Chapter- 6

6.0. An Analysis of Ubbhajānumaṇṭalikāsikkhāpada

   The Ubbhajānumaṇṭalikāsikkhāpada¹ is the fifth Pārājika for bhikkhuni. It concerns with sexual desire. The sexual desire forbids the spiritual progression. Therefore, the Buddha seriously prohibited the nun from taking part in sexual life. Therefore the Buddha laid down this fifth pārājika rule. The present chapter mentions the original pārājika rule, the English translation of the rule, the critical notes, the history of the rule, the comparison with Bhikkhus rule and its relevance to social life.

   The present chapter focuses on the bhikkhunī pārājika rules. According to bhikkhunī vibhaṅga there are eight pārājika rules for bhikkhunī. But the first four are the same with bhikkhu’s pārājikas. The distinct rules do not share with the rules for the bhikkhus.

   In brief, the fifth bhikkhunī pārājika prohibits the sexual intercourse. The second pārājika forbids the bhikkunīs not to steal other’s belonging. The third pārājika prohibits the taking of human life. It concerns not only adults, but also touches on abortion. In

¹ This is the first rule peculiar to nuns. A group of four defeats specified in the bhikkhu vibhaṅga are to be observed by nuns too, but the bhikkhunī vibhaṅga does not include them. In a complete Pātimokkha for nuns, this rule should be the fifth defeat. Miss Horner posits a hypothesis that a full pātimokkha for nuns may once have existed, and that the present bhikkhunī vibhaṅga is an abridged version of a more complete vibhaṅga for nuns. “the Book of discipline’ III p XXI
addition, both suicide and advocating of the suicide are included. The fourth pārājika forbids the bhikkunīs from false speaking. With regard to false speaking, there are three precepts in the vinaya which concern lies or false speaking, namely, pārājika, saṅghādisesa and pācittiya.²

If a nun tells lie that she has attained the superior human states (Uttarimanussadhamma) even though she has not attained it, she commits Pārājika offence. Saṅghādisesa offence is such ambiguous constructing if one speaks lie and falsely accuses a monk or nun of committing a pārājika offence who was actually pure in practice. Pācittiya offence is such ambiguous constructing if one speaks lie in the everyday senses of the word.

Therefore the present chapter explains only the last four pārājika offences that are different from bhikkhu’s pārājika. When a monk or nun commits a pārājika offence he or she is expelled from the Order. This is called asarīvāsa (not living together). The expelled person is never permitted to re-enter the Order. In pālī, this is called sisacchinna (to have one’s head cut off). If the bhikkhunī who has committed the pārājika confesses it, then she is expelled from the samgha without recourse to any kamma. The fifth pārājika for bhikkhunī concerns with sexual desire. The Buddha strictly

² “Monastic discipline for the Buddhist nuns” pg 110-113 by Prof AKIRA HIRAKAWA 1982,
prohibits the rules concerning with sexual desire. The rule is stated in
Vinaya as follows.

6.1. Original Pāli rule

“Yā pana bhikkhunī avassutā avassutassa purisapuggalssa
adhakkhakāṁ ubhajānumandalaṁ āmasanaṁ vā parāmasanaṁ vā
ghananī vā chupanāṁ vā patipilanaṁ vā sādiyeyya, ayaṁ pi
pārājiko hoti asaṁvāsā ubhajānumañḍalikā.”\(^3\)

6.2. The English Translation of the rule

“Should nay nun, filled with desire, should consent to rubbing
or rubbing up against, or taking hold of or touching or pressing
against a male person below the collar-bone, above the circle of the
knees, she also becomes defeated and no more in communion. She is
“above the circle of the knee-caps.”\(^4\)

6.3. The Critical Notes\(^5\)

Bhikkhunī, nun means: she is a nun because she is one who wears the
patch-work robes, she is a nun by the designation (of others), a nun
because of her acknowledgement, a nun (to whom it was) said,
‘Come, nun,\(^6\) a nun is one ordained by the three goings to a refuge,

\(^3\) Pācittiya pāli, 657/ PTS 4, 213
\(^4\) The Book of discipline v0l, 3, 160, I. B. Horner, 1979
\(^6\) This may be a mere copying of “come, monk” (ehi bhikkhu), which was the initial formula used
by the Buddha to ordained monks. The Therīgāthā gives an instance that the former jina nun
a nun is good,⁷ a nun has the essence (sāra),⁸ a nun is a learner, a nun is an adept, a nun is ordained by both complete Orders by means of a (formal) act at which the motion is put and followed by three proclamations, irreversible and fit to stand. In this way is this nun one who is ordained by both complete Orders by means of a (formal) act at which the motion was put and followed by three proclamations, irreversible, fit to stand, and this is how nun is to be understood in this case.

Avassutā, with desire means: infatuated, full of longing, whose heart was bound and physically in love with.⁹

---

⁷ Bhadda was ordained by the Buddha through this formula. Here the copying of “come, nun” formula indicates that to the canonical commentators this formula applied to both monks and nuns. The post-commentator, however, intended to restrict this formula to monks alone. Mp 1, 375-6-7 concludes it comments on Bhadda Sattha tassa pabbajjāni paticchi, sa bhikkhuni upassayam gantva pabayji. Although the text is silent about the formula “come, Bhadda”, its explanation tells us that Bhaddā received going forth not from the Buddha himself. Dhammapala argues in great lengths that this formula did not apply to nuns. It was because none of the nuns had done meritorious act. Controversies over Buddhist nuns by bhikkhuni Juo Hsueh Shih, the Pāli text society, Oxford, 2000

⁸ According to Pārājika pāli commentary, there are three kinds of essences; the essence of morality, the essence of concentration and the essence of wisdom. Essence means like a black garment with is endowed with blackness; the monks who are possessed of the essences of morality and so on should be understood as having the essence. Essence should be understood as a state in which the influxes are exhausted through lack of passions which are like the accessory wood.

⁹ In the Vibhaṅga both avassutā (feminine) and avassto (masculine) are explained, but in the same terms. Thus only the first half of the gloss in the feminine is translated; the second half is omitted in that it is identical with the first half expect for the gender of the words. According to SP, this means filled with passion for physical contact. P commentary 1, 45
Avassutassa, filled with desire means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.

Purisapuggalssa, a male person means: a human man, not a spirit (yakkha), not a ghost (peta), not an animal. He is learned, competent to come into physical contact.

Adhakkhakàn, below the collar-bone means: beneath the collar-bone.

Udbhajànumandalañ, above the circle of the knee means over the circle of the knee.

Amasanañ, rubbing means merely rubbed.

Paràmasanañ, rubbing up against means moving from here and there.

Gahanà, taking hold of means merely taken hold of.

---

10 Cross-cultural perspectives on religion have shed light on a striking experience present in every part of the world and in every society; the human world is never alone; it is closely related to human invisible supernatural worlds, and human life either benefits from or is interfered with by supernatural beings, whether they be God or gods, deities, spirit, demons or ghosts. Such belief in possible sexual relation with non-human beings is called “spectrophilia” (perera, sexuality, pp 199). One form of the interference is expressed by the union of demon or spirit and human. In medieval Europe, as Ernest Jones has shown, beliefs in incubi and succubi were universal. Incubi literally mean to lie upon, referring to the demon that descends upon a woman in her sleep to have sex with her. The fact that non-human beings are involved in human sexuality as seen in the Vinaya literature may indicate that during the time when the Vinaya texts were compiled, belief in the interaction between human and non-human worlds was common, and had been adopted by the monastic redactors. In the Bhikkhuvihanga, there is a case in which a monk has sex with a female nàga, a female yakka, and a female peta. Psychologists may interpret it as a nightmare resulting from sexual anxieties and wishes, but one wonders whether this theory can explain every case. Vi 1, 73/ Controversies over Buddhist nuns by bhikkhuni Juo Hsueh Shih, the Pàli text society , Oxford, 2000
**Chupanāṁ**, touching means merely contact.

**Patipilanaṁ**, should consent to pressing against means having taken hold of a limb she consents to pressing against.

**Pārājiko hoti**, becomes defeated means as a man with his head cut off cannot live by attaching his head to his body. Likewise, if a nun, filled with desire, consenting to rubbing or to rubbing up against or to taking hold of or to touching or to pressing a man who is filled with desire below the collar-bone, above the circle of the knee, she, then becomes not an ascetic, not a daughter of the Sakyans. Therefore it is said that she becomes defeated.

**Asamvāsā,** no more in communion: communion means to act in unity, to recite all together, to be trained in the same way. That communion does not exist with her. That is why she is called ‘no more in communion.’

### 6.4. Story of the first Pārājika

The fifth **pārājika** for **bhikkhunī** concerns with sexual desire. The story shows the history of this defeated. At one time the Buddha was staying at **Sāvatthi** in the **Jeta** Grove in **Anāthapiṇḍika’s**

---

11 Asamvāsā (not living together) is explained as prohibiting Dhammasanābhogha and Āmisasanābhogha. In other words, neither teaching nor food, clothing, and shelter may be shared with the person under suspension. The opposite of this, when both dhammasanābhogha and Āmisasanābhogha are effected is a harmonious saṅgha. Since the erring person is suspended from the harmonious saṅgha, such suspension is called asamvāsa, not living together. “Monastic discipline for the Buddhist nuns” pg 110-117 by Prof AKIRA HIRAKAWA 1982,
monastery. At the time, Salha, Migara's grandson, became desirous of building a dwelling-house for the Order of nuns. Therefore, having approached the nuns he spoke that he wants to build a dwelling place for the Order of nuns and he needs a nun who is an overseer of repairs.

At that time the four sisters had gone forth among the nuns: Nandā, Nandavati, Sundarinandā, Thullanandā. Among these, the nun Sundarinandā had gone forth when she was young. She was beautiful, charming, clever, wise, and skilled, possessed of consideration for those kinds of things. She was able to make arrangements. Therefore, the nuns, having chosen the nun Sundarinandā, gave her as overseer of repairs to Salha.

The nun Sundarinandā constantly went to the dwelling of Salha to get a knife, a hatchet, an axe, a spade, etc. Salha also constantly went to the nunnery to learn what was built and what not built was. They came to be in love due to constantly seeing each other. Salha was looking forward to get an opportunity to seduce the nun Sundarinandā. For this purpose, he gave a meal for the Order of nuns.

He appointed a seat in the refectory for the nun Sundarinandā in a concealed place, in a corner, so that the nuns who were elders might conclude that she is sitting with the junior nuns and the junior nuns might conclude that she is sitting with the nuns who are elders.
Then Sālha announced that the meal is ready. The nun Sundarinandā realized that Sālha went to seduce her by offering foods. She thought that if she goes, there will be ugly words about me. So she said to her pupil to bring back alms-food for her and if anyone asks for her, let it be known that she is ill.

At that time, Sālha came to be standing outside the porch of the door and asked for the nun Sundarinandā. The pupil of the nun Sundarinandā replied to Sālha as her teacher said. Then Sālha thought that this meal which I gave for the sake of the nuns was on purpose for the lady Sundarinandā. So, having commended the people to offer the meal for the Order of nuns, he approached the nunnery.

At that time the nun Sundarinandā came to be standing outside the porch of the nunnery waiting for Sālha. She saw him coming from a far. Seeing him, having entered the dwelling, having put on her upper robe including over her head, she lay down on a couch. Having approached her, he said that what is your discomfort and why are you lying down. She answered that he whom he desires is not desired her. Sālha said that he has desires her. Filled with desire or lustful he came into physical contact with the nun Sundarinandā and she also filled with desire came into it.

---

12 It means there will be ugly sound for me; there will be words of abuse. SP 901
13 This contact apparently falls short of full sexual intercourse, as that would be covered by the first defeat common to nuns. Controversies over Buddhist nuns by bhikkhuni Juo Hsueh Shih, the Pali text society , Oxford, 2000
At that time a nun, weakened by age, her feet affected, came to be lying down\textsuperscript{14} not far from the nun Sundarinandā. That nun saw\textsuperscript{15} Sālha filled with desire, coming into physical contact with the nun Sundarinandā who was filled with desire. On seeing this, the old nun was scornful, criticized, scolded and spread it about.

Then this old nun told this matter to the nuns and the nuns also told this matter to the monks. Then these monks told this matter to the Buddha. Therefore, the Buddha said that it is not suitable, it is unworthy of a recluse, it is not allowable and it is not to be done. The Buddha said that this will not make for faith among the non-believers or for increase of faith in believers. The Buddha lay down a rule of training for nuns for the sake of ten benefits.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{14} Nipanna, PP of nipajjati, means “lying down”. It is wrongly render as “sitting down” at BD III, pg 158.
\textsuperscript{15} Adhsa, pp of dassati, it means to see, to perceive. In some cases dassati also means to “see mentally”, i.e. to realize. A physical sight would not make sense in this context as the old nun was supposed to lie down in her own room. Therefore, here adassa should be understood as to realize through hearing.
\textsuperscript{16} (1) for the excellence of the Order (2) for the comfort of the Order (3) for the restraint of evil-minded nuns,(4) for the ease of well-behaved nuns, (5) for the restraint cankers belonging to the here and now, (6) for the combating of cankers belonging to other worlds,(7) for pleasing those who are not (yet) pleased, (8) for increasing (the number of) those who are pleased, (9) for establishing what is verily dhamma, (10) for following the rule of training.
6.5. Detail analysis of the offences

When both are oozing with desire and one touches with one’s body below the collar-bone above the knee-caps, the nun commits an offence of defeat.

It is not self-evident whether āmasati should mean ‘the nun touches, he touches or one touches.’ The passive construction of the rule itself allows us to take the man as the agent of āmasati, but ‘he touches’ does not fit when we come to the discussion of another incident later in the text: Touching of the body of spirit (in the masculine), or a ghost (in the masculine), or a eunuch (in the masculine). If one touches the other’s clothing, etc with one’s body, the nun commits a gross (thullaccaya) offence.

---

17 Ubato avassaute yakkassa va petassa vā pandakassa vā tiraccā- nagamanussavigahassa vā adhakkakāṁ kayaṁ āmasati apatti thullaccayassa. Vi IV, 215. One may thus take the agent of āmasati to be the nun, but the difficulty would be: the part of the body, namely, collar-bone above the knee-caps, delimited normally refers to the female (the samantapāśādīka commentary offers an explanation). Following the SP, this causality should be viewed from both sides touch in this context means she herself may touch or consent to his touching. (SP IV 901, āmasati ti ettha sayam vā āmasati tassa vā āmasanam sādayatu, thus āmasati should be rendered as ‘one touches’ and the object of touching ‘the other’. In this way, the discussion covers both situations, whether the nun is the initiator or the passive partner. SP IV, 191/ vi IV, 215/ Controversies over Buddhist nuns by bhikkhunī Juo Hsueh Shih, the Pāli Text Society, Oxford, 2000

18 Kāyapatibaddha literally means ‘bound to or attached to the body,’ referring to a variety of things according to its context, such as clothing, all kinds of ornaments, and any things, in its broadest sense, that could be put on the body or associated with the body for different purposes. Samantapāśādīka said kāyapatibaddhanati vattathāṁ vā pupphaṁ vā ābaranāṁ vā. Samanta pāśādīkā 1.549.

19 According to Parivāra pāli, there are two calcifications of offences, namely; (1) five categories of offences, Pārājika, Saṅghādīsesa, pācittiya, pātidesaniya and dukkata. Vi V, 91, 13-15 (2) seven categories of offence, Pārājika, Saṅghādīsesa, thullaccaya, pacittiya, pātidesaniya and dukkata and dubbhāsita. Vi V, 91, 23-25. Thullaccaya can be regarded as a category supplementary to defeat and Saṅghādīsesa offence. On the occasions when one stops or somehow fails to carry out the transgression of a precept belonging to these two above
If one touches the other’s body with one’s clothing etc, the nun commits a gross offence. If one touches the other’s clothing etc, with one’s clothing etc, the nun commits an offence of wrong-doing (dukkata). If one touches the other’s body with something thrown, the nun commits an offence of wrong-doing. If one touches the other’s clothing etc, with something thrown, the nun commits an offence of wrong-doing. If one touches something thrown by the other with something thrown by one, the nun commits an offence of wrong-doing.

If one touches with one’s body the other’s body above the collar-bone or below the knee-caps, the nun commits a gross offence. If one touches the other’s clothing etc, with one’s body the nun commits an offence of wrong-doing. If one touches the other’s body with one’s clothing etc, the nun commits an offence of wrong-doing. If one touches something thrown by the other with something thrown by one, the nun commits an offence of wrong-doing.

mentioned categories, then one may commit a thullaccaya or a dukkata offence, depending to the gravity of one’s behavior. Two types of thullaccaya are specified according to the gravity of deeds, namely, major and minor thullaccaya arising from defeat and Sāṅghādisesa respectively. SP, Pg 314.

Nissaggiya, gerundive of nissajjeti. It means to be given up. There is no gloss on this term in the Bhikkhuni vibhaṅga but some remarks in the bhikkhunīvibhaṅga seem to suggest that nissaggiya probably refers to flowers and fruits. Although this sounds a bit odd, it could be understood as an expedient to avoid direct or even direct physical contact by striking the flowers or fruits thrown by the other party. This is a symbolic contact. In this way, no sense of contact or even pleasure can be recognized, which could be the reason for a lighter penalty. Samantapāsādikā, 540/ Controversies over Buddhist nuns by bhikkhunī Juo Hsueh Shih, the Pāḷi text society, Oxford, 2000
When one alone is oozing with desire, if one touches one’s body below the collar-bone, above the knee-caps, the nun commits a gross offence. If the nun is oozing with passion for physical contact and the man too is just the same, and if the nun consents to physical contact on a part of the body from under the collar-bone to above the knee-caps, the nun commits an offence of defeat. If the nun desires physical contact while on the man’s part there may be passion for sexual intercourse or friendly feeling or a pure mind, it is only a gross offence.

If the nun desires for sexual intercourse while on the man’s part there may be passion for physical contact or sexual intercourse or friendly feeling or a pure mind, it is an offence of wrong doing. If the nun desires physical contact while the monk has a passion for sexual intercourse or friendly feeling, it is a gross offence for the nun, but a wrong doing for the monk. If both conceive passion for sexual intercourse or friendly feeling, it is only a wrong doing on both sides.

It is a case of a monk and nun, and (1) both desire physical contact; it is a Saṅghādisesa\textsuperscript{21} for the monk but a defeat for the nun.

When both are oozing with desire, should one touches, with one’s body, the body of a spirit (yakkha\textsuperscript{s}), or a ghost (petass\textsuperscript{a}), or

\textsuperscript{21} Saṅghādisesa is the second class of major offence which entails legal acts of the Saṅgha.
a eunuch (pandakassa), or an animal in human form below the collar bone above the knee-caps, the nun commits a gross offence.22

6.6. Comparison with the rules for Bhikkhus

For monks the committing of sexual intercourse is an offence of defeat. But for nuns the offences of both sexual intercourse and physical contact came under the category of defeat.

In the case of nuns, first defeat concerns exactly the same theme as the second Saṅghādisesa offence23 for monks, physical contact. A nun, however, merits expulsion from the sarīgha for such an offence, whereas a monk does not.

The offence against the physical contact merits the heaviest penalty; it is an offence of defeat for nuns, but it merits the secondary gravity, saṅghādisesa offence. The first defeat for nuns is highly likely to have been taken from the category of saṅghādisesa for monks.

6.7. Determination of the fifth Pārājika

According to the analysis in the casuistry, there are conditions underlying the penalty gradation: full satisfaction of all components. These conditions are as follow; (1) if offender is nun; (2) if that nun

22 Vi III 28-33
23 Should any monk, affected by desire, with perverted heart, come into physical contact with a women, or hold her hands, hold a braid of her hair, touch some of her limbs, he commits Saṅghādisesa offence. Vi I, 269
desires physical contact; (3) if the object is man; (4) if he desires physical contact; (5) if she consent; (6) if direct contact of the body; (7) if contact with a certain part of the body. These are all necessary conditions; if and only if all of them are completely happened regarding the nun under consideration it is an offence of defeat committed. A variation of any of these seven components causes a change in penalty, a thullaccaya or dukkata. When the ‘one’ refers to the nun, there will be an offence of a thullaccaya due to the absence of component.\textsuperscript{24}

6.8. The exception of the rule

There is no offence should it be unintentional or should she be inattentive, not aware, not consenting, mad, distracted, afflicted by pain, or the first offender (ādhikammika).\textsuperscript{25}

6.9. Vajjapaticchedikāsikkhāpada\textsuperscript{26}

The Vajjapaticchedikāsikkhāpada is sixth Pārājika. It concerns with concealing another nun’s Pārājika offence. This rule also is very strict for nuns. If a nun who conceals the offence of another

\textsuperscript{24} Vi IV, 215

\textsuperscript{25} Pācittiya Pāli 663

\textsuperscript{26} In Pāli version of the nuns’ monastic code, this rule would be defeat 6. The story seems to be a sequel to the previous one presented in first defeat, so it is natural for the Pāli Vinaya to put them next to each other. However, the problem is: the subject matter concerned in defeat 1 is physical contact, not sexual intercourse, but if physical contact falls short of sexual intercourse, as was argued throughout first defeat, how did Sundarīnandā get pregnant? Thus, the story in second defeat must be a sequel to another event.
bhikkhuni knowingly she commits *Parājika* offence. The original rule is stated as follows.

6.10. The Original Pāli rule

“Yā pana bhikkhunī janaṁ parājikaṁ dhammaṁ ajjhāpannam bhikkhuniṁ nevattanā paticodeyya na ganassa āroceyya, yadā ca sā thitā vā assa cutā vā nāsitā vā avastā vā sā pacchā evam vadeyya pubbhevaḥam aye annāsim etam bhikkhuniṁ evarūpā ca evarūpā ca sā bhagini ti, no ca kho attanā paticodassam na gaṇassa arocesaṁ ti, ayaṁ pi parājikā hoti asaṁvāsā vajjapaticchādiṁ.”

6.11. The English translation of the rule

“If any nun, knowing that a nun is guilty of an offence of defeat, should neither herself reprove her, inform the group, but afterwards when she either remains or is dead, or has been expelled

---

27 *Pācittiya pāli* 665/ PTS 4, 216
28 *Nāsitā*, pp of *nāseti*, it is the causative of *nassati*. The PED gives the following meanings for *nassati*: to perish, to be lost, or destroyed, to disappear, come to an end. For *nāseti*, we have (1) to destroy, spoil, ruin; (2) to atone for a fault. In the context of monastic life, an offender can remove an offence committed by means of confession or subsequent necessary compensation- to ‘atone for a fault’. In a technical sense, to be destroyed can mean that one’s communion with other members in the *Sāṅgha* or one’s fully-fledged membership is destroyed when one commits an offence of defeat. In monastic life, the offender should be excluded from the *Sāṅgha* due to defeated case. In this context, *nāsitā* could derivatively mean ‘expelled’. The another meaning is “to atone for a fault”, *Vi* 1, pp 85-86, 173 etc, actual refer to expulsion rather than atonement. According to *Samantapāsādikā*’s classification, there are three kinds of *nāsanā*, I.e, *linga-nāsanā* (expulsion as destruction of monastic status), *samvāsa-nāsanā* (exclusion as destruction of communion, and *dantakamma-nāsanā* (exclusion through the legal act of punishment). The first of the three involves loss of monastic status whereas the other two do not. Thus, *nāseti* has different connotations, but it does not mean “atone for a fault”, although it may refer to cases in which the person who is suspended or excluded from the residential area is required to mend their ways. *Samantapāsādikā* 384/ Controversies over Buddhist nuns, p 67, by bhikkhuni Juo Hsueh Shih, the *Pāli* text society , Oxford, 2000
or has defeated, should say this: “ladies, I knew of this nun before that she was such and such a sister and I would neither myself reprove her nor inform the group, she too becomes defeated and no more in communion. She is a ‘fault-concealer.’”

6.12. Classification of the words

Jayam, the nun knows means either she knows by herself or others tell her or the nun (the offender) tells her.

Pārājikāṁ dhammam ajjhapannam, being guilty of an offence of defeat means being guilty of one of the eight defeats.

Nevattanā paticodeyya, should neither herself reprove her means should neither herself reprimand her.

Na ganassa āroceyya, Nor should speak to a group means nor should speak to another nuns.

Yadā ca sā thītā vā assa cutā vā, But when the nun either remains alive or dead: “remains” means stays in her category. Nāsīta,

---

29 The Book of discipline, vol 3, 166, I.B. Horner, 1979
30 Pācittiya paḷi, 670/ PTS 218
31 One of the eight defeats means one precisely of the four defeats which are common to both monks and nuns and this defeat is laid down afterwards, so the Vibhaṅga mentions eight. Because this one is repaired with the previous one (i.e. defeat 1), it must be understood that it is allocated to this place. This became the second defeat (the sixth in a full Pātimokkha) due to a re-arrangement of the text. Samatapāsādiκā 903, 8-12
32 Thītā nāma salinge thūtā vuccatī, this means to remain as a nun, maintaining characteristic features. Vi 4,166/ In the Milindapanna two (outward) characteristics of a Buddhist ascetic are mentioned, namely, the wearing of a yellow robe and the head being shaven. Kathame visati samanassa dhammā dve ca lingheṇi; settho yamo, kāśāvadhāranam bhandubhāvo, ime kho dveca lingheṇi, Milinda 162-163
expelled means either the nun has herself forsaken the saṅgha or the nun has been expelled by others.  

Avassatā, has defected means she is said to have gone over to another sect.  

Pārājikā hoti, becomes defeated means as a withered leaf detached from its stalk cannot become green again. Likewise, a nun, knowing that another nun is guilty of an offence of defeat, thinks that she will neither herself reprove her nor inform the group, by the mere rejection of her responsibility she becomes no longer ascetic, a daughter of the Sakyans. Therefore, it is said that she becomes defeated.

6.13. Story for the second Pārājika

The sixth pārājika deals with concealing. The story mentions about its history as follow. At one time the enlightened one was staying at Sāvatthi in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery. At that time the nun Sundarinandā became pregnant by Sālha.

33 With the addition of a technical term linganāsanā, the khankhā commentary’s gloss differs slightly from the vibhaṅga. Here nāsitā means expulsion as destruction of monastic status. nāsitātī linganāsanāya sayamvā natthā annāhi vā nāsatī, Khankhā commentary 6, vajjapaticcā dika sikkhāpadavannanā, but according to the text of this defeat, nāsitā means either she has herself forsaken the Saṅgha or she has been expelled by the others. nāsitā nāma sayam vā vibhantā hoti annehi vā. Vi IV 217/34 Titthiyapakkanto bhikkhave anupasanpanno na upasanādētabbho, upasanpanno nāseta -bhottā, vi commentary, even going forth is not allowed. Samantapāsādikā 110.
Migara’s grandson. As long as it was immature,\(^{35}\) she concealed the embryo. When it had matured, she left the Order and gave birth. Other nuns said to the nun Thullanandā that Sundarinandā gave birth not long after leaving the Order. We wonder if she was pregnant when she was a nun.

The nun Thullanandā said she was pregnant when she was a nun. But the nuns blamed to her that why knowing that a nun had fallen into a matter involving defeat, she neither reproved herself, nor spoke to a group.\(^{36}\)

The nun Thullanandā replied that any blame for her is blame for me; any disgrace for her is disgrace for me; any dishonor for her is dishonor for me; any loss for her is loss for me. How can I speak to others of my own blame, my own disgrace, my own dishonor and my own loss?

Those nuns who were modest undemanding were scornful; they criticized, scolded and spread it about. Then these nuns told this matter to the monks. The monks told this matter to the Buddha. In this connection, the Buddha set forth this rule of training for nuns.

---

\(^{35}\) Vi IV 216, yāva gabbho taruno ahosi tāva cchādeti. Taruno means young, tender or fresh, here it is simply contrasted with paripakka, which means ready to be born. At BD III p 165 it is rendered as “quickened”. Vin IV 216/ Controversies over Buddhist nuns, p 64 by bhikkhuni Juo Hsueh Shih, the Pāli text society, Oxford, 2000

\(^{36}\) Na gaṇassa āroceti, Gana means, in a technical sense, a meeting or group of (two or three) nuns, a company as opposed to the Saṅgha or an individual.

This second defeat is a rule against concealing another nun’s offence of defeat. Again, similar rule appears in the bhikkhu pātimokkha, but in the category of Pācittiya. Should any monk knowingly conceal a monk’s grave transgression, he commits an offence requiring confession.37

Although the sixth Pārājika is formulated in quite different way, it shares the same concern with pācittiya sixty fourth that concealing someone else’s serious offence. It is interesting to note the expression that dutthullam āpattim paticcādeyya is abbreviated to form the technical designation vajjapaticcādika for the nuns offending under this rule.

Concealing of an offence of other nuns is heaviest penalty; defeat for nuns but it is light offence, pācittiya for monks. Therefore the second defeat for nuns and pācittiya sixty fourth for monks are very closely related.

6.15. The exception of the rule38

There is no offence if she thinks that there will be strife or dispute or quarrel or dispute or contention within the Sāṅgha and

---

37 Vi IV 127 / according to the casuistry (vi IV 127), if a monk knowingly conceals another monk’s grave transgression, it is a Pācittiya offence, but if he is in doubt whether the offence is a grave transgression, it is wrong doing. It is also a wrong action if he conceals another monk’s offence which does not fall in the category of grave transgression.

38 Pācittiya pāli, 667/ PTS 4, 217
does not say; or if she thinks that this nun is harsh, violent, and will endanger her life or her holy life; and hence does not say’ if she does not say as she sees no suitable nun; if she does not say but without intending to conceal for; if she thinks that it will be evident from her (the offender’s) own action; and hence does not say; if she is mad; if she is the first offender (ādikammika).

6.16. Ukkhitānuvattikāsikkhāpada

The Ukkhitānuvattikāsikkhāpada is seventh Parājika. It concerns with the following of a monk who was suspended by the saṅgha Order. This rule also is very strict for nuns. If a nun follows the suspended monk she is defeated. The Buddha prohibits the nuns not to associate with the suspended monks. The rule in Vinaya Piṭaka is stated as follows.

6.17. Original Pāli rule

“Yā pana bhikkhuni samaggena saṅghena ukkhitam bhikkhunī dhammena vinayana satthusāsanena anādaram appatikāram akatasahāyaṁ tam anuvatteya, sā bhikkhuni bhikkhunihi evamassa vacaniyā eso kho aye bhikkhu samaggena saṅghena ukkhitto dhammena vinayena satthusāsanena anādaro appatikāro akatasahāyo, māyye etam bhikkhunī anuvattiti. Evaṁ ca sā bhikkhuni bhikkhunihi vuccamānaḥ tattheva pagganheyya, sā bhikkhuni bhikkhunihi yāvatatiyam samanubhāsitabbā tassa patinissaggāya. Yāvatatiyam ce
samanubhasiyamānā taṁ patinissajjeyya, iccetaṁ kusalaṁ no ce patinissajjeyya, ayaṁ pi pārājikaṁ hotī asañvāsā ukkhitānuvattikā.39

6.18. The English translation of the rule40

“Should any nun follow a monk who has been suspended by the whole Saṅgha according to the rule, the discipline and the instructions of the teacher,41 and he is not respectful, has not made amends42, and who has not made a companion,43 the nuns should say

39 Pācittiya pāḷi, 669/ PTS 4, 218
41 Vi IV 218’ yāpana bhikkhunī saṅghena saṅgena ukkhittaṁ bhikkhunī dhammena vinayena satthusāsanena antādaranī apatikāraya akatassahāyaṁ taṁ anuvatteya. (satthusāsana could be one word (SKT sāstrāsana, or two words (SKT sāsthū sāsana). For example, SV 593, ‘mayaṁ satthusantike pabbajjīt’ anha cattāro paccayapi no satthusantikā va). According to Geiger, Grammar, 90-2, the r in skt compound appears in pāḷi u). On the one hand, dhammena vinayena satthusāsanena are in opposition to samagghena saṅghena, and on the other antādaranī apatikāraya akatassahāyaṁ taṁ agrees with and qualifies ukkhitām bhikkhum.
42 Apatikāraya, this is negative bhāubbhihi with patikāra, which means counteraction, compensation, or remedy.
43 Akatassahāyaṁ, this compound can be interpreted into two ways; (1) kammadhāraya: one who has not been made a companion by the saṅgha Oredor, (2) bhāubbhihi: one who has not made a companion; one who has been suspended has to make amends by following forty three observances in order to retain purity; that is to say, the Saṅgha will cancel the suspension, restoring the offender to the communion, as a companion. An offender who has not made amends cannot be granted companionship with other members of the Saṅgha. That is why he is called one who has not been made a companion. This indicates what is to be expected of normal situation. However, the second interpretation reflects a later development. According to the tenth chapter of MV (vi 1, pp 337-340), if there should be controversy over whether or not there is an offence, or the suspended one insists that he is not guilty of an offence, he is entitled to join another Saṅgha if that Saṅgha agrees to take him. Alternatively he can seek for other monks in the same Saṅgha to side with him and from their own community (samānasāntivāsaka in itself and nānāsaṁvāsaka in relation to the Saṅgha which suspended him), thus a suspended monk could choose to become a nānāsāntivāsaka (one who belongs to a different communion) but this would not be the necessary result. In this case, he finds his own companions, so he is called ‘one who has not made companions’. Saṅghādīsesa 4 for nuns clearly shows that this is not the case; the rule (vi IV 231,30-34) says “yāpana bhikkhuni saṅggena ukkhittaṁ bhikkhunīṁ dhammena vinayena satthusāsanena anpaloketvā karakaSaṅghaṁ anamuṇyā ganassa chandhaṁ osāreyya, ayaṁpi bhikkhuni’ should any nun, neither having asked permission from the executive Saṅgha nor having known the will of the group, restore a nun who has been suspended by the unanimous Saṅgha according to the rule, the discipline, the instructions of the teacher, this nun too it is worth nothing that in the entire Vinaya pīṭaka the term akatassahāya
to this nun; lady, this monk has been suspended by the whole *Saṅgha* according to the rule, the discipline and the instructions of the teacher, and he is not respectful, has not made amends, and has not been made a companion. Lady, do not follow this monk. And while the other nuns are saying so, should this nun persist, the nuns should admonish her up to three times in order that she gives up. If, being admonished up to three times, she should give up, it is all right. Should she not give up, she also becomes defeated and no more in communion. She is a “follower of the suspended.”

6.19. Critical notes

*Samaggena*, the whole *saṅgha* is a *saṅgha* taking the same communion and situated within the same boundary.

*Ukkhittam*, suspended means one is suspended due to not seeing one’s offence or not making amends for an offence or not giving up a wrong view.

appears only in this present defeat. This would suggest that this rule may date later than the *khandhakas*.

44 Of the eight rules against defeat, this is the only one that allows three acts of admonition in a *nāttichattutta* legal act before an offence is determined. However, such a legal act is absent in MI, in which two kinds of admonition are carried out: one nun is sent to admonish the offender in private; if this does not work, then a group of nuns go to admonish her. In general, before a legal act is performed, the offender has already been admonished informally. The Chinese vinaya text contains a strict formula: the offender should be admonished three times in private; three times in public and three times before the *Saṅgha*. This contradicts with *Theravāda vinaya* texts. Controversies over Buddhist Nuns pp 79, by *Bhikkhunī* Juo Hsueh Shih, the Pāḷi text society, Oxford, 2000

45 *Pācittiya pāli*, 670/ PTS 4, 218

46 *āpattiya adassanena*, not seeing an offence means not recognizing it or recognizing it but not acknowledging it. Vi II, 21
**dhammena vinayena**, according to the rule, the discipline means according to such and such a rule and discipline.

The **samantapāsādikā** said that according to the rule means in accordance with the actual case.⁴⁷ According to discipline means after exhorting and reminding, he is suspended. But the analysis of the words has been enunciated shows only the meaning that because of the rule and discipline by which he was suspended, he is suspended properly.

**Satthusāsanena**, according to the instructions of teacher means according to the instructions of the conqueror, the enlightened one’s instructions.

**Anādaram**, without respect means he does not pay respect to the **Saṅgha** or the group, an individual or legal act.

**Appatikāro**, has not made amends: he has suspended; he has not been restored.⁴⁸

**Akatasahāyam**, who has not been made a companion, monks belonging to the same communion are called companions. That

---

⁴⁷ *Bhutena vutthunā*, the expression *dhammena* covers a wide range of technicality, but here the SP restricts it to the issue of whether one has committed the offence of which one is accused. Differing denotations, which were cover by *dhammena*, are assigned to the expressions *vinayena* and *satthusāsanena* respectively. Thus this triad has been assigned more precise meaning. SP 903/ “Buddhist Law” pp 24, by Hinuber / *samantapāsādikā* 235/ *kaṅkhā* commentary 9, *kammapatibhāhāna sikkhāpadavaramañā.

⁴⁸ This gloss clearly indicated that he the expected result is that the offender is eventually received back into the **Saṅgha** which has suspended him, provided he makes due amends.
companion does not stay with them, therefore he is called one who has not been made a companion.

_Tamanuvatteya_, should follow him means: she too holds that view which he holds; she too holds that attitude which he holds; or she too has that inclination which he has.\(^{49}\)

_Parājika hoti_, she becomes defeated means as a flat stone broken in half cannot be reunited. Likewise, a nun who does not give up at up to three admonitions is no longer an ascetic, a daughter of the _Sakya_. Therefore, it is said she becomes defeated.

6.20. Story of the rule\(^{50}\)

The seventh _parājika_ concerns with the following of a monk who was suspended by the _sāṁgha_ Order. The story is as follows.

While the Buddha was staying at _sāvatthi_ in the _Jeta_ Grove in _Anāthapindika’s_ monastery, the nun _Thullananda_ imitated the monk _Arittha_ who had formerly been a vulture-trainer,\(^{51}\) and who was suspended by the _sāṁgha_ Order.

\(^{49}\) _Yaṁ ditthiko so hoti yaṁ khantiko yaṁ ruciko sāpi taṁ ditikā hoti taṁ khantikā taṁ rucikā_, _khanti_ usually means patience, forbearance. The commentary on the _mahāniddesa_ glosses this term: _khanti, khantiti attano sahanañ_ (endurance), _Niddesa_ 1, 193. Edgerton translates _kasanti_ as ‘receptivity’.

\(^{50}\) _Pācittiya pāli_, 668/ PTS 4, 281

\(^{51}\) _Gaddhabhādipubbham, pācittiya commentary said gaddhe bādhavimsu ti gaddhabhādino, gaddhabhādino pubnapurisā assā ti gaddhabhādipubbhho, tassa gaddhabhādipubbassa gijjhaghā takakalappasuttassa ti attho_, (they are vulture-snarers because they snared vultures. A man who is preceded by a vulture-snare is so called because his forebears were vulture-snarers, and the word means that he was born into a family of vulture-killers. _Samantapāśādikā_ 417-8)
Those who were modest nuns blamed her and spread it about, saying that “How can the lady *Thullananda* imitate the monk *Ariitha* who had formerly been a vulture-trainer, and who was suspended by a complete Order. Therefore, the Buddha set forth this rule of training for nuns.

**6.21. Classification of the offences**⁵²

If the nun does not give up, perceiving a legal valid act as legal valid act, she commits an offence of defeated.

If the nun does not give up, being uncertain about a legal act which is legal valid, she commits an offence of defeated.

If the nun does not give up, perceiving a legal valid act as not legal valid act, she commits an offence of defeated.

If the nun does not give up, perceiving a legal act which is not legal valid as legal valid, she commits an offence of wrong doing.

If the nun does not give up, being uncertain about a legal act which is not legal valid, she commits an offence of wrong doing.

If the nun does not give up, perceiving a legal act which is not as legal valid, she commits an offence of wrong doing.⁵³

---

⁵² Vi II, 672.

⁵³ It is worth nothing that whether the legal act of admonition is lawful or not plays a part in determining the penalty. If a legal act is not performed in accordance with the rule and
The nuns who see and hear she should be told up to three times “lady, this monk is suspended by the unanimous *sangha*, do not imitate and follow this monk. If the nun gives it up, that is good. If the nun does not give it up, she commits an offence of wrong-doing. If they hear but do not speak, they commit an offence of wrong-doing.

They should draw the nun into the midst of the *sangha* and say as above for three times. If the nun gives it up, it is good. If the nun does not give it up, she commits an offence of wrong doing.

6.22. The admonition\textsuperscript{54}

The nun who commits an offence should be admonished in this way. An able and accomplished nun should announce to the *sangha*: ‘ladies, let the Order listen to me. This nun so and so follows a monk who is suspended by a unanimous *sangha* according to the rule, the discipline, and the teacher’s instructions, and who is not respectful, who has not made amends, who has not been a companion. She is not giving up this matter. If this is right time for the *sangha*, let the *sangha* admonish this nun so and so in order that she gives up this matter. This is the motion. Ladies, let the Order discipline, the penalty will be extenuated in the *Pāli Vinaya*, an unlawful legal act nullifies the offence. One may easily take this as a sort of formalism resulting from the institutionalization of a religion, but if we consider the fundamental principle on which the Buddhist *Sangha* is based, it may open up a different perspective: that the formality presented here is to prevent an abuse of power by a few over anyone, including an offender, and hence it provide every member with protection.

\textsuperscript{54} *Pācitīya Pāli* 670-671
listen to me. Any lady who approves of this admonition of this nun so and so in order that she gives up this matter should remain silent. The nun who does not approve her offence should speak. Let me proclaim this case by three times.

At the motion, there is an offence of wrong doing if she does not give up. As a result of the two proclamations she commits the two gross offences and at the end of the proclamations, she commits an offence of defeat.

6.23. Comparison with Bhikkhus’s Pārājika rules

The third defeat prohibits nuns from following a monk who has been legally suspended and has not yet made any amendment so as to be readmitted into the saṅgha. Following of such a monk is an offence of defeat for nuns. In the case of monks, the same offence incurs only a pācittiya offence.\(^{55}\)

If a nun follows a suspended monk she commits a heaviest penalty, it is an offence of defeat, but if a monk follows a suspended monk he commits a light penalty, it is an offence of pācittiya.

6.24. The Exception of the rule\(^{56}\)

There is no offence if she is not admonished, if she gives it up, if she is mad, if she is the first offender (ādikammika).

\(^{55}\) Pācittiya Pāli 69
\(^{56}\) Pācittiya Pāli 673/ PTS 4, 220
6.25. An Analysis of atthavatthukasikkhāpada

The *atthavatthukasikkhāpada* is the eighth *Pārājika* rule for *bhikkhuni*. It concerns with sexual matter. The *bhikkhuni* are prohibited from taking part in sexual matters. The *Bhikkhuni Pārājika* rules are more serious than the *bhikkhu*. The rule is stated as follows.

6.26. The Original Pāli rule

"Yā pana bhikkhuni avassutā avassutassa purisapuggalassa hatthaggahanaṁ vā sādiyeyya saṁghātikannaggahanaṁ vā sādiyeyya saṁtīttheyya vā sallapeyya vā saṁketaṁ vā gaccheyya purisassa vā abbhāgahanaṁ sādiyeyya channam vā anupaviseyya kayam vā tadatthāya upasamhareyya etassa asaddhammassa patisevanatthāya, ayam pi pārājikā hoti asaṁvāsā atthavatthukā."

6.27. The English translation of the rule

"If any nun, filled with desire, would consented to the taking hold of her hands by a male person, filled with desire, would

---

57 Defeat one is dealing with the physical contact with a precise specification of the part of the body in contact and this defeat further deals with various contact of a sexual nature which lead to the final wrong practice, i.e physical contact. Therefore, this defeat can be seen as a supplementary rule to defeat 5 in that they form a natural sequence. Nevertheless, in the Pāli tradition, the background story to defeat 6, which prohibits nuns from concealing another nun’s offence of defeat, seems to be a sequel to the story presented in defeat 5, but it is problematic. The fifth and sixth (the first and second in the abridged version) rules are so obviously sequential in the Vinaya Pāli that they have to be placed next to each other, and this supplementary rule is placed at the end of the category of defeat, i.e. defeat 4(8 in a full list).

58 Pācittiya pāli, 675/ PTS 4, 221
consented to the taking hold of the edge of her outer robes, or would stand with a man, or would converse, go to a appointed place, or would consented approach of a man, would enter into a concealed place, or should dispose her body for purpose of engaging in this wrong practice, she too becomes defeated and no more in communion. She offends by the eight conditions.”

6.28. Classification of the words

Avassutā, filled with desire means: infatuated, full of desire and longing, physically in love with.

Avassutassa, filled with desire means: infatuated, full of desire, physically in love with.

Hatthaggahanāṁ vā sādiyeyya, should consent to taking hold of her hands: by hand is meant from the elbow to the nail-tips. If she, for purpose of engaging in this wrong practice, consented to being taken hold of below the collar-bone and above the knee-caps, she commits a gross offence.

60 According to SP, filled with desire means filled with passion for physical contact as intimacy between friends in worldly enjoyment. Samantapāśādikā 2, 675
61 This applies to both the male and female parties.
62 Here wrong practice should be understood as referring to physical contact, not sexual intercourse, because there is no gross offence bordering on sexual intercourse, and the words ‘he is conscious and able to undertake physical contact’ are operative here. It is truth that in the analysis of the words a male person is defined as being able to undertake physical contact, yet the definition here is obviously adopted from the first (the fifth in a full list) defeat, which deals with physical contact. Pācittiya commentary 675
One would not indulge in sexual intercourse with three kinds of females, three kinds of men, three kinds of hermaphrodites, or three kinds of eunuchs. Nor would one have sexual intercourse with genitals. There should be destruction because of the ground for sexual intercourse.

Sāṅghātikannaggahanāṁ vā sādiyeyya, should consent to taking hold of the edge of her outer robes: If she, for purpose of engaging in this wrong practice, consent to the taking hold of her inner robe or upper robe, she commits a gross offence.

Sātíthheyya vā, should stand; if she, for purpose of engaging in this wrong practice, stands within the reach of a man’s hand, she commits a gross offence.

Salla peyya vā, should converse: if she, for purpose of engaging in this wrong practice, converses standing the within the reach of a man’s hand, she commits a gross offence.

---

63 This verse applies to nuns only. However, it is presented as a riddle, so “one” is better than “she”, which is the game away at the very beginning.

64 The three kinds of females are human women, non-human females and female animals. (tīsso itthiyo manussitthi, amanusitthi, tiraccānagatitthi) vin 1, 56/ khuddhasikkhā pārājikavannanā 1-2/

65 The three kinds of males are human men, non-human males, and animal males. (tayo purisā manussapuriso, amanussapuriso, tiraccānagatapuriso. Vi 1, 56/ vajrabuddhītikā vajjiputtaka vannanā 43-44/ Vinaya viniccayatikā 1571

66 Three kinds of hermaphrodites are human, non-human and animal hermaphrodites. The same applies for three kinds of eunuchs.

67 Na cāre byañjanasamiṁ means she does not have sexual activity. Pācittiya commentary 675

68 Physical contact is the ground because of being the preparatory act to sexual intercourse. Parivāra commentary 675
**Saṅketaṁ vā gaccheyya.** should go to a rendezvous: when the man says to her “Come to a place of such a name, and she goes for purpose of engaging in this wrong practice, for each step there is an offence of wrong doing. In just approaching within the reach of a man, she commits a gross offence.

**Purisassa vā abbhagahanam sādiyeyya,** should consent to the approach of the man: if she, for purpose of engaging in this wrong practice, consents to the approach of the man, she commits an offence of wrong-doing. When the man just approaches within her reach, she commits a gross offence.

**Channam vā anupaviseyya,** should enter a concealed place: in merely entering a place concealed by anything for purpose of engaging in this wrong practice, she commits a gross offence.

**Kāyaṁ vā tadatthaya upasamhareyya.** for that purpose should dispose her body such a purpose: if while standing within the reach of the man she disposes her body for purpose of engaging in this wrong practice, she commits a gross offence.

**Pārājikā hoti,** becomes defeated means that as a Palmyra tree with its top cut off is unable to grow again, likewise, a nun who fulfils the eight condition become no longer an ascetic, a daughter of *Sakyāṁ.* Therefore, it is said that she becomes defeated.
According to *Samantapāsādikā*, any nun who is victim of one or even seven of these conditions does not thereby become a non-ascetic. Having confessed the offence committed, she is absolved.\(^{69}\)

The eight conditions enumerated in four defeats are all forerunners of sexual intercourse, with the stress on the eight. Offending the sexual intercourse incurs defeat; so does action preliminary to sexual intercourse.

Fourth Defeat aims to regulate nuns’ training on a more subtle level: it prohibits acts preliminary to physical contact, not sexual intercourse.

**6.29. The Story of Atthavatthukasikkhāpada**

The eighth *pārajīka* concerns with sexual matter. The *bhikkhunī vibhanga* shows the history as follows. At one time the Buddha was staying at *sāvatthi* in the Jeta Grove in *Anāthapiṇḍika*’s monastery. At that time the group of six nuns, filled with desire, consented to take hold of their hands by a male person, filled with desire, they consented to the take hold of the edge of their outer robes, and they also stood with a man. They conversed with a man and went to the appointed place. They entered into a concealed place and disposed their bodies for purpose of engaging in this wrong practice. Those who were modest nuns blamed them and spread it

---

\(^{69}\) *Samantapāsādikā* 2, 676
about. The other nuns reported to this matter to the monks and the monks reported to the Buddha. Therefore, the Buddha rebuked them and laid down this rule for the nuns.

6. 30. Comparison with Bhikkhus’s Pārājika rules

For monks the first five training rules in the *saṅghādisesa* category are considered to be forerunners of sexual intercourse and physical contact is one of the five. Their commission incurs a *saṅghādisesa* offence, not defeat as nuns.

For nuns, however, an offence bordering on sexual intercourse still counts as an offence of defeat; first defeat and fourth defeat cover such offences. The eight conditions listed in fourth defeat can be seen as forerunners of sexual intercourse.

A forerunner of sexual intercourse constitutes an offence of defeat for nuns but it constitutes an offence of *saṅghādisesa* offence for monks.

The fourth defeat for nuns was cobbled together from some ruling or ruling in the *saṅghādisesa* and *pācittiya* categories for monks.
6.31. The Exception of the rule

There is no offence should it be unintentional, should she be unconscious, not aware, not consenting, mad, distracted, afflicted by pain, or the first offender.\textsuperscript{70}

6.32. Conclusion

The four $bhikkhuni\ pârâjika$ rules are more serious than the $bhikkhus$. Of the four additional $Pârâjika$ rules, the first defeats (five in a full list) and fourth defeat (eight in a full list) concerns evidently sexuality: physical contact and conditions leading up to it. They can be seen as extensions of the first defeat, which prohibits any form of sexual intercourse which any kinds of object. Defeat two (or sixth) is against concealing another nun’s offence of defeat. Defeat three (or seventh) prohibits nuns from following a suspended monk. In summary, the four additional defeats for nuns reflect an emphasis on the control of nuns’ conduct towards the opposite sex and on nun’s duty towards their fellow nuns.

There is a generalized view of women in Buddhism implied in the Buddhist monastic rules for $bhikkhunîs$\textsuperscript{71} in the $Vinaya$. The

\begin{footnotes}
\item[70] Vin 2, 677
\item[71] A $bhikkhunî$ is a fully ordained Buddhist nun. There are three different levels of ordination in the $Sâṅgha$ of women in Buddhism. A novice nun ($Samanerî$) receives ten precepts. (1) abstention from taking life, (2) abstention from taking what is not giving, (3) abstention from sexual contact, (4) abstention from lying, (5) abstention from drinking alcohol, (6) abstention from beautifying oneself with ornaments or cosmetics, (7) abstention from dancing, singing, and entertainment, (8) abstention from using high or luxurious seat and bed, (9) abstention from eating food at afternoon, (10) abstention from handling silver or gold. (Vi I, 5).
\end{footnotes}
rules in the *Vinaya* subordinated the *bhikkhunī saṅgha* to the
*bhikkhu saṅgha*. Many people are potentially misled into thinking
that the rules in the *Vinaya* are unfairly harsher for *bhikkhunī*
because of the larger number of rules, including the eight rules,
which are only for *bhukkhunīs*. *Bhikkhunī* must be subordinated to
*bhikkhus* because of the prescriptions set forth in the eight rules.

There are four additional rules for nuns. Violation of any one
of the *pārājika* offences has no possibility of rehabilitation and
entails permanent expulsion from the *saṅgha*. Two rules (five,
eight) of the additional rules for nuns deal with sexual offenses,
number sixth with concealing another *bhikkhunī’s* *pārājika*
offense, and number seventh with a monk who is suspended by the *saṅgha*.

Without having sufficient knowledge of the Buddhist view of
women, some may think that the four more rules were added because
of women’s unrestrained sexual desires. For example, a Korean
(male) Buddhist scholar, Jung Shup Han, comments on the *bhikkhunī*
*pārājika* additional rules:

We should understand the reasons why the Buddha refused to
found the *bhikkhunī saṅgha* and laid down four additional rules for
*bhukkhunīs* than for *bhikkhus* in this category because *bhukkhunīs’*

---

When a female novice becomes eighteen, she was required to receive an interim ordination as a
probationary nun (*sikkhamāna*). A *sikkhamāna* must be trained for two years under the six rules.
The *sikkhamāna* ordination basically represents a training period in preparation for full
ordination, *bhikkhu*hood. When she becomes twenty, she may be fully ordained as a *bhikkhu*.

---

72 A Buddhist view of women, pp 572,1015.6, Journal of Buddhist ethics Vol, 6, 1999
sexual desires were lustful and uncontrollable. They had sexual relations with Buddhist lay people, non-Buddhists or even monks. Thus they created serious problems in the Buddhist community and caused the fall of the pure dharma during the time of the Buddha.\(^73\)

Some Buddhist scholars, writers, and practitioners claimed that \textit{bhikkhun\'is} as women have been discriminated against in the monastic rules. For example:

Richard F. Gombrich points out:

It is noteworthy that the Buddha did not hold the view, so widespread in traditional India and elsewhere, that sexual desire is the women’s fault and sexual intercourse the result of female temptation of the male. More substantial is his sermon which describes sexual desire of men for women and of women for men in identical terms.\(^74\)

Gross also mentions:

Interestingly, though many modern commentators feel that one of the major concerns of the monastic rules was to separate the monks and the nuns to protect celibacy, neither monks nor nuns are

---

\(^{73}\) Muk.dam Kuk and Jung. Shup Han, ( A translation and Commentary on the Chinese \textit{Bhikkhu} and \textit{Bhikkhuni}, 1987  

\(^{74}\) A Buddhist view of women by Young Chung, Journal of Buddhist ethics Vol, 6, 1999
tempted by each other, with very few exceptions. The real struggle is between monastic and lay people.\textsuperscript{75}

Nagata Mizu additionally claims a practical reason for the two additional rules (fifth, eighth) concerning sexual prohibition for *bhikkhunīs*. He notes that these rules prohibit *bhikkhunīs* from physical contact with men at any time and in any situation because of the *bhikkhunīs’* potential fertility, childbearing being contrary to monastic life.\textsuperscript{76}

The Ssu fen lu does not elaborate on how the seventh *pārājika* dharma for *bhikkhunīs* came to be formulated.\textsuperscript{77} However, the *Pāli Vinaya* gives *Vesālī* an historical account of how the rule was formed. The *bhikkhuni* Sundarīnandā was involved in sexual relations with the layman *Salha, Migāra’s* grandson, and became pregnant. She was forced to leave the *Saṅgha* after she could no longer conceal her condition. Her sister, *Thullanandā*, concealed Sundarīnandā’s offense even though she knew that Sundarīnandā had committed a *pārājika* offense. So even though rule number sixth of the *pārājika Dharmas* at first glance seems to deal with the

\textsuperscript{75} ‘A Buddhist view of women’ by Young Chung, Journal of Buddhist ethics Vol, 6, 1999

\textsuperscript{76} Nagata Mizu, a View of women in the *Bhikkhunī Vinaya* in journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies, Vol, 54, University of Tokyo, 1978

\textsuperscript{77} ‘A Buddhist view of women’ Journal of Buddhist ethics Vol, 6, 1999
concealment of an offense, it also indicates a concern with sexual matters between men and women.\footnote{78}{“A Buddhist view of women” Journal of Buddhist ethics Vol, 6, 1999}

Although Gautama Buddha laid down the rules that bhikkunīs should learn the dharma from bhikkhus who were authorized by the bhikkhu saṅgha,\footnote{79}{“A Buddhist view of women” by Young Chung, Journal of Buddhist ethics Vol, 6, 1999} he also established rule number eight to protect bhikkunīs from abuse by a man who was no longer a bhikkhu. This rule may be a relic of the early period of the bhikkhuni saṅgha when some bhikkhunīs were used by a bhikkhunī who had been expelled by the saṅgha.

The additional rules for bhikkunīs in the pārājika Dharmas look varied, but the case histories establish them as generally concerning sexual offenses. Rule number eight is one of the most important rules of the monastic life for bhikkhunīs. However, violation of the rule is not an offense until the third admonition. Chatsuman Kabilsingh comments on rule number eight.

“It is interesting to note that the structure of eight pārājika stands out from the rest. A bhikkhuni is defeated only after the third admonition; the form resembles that of saṅghādisesa more than pārājika. Could it be possible that it has been shifted from saṅghādisesa? If that was the case, then it must have occurred at a
very early period before the separation of the various sects, for all of
them shares this rule.”

Nagata Mizu\textsuperscript{80} contends that if a \textit{bhikkhunī} is involved in
sexual relations, she is required to leave the \textit{bhikkhunī saṅgha}. Additionally, the result of the offense can cause her pregnancy, and
this can result in a serious external problem for the Buddhist
community as well as the individual. In contrast, if a \textit{bhikkhu} is
involved in sexual relations, the punishment of the offense could be
inwardly limited only to the \textit{bhikkhu}. From a close examination of
the comparative study of the defeats for \textit{bhikkhunīs} and \textit{bhikkhus},
we see that the four additional \textit{pārājika dharmas} for \textit{bhikkhunīs}
actually deal with sexual matters. It seems that Gautama Buddha put
great emphasis on providing stronger guards for the life of chastity
for \textit{bhikkhunīs} than for \textit{bhikkhus}, and strong guards against sexual
behavior for \textit{bhikkhunīs} because of their potential fertility.

As Nagata Mizu asserts, the results of sexual offenses of
\textit{bhikkhunīs} can be greatly different from those of \textit{bhikkhus}. The
result of the sexual offense of a \textit{bhikkhunī} is not simply settled by
only leaving the \textit{saṅgha} herself, because of her motherhood and
childbearing.

Kate Wheeler asserted that the Buddha required nuns to submit
eight special rules explicitly subjugating them to monks. Later He
added at least eighty four additional precepts for nuns on top of the monks’ two hundred and twenty seven, often stipulating worse penalties for similar infractions.\textsuperscript{81}

Diana Y. Paul said that unlike the Christian organizational structure of nuns which was separate from that of monks, the Buddhist nuns in ancient Indian society were accountable to the monks. Their organizational structure was subordinate to that of the monks. They were directly governed by the monks at joint meetings of both orders.\textsuperscript{82}

Susan Murcott said that the bhikkhuni saṅgha modeled itself after the monks’ saṅgha, only the nuns’ rules and regulations were stricter. The purpose of these stricture rules was to keep women’s’ supposedly more wayward nature under control and to keep final authority in the hands of the monks.\textsuperscript{83}

I disagree that bhikkunīs were subordinated to bhikkhus by having so many additional rules and the eight rules imposed upon them. The Buddhist monastic rules reveal a compassionate and practical regulation of the daily monastic life, based on the reality of life at the time the rules were formulated. It is perhaps a mistake to depend solely on the existence of the additional rules for bhikkunīs.

\textsuperscript{81} Kate Wheeler, “Bowing Not Scraping,” in tricycle, 1993, pp 27/ Journal of Buddhist ethic Vol, 6, 1999
\textsuperscript{82} Diana Y. Paul, Women in Buddhism. University of California, 1985, p.80
\textsuperscript{83} Susan Murcott, the first Buddhist women, Berkeley: parallax press, 1991, p 196
without examining their original or social context, to form a
generalized Buddhist view of women. Therefore, the main purpose
of this chapter is to examine the rules for bhikkhunī in the Vinaya.

If a bhikkunī commits a pārājika offense, she is compared with
“a person whose head is cut off.” The offender totally loses her
monastic status and is no longer in association with the pure bhikkhunīs. In this category, we see that bhikkhunī have four
additional rules concerning sexual behaviors. If a bhikkhu is involved
in sexual offense, the bhikkhu is required to leave the bhikkhu
sāṅgha. In the same way, if a bhikkhunī has committed a sexual
offense, she is also required to leave the bhikkhunī sāṅgha. However, the result of the bhikkhunī’s sexual offense may lead to
pregnancy because bhikkhunīs potentially fertile. For this reason, the
four additional rules are restricted rules to bhikkunīs.

The first fours pārājika rules are the same as those for monks.
Life for nun was probably harder that it was for monks. A monk is
allowed to resume his monkhood as long as he formally renounces
his training and disrobes, but a nun is not. There is no chance for
nuns to become a nun again after leaving the bhikkhunī Order or
disrobes.84

84 Vi 4, 434
Therefore, the Order of nuns died out long ago in *Theravāda* Buddhism.\(^{85}\) Nuns, indeed women as a whole, appear to have been very numerous, very active and as a consequence, influential in the actual Buddhist communities of early India.

The restitution of the *bhikkhunī saṅgha* stood as a symbol of women's spiritual power and equality and serve as a bridge linking women in Buddhist cultures with women's movements.

---

\(^{85}\) On the basis of archeological evidence, Vajirannavarorasa writes; “the *Bhikkhunī Saṅgha* in Sri Lanka lasted up to about B.E 1400-1500 (9\(^{th}\)-10\(^{th}\) century C.E) when there were a succession of disasters in that island. (Vīnayaṃukha III, pg 269)/ In tracing the history of women mendicants, however, Bloss writes about the collapse of the nuns’ *Saṅgha* in the 12\(^{th}\) or 13 centuries. (Bloss, “Female Renunciants”, pg 8) / Peter Skilling mentions the opinion that the nuns’ *Saṅgha* died out in the Polonnaruva (11\(^{th}\)-12\(^{th}\) century) but considers this date unlikely and presents evidence of the existence of up to the end of the Anurādhāpurā period, the very end of the 10\(^{th}\) century (Skilling, ‘History of the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha’ II, pg 33); also Sagado, “Theravāda Buddhist Nuns”, pg 63. On the Indian side, B.C. Law tells us that the latest epigraphic record of a nun’s donation is dated 549-550, A.D, I-Ching’s report, however, proved that the nun’s *Saṅgha* continued in India “here and there among certain sects of the Buddhists’, but by the 9th or 10th century A.D, it may have become defunct, (B.C. Law, ‘Bhikkhuṇis’ pg 33, / “ Controversies over Buddhist Nuns” pg 11, by bhikkhuṇī Jo Hsueh Shih, the Pīḷī text society, Oxford, 2000