1425, 摩訶僧祇律, trans. Buddhahadra and 法顯 Faxian (<i>Mahā-sāṃghikaVinaya</i>).
<i>Mahī</i>	T.1421, 彌沙塞部和醯五分律, trans. Buddhajīva, 慧嚴 Huiyan and 竺道生 Zhu Daosheng (<i>MahīśāsakaVinaya</i>).
<i>Moniales</i>	Wijayaratna, M. (1991), <i>Les moniales bouddhistes, naissance et développement du monachisme féminin</i> , Paris.
<i>Mūla</i>	T.1442, 根本說一切有部毘奈耶, trans. 義淨 Yijing (<i>bhikṣuvibhaṅga</i> of the Mūlasarvāstivādins); T.1443: 根本說一切有部苾芻尼毘奈耶, trans. 義淨 Yijing (<i>bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga</i> of the Mūlasarvāstivādins).
<i>pāc.</i>	<i>pācittika</i> (Pāli: <i>pācittiya</i>) or variants
<i>pār.</i>	<i>pārājika</i> or variants
<i>saṃ.</i>	<i>saṃghāvaśeṣa</i> (Pāli: <i>saṃghādisesa</i>) or variants
<i>Sarva</i>	T.1435, 十誦律, trans. Punyatrāta / Puṇyatara, Kumārajīva, Dharmaruci and Vimalākṣa (<i>SarvāstivādaVinaya</i>)
<i>Sp</i>	Buddhaghosa, <i>Samantāpāsādikā</i> , J. Takakusu, M. Nagai and (Vols.5 and 7) K. Mizuno (editors) [1924-1947], London, Pāli Text Society, 7 Vols.
T.	<i>Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō</i> 大正新修大藏經, J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe (editors), Tōkyō: 1924-1934.
T.1437	十誦比丘尼波羅提木叉戒本”, compilation 法穎 Faying (<i>bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa</i> of the Sarvāstivādins).
<i>Vin</i>	Oldenberg, H. (1964 ²⁻³ [1879-1883]), <i>The Vinaya Piṭakam</i> , London, Pāli Text Society, 5 Vols.