

Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 20 • Number 2 • 1997

Editorial	1
<i>In memoriam</i> Sir Harold Walter Bailey by EIVIND KAHS	3
TORKEL BREKKE The Early Saṃgha and the Laity	7
ANN HEIRMAN Some Remarks on the Rise of the <i>bhikṣuṇīsamgha</i> and on the Ordination Ceremony for <i>bhikṣuṇīs</i> according to the Dharmaguptaka <i>Vinaya</i>	33
OSKAR VON HINÜBER Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda <i>Vinaya</i> II: Some Additions and Corrections	87
UTE HÜSKEN The Application of the Vinaya Term <i>nāsanā</i>	93
CHARLES B. JONES Stages in the Religious Life of Lay Buddhists in Taiwan	113
PETRA KIEFFER-PÜLZ Rules for the <i>sīmā</i> Regulation in the <i>Vinaya</i> and its Commentaries and their Application in Thailand	141

93-2/20.2
INSTITUT FÜR TIBETOLOGIE
UND BUDDHISMUSKUNDE
UNIVERSITÄTSCAMPUS AAKH, HOF 2
SPITALGASSE 2-4, A-1080 WIEN
AUSTRIA, EUROPE

93.07.98

The Application of the *Vinaya* Term *nāsanā*¹

The first section in the book of Buddhist monastic discipline (*Vinaya-piṭaka*) is known as *pārājika*. The significance of these rules is emphasized by the fact that out of the list of 220 prescriptions which are recited fortnightly (*pāṭimokkha*) only these four rules are announced to a newly ordained monk immediately after full ordination (*upasampadā*; Vin I 96.20-97.18)². The transgression of one of the *pārājika* rules leads to the monk's or nun's permanent and irreversible loss of status as a fully ordained member of the order.

Buddhist law as specified in the *Vinaya-piṭaka* is generally based on the concept that an offence is established only after the offender pleads guilty.³ Consequently, if an offender is aware of his *pārājika* offence and leaves the order on his own initiative, the *Vinaya* describes no concrete act of expulsion by the Saṃgha. Rather the actual status of a person guilty of such a transgression is rendered by the words *ayam pi pārājiko hoti asaṃvāso*, "This one has committed a *pārājika* and (therefore) is without (any) communion" (e.g. Vin III 46.20**; cf. Vin IV 213.37**-38**)4.

There are, however, a few instances in the *Vinaya-piṭaka* where another term is applied to express that a person has to leave the order, namely *nāsanā*, *nāseti* etc. This state of affairs led Isaline Blew HORNER in her English translation of the *Vinaya-piṭaka* to the conclusion that the verb

1. I wish herewith to express my gratitude to Prof. Oskar VON HINÜBER, who kindly sent me material on the term *nāsanā* which he had collected, and provided very helpful suggestions. Additionally, I wish to draw the reader's attention to an article written by Édith NOLOT, which is published in the *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XXIII ("Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms VI"). There NOLOT provides an extremely useful systematic collection of the material on *nāsanā* in the Pali and Sanskrit sources.
2. Nuns have to observe eight *pārājika* rules which are announced to them after full ordination (Vin II 274. 23-24).
3. Cf. VON HINÜBER, "Buddhist Law", p. 11.
4. In the casuistries the expression is *āpattim tvam bhikkhu āpanno pārājikam*, "You, monk, have committed a *pārājika* offence" (e.g. Vin III 57. 14-15).

nāseti in the *Suttavibhaṅga* generally refers to the expulsion of members of the order who have committed a *pārājika* offence (BD I, p. xxvii). This statement will be qualified in this paper.

In the eldest stratum of the *Vinaya*, the *Pāṭimokkha*, *nāsanā* with respect to monks or nuns is used in only one instance, that is *Pārājika 2* of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* (Vin IV 216.31** - 217.3**).⁵ This rule forbids nuns to keep quiet about the *pārājika* offence of a fellow nun.⁶ “Has been expelled” (*nāsitā*) in this rule is listed in a series of verbs expressing that the nun guilty of a *pārājika* offence has not left the order in the usual way, but rather that she kept quiet about her misdeed for a certain period before finally leaving the order for another reason. Indeed, both the forced and the voluntary leaving of the order are clearly contrasted here by the use of the terms *nāsitā* and *avasatā* (Vin IV 216.33** - 34** and 217.13-15). Thus *Pārājika 2* of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* indicates that the expulsion *nāsanā* of nuns (and monks) comes about when they, after committing a *pārājika*, keep their deed quiet and as a result fail to leave the order on their own initiative. In this case the Saṃgha is apparently forced to take an active role in the expulsion of the offender. The procedure of expulsion, however, is not described in the *Vinaya*.

Another reference in the *Vinaya* also uses *nāsanā* in connection with a *pārājika* offence (Vin I 173.20-22): A monk, who is accused of a *pārājika* offence during the *pavāraṇā* ceremony at the end of the rainy

5. In another passage of the *pāṭimokkha*, *nāsanā* does not refer to fully ordained individuals but to novices (*sāmaṇera*) (see below, p. 99).
6. The text of this rule in OLDENBERG's edition (Vin IV 216.31 - 217.3) is not correct. The text of the Burmese, Sinhalese, and Thai editions is: *yā pana bhikkhunī jānaṃ pārājikaṃ dhammaṃ ajjhāpannaṃ bhikkhunim n' ev' attanā paṭicodeyya na gaṇassa āroceyya yadā ca sā ṭhitā vā assa cutā vā nāsitā vā avasatā vā sā pacchā evaṃ vadeyya: pubbevāhaṃ ayye aññāsim etaṃ bhikkhunim evarūpā ca evarūpā ca sā bhaginīti, no ca kho attanā paṭicodessaṃ na gaṇassa ārocassaṃ* [Vin: *paṭicodeyyaṃ na gaṇassa ārocceyyaṃ*] *ti, ayam pi pārājikā hoti asamvāsā vajjapaṭicchādikā 'ti*. HORNER's translation of this rule (BD III, p. 166) has to be corrected accordingly: “Whatever nun, knowing that a nun has fallen into a matter involving defeat, should neither herself reprove her, nor speak to a group, but when she may be remaining or deceased or expelled or withdrawn, should afterwards speak thus: ‘Ladies, before I knew this nun, she was a sister like this and like that, (but I thought:) ‘I will neither myself reprove her nor speak to a group [BD III, p. 166: and should neither herself reprove her nor should speak to a group]’, she also becomes one who is defeated, she is not in communion, she is one who conceals a fault.”

season⁷, admits to having committed it. The Saṃgha then performs *pavāraṇā* only after having expelled him (*nāsetvā*). In this particular case the expulsion of the offender may be necessitated by the Saṃgha's desire to perform an ecclesiastical act, the validity of which requires the order to be both "complete" (*samagga*) and "pure" (*parisuddha*), that is, without offence at that very moment. When one of the participants is found to be not "pure" the ecclesiastical act loses validity. Thus a monk guilty of a *pārājika* offence has to be removed perhaps even physically⁸ by the Saṃgha. He must remain outside the spatial boundary (*sīmā*) stipulated for this ecclesiastical act within which only "pure" monks can be present. Thus in this particular case the reason for the use of the term *nāsanā* might once again be the necessity for an active role of the Saṃgha in the expulsion. This supposition seems more likely if one remembers that the offender evidently failed to confess his offence immediately after having committed it but rather only after having been placed under investigation during the ecclesiastical act of *pavāraṇā*.

In other passages of the *Suttavibhaṅga* the term *nāsanā* instead of *pārājika* is used. Some of these references are to be found in the casuistry of *Pārājika* 1 of the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, that is, the rule prescribing celibacy. There the following cases are mentioned (Vin III 33.24-28): A monk, who is guilty of having raped a sleeping co-monk or novice, should be expelled (*nāsetabbo*). In the event that the victim wakes up and consents to the behaviour of the monk, both participants have to be expelled (*nāsetabbā*). The same rule applies in the case of a novice raping a sleeping monk or fellow-novice (Vin III 33.28-31), and in the case of a monk who is forced to rape a nun, a female probationer (*sikkhamānā*), or a female novice (Vin III 39.37-40.6): Both participants are found not guilty if they do not consent, but otherwise have to be expelled (*nāsetabbā*). The same goes for a monk who is forced to rape a lay-woman, a homosexual⁹, or another monk (Vin III 40.5-13).

7. On this ecclesiastical act see Jin-Il CHUNG, *Pravāraṇāvastu im Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*, Göttingen, 1997 (SWTF, Beiheft 7) (in press).
8. There is at least one instance of a physical expulsion of a monk found to be not "pure" (Vin II 237. 8-10: *atha kho Mahāmoggallāno taṃ puggalaṃ bāhāyama gahetvā bhi dvārakoṭṭhakā nikkhāmetvā sucighaṭṭikam datvā ...*).
9. For an interpretation of the term *paṇḍaka* see Leonard ZWILLING, "Homosexuality as Seen in Indian Buddhist Texts", *Buddhism, Sexuality, and Gender*, ed. José Ignacio CABEZÓN, Albany, 1992 (Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series, 113), pp. 203-214.

In all these cases the term *pārājika* is not applied even though the respective offenders are apparently guilty of a *pārājika* offence. It may be that in the *Vinaya* for these instances the term *nāsetabba* is used instead of *pārājika*, once again because an expulsion performed by the Saṃgha is thought necessary.¹⁰

Another instance of rape is mentioned in the introductory story of the rule *Samghādisesa* 8 in the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*: Two monks feel that they have been treated unfairly by the monk Dabba. Therefore, they persuade the nun Mettiyā to accuse Dabba of having raped her in order to have Dabba expelled (*nāsāpeyya*; Vin III 162.14-27).¹¹ Thus this passage also pertains to the instances of the casuistry of *Pārājika* 1 mentioned above. It is quite possible that the two malicious monks aimed to have Dabba expelled by the Saṃgha, as implied by the application of the verb *nāsāpeyya*. However, according to the story, the Buddha asked Dabba whether the nun's accusations were true (Vin III 162.30-31), and the *pāṭimokkha* rule views the case as an example of a consciously false accusation of a *pārājika* offence (Vin III 163.22**).¹² Since Dabba pleaded innocent to having raped Mettiyā, the Buddha ordered Mettiyā to be expelled (Vin III 162.38-163.1: *tena hi bhikkhave Mettiyam bhikkhunim nāsetha*).¹³ This procedure, however, is not based on any fixed rule of the *Vinaya*, since until then there existed no regulation prohibiting monks or nuns from accusing another of having committed a *pārājika* offence. In the *Vinaya* a person having caused the formulation

10. This could be the case because a rape is viewed as a very grave transgression of both Buddhist monastic and Brahmanical law. Rape in the *Vinaya*, particularly the rape of a nun, is frequently mentioned as one of the most serious infringements of Buddhist monastic law (cf. Vin I 85.24; 89.2-3 and 11-12; 121.7; 135.3; 168.10; 320.13 etc.); for some examples in the Brahmanical law see Ganganatha JHA, *Hindu Law in its Sources*, Vol. I, Allahabad, 1930, pp. 481-484.
11. In the *Cullavagga* (Vin II 74.24 - 79.37) the introductory story of *Samghādisesa* 8 is repeated almost word for word. Here Mettiyā is also expelled, and the story introduces the ecclesiastical act of the giving of a *sativinaya*, "a verdict of innocence" (Vin II 79.37-80.31). By means of this ecclesiastical act it is officially agreed that the Saṃgha trusts the accused person (cf. NOLOT, SVTT II, pp. 99, 109).
12. However, the focus of this rule is not on the behaviour of the nun Mettiyā but on the behaviour of the monks who caused Mettiyā to utter the wrong accusation.
13. Vin III 162.38 - 163.3. After that the malicious monks were remorseful and begged the other monks not to expel Mettiyā for she had not committed any offence (Vin III 163.3-6).

of a *pātimokkha* rule is exempted from any punishment, since Buddhist monastic law is a case-law following the principle *nulla poena sine lege*.¹⁴ In any case, even if Mettiyā had been found guilty of an offence, she would have had to undergo the punishment for a *saṃghādisesa* offence, that is a 14 days probation (*mānatta*)¹⁵, rather than an expulsion from the order, as was the case according to the introductory story of *Samghādisesa* 8. Until this point in the text the only cause for the application of *nāsanā* mentioned in the *Vinaya* is rape or the concealment of a *pārājika* offence. However in this case, Mettiyā neither concealed a *pārājika* offence nor did she rape anybody, but rather accused another of having raped her. Therefore, her expulsion must be regarded as an exception, made possible through the personal intervention of the Buddha.¹⁶ In addition, it is worth noting that according to the introductory story and the *pātimokkha* rule it was not Mettiyā's behaviour which gave rise to the formulation of the rule but rather the behaviour of the two monks who caused Mettiyā to make the unfounded accusation.¹⁷ In any case, in this passage the term *nāsanā* is not used as a technical term of Buddhist monastic law. The same holds true for one passage of the *Suttapiṭaka*, namely an account in the *Kāraṇḍavasutta* of the *Mettāvagga* in the *Ānguttaranikāya*. Here a monk accused of having committed an offence changes the subject and talks about other things (AN IV 168.24-27). This leads the Buddha himself to demand his expulsion (AN IV 169.1-2: *dhamath' ... niddhamath' ...*, AN IV 169.10: *tam enaṃ ... bahiddhā nāsentī*). This procedure is not based on any fixed rule of the *Vinaya* but, on the contrary, contradicts the regulations of Buddhist monastic law: According to *Pācittiya* 12 of the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* the evasion of an accusation is a *pācittiya* offence, the conse-

14. Cf. VON HINÜBER, "Buddhist Law", p. 7; cf. Hellmuth HECKER, "Allgemeine Rechtsgrundsätze in der buddhistischen Ordensverfassung (*Vinaya*)", *Verfassung und Recht in Übersee* 10/1, ed. Herbert KRÜGER (1977), pp. 89-115; p. 96.

15. For *mānatta* see NOLOT, SVTT III, pp. 117-122.

16. Thus this reference does not confirm C. S. UPASAK's opinion that *nāsanā* generally is applied as a term for the expulsion of nuns (*Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms [Based on Pali Literature]*, Varanasi 1975; s.v. *Nāsanā*).

17. This issue is extensively discussed in the commentary and is dealt with again here below (p. 103).

quence of which is confession but not expulsion.¹⁸ Thus it is possible that the introductory story of *Samghādisesa* 8 and the just mentioned account in the *Suttapiṭaka* belong to the eldest stratum of the canonical texts, being formulated before the term *nāsanā* was used with a “juridical” meaning.

In another passage of the *Mahāvagga* the term *nāsanā* is applied for the expulsion of fully ordained members of the order (Vin I 85.27-90.9). There it is stated that certain individuals are not entitled to full ordination (*upasampadā*) and, if ordination already has been bestowed on them, they have to be expelled (*nāsetabbo*). The eleven types of individuals concerned apparently did not receive *upasampadā* legitimately, having committed a grave offence in the time of household-life, or simply because they were considered physically unfit for full membership in the order.¹⁹ The individuals concerned include homosexuals (*paṇḍaka*; Vin I 86.7-9)²⁰, fake monks, persons converted to another

18. On the other hand, this account in the *Āṅguttaranikāya* may well have served as a basis for *Pācittiya* 12 of the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* (Vin IV 36.37**). According to the introductory story of this rule a monk also evaded an accusation (Vin IV 35.26-29). Since the *Manorathapūraṇi* (Mp IV 74.11-13), the commentary on the *Āṅguttaranikāya*, links the canonical passage commented upon with an ecclesiastical act introduced and described in the *Cullavagga* (Vin II 101.4-102.10: *tassapāpiyyasikākamma*) by rendering “he evades” (*aññen’ aññam paṭicarati*) with “he conceals (his offence)” (*paṭicchādeti*), this passage of the *Cullavagga* may also have been inspired by the above-mentioned passage of the *Āṅguttaranikāya*. For some more examples of passages of the *Suttapiṭaka* which contain rather old *Vinaya* material, cf. VON HINÜBER, *Handbook*, §§ 67, 74, 80; cf. the references given in VON HINÜBER, “Buddhist Law”, note 5.
19. One passage in the *Parivāra* (Vin V 140.14-15) refers to this passage in the *Mahāvagga* without adding anything new. According to the *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp 1391.26-27) in another passage of the *Parivāra* (Vin V 216.32) the term *nāsita* refers to the eleven types of individuals mentioned above as well.
20. The *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* (Vjb 114.24-115.31) provides several additional explanations of the casuistry of *Pārājika* 1 of the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*. In the canonical text a monk or a nun changes sex. The *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* has a discussion about what age the individuals received full ordination, since married women are allowed to enter the order at the age of twelve, whereas men can only receive full ordination at the age of twenty. It is explicitly stated in this passage of the subcommentaries that during the sex change process the individuals are **not** considered to be *paṇḍakas* (in this case *paṇḍaka* probably means “without outer signs of sex”) and thus do not have to be expelled because of Vin I 85.27-86.9 (Vjb 115, 10-12; cf. Sp-ṭ III 256.19-22).

religion (*theyyasamvāsaka*, *titthiyapakkantaka*; Vin I 86.31-35)²¹, animals (*tiracchānagata*; Vin I 88.1-3), matricides (*mātughātaka*; Vin I 88.20-21), patricides (*pitughātaka*; Vin I 88.24-26), those who have killed an Arhat (*arahantaghātaka*; Vin I 89.4-6), raped a nun, or caused a split within the order, as well as persons who have caused bloodshed (*bhikkhunīdūsaka*, *saṃghabhedaka*, *lohituppādaka*; Vin I 89.11-16)²², and hermaphrodites (*ubhatovjañjanaka*; Vin I 89.19-21). Although these persons committed no offence during monkhood, the expulsion *nāsanā* has to be performed by the Saṃgha, since it was the Saṃgha which acted improperly (though unknowingly) by bestowing ordination in these cases. Therefore the Saṃgha is forced to restore a lawful state by explicitly cancelling the ecclesiastical act of ordination. In the *Parivāra* one additional piece of information referring to the expulsion of these eleven persons is provided: The ecclesiastical act of ordination in these cases is referred to as *vatthuvipatti*, i.e. “defect in material” (Vin V 222.6-14: ... *vatthuvipannaṃ adhammakammaṃ* ...). This is confirmed by the commentary upon the *Pāṭimokkha*, the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, stating that these eleven cases are *avatthukā*, meaning that they are “not potential material” for an ordination procedure (Kkh 17.27-29 and 19.3-5). Therefore, if the ordination ceremony (*upasampadākamma*) has indeed been performed notwithstanding the *avatthuka* status of these persons, then the ecclesiastical act itself is considered invalid and has to be openly annulled by the Saṃgha.

Unlike the monks novices are not subject to Buddhist monastic discipline, but have to observe ten specified rules. The expulsion of novices is also called *nāsanā* in the *Vinaya*. According to *Pācittiya* 70 of the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* (Vin IV 139.18**-34**) a novice (*samaṇuddesa*) who upholds a view specified as false about the utterances of the Buddha has to be expelled (Vin IV 139.32**): ... *tathā nāsitaṃ samaṇuddesaṃ*). This is the only passage describing the actual procedure of *nāsanā* in the *Vinaya*.²³ If a novice ignores one admonition he is to be sent away with

21. According to the *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp 1017.10-12) a *theyyasamvāsaka* may not obtain even a lower ordination (*pabbajjā*).
22. With regard to the individuals who have caused a split within the order and the ones who have converted to another religion, the refusal to ordain clearly refers to their second ordination, since they have both previously been members of the order.
23. This procedure is described in the introductory story, in the rule, and in the canonical commentary (*padabhājanīya*) of *Pācittiya* 70 (Vin IV 138.32 - 139.4).

the following words: “From this day onwards, dear friend Samañuddesa, this Lord is not to be viewed as your teacher anymore; the privileges given to other Samañuddesas, namely sleeping two or three nights in one room with the monks, these are not (given) to you anymore; go, leave!” This suggests that the expulsion of novices is not an ecclesiastical act but rather an informal – though to some extent formalized – request made to the novice. In addition we know from the *anāpatti* formula that this expulsion can later be amended (Vin IV 140.30-31).²⁴ According to the rule’s introductory story, the novice Kaṇṭaka advocated the false view given in the rule itself (Vin IV 138.20-24). There his misconduct is referred to as “slandering” of the Lord (*mā bhagavantam abbhācikkhi, na hi sādhu bhagavato abbhākkhānam*; cf. Vin IV 134.14-15). According to the *Cullavagga* (Vin II 25.10-27.18) similar behaviour by a monk leads to his suspension (*ukkhepanā*)²⁵, whereas in the case of a novice expulsion (*nāsanā*) is called for. This mutual proximity of suspension (*ukkhepanā*) of a fully ordained member of the order and expulsion (*nāsanā*) of a novice is implied in one passage of the *Parivāra* as well (Vin V 115.23-24).

The misbehaviour of the novice Kaṇṭaka, however, is one of the ten general reasons for *nāsanā* for novices. These ten reasons are listed in the *Mahāvagga* (Vin I 85.19-26):²⁶

I prescribe, monks, the expelling of a novice possessing the following ten characteristics: If he destroys living beings, takes things not given, adheres to an impure moral code, if he lies, drinks alcoholic drinks, speaks ill of the Buddha, speaks ill of the Saṃgha, speaks ill of the Dhamma, holds false views, or is a rapist of nuns.

Five of these ten characteristics are in violation of the first five of the ten training rules set forth for novices²⁷ and the remaining five are other

24. The focus of the rule *Pācittiya* 70 is, of course, on the behaviour of the monks, who are not allowed to keep regular contact with a Samañuddesa expelled in this manner.
25. In *Pācittiya* 68 of the *Bhikkhuvibhāṅga* the same behaviour as Kaṇṭaka’s is attributed to the monk Ariṭṭha. There it results in a *pācittiya* offence. However, the introductory story of *Pācittiya* 68 (Vin IV 133.32-135.5) is repeated word for word in the *Cullavagga* (Vin II 25.10-26.33). There the suspension (*ukkhepanā*) of the monk Ariṭṭha who did not give up his false view is described.
26. *Parivāra* VI.10 (Vin V 138.16-17) refers to this passage without making any additions.
27. Consequently it is stated in the *Samantapāsādikā* that the violation of the first five training rules is punished by *nāsanā*. To complement the content of the

examples of incorrect behaviour. The expulsion of the novice Kaṇṭaka in *Pācittiya* 70 fits into either the sixth or the ninth of these ten situations. Kaṇṭaka either “speaks ill of the Buddha” (*buddhassa avaṇṇam bhāsati*) or could be said to “hold a false view” (*micchādiṭṭhiko*), as can be seen from the introductory story of *Pācittiya* 70 (see above). Additionally, one can conjecture from the *anāpatti*-formula of *Pācittiya* 70 that the expulsion of novices in any of these cases can later be amended.

In the canonical references discussed above three concepts of the use of the term *nāsanā* can be distinguished. Firstly, Mettiyā and the monk in the *Āṅguttaranikāya* are expelled not because of any violation of a *pāṭimokkha* rule but because of the personal intervention of the Buddha. Secondly, as a technical term of Buddhist monastic law as laid down in the *Vinayaṭīkā*, *nāsanā* stands for the expulsion of a member of the order performed by the Saṃgha. This expulsion seems to be irreversible, since with regard to monks and nuns it is frequently applied in the case of a *pārājika* offence.²⁸ In these cases *nāsanā* is used either because the committed offence is considered to be a very grave one (rape), or because the respective person did not admit to his offence immediately after having committed it, but rather only after a certain period of concealment, as illustrated by *Pārājika* 2 of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* and by the expulsion of a monk during the ecclesiastical act of *pavāraṇā*.²⁹

canonical text the same commentary informs us that the violation of rules 6-10 of the Sāmaṇeras' is to be punished by a *dandakamma* (Sp 1012. 32 - 1013. 1 and 1015. 2-4; cf. Sp-ṭ III 255. 8-9).

28. On the other hand, one passage found in the *Parivāra* fails to conform the supposition that *nāsanā* in the *Vinaya* generally refers to the Saṃgha's expulsion of a monk or nun who has committed a *pārājika* offence. In Vin V 137. 5-7 *nāsanā* is used only with regard to the eighth *pārājika* rule for nuns, but not with regard to any of the other seven *pārājikas*. It is unclear why the term *nāsanā* is employed in only this instance.
29. In addition to the information gathered from the canonical text, the commentaries *Samantapāsādikā* and *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* also mention *nāsanā* in connection with a previous concealment of a *pārājika* offence, while commenting upon the potential ways of settling the four kinds of “legal matters” (*adhikarana*). In the *Cullavagga* (Vin II 101. 4 - 102. 10) a monk is accused of having committed a weighty offence, that is to say, a *pārājika* or another, “similar offence” (Vin II 101. 8-11; according to *Samantapāsādikā* [Sp 1199. 1-3] this means a *dukkata* or *thullaccaya*, according to the *Papañcasūdanī* [Ps IV 48. 3-10] *pārājika-sāmantam* here is a “heavy offence”, that is a Saṃghādisesa). The accused monk pretends for a while not to recall the particular incident referred to, after which he then admits to having committed another, less significant offence (*appamattikam*

Additionally, in the *Vinayapiṭaka nāsanā* is applied for the expulsion of persons who should not have received full ordination at all. In this case it was the Saṃgha's mistake to bestow ordination on the unsuitable individuals. For this reason the Saṃgha is forced to act by revoking the ecclesiastical act by the expulsion *nāsanā*. Thirdly, *nāsanā* is applied to the expulsion of novices, which may become necessary because of the ten reasons listed in the *Mahāvagga*. One of these reasons is referred to in a *pāṭimokkha* rule (*Pācittiya* 70). This specific expulsion of novices evidently corresponds to the temporary suspension (*ukkhepanā*) of monks and may be cancelled.

The only canonical trace of a more explicit classification of the application of the term *nāsanā* is to be found in the *Parivāra*, the most recent section of the *Vinayapiṭaka*. There "three expelled (persons)" (*nāsitakā tayo*; Vin V 211.13-17) are mentioned. This specific tripartition marks the transition to the much more elaborate definition as formulated in the commentaries. The commentary *Samantapāsādikā*, which was compiled more than half a millenium after the completion of the *Vinayapiṭaka*, comments upon this passage of the *Parivāra* (Sp 1383.36-1384.4). There a short explanation is given, and a more detailed definition in an earlier passage of the same commentary is referred to. There (Sp 582.19-26), in the commentary on the introductory story of *Samghādisesa* 8 mentioned above, the tripartition of *nāsanā* is explained in detail:

There are three (kinds of) *nāsanā*: *liṅganāsanā*, *saṃvāsanāsanā* and *daṇḍakammanāsanā*. Of these 'A rapist has to be expelled' is a *liṅganāsanā*. If

āpattim), before finally pleading guilty to the offence he is actually accused of. In such a case the ecclesiastical act known as *tassapāpiyyasikā-kamma* is applied, whereby the accused monk is deprived of some of his rights until his rehabilitation (see NOLOT, SVTT II, p. 110). In the commentary on this passage of the *Cullavagga* in the *Samantapāsādikā* the term *nāsanā* is used: The accused monk evades the accusation because he fears expulsion (*nāsanā*) once having admitted to the offence (Sp 1199.6-7). Similar explanations are to be found in the *Sumāṅgalavilāsini*, in the commentary on the *Sanḅhitisutta* in the *Dīghanikāya* (DN III 254.10-18). The canonical text commented upon briefly mentions the same situation as described in the *Cullavagga*. According to the *Sumāṅgalavilāsini*, the accused monk will be expelled if he has committed a *pārājika* offence (*ayaṃ ev' assa nāsanā bhavissatī ti*). If he has committed a less serious offence, the so-called *tassapāpiyyasikā-kamma* is performed and he can, after a period of good behaviour, regain his status as a regular monk (Sv III 1042.20-24). Evidently the expulsion following the concealment of a *pārājika* offence in these cases is referred to by the term *nāsanā*.

(monks) perform an ecclesiastical act of suspension (*ukkhepaniyakamma*) because of the non-recognition of or the not making amends for an offence or because of the not giving up of a wrong view, it is a *samvāsanāsanā*. If (monks) perform an ecclesiastical act of punishment (*daṇḍakamma*) (by saying): ‘Go, leave!’, that is a *daṇḍakammaṇāsanā*. In this case, however, with reference to *liṅganāsanā*, the wording is: ‘Expel the nun Mettiyā!’

Following this definition a controversy between the Abhayagirivāsins and the Mahāvihāravāsins is reported in the *Samantapāsādikā*.³⁰ This controversy evidently is the result of the *Samantapāsādikā*’s interpretation of an earlier passage in the *Vinaya* containing the term *nāsanā*. In the commentary on the casuistry of *Pārājika* 1, which demands expulsion (*nāsanā*) for a rapist (*dūsaka*) (see above, p. 95), the *Samantapāsādikā* seems to be in need of an explanation as to why in this case the culprit is expelled by *nāsanā*. The commentary thus claims that no evidence from the side of the culprit is necessary in case of rape. A rapist (*dūsaka*) is thus expelled without having given his own view (Sp 269.9-12):³¹

‘Both have to be expelled’ is: both have to be expelled by a *liṅganāsanā*. In this case no evidence from the rapist is required. The victim has to be expelled if he – after having been asked – gave evidence (that he consented to the rape). If he did not consent, (the victim) does not have to be expelled. The same goes for a *Sāmaṇera*.³²

The controversy between Abhayagirivāsins and Mahāvihāravāsins now focuses on the question of what the actual reason was for the expulsion of Mettiyā. Oskar VON HINÜBER (“Buddhist Law”, p. 37) states “in the commentary the problem is discussed at some length, whether the nun

30. Oskar VON HINÜBER (“Buddhist Law”, pp. 37f.) emphasises the importance of this passage, since this is the only instance in the *Vinaya* where two existing versions of the *Vinaya* are given.
31. This is in contradiction with the statement of the *Samantapāsādikā* as to why the Buddha asked Dabba, whether the nun Mettiyā’s accusation was true (Sp 581. 15-19): “[The Buddha said to Dabba:] ‘If it is done by you, (say) ‘It is done’ means: what does he show by this (word)? He shows that (the accused person) has to speak out himself whether or not he has done it, since it is not possible using the (monks’) assembly’s authority or favouritism to find a person, who is in fact innocent, to be guilty or *vice versa*.” Cf. also Sp 582. 16-19: “‘For this reason, monks, expel the nun Mettiyā!’ means: the words of Dabba and (the words of) the (nun) do not conform. Therefore it is said: ‘Expel the nun Mettiyā!’”
32. This last statement probably refers to the tenth of the ten reasons for *nāsanā* of a novice, which are listed in the *Mahāvagga* (see above, p. 100).

was expelled with the consent (*paṭiññāya*) of Dabba Mallaputta or not”. According to the *Sāratthadīpanī*³³ *paṭiññāya* apparently does not mean “having consented” but rather “having given her view”, which refers to Mettiyā. Thus the discussion of the two factions in the *Samantapāsādikā* is about whether the expulsion of Mettiyā was because of her (false) statement (Abhayagiri view) or for another reason (Mahāvihāra view).³⁴ The *Samantapāsādikā* enlightens us that an expert then intervened who decided that the Mahāvihāravāsins were right (Sp 583.14-15)³⁵. However, even then it remained unclear which offence Mettiyā was accused of. This question is extensively discussed in the subsequent passage of the *Samantapāsādikā*. There it is stated that Mettiyā did not commit a *saṃghādisesa* offence since the rule *Samghādisesa* 8 of the *Bhikkhuvibhāṅga* applies only to nuns with respect to other nuns or to monks with respect to other monks, but not to nuns with respect to monks (Sp 583.15-17 and 28; Sp 584.3-5).³⁶ This suggests that Mettiyā had com-

33. Sp-ṭ II 346.8-11: *ayyenamhi dūsitāti paṭiññātattā tāya paṭiññāya yadi nāsitā thero kārako hoti saddoso ti attho. akārako hoṭīti tāya katapaṭiññam anapekkhivā yadi bhagavatā pakatidussilabhāvaṃ yeva sandhāya sā nāsitā thero akārako hoṭīti adhippāyo.*
34. It is not doubted at all that she had made this statement: Vin III 162.21-22 and 27: *ayyena ’mhi Dabbena Mallaputtana dūsitā ’ti.* In the above-mentioned commentary in the *Samantapāsādikā* and the subcommentary on this passage it is not clear what person *thero* stands for, and what action is referred to by *kārako*. If *thera* refers to Dabba, then *kāraka* means that he was thought to actually have raped Mettiyā. This is not true, as we know from the introductory story of *Samghādisesa* 8. Additionally, if Dabba was a rapist – why should Mettiyā have been expelled because of her accusation? Therefore it is quite probable that *kārako thero* stands for the monk who performed the expulsion of nun Mettiyā. If he did so because Mettiyā had made her (false) statement, then he evidently doubted the truthfulness of her evidence. However, a rape is believed to have actually happened as soon as a person claims to have been raped (Vmv I 282.1-2). Therefore, if the monk in spite of Mettiyā’s evidence performed her expulsion, then he is a *kārako thero* and is said to be “with fault” (*sadosa*). If, on the other hand, the monk entrusted with Mettiyā’s expulsion expelled her for another reason, then he is thought to be not instrumental in the performance of the wrong punishment (*akārako thero*) and is consequently “without fault” (*niddosa*).
35. Cf. Sp 584.5-9; cf. Vmv I 282.9-10; cf. Sp-ṭ II 346.8-13.
36. See also Sp-ṭ II 346.21 and Sp-ṭ II 347.2-3. Additionally, according to the *Cullavagga* (Vin II 276.9-18) a monk may not be accused by a nun. For the difficulty of applying to nuns the rules given only in the *Bhikkhuvibhāṅga*, see Ute HÜSKEN, *Die Regeln für die buddhistische Nonnengemeinde im Vinaya-*

mitted either a *dukkata* or a *pācittiya*. However, the outcome of both offences is not the expulsion of the culprit but a simple confession (Sp 584.5-7).³⁷ The commentator solves this discrepancy by stating that Mettiyā herself was aware of her bad conduct and was because of this expelled by the Buddha (Sp 584.7-9). However, we have to remember the fact that there is no hint of Mettiyā's self-awareness in the *Vinaya*. This explanation thus seems to be a provisional solution by the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*, who otherwise would have had to admit that the Buddha ordered the monks to act against the *Vinaya*.

The *dūsaka* in *Pārājika* 1 (*Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*) and Mettiyā are expelled by a *liṅganāsanā* according to the passages of the *Samantapāsādikā* discussed above. The same source provides the additional information that the actual expulsion of the nun Mettiyā involves her disrobing (Sp 584.11-13)³⁸. Disrobing is therefore called *liṅganāsanā*. Since the expulsion of fully ordained persons is called *liṅganāsanā* also in the cases of the monk admitting during *pavāraṇā* to having committed a *pārājika* offence (see above, p. 94; Sp 1078.9), and in the case of the erroneously ordained eleven kinds of individuals in the *Mahāvagga* (see above, p. 98; Sp 1016.15-16), it is probably, in each of these cases, also performed by disrobing the guilty party. In all these instances the expulsion seems to be irreversible.

Once again, as in the commentary on *Samghādisesa* 8, in the commentary on the passage of the *pāṭimokkha* about the expulsion of the novice Kaṇṭhaka (*Pācittiya* 70, see above, p. 99) the "three kinds of *nāsanā*" are listed in the *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp 870.34 - 871.6):³⁹

"Expel him" means: here we are faced with a threefold *nāsanā*: *saṃvāsanāsanā*, *liṅganāsanā* and *daṇḍakammanāsanā*. Thus the suspension because of the refusal to see an offence etc. is called *saṃvāsanāsanā*. "A rapist has to be expelled" (and) "Expel nun Mettiyā!" is called *liṅganāsanā*. "From this day on, Venerable Samañuddesa, this Lord is not to be perceived as your teacher anymore!", this is *daṇḍakammanāsanā*: this is valid here. Therefore he said: "And thus, monks, he should be expelled: '... leave!'"

Piṭaka der Theravādin (Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, 11), in press, § 1.1.1.

37. Cf. Sp-ṭ II 347. 11-13 and Vjb 196. 15-17.

38. See also Sp 591. 26; 592. 1; and Sp-ṭ II 345. 27: "'Expel her' means: give her white clothes and reduce her to lay status."

39. Cf. Kkh 127. 39 – 128. 6.

It follows, according to this interpretation, that the expulsion of Kaṇṭaka in *Pācittiya* 70 is a *daṇḍakammanāsanā*. According to the information of the canonical text (see above, p.99) the novice is sent away and is thus excluded from membership in the order, since he may no longer view the Buddha as his teacher. However, he may later regain his status as a novice.

Contrary to the *Samantapāsādikā*, in the *Vinaya* the term *daṇḍakammanāsanā* is unknown, but *daṇḍakamma* and *nāsanā* are treated in different sections of *Mahāvagga* and *Cullavagga*. An ecclesiastical act of punishment (*daṇḍakamma*) can be performed by monks or nuns. The *Vinaya* gives accounts of *daṇḍakammas* being performed by monks regarding novices or nuns, and by nuns regarding monks, but not by monks regarding monks or by nuns regarding nuns. In the *Mahāvagga* (Vin I 84.11-15) five particular situations are enumerated which result in the performance of a *daṇḍakamma* by monks with respect to novices. The result of this *daṇḍakamma* is not preordained. The severity of the punishment is, to a large extent, determined by the particular monks performing the *daṇḍakamma*. However, according to the *Mahāvagga* (Vin I 84.22-25) the punishment may not include prohibiting entry into the whole area of an *Ārāma* (Vin I 84.15-25).⁴⁰

The outcome of *nāsanā* for novices is not defined in the *Vinaya*, but is discussed in the *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp 1014.8-12; cf. Sp-ṭ III 255.6-7). There the expulsion of a novice due to any of the ten characteristics listed in Vin I 85.19-26 is called *liṅganāsanā*. That means that his “taking of refuge”, his choice of a preceptor (*upajjhāya*), and his right to occupy a lodging no longer has any relevance for him. For the time being only “the outer sign” (*liṅga*) is retained by him. If in future he does not conform to correct conduct he should then definitely be excluded (Sp 1014.16-19; cf. Sp-ṭ III 256.3-5). If, however, he recognizes his mistake, the offence is not within the scope of *liṅganāsanā* and the guilty novice can reestablish integration within the order (Sp 1014.19-30). At the same time, it is certain that the conscious transgression of any one of the first five of the rules of *Sāmaṇeras* is tantamount to a *pārājika* for the monks (Sp 1014.30-1015.2). In the *Samantapāsādikā* a passage of the *Kurundī* is cited. This source informs

40. The introductory sentences state that *Sāmaṇeras*, who were prohibited from entering an *Ārāma*, departed, left the order, and converted to other religious groups (Vin I 84.19-21).

us that if a novice transgresses the rules 6-9 mentioned in the *nāsanā* chapter of the *Mahāvagga*, he will be expelled “in the same way as Kaṇṭaka” in *Pācittiya* 70, that is, by means of a *daṇḍakamma* (Sp 1015.7-15),⁴¹ only after he is admonished up to three times. On the other hand, according to the *Mahā-aṭṭhakathā* and the *Samantapāsādikā*, even a successful admonition and the subsequent admission of the offence fail to release the novice from a *daṇḍakamma*. At the same time, an unsuccessful admonition definitely results in a *liṅganāsanā* (Sp 1015.15-20),⁴² whereas a novice who has raped a nun can never receive lower ordination (*pabbajjā*) again, even if he should promise to refrain from such behaviour in future (Sp 1015.23-29).

Thus, although *daṇḍakamma* and *nāsanā* in the *Vinaya* itself differ considerably, the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* links both terms by distinguishing between different kinds of *nāsanā* to be applied to novices. Moreover, in the *Samantapāsādikā* it is stated that on occasion monks performed *daṇḍakammās* with regard to novices with a view to preventing them from being expelled or from leaving the order (Sp 1013.23-27). These explanations are evidently an attempt to differentiate the general term *nāsanā*. The variation between *daṇḍakamma-nāsanā* and *liṅganāsanā* in the case of novices may have become necessary once the ten reasons for *nāsanā* listed in Vin I 85.19-26 were seen to have various degrees of seriousness. Despite the fact that each case concerns *nāsanā*, only an infringement of the first five training rules of the *Sāmaṇeras*, which is not later regretted, leads to the expulsion known as *liṅganāsanā*, the result of which appears irreversible. However, only after three unsuccessful admonitions does the violation of rules 6-9 lead to the expulsion of a novice known as *daṇḍakamma-nāsanā*, which can be cancelled, as noted above.⁴³

41. It is interesting that in the *Vinaya* only one admonition of Kaṇṭaka is mentioned, although the procedure of a threefold admonition is well known in the *pāṭimokkha*, as we can see from the *yāvattiyaka samghādisesa* rules.
42. A similar description is given in the *Kaṅkhāvitaranīporāṇaṭīkā* (Kkh-pt 100. 16-101. 2; see also Sp-t II 345. 30 - 346. 1).
43. Both execution and reversal of *daṇḍakamma-nāsanā* are described at length in the *Samantapāsādikā*. However, there the expulsion is known as *nissāranā* (Sp 1402. 22-28; cf. Kkh 131. 31-33), although the wording of the formula suggests that *Pācittiya* 70 and Vin I 85. 19-26 (reasons 6-9) are being referred to (Sp 1402. 28-35). The reversal of the measure is known as *osāranā* (Sp 1403. 3-13; cf. Kkh 131. 33-34). According to the same text expulsion as well as revocation are ecclesiastical acts (*apalokanakamma*; Sp 1402. 22-28 and 1403. 3-13).

The last of the three types of *nāsanā* frequently mentioned in the *Samantapāsādikā* is the *saṃvāsanāsanā*, which is not described in the *Vinaya*. *Samvāsa* in the *Vinaya* is a general term encompassing all the rights and duties of a monk or nun within their respective community.⁴⁴ The term is consistently defined in the *Vinaya* as *ekakammam ekuddeso samasikkhātā*, “one common ecclesiastical act, a common recitation, and one and the same training” (e.g. Vin IV 214.31-33).⁴⁵ Even in the *Vinaya* the term *saṃvāsa* is qualified more specifically: *asaṃvāsa* means “without (any) communion”, *samānasamvāsaka* means “belonging to the same communion”, and *nānāsamvāsaka* means “belonging to a different communion”. As mentioned in the beginning of this paper, the term “without (any) communion” (*asaṃvāsa*) refers to a monk or nun who has transgressed one of the *pārājika* rules. The offender has lost his status as member of the Buddhist order and may never be ordained again. According to the *Mahāvagga* (Vin I 339.6-340.38) a suspended monk (*ukkhitta bhikkhu*) is not excluded from membership in the Buddhist order as a whole, but no longer belongs to the **same** communion (*samānasamvāsaka*) as the suspending monks (*ukkhepakā bhikkhū*). He is not prevented from founding or attaching himself to **another** communion. Therefore he is called “belonging to another communion” (*nānāsamvāsaka*).

In the *Samantapāsādikā*, *saṃvāsanāsanā* is defined concisely as the suspension of a monk due to the refusal to see or for not making amends for an offence, or because of the refusal to give up a false view (Sp

VAJIRAÑĀVARORASA views the expulsion of novices in a different way. According to him it is stated in the *Aṭṭhakathās* that a novice’s rights and privileges are lost completely, leaving only the status (*Entrance* III, p. 243). However, he does not tell us to what extent and in what respect the status is retained. In his opinion the *nāsanā* mentioned with regard to the Sāmaṇera Kaṇṭaka implies that the status is not in fact relinquished but instead that the culprit is simply excluded from the *āvāsa*. Because of this, he renames this particular expulsion *sambhoga-nāsanā*, “depriving of sharing”, a term not to be found in the *Vinaya* or even in the commentaries.

44. This definition only touches on the relationship between monks and monks or between nuns and nuns. Consequently, novices in this legal sense are not “in communion” with anyone.

45. *Samvāsanāsanā* in the *Sāratthadīpanī* is explicitly defined with reference to this definition in the *Vinaya* (Sp-ṭ II 345. 29-30).

582.21-23; Sp 870.36-871.1).⁴⁶ This definition implies that *saṃvāsanaśanā* generally means “expulsion from the (same) communion” (**saṃānaśaṃvāsanaśanā*). However, as noted above, *nāśanā* may refer to monks who have broken a *pārājika* rule, who have concealed the offence, but who in the end have admitted to the transgression. In cases of *saṃvāsanaśanā* one could therefore think of a monk who has broken a *pārājika* rule but who does not wish to recognize his offence and, consequently, who does not wish to leave the order. The only means of getting rid of such a monk mentioned in the *Vinaya* to my knowledge is the performance of the ecclesiastical act of suspension (*ukkhapaniyakamma*). It is quite possible that this particular case is called *saṃvāsanaśanā*, too. *Samvāsanaśanā* may thus implicitly include the suspension of a member of the order who has committed a *pārājika* but does not wish to admit to his wrongdoing. Thus two types of suspension, which are similar in procedure but different in effect are called *saṃvāsanaśanā*: A monk, who has committed either a *saṃghādisesa* or a lesser offence, can be restored once he submits to the decision of the Saṃgha regarding his offence. However, a suspension due to the non-acknowledgement of a *pārājika* offence does not include the possibility of restoration.⁴⁷

46. However, despite the fact that the commentary on two passages in the *Parivāra* (Vin V 115.23-24 and 211.14-17) mentions only Mettiyā, the *dūsaka*, and the novice Kaṇṭaka, all three kinds of *nāśanā* are listed (Sp 1320.31-34 and Sp 1383.36–1384.4). The common connection of *saṃvāsanaśanā* and suspension is thus missing in these instances. These two passages may be considered as evidence of multiple authorship of the *Samantapāsādikā*, as suggested by VON HINÜBER, *Handbook*, § 220.

47. Prompted by the fact that the restitution of a suspended (*ukkhitta*) monk is generally possible, VAJIRAÑĀVARORASA states that *saṃvāsanaśanā* is an inaccurate term used in the *Aṭṭhakathās* (*Entrance* III, pp. 243.245). On the other hand, he claims that a monk who commits a *pārājika* (*antimavatthu*) and who does not leave the order, is then excluded by *saṃvāsanaśanā*: “the Saṃgha prohibits *saṃvāsa* absolutely and does not receive him again.” According to him, there is no example to be found in the texts even though this is the way such cases are dealt with on a practical level up to the present day. He apparently overlooked the link of the above-mentioned particular ecclesiastical act of suspension (*ukkhapaniyakamma*) because of the non-admission of a *pārājika* offence with the “absolute prohibition of *saṃvāsa*”.

In conclusion, it is possible to summarize the application of the term *nāsanā* and to trace the development of the use of this term and its derivations in the *Vinaya* and in the commentarial literature. The combined texts referred to above suggest the following historical development. In the *Kāraṇḍavasutta* in the *Āṅguttaranikāya* and in the introductory story of *Samghādisesa* 8 the term *nāsanā* is a very general term for “expulsion”. As the juridical terminology in the *Vinaya* developed, a distinction between *pārājika* and *nāsanā* was made, *nāsanā* then designated the expulsion to be performed by the Saṃgha. The circumstances under which such an expulsion was thought to be necessary vary considerably: For example due to an invalid ordination, initial concealment of a *pārājika*, or committing a serious offence such as rape. Additionally, the expulsion of novices is also called *nāsanā*.

The *Parivāra* contains the first indication of a classification into three different types of *nāsanā*. This categorization, however, is elaborate only in the commentaries, which were compiled more than a half millenium later.⁴⁸ There we find the terminological distinction of three kinds of *nāsanā*. *Līganāsanā* here is the name for the irreversible expulsion of monk, nun, or novice. *Daṇḍakammanāsanā* entails a less harsh type of expulsion of novices since it can later be revoked. This expulsion equates to *saṃvāsanāsanā* for monks, since *saṃvāsanāsanā* determines the suspension of individuals who until their restoration are not allowed to live in the same communion (*samānasamvāsa*) with the suspending monks. Additionally, *saṃvāsanāsanā* probably designates the special case of the suspension of a monk due to non-recognition of his *pārājika* offence. In this case no restoration is possible.

48. Similar observations could be made by Oskar VON HINÜBER regarding the treatment of the *samuṭṭhānas* of the different offences of the *Pāṭimokkha* (“The arising of an offence: *āpattisamuṭṭhāna*. A note on the structure and history of the Theravāda-Vinaya”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 16 [1992], pp. 55-69; pp. 58f., 61, 68).

Abbreviations:

- AN = *Āṅguttaranikāya*, ed. R. MORRIS, E. HARDY, 5 Vols., London, 1885-1900 (Pali Text Society); Vol. 6 (Indexes, by M. HUNT and C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS), London, 1910 (Pali Text Society).
- BD = Isaline Blew HORNER, *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya Piṭaka)*, 6 Vols., London, 1938-1966 (Sacred Books of the Buddhists Series, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 25).
- DN = *Dīghanikāya*, ed. T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, J. E. CARPENTER, 3 Vols., London, 1890-1911 (Pali Text Society).
- VON HINÜBER, "Buddhist Law" = Oskar VON HINÜBER, "Buddhist Law according to the Theravāda-Vinaya. A Survey of Theory and Practice", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 18.1 (1995), pp. 7-45.
- VON HINÜBER, *Handbook* = Oskar VON HINÜBER, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin 1996 (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, 2).
- Kkh = Buddhaghosa, *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī nāma Mātikaṭṭhakathā*, ed. DOROTHY MASKELL, London, 1956 (Pali Text Society).
- Kkh-pt = Buddhānāga, *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīporāṇaṭṭhikā*, Chatṭhasaṅgāyana edition, publ. Buddha Sasana Council, Rankun, 1965.
- Mp = Buddhaghosa, *Manorathapūraṇī, Āṅguttaranikāya-aṭṭhakathā*, ed. M. WALLESER, H. KOPP, 5 Vols., London, 1924-1956 (Pali Text Society).
- NOLOT, SVTT II = Édith NOLOT, "Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms, I-III", *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XXII (1996), 73-150.
- Ps = Buddhaghosa, *Papañcasūdanī*, Vol. I (1922) and II (1928) ed. by J. WOODS and D. KOSAMBI; Vol. III (1933), Vol. IV (1937) and Vol. V (1938) ed. by I. B. HORNER; London (Pali Text Society).
- Sp = Buddhaghosa (?), *Samantapāsādikā, Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā*, ed. J. TAKAKUSU, M. NAGAI (and K. MIZUNO Vols. 5 and 7), 7 Vols., London, 1924-1947 (Pali Text Society). [Index Vol. by H. KOPP, London, 1977 (Pali Text Society)].
- Sp-ṭ = Sāriputta, *Sāratthadīpanī*, Chatṭhasaṅgāyana edition, publ. Buddha Sasana Council, Rankun, 3 Vols.; Vol. I: 1961, Vol. II: 1960, Vol. III: 1960.
- Sv = Buddhaghosa, *Sumaṅgalavilāsini, Dīghanikāya-aṭṭhakathā*, ed. T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, J. E. CARPENTER, W. STEDE, 3 Vols., London, 1886-1932 (Pali Text Society).
- VAJIRAÑĀVARORASA, *Entrance* = SOMDETC PHRA MAHĀ SAMAṆA CHAO KROM PHRAYĀ VAJIRAÑĀVARORASA, *The Entrance to the Vinaya. Vinaya-mukha*, 3 Vols., Bangkok, 1969, 1973, 1983.
- Vin = *Vinaya-piṭaka*, ed. Hermann OLDENBERG, 5 Vols., London, 1879-1883.
- Vjb = *Vajirabuddhiṭṭhikā*, Chatṭhasaṅgāyana edition, publ. Buddha Sasana Council, Rankun, 1962.
- Vmv = *Vimativinodaniṭṭhikā*, 2 Vols., Chatṭhasaṅgāyana edition, publ. Buddha Sasana Council, Rankun, 1960.