CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENTS OF

CULLAVAGGA

1. Meaning of the Word Cullavagga

The etymological definition of Cullavagga can be, “Culla - Lesser or Small and Vagga - Section or Group”; the “Lesser Section”. Cullavagga contains 12 Khandhakas or 12 Sections short in size. The Cullavagga is known as the small section, Cullavagga (“Small section”).

The Cullavagga has an important place in the whole of the Tipiṭaka literature. It includes accounts of the First and Second Buddhist Councils, and the establishment of the community of Buddhist nuns, as well as rules for addressing offenses within the community. The Twelve Khandhakas or twelve Sections of Cullavagga are discussed in detail in this chapter.

2. Contents of Cullavagga and Their Analysis

2.1. Kammakkhandhakaṃ.¹⁰ The First Khandhaka (Section) deals with various procedures to be followed in dealing with Badly Behaved Monks.

It was no doubt ever more and more necessary to put the proper ways of meeting disturbances in the Order on a firm basis. This certainly appears to be the purpose of Section I, which deals with seven formal

¹⁰ S-K- Miln-M, p. 1
acts which are but various procedures to be followed in dealing with badly behaved monks. (*Kammakkhandhakāṇṭa*).

The seven formal acts described in the first section are:

(1). *Tajjanīyakammānti* - The First (Formal) Act: that of Rebuke. *Paṇḍukalohitakānambhikkhūnamvatthu*: the story of Bhikkhus who were followers of Paṇḍuka and of Lohitaka

When the Blessed One was staying at Sāvatthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery, Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka who were makers of quarrels, strife and disputes in the Community, approached similar ones and instigated them to create conflict among the Bhikkhus. Because of this, quarrels that had not yet arisen arose and quarrels that had already arisen rolled on to become bigger and more abundant. Those Bhikkhus who were modest became indignant saying, ‘how can the Bhikkhus act thus’. Those Bhikkhus told the matter to the Blessed One. The Buddha rebuked Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka and then the *Tajjanīyakamma* was carried out against the Bhikkhus by the Saṅgha. The Saṅgha approved the motion on the basis of *Adhammakammadvādasaṁkaṇṭa*: The twelve cases of a proceeding (*Kamma*) which is against the law, *Dhammakammadvādasaṁkaṇṭa*: the twelve cases of a proceeding (*Kamma*) which is according to law, *Ākaṅkhamānachakka*: the Six Cases on Being Desirous (These indicate the characteristics of the person to be punished by the *Tajjanīyakamma*), *Atthārasavattānti*: the Eighteen Cases where a Formal Act of Censure should not be revoked, (These are the duties of the person punished that he has to follow), *Napaṭippassambhetabba*: the eighteen cases in which there ought to be no

---

11 *Mh-Kl* p. 329
revocation, *Paṭippassambhetabba - Aṭṭhārasakaṃ* - the eighteen cases in which there ought to be a revocation.

A *Bhikkhu* against whom the *Tajjanīyakamma* has been carried out ought to conduct himself aright. He ought to confer Ordination (*Upasampadā*); he ought not to provide himself with a novice (*Sāmañña*), he ought not to accept the office of giving exhortation to the nuns and if he has accepted the office, he ought not to exhort the nuns.

The revocation of the *Tajjanīyakamman* for the *Bhikkhus* who were followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka was thus carried out by the *Saṅgha*.

(2). *Niyassakamman*¹² - Act of Subordination to an elder monk (subjecting a monk to guardianship)

*Seyyasakatheravatthu*: The story of venerable Seyyasaka.

Venerable Seyyasaka who was stupid, indiscreet and devoid of merit, was living in society in unlawful association with the world. The *Bhikkhus* were agitated by placing him on probation, throwing him back to the beginning (of his probationary term), subjecting him to the *Mānatta* discipline and by rehabilitating him. The Buddha rebuked venerable Seyyasaka and then the *Niyassakamma* was carried out against venerable Seyyasaka and his followers by the *Saṅgha*. The *Saṅgha* approved and carried out the motion based on the same matters as the *Tajjanīyakamma*.

(3). *Pabbājanīyakamman*¹³ - The Act of Banishment (Expelling a monk from his residing place)

---

¹² *Mh-Kl*, p. 343
It is the story of Assaji and Punabbasu who were dwelling on the Kīṭāgiri Hill. They were wicked and shameless Bhikkhus. They followed all kinds of indecent practices like dancing with girls, playing various games, gambling etc.

The Blessed Buddha rebuked them and the *Pabbājanīyakammāṃ* was carried out by the Saṅha against those Bhikkhus to the effect that they were not to dwell on the Kīṭāgiri. The Saṅha approved of it and carried out the Act on the basis of the twelve cases of a proceeding which is against the law, the twelve cases of a proceeding which is according to the law, the fourteen cases on being desirous, the eighteen cases where a formal Act should not be revoked, the eighteen cases in which there ought to be no revocation and the eighteen cases in which there ought to be a revocation.

(4). *Paṭisāraṇiyakammāṃ*¹⁴ - The Act of Reconciliation (Compelling a monk to beg pardon of lay disciple wronged by him)

*Sudhammatheravatthu* - the story of Venerable Sudhamma who was residing at *Macchikāsaṇḍa* in dependence upon *Citta* the householder, superintending the new buildings he erected, and being constantly supplied by him with food. But Venerable *Sudhamma* abused *Citta* about the food he served to the *Bhikkhu*. Then the Blessed Buddha rebuked him and the *Paṭisāraṇiyakammāṃ* was carried out against the *Bhikkhu*. The Saṅha approved the motion and the Act was carried out on the basis of the twelve cases of a proceeding which is against the law, the twelve cases of a proceeding which is according to law, the four cases on being desirous, the eighteen cases where a formal Act should

---

¹³ *Mh-Kl*, p. 347
¹⁴ *Ibil*, p. 359
not be revoked, the eighteen cases in which there ought to be no revocation and the eighteen cases in which there ought to be a revocation.

(5). Āpattiyādassane Ukkhepanīyakammaṃ: The Act of Suspension for Not Seeing an Offence (Inflicting social non-operation on a monk for being reluctant to accept his fault)

Channatheravatthu: the story of venerable Channa.

The Blessed Buddha was dwelling at Kosambī, in the Ghosita Ārāma when there lived the venerable Channa, who was not willing to acknowledge the fault he had committed. The moderate Bhikkhus told the matter to the Blessed One.

The Blessed Buddha rebuked him and sent a proclamation, from residence to residence, saying, “Channa, the Bhikkhu has been subjected by the Saṅgha to the Ukkhepanīyakammaṃ for not acknowledging a fault.” The Saṅgha approved the motion and the Act was carried out on the basis of the twelve cases of a proceeding which is against the law, the twelve cases of a proceeding which is according to law, the six cases on being desirous and the forty-three duties which follow on an Ukkhepanīyakammaṃ for not acknowledging a fault.

The Saṅgha carried out the Act to the effect that Channa should not at all dwell together with the Saṅgha. After he had been subjected to the Ukkhepanīyakammaṃ, he went from that residence to another residence. The Bhikkhus there did no reverence to him, did not rise from their seats to welcome him, did not render him service, did not offer him salutation, did not pay respect to him, did not offer him hospitality, nor esteemed him, nor Honored him, nor supported him. When he received

---

15 Mh-Kl, p. 370
neither hospitality, nor welcome, nor esteem, nor honor, nor support, he
got from that residence to another residence. The *Bhikkhus* there
treated him in the same way. When he received no hospitality, he
returned to Kosambī. Then he conducted himself aright, he became
subdued, and sought for release. Then the Buddha said to the monks,
“Let the *Saṅgha* revoke the *Ukkhepanīyakammaṃ* for not
acknowledging his fault.” Then the *Saṅgha* carried out the Act on the
basis of (*Napatippassambhetabba - tecattārīsakaṃ*) the forty - three
cases (in which an *Ukkhepanīyakammaṃ* for not acknowledging a fault
is not to be revoked) and *Paṭippassambhetabba - tecattārīsakaṃ* - the
forty - three cases (in which an *Ukkhepanīyakammaṃ* for not
acknowledging a fault ought to be revoked). Thus, the
*Ukkhepanīyakamma* was carried out by the *Saṅgha*.

(6). *Āpattiyāappāṭikamme Ukkhepanīyakammaṃ*16 - Act of
Suspension for not making amends for an Offence (Inflicting non co-
operation on a monk for not accepting punishment for his offence).

*Channatheravatthu*: the story of Venerable Channa.

Venerable Channa was not willing to atone for the offence
committed by him. Then the Buddha ordered the *Ukkhepanīyakamma*
against him for not making amends for his offence. The *Saṅgha*
approved the motion and the Act was carried out on the basis of the
twelve cases of a proceeding which is against the law, the twelve cases
of a proceeding which is according to law, the six cases on being
desirous, the forty - three duties which follow on an
*Ukkhepanīyakammaṃ* for not accepting atonement for a fault, the forty -
three cases (in which an *Ukkhepanīyakammaṃ* is not to be revoked),

---

16 *Mh-Kl*, p. 376
and the forty-three cases (in which an *Ukkhepanīya-kammaṃ* for not acknowledging a fault ought to be revoked).

(7). *Pāpiyādiṭṭhiyāappāṭinissagge Ukkhepanīya - Kammaṃ*\(^{17}\) - The Act of Suspension for not giving up a wrong view (Inflicting non co-operation for not giving up a wrong view).

*Ariṭṭhabhikkhuwatthu* - the story of Ariṭṭha Bhikkhu who had formerly been a vulture tormentor, had fallen into a sinful belief of this kind; (that is to say)‘In this wise do I understand the *Dhamma* preached by the Blessed One, that to him who practices those things which have been declared by the Blessed One to be impediments there will arise no impediment sufficient (to prevent his acquiring spiritual gifts)’. The Blessed Buddha rebuked him and delivered a religious discourse; the Blessed One addressed the *Bhikkhus*, and said: ‘Let then the *Sāṅgha*, O Bhikkhus, revoke the *Ukkhepanīya - kammaṃ* for not renouncing a sinful doctrine’. The Act was carried out against Ariṭṭha on the basis of the twelve cases of a proceeding which is against the law, the twelve cases of a proceeding which is according to law, the six cases on being desirous, the forty-three duties which follow on an *Ukkhepanīya-kammaṃ*, the eighteen cases in which there ought to be no revocation and the eighteen cases in which there ought to be a revocation.

Here ends the First *Khandhaka* (First Section) the *Khandhaka* on the *Kammas*.

\(^{17}\) *Mh-Kl*, p. 377
2.2. Parivāsikakhandhaṃ.\textsuperscript{18} The Second Khandhaka (Section) deals with probation for monks guilty of Saṅghādisesa\textsuperscript{19} offences.

If a group of four Bhikkhus, one of whom is a probationer, should place a bhikkhu on probation or throw him back to the beginning of his probationary course, or subject him to the Mānatta discipline or if a group of 20 Bhikkhus, one of whom is a probationer, should rehabilitate a Bhikkhu, it is an invalid act and should not be obeyed.

If one deserving to be sent back to the beginning of probationary course, if one deserving penance, if one observing penance, if one deserving rehabilitation, from a meeting of four, should grant probation to a Bhikkhu, send him back to the beginning of probationary course, or grant penance (Mānatta discipline); or if one on probation from a meeting of twenty, should rehabilitate a Bhikkhu, it is not a (valid) act and is not to be obeyed.

There are numerous duties of Bhikkhus who come under any of the above mentioned categories. There are various ways of interruption of the probationary period and of the Mānatta discipline; three for those under probation, four for those undergoing Mānatta.

There is very little, rather no practical, difference between the Parivāsa, which is rendered ‘probation,’ and the Mānatta, which is sometimes rendered ‘penance.’ Neither the one nor the other are at present enforced anywhere among the Buddhists.

\textsuperscript{18} Mh-Kl, p. 384

\textsuperscript{19} These are thirteen rules which in their earlier as well as later stages, require formal meeting of the Order. A bhikkhu guilty of violating any of these rules must undergo penance (Mānatta).
2.3. *Samuccayakkhandhakāṇṭ*

The Third *Khandhaka* (Section) is Accumulation (of Offences)

There are proceedings on the breach of the first *Saṅghādisesa* rule. It deals with the cases where a monk on probation commits a further offence; the first *Saṅghādisesa* offence. The *Saṅgha* lays the penalty on a *Bhikkhu* for the space of six days on account of the first *Saṅghādisesa* which he has not concealed. The *Mānatta* is imposed for the first *Saṅghādisesa* offence, which a *Bhikkhu* conceals in accordance with the number of days for which he conceals the offence. When a *Bhikkhu* who is on probation for concealing the first *Saṅghādisesa* offence, commits the same offence, he is thrown back to the beginning of his probationary period. If a *Bhikkhu* who is following the *Mānatta* for the previous offences comits a *Saṅghādisesa* offence then he is thrown back to the commencement of his *Mānatta*. The *Saṅgha* imposes upon the *Bhikkhu*, a probation for half a month for the *Saṅghādisesa* offence concealed for half a month. This probation did not affect the *Mānatta* to which he was liable for that first offence. The *Mānatta* always lasted six days, and was preceded by a probation equal in length to the time during which the offence had been concealed. If now, during that probation, another offence was committed and concealed, the penalties for this new offence and for the old one were not accumulative but concurrent. The offender lost the advantage of the probation he had already undergone, he was thrown back to the commencement of his term of probation, and had to begin again. But the new term of probation (- equal in length to whichever was the longest of the two periods during

---

20 Mh-Kl.p. 397

21 The first *Saṅghādisesa* offence is, ‘conscious emission of semen’
which he had concealed the two offences) satisfied both the concealments, and the Mānatta which still (as it would have done before), followed at the end of the probation, satisfied both the offences. This is known as the inclusive probation (samodhāna parivāsa). The Bhikkhus are to follow three Kammavacas\textsuperscript{22}, one for the throwing back, one for the inclusive probation, and one for the new Mānatta. The Saṅgha imposes upon a Bhikkhu a probation for a further month for the two Saṅghādisesa offences concealed for two months. If a Bhikkhu while he is undergoing probation, becomes a Sāmaṇera, there can happen no probation to him so long as he is a Sāmaṇera. There are thirty-six cases of fresh offences being committed whilst under probation. If a Bhikkhu who is undergoing probation is guilty meanwhile of a number of Saṅghādisesa offences, and without concealing them throws off the robes, and he, when he has again received the Upasampadā, does not conceal those Offences - that Bhikkhu ought to be thrown back to the commencement of his term of probation. If a Bhikkhu in the same process does conceal those offences, the Bhikkhu ought to be thrown back to the commencement of his term of probation, and an inclusive probation ought to be imposed upon him corresponding to the time which has elapsed since the first offence among those offences which he has concealed. There are nine principal cases in which a Bhikkhu is not purified by undergoing a term of probation.

\textsuperscript{22} They are text or word of an official Act. These texts form some of the oldest literature and are embodied in the Vinaya. The number of officially recognized Kammavacas is eleven. They are used to proclaim or put a resolution to a chapter of bhikkhus.
2.4. *Samathakkhandhakaṃ*. The Fourth *Khandhaka* (Section) is devoted to the different ways of settling Legal Questions: That on Settlements.

In the first place, the case must be settled in the presence of the accused monk. But this verdict “in the presence of” is necessary to all legal settlements. Secondly, there is the verdict of innocence given in favour of a monk who was wrongfully accused of an offence. *Dabba* the Mallian is taken as the example. The interest is centred on *Dabba* who is to have a verdict of innocence accorded to him. We must therefore understand that this is a case where two separate actions of the Order were called for: one dealing with the monks who brought the false accusation against *Dabba*, and one for acquitting him. There are five things which make a grant of acquittal to the *Bhikkhu* who is conscious of innocence to be according to law. The *Bhikkhu* must be innocent and without offence, others must have censured him, he must ask the *Saṅgha* for acquittal as being conscious of innocence, the *Saṅgha* must grant it, the *Saṅgha* must be duly held and duly constituted. Then comes the “verdict of past insanity”, to be given for monks who were mad when they committed an offence. As is usual, the properties that render the act legally valid or not are enumerated.

Then follows the settlement of disputes by the “decision of the majority”. The *Bhikkhus* assembled in the *Saṅgha* were unable to settle the disputed question (that was brought before them) since they became violent, quarrelsome and disputatious and kept on wounding one another with sharp words. There are four kinds of legal questions requiring formal settlement by the *Saṅgha*, that is to say, legal questions arising

---

\(^{23}\) *Kula*, p. 1
out of (1) disputes, (2) censure, (3) offences, and (4) business. These legal questions have already been mentioned in the *Sutta Vibhaṅga*. Legal questions such as this could be covered up by each contending side confessing through a competent monk whatever were the offences that had been committed, unless they were serious offences (involving Defeat or a Formal Meeting of the Order), or ones that affected the laity. And moreover, such offences could not be settled in this way for anyone who objected or who was not present. If the Bhikkhus were not able to settle the legal question within their own residence (Āvāsa), those Bhikkhus had to go to some residence in which there were a larger number of Bhikkhus. If the Bhikkhus dwelling in that residence were not able to settle this legal question, it had to be settled by referring it to a jury or commission. The Bhikkhus were allowed to appoint on the jury a Bhikkhu possessed of ten qualities. If those Bhikkhus were not able to settle that case by the committee, the Bhikkhus were allowed to settle such a dispute by the vote of the majority. There were three ways of taking votes: the secret method, the whispering method, and the open method. A Bhikkhu who was the teller of the votes was to make the voting tickets of different colours and as each Bhikkhu came up to him he was to say to him thus, “This is the ticket for the man of such an opinion; this is the ticket for the man of such an opinion. Take whichever you like.” When he had chosen, (he was to add) “don’t show it to anybody”. If he ascertained that those whose opinion is against the Dhamma are in the majority, he was to reject the votes as wrongly taken. If he ascertained that those whose opinion is in accordance with the Dhamma are in the majority, he was to report the votes as well taken. This is the secret method of taking the votes.
The Bhikkhu who was the teller of the votes was to whisper in each Bhikkhu’s ear, “this is the ticket of those of such an opinion; this is the ticket of those of such an opinion”. Take whichever you like. “When he had chosen (he was to add),” do not tell anybody (which way you have voted). “If he ascertained that those whose opinion is against the Dhamma are in the majority, he was to reject the vote as wrongly taken. If he ascertained that those whose opinion is in accordance with the Dhamma are in the majority, he was to report the vote as well taken. This is the whispering method of taking the votes. If he ascertained (beforehand) that those whose opinion is in accordance with the Dhamma are in the majority, the vote was to be taken undisguised, openly. This is the open method of taking the votes.

Next, there is the “decision for specific depravity” when a monk, on being examined for an offence, prevaricates and lies. Finally there was the settlement by the “covering up as with grass”, enacted when things had been done or said in the heat of a quarrel and which, if made into a legal question, would only lead to further trouble and perhaps schism. Otherwise, a legal question arising from disputes could be settled by a committee or referendum or, failing this, by the decision of the majority.


The Khandhaka V is as loaded with detail as to make it almost impossible to pick out salient points. But mention must be made of the “group of six monks”, which really means a number of monks under three pairs of leaders. For they are constantly referred to as the

---
²⁴Kula, p. 66
malefactors from whose conduct, springs the opportunity to regularize behavior on all pertinent points. The section deals with numerous rules regarding general behaviour and daily life of the Bhikkhus. These include rules about the material, use and maintenance of the bowls, sewing, washing and drying procedures of the Kathina cloth and robes among others. The Bhikkhus were not allowed to rub their bodies against a tree, a pillar, or a wall, or with a hand instrument, a string, a scrubber, or a scab. The ear ornaments, chains, ornamental strings of beads for the throat, ornamental girdles, bangles, armlets, bracelets, finger rings could not be worn by them. They were not to wear long hair. They were allowed hair that was two months old or two inches long. They were not to smooth the hair with a comb, or with a smoothing instrument shaped like a snake’s hood or with the hand used as such an instrument or with pomade or with hair-oil of beeswax. They were not allowed to anoint their faces or paint their bodies.

They could not go to see dancing, singing, or music. There were some exceptions to these rules in case of illness. It is a Section where the laity are made important; a wonder of psychic power is not to be displayed in front of them; their “bowls could be turned upside down”, a symbolic expression meaning that if they offered food to the monks, these could, after agreeing to a motion put before the Order, turn their bowls upside down to show that they held a layman in such disgrace they would accept no food from him, thereby depriving him of merit. There is also the allowance that monks may tread on cloths when being asked to do so by householders “for good luck’s sake”. Then there is the episode when people bring scents and garlands to a monastery. The monks are allowed to accept the scents on condition that they place the
“five - finger mark” on a door. This has the appearance of a protective measure.

2.6. Senāsanakkhandhakam\textsuperscript{25}. The Sixth Khandaka (Sixth Section) are Lodgings.

\textit{Khandhaka} (Section) VI is a compendium of what is allowable and what is not in regard to dwelling places as the name indicates. Dwelling place, curved house, long house, mansion, cave, the Buddha allowed these five (kinds of) abodes. The Buddha allowed door - posts and lintel, hollow like a mortar, for the door to revolve in, and projections to the door for it to revolve on, a hole to pass a string through with which can help to pull the door, and a string for that purpose, rings on the door for the bolt to work along in, blocks of wood fixed to the edge of the door - post and containing a cavity for the bolt to go into, a pin to secure the bolt by, and a bolt. The Buddha allowed to cover the \textit{Vihāras} (with skins) and to plaster them within and without. The windows of the \textit{Vihāra} are three kinds: windows made with railings, network and with slips of wood. A solid bench or divan (built up against the wall of a room, or under the verandah against the outside wall of the house), bedsteads made of laths of split bamboo, a rectangular chair, an arm - chair, a sofa, a sofa with arms to it, a state chair, a cushioned chair, a chair raised on a pedestal, a chair with many legs, a board (to recline on), a cane - bottomed chair, a straw bottomed chair were also allowed by the Master. The \textit{Bhikkhus} were not to sleep on lofty beds. They were allowed to the use whitewash, black colouring and red colouring in their \textit{Vihāras}.

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Kula}, p. 157
He did not allow them to have imaginative drawings painted; figures of men and women on the walls of *Vihāras*. The use of bamboos to hang robes on, and strings to hang robes in, in the open air, chank shells and saucers for the water, ramparts (*Pakara*) of three kinds: brick walls, stone walls, and wooden fences to enclose the *Vihāras* with, was also allowed. They were not to wear woolen cloth with long fleece to it. They were not to put away their bowls with water in them. They were allowed to dry their bowls for a short time in a warm place and then to put them away. They were allowed the use of a mat made of grass, the use of a small cloth, the use of bags to carry their bowls in. They were not to put their bowls on the bed or on a chair. They were not to keep their bowls on their laps. They were not to put them down on a sunshade. They were not to open the door with their bowls in their hands. They were allowed the use of a blade and of a sheath (for the blade) made of felt. They can use needles and, needlecase made of bamboo. They were allowed the use of a grass - mat, false threads, a box or drawer in the workshop. The *Bhikkhus* were allowed to line the basement of a hall or a shed with facing of three kinds - brick facing, stone facing, and wooden facing; the use of stairs of three kinds - brick stairs, stone stairs, and wooden stairs and the use of a balustrade. They were allowed to provide a railing for the cloister. They were allowed to face round the lower half of the wall with bricks. The use of a chimney was allowed. They were allowed the use of clay to spread over their faces, if their faces are scorched. A trough could be used by the *Bhikkhus* to moisten the clay in. They were allowed to lay the floor with flooring of 3 kinds - brick flooring, stone flooring, and wooden flooring. The use of a drain to carry off the water was allowed. The use of stools for the bathroom was allowed. They were allowed to enclose the
bathroom with three kinds of enclosures - brick walls, stone walls, and wooden fences. The Bhikkhus could have an antechamber in the bathroom. Outlet in the antechamber of the bathroom was also allowed. The hall to the bathroom was allowed. Water vessels of three kinds could be used - brass pots, wooden pots, and skins. The Bhikkhus were allowed to make use of a towel and to wipe the water off with a cloth. They were allowed a tank. A stand for the bowl could be used. The Bhikkhus were allowed the use of small jars and brooms, the use of fans and flower - stands, and the use of mosquito - fans. They were allowed to cut their nails according to the length of the flesh. They were allowed the use of razors, of a stone to sharpen the razors on, of powder prepared with Sipitika - gum to prevent them rusting, of a sheath to hold them in, and of all the apparatus of a barber. They were not to have their beards cut by barbers, not to let them grow long nor to wear them long on the chin like a goat’s beard. They were allowed the use of an instrument to remove the wax from the ear. They were allowed the use of a loom and of shuttles, strings, tickets, and all the apparatus belonging to a loom. They were not to wear their under garments arranged as laymen do, nor to wear upper - garments as the laymen do. Tooth sticks four finger - breadths long at the least were allowed. They were allowed to eat onions when diseased. They were not to follow manifold evil practices. There are numerous such details about other things related with the daily life of the Bhikkhus in the section.

For narrative material, it contains the story of how Anāthapindika heard the words “Awakened One”, Buddha, for the first time and determined to see the Lord, who addressed him by the name of Sudatta, unknown outside his family, and spoke to him on Dhamma. The vision
of *Dhamma* thereupon arose in Anāthapindika, he became a lay follower, and acquired Prince Jeta’s Grove as a gift to the Order. The story of his first meeting with the Buddha is also told, but more briefly, in the *Samyutta*. In this Section is also to be found the *Tittira - Jātaka* which came to be known as the Partridge *Brahma -* faring, told here to encourage monks to be courteous and polite to one another. Harmony in the Order was constantly being sought, as a number of episodes and allusions in the *Vinaya* indicate. It is by no means only in Section VI that passages occur that have parallels in other parts of the *Pāli* canon or the *Jātaka*. Throughout the *Vinaya* this is the case, and probably a concordance of *Vinaya* stories would show only few to be peculiar to it.

2.7. *Saṅghabhedakkhandhakaṃ*\(^{26}\). The Seventh *Khandhaka* (Seventh Section) is Schism

Section VII begins with the story of the Buddha’s fellow clansman Anuruddha’s going forth from home together with Bhaddiya, a Sakyan chieftain who, within a year, realized the threefold knowledge and acclaimed his happiness. Monks, hearing him, grew suspicious that he was remembering the former joys of rulership. But Bhaddiya was able to convince Gotama that previously, although he had had a fully appointed guard, he had been nervous and frightened all the same; but, now, alone in a forest he is unconcerned and unruffled. An explanation of why this story is placed at the beginning of the Section on Schisms seems called for. I can only suggest that if the monks who alleged that Bhaddiya was dissatisfied with the Brahma - faring had turned out to be right, it is not unreasonable to suppose they would next have regarded him as a potential schismatic.

\(^{26}\) *Kula*, p. 224
This was the role for which, however, Devadatta was cast, and for far more: he was also a potential murderer, prepared to go to great lengths to get rid of the Buddha. In his overweening ambition, Devadatta thought he should no longer be the leader and coveted this position for himself. He started by inviting the elderly Buddha to retire and appoint him in his place; when this was refused he made three attempts to assassinate the Buddha; when these failed he asked the Buddha to impose strict practices, including vegetarianism, on the monks; when this was refused he led a schism. Devadatta is said to be irretrievably doomed to remain for a Kalpa in states of suffering and woe.

Now, although those who have progressed some distance on the Way may feel themselves safe and immune to attacks, the tradition nevertheless recognises slayers of Arahants. While various Commentaries hold that Moggallana, an Arahant of long standing, was actually murdered, Tathāgatas, Truth-finders, must be different, for although they may be hurt and their bloods shed. According to Section VII they need no protection and cannot be deprived of life by aggression. Their attainment of Nibbāna (with no residue remaining) is in fact a matter precisely of their own volition.

In this Section, we hear of another formal act, one that is extra to the seven dealt with in Section I. This is the formal act of Information or proclamation, Pakāsaniyakamma, which allowed it to be proclaimed that someone’s nature or character had altered, for the worse. After the first time that Devadatta bore malice against the Blessed One at Rājagaha, the Blessed One said to the Bhikkhus, ‘Let then the Saṅgha,
O Bhikkhus, carry out against Devadatta the Act of Proclamation\textsuperscript{27} in Rājagaha, to the effect that whereas the nature of Devadatta used to be of one kind it is now of another kind, and that whatsoever he shall do, either bodily or verbally, in that neither shall the Buddha be recognised, nor the Dhamma, nor the Saṅgha, but only Devadatta.'\textsuperscript{28}

2.8. \textit{Vattakkhandhakaṃ}\textsuperscript{29}. The Eighth \textit{Khandhaka} (Eighth Section) Observances; Various Duties

In this \textit{Khandhaka} there are regulations as to the duties of the Bhikkhus towards one another. If the resident Bhikkhu is senior, he ought to be saluted; if junior he ought to be made to salute (the incomer). If a Vihāra is unoccupied, he ought to knock at the door, then to wait a minute, then to undo the bolt, and open the door and then still standing outside, to look within. If the Vihāra is covered with cobwebs, they should first be removed with a cloth. If the cell or the storeroom or the refectory, or the room where the fire is kept, or the privy, is covered with dust, it should be swept out. If there is no drinking water, or water for washing, they should be provided. If there is no water in the rinsing-pot, water should be poured in. The Bhikkhus were allowed to leave the hall, if necessary, after informing the Bhikkhu sitting immediately next.

Much of Section VIII consists of passages of some considerable length, most of which have already occurred in the \textit{Mahavagga} (MV.), use also being made of \textit{Sekhiya} material. But the contexts are different. For example, MV. I. 25 lays down the proper conduct for those who

\textsuperscript{27} Pakasaniya - kammaw. This is not one of the regular official acts of the Saṅgha, as described in \textit{Kulla}, and is only mentioned in this passage. It is not referred to by the Dhammapada commentator.

\textsuperscript{28} Tsbe, p.239.

\textsuperscript{29} Kula, p. 272
share cells towards their preceptors, while in CV. VIII. 1. 2-5 this same conduct, laid down in almost identical words except for a few additions or omissions, is to be observed by a monk arriving at a monastery, and again in CV. VIII. 7. 2 - 4 by monks in respect of their lodgings. These are three occasions where conduct is, rather naturally, to be the same, for all three concern monks actually in a monastery, even if only just arrived. Yet the instructions specifically for resident monks (CV. VIII. 2. 2-3) are connected more with their behaviour to incoming monks than with anything else. We have seen that the same story, for example that of Dabba and that of Ariṭṭha, may be told so as to introduce varying effects. So here, the same behavior may be followed in varying circumstances. A great process of stabilization was at work. As the mass of allowances and offences in the CV., mostly those of wrong-doing pile up and increase, so the allusions become all the clearer. Thus, by the time we get to CV. VIII. 3. 2 the nature of the clay goods and the wooden goods that have to be packed away by a monk who is leaving a residence, can be understood by referring to CV. V. 37. For it is here that Gotama “allows”, as recorded, all clay goods and all wooden ones with certain specified exceptions.


The ninth Section, concerned mainly with the legally valid and the legally invalid suspensions of the *Pāṭimokkha*, is introduced by the eight beautiful similitudes of the great ocean, a passage found also in the *Aṅguttara* and the *Udāna*. The third of these similes showing what, ideally, the monks ought to be, is particularly to the point: the Order
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does not live in communion with an impure monk, but, having assembled quickly, suspends him, with the result that he is far from the Order and the Order is far from him (IX. 1. 4). Therefore, also to the point, is the story that precedes the similes of the sea. It is a story of how the Buddha refused, in spite of a plea made three times by Ānanda, to recite the *Pāṭimokkha* to the monks. For the assembly is not entirely pure, Ānanda having in it one individual of a depravity so grave that he is described in strongly derogatory, if stereotyped, terms. The Truth-finder cannot recite the *Pāṭimokkha* to an assembly containing a monk like this (IX. 1. 2). Instead, he delegates his powers, now as it seems, out of disappointment and disgust, whereas formerly (in MV), he had delegated other powers in the full tide of success (MV. I. 12. 1). In both cases it is reasonable to suppose that he did so because the Order was growing beyond the capacity of one man to handle; and because he had therefore increasingly to look to the monks themselves to maintain the Order on the lines laid down by him, both while he was alive and after he was with them no longer.

At the end of Section IX we are at the end of the discipline for monks. Many and exceedingly various are the points that have been raised, and a ruling given on each. The whole method of conducting Buddhist monasticism for those who follow the *Pāli Vinaya* is contained in this and amounts to a very complete system. All doubts as to what is allowable and what is not, or all doubts as to how to act either in conclave or as an individual may be resolved by referring to the discipline that has been laid down. All misdoings, whether serious or nor, have their appropriate penalty attached to them. Behaviour is right
if it promotes one’s own progress along the Way or that of others. As such it is skilful, Kusala.

2.10. Bhikkhuṇīkhandhakaṃ\textsuperscript{31}. The Tenth Khandhaka (Tenth Section): On the Duties of Bhikkhuṇīs.

It begins with an account of the formation of this Order, and contains the important statement, attributed to Gotama, that women are capable of attaining Arahantship.

(1). Conditions for entering the Order

There were eight conditions on which a woman could enter the Order. The conditions are as follows:

(a) A Bhikkhuṇī even if she is of a hundred years standing shall pay respects to a new Bhikkhu.

(b) A Bhikkhuṇī must not spend the lent in a district in which there is no Bhikkhu.

(c) Every half month a Bhikkhuṇī must ask the Bhikkhuṣaṅgha as to the date of the Uposatha ceremony, and the time when the Bhikkhu will come to give the exhortation.

(d) After the expiry of the lent, a Bhikkhuṇī is to hold Pavāranā (to enquire whether any fault can be laid to her charge) before both the Bhikkhu and the Bhikkhuṇīṣaṅghas in respect of what she has seen, heard, or thought of.

(e) A Bhikkhuṇī is to undergo the Mānatta discipline towards both the saṅghas if any serious offence is committed.

\textsuperscript{31} Kula, p. 320.
(f) A Bhikkhunī shall ask for upasampadā from both the Saṅghas after she has learnt six precepts for two years.

(h) A Bhikkhunī must not abuse or speak ill of any Bhikkhu.

(i) A Bhikkhunī must not talk with a bhikkhu but a Bhikkhu can give instructions to a Bhikkhunī.

The remainder of this Section is taken up with regularizing for nuns the recital of the Pāṭimokkha, the confession of offences, the settlement of legal questions, and their exhortation, and so forth. Then come incidents told so as to establish various offences of wrong-doing and various “allowances”. There follows on this the method to be followed for the second ordination of nuns, that by monks, after they have been ordained by nuns as laid down in the Nuns’ Pacittiyas. After more offences of wrong-doing, there is a reversion to ordaining, this time through a messenger, and finally more offences of wrong-doing and more “allowances”.

In this Section there is included the prohibition of forest-dwelling for nuns (X. 23), a prohibition not precisely repeated elsewhere. This reduces the number of their “resources” to three, instead of four, as for monks. It is said that if a nun stays in a forest there is an offence of wrong doing. But in Nuns’ Formal Meeting III, it is said that a nun incurs a grave offence if, while she is in a forest, she goes out of sight or hearing of her companion nun, and an offence entailing a Formal Meeting of the Order once she has got outside. The whole of this amounts to saying that nuns may pass through a forest if they go two together, but that they must not stay in one either together or separately. This was for the sake of their security.
Another interesting point is that nuns, on returning to the Order after they had joined one of the other sects, should not be ordained again. This privilege could be extended to monks, provided that they first underwent a four months probation. Life for nuns was probably harder than it was for monks. In spite of the sympathy and justice with which their troubles were met, they were to some extent discriminated against. There are discrepancies between the penalties inflicted on monks and on nuns for similar behaviour. Possibly the only exception to the general trend of the heavier penalty being imposed on a nun is in the case of “giving a blow to a monk”. Here, if a nun does so, her offence is ranked as one of wrong-doing while, if a monk strikes another monk, his offence is one of expiation.

In the Monks’ *Paṭidesaniya* (Confession) I, because “women obtain things with difficulty” it was made an offence to be confessed if a monk accepted, with certain reservations, food from the hand of a nun who was not a relation. But in the *Cullavagga*, a nun is to offer any food there is in her bowl to a monk. On the other hand, monks could offer nuns food that had been stored, if they had more than they wanted for themselves; and if nuns were short of lodgings the monks might give them some temporarily, again if they had more than they wanted.

A great number of women are traditionally held to have flocked to the Order of nuns. It is conceivable that they were generally regarded as of poorer quality than the monks, and that therefore there had to be a severer testing in order to weed out those who had entered without having a real vocation. It is significant that in the *Etad Aggas* of the *Aṅguttara* there are for monks forty-seven classes of attainments and forty-one monks said to be chief in them (for some are chief in more
than one attainment), while for nuns there are only thirteen classes of attainments, as many nuns being chief in them. Among the former Nandaka is called the chief of monks who exhort nuns.

(2). Violation of Order

(a) A Bhikkhuṇī who knowingly hides any Pārājika offence of any other Bhikkhuṇī, is also guilty of Pārājika.

(b) If a bhikkhuṇī follows a Bhikkhu excommunicated by the Bhikkhusaṅgha, she will be guilty of Pārājika.

(c) A Bhikkhuṇī cannot bring any suit against any householder, or householder's son, slave, employee, even samaṇa or Paribbājaka. If she does so, she will be guilty of Saṅghādisesa offence.

(d) If a person with evil motive sends presents to any Bhikkhuṇī and if she knowingly accepts them, the Bhikkhuṇī will be guilty of Saṅghādisesa offence.

(3). Buddha’s prediction on the effect of the admittance of women into Order

“If, Ānanda, women had not received permission to go out from the household life and enter the homeless state, under the doctrine and discipline proclaimed by the Tathāgata, then would the pure religion, Handa, have lasted long, the good law would have stood fast for a thousand years. But since, Ānanda, women have now received that permission, the pure religion, Ānanda, will not now last long, the good law will now stand fast for only five hundred years. Just, Ānanda, as houses in which there are many women and but few men are easily violated by robbers or burglars, just so, Ānanda, under whatever doctrine and discipline women are allowed to go out from the household
life into the homeless state, that religion will not last long. And just, Ānanda, as when the disease called mildew falls upon a field of rice in fine condition, that field of rice does not continue long; just so, Ānanda, under whatsoever doctrine and discipline women are allowed to go forth from the household life into the homeless state, that religion will not last long. And just, Ānanda, as when the disease called blight falls upon a field of sugar-cane does not continue long; just so, Ānanda, under whatsoever doctrine and discipline women are allowed to go forth from the household life into the homeless state, that religion does not last long. And just, Ānanda, as a man would in anticipation build an embankment to a great reservoir, beyond which the water should not overpass; just even so, Ānanda, have I in anticipation laid down eight chief rules for the Bhikkhuṇīs, their lifelong not to be overpassed.

(4). Historical overview of the early Buddhist Councils

According to Pāli tradition, three Saṅgītis (recitals) or Councils were held, following the death of Lord Buddha to draw up the canonical texts of the Dhamma and Vinaya in the pure form. (Gāyana - song. Saṅgāyana - singing together) Parinibbāna (Skt: Parinirvāṇa; death and final release) of the Buddha at the age of 80, at Kusinārā (now Kusinagar, India).

It is asserted that Venerable Mahākassapa, who was absent at the Parinibbāna of the Buddha in Kusinārā, was on his way to Kusinārā from Pāvā. Mahākassapa received news of the Buddha’s demise from a naked ascetic of the Ājīvika sect. It is also recorded that a monk,

---

32 Ājīvika is the name given to an ascetic sect that emerged in India about the same time as Buddhism and Jainism and that lasted until the 14th century. The name comes from Ajīvia, meaning “one who observes the mode of living appropriate to his class.” The name was was supposed to be
named Subhadda, openly told other monks who were grieving, to stop and to think of the occasion as a new beginning; since they were treated as schoolboys by the Master. They would now be free to do as they liked without any hindrance.

This remark of Subhadda alarmed Mahākassapa for the future safety and purity of the Dhamma preached by the Buddha. Mahākassapa also had other reasons for his anxiety; he had received the robe of the Master as a token of succession of Dhamma authority. Therefore, he was determined to fulfill the Master’s command to establish the Truth. Thus, Subhadda’s remark was a clear indication of the necessity of holding a council to preserve the purity of the Buddha’s teachings.

2.11. Pāñcasatikakkhandhakaṃ 33. The Eleventh Khandhaka (Eleventh Section)

(1). First Buddhist Council

The meeting for the council took place in the second month of the rainy season (Vassa) after the Buddha’s Parinibbāna. It is further stated in the Pāli Chronicle that the Council was held near Saptaparni Cave. Ajātasattu helped the session of the Council and made arrangement for seats, accommodation and food. In the Samantapāsādikā, we find a opprobrious, since Gosala was an ascetic not for reasons of salvation but as a livelihood (Ajiva) and so they were professionals. The name Ajivika means “following the ascetic way of life,” which means that ascetism was their profession. It was founded by Goshala Maskariputra, a friend of Mahāvira, the 24th Tirthankara (“Ford-maker,” i.e., saviour) of Jainism. The fifth Anga of the Jain canon states that he was a disciple of Mahāvira for 6 years, before defecting and developing the Ajivika sect. His doctrines and those of his followers are known only from Buddhist and Jain sources, which state that he was lowborn and died after a quarrel with Mahāvira shortly before the Buddha pass a way.
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detailed description of the ceremonies that took place about 6 weeks before the actual opening of the session.  

_Mahākassapa_ had proposed that a council of 500 _Arahants_ (fully enlightened) _Bhikkhus_ should meet to rehearse the teachings of the Buddha in order to establish a canon of the Buddha’s sermons on _Dhamma_ and of the _Vinaya_, a code of discipline for monastics. It was stated in the _Cullavagga_ and confirmed in the _Dīpavaṃsa_ that the number of monks was chosen through a vote by the general congregation of monks assembled at the place of the _Parinibbāna_ of the Master.

In the _Cullavagga_ it is stated that the _Bhikkhus_ strongly interceded for Ānanda, though he had not attained _Arahanthood_ because of the high moral standard he had reached and because he had learnt the _Dhamma_ and _Vinaya_ from the Buddha himself. _Mahākassapa_ finally accepted Ānanda. It should be noted that Ānanda was brought to trial in the course of the proceedings; the _Cullavagga_ declared that Ānanda had to meet certain charges after the recital of the _Dhamma_ and _Vinaya_.

(2). Proceeding of the First Council

The Council proceeding was a simple one. With the permission of the _Saṅgha_, _Mahākassapa_ asked questions on the _Vinaya_ to the Venerable Upāli, thus in this way the _Vinaya - Piṭaka_ was agreed upon. Then Ānanda recited all of the sermons given by the Master and again was questioned by _Mahākassapa_, thus the _Sutta - Piṭaka_ was compiled.

Buddhaghoṣha in his _Samantapāsādikā_ gives a detailed account of the constituent parts of the _Vinaya_ and the _Sutta - Piṭaka_ that were

---
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recited at the Council. According to the accounts of the *Cullavagga* and the *Samantapāsādikā, Mahākassapa* presided over the entire business of the Council, leaving the remaining participants to be Upāli and Ānanda only. However, the *Dīpavamsa* says that the texts have been compiled by the *Bhikkhus* with Upāli and Ānanda as leaders in the *Vinaya* and the *Dhamma* respectively.

(3). Charges against Ānanda

There was considerable agitation over the admission of Ānanda to the Council because of Ānanda’s failure to reach the stage of *Arahant*, which he actually did attain on the eve of the Council. However, because of the conventional belief that the level of *Arahant* clears one of all guilt, and because of the late development of Ānanda’s attainment, he was still questioned by his peers on several charges as follows:

(i). He could not formulate the lesser and minor precepts as he was overwhelmed with grief over the demise of the Master.

(ii). He had to tread upon the robe of the Master while sewing it as there was no one to help him.

(iii). He permitted women to salute the body of the Master first because he did not want to detain them.

(iv). He was under the influence of *Mara* (the Evil One) when he forgot to request the Master to remain for a kalpa when the Buddha announced the approach of his demise.

(v). He called for the admission of women into the Order out of consideration for Mahāpajāpati Gotamī, who nursed the Master in his infancy.
These charges are differently framed in other accounts. The replies given may be taken to have satisfied the Assembly.

Another important matter was the passing of the highest penalty (*Brahmadaṇḍa*) on Channa, the Buddha’s charioteer, on the day of his renunciation. As a monk, Channa was extremely arrogant and had slighted every member of the Order, high and low. The penalty imposed was complete social boycott. When the punishment was announced to Channa he was seized with such grief and repentance that he was purged of his weaknesses and thus became *Arahant*, and the punishment removed.

In summary, the proceedings of the First Council produced four results:

(i) Settlement of the *Vinaya* by the Venerable Upāli.

(ii) Settlement of the *Dhamma* by Venerable Ānanda.

(iii) The trial of Ānanda

(iv) The punishment of Channa

The teachings that had been agreed upon at the First Council were carried away from *Rājagaha* in memorized form to various places where the scattered *Saṅgha* had become established. The next thing that was done was the translation of these texts from the common language of *Rājagaha*, which possibly was Māgadhī, into the various local languages. Then in each locality they would have been distributed to different monks who would take the responsibility of memorization and passing it on to others. The members of the First Council agreed to the authenticity of the canon, while those who were absent reserved the preference to decline the parts of the canon they saw fit and present their
own versions of the Master’s teachings. At this point, there was no centralized authority or religion of “Buddhism”, consequently allowing the scattered community of monks and nuns to grow creatively. This liberal environment allowed the development of various forms of discipline, religious practice and philosophical interpretation indicating the Buddha as the originator. Due to a decline of the original standards set forth by the Buddha, other councils were convened to purify the Buddha’s teachings and the Saṅgha again.

At the end of Khandhaka (Section) XI, in the Council of Rājagaha, because exactly five hundred monks were there, it is said that this “chanting of the discipline” Vinayasāṅgiti, is in consequence called that of the Five Hundred. To speak of a “chanting of discipline” is rather a curious and limited description. For it is expressly said in Cullavagga XI. 8 that Ānanda undertook to answer questions on Dhamma, and beginning with the Brahmajāla and the Sāmaññaphala Suttantas, did in fact answer corresponding questions about the five Nikāyas. This is no less a feat than that performed by Upāli, the great Vinaya expert, who, having answered questions about the four Pārājika offences, then went on to answer questions about the two disciplines. All the questions on Dhamma and discipline were put by the learned Kassapa the Great. It seems that this elder, reacting to Subhadda’s unsatisfactory attitude to Gotama’s death, with great prevision suggested to the other monks that Dhamma and discipline should be chanted before not - Dhamma and not - discipline should shine out and Dhamma and discipline be withheld. The final name: “chanting of the discipline” seems therefore to sum up only half the proceedings dealt with at the

35 Noticed of Tvp1p. xxix, note.
first Council. This Council or Conference was held shortly, some Commentaries say three months, after Gotama had died. The record of this Council is of the utmost importance as the tradition - oral only, it is true - of a *Dhamma* that was taught and a discipline that was laid down if not wholly by the Founder himself, at all events while he was still alive.

How far their recital was well based and well carried out is brought into a little doubt by the episode of the monk Puraṇa, the Old One, who told the elders he would remember *Dhamma* and discipline just as he had heard and learnt them in the Lord’s presence. His words: “Well chanted by the elders”, are polite, but he was apparently not quite convinced.

According to Section XI, discipline was recited before *Dhamma*. The rather bald narrative gives no reason. The Commentaries however come forward with an explanation. They say that Kassapa asked the monks whether *Dhamma* or discipline should be chanted first, and the monks replied: “Discipline is called the Āyu, the life or vitality, of the Buddha’s dispensation; while the discipline stands, the dispensation stands. Therefore let us chant discipline first.” The same sentiment is expressed in the verse inserted before the *Uddāna*, the key, at the end of Section I of the MV. The underlying notion is that discipline is primarily concerned with *Sīla*, or purification of the ways of acting in body and speech, and therefore with the first of the three categories into which the whole *Sāsana*, dispensation or teaching, is graded.

The remainder of Section XI is devoted to Ānanda. He is the central figure. Feeling that it was not suitable in him to go to the Council while he was still a *Sekha*, a learner, he made an effort to
realise *Arahantship* and, at a moment when no part of him was touching the earth, his mind’ was freed from the cankers. It is said: “in this teaching when a monk attains *Arahantship* neither lying nor sitting down, neither standing nor pacing up and down”, it is to be said of Ānanda. It is also said that Ānanda, now thinking he was fit to enter the assembly, delighted and rejoicing, went there shining like a full moon on a cloudless night, like a lotus blooming at the sun's touch, his face pure and radiant as though he were announcing his attaining of *Arahantship*. According to another version: “Ānanda, not wishing to tell of his attainment of *Arahantship*, did not go with the monks. They asked whom an empty seat was for, and hearing it was for Ānanda, asked where he had gone. At this moment he thought: Now is the time for me to go and displaying his psychic power, plunging into the earth, he showed himself as it were in his own seat. Some say he sat down after going through the air.”

His *Arahantship*, however, did not appear to have commanded much respect. After the Council was over, he told the elders what the Lord had said at the time of his *Parinibbāna* about abolishing the “lesser and minor rules of training”. This acted like a goad on the elders and they charged him with one offence of wrongdoing after another - all of which must have been committed before he attained *Arahantship*, even the imputed offence of allowing women, to weep and lament beside Gotama’s body. I know of no other occasion recorded in the *Pāli* Canon where an *Arahant* is asked to confess offences said to have been committed by him before gaining liberation. This episode therefore not only puts the accusing elders in a very dubious light, it also indicates that offences of wrongdoing could be invented after Gotama’s pas a
way. But as the offences with which Ānanda was charged were all concerned with the Founder himself, they are not likely to be repeated.

What must be regarded as a more dignified and correct attitude was taken, later, by Ānanda himself when he was sent to inflict the supreme or highest penalty, *Brahmadanda*, on Channa. Channa was so much overcome by the thought of submitting to this penalty of ostracism that he took himself seriously in hand and won *Arahantship* - the second monk recorded in this Section to do so. Ānanda then tells him that from the moment he won it the highest penalty became revoked - automatically - for him. This is the Channa who was Gotama’s charioteer while he was still the *Bodhisatta*. It was because of his affection for Gotama, and then because of his pride in our Buddha, our *Dhamma* that he was unable to carry out the *Samaṇadhamma*, the rule for recluse36, until he had received the emotional shock (*Saṃvega*) of the imposition of the supreme penalty on him.

Oldenberg states that the story of the First Council as it has come down to us in the *Cullavagga*, is not history, but pure invention and, moreover, invention of no very ancient date He bases his argument on a comparison with the *Mahaparinibbāna - Sattanta* which, while it contains passages word for word the same as in the *Cullavagga*, yet makes no allusion either to Kassapa’s proposal for holding a Council, or to the Council itself. Oldenberg concludes that “the author” of the *Milindapañña* did not know anything of the First Council. Certainly, his silence is otherwise hard to account for unless we allow that ‘he’ (the author, who should rather be spoken of as the compiler or compilers) did not want to refer to it. We are accustomed in the *Pāli*

36 *Theragāthā* Commentary. i.p. 166
canon to finding the same stories running parallel up to a certain point and then turning off into different endings. It is possible that we have such a case here; and that the opening part of Cv. XI was told so as to lead up to the proposal to convene a Council, while the same story was told in the Dīgha (with the transposition of the Subhadda incident) so as to lead up to the account of the disposal of the relics. This affected the Buddha’s body, whereas the Council of Rājagaha was held in the attempt to get clear precisely what had been his Dhamma and discipline. Recited by 500 elders, it could carry weight.

Nevertheless, the Pāli recension of the Council may be neither wholly correct nor wholly complete. It is one of several versions stemming from different schools and whose canons may vary from sect to sect. The late Professor Przyluski was of the opinion that, in respect of this Council, the sutras may contain older material than the Vinayas. He collected a number of versions of both and presented them, translated into French, in his valuable work: Le Concile de Rājagaha, Paris, 1926. The student is referred to this book; he will then be able to make any comparisons he wishes between the Pāli Vinaya account and the others. For it is not a necessary function of this S.B.B. Series to stray from the Pāli texts themselves.

2.12. Sattasatikkhandhakaṃ

(1). Second Buddhist Council BE 100 (-444 BCE)

One hundred years after the Parinibbāna of the Buddha the Second Buddhist Council was held at Vesāli in order to examine and suppress

---
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10 practices that ran counter to the *Vinaya*, by a group of Vajjian monks. In the *Cullavagga*, it is said that the Vajjian monks were practicing the Ten Points (*Dasa Vathuni*) that were regarded as unorthodox by Venerable Yasa of Kosambi who was at Vesāli.

These Ten Points were:

(i). The practice of carrying salt in a horn for use when needed.
(ii). The practice of taking food after midday.
(iii). The practice of going to a neighboring village and taking a second meal the same day (the offence of overeating).
(iv). The observance of *Uposathas* in different places within the same parish.
(v). The practice of performing an ecclesiastical act and obtaining its sanction afterward.
(vi). The practice of using customary practices as precedents.
(vii). The practice of drinking milk whey after meals.
(viii). The drinking of fermented palm juice that is not yet toddy.
(xi). The use of a borderless sheet for sitting.
(x). The acceptance of gold or silver.

Also at issue was the Vajjian monk reluctance to accept the *Suttas* and the *Vinaya* as the final authority on the Buddha’s teachings.

The Vajjian monks however pronounced the penalty of *Pāṭisāraniyakamma* upon Yasa, which required him to apologize to the laity who had been forbidden by Yasa to carry out the precepts of the Vajjian monks.
Yasa defended his own views before the laity and by his eloquent advocacy won them over to his side, thus increasing the fury of the monks who expelled Yasa from the Saṅgha.

Yasa went to Kausambi and sent messengers to the Bhikkhus of the western country of Avanti and of the southern country, inviting them to assemble and decide the question in order to ensure the preservation of the Vinaya.

Next, he went to Ahoganga hill where Sambhuta Sanavasi dwelt, told him about the Vajjian monk’s practices and invited him to take part in resolving this question. Venerable Sanavasi agreed.

At the same time, about 60 Arahants from the western country and 88 from Avanti and the southern country assembled at Ahoganga hill, enlisting the support of Venerable Revata of Sahajati.

Venerable Revata suggested that they would settle the dispute at the place of its origin. Thus, a council of 700 Bhikkhus was held at Vesāli to discuss the “Ten Points” of the Vajjian Bhikkhus and to settle the disputes between the Vajjian monks and Yasa. It is estimated that this took place in the Valikarama in Vesāli in the year of King Kālāsoka’s reign.

(2). Proceedings of the Second Buddhist Council

There were eight members selected in the committee, which comprised of four members from each of the east and west countries. Bhikkhu Sabbakami was the president. Bhikkhu Revata asked the questions and Sabbakami responded to them.
The Accounts of the *Dīpavaṃsa* and *Samantapāsādikā* said that king *Kālāsoka*, a descendant of *Ajātasattu*, was at first in favor of the Vajjjian monks but later gave his support to the council of Theras.

The *Dīpavaṃsa* also mentions the “Vajjian Council”. The Vajjian monks disagreed with the decision of the council chaired by *Sabbakami* and convened the *Mahāsaṅgīti* (Great Council). After the Second Buddhist Council the Vajjian monks did not want to remain in the *Saṅgha* of the *Theravāda* or *Sthaviravāda*. Thus, they left and formed a new *Saṅgha* known as the *Mahāsaṅgha* or *Mahāsāṃghika*, “The Great Congregation”.

The schism marks the first beginning of what would later evolve into *Mahāyana* Buddhism, which would come to dominate Buddhism in northern Asia (China, Tibet, Japan and Korea).

The Twelfth Section is more truly characterised at its end as “a chanting of discipline” than is Section XI. For this chanting by the 700 monks is concerned with ten points of discipline only, and whether these could not be relaxed. The very fact that they were called in question shows that, in the years that had passed since the Buddha’s *Mahāparinibbāna*, a less austere attitude, a more demanding note had crept in. It was to determine which was to be followed - the less austere attitude or the more austere one - that this Council was held.

It was ultimately the monk Yasa, the son of Kakandaka, who was responsible for the “chanting of discipline” which, limited to the ten points, was the subject before the Council of Vesālī. Various Commentaries recognise this by referring to this chanting as *Yasattherassa Saṅgīti*, the Recital of the Elder Yasa. He got the laypeople on his side by telling them three stories where the Buddha had
denounced the acceptance of gold and silver by monks - the tenth point, and possibly the most important; and that he aroused much interest among the monks is clear from the records. The endless disputation that arose, the speeches made whose meanings were not clear (XII. 2. 7) impelled the elder Revata, whose opinion on the ten points in question coincided with Yasa’s, to select a referendum of eight monks to settle the points. Their decision still holds good to - day in Theravadin countries. In the traditional way of the democratic Order, all the monks present were asked to agree on the eight elders proposed by Revata. They further agreed on a ninth monk, Ajita, to appoint the seats for the elders who would be listening to the proceedings.

The exact place in Vesāli where the Council was held is doubtful. The Cullavagga (CV. XII. 2. 7) says it took place in the Valika monastery, as does the Mahāvaṃsa; but the Dipavaṃsa lays the scene in the Hall of the Gabled House. It is perhaps of no great importance, except as adding to the confusion, which surrounds the legends of the Councils. What the Vinaya record of the Council of Vesāli clearly indicates is that there was enough dissatisfaction among certain monks to bring about a schism, if not checked, with the attendant danger of Dhamma turning into not - Dhamma and discipline into not - discipline.

It may be asked why the Cullavagga is rounded off by the Sections dealing with the first two Councils, and which make the Cullavagga longer by two Sections than the Māhavagga. Whether they were a later addition or not, it can be only suggested that they are included, reasonably and suitably as it seems to me, at the end of the enormously long compendium of discipline for monks and nuns so as to
give a culminating authority and sanction to this discipline, which at the
time of the Council of Vesāli, had been tested for a “century”.

All the words spoken by the Buddha between his attainment of
supreme self - awakening and his Parinibbāna have but the one flavour,
that of freedom. This is a characteristic of the Buddhavacana. Freedom
is to be sought and realised by those who have entered on the Way. For
their help and guidance, there are two parts of the Buddhavacana,
namely Dhamma and discipline.

3. The Moral Values in the Khandhaka

When we remember that the cultivation of mindfulness and
awareness is a central discipline in the Buddha’s Teaching, that the
Suttas were arranged in as mnemonic a manner as possible, that monks
were encouraged to review often the discourses in their minds and that
they were expected to meet frequently for group rehearsals, both within
their own company and together with other companies, we will not be
surprised that at a time when memorization was the only way to transmit
the Teaching, such an ability, assiduously fostered, would be
widespread and reliable. It will be seen, then, that it was not (as is often
asserted) due to the writing down of the texts that they achieved their
definitive form. Well before that time, when they had come to be
regarded as sacred, there already existed a method whereby they could
be transmitted from generation to generation without error.

Not everyone agreed with what was being done. A wandering
monk, the leader of a large company, Venerable Purana, while travelling
through the Southern Hills south of Rājagaha, came to the cave in the
canebrake where the Council was meeting. At this time the Vinaya and
Suttas had already been recited (i.e. organized, assigned and rehearsed).
“Friend Puraṇa,” the elders said to him, “the Teaching and Discipline have been recited together by the elder monks. Please submit yourself to this recitation.”

“Friends,” he replied, “the Teaching and Discipline are well - recited by the elders. But in the way I have heard them in the Exalted One’s presence, in the way that I have received them in his presence, thus will I bear it in mind.”

Thereby Venerable Puraṇa rejected not only the organization of the Suttas into collections but, apparently, the structuring of the Suttas individually into the form in which they had been cast for transmission. The Council had no “legal” status by which it could compel other monks to submit to it. Decisions nor is the notion of compulsion consistent with the spirit of the Suttas and the Vinaya: its strength lay in the collective repute, the upright conduct, and the wisdom of its individual members. They could urge, and perhaps generally receive, compliance; but they could not command it. Probably, then, Venerable Puraṇa was not the only teacher who chose to go his own way. Others too, though acknowledging that the Council’s recension was well - recited - i.e. providing right-view guidance - may have preferred to continue teaching according to their own methods. We do not know for sure for none of those other traditions have survived. The only record we have today of the Buddha’s Teaching is that dependent upon the collective repute, the upright conduct, and the wisdom of the individuals who comprised the First Council.
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4. Analysis of the Contents of the Cullavagga

The whole subject of the legal questions and their settlement, although complicated, must be studied by anyone who wishes to grasp an important branch of the disciplinary proceedings of the Order together with the very exact machinery laid down for carrying them out. A certain pattern will be found to emerge.

In *Khandaha* (Section) IV, Dabba the Mallian is taken as the example, and his story is told in the same words as in Formal Meeting VIII. But in the Formal Meeting, the interest, at the end, is shifted to the monks who accused him and who incur an offence for doing so; while in the *Cullavagga* the interest is centred on Dabba who is to have a verdict of innocence accorded him. We must therefore understand that this is a case where two separate actions of the Order were called for: one dealing with the monks who brought the false accusation against Dabba, and one for acquitting him.

Section IV deals with two aspects: speaking in accordance and not in accordance. This short enumeration of the different categories occurring in the subsequent paragraphs is quite in the style of the *Abhidhamma* texts.

Section V is a Section well worth studying for the light it throws on contemporary manners and the things in common usage. We know from the Buddhist charms or spells, one of which is to be found in this Section (V. 6), that such runes or chants for self-guarding played, a not negligible part in Early Buddhist life.